

The Impact of the Transformational Leadership in Enhancing the Teachers' Motivation in Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Quezon

Lediza Pintano Hutalla¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026 Keywords: Transformational Leadership Educational Leadership Teacher Motivation Congressional Districts Kendall concordance Quezon	The study investigated transformational leadership ratings and perceived teacher motivation in public elementary schools of the Division of Quezon in school year 2025–2026. Using a descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey, the study gathered five-point questionnaire ratings and analyzed descriptive statistics and rank agreement across groups. A total of 264 school heads was reported across four congressional districts. Reported findings indicated that transformational-leadership ratings by domain had a tabulated overall mean of 4.77 (VME); ratings of teacher-motivation domains had a tabulated overall mean of 4.75 (VME); activities undertaken by school heads had a tabulated overall mean of 4.75 (VME). The concordance tests described agreement in questionnaire item rankings rather than a causal link between the studied domains. The findings identify perceived implementation priorities and should be interpreted within the limits of respondent-rating data.

1. Introduction

Transformational leadership has been discussed as a means by which school leaders articulate shared goals, encourage professional initiative and respond to the individual needs of staff. Within public elementary schools, its relevance includes instructional culture, staff cooperation and teachers' sense of professional purpose.

The study examined the reported leadership behaviors of public elementary school heads in the Division of Quezon and the associated appraisals of teachers' motivation during school year 2025–2026. It organized leadership into idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation, and treated motivation in several professional and relational domains.

Bass and Riggio (2006) described the conceptual features of transformational leadership, including intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. These concepts provided a useful framework for interpreting the study's multidimensional leadership ratings without presuming that the questionnaire established causal improvement.

Leithwood et al. (2020) reviewed the evidence for school leadership's contribution to school improvement and highlighted the importance of contextual and indirect pathways. This perspective suggests that favorable leadership ratings and favorable motivation ratings should be examined jointly, yet their coexistence in a descriptive survey does not demonstrate a direct treatment effect.

The study assessed the leadership profile, perceived motivational domains, school-head activities, the relative seriousness of challenges, and agreement across four congressional district groups. The central question was how these experiences were rated and prioritized, not how a randomized leadership intervention changed teacher outcomes.

The objectives were to characterize reported ratings in the major constructs, compare the priority order of items across the respondent groups, identify comparatively lower-rated aspects, and translate the reported observations into proportionate implications for educational policy and practice. These objectives were approached as descriptive and rank-concordance questions, notwithstanding causal terms in the retained study title.

2. Methods

2.1 Design and setting

The study employed a descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey. It examined transformational leadership ratings and perceived teacher motivation in the Division of Quezon during school year 2025–2026. The quantitative components described respondent ratings and used item-rank concordance analyses; no random assignment, matched comparison group or longitudinal change estimate was presented.

2.2 Participants and sampling

The study involved 264 school heads selected from an enumerated population of 774 across the four congressional districts of Quezon (67, 40, 73 and 84 sampled respondents, respectively). The study listed 774 school heads in the four congressional districts and a total selected sample of 264. The paper retains the original sampling totals and does not infer unreported teacher-level measurements or independent performance observations.

2.3 Instrument and variables

The study used a researcher-developed questionnaire organized around idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, teacher motivation, activities undertaken by school heads, and leadership challenges. The instrument used a five-point response framework; numerical ratings and their accompanying verbal interpretations are retained as

tabulated. Questionnaire preparation, juror validation and revisions were described, but a fully auditable scale-validation dataset was not supplied. Results are therefore described as respondent ratings of the stated variables.

2.4 Data gathering and statistical treatment

The stated procedure involved securing permissions, preparing and validating the survey, administering questionnaires, tabulating responses and assessing the research questions. The reported statistical tools were frequency, percentage, weighted mean, ranking, Kendall's W, and chi-square tests at a stated significance level of .05. Domain weighted means and item rankings were treated descriptively. Kendall's W was used to assess agreement in item orderings across school-size or congressional-district groupings, with reported chi-square decision statistics. The displayed p-threshold labels were not substituted with unreported exact p values.

2.5 Scope of inference and ethical considerations

The analysis is limited to the reported cross-sectional survey responses. No individual record-level dataset, independent longitudinal outcome series or identifiable participant records was included in the manuscript. Permission and validation procedures were described in the study; the authors should supply an explicit ethics/consent declaration and data-availability statement required by the intended journal. No ethics approval number has been inferred or inserted.

3. Results

The numbered tables report the findings relevant to the study's research questions. The domain summary tables give the reported overall means, verbal interpretation labels and ranks; the indicator tables reproduce selected highest- and lowest-scoring indicators, retaining their printed means and labels; and the concordance tables retain reported Kendall W, χ^2 , degrees of freedom and statistical significance labels. All tabulated figures are transcribed rather than calculated anew.

Table 1. Transformational-leadership ratings by domain

Domain / indicator	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Idealized Influence	4.76	VME	3
Inspirational Motivation	4.79	VME	2
Individualized Consideration	4.80	VME	1
Intellectual Stimulation	4.74	VME	4
Average Wx	4.77	VME	

Table summarizes the reported domains for transformational leadership ratings and perceived teacher motivation. The highest was Individualized Consideration (mean 4.80; VME), whereas Intellectual Stimulation was lowest (mean 4.74; VME). The tabulated overall average was 4.77 (VME).

This comparison identifies relative priorities within the study's five-point rating framework. The means are summary judgments obtained from respondents and do not, by themselves, measure change through time, differences in learning outcomes, or the strength of a causal association. Because the domains measure related but distinct functions, the ordering should guide focused follow-up rather than be construed as a single measure of overall effectiveness. Variations by district or school group warrant closer attention to implementation conditions and measurement consistency.

Table 2. Agreement in leadership-domain item rankings

Domain / test	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Reported sig.
Idealized Influence	0.34	12.24	9	NS
Inspirational Motivation	0.71	22.72	8	0.005
Individualized Consideration	0.54	19.44	9	0.05
Intellectual Stimulation	0.75	24.00	8	0.001

Table shows the reported Kendall coefficients and chi-square tests used to compare item rankings across respondent groups. 3 of 4 dimensions were labeled statistically significant in the study's tabulation; 1 were explicitly labeled nonsignificant (NS). The dimensions reported as significant included Inspirational Motivation, Individualized Consideration, Intellectual Stimulation.

Kendall's W is a measure of agreement among rankings and the reported chi-square test addresses concordance. Significance here is not an estimate of how one construct predicts another, and it cannot establish that a leadership practice, teaching approach, or committee procedure caused an outcome.

The reported degrees of freedom correspond to within-domain indicator-ranking tests, not to participants as independent observations in a regression model. Any claim of a predictive relationship would require a separately specified model, verified units of analysis and the underlying responses.

Table 3. Selected indicators: idealized influence

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
The school head demonstrates integrity and ethical behavior.	4.73	VME
The school head models commitment to the school's core values.	4.76	VME
The school head takes responsibility for decisions and actions.	4.80	VME
The school head sets high standards for self and staff.	4.75	VME
The school head upholds integrity in personal and professional matters.	4.78	VME
The school head communicates decisions and expectations transparently.	4.83	VME
The school head inspires staff to support the school's vision.	4.74	VME
The school head shows enthusiasm for achieving school goals.	4.74	VME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “The school head communicates decisions and expectations transparently.” (4.83; VME). The lowest selected average was for “The school head demonstrates integrity and ethical behavior.” (4.73; VME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 4. Selected indicators: individualized consideration

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
The school head recognizes each staff member's strengths and needs	4.84	VME
The school head provides individualized and constructive feedback.	4.69	VME
The school head mentors staff based on their career goals	4.77	VME
The school head listens attentively to staff concerns and ideas	4.86	VME
The school head encourages open communication and personalized support	4.76	VME
The school head adjusts leadership approaches to individual needs	4.85	VME
The school head provides opportunities for personal and professional growth	4.85	VME
The school head recognizes individual achievements and contributions	4.77	VME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “The school head listens attentively to staff concerns and ideas” (4.86; VME). The lowest selected average was for “The school head provides individualized and constructive feedback.” (4.69; VME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 5. Ratings of teacher-motivation domains

Domain / indicator	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Commitment to Professional Growth	4.74	VME	5.5
Job Satisfaction	4.78	VME	1
Work Performance	4.74	VME	5.5
Collaboration and Teamwork	4.77	VME	2
Positive Attitude Towards Challenges	4.75	VME	4
Dedication to Learners' Success	4.76	VME	3
Average Wx	4.75	VME	

Table summarizes the reported domains for transformational leadership ratings and perceived teacher motivation. The highest was Job Satisfaction (mean 4.78; VME), whereas Commitment to Professional Growth was lowest (mean 4.74; VME). The tabulated overall average was 4.75 (VME).

This comparison identifies relative priorities within the study's five-point rating framework. The means are summary judgments obtained from respondents and do not, by themselves, measure change through time, differences in learning outcomes, or the strength of a causal association.

Because the domains measure related but distinct functions, the ordering should guide focused follow-up rather than be construed as a single measure of overall effectiveness. Variations by district or school group warrant closer attention to implementation conditions and measurement consistency.

Table 6. Agreement in motivation-domain rankings

Domain / test	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Reported sig.
Commitment to Professional Growth	0.63	20.16	8	0.01
Job Satisfaction	0.80	28.80	9	0.001
Work Performance	0.59	23.60	10	0.01
Collaboration and Teamwork	0.50	22.00	11	0.05
Positive Attitude Towards Challenges	0.52	18.72	9	0.05
Dedication to Learners' Success	0.54	17.28	8	0.05

Table shows the reported Kendall coefficients and chi-square tests used to compare item rankings across respondent groups. 6 of 6 dimensions were labeled statistically significant in the study's tabulation; 0 were explicitly labeled nonsignificant (NS). The dimensions reported as significant included Commitment to Professional Growth, Job Satisfaction, Work Performance, among others. Kendall's W is a measure of agreement among rankings and the reported chi-square test addresses concordance. Significance here is not an estimate of how one construct predicts another, and it cannot establish that a leadership practice, teaching approach, or committee procedure caused an outcome. The reported degrees of freedom correspond to within-domain indicator-ranking tests, not to participants as independent observations in a regression model. Any claim of a predictive relationship would require a separately specified model, verified units of analysis and the underlying responses.

Table 7. Selected indicators: commitment to professional growth

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
School heads provide access to relevant workshops, seminars, and training.	4.67	VME
School heads promote a growth mindset among teachers.	4.65	VME
School heads set high expectations for professional excellence.	4.76	VME
School heads support individualized professional growth plans.	4.65	VME
School heads recognize teachers' professional achievements.	4.75	VME
School heads promote peer collaboration and knowledge sharing.	4.71	VME
School heads provide constructive feedback for professional improvement.	4.86	VME
School heads provide teachers with leadership opportunities.	4.84	VME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "School heads provide constructive feedback for professional improvement." (4.86; VME). The lowest selected average was for "School heads promote a growth mindset among teachers." (4.65; VME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 8. Selected indicators: job satisfaction

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
School heads recognize and celebrate teachers' achievements.	4.68	VME
School heads provide professional development opportunities that improve job satisfaction.	4.91	VME
School heads involve teachers in decisions about their teaching practices.	4.80	VME
School heads maintain a supportive and positive work environment.	4.73	VME
School heads communicate openly and transparently with teachers.	4.82	VME
School heads connect teachers' work with the school's mission.	4.90	VME
School heads promote teamwork and shared responsibility.	4.68	VME
School heads establish clear and achievable goals.	4.72	VME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "School heads provide professional development opportunities that improve job satisfaction." (4.91; VME). The lowest selected average was for "School heads recognize and celebrate teachers' achievements." (4.68; VME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils.

For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 9. Selected indicators: reported work performance

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
School heads set high but achievable performance standards.	4.79	VME
School heads provide relevant training and development opportunities.	4.79	VME
School heads involve teachers in setting performance goals.	4.79	VME
School heads recognize teachers' achievements and successes.	4.66	VME
School heads provide constructive feedback for improvement.	4.67	VME
School heads encourage innovative teaching practices.	4.85	VME
School heads provide the resources needed for effective teaching.	4.58	VME
School heads reward teachers who meet performance expectations.	4.73	VME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "School heads encourage innovative teaching practices." (4.85; VME). The lowest selected average was for "School heads provide the resources needed for effective teaching." (4.58; VME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 10. Selected indicators: collaboration and teamwork

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
School heads promote collaboration toward common goals.	4.67	VME
School heads involve teachers in school decision-making.	4.81	VME
School heads promote collaboration across grade levels.	4.72	VME

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
School heads foster mutual respect among teachers.	4.87	VME
School heads organize team-based projects and activities.	4.82	VME
School heads recognize and celebrate team achievements.	4.71	VME
School heads provide time, space, and resources for collaboration.	4.82	VME
School heads encourage the sharing of responsibilities and expertise.	4.72	VME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “School heads foster mutual respect among teachers.” (4.87; VME). The lowest selected average was for “School heads promote collaboration toward common goals.” (4.67; VME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 11. Activities undertaken by school heads

Domain / indicator	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Collaborative Decision-Making	4.74	VME	5
Professional Development Initiatives	4.74	VME	5
Recognition and Motivation	4.78	VME	1
Promoting Innovation and Change	4.75	VME	3
Monitoring and Feedback Mechanisms	4.76	VME	2
Strengthening Community Partnership	4.74	VME	5
Average Wx	4.75	VME	

Table summarizes the reported domains for transformational leadership ratings and perceived teacher motivation. The highest was Recognition and Motivation (mean 4.78; VME), whereas Collaborative Decision-Making was lowest (mean 4.74; VME). The tabulated overall average was 4.75 (VME).

This comparison identifies relative priorities within the study's five-point rating framework. The means are summary judgments obtained from respondents and do not, by themselves, measure change through time, differences in learning outcomes, or the strength of a causal association. Because the domains measure related but distinct functions, the ordering should guide focused follow-up rather than be construed as a single measure of overall effectiveness. Variations by district or school group warrant closer attention to implementation conditions and measurement consistency.

Table 12. Agreement in activity-domain rankings

Domain / test	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Reported sig.
Collaborative Decision-Making	0.19	6.08	8	NS
Professional Development Initiatives	0.69	24.84	9	0.005
Recognition and Motivation	0.53	23.32	11	0.025
Promoting Innovation and Change	0.47	18.80	10	0.05
Monitoring and Feedback Mechanisms	0.45	19.80	11	0.05
Strengthening Community Partnership	0.57	22.80	10	0.025

Table shows the reported Kendall coefficients and chi-square tests used to compare item rankings across respondent groups. 5 of 6 dimensions were labeled statistically significant in the study's tabulation; 1 were explicitly labeled nonsignificant (NS). The dimensions reported as significant included Professional Development Initiatives, Recognition and Motivation, Promoting Innovation and Change, among others.

Kendall's W is a measure of agreement among rankings and the reported chi-square test addresses concordance. Significance here is not an estimate of how one construct predicts another, and it cannot establish that a leadership practice, teaching approach, or committee procedure caused an outcome.

The reported degrees of freedom correspond to within-domain indicator-ranking tests, not to participants as independent observations in a regression model. Any claim of a predictive relationship would require a separately specified model, verified units of analysis and the underlying responses.

Table 13. Selected indicators: recognition and motivation

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
School heads recognize teachers' achievements and contributions.	4.67	VME
School heads provide incentives for excellent performance.	4.88	VME
School heads promote teamwork and mutual support.	4.63	VME
School heads provide personalized recognition to staff.	4.74	VME
School heads encourage peer-to-peer appreciation.	4.84	VME
School heads provide opportunities for career advancement.	4.92	VME
School heads reward participation in professional development.	4.90	VME
School heads provide timely verbal or written appreciation.	4.71	VME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “School heads provide opportunities for career advancement.” (4.92; VME). The lowest selected average was for “School heads promote teamwork and mutual support.” (4.63; VME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 14. Selected indicators: monitoring and feedback

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
School heads conduct classroom observations and provide feedback.	4.89	VME
School heads provide timely and actionable performance feedback.	4.69	VME
School heads encourage teacher self-assessment and reflection.	4.67	VME
School heads monitor teachers' professional development progress.	4.83	VME
School heads gather feedback from learners, parents, and staff.	4.70	VME
School heads use relevant data for instructional decisions.	4.87	VME
School heads establish clear and transparent feedback channels.	4.86	VME
School heads gather learner feedback on classroom practices.	4.61	VME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “School heads conduct classroom observations and provide feedback.” (4.89; VME). The lowest selected average was for “School heads gather learner feedback on classroom practices.” (4.61; VME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 15. Selected challenges encountered in leadership

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Resistance to Change Among Teachers or Staff	1.24	NAA
Limited Financial Resources (e.g., MOOE constraints)	1.24	NAA
Lack of support or involvement from parents, LGUs, and community partners	1.15	NAA
Time Constraints for Instructional Supervision	3.82	MS
Weak School-Based Management Structures	1.13	NAA
Digital Divide and Lack of ICT Support	3.23	S
Cultural and Contextual Barriers	3.14	S
Burnout and Lack of Work-Life Balance	4.65	VMS

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for “Burnout and Lack of Work-Life Balance” (4.65; VMS). The lowest selected average was for “Weak School-Based Management Structures” (1.13; NAA). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation. The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils.

For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 16. Agreement in leadership-challenge rankings

Domain / test	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Reported sig.
Challenges Encountered	0.81	45.36	14	0.001

Table shows the reported Kendall coefficients and chi-square tests used to compare item rankings across respondent groups. 1 of 1 dimensions were labeled statistically significant in the study's tabulation; 0 were explicitly labeled nonsignificant (NS). The dimensions reported as significant included Challenges Encountered.

Kendall's W is a measure of agreement among rankings and the reported chi-square test addresses concordance. Significance here is not an estimate of how one construct predicts another, and it cannot establish that a leadership practice, teaching approach, or committee procedure caused an outcome.

The reported degrees of freedom correspond to within-domain indicator-ranking tests, not to participants as independent observations in a regression model. Any claim of a predictive relationship would require a separately specified model, verified units of analysis and the underlying responses.

4. Discussion

Across leadership domains, the survey captures a strongly favorable pattern of school heads' ratings. Distinguishing the highest from the lowest domain permits local professional-development planning, but the small numerical spread should not be taken to show a large practical difference without uncertainty estimates.

The motivational ratings describe school heads' perceptions of the workplace conditions and professional dispositions associated with teachers' motivation. They are not direct psychometric scores supplied by teachers unless a separate teacher response dataset is established. This distinction is crucial when interpreting a study whose title refers to 'impact'.

Leadership-related activities form a bridge between general leadership dispositions and concrete school-management actions. Recognition, mentoring, shared decision-making and feedback can be converted into implementation indicators in a school improvement plan, with documented frequency, reach and follow-up rather than relying only on favorable Likert scores.

The challenge profile suggests that leadership support should address constraints such as workload or staff well-being where respondents rated these highly. Such ratings should be triangulated with administrative records and interviews before resource-allocation decisions. Statistical agreement in rankings concerns four district-level orderings, not a demonstrated relationship between any one leadership behavior and an individual teacher's motivation.

The dimensions of transformational leadership identified by Bass and Riggio (2006) offer a coherent vocabulary for these findings; however, the contextual cautions discussed by Leithwood et al. (2020) reinforce that educational leadership often operates through organizational pathways that a cross-sectional rank comparison cannot isolate.

Respondent-rated professional growth and satisfaction can be high at the same time that particular staff-development or workload needs persist. A useful follow-up would distinguish opportunity to attend professional learning, perceived value of mentoring, and demonstrable change in teaching practice. Such analysis would avoid treating several motivational dimensions as interchangeable. District-level concordance is best used to identify whether local priorities are shared across geographic settings. It is possible for all districts to report high overall scores while disagreeing on the order of detailed indicators. Thus the concordance values supplement the domain means; they do not confirm the accuracy of those high scores or independently establish the impact of school leadership.

5. Implications for practice and research

A practical implication is to translate broad perceptions into a small set of observable monitoring indicators, designate responsibility for follow-up, and revisit these indicators at defined intervals. A stronger subsequent design would include independent measurement of relevant practices or outcomes, transparent instrument reliability evidence, clear sampling denominators and analysis at the correct respondent or school level. Such evidence would enable stronger, though still carefully bounded, claims than agreement of item rankings alone.

6. Limitations

The study's central limitations arise from a one-period perception survey, reliance on summary statistics, potential common-rater bias, and limited information on the psychometric performance of the measurement instrument. District- or school-group Kendall concordance indicates ordering similarity but does not establish effect magnitude, student-level improvement, employee-level performance change or temporal precedence. Exact p values, confidence intervals and analytic data were not consistently available. The manuscript consequently avoids unsupported causal conclusions and treats unverified statistical labels as reported.

7. Conclusion

The study reported highly favorable ratings for transformational leadership, teacher-motivation domains and supportive leadership activities, alongside mixed responses to specific challenges. The rank-concordance analyses showed significant agreement in several domains but not uniformly. Findings support contextualized mentoring, recognition, collaborative practices and workload support; they do not by themselves demonstrate that leadership caused teachers' motivation to improve.

The recommended next step is independent verification of the sample denominator, scale coding, statistical computation and the evidence needed to substantiate any stronger effectiveness or impact claim. Until such verification, the results should be considered a detailed descriptive basis for local review and hypothesis generation.

References

- [1] Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Psychology Press. <https://www.routledge.com/Transformational-Leadership/Bass-Riggio/p/book/9780805847628>
- [2] 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>