WJSAM | World Journal of Sustainable Advances in Multidisciplinarity
RESEARCH | INNOVATION | INTERDISCIPLINARITY | SUSTAINABILITY
Volume 1, Issue 2 | ISSN: 3155-783X
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/wjsam.V1.I2.12

A Mediation Analysis of Teacher Responsibility on the Goal Setting and Performance of Social Studies Teachers

Richel C. Encallado
Master in Arts Major in Social Studies, University of Mindanao, Davao City, Philippines

Email: richel.encallado001@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationships among goal setting, teacher responsibility, and teaching performance among Social Studies teachers and determined whether teacher responsibility mediated the relationship between goal setting and teaching performance. A descriptive-correlational research design with mediation analysis was employed among public elementary school Social Studies teachers in Kiblawan, Davao del Sur. Stratified random sampling was employed to select participants from the participating public elementary schools. Data were gathered using a structured questionnaire and analyzed through descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and mediation analysis. The findings revealed very high levels of goal setting (M = 4.46), teacher responsibility (M = 4.821), and teaching performance (M = 4.77). Goal rationale demonstrated a strong positive association with classroom management ($r = 0.73$, $p < .001$), while responsibility for student achievement was positively associated with overall teaching performance ($r = 0.308$, $p < .001$). However, overall goal setting was not significantly associated with overall teaching performance ($r = -0.08$, $p = .32$), and teacher responsibility showed no significant mediating effect ($p = .995$). These findings indicated that favorable professional assessments did not necessarily translate into significant relationships among the examined variables. School administrators should strengthen meaningful goal-setting practices, instructional guidance, and professional collaboration. The context-specific, correlational design limited causal interpretation and broader generalizability. The study contributes to educational research by clarifying the distinct relationships among professional goal setting, responsibility, and instructional performance, providing a basis for targeted teacher development and further investigation of alternative mediating factors.

Keywords: *Classroom Management, Goal Setting, Mediation Analysis, Social Studies, Teacher Responsibility, Teaching Performance*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and Context of the Study

Teaching performance remains a central concern in education as schools respond to changing instructional expectations and the continuing effects of disruptions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. Effective teaching involves more than subject knowledge; it requires purposeful planning, classroom management, assessment, constructive relationships with learners, and collaboration with colleagues. The importance of supporting teachers is emphasized in UNESCO's (2024) global report, which identifies professional preparation and sustained institutional support as essential to strengthening education systems. For Social Studies teachers, these demands are particularly significant because instruction also involves developing learners' historical understanding, critical thinking, and civic awareness. Wiens et al. (2022) found that Social Studies teachers' reported instructional practices were associated with their preparation, demonstrating the continuing relevance of professional development to classroom practice. Goal setting provides a means of translating instructional expectations into specific priorities and measurable targets. Goal-Setting Theory explains how clear and appropriately challenging goals can direct attention, effort, and persistence toward performance objectives (Locke & Latham, 2002). In a study of Indonesian junior high school teachers, Fitriah et al. (2021) reported a positive direct relationship between goal setting and work performance. Yet teachers' ability to pursue instructional targets may also depend on their sense of responsibility for students, teaching, and professional obligations. Zhang and An (2024) identified positive associations among instructional competence, teacher responsibility, and job satisfaction, suggesting that responsibility forms part of a broader pattern of professional engagement. Together, these findings establish a rationale for examining goal setting, teacher responsibility, and teaching performance as related but distinct constructs among Social Studies teachers. Determining how responsibility operates between goal setting and performance may clarify the professional processes underlying effective instructional practice.

1.2. Research Problem

Although goal setting is associated with professional improvement, its application in schools is complex. Teachers must reconcile instructional targets with competing duties, appraisal expectations, limited time, and actionable feedback. Hunter and Springer (2022) found that goal setting was the feedback characteristic associated with subsequent performance among early-career teachers, while many evaluation conferences lacked actionable feedback. Criss et al. (2024) observed improvements in preservice teachers' classroom-management practices following written feedback with and without goal setting, indicating the value of structured support but not establishing an additional effect of goal setting in isolation. Responsibility likewise presents a complex concern. Commitment to student learning can coexist with accountability pressures. Li and Tsang (2023) showed that relationships among accountability, emotional labor, and burnout required consideration beyond simple assumptions that greater accountability is always beneficial. Meanwhile, Meshack et al. (2025) reported a positive association between performance goal setting and teachers' performance but noted uneven participation in goal-setting processes. For Social Studies teachers, the unresolved issue is whether goal setting relates to teaching performance directly and whether teacher responsibility helps explain that relationship. Without examining these paths together, school-level improvement efforts may overlook how goals become sustained professional action.

1.3. Research Gap

Existing studies have provided evidence about individual components of teacher performance, but they address different relationships and contexts. Meshack et al. (2025) examined performance goal setting within an appraisal system, whereas Zhang and An (2024) considered teacher responsibility alongside instructional competence and satisfaction. Criss et al. (2024)

focused on goal setting and feedback in preservice teachers' classroom practices. These contributions do not, by themselves, determine whether teacher responsibility statistically mediates the association between goal setting and teaching performance among Social Studies teachers. Direct associations alone cannot establish how goals translate into professional conduct. This study addresses that gap through a mediation framework. Drawing on Social Cognitive Theory's emphasis on interactions among personal factors, behavior, and environment (Bandura, 1986), it tests whether teachers' perceived responsibility accounts for part of the association between goal setting and their reported teaching performance, while also examining the direct relationships. This yields a defined, testable model.

1.4. Purpose and Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to examine goal setting, teacher responsibility, and teaching performance among Social Studies teachers. It assessed goal setting through supervisor support and participation, goal stress, goal efficacy, goal rationale, use in performance appraisal, tangible rewards, goal conflict, organizational facilitation, dysfunctional effects, and goal clarity. Teacher responsibility covered student motivation, student achievement, relationships with students, and teaching. Teaching performance encompassed teaching and learning, classroom management, assessment, teacher–student relationships, and staff collaboration. The study further examined the relationships among the three variables, tested whether teacher responsibility mediated the association between goal setting and teaching performance at the 0.05 significance level, and sought to formulate a regression model reflecting these relationships.

1.5. Significance and Practical Contribution of the Study

The study contributes to educational research by assessing whether teacher responsibility functions as a mediating mechanism between goal setting and teaching performance, rather than treating these factors solely as separate predictors. Its findings may help Social Studies teachers reflect on how instructional targets relate to their professional commitments and classroom practices. School administrators and instructional supervisors may use the results to review goal-setting procedures, teacher participation, feedback, and performance-appraisal practices. The proposed regression model may also inform more focused professional development and institutional planning, subject to the strength and scope of the observed relationships. For curriculum planners, policymakers, and future researchers, the study offers a context-specific basis for examining how teacher support and responsibility align with instructional effectiveness.

1.6. Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Alignment

The study is directly aligned with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4): Quality Education, officially framed as ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all. This alignment rests on the study's concern with the quality of instruction delivered by Social Studies teachers. By examining goal clarity, teacher responsibility, and performance in teaching, assessment, classroom management, and professional collaboration, the research addresses conditions that may support more effective learning experiences. Its potential application to instructional supervision and teacher development is consistent with the emphasis on a capable and supported teaching workforce highlighted by UNESCO (2024). Rather than measuring SDG 4 progress directly, the study offers evidence for improving relevant teaching practices.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research Design

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design with mediation analysis to examine goal setting, teacher responsibility, and teaching performance among public elementary school Social Studies teachers. It described the constructs and assessed their relationships without manipulation, consistent with quantitative research approaches (Creswell & Creswell, 2022; Creswell & Guetterman, 2024). Specifically, mediation analysis examined whether teacher responsibility statistically mediated the association between goal setting and teaching performance. This approach permitted examination of indirect relationships but did not establish causation (Hayes, 2022).

2.2. Research Locale, Population, and Participants or Respondents

The study involved public elementary schools in Kiblawan, Davao del Sur. The sampling frame covered approximately 30 schools, with 300 Social Studies teachers identified as the target sample. Eligible respondents held permanent or regular teaching positions, were actively teaching Social Studies, had at least three years of relevant teaching experience, and voluntarily consented. Exclusions included nonregular appointments, insufficient experience, long-term leave, nonteaching duties, outside-division employment, or refusal of consent. Participants were recruited from five participating medium and large public elementary schools in Kiblawan, Davao del Sur (Johnson & Christensen, 2024).

2.3. Sampling Technique and Sample Determination

Stratified random sampling was specified to obtain proportional representation across schools and teacher subgroups, following principles of probability-based survey sampling (Lohr, 2021). The target sample comprised 300 teachers. The manuscript justified this number using the regression heuristic $N \geq 50 + 8m$, where m represented the number of predictors. This guideline served as a preliminary sample-size planning criterion rather than a formal statistical power analysis (Lakens, 2022). This followed survey-methods guidance on sample determination (Saunders et al., 2023).

2.4. Research Instrument and Validation

The structured questionnaire contained three parts: teacher responsibility, goal setting, and teaching performance. It drew on the Teacher Responsibility Scale (Lauermann & Karabenick, 2013), goal-setting questionnaire research by Lee et al. (1991), and the Teachers' Performance Appraisal Scale (Hyder & Farooq, 2022). Previously published reliability coefficients for the source instruments ranged from .87 to .94 for teacher responsibility, with values of .89 for goal setting and .915 for teaching performance. These coefficients reflected the reliability of the original instruments rather than estimates obtained from the present sample. A panel of experts reviewed the adapted questionnaire before administration. Distinguishing source reliability from study-specific validation supports sound scale evaluation (DeVellis & Thorpe, 2021).

2.5. Data Gathering Procedure

The University of Mindanao Ethics Committee evaluated the study, and permission was secured through a letter signed by the Dean of the Graduate School. Permission letters were sent to principals of five medium and large schools, whose school heads assisted with contacting eligible teachers. Teachers received information about the study, asked questions, and signed consent forms. Questionnaire responses were encoded in Excel and prepared for analysis. These procedures reflected survey-reporting considerations (Fink, 2024).

2.6. Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Means and standard deviations summarized goal setting, teacher responsibility, and teaching performance. Pearson's correlation coefficient examined relationships among the three variables, while mediation analysis assessed the indirect relationship between goal setting and teaching performance through teacher responsibility (Field, 2024; Hayes, 2022). Mean scores followed five interpretation bands: Strongly Disagree (1.00–1.80), Disagree (1.81–2.60), Neutral (2.61–3.40), Agree (3.41–4.20), and Strongly Agree (4.21–5.00). Excel supported data preparation; statistical software supported analysis. Descriptive statistics and correlation were applied as specified in the manuscript (Salkind & Frey, 2025).

2.7. Ethical Considerations

Participation was voluntary, and teachers could withdraw without penalty. Signed informed consent, confidential handling, aggregated reporting, and password-protected storage safeguarded participant information. The procedures followed the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173, 2012) and accepted educational research ethics principles (Johnson & Christensen, 2024). Electronic records were deleted and printed materials shredded after completion and hard binding. The University of Mindanao Ethics Committee issued Certification No. UMERC-2025-312. Professional boundaries and data integrity were maintained (Saunders et al., 2023).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Goal-Setting Practices among Social Studies Teachers

The overall level of goal setting among Social Studies teachers was classified as Very High (M = 4.46, SD = 0.06). The use of goal setting in performance appraisal obtained the highest mean (M = 4.85, SD = 0.26), followed by goal clarity (M = 4.80, SD = 0.17), goal efficacy (M = 4.77, SD = 0.20), and organizational facilitation of goal achievement (M = 4.76, SD = 0.17). Goal rationale (M = 4.59, SD = 0.22), supervisor support and participation (M = 4.52, SD = 0.30), and goal conflict (M = 4.44, SD = 0.13) also received favorable ratings. Tangible rewards (M = 4.01, SD = 0.17) and goal stress (M = 3.65, SD = 0.29) obtained the lowest mean ratings and fell within the Agree category based on the established five-point interpretation scale. The prominence of appraisal-related goal setting and goal clarity indicates that respondents perceived instructional targets as clearly communicated and integrated into formal expectations. At the same time, differences across the indicators suggest that teachers did not experience all aspects of goal setting equally. These descriptive ratings represent the teachers' reported goal-setting conditions; they do not establish that goal setting caused improvements in teaching performance. Meshack et al. (2025) reported an association between performance goal setting and teachers' performance in Kenyan secondary schools, particularly where goals were clear and aligned with professional expectations. Criss et al. (2022), in a systematic review of goal setting combined with performance feedback, identified teacher involvement, monitoring, and discussion of goals as features frequently associated with stronger implementation of teaching practices. Similarly, Wang et al. (2026) examined goal-setting mechanisms in relation to teachers' professional behavior and psychological processes. These studies provide context for the favorable ratings observed here, but the present study's subsequent correlational findings are necessary to determine whether the highly rated goal-setting practices were associated with its other variables.

3.2. Teacher Responsibility among Social Studies Teachers

Teacher responsibility was classified as Very High overall (M = 4.821, SD = 0.355). Teaching had the highest mean (M = 4.923, SD = 0.143), followed by relationships with students (M = 4.847, SD = 0.207), student motivation (M = 4.838, SD = 1.383), and student achievement (M = 4.675, SD =

0.237). All four dimensions were classified as Very High based on the study's interpretation criteria. These dimensions describe teachers' sense of responsibility for instructional and student-related matters rather than direct measurements of students' motivation or academic results. The higher rating for teaching suggests that respondents expressed responsibility most strongly in relation to their immediate instructional duties. Responsibility for student achievement, although still rated very highly, was relatively less prominent. The distinction is important because teachers' responsibility for instruction and their responsibility for learning outcomes are related but not identical professional orientations. The reported variation in responses also indicates that the overall favorable rating should not be treated as evidence of uniform experiences across all responsibility dimensions. Barahona et al. (2024) emphasized that professional pedagogical responsibility involves more than carrying out instructional tasks and includes responsiveness to learners and educational circumstances. Browes and Altinyelken (2022) likewise documented how teachers navigate tensions between formal accountability requirements and their professional understanding of meaningful teaching. These perspectives help situate the present findings: respondents reported strong professional responsibility, but the importance of its particular dimensions could only be established through their relationships with performance, examined in the later analyses.

3.3. Teaching Performance among Social Studies Teachers

The overall teaching-performance rating was Very High (M = 4.77, SD = 0.08). Classroom management recorded the highest mean (M = 4.86, SD = 0.15), followed by teaching and learning (M = 4.82, SD = 0.14), assessment (M = 4.79, SD = 0.15), and teacher–student relationship (M = 4.75, SD = 0.16). Staff collaboration obtained the lowest mean (M = 4.64, SD = 0.23), although it remained within the Very High category. The narrow differences among mean ratings reflected consistently favorable assessments of the five performance domains. The ordering of these indicators suggests that classroom-facing aspects of teaching, particularly classroom management, were rated slightly more favorably than collaboration with colleagues. The relatively lower collaboration score does not indicate weak performance; rather, it identifies a dimension that was less highly rated within an otherwise favorable profile. The measures describe teaching performance as assessed in this study, not changes in performance over time or independently observed effects on learners. Duan et al. (2024) identified teacher-, classroom-, and school-level factors associated with classroom-management self-efficacy, indicating that classroom practice is situated within a broader professional environment. More specifically to the study's subject area, Wiens et al. (2022) examined how preparation and instructional practice are related among Social Studies teachers. Helding Vembye et al. (2024) further synthesized research on collaborative instructional models, highlighting the relevance of cooperation to educational practice. These findings suggest useful contexts for interpreting classroom management and staff collaboration, without implying that the cited studies measured the same performance dimensions or produced identical results.

3.4. Associations between Goal Setting and Teacher Responsibility

The analysis indicated that most correlations between goal-setting indicators and overall teacher responsibility were small and statistically non-significant at the $p < 0.05$ threshold. The use of goal setting in performance appraisal had a significant negative correlation with overall teacher responsibility ($r = -0.235$, $p = 0.004$). Goal efficacy had a small positive correlation that did not meet the significance threshold ($r = 0.154$, $p = 0.059$). The overall goal-setting composite was essentially unrelated to overall teacher responsibility ($r = 0.000563$, $p = 0.995$). Thus, the

composite findings did not support a consistent positive relationship between the two constructs. Several indicator-level associations qualified this overall pattern. Appraisal-based goal setting was negatively associated with responsibility for student motivation ($r = -0.280$, $p < 0.001$). Goal efficacy was positively associated with responsibility for student achievement ($r = 0.162$, $p = 0.048$) and relationships with students ($r = 0.169$, $p = 0.039$). Tangible rewards were also positively associated with responsibility for student achievement ($r = 0.177$, $p = 0.031$). These correlations were generally small and varied by domain; none supports an inference that modifying appraisal practices, efficacy, or rewards would directly change teachers' responsibility. Parcerisa et al. (2022) showed that accountability arrangements differ in how they regulate teachers' professional roles, while Browes and Altinyelken (2022) described the competing demands teachers may experience under performance-based accountability. The present inverse association involving appraisal-based goals is consistent with the need to distinguish formal evaluation requirements from a personally held sense of responsibility. However, it does not demonstrate that appraisal itself reduced responsibility. The overall result instead indicates a differentiated relationship in which selected goal-setting dimensions were weakly associated with particular responsibility domains, while the two composite measures were not meaningfully correlated.

3.5. Associations between Goal Setting and Teaching Performance

Goal-setting dimensions showed a mixture of positive, negative, and non-significant associations with teaching-performance indicators. Goal rationale was positively associated with teaching and learning ($r = 0.29$, $p < 0.001$), classroom management ($r = 0.73$, $p < 0.001$), and overall teaching performance ($r = 0.26$, p reported as 0.00). The correlation with classroom management was particularly strong compared with the other reported associations. In contrast, dysfunctional effects of goals were negatively associated with classroom management ($r = -0.17$, $p = 0.04$) and overall teaching performance ($r = -0.21$, $p = 0.01$). Other statistically significant relationships reinforced the varied pattern. Supervisor support and participation were positively associated with teaching and learning ($r = 0.20$, $p = 0.01$) but negatively associated with assessment ($r = -0.24$, p reported as 0.00). Goal stress was negatively associated with classroom management ($r = -0.19$, $p = 0.02$), while appraisal-based goal setting was negatively associated with teacher–student relationship ($r = -0.21$, $p = 0.01$). The overall goal-setting score was positively related to teaching and learning ($r = 0.25$, p reported as 0.00), but negatively related to assessment ($r = -0.21$, $p = 0.01$) and staff collaboration ($r = -0.20$, $p = 0.02$). Importantly, overall goal setting was not significantly correlated with overall teaching performance ($r = -0.08$, $p = 0.32$). Values reported as $p = 0.00$ were rounded in the source and should not be interpreted as probabilities of exactly zero. These findings suggest that understanding the rationale for instructional goals was the goal-setting dimension most clearly aligned with favorable classroom-management ratings. They also show that appraisal demands and other goal-related experiences were not uniformly associated with stronger teaching practices. Criss et al. (2022) found that goal setting combined with feedback can support implementation of instructional practices, particularly when goals are teacher-developed and accompanied by monitoring. Wang et al. (2026) identified positive relationships between goal-setting mechanisms and teaching behavior in a different educational sample, whereas Jerrim et al. (2023) reported that professional autonomy does not necessarily correspond to stronger measured student outcomes. Considered together, these studies reinforce the importance of context and the specific practice examined. In the present study, however, the positive and negative correlations

should be interpreted as associations, not evidence that particular goal-setting arrangements caused the observed performance ratings.

3.6. Associations between Teacher Responsibility and Teaching Performance

Responsibility for student achievement showed significant positive correlations with teaching and learning ($r = 0.263$, $p = 0.001$), staff collaboration ($r = 0.236$, $p = 0.004$), and overall teaching performance ($r = 0.308$, $p < 0.001$). These were the clearest relationships in the responsibility–performance matrix. By contrast, the overall teacher-responsibility composite was not significantly related to overall teaching performance ($r = 0.026$, $p = 0.752$). The other reported associations involving student motivation, relationships with students, and responsibility for teaching did not reach statistical significance. The pattern indicates that teachers who reported greater responsibility for student achievement also tended to receive more favorable ratings in selected instructional and collaborative domains. The finding is specific to the responsibility-for-achievement indicator and should not be extended to teacher responsibility as a whole. It is also important to distinguish this indicator from actual student achievement: the analysis related a professional-responsibility measure to teaching-performance ratings and did not establish changes in learner outcomes. Hwang et al. (2026) found that associations between collective teacher responsibility and student achievement differed across subjects and student groups, illustrating that responsibility-related relationships may depend on their form and context. Although collective school-level responsibility is distinct from the individual responsibility measure used here, this comparison underscores the importance of avoiding a single undifferentiated interpretation. Barahona et al. (2024) likewise characterized pedagogical responsibility as encompassing several dimensions of professional practice. The present results identify responsibility for student achievement as the most consistently performance-related dimension in this dataset, without supporting a broad claim that overall responsibility predicted teaching performance.

3.7. Mediating Role of Teacher Responsibility in the Goal Setting–Teaching Performance Relationship

The mediation analysis did not support teacher responsibility as a statistically significant mediator between goal setting and teaching performance. The indirect-effect estimate was 1.905×10^{-5} ($SE = 0.003$, $z = 0.007$, $p = 0.995$; 95% CI [−0.005, 0.005]). The direct effect of goal setting on teaching performance was also non-significant (estimate = −0.106, $SE = 0.105$, $z = -1.009$, $p = 0.313$; 95% CI [−0.313, 0.100]). The reported total effect was similarly non-significant (estimate = −0.106, $SE = 0.105$, $z = -1.008$, $p = 0.313$; 95% CI [−0.313, 0.100]). Each of these confidence intervals included zero. The two component paths further supported this conclusion. The path from goal setting to teacher responsibility was not significant (estimate = 0.003, $p = 0.994$; 95% CI [−0.895, 0.901]), and neither was the path from teacher responsibility to teaching performance (estimate = 0.006, $p = 0.748$; 95% CI [−0.031, 0.043]). The source reported maximum-likelihood estimation with delta-method standard errors and normal-theory confidence intervals. Although some individual dimensions were significantly correlated in the preceding analyses, their associations did not constitute evidence of an indirect pathway between the overall variables in the specified mediation model. The absence of a statistically supported mediation pathway contrasts with the positive mechanisms identified by Wang et al. (2026), whose educational-management model examined professional identity and teaching efficacy rather than teacher responsibility as mediators. Ninković and Knežević Florić (2024) highlighted the importance of specifying and testing indirect relationships in research on school leadership and teaching

practice. Jerrim et al. (2025) further demonstrated that associations involving teachers' professional beliefs and instructional quality can vary according to the measures used. The present results therefore indicate that highly favorable descriptive ratings did not translate into a statistically significant overall direct or mediated association. They do not establish that goal setting or teacher responsibility is unimportant; rather, this particular indirect relationship was not supported by the reported data and model.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study established that Social Studies teachers demonstrated very high levels of goal setting, teacher responsibility, and teaching performance. Goal-setting practices were particularly evident in performance appraisal, goal clarity, and goal efficacy, while teacher responsibility was most pronounced in teaching, student motivation, and relationships with students. Teaching performance was similarly rated very high, with classroom management emerging as the strongest area and staff collaboration receiving the lowest rating. Despite these favorable assessments, most goal-setting dimensions showed weak or nonsignificant relationships with teacher responsibility and teaching performance, with only limited significant associations. Furthermore, the mediation analysis revealed no significant direct, indirect, or total effects, indicating that teacher responsibility did not mediate the relationship between goal setting and teaching performance. These findings suggest that high levels of goal setting and teacher responsibility did not necessarily correspond to significant relationships among the examined variables. Consequently, the proposed mediation model was not supported by the findings among the participating Social Studies teachers.

School administrators and educational leaders should strengthen goal-setting practices by ensuring that instructional goals are clearly communicated, contextually relevant, and meaningfully integrated into teachers' professional responsibilities. Greater attention should be given to tangible rewards, organizational facilitation, and continuous guidance to improve the practical application of goal-setting systems. Teacher development programs should sustain the high levels of responsibility and teaching performance while strengthening instructional quality, student engagement, and accountability. Particular emphasis should be placed on improving staff collaboration through professional learning communities, structured peer collaboration, and collaborative instructional planning. Existing strengths in classroom management, student motivation, and student relationships should also be maintained. Furthermore, future researchers should investigate other potential explanatory variables, including teacher motivation, self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and organizational support, considering the nonsignificant mediating role of teacher responsibility. More refined regression or structural models may also be employed to provide a deeper understanding of the relationships among goal setting, teacher responsibility, and teaching performance.

The study focused specifically on Social Studies teachers and examined the relationships among goal setting, teacher responsibility, and teaching performance. Consequently, the findings should be interpreted within this educational context and should not be generalized automatically to teachers from other disciplines or settings. The relational and mediation analyses identified statistical associations but did not establish causal relationships among the examined variables. Moreover, the nonsignificant mediation findings were limited to the proposed model and did not exclude other possible explanatory factors. Future studies may examine additional variables and employ more refined analytical models to further investigate these relationships in different educational contexts.

5. REFERENCES

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice-Hall. https://books.google.com/books?id=89mfzwEACAAJ

Barahona, M., Darwin, S., Durán-Castro, M., & Lobos Stevens, C. (2024). Analyzing teacher educators' perspectives on professional pedagogical responsibility in initial EFL teacher education. Cogent Education, 11(1), Article 2356429. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2356429

Browes, N., & Altinyelken, H. K. (2022). Professionalism in the era of accountability: Role discrepancy and responses among teachers in the Netherlands. The British Journal of Sociology, 73(1), 188–205. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12917

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2022). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (6th ed.). SAGE Publications. https://www.sagepub.com/shop/buy-a-book/research-design-6-270550

Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2024). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (7th ed.). Pearson. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED672918

Criss, C. J., Devine, S. M., & Massey, C. C. (2024). From knowledge to application: Effects of performance feedback and goal-setting on pre-service teacher implementation of evidence-based practice. Journal of the American Academy of Special Education Professionals, 19(2), 8–25. https://doi.org/10.64546/jaasep.547

Criss, C. J., Konrad, M., Alber-Morgan, S. R., & Brock, M. E. (2022). A systematic review of goal setting and performance feedback to improve teacher practice. Journal of Behavioral Education, 33(2), 275–296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10864-022-09494-1

DeVellis, R. F., & Thorpe, C. T. (2021). Scale development: Theory and applications (5th ed.). SAGE Publications. https://www.sagepub.com/shop/buy-a-book/scale-development-5-269114

Duan, S., Bissaker, K., & Xu, Z. (2024). Correlates of teachers' classroom management self-efficacy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 36, Article 43. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09881-2

Field, A. (2024). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (6th ed.). SAGE Publications. https://www.sagepub.com/shop/buy-a-book/discovering-statistics-using-ibm-spss-statistics-6-285130

Fink, A. (2024). How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide (7th ed.). SAGE Publications. https://www.sagepub.com/shop/buy-a-book/how-to-conduct-surveys-7-279527

Fitriah, A., Ahmad, M., & Matin, M. (2021). The effect of goal setting and intrinsic motivation on teacher work performance. Akademika: Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan, 10(1), 219–233. https://doi.org/10.34005/akademika.v10i01.995

Hayes, A. F. (2022). Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach (3rd ed.). Guilford Press. https://www.guilford.com/books/Introduction-to-Mediation-Moderation-and-Conditional-Process-Analysis/Andrew-Hayes/9781462549030

Helding Vembye, M., Weiss, F., & Bhat, B. H. (2024). The effects of co-teaching and related collaborative models of instruction on student achievement: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 94(3), 376–422. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543231186588

Hunter, S. B., & Springer, M. G. (2022). Critical feedback characteristics, teacher human capital, and early-career teacher performance: A mixed-methods analysis. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 44(3), 380–403. https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737211062913

Hwang, N., Huang, F., & Berends, M. (2026). Feeling responsible together: The links between collective teacher responsibility and student achievement. Improving Schools, 28(2), 228–244. https://doi.org/10.1177/13654802261432724

Hyder, M. R., & Farooq, M. S. (2022). Development and validation of teachers' performance appraisal scale (TPAS) for public primary schools of Punjab. International Research Journal of Education and Innovation, 3(2), 241–256. https://doi.org/10.53575/irjei.v3.02(22)25.241-256

Jerrim, J., Morgan, A., & Sims, S. (2023). Teacher autonomy: Good for pupils? Good for teachers? British Educational Research Journal, 49(6), 1187–1209. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3892

Jerrim, J., Prieto-Latorre, C., Marcenaro-Gutierrez, O. D., & Shure, N. (2025). Teacher self-efficacy, instructional practice, and student outcomes: Evidence from the TALIS video study. American Educational Research Journal, 62(2), 378–413. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312241300265

Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. B. (2024). Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches (8th ed.). SAGE Publications. https://www.sagepub.com/shop/buy-a-book/educational-research-8-277701

Lakens, D. (2022). Sample size justification. Collabra: Psychology, 8(1), Article 33267. https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.33267

Lauermann, F., & Karabenick, S. A. (2013). The meaning and measure of teachers' sense of responsibility for educational outcomes. Teaching and Teacher Education, 30, 13–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.10.001

Lee, C., Bobko, P., Earley, P. C., & Locke, E. A. (1991). An empirical analysis of a goal setting questionnaire. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12(6), 467–482. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030120602

Li, G., & Tsang, K. K. (2023). Does accountability aggravate the risk of teacher burnout? Evidence from the Chinese education system. Behavioral Sciences, 13(9), Article 772. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13090772

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. American Psychologist, 57(9), 705–717. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705

Lohr, S. L. (2021). Sampling: Design and analysis (3rd ed.). CRC Press. https://www.routledge.com/9780367279509

Meshack, O. J., Mulwa, D. M., & Munguti, S. (2025). Influence of performance goal setting on enhancing teachers' performance in public secondary schools in Kajiado County, Kenya. European Journal of Education Studies, 12(10). https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v12i10.6205

Ninković, S., & Knežević Florić, O. (2024). School leadership and teaching practice: A systematic review of studies of the indirect effects. Journal of Educational Administration, 62(4), 357–372. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-08-2023-0190

Parcerisa, L., Verger, A., Pagès, M., & Browes, N. (2022). Teacher autonomy in the age of performance-based accountability: A review based on teaching profession regulatory models (2017–2020). Education Policy Analysis Archives, 30, Article 100. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.30.6204

Republic Act No. 10173. (2012). Data Privacy Act of 2012. https://officialgazette.gov.ph/2012/15/republic-act-no-10173

Salkind, N. J., & Frey, B. B. (2025). Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics (8th ed.). SAGE Publications. https://www.sagepub.com/shop/buy-a-book/statistics-for-people-who-think-they-hate-statistics-8-275288

Saunders, M. N. K., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2023). Research methods for business students (9th ed.). Pearson. https://www.pearson.com/en-gb/subject-catalog/p/research-methods-for-business-students/P200000010080/9781292402727

UNESCO. (2024). Global report on teachers: Addressing teacher shortages and transforming the profession. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/global-report-teachers-addressing-teacher-shortages-and-transforming-profession

Wang, Y., Tang, S., & Meng, Y. (2026). Goal-setting mechanisms in educational management: A psychological perspective on student and teacher behavior. Frontiers in Psychology, 16, Article 1680752. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1680752

Wiens, P. D., Calkins, L., Yoder, P. J., & Hightower, A. (2022). Examining the relationship between instructional practice and social studies teacher training: A TALIS study. The Journal of Social Studies Research, 46(2), 123–133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2021.05.006

Zhang, X., & An, I. L. (2024). Teacher's instructional competence, commitment, and satisfaction: Basis for professional development program. International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 13(4), 187–198. https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2024.24628