School Heads' Transformational Leadership and Its Relationship with Teachers' Organizational Commitment and Level of Motivation

Faye Marie S. Ilano, Ed.D.

Saint Joseph, Missouri, USA

Wesleyan University-Philippines, Cabanatuan City, Philippines

***Corresponding Author**

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.101000465

Received: 24 October 2026; Accepted: 29 October 2026; Published: 05 November 2026

ABSTRACT

Effective leadership has a significant role in maintaining a school environment that supports teacher engagement, motivation, and organizational commitment. This study explored the relationship between school heads' transformational leadership practices and teachers' organizational commitment and level of motivation in Congressional District IV, Division of Nueva Ecija, Philippines. Grounded in Transformational Leadership Theory and Self-Determination Theory, the study examined responsibility and decision-making, ability to develop employees, vision for the future, and communication with employees. A descriptive correlational design was employed. The sampling plan identified 352 teachers from a population of 2,036 across 112 public elementary schools, while the reported results were based on 291 teacher-respondents. Purposive selection required at least one year of service in the school. Data were gathered through adapted leadership, organizational commitment, and work motivation questionnaires. Frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, and Pearson correlation summarized the reported findings. Teachers rated all four transformational leadership dimensions as always observed, with means ranging from 3.47 to 3.55. Affective commitment had a mean of 3.49, normative commitment 3.26, and continuance commitment 3.17. Intrinsic motivation and integrated regulation each had a mean of 3.53. Transformational leadership dimensions were positively correlated with all commitment dimensions ($r = .250–.723$) and all motivation dimensions ($r = .332–.602$), with reported p-values below .001. Affective commitment was most strongly associated with responsibility and decision-making and employee development. School-profile associations were generally small and selective. Based on the findings, a sustainability plan was developed to strengthen leadership development, teacher engagement, transparent communication, and professional collaboration. The findings support continued attention to transformational leadership practices while recognizing limits on generalization and that the correlational design does not establish causation.

Keywords: transformational leadership, organizational commitment, teacher motivation, school heads, educational leadership

INTRODUCTION

Effective leadership has a significant role in any organization's success, including schools. Leadership behaviors of school heads are essential for maintaining an environment that supports teacher engagement, motivation, and productivity. Identifying leadership styles that cultivate commitment and motivation is vital for the success of the organization. Transformational leaders inspire positive change, set clear visions, provide individualized support, and build strong team cultures aligned with organizational goals. However, despite growing interest, a gap remains in localized studies exploring how transformational leadership relates to teachers' organizational commitment and motivation in Congressional District IV of the Division of Nueva Ecija.

Recognizing the growing demands in the Philippine education system, particularly in the Department of Education, it becomes essential for school heads to adopt leadership practices that empower and inspire. Resource limitations, high student-to-teacher ratios, and infrastructure constraints require leaders who can support teachers despite systemic barriers. Understanding the dynamics of leadership, commitment, and motivation can provide valuable input for programs that support educators and the wider school community.

Among various leadership styles, transformational leadership stands out for its alignment with educational goals. It emphasizes building trust, inspiring a shared vision, fostering individual growth, and promoting a culture of collaboration and innovation. Its continuing relevance in educational leadership has been discussed by Bush (2017), while Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) reviewed its application in school settings. These perspectives provide a basis for examining leadership practices in the local context rather than assuming that findings from other settings apply uniformly.

Recognizing the growing demands in the Philippine education system, particularly in the Department of Education (DepEd), it becomes even more essential for school heads to adopt a leadership style that empowers and inspires. Challenges such as resource limitations, high student-to-teacher ratios, and infrastructure constraints require leaders who can motivate teachers despite the systemic barriers. These challenges are also evident in the implementation of technology-based educational programs. Bautista (2026) found that the implementation of the DepEd Computerization Program in public elementary schools was affected by limitations in computer facilities, functional computer units, internet access, and teachers' readiness to integrate technology into the curriculum. Transformational leadership emerges as a powerful approach capable of addressing these needs by fostering teacher commitment, boosting morale, and enhancing school performance. This dynamic exchange is a key factor to improving both academic outcome and institutional performance.

Transformational leadership in school settings

Transformational leadership centers on motivating and inspiring followers through shared vision and values. Bass and Avolio (1994) described leadership behaviors that support organizational effectiveness, while Bass and Riggio (2006) emphasized idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Idealized influence concerns ethical conduct and trust; inspirational motivation involves communicating a compelling vision; intellectual stimulation encourages critical thinking; and individualized consideration recognizes personal and professional development needs.

The role of school heads has evolved beyond administrative tasks. Teachers need leaders who listen, provide meaningful feedback, support professional growth, and maintain a clear direction for the school. Damanik and Aldridge (2017) examined transformational leadership in relation to school climate and teacher self-efficacy in Indonesian high schools. Day et al. (2016) considered how successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies. Such studies reinforce the importance of examining leadership as part of the school environment, while recognizing that school climate, teacher motivation, and student achievement are different outcomes. Bautista and De Castro (2025) examined the adaptability of foreign special education teachers working with students with special needs and highlighted their experiences of adjusting to professional, cultural, and educational demands.

Tengi et al. (2017) described transformational leadership as a driver of adaptability and critical thinking, encouraging teachers to challenge norms and engage in creative problem solving. Similarly, Bautista and De Castro (2025) explored the adaptability of foreign special education teachers working with students with special needs, highlighting the importance of adaptability as educators navigate professional, cultural, and educational demands in a different educational context.

The present study described leadership through four practice areas: responsibility and decision-making, ability to develop employees, vision for the future, and communication with employees. These operational categories reflect the adapted questionnaire used in the study. They should not be treated as exact equivalents of the four theoretical components without further evidence on the adapted instrument's structure.

Teachers' organizational commitment and motivation

Organizational commitment reflects the connection between employees and the institutions they serve. Allen and Meyer (1990) distinguished affective commitment, or emotional attachment to the organization; continuance commitment, associated with the perceived costs of leaving; and normative commitment, or a sense of obligation to remain. These components help distinguish why teachers remain connected to their schools. Emotional attachment, practical necessity, and moral obligation may coexist, but they represent different forms of commitment.

Leadership styles and teachers' organizational commitment have been examined across educational contexts. Nguni et al. (2006) studied transformational and transactional leadership in relation to teachers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Yahaya and Ebrahim (2016) reviewed the broader relationship between leadership styles and commitment. These perspectives support examining teachers' perceptions of leadership alongside the forms of commitment they report, while keeping the measures conceptually distinct.

Work motivation also includes different reasons for engaging in professional responsibilities. Intrinsic motivation concerns enjoyment and interest in the work itself. Integrated regulation occurs when work aligns with personal identity and values. Identified regulation involves recognizing the personal importance of the activity. Introjected regulation reflects internal pressures, such as avoiding shame or disappointment, while external regulation concerns rewards, income, and job security (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Tremblay et al., 2009). A high score across these dimensions does not mean that all forms of motivation have the same quality or implications.

Hyseni Duraku and Hoxha (2021) examined principal leadership attributes in relation to teachers' work motivation, while Schoch et al. (2021) explored transformational leadership, teachers' relatedness needs, and social support. Locally, Ilano (2026) found strong emotional intelligence, particularly teamwork, among principals and teachers in San Antonio, Nueva Ecija, although it was not significantly related to job performance. Together, these studies provide a basis for examining how leadership practices and supportive professional relationships relate to teachers' organizational commitment and motivation in the present study.

Theoretical and conceptual framework

Transformational Leadership Theory served as a foundation for analyzing the relationships among the study variables. Leaders who communicate clear goals, encourage development, recognize individual needs, and build trust may create conditions that support commitment and motivation. The framework provides a lens for interpreting leadership practices; it does not by itself establish that the observed relationships are causal (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bass & Riggio, 2006).

To deepen the understanding of teacher motivation, Self-Determination Theory was integrated into the framework. The theory emphasizes autonomy, competence, and relatedness as basic psychological needs. When these needs are supported, individuals may engage in their work with greater enthusiasm, persistence, and satisfaction (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The study used this perspective to interpret intrinsic motivation and the different forms of regulation, although psychological need satisfaction and mediation were not directly tested.

The conceptual framework examines associations between school profile and perceived transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and motivation. School profile includes size, district, School-Based Management (SBM) level, and school head's designation. Perceived transformational leadership includes the four practice areas used in the questionnaire. Organizational commitment includes affective, continuance, and normative commitment, while motivation includes intrinsic motivation, integrated regulation, identified regulation, introjected regulation, and external regulation. The sustainability plan is a proposed application of the findings rather than a measured dependent variable.

Research objectives

The study aimed to describe the school profile of the teacher-respondents; assess perceived school heads'

transformational leadership, teachers' organizational commitment, and work motivation; determine the relationships between school-profile variables and these measures; examine the relationships of transformational leadership with commitment and motivation; and develop a sustainability plan based on the findings. The corresponding null hypotheses stated that no significant relationships existed between the variables examined.

METHODOLOGY

Research design and locale

This study emphasized the transformational leadership qualities of school heads and the organizational commitment and work motivation of teachers in Congressional District IV, Division of Nueva Ecija. A descriptive correlational design was chosen because it describes the key variables and examines relationships between them without manipulation or direct interference by the researcher. The findings concern associations among teacher-reported measures rather than the effects of an intervention.

The research locale included eight school districts: Cabiao, General Tinio, Jaen North, Jaen South, Peñaranda, San Antonio, San Isidro, and San Leonardo. The sampling frame covered 112 public elementary schools with a reported teacher population of 2,036. The study focused on teachers' perceptions of their school heads and their own commitment and motivation. Students, parents, and policymakers were not included, and student academic achievement was not measured.

Respondents and sampling procedure

Purposive sampling was used. Eligible respondents were public elementary teachers in the stated locality who had served in their school for at least one year. This criterion was considered necessary for teachers to provide informed observations of the school head's leadership and report their commitment and motivation. The sampling plan listed 352 teachers, equivalent to 17.29% of the reported population of 2,036. The distribution of planned and analyzed respondents is shown in Table 1.

The reported analyses included 291 teacher-respondents across the eight districts. The planned sample of 352 and the analyzed sample are distinguished in Table 1. Purposive sampling limits assumptions about population representativeness.

Table 1: Sampling frame, planned sample, and analyzed respondents

District	Schools	Teacher population	Planned n	Analyzed n
Cabiao	19	353	61	50
General Tinio	13	262	45	35
Jaen North	13	158	27	14
Jaen South	17	199	35	35
Penaranda	8	175	30	22
San Antonio	19	346	60	60
San Isidro	12	266	46	46
San Leonardo	11	277	48	29
Total	112	2,036	352	291

Research instruments

The main tool was a structured questionnaire combining a researcher-developed school-profile section and adapted instruments. Part I gathered information on school size, district, SBM level, and school head's designation. Part II drew from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire to assess perceived leadership behaviors

(Avolio & Bass, 2004). It contained 20 items across responsibility and decision-making, ability to develop employees, vision for the future, and communication with employees. Each practice area included five items.

Part III was adapted from the organizational commitment scales of Allen and Meyer (1990). It contained 24 items, with eight questions each for affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Part IV drew from the work motivation instrument of Tremblay et al. (2009). The adapted questionnaire reported 15 items, with three each for intrinsic motivation, integrated regulation, identified regulation, introjected regulation, and external regulation. These are adaptations of the source instruments, and the original instruments' validation evidence should not be assumed to apply unchanged.

Five research specialists evaluated the questionnaire's appropriateness and coverage. The reported pilot reliability coefficients were .9908 for the leadership questionnaire, .9608 for organizational commitment, and .952 for work motivation. These coefficients are reported as pilot estimates rather than reliability estimates from the 291 analyzed teacher responses. High internal consistency does not independently establish construct validity.

Data gathering procedure

Permission from the Schools Division Superintendent, district supervisors, and school heads was obtained before administering the instruments. Following approval of the necessary letters and permissions, the researcher explained the study's purpose, relevance, and goals to participants. Questionnaires were distributed electronically through an online survey platform to teachers in Congressional District IV.

Participants were assured that the information they provided would be used strictly for research purposes and that their identities would remain confidential. They were informed of the voluntary nature of participation and their freedom to withdraw. Once responses were gathered, the data were organized and prepared for analysis so that the findings addressed the research questions.

Scoring and statistical treatment

A four-point rating scale was used, with 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = often, and 4 = always. The interpretation bands were 1.00–1.749, never; 1.75–2.49, seldom; 2.50–3.249, often; and 3.25–4.00, always. The same descriptive labels were used for leadership, commitment, and motivation. These labels describe respondents' ratings under the study's scoring scheme and do not demonstrate that a behavior occurred in every situation.

Frequency and percentage summarized the school-profile variables. Mean and standard deviation summarized leadership, commitment, and motivation. The reported correlation tables presented Pearson r and two-tailed p-values, with significance assessed at .05 and .01. Although the methodology also mentioned Spearman correlation, separate Spearman results were not provided in the reported findings. The article therefore reports the Pearson correlations shown in the tables. Values displayed as .000 are expressed as $p < .001$.

School district is a nominal variable, and school head's designation is categorical. Their coded correlations require caution because the coding scheme was not specified. Correlations involving district codes cannot be interpreted as evidence that one named district is better or worse than another. No adjusted estimates, confidence intervals, or corrections for multiple testing were reported.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Prior to participation, individuals were briefed on the purpose, scope, and potential risks and benefits of the study. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was secured before data collection. Responses were anonymized, data were securely stored, and access was limited to the researcher. Information was used for academic purposes. Equal treatment was provided to participants regardless of personal attributes, and the researcher reported addressing potential conflicts of interest. Institutional ethical approval was secured before implementation.

ISSN No. 2454-6186 | DOI: 10.47772/IJRISS | Volume X Issue X October 2026

RESULTS

School profile of the respondents

Table 2 describes the school characteristics reported by the 291 teacher-respondents. The largest group came from medium-sized schools, with 129 respondents or 44.33%, followed by large schools with 97 or 33.33%. Small and mega schools accounted for 12.37% and 9.97%, respectively. These percentages represent teacher responses by school category rather than the percentage of distinct schools in the district.

San Antonio had the largest number of analyzed respondents, with 60 or 20.62%, followed by Cabiao with 50 or 17.18% and San Isidro with 46 or 15.81%. General Tinio and Jaen South each contributed 35 or 12.03%. San Leonardo contributed 29 or 9.97%, Peñaranda 22 or 7.56%, and Jaen North 14 or 4.81%. All eight districts were represented, although their contributions varied.

Most respondents reported an advanced SBM level for their schools: 229 or 78.69%. Fifty-three or 18.21% reported a maturing level, and 9 or 3.09% a developing level. In terms of designation, 241 respondents or 82.82% reported being led by a school principal, while 50 or 17.18% reported the category labeled “school head.” The source used these designation categories separately.

Table 2: School profile reported by teacher-respondents

Variable	Category	n	Percentage
School size	Mega	29	9.97
School size	Large	97	33.33
School size	Medium	129	44.33
School size	Small	36	12.37
School district	Cabiao	50	17.18
School district	General Tinio	35	12.03
School district	Jaen North	14	4.81
School district	Jaen South	35	12.03
School district	Penaranda	22	7.56
School district	San Antonio	60	20.62
School district	San Isidro	46	15.81
School district	San Leonardo	29	9.97
SBM level	0.50-1.49 (Developing)	9	3.09
SBM level	1.50-2.49 (Maturing)	53	18.21
SBM level	2.50-3.0 (Advanced)	229	78.69
Head’s designation	School Head	50	17.18
Head’s designation	School Principal	241	82.82

Note: n = 291 teacher-respondents. Percentages are reproduced from the source tables and may not total exactly 100 because of rounding.

Perceived transformational leadership

Table 3 summarizes the leadership, commitment, and motivation dimensions. Teachers rated all four leadership practice areas as always observed. Responsibility and decision-making had the highest pooled mean of 3.55 (SD = .54), followed by ability to develop employees at 3.54 (SD = .53), communication with employees at 3.51 (SD = .57), and vision for the future at 3.47 (SD = .61).

Within responsibility and decision-making, respectful actions received the highest item mean of 3.62, followed by consideration of the moral and ethical implications of decisions at 3.61. Treating teachers as individuals rather than merely members of a group received 3.47. The findings indicate favorable perceptions of respect and ethical conduct while identifying opportunities for continued attention to individual needs and diverse perspectives.

The ability to develop employees received consistently high ratings. Assistance in developing personal strengths had an item mean of 3.57, innovative suggestions for assignments 3.56, teaching and coaching 3.55, shared mission 3.54, and a strong sense of purpose 3.48. These responses reflected teachers' perceptions of leadership support for growth and alignment with institutional goals.

Vision for the future had item means ranging from 3.44 to 3.49. Optimism about the future received 3.49, while cultivating pride in association with the school head received 3.44. For communication, discussing core values and beliefs received 3.56, recognizing teachers' concerns 3.52, confidentiality 3.49, seeking diverse perspectives 3.48, and re-evaluating critical assumptions 3.42. Although all were classified as always, the relative differences may guide professional development priorities.

Teachers' organizational commitment

Affective commitment had the highest pooled mean of 3.49 (SD = .52), interpreted as always. Teachers reported a sense of belonging and emotional attachment to their organization. Normative commitment had a pooled mean of 3.26 (SD = .57), also within the always category, while continuance commitment had a mean of 3.17 (SD = .65), interpreted as often. The results indicate stronger emotional attachment than commitment based on the perceived costs of leaving.

The normative commitment items varied. Loyalty and the aspiration to remain a dedicated member of one organization each received a mean of 3.43, while changing organizations without hesitation received 3.08. Because some adapted commitment statements express different directions of agreement, verification of reverse scoring is important before interpreting their contribution to pooled scales.

Teachers' level of motivation

Intrinsic motivation and integrated regulation each had a pooled mean of 3.53, with standard deviations of .55 and .51, respectively. Teachers reported enjoyment in learning, satisfaction in meeting challenges, and alignment between teaching and personal identity. Identified regulation had a mean of 3.50 (SD = .56), while external regulation had 3.42 (SD = .62). The findings suggest that personal meaning and interest coexist with practical considerations such as income and security.

The introjected regulation indicator had a reported pooled mean of 3.50 (SD = .56), classified as always under the study's scale. Its three item means were 3.32, 3.36, and 3.38. These responses reflect internal pressures such as maintaining self-worth, avoiding disappointment, and seeking recognition. The pooled score should be interpreted cautiously until its consistency with the item-level results is established.

Table 3: Reported pooled scores for leadership, commitment, and motivation

Construct	Dimension	Mean	SD	Description
Leadership	Responsibility and decision-making	3.55	0.54	Always
Leadership	Ability to develop employees	3.54	0.53	Always
Leadership	Vision for the future	3.47	0.61	Always
Leadership	Communication with employees	3.51	0.57	Always
Commitment	Affective commitment	3.49	0.52	Always
Commitment	Continuance commitment	3.17	0.65	Often
Commitment	Normative commitment	3.26	0.57	Always

Motivation	Integrated regulation	3.53	0.51	Always
Motivation	Intrinsic motivation	3.53	0.55	Always
Motivation	Identified regulation	3.50	0.56	Always
Motivation	Introjected regulation†	3.50	0.56	Always
Motivation	External regulation	3.42	0.62	Always

Note: Scores use the study's four-point scale. † Introjected regulation's reported pooled mean and SD require verification against the item-level data and original statistical output.

School profile and transformational leadership

Table 4 presents correlations between school profile and perceived transformational leadership. School size had a small negative association with responsibility and decision-making ($r = -.126$, $p = .032$). School district coding had a small positive association with ability to develop employees ($r = .122$, $p = .037$). None of the reported SBM associations reached $p < .05$.

School head's designation was negatively correlated with ability to develop employees ($r = -.143$, $p = .014$), vision for the future ($r = -.129$, $p = .028$), and communication with employees ($r = -.131$, $p = .026$). Its association with responsibility and decision-making was reported as $r = -.115$, $p = .050$. The latter lies at the displayed threshold, so its classification should be checked using the unrounded p-value. The designation coding was not provided, preventing conclusions about which category had higher ratings.

Table 4: School profile and transformational leadership

Profile variable	Responsibility and decisions	Employee development	Future vision	Communication
Size	-.126 (.032)	-.089 (.131)	-.015 (.799)	-.063 (.281)
School District	.075 (.201)	.122 (.037)	.068 (.245)	.054 (.362)
SBM Level	.070 (.234)	.106 (.072)	.063 (.288)	.040 (.496)
School Head's Designation	-.115 (.050)	-.143 (.014)	-.129 (.028)	-.131 (.026)

Note: Entries are Pearson r (two-tailed p-value), reproduced from the reported tables. Nominal district codes and designation codes require cautious interpretation.

School profile and teachers' commitment and motivation

Table 5 shows a small negative correlation between school size and affective commitment ($r = -.189$, $p = .001$). School district coding was positively correlated with normative commitment ($r = .127$, $p = .030$). School head's designation had a small negative association with affective commitment ($r = -.118$, $p = .044$). No SBM association with commitment was statistically significant at $p < .05$.

Table 5: School profile and organizational commitment

Profile variable	Affective commitment	Continuance commitment	Normative commitment
Size	-.189 (.001)	-.100 (.090)	-.073 (.217)
School District	.030 (.612)	.108 (.065)	.127 (.030)
SBM Level	.050 (.393)	-.025 (.673)	-.022 (.714)
School Head's Designation	-.118 (.044)	-.019 (.741)	-.047 (.426)

Note: Entries are Pearson r (two-tailed p-value), reproduced from the reported tables. Nominal district codes and designation codes require cautious interpretation.

Table 6 presents the relationships between school profile and motivation. School district coding had a small positive correlation with identified regulation (r = .119, p = .042). No other school-profile association with motivation reached p < .05. School size, SBM level, and school head's designation were not significantly related to the five motivation dimensions in the reported analyses. Nonsignificant findings do not establish that these contextual factors have no relationship with motivation in other samples or under other analyses.

Table 6: School profile and teachers' motivation

Profile variable	Intrinsic	Integrated	Identified	Introjected	External
Size	-.038 (.513)	-.098 (.094)	-.052 (.377)	-.003 (.958)	-.043 (.468)
School District	.090 (.125)	.072 (.220)	.119 (.042)	.064 (.280)	.068 (.244)
SBM Level	.018 (.754)	.031 (.595)	-.009 (.879)	.024 (.680)	-.008 (.890)
School Head's Designation	-.074 (.207)	-.108 (.065)	-.057 (.335)	-.045 (.447)	-.045 (.442)

Note: Entries are Pearson r (two-tailed p-value), reproduced from the reported tables. Nominal district codes and designation codes require cautious interpretation.

Transformational leadership and organizational commitment

Table 7 shows positive correlations between all four leadership practice areas and all three commitment dimensions, with reported p-values below .001. Affective commitment had the strongest associations: responsibility and decision-making (r = .723), ability to develop employees (r = .720), communication with employees (r = .654), and vision for the future (r = .562). Teachers who rated leadership more favorably also tended to report stronger emotional attachment to their organization.

Normative commitment was positively associated with responsibility and decision-making (r = .478), ability to develop employees (r = .476), communication (r = .442), and future vision (r = .381). Continuance commitment had smaller positive correlations, ranging from .250 for future vision to .359 for responsibility and decision-making. These results distinguish the strength of emotional attachment from commitment associated with obligation or the perceived costs of leaving.

Table 7: Transformational leadership and organizational commitment

Leadership practice	Affective commitment	Continuance commitment	Normative commitment
Responsibility & Decision-making	.723	.359	.478
Ability to develop employees	.720	.329	.476
Vision for the Future	.562	.250	.381
Communication with Employees	.654	.279	.442

Note: Entries are Pearson r. All reported two-tailed p-values are < .001.

Transformational leadership and teachers' motivation

Table 8 shows positive correlations between leadership practices and all five motivation dimensions, with reported p-values below .001. Integrated regulation was most strongly associated with ability to develop employees (r = .602), followed by responsibility and decision-making (.587), communication (.551), and future vision (.459).

Intrinsic motivation was associated with responsibility and decision-making (r = .580), ability to develop employees (.579), communication (.512), and future vision (.503). Identified regulation showed positive correlations ranging from .417 to .571. These associations indicate that favorable leadership ratings tended to occur alongside teachers' enjoyment of work and alignment between work and personal goals.

Introjected regulation was most strongly associated with communication (r = .458), followed by responsibility and decision-making (.436), employee development (.404), and future vision (.358). External regulation had correlations ranging from .332 for future vision to .475 for employee development. Positive associations with controlled forms of motivation should not be interpreted as evidence that internal pressure or dependence on rewards necessarily improves teacher well-being.

Table 8: Transformational leadership and teachers' motivation

Leadership practice	Intrinsic	Integrated	Identified	Introjected	External
Responsibility & Decision-making	.580	.587	.568	.436	.437
Ability to develop employees	.579	.602	.571	.404	.475
Vision for the Future	.503	.459	.417	.358	.332
Communication with Employees	.512	.551	.488	.458	.383

Note: Entries are Pearson r. All reported two-tailed p-values are < .001.

DISCUSSION

Leadership practices and teachers' organizational attachment

The findings established positive associations between perceived transformational leadership practices and teachers' organizational commitment. Responsibility and decision-making and the ability to develop employees had the strongest correlations with affective commitment. This highlights the importance of leaders who treat teachers respectfully, consider ethical implications, provide opportunities for growth, and recognize individual contributions. These practices may support a school environment in which teachers feel valued and connected.

The stronger associations with affective commitment than with continuance commitment suggest that leadership perceptions were more closely related to emotional attachment than to the perceived costs of leaving. The three forms of commitment should therefore be interpreted separately (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Continued employment was not directly observed, so the findings do not establish actual retention or prove that teachers will remain in the institution.

The results can be considered alongside research examining transformational leadership and teacher commitment, including Nguni et al. (2006) and the broader review of leadership styles and organizational commitment by Yahaya and Ebrahim (2016). Nevertheless, the local associations reflect teachers' perceptions within this sample. Their size and direction should not be assumed to represent every school or district.

Leadership and the quality of teacher motivation

The relationships with intrinsic motivation, integrated regulation, and identified regulation align with the study's emphasis on meaningful professional engagement. Teachers who perceive support for development, shared responsibility, and clear communication may also report that teaching fits their personal values and professional aspirations. These relationships are consistent with the relevance of autonomy, competence, and relatedness in Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The study did not directly measure those needs or test them as mediators.

Hyseni Duraku and Hoxha (2021) provide a related school context for examining leadership attributes and teacher motivation. Schoch et al. (2021) also highlight the role of relatedness and social support in educational settings. The present findings support attention to teachers' professional relationships and development opportunities while retaining the distinction between autonomous motivation and motivation driven by pressure or external rewards.

The positive correlations with introjected and external regulation indicate that multiple motivational drivers can coexist. School heads may encourage professional growth while teachers also seek recognition, financial security, or protection from disappointment. A balanced leadership approach should support meaningful work

and clear expectations without assuming that guilt, shame, or pressure is a desirable outcome. The proposed programs should therefore be evaluated for their effects on both engagement and well-being.

School context and interpretation of profile associations

The reported school-profile correlations were generally small and selective compared with the leadership–commitment and leadership–motivation correlations. School size was negatively associated with affective commitment and responsibility and decision-making. These findings may guide attention to personalized communication and shared leadership in larger schools, but they do not establish that school size causes weaker attachment or decision-making practices.

The correlations involving school district and designation cannot identify better-performing districts or more effective ranks without the original coding scheme and appropriate analysis. Similarly, the nonsignificant SBM findings do not demonstrate that school-based management is unimportant. Context-sensitive professional development remains relevant, but recommendations should not be presented as causal conclusions from these profile correlations.

Proposed sustainability plan

Based on the findings, a sustainability plan was developed to strengthen areas of leadership practice, teacher engagement, organizational commitment, and motivation. It aims to cultivate a culture of continuous improvement by equipping school leaders with the skills, insights, and support needed for sustainable leadership practices. The plan was proposed rather than implemented and evaluated as part of the study.

The plan includes quarterly leadership training, effective task delegation, peer mentoring, and coaching for future planning and employee development. Teacher motivation initiatives include recognition programs, clear goals, and teacher-led advocacy teams. Organizational commitment activities focus on professional collaboration, mentoring, knowledge sharing, and consistent engagement with the district's mission and values. Additional activities address equitable access to leadership development, SBM support, transparent communication, inclusive participation, and data-informed monitoring.

The nine estimated allocations in the original proposal sum to Php 375,000. Table 9 retains the proposed activities and budget amounts in a compact format. These figures are planning estimates rather than approved expenditure or evidence of program effectiveness. Some timelines in the source plan were inconsistent; the revised summary identifies the schedules clearly stated and leaves unspecified schedules for confirmation.

Table 9: Proposed sustainability activities and estimated allocations

Priority	Proposed activity	Schedule	Budget PHP
Leadership development	Quarterly leadership training, delegation, peer mentoring, and coaching	Quarterly	80,000
Teacher motivation	Recognition program and teacher-led advocacy teams	Monthly	60,000
Organizational commitment	Professional development communities and collaboration	Twice yearly	50,000
Leadership equity	Best-practice sharing among school heads	Quarter 2	25,000
SBM support	Targeted training on participatory management and SBM	Quarter 3	40,000
Transparent communication	Sharing techniques for open communication	Quarterly	35,000
Inclusive engagement	Teacher sharing and alignment of personal and school goals	Quarterly	20,000
Peer relationships	Team building and socialization	Quarterly	35,000

Policy monitoring	Leadership seminar and integration of feedback	To be confirmed	30,000
Total			375,000

Implementation would involve school heads, teachers, master teachers, district supervisors, instructional coaches, SBM coordinators, guidance personnel, and division planning staff. Monitoring should review leadership feedback, participation, teacher engagement, and commitment indicators. Improvements must be assessed through implementation data rather than assumed from the correlations reported in this study. The proposal's broader relevance to quality education and supportive institutions is consistent with the Sustainable Development Goals, but no SDG outcome was directly measured (United Nations, 2015).

LIMITATIONS

This study was focused on the correlation between transformational leadership of school heads and organizational and commitment qualities of teachers in Congressional District IV, Division of Nueva Ecija. Through the distribution of a comprehensive survey questionnaire, the research collected crucial data from teachers situated within Congressional District IV. The questionnaire is thoughtfully designed to gauge the nuances of transformational leadership behaviors and organizational values embedded within the school leadership. As such, this research served as an important step towards comprehending the broader landscape of educational leadership and its impact on the commitment and engagement of teachers.

The study is limited within the Congressional District IV, Division of Nueva Ecija. It did not include other stakeholders such as students, parents, and policy makers. The study did not delve into other leadership styles aside from transformational leadership. Furthermore, the study did not investigate the impact of transformational leadership on student academic achievement.

The study's data were analyzed descriptive and inferential statistics, such as frequency distributions, percentages, and correlation analysis. The analysis was limited to the data gathered from the survey questionnaire. The study's results were interpreted based on the data gathered and analyzed.

CONCLUSION

Teacher-respondents rated their school heads positively across the four transformational leadership practice areas. Responsibility and decision-making and ability to develop employees had the highest pooled means, while vision for the future had the lowest relative mean. Affective commitment was stronger than continuance commitment. Intrinsic motivation and integrated regulation were prominent, showing that enjoyment of work and alignment with personal identity were important reasons teachers reported for engaging in their duties.

Perceived transformational leadership was positively correlated with all three commitment dimensions and all five motivation dimensions. The strongest commitment associations involved affective commitment, responsibility and decision-making, and employee development. Employee development also had the strongest reported association with integrated regulation. These findings support continued attention to ethical, supportive, and development-oriented leadership while avoiding claims of causation.

School-profile correlations were generally small and selective, and the coded district and designation results require cautious interpretation. The findings provided a basis for a proposed sustainability plan focused on leadership development, teacher engagement, collaboration, transparent communication, and monitoring.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Schools Division Office may consider differentiated support, resource allocation, and capacity-building programs so that schools receive equitable opportunities regardless of size and SBM level. School heads may delegate responsibilities to senior teachers or appropriate leadership teams and include teachers in school-wide

planning. Regular opportunities for teachers to express concerns and contribute ideas may help sustain trust and professional collaboration.

Leadership programs may build on the positive ratings while giving specific attention to future vision and communication. Professional development should include mentoring, personalized coaching, ethical decision-making, and clear feedback. School heads should communicate the long-term vision of the school and explain how teachers' work contributes to shared goals. Programs should support autonomy, competence, and relatedness while recognizing teachers' achievements without relying on guilt or pressure.

Schools may adapt the sustainability plan to their actual context and resources, with confirmed timelines, responsible personnel, budget approval, and measurable monitoring indicators. Its effectiveness should be evaluated separately. Future research should use clearly documented sampling and scoring procedures, account for school clustering, validate adapted measures, and consider longitudinal or mixed-method approaches to understand how leadership, commitment, and motivation develop over time.

REFERENCES

1. 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), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x
2. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and sampler set (3rd ed.). Mind Garden.
3. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Sage.
4. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
5. Bautista, N. A. V., & De Castro, L. B. (2025). Exploring the adaptability of foreign special education teachers working with students with special needs in Columbia South Carolina. International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 6(11), 5827–5864. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.11.36
6. Bautista, N. A. V. (2026). Status of the implementation of the Philippines' DepEd Computerization Program in Santa Rosa North District. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science, 11(8), 4275–4319. https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2026.1308000273
7. Bush, T. (2017). The enduring power of transformational leadership. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 45(4), 563–565. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217714252
8. Damanik, E., & Aldridge, J. (2017). Transformational leadership and its impact on school climate and teachers' self-efficacy in Indonesian high schools. Journal of School Leadership, 27(2), 269-296. https://doi.org/10.1177/105268461702700205
9. Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. Educational Administration Quarterly, 52(2), 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863
10. 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.
11. Ilano, F. M. S. (2026). Emotional Intelligence and Job Performance of Public Elementary School Principals and Teachers in San Antonio, Nueva Ecija. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 10(9), https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100900836.
12. Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership research 1996–2005. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4(3), 177–199. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244769
13. Nguni, S., Sleegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17(2), 145–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450600565795

14. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American Psychologist, 55(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68
15. Schoch, S., Keller, R., Buff, A., Maas, J., Rackow, P., Scholz, U., Schüler, J., & Wegner, M. (2021). Dual-focused transformational leadership, teachers' satisfaction of the need for relatedness, and the mediating role of social support. Frontiers in Education, 6, Article 643196. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.643196
16. Tremblay, M. A., Blanchard, C. M., Taylor, S., Pelletier, L. G., & Villeneuve, M. (2009). Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale: Its value for organizational psychology research. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 41(4), 213–226. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015167
17. United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda
18. Yahaya, R., & Ebrahim, F. (2016). Leadership styles and organizational commitment: Literature review. Journal of Management Development, 35, 190–216. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-01-2015-0004