

Why Teachers Stay: How Transformational School Leadership Shapes Affective, Normative, and Continuance Commitment in Philippine Public Schools

Lani Ealse G. Metante, Abigael Balaga, Norie Ann C. Altejar, Mary Jane Campos, Joycy Barbarona, Joy M. Olarte*

Graduate School, Cebu Technological University - Main Campus, Cebu City, Philippines

Email: *jmolarte776@gmail.com

How to cite this paper: Metante, L. E. G., Balaga, A., Altejar, N. A. C., Campos, M. J., Barbarona, J., & Olarte, J. M. (2026). Why Teachers Stay: How Transformational School Leadership Shapes Affective, Normative, and Continuance Commitment in Philippine Public Schools. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 14, 31-49.

<https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2026.1410003>

Received: August 17, 2026

Accepted: October 6, 2026

Published: October 9, 2026

Copyright © 2026 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract

Teacher commitment is a decisive factor in educational quality, learner outcomes, and school stability, yet the mechanisms by which school leadership sustains it remain understudied in Philippine public basic education. This study investigated the dynamics of teacher commitment through the integrated lenses of Transformational Leadership Theory and Organizational Commitment Theory in Department of Education (DepEd) schools in Region VIII, Philippines. It determined how the four transformational leadership dimensions of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration were associated with teachers' affective, normative, and continuance commitment. An exploratory quantitative design using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) was employed with 319 public basic education teachers drawn through convenience sampling from the schools divisions of the region, exceeding the G*Power minimum of 129 respondents for the largest four-predictor equation (138 under a more conservative five-predictor specification). Data were gathered through a structured questionnaire measuring the seven constructs, analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and WarpPLS 8.0. The measurement model demonstrated acceptable indicator reliability, internal consistency, convergent validity, and discriminant validity after limited item purification, with retained loadings of 0.701 to 0.880, Cronbach's alpha of 0.715 to 0.914, composite reliability of 0.824 to 0.935, and AVE of 0.539 to 0.743. Respondents reported favorable perceptions of all constructs, with individualized consideration obtaining the highest mean (3.77) and idealized influence the lowest (3.44). Four of the seven hypothesized paths were supported: idealized influ-

ence ($\beta = 0.249, p < 0.001$) and individualized consideration ($\beta = 0.163, p = 0.039$) were significantly associated with affective commitment, and affective commitment was significantly associated with normative commitment ($\beta = 0.251, p < 0.001$) and continuance commitment ($\beta = 0.128, p = 0.022$). Inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation were not significantly associated with affective commitment, and idealized influence was not directly associated with normative commitment. The structural model satisfied the WarpPLS fit and quality criteria but explained only 8.6%, 7.4%, and 1.6% of the variance in affective, normative, and continuance commitment, indicating that teacher commitment was also related to conditions beyond the tested leadership pathways. The study concluded that ethical role modeling, individualized support, and emotional attachment were the principal working mechanisms of teacher commitment, while motivational messaging alone was insufficient without supportive systems and enabling conditions. Based on the findings, a Teacher Commitment Strengthening Program anchored on the supported pathways was developed to strengthen the supported commitment pathways in DepEd schools; because no retention, turnover-intention, or actual-stay outcome was measured, implications for teacher retention are indirect and grounded in the wider commitment literature.

Keywords

Transformational Leadership, Organizational Commitment, Teacher Commitment, Affective Commitment, Philippine Public Schools

1. Introduction

Teacher commitment is a central determinant of educational quality, student outcomes, and school effectiveness. In the Philippine Department of Education (DepEd) context, commitment becomes particularly important as educators contend with resource constraints, ongoing reforms, and increasingly complex classrooms, making the study of commitment and its drivers highly relevant for policy and practice (Ramadhini, 2025). Empirical work in Philippine settings links principal leadership and organizational dynamics with teacher motivation, commitment, and retention considerations (Banata et al., 2023; Soelistya, 2024), while evidence from Filipino school and higher education contexts shows how organizational commitment relates to job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and educational quality (Celeste & Bolen, 2024; Rubia et al., 2023).

Transformational Leadership Theory provides a robust framework for understanding how educational leaders inspire teachers to enhance performance and strengthen organizational attachment through four key dimensions: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Kareem et al., 2023; Coşkun et al., 2023). Empirical work in schools demonstrates that transformational leadership is associated with greater teacher motivation and willingness to invest effort in organizational aims, while recogniz-

ing the contextual sensitivity of leadership effects (Liao, 2024; Cortes, 2025; Rubia et al., 2023). Organizational Commitment Theory complements this lens by distinguishing affective, normative, and continuance components of teachers' attachment and their behavioral consequences for retention and performance (Banata et al., 2023; Celeste & Bolen, 2024; Othman et al., 2025).

The integrated framework positions leadership practices as primary correlates of affective attachment: transformational leadership can bolster affective commitment by creating meaningful work, supportive relationships, and a compelling shared vision, and these responses are in turn associated with teachers' normative and continuance engagement with the school (Manggiasih & Santoso, 2024; Resa & Sandi, 2025; Nasution et al., 2024; Hidayat et al., 2024). However, comprehensive empirical evidence on these pathways among Philippine public basic education teachers remains limited, and dimension-specific research indicates that transformational leadership components can have unequal or mediated effects depending on culture, well-being, and available support (Meidelina et al., 2023).

Accordingly, this study evaluated the factors associated with teacher commitment through the integrated frameworks of Transformational Leadership Theory and Organizational Commitment Theory among DepEd teachers in Region VIII, Philippines, as a basis for a Teacher Commitment Strengthening Program. Specifically, it 1) described the demographic profile of teacher-respondents; 2) measured perceptions of the four transformational leadership dimensions and three organizational commitment components; 3) evaluated the reliability and validity of the measurement model; 4) assessed the structural model; and 5) tested seven hypothesized paths using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM), an approach well suited for exploratory models with multiple latent constructs in educational research (Sunaengsih et al., 2023; Hair et al., 2019).

2. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

2.1. Theoretical Background

Transformational Leadership Theory describes leaders who motivate followers to transcend personal interests in pursuit of a collective vision. Idealized influence operates through ethical role modeling that fosters relational trust and admiration; inspirational motivation communicates a compelling shared vision; intellectual stimulation encourages questioning, innovation, and creative problem solving; and individualized consideration attends to each follower's developmental needs through mentoring and coaching (Kareem et al., 2023; Hyseni Duraku & Hoxha, 2021; Bellibaş et al., 2021). Organizational Commitment Theory distinguishes affective commitment (emotional attachment and identification), normative commitment (felt obligation to remain), and continuance commitment (perceived costs of leaving), which are related yet conceptually distinct dimensions of attachment (Caballes & Limos-Galay, 2023; Othman et al., 2025; Stark et al., 2025). In value-driven educational environments such as DepEd, the alignment between a leader's vision and teachers' values is theorized to foster cultural identity, pride,

and loyalty, with trust and perceived organizational support acting as reinforcing mechanisms (Resa & Sandi, 2025; Nasution et al., 2024; Hidayat et al., 2024).

2.2. Hypotheses

Seven hypotheses were formulated and tested at the 0.05 level of significance. H1 - H4 proposed that idealized influence (H1), inspirational motivation (H2), intellectual stimulation (H3), and individualized consideration (H4) are each positively associated with affective commitment, grounded in evidence that transformational leadership dimensions enhance emotional attachment through trust, identification with a shared vision, and personalized support (Manggiasih & Santoso, 2024; Resa & Sandi, 2025; Tran et al., 2023; Eyal et al., 2024). H5 and H6 proposed that affective commitment is positively associated with normative commitment (H5) and continuance commitment (H6), reflecting the layered development of attachment orientations within the three-component model (Caballes & Limos-Galay, 2023; Masry-Herzallah & Dor-Haim, 2023). The directional specification of these two paths warrants explicit justification because the three commitment components are commonly treated as related but distinct dimensions rather than as causally ordered states (Othman et al., 2025; Stark et al., 2025). Within the three-component model, affective commitment is theorized to develop earliest and most directly from favorable work experiences, whereas normative commitment develops partly through the internalization of reciprocity obligations that favorable, emotionally engaging treatment creates, and continuance commitment accumulates through the side-bets and organization-specific investments that emotionally attached teachers are more likely to make and to value (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991). On this reasoning, emotional attachment functions as the proximal orientation from which felt obligation and perceived leaving costs partly derive. Because the design is cross-sectional, however, H5 and H6 are specified and interpreted as directional associations implied by this theoretical ordering, not as causal claims. Finally, H7 proposed that idealized influence is directly and positively associated with normative commitment, consistent with reports of positive associations between transformational leadership and normative dimensions of commitment (Özkaya & Akın, 2023; Sucitra & Hariri, 2023).

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

The study utilized an exploratory quantitative research design employing PLS-SEM to investigate the determinants of teacher commitment in DepEd schools in Region VIII. The exploratory design suited the intricate, multifaceted linkages between transformational leadership practices and organizational commitment components in Philippine public schools, where comprehensive empirical information was limited. PLS-SEM served as the principal analytical method owing to its appropriateness for theory development and predictive research with multiple latent constructs, its capacity to concurrently assess measurement and structural

models, and its tolerance for non-normal data distributions and moderate sample sizes typical in educational research (Hair et al., 2019; Sunaengsih et al., 2023). Data analysis utilized WarpPLS 8.0, which produced extensive diagnostics for model fit, reliability, validity, effect sizes, and predictive relevance.

3.2. Respondents and Sampling

The participants were teachers employed by DepEd in Region VIII (Eastern Visayas), a region combining urban and rural schools with notable variation in class sizes, resource availability, and access to professional development (Anog et al., 2024). The minimum required sample size was determined using G*Power 3.1.9.7 under the F-tests framework for linear multiple regression (fixed model, R^2 deviation from zero; effect size $f^2 = 0.15$, $\alpha = 0.05$, power = 0.95). The largest structural equation contains four predictors (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration predicting affective commitment), for which this setup requires 129 participants; the originally computed figure of 138 corresponds to a more conservative five-predictor specification and was retained as the recruitment floor. Convenience sampling was employed across the geographically dispersed divisions; 332 teachers initially participated, and after data cleansing, 319 valid responses were retained, substantially exceeding the minimum requirement. The largest groups came from the Division of Leyte (31.0%) and the Division of Southern Leyte (23.5%), followed by the Divisions of Samar (11.3%), Eastern Samar (8.5%), and Northern Samar/Biliran (7.5%), with the remainder from the Ormoc, Calbayog, Baybay, Catbalogan, and Tacloban City Divisions and other offices.

The sampling frame consisted of teachers currently employed in public elementary and secondary schools under the DepEd Region VIII schools divisions during the data-collection period. Eligibility required current employment as a DepEd basic education teacher in the region and provision of written informed consent; non-teaching personnel were excluded. Recruitment was school-mediated: following division- and school-level authorization, questionnaires were disseminated through school heads after the orientation sessions described in Section 3.4, so the number of teachers invited per division was not centrally logged and division-level response rates cannot be computed; this is acknowledged as a limitation of the convenience sampling design. Of the 332 completed questionnaires retrieved, 319 (96.1%) were retained after data cleansing (Section 3.5). The retained respondents were distributed as follows: Division of Leyte, 99 (31.0%); Division of Southern Leyte, 75 (23.5%); Division of Samar, 36 (11.3%); Division of Eastern Samar, 27 (8.5%); Divisions of Northern Samar and Biliran, 24 (7.5%); Ormoc City Division, 21 (6.6%); Calbayog City Division, 13 (4.1%); Baybay City Division, 8 (2.5%); Catbalogan City Division, 7 (2.2%); Tacloban City Division, 4 (1.3%); and other offices, 5 (1.6%).

3.3. Instrument

A structured questionnaire adapted from established measures of transforma-

tional leadership and organizational commitment and contextualized to the DepEd setting measured seven constructs: Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration, Affective Commitment, Normative Commitment, and Continuance Commitment. Each construct was operationalized through five reflective items rated on a five-point Likert scale, with leadership items representing observable behaviors such as ethical example, vision communication, open discussion, and individualized coaching, and commitment items representing belonging, duty, and perceived costs of leaving.

The leadership items were adapted from the four transformational leadership dimensions operationalized in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire tradition (Bass & Avolio, 1995), and the commitment items were adapted from the three-component organizational commitment scales of Allen and Meyer (1990) and Meyer and Allen (1991). Adaptation involved rewording the items to the DepEd school context, referring to the school head, the school community, and DepEd programs and conditions, while preserving each construct's definitional content. The adapted instrument was reviewed for content and face validity by a panel of experts in educational leadership and research methodology, whose feedback guided item refinement before administration, and it was administered in English, the official working language of DepEd. The complete 35-item instrument, organized by construct, is reproduced in Appendix A.

3.4. Data Collection and Ethical Considerations

After securing institutional authorization through a formal transmittal letter, the researchers conducted an orientation with participating teachers, explained the voluntary nature of participation and the confidentiality of responses, and obtained written informed consent. Printed and digital questionnaires were administered over a three-week period to accommodate teachers across the region; completed instruments were retrieved, checked for completeness, coded, anonymized, and handled confidentially.

3.5. Data Analysis

Prior to modeling, the dataset underwent comprehensive cleansing. Of the 332 questionnaires retrieved, 13 cases (3.9%) were excluded for zero-variance (straight-lined) response patterns. The 319 retained cases contained no missing construct responses, so no imputation was applied. Indicator screening for very low variance ($SD < 0.25$), multicollinearity assessment, and verification of consistent coding were also performed before estimation. Frequency counts and percentages summarized demographic characteristics, and weighted means described construct perceptions. PLS-SEM evaluated indicator loadings, Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability, Average Variance Extracted, the Fornell-Larcker criterion, and the HTMT ratio for the measurement model (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Henseler et al., 2015; Hair et al., 2020), and model fit and quality indices, R^2 , full collinearity VIF, Q^2 , path coefficients, and effect sizes for the structural model (Tenenhaus et al., 2005; Wetzels et al., 2009; Kock, 2015; Hair et al., 2019).

4. Results

4.1. Respondent Profile

The largest age group consisted of respondents aged 30-39 years (38.9%), and most were female (63.9%). Teachers with master's units comprised the largest educational attainment group (41.1%), and Teacher III was the most frequently reported position (33.9%). The largest experience group had one to five years of teaching service (29.2%), and the largest assignment group handled elementary classes (41.7%). Participation in one or two leadership or professional development activities was the most common training category (39.2%), although 34.2% had not attended any such activity. Limited access to educational and technological resources was reported by 30.4%, with another 27.6% reporting very limited access.

4.2. Descriptive Results

Table 1 summarizes the respondents' perceptions of the seven constructs. All constructs were interpreted as Agree, with overall means ranging from 3.44 to 3.77. Individualized Consideration obtained the highest mean (3.77), followed by Affective Commitment (3.74) and Normative Commitment (3.73), while Idealized Influence obtained the lowest mean (3.44). The pattern indicated that personalized mentoring, listening, coaching, and recognition were the most strongly perceived leadership practices, whereas ethical role modeling and the consistent consideration of ethical consequences in school decisions represented comparatively greater areas for strengthening.

Table 1. Overall summary perception of the constructs in the model.

Construct	Mean	SD	Description
1. Idealized Influence (II)	3.44	0.66	Agree
2. Inspirational Motivation (IM)	3.72	0.91	Agree
3. Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	3.61	0.88	Agree
4. Individualized Consideration (IC)	3.77	0.89	Agree
5. Affective Commitment (AC)	3.74	0.61	Agree
6. Normative Commitment (NC)	3.73	0.64	Agree
7. Continuance Commitment (CC)	3.72	0.72	Agree

4.3. Measurement Model

Table 2 presents the indicator loadings, reliability, and convergent-validity coefficients after limited item purification (items AC5, NC5, and CC4 were removed for falling below the reflective-measurement criteria). Item removal occurred during measurement-model assessment, before any structural-path estimation. Each affected construct retained four reflective items spanning its definitional content: the retained affective commitment items continue to capture emotional attachment, belonging, and identification (the removed AC5 referenced attachment through collegial camaraderie and student interactions); the retained normative commitment items continue to capture felt duty and loyalty to the school (the

removed NC5 referenced a self-directed promise to students); and the retained continuance commitment items continue to capture the perceived costs and investments associated with leaving (the removed CC4 referenced limited external opportunities). Construct coverage was therefore preserved at the level of each construct's core definition. The retained loadings ranged from 0.701 to 0.880, Cronbach's alpha from 0.715 to 0.914, composite reliability from 0.824 to 0.935, and AVE from 0.539 to 0.743, satisfying the conventional thresholds for indicator reliability, internal consistency, and convergent validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2019, 2020).

Table 2. Indicator loadings, reliability, and convergent validity.

Construct	Retained Items (Loadings)	α	CR	AVE
Idealized Influence (II)	II1 (0.716), II2 (0.761), II3 (0.790), II4 (0.750), II5 (0.733)	0.805	0.865	0.563
Inspirational Motivation (IM)	IM1 (0.779), IM2 (0.823), IM3 (0.792), IM4 (0.772), IM5 (0.801)	0.851	0.895	0.630
Intellectual Stimulation (IS)	IS1 (0.870), IS2 (0.861), IS3 (0.877), IS4 (0.848), IS5 (0.708)	0.889	0.920	0.698
Individualized Consideration (IC)	IC1 (0.807), IC2 (0.875), IC3 (0.880), IC4 (0.876), IC5 (0.870)	0.914	0.935	0.743
Affective Commitment (AC)	AC1 (0.701), AC2 (0.760), AC3 (0.761), AC4 (0.732)	0.722	0.828	0.546
Normative Commitment (NC)	NC1 (0.747), NC2 (0.738), NC3 (0.723), NC4 (0.729)	0.715	0.824	0.539
Continuance Commitment (CC)	CC1 (0.727), CC2 (0.730), CC3 (0.735), CC5 (0.759)	0.720	0.827	0.544

Table 3 presents the Fornell-Larcker results: the square roots of AVE on the diagonal (0.734 to 0.862) exceeded all corresponding inter-construct correlations, the highest being 0.662 between Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration. **Table 4** presents the HTMT ratios, which ranged from 0.083 to 0.749 and remained below the 0.90 criterion, with the highest ratios occurring among the transformational leadership dimensions. Both criteria therefore supported the discriminant validity of the seven constructs (Henseler et al., 2015).

Table 3. Discriminant validity using the Fornell-Larcker criterion (square roots of AVE on the diagonal).

Construct	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. II	(0.750)	0.222	0.152	0.221	0.269	0.124	0.177
2. IM	0.222	(0.794)	0.656	0.654	0.091	0.043	0.061
3. IS	0.152	0.656	(0.835)	0.662	0.047	0.078	0.039
4. IC	0.221	0.654	0.662	(0.862)	0.150	0.066	0.103
5. AC	0.269	0.091	0.047	0.150	(0.739)	0.266	0.128
6. NC	0.124	0.043	0.078	0.066	0.266	(0.734)	0.266
7. CC	0.177	0.061	0.039	0.103	0.128	0.266	(0.738)

Table 4. Discriminant validity using the HTMT ratio of correlations.

Construct	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. IM	0.268					
3. IS	0.182	0.749				
4. IC	0.264	0.738	0.733			
5. AC	0.351	0.123	0.083	0.185		
6. NC	0.172	0.087	0.100	0.095	0.372	
7. CC	0.234	0.105	0.086	0.127	0.188	0.368

4.4. Structural Model

Table 5 presents the model-fit and quality indices. The Average Path Coefficient (0.136), Average R-Squared (0.059), and Average Adjusted R-Squared (0.052) were significant at $p < 0.001$; AVIF (1.506) and AFVIF (1.567) were below both the maximum and ideal limits; and the SPR, RSCR, SSR, and NLBCDR values met their respective criteria. The Tenenhaus GoF of 0.189 was above the small benchmark but below the medium benchmark, indicating limited combined explanatory performance (Tenenhaus et al., 2005; Wetzels et al., 2009).

Table 5. Model fit and quality indices.

Index	Value	Criterion
Average Path Coefficient (APC)	0.136, $p < 0.001$	$p < 0.05$
Average R-Squared (ARS)	0.059, $p < 0.001$	$p < 0.05$
Average Adjusted R-Squared (AARS)	0.052, $p < 0.001$	$p < 0.05$
Average Block VIF (AVIF)	1.506	≤ 5 , ideally ≤ 3.3
Average Full Collinearity VIF (AFVIF)	1.567	≤ 5 , ideally ≤ 3.3
Tenenhaus GoF	0.189	Small ≥ 0.10 ; medium ≥ 0.25 ; large ≥ 0.36
Sympson's Paradox Ratio (SPR)	0.714	≥ 0.70 , ideally = 1.00
R-Squared Contribution Ratio (RSCR)	0.972	≥ 0.90 , ideally = 1.00
Statistical Suppression Ratio (SSR)	0.714	≥ 0.70
Nonlinear Bivariate Causality Direction Ratio (NLBCDR)	1.000	≥ 0.70

Table 6 shows that the model explained 8.6% of the variance in Affective Commitment, 7.4% in Normative Commitment, and 1.6% in Continuance Commitment, all well below the rough benchmark for weak explanatory power, although the positive Q^2 values (0.059, 0.059, and 0.013) indicated that predictive relevance was present. Full collinearity VIF values between 1.108 and 1.165 were far below 3.30, reducing concern about serious multicollinearity or common-method bias (Kock, 2015; Hair et al., 2019), although this diagnostic cannot rule out common-source inflation of the observed associations.

Table 6. Coefficient of determination, full collinearity VIF, and predictive relevance.

Endogenous Construct	R ²	Full Collinearity VIF	Q ²
Affective Commitment (AC)	0.086	1.165	0.059
Normative Commitment (NC)	0.074	1.152	0.059
Continuance Commitment (CC)	0.016	1.108	0.013

4.5. Hypothesis Testing

Table 7 summarizes the results of the seven hypotheses. Four paths were statistically supported: Idealized Influence was positively associated with Affective Commitment ($\beta = 0.249$, $p < 0.001$, $f^2 = 0.064$), Individualized Consideration was positively associated with Affective Commitment ($\beta = 0.163$, $p = 0.039$, $f^2 = 0.014$), and Affective Commitment was positively associated with both Normative Commitment ($\beta = 0.251$, $p < 0.001$, $f^2 = 0.063$) and Continuance Commitment ($\beta = 0.128$, $p = 0.022$, $f^2 = 0.017$). Inspirational Motivation ($\beta = -0.010$, $p = 0.898$) and Intellectual Stimulation ($\beta = -0.092$, $p = 0.241$) were not significantly associated with Affective Commitment, and Idealized Influence was not directly associated with Normative Commitment ($\beta = 0.057$, $p = 0.315$). The supported effect sizes were below or within the small-effect range, indicating selective and limited practical influence rather than strong explanatory power.

Table 7. Results of hypothesis testing.

Hypothesis	Path	β	p -value	f^2	Decision
H1	II $\rightarrow$ AC	0.249	<0.001	0.064	Supported
H2	IM $\rightarrow$ AC	-0.010	0.898	0.000	Not supported
H3	IS $\rightarrow$ AC	-0.092	0.241	0.004	Not supported
H4	IC $\rightarrow$ AC	0.163	0.039	0.014	Supported
H5	AC $\rightarrow$ NC	0.251	<0.001	0.063	Supported
H6	AC $\rightarrow$ CC	0.128	0.022	0.017	Supported
H7	II $\rightarrow$ NC	0.057	0.315	0.003	Not supported

5. Discussion

The supported results identified idealized influence and individualized consideration as the leadership dimensions with direct relationships to teachers' emotional attachment, with affective commitment in turn associated with both normative and continuance commitment. Teachers were more likely to feel emotionally attached to their schools when school heads modeled integrity, confidence, inclusivity, and commitment to the collective good, consistent with studies linking transformational role-modeling behaviors with organizational commitment (Coşkun et al., 2023; Kareem et al., 2023), and when leaders provided consistent, individualized mentoring, coaching, and recognition of individual strengths (Tran et al., 2023; Eyal et al., 2024). Emotional identification, in turn, appears to provide the

pathway through which professional dedication becomes a felt responsibility to remain and strengthens teachers' valuation of what would be lost by leaving (Caballes & Limos-Galay, 2023; Othman et al., 2025).

The unsupported paths were equally instructive. Favorable average perceptions of inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation were not accompanied by stronger affective commitment: encouraging messages may be valued without changing how deeply teachers identify with the school (Hyseni Duraku & Hoxha, 2021; Munajim & Acharjya, 2025), and cognitive challenge and innovation may primarily influence instructional practice rather than organizational attachment when no implementation time, materials, or follow-up support accompanies them (Bellibaş et al., 2021; Lin et al., 2022). Similarly, idealized influence was not directly associated with normative commitment, although an indirect association through affective commitment was consistent with the supported paths; admiration for a leader does not automatically become a moral duty toward the organization, which also depends on professional opportunities, treatment, workload, school culture, and whether the institution honors its commitments to staff (Özkaya & Akin, 2023; Windasari et al., 2023; Magnate, 2023).

The weak explanatory power across all three commitment dimensions carries its own message: teachers' emotional, moral, and cost-based reasons for remaining were related to substantial factors outside the tested leadership pathways. Continuance commitment in particular may depend on benefits, family stability, tenure, available alternatives, and location, while normative commitment may be shaped by professional ethics, socialization, and reciprocal organizational support (Banata et al., 2023; Anog et al., 2024; Stark et al., 2025). School heads should therefore avoid assuming that motivational speeches, innovation discussions, or ethical example will independently secure loyalty without supportive systems, equitable workload arrangements, and meaningful teacher experiences, and administrators should combine the supported leadership practices with broader human-resource and school-improvement measures (Hair et al., 2019; Meidelina et al., 2023).

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

The integrated Transformational Leadership and Organizational Commitment model was reliably measured and provided a statistically acceptable but modest explanation of teacher commitment among public basic education teachers in Region VIII. Teachers generally perceived their school heads positively and reported favorable affective, normative, and continuance commitment, yet only idealized influence and individualized consideration were directly associated with affective commitment, which in turn was associated with normative and continuance commitment. Ethical role modeling, personalized support, and emotional attachment were therefore the principal supported mechanisms within the proposed model, and favorable leadership perceptions alone did not automatically produce strong or comprehensive teacher commitment.

Based on the findings, a Teacher Commitment Strengthening Program is proposed, prioritizing ethical and values-consistent leadership, individualized mentoring and coaching, and school experiences that strengthen teachers' emotional attachment, with mechanisms for monitoring organizational loyalty, retention intentions, and teacher-support needs. The program should be subjected to expert and stakeholder validation, pilot-tested in schools divisions representing different resource and geographic conditions, refined through implementation evidence, and institutionalized where feasible. The DepEd Regional Office and Schools Division Offices should implement targeted leadership development for school heads emphasizing the two supported antecedents of affective commitment, requiring leaders to demonstrate transparent and ethical decision-making, fair recognition, consistent role modeling, and structured individualized follow-up. Vision communication, innovation, professional learning, resources, and workload arrangements should be translated into concrete and context-responsive school practices rather than treated as sufficient commitment strategies by themselves.

The findings should be interpreted in light of the study's exploratory, cross-sectional, self-report design, the use of convenience sampling, and its restriction to DepEd teachers in one Philippine region, together with the modest explained variance of the structural model. Because the design is cross-sectional and all constructs were self-reported by the same respondents on a single instrument, the reported relationships are associations whose causal direction cannot be established, and common-source (common-method) variance may inflate their magnitude. In addition, no retention, turnover-intention, or actual-stay outcome was measured; statements concerning teacher retention are therefore extrapolations from the wider commitment-retention literature rather than findings of this study. Future research should replicate and extend the model using probability sampling, additional regions, longitudinal or mixed-method designs, and objective retention indicators, and should examine mediators such as trust, perceived organizational support, school culture, and job satisfaction that may explain the unsupported pathways.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the Dissertation Advisory Committee of the Graduate School of Cebu Technological University for their guidance, and the participating Department of Education schools divisions and teachers of Region VIII for their cooperation in this study.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, L.E.G.M. and J.M.O.; methodology, L.E.G.M.; software, L.E.G.M. and M.J.C.; validation, A.B., N.A.C.A., and J.B.; formal analysis, L.E.G.M. and A.B.; investigation, L.E.G.M.; resources, N.A.C.A. and M.J.C.; data curation, L.E.G.M. and J.B.; writing—original draft preparation, L.E.G.M.; writing—review and edit-

ing, A.B., N.A.C.A., M.J.C., J.B., and J.M.O.; visualization, M.J.C.; supervision, J.M.O.; project administration, J.M.O. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request; the data are not publicly available because they contain information that could compromise the privacy of the participating teachers and schools.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
- Anog, M. D. I., Vera, J. V. D., & Peteros, E. D. L. (2024). Examining Teacher Retention through the Lens of Job Satisfaction and Commitment in a Philippine Private School. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 23, 242-264. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.9.13>
- Banata, A., Pandjaitan, N. K., & Ramly, A. T. (2023). Teachers Turnover Intention: The Role of Work Motivation, Job Stress, and Organisational Commitment. *International Journal of Social Service and Research*, 3, 2931-2941. <https://doi.org/10.46799/ijssr.v3i11.587>
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Mind Garden. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t03624-000>
- Bellibaş, M. Ş., Kılınç, A. Ç., & Polatcan, M. (2021). The Moderation Role of Transformational Leadership in the Effect of Instructional Leadership on Teacher Professional Learning and Instructional Practice: An Integrated Leadership Perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57, 776-814. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161x211035079>
- Caballes, C. S., & Limos-Galay, J. A. (2023). Correlates of Organizational Commitment: Basis for Strategic Intervention Plan. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management*, 11, 15-32. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsm.2023.1148>
- Celeste, J., & Bolen- Amparo, J. (2024). Spiritual Leadership of School Heads and Organizational Commitment of Teachers: Inputs for Capability-Building Program. *Journal of Higher Education Research*, 12, 128-143. <https://doi.org/10.70228/pfree2024027jher>
- Cortes, F. D., & Laranjo, F. (2025). Teaching Efficacy and Organizational Commitment of Public School Teachers in the Dinagat Islands. *Teaching Efficacy and Organizational Commitment of Public School Teachers in the Dinagat Islands*, 2, 294-304. <https://doi.org/10.69481/teocp>
- Coşkun, B., Katitaş, S., & Arslan, P. (2023). School Principals' Transformational Leadership Behaviors as a Predictor of Teachers' Perceptions of Organizational Commitment. *Research in Pedagogy*, 13, 193-207. <https://doi.org/10.5937/istrped2301193c>
- Hyseni Duraku, Z., & Hoxha, L. (2021). Impact of Transformational and Transactional Attributes of School Principal Leadership on Teachers' Motivation for Work. *Frontiers*

- in Education*, 6, Article 659919. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.659919>
- Eyal, O., Berkovich, I., & Yosef-Hassidim, D. (2024). Principal-Teachers Agreement on Teachers' Interpersonal Emotion Regulation: Relations with Principals' Transformational Leadership, Teaching Staff Positive Collective Emotions, and Teaching Staff Organizational Commitment. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 35, 43-53. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-024-00938-y>
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39-50. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3151312>
- Hair, J. F., Howard, M. C., & Nitzl, C. (2020). Assessing Measurement Model Quality in PLS-SEM Using Confirmatory Composite Analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 109, 101-110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.069>
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to Use and How to Report the Results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31, 2-24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb-11-2018-0203>
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A New Criterion for Assessing Discriminant Validity in Variance-Based Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43, 115-135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>
- Hidayat, C., Hermawan, A., & Berlianti, D. O. (2024). The Influence of Organizational Culture, Transformational Leadership on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, and Organizational Commitment through Employee Engagement. *Indonesian Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 3, 100-120. <https://doi.org/10.56916/ijess.v3i2.635>
- Kareem, J., Patrick, H. A., Prabakaran, N., B, V., Tania, V., M. P. M., P. K. et al. (2023). Transformational Educational Leaders Inspire School Educators' Commitment. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, Article 1171513. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1171513>
- Kock, N. (2015). Common Method Bias in PLS-SEM: A Full Collinearity Assessment Approach. *International Journal of e-Collaboration*, 11, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijec.2015100101>
- Liao, J. (2024). Situational Leadership Practices of Higher Education in China as Correlates to Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Education and Educational Research*, 9, 93-99. <https://doi.org/10.54097/5jttnn58>
- Lin, W., Yin, H., & Liu, Z. (2022). The Roles of Transformational Leadership and Growth Mindset in Teacher Professional Development: The Mediation of Teacher Self-Efficacy. *Sustainability*, 14, Article 6489. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14116489>
- Magnate, F. (2023). Exploring the Mediating Role on Distributive and Instructional Leadership of Teacher Organizational Satisfaction to Commitment: A Structural Equation Model. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, 14.
- Manggiasih, M., & Santoso, C. B. (2024). Transformational Leadership and Employee Performance: The Mediating Role of Affective Commitment among Millennial Workers. *Journal of Social Studies Arts and Humanities (JSSAH)*, 4, 6-11. <https://doi.org/10.33751/jssah.v4i1.9955>
- Masry-Herzallah, A., & Dor-haim, P. (2023). Jewish and Arab Teachers' Views on School Communications, Innovation and Commitment after COVID-19: Sector of Education as a Moderator. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 38, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-11-2022-0467>
- Meidelina, O., Saleh, A. Y., Cathlin, C. A., & Winesa, S. A. (2023). Transformational Leadership and Teacher Well-Being: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 17, 417-424. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v17i3.20858>

- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-z)
- Munajim, A., & Acharjya, V. (2025). Exploring the Role of Transformational Leadership in Boosting Lecturer Commitment and Performance in Islamic Higher Institutions. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 9, 624-638. <https://doi.org/10.33650/al-tanzim.v9i2.11057>
- Nasution, N. A., Fahruzi, A., Rusmewahni, R., & Dewi, K. V. (2024). Implementation of Transformational Leadership to Influence Affective Commitment through Perceived Organization Support. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting Research (IJEBAR)*, 8, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.29040/ijebar.v8i2.14121>
- Othman, C., Busari, A. H., & Sulong, M. (2025). The Role of Followership in Enhancing Teachers' Organizational Commitment Dimensions. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 19, 1753-1762. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v19i4.23042>
- Özkaya, E., & Akin, M. A. (2023). Analysis of the Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Organizational Commitment According to Teacher Perceptions. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 31, 109-120. <https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.1246446>
- Ramadhini, K. (2025). The Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Meaningful Work to the Commitment of Teacher Organizations in the Regional Secondary School of Padang City, West Sumatra. *American Journal of Economic and Management Business (AJEMB)*, 4, 302-316. <https://doi.org/10.58631/ajemb.v4i4.199>
- Resa, R., & Sandi, H. H. (2025). Effect of Transformational Leader on Affective Commitment: The Mediating Role of Trust in Leader at Bappeda of West Sumatra Province. *Golden Ratio of Human Resource Management*, 6, 113-126. <https://doi.org/10.52970/grhrm.v6i1.1620>
- Rubia, J., Niere, M. I., & Jortil, M. (2023). Transformational Leadership and Organizational Commitment of Selected Higher Education Institutions in Zamboanga Peninsula. *Sprink Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2, 19-30. <https://doi.org/10.55559/sjahss.v2i06.116>
- Soelistya, D. (2024). Investigating the Relationship between Transformational Leadership, Compensation, and Teacher Performance through Organizational Commitment in an Islamic Foundation Setting. *Al-Tanzim: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 8, 377-391. <https://doi.org/10.33650/al-tanzim.v8i2.6428>
- Stark, H. P., Smith, R. W., & Carter, N. T. (2025). Organizational Commitment Profiles and Employee Well-Being: Exploratory and Confirmatory Latent Profile Analyses. *Occupational Health Science*, 9, 639-673. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41542-025-00225-2>
- Sucitra, D. A., & Hariri, H. (2023). The Influence of Principal's Instructional Leadership on Teacher Commitment. *Improvement: Jurnal Ilmiah untuk Peningkatan Mutu Manajemen Pendidikan*, 10, 123-128. <https://doi.org/10.21009/improvement.v10i2.39682>
- Sunaengsih, C., Djuanda, D., Irawati, R., Isrok'atun, I., Karlina, D. A., & Juneli, J. A. (2023). Survey on Transformational Leadership Models in Improving the Quality of Academic Services of Elementary Schools. *Mimbar Sekolah Dasar*, 10, 429-455. <https://doi.org/10.53400/mimbar-sd.v10i2.51289>
- Tenenhaus, M., Vinzi, V. E., Chatelin, Y., & Lauro, C. (2005). PLS Path Modeling. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 48, 159-205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2004.03.005>
- Tran, V. D., Huynh, T. T. V., & Le, T. A. D. (2023). Effects of Principals' Leadership Styles on Teachers' Commitment in Vietnam. *International Journal of Evaluation and Re-*

search in Education (IJERE), 12, 1572-1581.

<https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i3.25225>

Wetzels, M., Odekerken-Schröder, G., & van Oppen, C. (2009). Using PLS Path Modeling for Assessing Hierarchical Construct Models: Guidelines and Empirical Illustration1. *MIS Quarterly*, 33, 177-195. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20650284>

Windasari, W., Roesminingsih, E., Sholeh, M., Setyowati, S., & Hamzah, M. I. B. M. (2023). Examining the Mediating Role of School Culture on the Relationship between Transformational Leadership, Teacher Commitment and Organizational Change in Elementary School. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian dan Kajian Kepustakaan di Bidang Pendidikan, Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran*, 9, 893-902.

<https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v9i3.8408>

Appendix A. Survey Instrument

The complete 35-item questionnaire administered to respondents is reproduced below, organized by construct. All items were rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). Leadership items were adapted from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire tradition (Bass & Avolio, 1995) and commitment items from the three-component commitment scales (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991), contextualized to the DepEd setting; content validity was established through expert-panel review as described in Section 3.3. Items AC5, NC5, and CC4 (marked with an asterisk) were removed during measurement-model purification and did not enter the structural analysis.

Idealized Influence (II)

II1. My school head instills pride in me for being part of the school community by publicly recognizing my creative contributions, such as providing innovative teaching strategies during school-based recognition programs.

II2. My school head demonstrates confidence and authority, such as by effectively addressing issues like limited instructional materials during meetings with school stakeholders.

II3. My school head emphasizes the importance of creating a strong and inclusive learning environment where no student is left behind, regardless of socioeconomic background.

II4. My school head considers ethical consequences in decisions, such as balancing achieving high test scores while ensuring we do not compromise our students' well-being.

II5. My school head prioritizes the collective good of the school and goes beyond personal interests, such as personally contributing supplies during Brigada Eskwela to support the school community.

Inspirational Motivation (IM)

IM1. My school head speaks with passion and excitement during faculty meetings about the vision of the school achieving higher National Achievement Test (NAT) scores and becoming a model for other DEPED schools.

IM2. My school head inspires me to undertake challenging goals, such as developing instructional plans for multigrade-level learners despite limited resources available in the school.

IM3. My school head articulates a compelling vision of producing globally competitive and values-driven graduates from our school, inspiring us to strive harder in our teaching roles.

IM4. My school head consistently assures us that we can overcome any challenges we face, such as when preparing students for competitions like the Math Olympiad or journalism contests.

IM5. My school head promotes team spirit by emphasizing collaboration during school-based management projects, such as enhancing the school facilities

through programs like Brigada Eskwela.

Intellectual Stimulation (IS)

IS1. My school head involves teachers in decision-making and seeks our input during Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions to improve our approaches to the Enhanced Basic Education Curriculum (K-12).

IS2. My school head encourages thinking of new strategies, such as using technology and interactive tools, to address challenges like enhancing students' reading comprehension in the "Every Child a Reader Program" (ECARP).

IS3. My school head challenges traditional teaching methods, such as by introducing project-based learning or inquiry-based learning as part of classroom instruction.

IS4. My school head motivates us to suggest innovative practices, like organizing remedial tutorials or after-school reading clubs for struggling learners.

IS5. My school head facilitates open discussions during LAC sessions and demonstrates openness to diverse perspectives on teaching strategies or classroom management practices, such as strategies for multigrade classrooms.

Individualized Consideration (IC)

IC1. My school head takes time to mentor me and help me strengthen my instructional competencies by conducting classroom observations and offering constructive feedback afterward.

IC2. My school head listens to my concerns, such as dealing with challenges related to large class sizes or parental engagement, and provides practical advice to address these issues.

IC3. My school head acknowledges my strengths, such as my skills in organizing events, by assigning me key responsibilities like leading the Teachers' Day program or coordinating school outreach programs.

IC4. My school head supports me in personal circumstances, such as allowing schedule adjustments when I faced family emergencies or needed additional time for professional development.

IC5. My school head acts as a coach by providing clear guidance when I encounter challenges in implementing innovations in teaching, such as integrating gamification into lessons for higher student engagement.

Affective Commitment (AC)

AC1. I feel a strong sense of belonging to this school because of the shared vision of providing quality, accessible, and inclusive education to every student.

AC2. I am proud to represent my school in DEPED-organized events like sports competitions, district conferences, and teachers' conventions, knowing that our collective efforts make a difference.

AC3. I identify with the mission and values of my school, especially in fostering student-centered teaching that focuses on lifelong learning and social responsibility.

ity.

AC4. I feel that being a teacher in this school allows me to significantly contribute to improving the lives of Filipino learners and fulfilling the national goals of education.

AC5*. I feel emotionally attached to the school because of the camaraderie and support shared with my colleagues and the inspiring interactions I have with my students.

Normative Commitment (NC)

NC1. I feel obligated to stay in this school because of the trust, support, and opportunities extended by my school leadership, such as sponsoring my attendance at professional development seminars.

NC2. Remaining with the school feels like the “right thing” to do because it aligns with my dedication to fulfilling the pledge I took as a teacher to serve Filipino learners.

NC3. I believe it would be unethical to leave my school at this time, knowing the school is dependent on my active contributions for programs like remedial reading and intervention classes.

NC4. I feel a sense of duty to continue serving in my school because I believe my work has a significant impact on addressing student needs and promoting equity in education.

NC5*. I remain committed to my school because of the promise I made to myself and my students to uphold quality teaching and inspire them to reach their full potential.

Continuance Commitment (CC)

CC1. Leaving this school would disrupt the professional relationships I have developed with my colleagues, students, and the community over the years.

CC2. I stay with this school because of the stability and benefits provided, such as scholarship grants for graduate studies or scholarships for my children.

CC3. I find it difficult to leave this school due to the investments I have made in enhancing my teaching practices here, such as leading several successful school projects and programs.

CC4*. I remain with this school as there are limited opportunities available in similar institutions, especially for my teaching experience and specialization.

CC5. Leaving this school would disrupt many aspects of my life, such as my current working schedule, access to professional growth opportunities, and my family’s financial stability.