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Instructional Leadership, Work Motivation, and Work Performance of History Teachers in Sabah, Malaysia

ABSTRACT: The study involved 120 teachers, who teach History in Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia. Respondents were given a questionnaire, which consisted of three parts. Part A consisted of demographic questions. Part B consisted of 55 items that were on instructional leadership. Part C consisted of 20 items on work motivation; and Part D consisted of 30 items on teacher performance. A total of four hypotheses have been presented in this study. Data test has been measured and tested by using descriptive statistics and ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) with significance level $p < 0.01$. The findings of Pearson correlation analysis showed a significant relationship of instructional leadership and teacher performance in History ($r = .523$, $sig = .000$). While the findings of Pearson correlation analysis showed no significant difference of work motivation and work performance of History subject teachers ($r = .172$, $sig = .060$). In terms of implications of the study found that History teachers, who practice instructional leadership in their teaching and learning, will show a positive impact on teacher performance in History.
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INTRODUCTION

A History subject is one of core subjects to secondary students in the Integrated Curriculum for Secondary Schools or KBSM (Kurikulum Bersepadu Sekolah Menengah) in Malaysia. In line with the implementation of this KBSM, changed the subject position. This
subject is compulsory for all secondary school students on an ongoing basis from form one to five. This is a positive effort of the Ministry of Education in Malaysia, in emphasizing the importance of this subject in the context of an integrated education and school curriculum (KPM, 1990).

History records many events of human life to be learned and guidelines (Arbai’yah, 2002). History should be a fun subject to learn, but so what happened in the History of the school environment is considered a boring subject (cf Abd Rashid, 2000; Razaq Ahmad & Ali Seman, 2000; Razaq Ahmad & Suwirta, 2007; and Ahmad, Abd Rahman & Atiqah Abdullah, 2009). It is often stated that students were bored and not interested in History, due to teacher factor (Ahmad, Abd Rahman & Atiqah Abdullah, 2009).

This subject has many objectives and goals contained in order to produce students who would know the historical development in Malaysia and around the world, as well as to stimulate the thinking of students through the learning process experienced by them. Teaching and learning of History in the classroom and outside the classroom should not be rigid (cf Abd Rashid, 2002; and Aziz & Nik Ismail, 2007).

In the study of Anuar Ahmad, Siti Haishah Abd Rahman & Nur Atiqah Abdullah, they found that many students experience in the process of teaching and learning of History in secondary schools as boring and pointless (Ahmad, Abd Rahman & Atiqah Abdullah, 2009). In fact, there are teachers who teach this History are not aware of what is meant by a better History lesson, but they also teach as they were taught by their previous teachers.

They repeated of ideas in the teaching of History, because students to feel bored, tired, and not interested in History. This is due to the methods of teaching History is examination oriented (cf Berliner, 1988; and Jamil, 2003). Students also thought that this subject is not challenging stereotype, static, and boring (KPM, 2004b).

However, it is obvious that History is not a static subject, traditional, or limited to emphasizing memorization of facts; and to be narrative and descriptive as understood by most people. Therefore, teachers need to choose the method of teaching that can being both exciting and challenging students’ ability to stimulate learning fun, social, moral, spiritual; and create a positive perspective since History is useful for the future (Ahmad, Abd Rahman & Atiqah Abdullah, 2009).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The government of Malaysia stated that students must pass their History examination in SPM (Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia or Malaysian Certificate of Education) in 2013; and this has made History an important subject in school. In fact, the subject is the core subjects for all secondary schools from form one to five. The subject must be taken by each PMR (Penilaian Menengah Rendah or Lower Secondary Assessment) and SPM candidates. However, according to a report released by the Division of State History Curriculum, the results of the students in the PMR and SPM for the subject of the state were not satisfactory since only SPM 2010 experienced an increase in the percentage pass, while the result of History in the PMR experienced a decrease in percentage of passing for two consecutive years (cited in SPA Negeri Sabah, 2011).

If we look closely, this History subject is an interesting subject, because it contains information about early human history, the remains of artifacts, narration heritage of human civilization, and the struggle of their predecessor (KPM, 2000 and 2001). In addition, the subject is a subject that is full of facts (Aziz & Nik Ismail, 2007); but the method of instruction delivered to students has caused History to turn
into a boring subject (KPM, 2003b; and KPM, 2004b); and poorly absorbed by
the student (Razaq Ahmad & Ali Seman, 2000; Abd Rashid, 2001; and Ahmad,
Abd Rahman & Atiqah Abdullah, 2009).
Rupawan Ahmad (1990) asserted
that History has moral education and
nationalism. This has caused the lack of
interest among students. This situation,
he said, is actually happening in many
countries in the world, including our
country, Malaysia. In our country, for
example, History is not the preferred
subject among students. If they were
given a choice, many students are not
willing to learn History. Generally, the
students cannot feel the importance and
significance of learning history. Students
often responded that learning History
is not a fun experience and boring (cf
Murphy, 1988a; and Ahmad, 1990).
The subject of History contains
many abstract ideas and concepts that
are sometimes difficult to understand
(Ahmad, 1990). This concept is
important for shaping the thinking and
intellectual form students (Ismail, Aziz
& Nur Puteh, 2009). These conditions
cause to students to lose interest in
this History subject; and, thus, affect
their academic performance. Students’
academic achievement in public
examinations is the main criteria in
determining the effectiveness of a school
in this country (Ahmad, Abd Rahman &
Atiqah Abdullah, 2009).
Apart from the fact, History is
also loaded with conceptualization.
Understanding of the concept needs
to be emphasized by teachers when
teaching. To understand the concepts,
students need to understand the
purpose and meaning of the word.
Students will not understand the
concept if they do not know the purpose
and meaning of certain words (Shukor
Abdullah, 2000; and Aziz & Jair, 2009).
Teachers are among the key agents
in generating quality education.
Teaching quality is the result of their
knowledge and skills required in a
discipline of knowledge. Effective
teachers are teachers who have the
following characteristics: (1) deep
knowledge in the subjects they teach;
(2) plenty of imagination to enable
them to make a variety of examples
to help students understand a simple
concept; and (3) can use the tools and
instructional materials well in lessons.
Based on this statement, D. Sparks &
S. Loucks-Horsley (1989); D. Sparks &
S. Hirsh (1997); and G.M. Sparks (1983)
suggested that a form of specialized
training is essential to provide an
effective teacher (cf Hallinger et al.,
1983; Abdul Kadir, 1997; Abdul Kadir &
Ismail, 1997; and Mohamad, 2003).
The effectiveness of teaching depends
on how the teacher plans the History
lesson and also the teacher’s quality.
Good history teachers demonstrate the
good quality personally, socially, and
professional (Ahmad, Abd Rahman &
Atiqah Abdullah, 2009). One of the main
factors related to student achievement
in SPM (Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia or
Malaysian Certificate of Education) would
be poor teaching quality (cf Kerajaan
Malaysia, 2009; and KPM, 2003a, 2004a,
2004c, 2005b, and 2006).
J.H. Magisos (1989) and Abd Rahim
Abd Rashid (2005) pointed out that
the best teachers are those who are
knowledgeable, skilled, and competent
technical duties as a teacher. Therefore,
effective teaching requires skills and
extensive knowledge about the subject
and has an understanding of aspects
of pupils’ learning (Magisos, 1989; and
Abd Rashid, 2005).
History teachers rarely see whether
the information is able to evoke interest
or spirit that can help students to
understand the History. Thus, many
students find the subject very tedious
and not encouraging them to think.
However, if teachers train students
to think, when students leave school
and enter the working world, they will
become more confident as they are
capable and initiative in problem solving
The lack of student interest in learning History has been raised in the Educational Planning Committee 170th (KPM, 2003c). The issues on effectiveness of teaching and learning arose, when teachers could not identify the relevant pass events might not relevant today’s. However, according to the Inspectorate Report in 2004, there are teachers who teach without a set induction, conduct student-centered teaching, not having systematic strategic planning, the quality of teaching is still at a moderate level, the teaching regardless of existing knowledge of their students, less monitoring, and ineffective assessment system (KPM, 2004d).

As a result, teachers do not know how to respond accordingly to any changes that occur in their lessons. The dynamic and rapid changes in classrooms have created a lot of critical issues for the teacher. Therefore, the instructional leadership should be emphasized, so that it can contribute to the school’s mission to produce quality teaching and learning (cf' Murphy et al., 1984; Smith & Andrews, 1990; Zakaria, Fatimah Mohd & Bong Cheang, 1996; and Abdullah & Ismail, 2007).

Besides that, some teachers have inaccurate perceptions of instructional leadership in terms of the leadership class, because they perceived that it would be the responsibility of school administrators. D. Sparks & S. Loucks-Horsley (1989); D. Sparks & S. Hirsh (1997); Sparks, 2003; Abd Rashid (2005); and Yahya Don (2005) felt that teachers are important agents of change in ensuring that their schools would turn into an effective school. Therefore, the teachers play an important role in instructional leadership to ensure that the schools would go through the necessary changes (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1989; Sparks & Hirsh, 1997; Sparks, 2003; Abd Rashid, 2005; and Don, 2005).

In educational organizations, the most common problems are about teachers’ performances. Soetjipto & Rafli Kosasih (2007) study found that there are teachers who do not demonstrate commitment in performing their duties and do not care about improving the quality of teaching. These attitudes will, then, affect teachers’ performances and leave negative impact and critical and creative thinking with it (cf JNSP, 1993; dan Zahra, 1999).

The pattern of teaching History in schools is still very traditional and boring students (KPM, 2003b). Teachers’ failure in the use of teaching and learning methods caused students to become bored, sleepy, and tired during this subject. Based on the findings, Mohammad Sultan Faujar showed that the teaching of History in schools is poor quality (Sultan Faujar, 2000).

The results of Abdul Razaq Ahmad & Ahmad Ali Seman (2000); Abdul Razaq Ahmad & Andi Suwirta (2007); and Anuar Ahmad, Siti Haishah Abd Rahman & Nur Atiqah Abdullah (2009) have also shown that many students perceived the History is a boring subject. This initial impression will cause students to lose focus and less motivated to learn the subject (Razaq Ahmad & Ali Seman, 2000; Razaq Ahmad & Suwirta, 2007; and Ahmad, Abd Rahman & Atiqah Abdullah, 2009).

The community has not also considered the History as commercial value (Ahmad, 1990). This is supported by Abdullah Mohd Noor (1998) and interview with Abdul Razak Manaf (31/3/2006), based on their findings in the district of Petaling Jaya and Kuala Selangor, Malaysia, they found that students regarded History as not important and has no benefit. Similarly, the results of Sivachandralingam Sundara Raja et al. (2008) found that History was not related to job security and has no commercial value. In addition, his study also found that learning and teaching of history was taken for granted and has difficult for teachers (Sundara Raja et al., 2008).

The lack of student interest in learning History has been raised in the Educational Planning Committee 170th (KPM, 2003c). The issues on effectiveness of teaching and learning arose, when teachers could not identify the relevant pass events might not relevant today’s. However, according to
on the teaching profession (cf. JNS, 2004; and Soetjipto & Kosasih, 2007).

Performance should be evaluated wisely, so that the organization can utilize the available resources to its best advantage (Murphy, 1990; Mat Yusof, 2001; and Lambert, 2003). All these problems imply that the teaching profession, which was once regarded as good, has now faced an increasingly challenging problem. This could have a negative impact on student achievement and the quality of education.

THE HYPOTHESIS AND STUDY DESIGN

The hypothesis of the study is commonly used in quantitative studies to express the relationship and differences between the variables. It is researchers’ predictions about the relationship or differences that may exist between the variables. It is also a prediction of what is expected by the researchers on the research issue or problem. In addition, it is also the prediction made by the researchers about a relationship or differences in inferential research before data is collected (cf. Murphy, 1988b; Pearson, 2000; Mahdzan, 2005; and Yusri Ibrahim, 2010).

The followings were the hypotheses of this study:

Ho1: “There was no significant difference for the instructional leadership and job performance based on History teachers’ teaching experiences”.

Ho2: “There was no significant difference in mean scores of the instructional leadership of the teachers who have been to professional development courses and those who have not”.

Ho3: “There was no significant relationship between instructional leadership and History teachers’ performances”.

Ho4: “There was no significant relationship between motivation and History teachers’ performances”.

This study was to investigate the relationship among instructional leadership, work motivation, and History teachers’ performances in Sabah, Malaysia. This study was a quantitative survey. The questionnaire consisted of 5-point of Likert scale, which was similar to the format of the objective questions of the test or examination at school. Therefore, this facilitates the respondents in answering the questionnaire (Idris, 2010).

According to J. Levin & J.A. Fox (2007), a survey is more representative, because the findings can be generalized or applied to a wider range of individuals. The sampling used in this study was purposive sampling, because it only involved 120 respondents teaching in History of form 1 to 5 only.

The construct of instructional leadership was based on the instructional leadership model from P. Hallinger & J. Murphy (1985); P. Hallinger & J.F. Murphy (1987); P. Hallinger & C.E. McCary (1990); P. Hallinger (1992); P. Hallinger, L. Bickman & K. Davis (1996); P. Hallinger & R.H. Heck (1996); P. Hallinger & K. Leithwood (1996); and P. Hallinger (2003); the work motivation is based on the theories from A. Maslow (1943); H.V. Vroom (1964); and D.C. McClelland (1965)’s motivational needs; and the performance construct was based on the model performance by H.J. Bernardin & J. Russell (1993); P. Hersey & K.H. Blanchard (1996); and K. Timpe (1998).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Ho1: “There was no significant difference for the instructional leadership and job performance based on History teachers’ teaching experiences”.

As shown in tables 1, 2, and 3, Ho1 was rejected. This was because there were significant differences in instructional leadership and teachers’ performances based on their teaching experiences in History (F = 6095, df = 115, and sig = .000). This showed that teachers who have longer teaching experience will show instructional
Table 1:
Post Hoc Analysis Instructional Leadership and Work Performance Based on Teacher Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>(I) Work Experience</th>
<th>(J) Work Experience</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>LSD</td>
<td>3 Years and below</td>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>.18864</td>
<td>.13054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-15 Years</td>
<td>-.46273(*)</td>
<td>.14300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>-.42273(*)</td>
<td>.14300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 20 Years</td>
<td>-.76818(*)</td>
<td>.18461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>3 Years and below</td>
<td>-.18864</td>
<td>.13054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-15 Years</td>
<td>-.65136(*)</td>
<td>.12152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>-.61136(*)</td>
<td>.12152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 20 Years</td>
<td>-.95682(*)</td>
<td>.16852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-15 Years</td>
<td>3 Years and below</td>
<td>.46273(*)</td>
<td>.14300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>.65136(*)</td>
<td>.12152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>.04000</td>
<td>.13482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Years and over</td>
<td>-.30545</td>
<td>.17835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>3 Years and below</td>
<td>.42273(*)</td>
<td>.14300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>.61136(*)</td>
<td>.12152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-15 Years</td>
<td>-.04000</td>
<td>.13482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Years and over</td>
<td>-.34545</td>
<td>.17835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Years and over</td>
<td>3 Years and below</td>
<td>.76818(*)</td>
<td>.18461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>.95682(*)</td>
<td>.16852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-15 Years</td>
<td>.30545</td>
<td>.17835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>.34545</td>
<td>.17835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance</td>
<td>LSD</td>
<td>3 Years and below</td>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>.06875</td>
<td>.07000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-15 Years</td>
<td>-.22000(*)</td>
<td>.07668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>-.15000</td>
<td>.07668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Years and over</td>
<td>-.10000</td>
<td>.09900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>3 Years and below</td>
<td>-.06875</td>
<td>.07000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-15 Year</td>
<td>-.28875(*)</td>
<td>.06517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 Year</td>
<td>-.21875(*)</td>
<td>.06517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Years and over</td>
<td>-.16875</td>
<td>.09037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-15 Years</td>
<td>3 Years and below</td>
<td>.22000(*)</td>
<td>.07668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>.28875(*)</td>
<td>.06517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>.07000</td>
<td>.07230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Years and over</td>
<td>.12000</td>
<td>.09564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>3 Years and below</td>
<td>.15000</td>
<td>.07668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>.21875(*)</td>
<td>.06517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-15 Years</td>
<td>-.07000</td>
<td>.07230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Years and over</td>
<td>.05000</td>
<td>.09564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Years and over</td>
<td>3 Years and below</td>
<td>.10000</td>
<td>.09900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-9 Years</td>
<td>.16875</td>
<td>.09037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-15 Years</td>
<td>-.12000</td>
<td>.09564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>-.05000</td>
<td>.09564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
leadership and a good performance.

Ho2: "There was no significant difference in mean scores of the instructional leadership of the teachers who have been to professional development courses and those who have not".

As shown in tables 4 and 5, Ho2 was rejected. This was because there were significant differences between the mean scores of History teacher, who have and have not been to professional development courses. The mean for teachers who have attended professional development courses was 3.82 and its standard deviation was .258. While, the mean for the teachers who have never been to professional development courses was 3.60 and its standard deviation was .260.

Ho3: "There was no significant relationship between instructional leadership and History teachers’ performances”.

As shown in table 6, Ho3 was rejected. This was because there was significant relationship between instructional leadership and History teachers’ performances (r = .523, sig = .000). The coefficient of r = .523, which showed a moderately strong relationship.

Ho4: “There was no significant relationship between motivation and History teachers’ performances”.

As shown in table 7, Ho4 was accepted. This was because there was no significant relationship between work motivation and History teachers’ work performances (r = .172, sig = .0.60). Although the coefficient of r = .172, this showed a very weak relationship.

Based on the analysis of data in tables 1, 2, and 3, Ho1 was rejected as there were differences in terms of the instructional leadership based on teaching experiences (min 3 years and under 3.66, 20 and over 4.43). This proved that the more experiences that teachers have, the better their instructional leadership are.

This finding was supported by Noriah Mohd Ishak et al. (1999) study that experienced teachers were more responsible towards themselves and the learning process in comparison with inexperienced teachers. This scenario can be attributed to teachers’ age factor.
The older and experienced teachers would think more about the effects and consequences of their actions (cf Mohd Ishak et al., 1999; Southworth, 2002; and Sani Yahya, Rashid Mohamed & Ghani Abdullah, 2007).

In addition, an experienced teacher will portray instructional leadership from time to time. Teachers who are more experienced and older are more likely to improve their work performances in school as compared to teachers who are less experienced and younger. Therefore, the expected quality of teaching and learning is at the highest level (Hussin, 2004; KPM, 2005a; and Wilcox, 2005).

Next, the findings in tables 4 and 5, in which Ho2 was rejected, there was a difference between teachers who have attended professional development courses and those who never attend professional development courses. This was consistent with the results obtained by Nana Syaodih Sukmadinata (2003) and Nanang Fattah (2008), who found, based on management and psychological education, that teacher training programme could influence teachers’ performances.

The data indicated that the training received by teachers has improved teachers’ performances. Similar results could be seen in the study by A.L. Uche, D. Fiberesima & O. Christiana (2011) in Nigeria. The study found that teachers, who have attended professional development courses, showed a better performance compared to teachers who never attend professional development courses.

Based on the analysis in table 6, in which Ho3 was rejected, the data showed a significant relationship

Table 5:
ANOVA Analysis Work Performance Based on Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>17.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>7.914</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.106</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6:
Pearson Correlation Analysis Leadership Instructional and Work Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Instructional Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Work Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.523(**), .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>120, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.523(**), 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>120, 120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

Table 7:
Pearson Correlation Analysis Work Motivation and Work Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Performance Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Work Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>120, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Motivation Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.172, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>120, 120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between instructional leadership and History teachers’ performances. The coefficient of .523 indicated a moderately strong relationship.

Sudarwan Danim (2002)’s study, which involved teachers in Indonesia, stated that the work performance was one of the factors contributing to the education crisis in Indonesia. There are teachers who have not been able to demonstrate adequate performance (Danim, 2002). The survey findings of several studies showed that some teachers were not serious about their work and were ignorant to improving the quality of teaching.

This situation was caused by teachers’ low work performances (Soetjipto & Kosasih, 2007). Such situation should not be ignored as it would affect the quality of teaching and learning in a negative manner. Jon R. Katzenbach, in his book, Peak performance: Aligning the Hearts and Minds of Your Employees (2000), stated that performance was closely related to the work; a group of individuals that share the same appreciation of the work could help to improve the performance of their organizations (cf Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Lambert, 1989; Katzenbach, 2000; and Keow Ngang, 2000 and 2007).

Finally, table 7, which consisted of the analysis of Ho4 was accepted, showed no significant relationship between the work motivation and History teachers’ work performances (r = .172 and sig = .060). Nonetheless, the data obtained was contrary to the findings of the study by M. Nur Mustafa & Norasmah Othman (2009) in Indonesia; and a study conducted by A.L. Uche, D. Fiberesima & O. Christiana (2011) in Nigeria. Their findings showed a significant relationship between work motivation and performance of teachers (cf Main, 1985; KPM, 1992; Hallinger et al., 1994; Mamat, 2006; Mamat & Hassan, 2008; Mustafa & Othman, 2009; and Uche, Fiberesima & Christiana, 2011).

This further indicated that motivation helped teachers to improve their work performances. This finding was influenced by certain factors, such as different locations, different cultural values work between three different countries, and different number of respondents (120 people in Sabah, Malaysia; and in Indonesia and Nigeria were 327 and 150). This finding was supported by A.M. Sardiman (2000) and E. Mulyasa (2003), who stated that there were several factors that influenced teachers’ performances in the context of Indonesian culture. They also stressed that work motivation could influence teachers’ performances (Sardiman, 2000; and Mulyasa, 2003).

**CONCLUSION**

The concept of teacher instructional leadership, within the context of research institutions among the organizations, is not new in developed countries, but this issue seems to be neglected in Malaysia. It also appears that instructional leadership has always been associated with the headmaster or principal, which is a farfetched concept. Linda Lambert (1989 and 2003), who conducted a detailed study of this matter, viewed the context of an institution as empowering the leadership among the school community.

Teachers with instructional leadership are able to implement quality teaching and learning in schools. Hence, in order to make it a success, History teacher should be well-prepared to understand, accept, and implement the changes in History education. Their readiness is actually a major prerequisite of excellence in their profession as History teachers, and those with good quality would always strive to strengthen the instructional leadership in schools. All these positive elements should be blended wisely to empower the education system which is full of challenges.
The escalating focus on the process of globalization has prompted the Ministry of Education in Malaysia to take various measures to improve the quality of education in Malaysia. This scenario demands History teachers to become more proactive and competent. In addition, the instructional leadership is needed to increase the quality of the management of History. Thus, History teachers’ instructional leadership component is very important in generating their work performances.¹
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Teachers are among the key agents in generating quality education. Teaching quality is the result of their knowledge and skills required in a discipline of knowledge. Effective teachers are teachers who have the following characteristics: (1) deep knowledge in the subjects they teach; (2) plenty of imagination to enable them to make a variety of examples to help students understand a simple concept; and (3) can use the tools and instructional materials well in lessons.