

The Predicting Effect of Occupational Commitment and Leadership Styles on Organizational Effectiveness of Public School Heads

Jalaisa M. Mamasarogan¹, Mark Raymond S. Tan^{2*}

¹Capitol University, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

²City College of Cagayan de Oro, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

*Corresponding Author Email: tan.markraymond@g.cu.edu.ph

Date received: July 16, 2024

Date revised: July 24, 2024

Date accepted: July 27, 2024

Originality: 95%

Grammarly Score: 99%

Similarity: 5%

Recommended citation:

Mamasarogan, J., & Tan, M.R. (2024). The predicting effect of occupational commitment and leadership styles on organizational effectiveness of public school heads. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(9), 97-110. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0354>

Abstract. The research aimed to assess the predictive impact of occupational commitment and leadership styles on the organizational effectiveness of public school leaders. The results revealed that rank, years in service as school head, and type of school exhibited statistically significant differences in the school heads' occupational commitment. On the other hand, the statistical significance test exposed that school heads' leadership styles of transformational, transactional, and democratic leadership exhibited a significant positive association with organizational effectiveness. Furthermore, the influence test showed that occupational commitment significantly contributed to explaining the variance in organizational effectiveness among respondents. Alternatively, leadership styles, specifically transformational, transactional, and democratic, were found to be predictors of organizational effectiveness. Lastly, the multiple regression results for predicting organizational effectiveness based on the school heads' occupational commitment and leadership styles revealed that the model fit is robust, demonstrating that the overall model is statistically significant and provides a good fit for the data. Among the independent variables under study, occupational commitment had a more important influence on organizational effectiveness. On the other hand, leadership styles also significantly predict organizational effectiveness, though with a minor impact. This indicated that while effective leadership styles positively influence organizational effectiveness, their effect is less pronounced than occupational commitment. The study underscored the importance of commitment and leadership in cultivating favorable organizational climates that facilitate collaboration, innovation, and continuous improvement.

Keywords: Authoritarian leadership; Democratic leadership; Occupational commitment; Organizational effectiveness; Leadership styles; Transformational leadership; Transactional leadership.

1.0 Introduction

Education leaders' commitment to their responsibilities is essential to organizational stability and progress. Occupational commitment, which includes emotional attachment, identification with organizational goals, and a sense of belonging, can drive school leadership success. On the other hand, school leaders' leadership styles influence corporate culture and impact the educational institution's overall effectiveness. Moreover, public schools, as vital components of the larger educational system, face various obstacles, ranging from limited resources to the ever-changing needs of an increasingly diverse student body. Understanding how school principals' commitment levels and leadership approaches contribute to organizational effectiveness is not only academically important but also has practical implications for educational policymakers, administrators, and stakeholders interested in the success of public education (Coşkun et al., P., 2023).

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

Fundamentally, the leadership styles of school heads and occupational commitment are important in achieving organizational success and improving the quality of educational institutions. School leadership is intrinsically the day-to-day functioning of the school and holds great significance as it serves as a pivotal educational catalyst for both change and success while also potentially acting as a catalyst for failure (Day et al., 2016). Building strong schools requires effective leadership styles that continuously match school goals and visions with actions. Occupational commitment is a necessary component of organizational health. Employee commitment is the primary axis around which all sources' variables begin to emerge. Commitment is an organization's working force's attitude toward the organization, top management, work, and physical and social surroundings. Top management's most imaginative and innovative ideas and initiatives cannot be accomplished without occupational commitment. All goals and initiatives would eventually be completed with occupational commitment (Bit, 2021).

In like manner, employees with a high level of occupational commitment are anticipated to perform well. When someone joins an organization, they must demonstrate occupational commitment. Low occupational commitment causes challenges for the organization since commitment is a costly "commodity" that defines the company's performance. Low occupational commitment shows a lack of accountability in one's responsibilities. According to Hallinger and Lee (2013), understanding the particular dynamics of public-school administrators, their dedication, and leadership styles may be missing in research. Locally, the Department of Education-Division of Lanao II supports decision-making decentralization in school management. This provides school administrators the authority and responsibility to supervise and track school functions. Despite the empowerment of these administrators, the schools within display vocational devotion and organizational challenges in reaching their achievement. Furthermore, it appeared that there may be a need for studies that specifically address the unique challenges and dynamics within the educational system of Lanao Del Sur II, with a focus on the leadership styles and occupational commitment of school heads as they influence organizational effectiveness among elementary and secondary schools in the division.

There is a gap in examining how these two characteristics interact and impact organizational success in the context of public school heads. Understanding these distinctions may aid in customizing leadership development programs. Lastly, the researcher was encouraged to conduct this research to determine the vital roles of school heads in the educational context and the leadership style they used, particularly in making the organization more effective and efficient, which may increase organizational success.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

The research design in this study, a concurrent mixed-method research design, was employed to comprehensively investigate the extent to which occupational commitment and leadership styles influence or affect organizational effectiveness. This approach involved the simultaneous collection of both quantitative and qualitative data, ensuring that the strengths of each method were leveraged to provide a fuller understanding of the phenomena under study.

On the other hand, a comprehensive approach was undertaken to establish the validity and reliability of the research instrument. Firstly, three field experts conducted a validation process. Their meticulous evaluation ensured that the tools accurately measured the intended constructs and adhered to established standards within the discipline, thus enhancing their credibility. In addition to the validation process, the reliability of the research instruments was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The robust findings of the reliability test, combined with the expert validation, collectively support the assertion that the research instrument is well-suited for use in the survey.

2.2 Research Locale

This research study was conducted in the Division of Lanao Del Sur II, whose office is currently located in Malabang, Lanao Del Sur, and led by the Schools Division Superintendent to reform and develop the department to ensure the delivery of quality education to our learners. With the constant risk of educational revolution, the division has established a strong structure to maintain its ultimate purpose. This wonderful scenario is supported

by 22 municipalities and 135 school heads from elementary and secondary of the Division of Lanao Del Sur II, and it covers coastal and lake locations that serve a varied range of culturally diverse learners. Students in coastal locations include Iranun, Maguindanaon, Waray, Bisaya, and Maranao, while in lake areas, mostly Maranaos.

2.3 Research Participants

The study's respondents comprised 135 school heads from elementary and secondary schools in the Division of Lanao Del Sur II, which are considered the primary data source. They were selected irrespective of their item position, rank, or designation.

2.4 Research Instrument

The research instruments used in the study were a combination of adopted, modified, and researcher-made survey tools, all referenced and sourced from related studies and literature. The first part explored the School Heads' demographic profile. On the other hand, the second part, which was adopted and modified to fit the respondents' occupational commitment vis-à-vis facilitating a shared vision and mission, building a trusting relationship, communicating effectively, and being visible and accessible, was referenced from the studies of Karl (1997) entitled "Managers as facilitators: A practical guide to getting work done in a changing workplace, which Karl first used (1997) and later used by Lanz, Waghmare, and others. The third part, which was adopted, measured the leadership styles of the school heads in terms of transformational, transactional, democratic, and authoritarian. This adaptation was referenced from the studies of Schermerhorn and Osborn (1991) for transactional and transformational. Rivera (2021) for democratic and authoritarian. In this research, the researcher adopted a categorical classification presenting respondents with distinct categories of leadership styles based on predefined theoretical frameworks, asking them to identify which category most closely aligns with their typical behavior or preferred approach. This method facilitated a clearer and more direct analysis of leadership style prevalence and its impacts, as it bypasses the ambiguity and variability of rating scales, allowing for a more straightforward interpretation of the data within the context of the research objectives. Lastly, the fourth part, a researcher-made one, explored organizational effectiveness in goal attainment, operational effectiveness, control and decision making, conflict resolution, and strategy and leadership. This aspect was referenced from the studies of Mulford and Leithwood (2004) entitled "Educational Leadership for Organizational Learning and improved student outcomes" and Olcum and Titrek (2015) entitled "Control and Decision Making: The Effect of school administrators' Decision-making Styles on teacher job satisfaction," Solà-Martín (2010) entitled "Conflict Resolution: Conflict resolution in Western Sahara," and Nickols (2016) entitled "Strategy Leadership: Six factors affecting performance alignment.

2.5 Data Gathering Procedure

The essential data for this research study were gathered by following proper procedures and protocols. A letter of request was prepared and delivered by the researcher, duly signed by him and endorsed by his adviser and the Dean of the Graduate School, to the Schools Division Superintendent of the Division of Lanao del Sur II. A similar letter was personally delivered to the school heads, requesting that the researcher be allowed to conduct the study. Once permission was granted, the gathering procedure was administered. The researcher personally distributed the instruments to the participants, encouraging them to answer the questions wholeheartedly.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

In this study, the participants comprised the school heads in Lanao Del Sur II. The study was conducted in various Elementary and Secondary Schools in the Lanao Del Sur II Division. Since this study involved school heads as participants, the researcher obtained permission from the specific schools to conduct it. The researcher also gained approval from the school authorities where the study was conducted. To obtain this approval, the researcher addressed questions and submitted requirements as requested by the school officials. After securing the permit and approval for the study, the researcher scheduled a time and day with the school heads involved to plan the survey and interview and identify matters considered in the study. Lastly, the researcher emphasized that the participants had the right to withdraw at any point during the study period. The researcher assured the participants that all information they provided would be treated with strict confidentiality and utilized only for this research study and not in any other way. The survey and interview of participants were employed to safeguard their privacy and protect their identity.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Respondents' Demographic Profile

Table 1 shows the Summary of Demographic Profile of the Respondents.

Table 1. Summary of the demographic profile of the respondents

Profile	Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Educational Background	Bachelor's Degree	44	32.6
	With MA units	48	35.6
	Full-pledged MA	30	22.2
	With PhD units	8	5.90
	Full-pledged PhD	53	3.70
	Total	135	100.0
Rank	Teacher 1-3	40	29.6
	Master Teacher 1-3	28	20.7
	Head Teacher 1-3	8	5.90
	OIC Principal	24	17.8
	Principal 1-3	35	25.9
	Total	135	100.0
Number of Teachers/ Personnel Handled	31-40	5	3.70
	21-30	35	25.9
	11-20	40	29.6
	1-10	55	40.7
	Total	135	100.0
Years of Services	1-5 years	19	14.1
	6-10 years	37	27.4
	11-15 years	40	29.6
	A6 and above	39	28.9
	Total	135	100.0
Type of School	National HS	30	22.2
	Elementary School	60	44.4
	Primary School	45	33.3
	Total	135	100.0

Most respondents had advanced educational qualifications. (35.6%) had completed some units towards a master's degree (MA). The distribution of ranks among the respondents showed that 29.6% were categorized as Teacher I-III, making this the largest group. The data on the number of teachers or personnel managed by the respondents revealed that a substantial majority (40.7%) handled 1-10 individuals. The years of service among the respondents were quite evenly distributed, with 29.6% having 11-15 years of experience and 28.9% with 16 years or more. Those with 6-10 years of service accounted for 27.4%, and 14.1% had 1-5 years of experience. The types of schools where respondents are employed showed a notable distribution, with 44.4% working in Elementary Schools, 33.3% in Primary Schools, and 22.2% in National High Schools. This suggested that the data predominantly represents educators in the earlier stages of the education system, which may influence this demographic study's overall findings and implications.

3.2 Perceived Occupational Commitment of School Heads

Table 2 shows the perceived occupational commitment of school heads.

Table 2. Summary table of perceived occupational commitment of school heads

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Facilitating a shared vision and mission	3.78	0.49	Highly Committed
Building a trusting relationship	3.82	0.39	Highly Committed
Communicating effectively	3.95	0.21	Highly Committed
Being visible and accessible	3.53	0.35	Highly Committed
Overall Mean	3.77	0.36	Highly Committed

Communicating effectively got the highest mean of 3.95. It is described as "Highly committed," and being visible and accessible got the lowest mean of 3.53, which is described as "Highly committed," with an overall mean of 3.77 and described as "Highly committed." The findings indicated that school heads exhibited a strong sense of occupational commitment. Notably, "Communicating effectively" received the highest rating, suggesting that school heads prioritized clear and effective communication as a critical aspect of their roles. Conversely, "Being visible and accessible" garnered the lowest mean, though it still reflected a high level of commitment. It implied a

high level of commitment, reflecting a consistent dedication to their occupational responsibilities. Many school heads do demonstrate a strong commitment to their role. Drawing from personal experience and observations, it is evident that the commitment level varies among school heads, influenced by individual motivations, career aspirations, and external circumstances. In the context of BARMM, where educational challenges and socio-political factors may intersect, the commitment of school heads could be influenced by complex dynamics unique to the region. A study by Mulford (2004) found that while many school heads expressed high levels of commitment to their roles, there were instances where factors such as workload, administrative challenges, and lack of support affected their commitment levels. Similarly, a study by Khalifa et al. (2016) highlighted the importance of professional development in enhancing the commitment of school heads.

3.3 Perceived Leadership Style of School Heads

Table 3 depicts the summary of the perceived leadership style of school heads.

Table 3. Summary table of the perceived leadership style of school heads

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Transformational	3.89	0.30	Highly Practiced
Transactional	3.88	0.32	Highly Practiced
Authoritarian	3.63	0.35	Highly Practiced
Democratic	3.93	0.25	Highly Practiced
Overall Mean	3.83	0.31	Highly Practiced

Democratic leadership got the highest mean of 3.93, described as “Highly practiced,” and Authoritarian leadership got the lowest mean of 3.63, described as “Highly practiced,” with an overall mean of 3.83, described as “Highly practiced.” The result that the perceived leadership style of school heads was "Highly practiced" highlighted a predominantly positive view of leadership within the educational environment. In the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (BARMM), the high commitment of school heads to their work can be attributed to several highly practiced best practices. These include community engagement, culturally responsive leadership, and adaptive management strategies. School heads often actively involve community leaders and parents in school activities, fostering a sense of shared responsibility and support for educational goals. Additionally, recognizing the region's unique cultural context, they implement leadership styles that respect and integrate local traditions and values, which enhances trust and cooperation. This further implied that leadership styles in BARMM are multifaceted. Studies by Khalifa et al. (2016) supported this, highlighting the effectiveness of culturally responsive leadership in enhancing educational outcomes in similar contexts.

3.4 Organizational Effectiveness of the School Heads

Table 4 shows the organizational effectiveness of the school heads.

Table 4. Summary table of organizational effectiveness assessed by school heads

Items	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Goal attainment	3.68	0.35	Highly Effective
Operational effectiveness	3.57	0.42	Highly Effective
Control and decision-making	3.88	0.31	Highly Effective
Conflict resolution	3.79	0.27	Highly Effective
Strategy and leadership	3.67	0.45	Highly Effective
Overall Mean	3.72	0.36	Highly Effective

Control and decision-making had the highest mean of 3.88 and were described as “Highly effective.” The lowest indicator was Operational effectiveness, with a mean of 3.57, and described as “Highly effective” with an overall mean of 3.72 and described as “Highly effective.” School heads' organizational effectiveness assessment, with an overall mean score, indicated that schools are generally performing well in key areas. The highest-rated aspect, control and decision-making, highlights the principals' strengths in governance and strategic planning, suggesting that they are adept at effectively making informed decisions that guide their schools. However, the slightly lower score highlighted areas that might benefit from further improvement, such as resource management and day-to-day operational processes. For principals, this result suggested a need to maintain strong leadership in decision-making while also focusing on optimizing operational aspects to ensure smooth and efficient school functioning. For the school, these insights provided a roadmap for sustaining high performance while identifying and addressing operational challenges to enhance overall effectiveness further (Raharja et al., 2022).

3.5 Differences in the Respondents' Assessment of their Occupational Commitment

Table 5 illustrates significant differences in the respondents' assessment of their occupational commitment when grouped according to profile.

Table 5. Test of difference in respondents' assessment of their occupational commitment according to profile

Profile	Occupational Commitment														
	Facilitating a shared vision and mission			Building a trusting relationship			Communicating effectively			Being visible and accessible			Overall Measure		
	F-value	p-value	Decision on Ho	F-value	p-value	Decision on Ho	F-value	p-value	Decision on Ho	F-value	p-value	Decision on Ho	F-value	p-value	Decision on Ho
Educational background	3.52	.009	Reject	1.08	.368	Failed to Reject	.509	.729	Failed to Reject	1.712	.151	Failed to Reject	1.904	.114	Failed to Reject
Rank	3.07	.019	Reject	6.90	.000	Reject	.954	.435	Failed to Reject	2.133	.080	Failed to Reject	5.344	.001	Reject
Number of teachers personnel handled	7.54	.000	Reject	3.10	.029	Reject	.788	.503	Failed to Reject	1.143	.334	Failed to Reject	1.574	.199	Failed to Reject
Years in service as school head	5.32	.002	Reject	.860	.464	Failed to Reject	2.084	.105	Failed to Reject	.954	.416	Failed to Reject	3.842	.011	Reject
Type of school	1.09	.340	Failed to Reject	1.69	.188	Failed to Reject	1.770	.174	Failed to Reject	3.353	.038	Reject	3.656	.028	Reject

Significant if p-value < 0.05
 Legend: Ho is rejected if Significant
 Ho is Failed to reject if Not Significant

The data revealed that rank (F-value = 5.344, p-value = .001), years in service as school head (F-value = 3.842, p-value = .011), and type of school (F-value = 3.656, p-value = .028), exhibited a statistically significant difference in the school heads' occupational commitment. When grouped according to demographic profile, the null hypothesis of no significant difference in the respondents' assessment of their occupational commitment was rejected since the p-value was less than 0.05. The rejection of the null hypothesis is that various factors within the respondents' backgrounds play a role in shaping their commitment to their profession. This finding underscored the importance of considering individual characteristics such as age, gender, educational attainment, and years of experience when understanding occupational commitment among school leaders. Identifying demographic factors that influence occupational commitment in BARMM can support the initiatives and professional development programs addressing the specific needs and challenges school heads face. Chou et al. (2016) explored the relationship between educational attainment and commitment, indicating that higher levels of education may correlate with increased dedication to the profession. In terms of rank, a statistical difference indicated that the level of commitment to their profession and role as school heads differs significantly based on their rank within the educational hierarchy. Higher-ranking school heads, such as principals or superintendents, often have broader leadership roles and oversee multiple schools or districts. They may have a greater sense of responsibility and commitment to the overall success and performance of the educational institution.

3.6 Relationship Between the School Heads' Leadership Styles and Organizational Effectiveness

Table 6 depicts the significant relationship between the school heads' leadership styles and organizational effectiveness. The data exposed that school heads' leadership styles in terms of Transformational (r=.529, p-value=.000), Transactional (r=.419, p-value=.000), Democratic (r=.490, p-value=.000), and Overall Measure (r=.625, p-value=.000) exhibited a significant relationship with organizational effectiveness since the p-values were less than 0.05. This means the null hypothesis was rejected, which states that no significant relationship exists between the school heads' leadership styles and organizational effectiveness. This implied a strong association between the specific leadership styles of school heads and the organization's overall effectiveness. This finding indicated that these factors are significantly associated with organizational effectiveness. However, leadership styles in terms of Authoritarian leadership did not exhibit a significant relationship with organizational effectiveness since the p-

values were greater than 0.05. While leadership styles impacted certain aspects of organizational effectiveness, the relationship was not consistently significant across all dimensions.

Table 6. Test of the relationship between the school heads' leadership styles and organizational effectiveness

Leadership Style	Organizational Effectiveness																	
	Goal attainment			Operational effectiveness			Control and decision making			Conflict resolution			Strategy and leadership			Overall Measure		
	r	p-value	Decision on Ho	r	p-value	Decision on Ho	r	p-value	Decision on Ho	r	p-value	Decision on Ho	r	p-value	Decision on Ho	r	p-value	Decision on Ho
Transformational	.53**	.00	Reject	.27**	.00	Reject	.53**	.00	Reject	.35**	.00	Reject	.72**	.00	Reject	.53**	.00	Reject
Transactional	.42**	.00	Reject	.19*	.03	Reject	.42**	.00	Reject	.35**	.00	Reject	.42**	.00	Reject	.42**	.00	Reject
Authoritarian	-.02	.82	Failed to Reject	.13	.14	Failed to Reject	-.02	.82	Failed to Reject	-.06	.49	Failed to Reject	-.02	.82	Failed to Reject	-.02	.82	Failed to Reject
Democratic	.49**	.00	Reject	.22*	.01	Reject	.49**	.00	Reject	.43**	.00	Reject	.35**	.00	Reject	.49**	.00	Reject
Overall Measure	.63**	.00	Reject	.35**	.00	Reject	.63**	.00	Reject	.32**	.00	Reject	.63**	.00	Reject	.63**	.00	Reject

Significant if p-value <0.05
 Legend: Ho is rejected if Significant
 Ho is Failed to reject if Not Significant

This suggests that other factors, such as organizational culture and resources, maybe more significant in determining organizational effectiveness (Kasalak et al., 2022). Furthermore, while transformational leadership positively impacted leader-member exchange, which in turn influenced organizational effectiveness, the direct relationship between transformational leadership and organizational effectiveness was not significant. This highlighted the complex relationship between leadership styles and organizational effectiveness (Keskes et al., 2018).

3.7 Relationship Between the School Heads' Occupational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness

Table 7 depicts the significant relationship between the school heads' occupational commitment and organizational effectiveness.

Table 7. Test of the relationship between the school heads' occupational commitment and organizational effectiveness

Variables Occupational Commitment	Organizational Effectiveness																	
	Goal attainment			Operational effectiveness			Control and decision making			Conflict resolution			Strategy and leadership			Overall Measure		
	r	p-value	Decision on Ho	r	p-value	Decision on Ho	r	p-value	Decision on Ho	r	p-value	Decision on Ho	r	p-value	Decision on Ho	r	p-value	Decision on Ho
Facilitating a shared vision and mission	.59**	.00	Reject	.55**	.00	Reject	.59**	.00	Reject	.39**	.00	Reject	.38**	.00	Reject	.59**	.00	Reject
Building a trusting relationship	.56**	.00	Reject	1.0**	.00	Reject	.55**	.00	Reject	.29**	.00	Reject	.43**	.00	Reject	.55**	.00	Reject
Communicating effectively	.73**	.00	Reject	.38**	.00	Reject	.73**	.00	Reject	.35**	.00	Reject	.58**	.00	Reject	.73**	.00	Reject
Being visible and accessible	.50**	.00	Reject	.28**	.00	Reject	.50**	.00	Reject	.97**	.00	Reject	.50**	.00	Reject	.50**	.00	Reject
Overall Measure	.43**	.00	Reject	.15	.07	Reject	.43*	.00	Reject	.30*	.00	Reject	.33**	.00	Reject	.43*	.00	Reject

Significant if p-value <0.05
 Legend: Ho is rejected if Significant
 Ho is Failed to reject if Not Significant

The data exposed that school heads' occupational commitment in terms of facilitating a shared vision and mission (r=.585, p-value=.000), building a trusting relationship (r=.555, p-value=.000), communicating effectively (r=.734, p-value=.000), being visible and accessible (r=.500, p-value=.000), and the overall measure (r=.433, p-value=.000) exhibited a significant relationship with organizational effectiveness. These findings emphasized that higher

levels of commitment in these areas are strongly linked to better organizational outcomes. Effective communication emerged as the most influential factor, highlighting its critical role in ensuring that all stakeholders convey and understand goals, fostering a collaborative and motivated school environment. The strong relationships with trust-building and visibility further emphasize the importance of relational leadership qualities in driving school effectiveness. For school heads, these insights suggested that enhancing skills in these areas can significantly boost their schools' performance. Consequently, professional development programs should prioritize these competencies to help school leaders cultivate a more effective and cohesive educational environment (Day et al., 2016). The p-values were less than 0.05; therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the school heads' occupational commitment and organizational effectiveness was rejected. This finding revealed that school heads who are highly committed to their profession and role tend to contribute to a more effective and successful educational institution. Moreover, Raharja et al. (2022) explored the association of transformational leadership and organizational climate on the occupational commitment of school principals. The study found that both transformational leadership and positive organizational climate were positively associated with occupational commitment. This disclosed that effective leadership practices and a supportive organizational climate contribute to higher levels of commitment among school heads, which in turn influences organizational effectiveness.

3.8 Predicting Organizational Effectiveness Based on the School Heads' Occupational Commitment

Table 8 presents the linear regression analysis used to predict organizational effectiveness based on the school heads' occupational commitment.

Table 8. Linear regression analysis of predicting organizational effectiveness by school head's occupational commitment

Model 1

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients, β	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	0.853	0.210		4.068(0.000)	Significant
X ₁ : Facilitating a shared vision and mission	0.195	0.063	0.195	3.081(0.003)	Significant
X ₂ : Building a trusting relationship	0.127	0.036	0.212	3.494(0.001)	Significant
X ₃ : Communicating effectively	0.384	0.044	0.508	8.709(0.000)	Significant
X ₄ : Being visible and accessible	0.085	0.031	0.153	2.716(0.008)	Significant

Note: Adjusted R²=.671 ANOVA for Regression: F=69.323, p=.000.
Significant (p<.05), Not significant (p>.05)

Fitted Regression Model: Organizational Effectiveness = 0.853 + 0.195 (facilitating a shared vision and mission) + 0.127 (building a trusting relationship) + 0.384 (communicating effectively) + 0.085 (being visible and accessible)

Model 2

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients, β	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	3.130	0.151		20.718(0.000)	Significant
X ₁ : Occupational Commitment	0.217	0.039	0.433	5.536(0.000)	Significant

Note: Adjusted R²=.181 ANOVA for Regression: F=30.650, p=.000.
Significant (p<.05), Not significant (p>.05)

Fitted Regression Model: Organizational Effectiveness = 3.130 + 0.217 (Occupational Commitment)

The results in Model 1 indicated a statistically significant model (ANOVA F=69.323, p=.000), suggesting that independent variables of occupational commitment significantly contribute to explaining the variance in organizational effectiveness among respondents. The adjusted R² value of .671 or 67.1% indicated a provision for the descriptive influence of the model. Furthermore, with a per-unit increase in Facilitating a shared vision and mission, there is a 0.195 increase in organizational effectiveness; with a per-unit increase in Building a trusting relationship, there is a 0.127 increase in organizational effectiveness; per-unit increase in Communicating effectively, there is a 0.384 increase in organizational effectiveness and per-unit increase in Being visible and accessible, there is a 0.085 increase in organizational effectiveness. This means that school heads' occupational commitment to Communicating effectively is the highest predictor of organizational effectiveness in the context

of this study. On the other hand, the results in Model 2 revealed a statistically significant overall model (ANOVA $F=30.650$, $p=.000$), indicating that the overall measure of occupational commitment does predict the variance in organizational effectiveness among respondents. The adjusted R^2 value of .181 or 18.1% supports the model's explanatory power. Therefore, the null statement stating that occupational commitment does not significantly predict organizational effectiveness was rejected since the p-value is less than 0.001. This implied that the level of commitment displayed by the school head directly impacts how effective the organization is perceived. Oloso and Baja (2019) further supported this finding. They found that school heads who exhibit high levels of commitment are more likely to engage in continuous professional development, actively seek feedback from staff and stakeholders, and promote a culture of accountability and excellence. These behaviors positively impact the organization's ability to achieve its goals and objectives.

3.9 Predicting Organizational Effectiveness Based on the School Heads' Transformational Leadership Styles

Table 9 presents the linear regression analysis used to predict organizational effectiveness based on the school heads' transformational leadership styles.

Table 9. Linear regression analysis of predicting organizational effectiveness by school heads' transformational leadership styles

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients, β	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	2.047	0.267		7.660(.000)	
X ₁ : Transformational	0.484	0.067	0.529	7.183(.000)	Significant

Note: Adjusted $R^2=.274$ ANOVA for Regression: $F=51.598$, $p=.000$.
Significant ($p<.05$), Not significant ($p>.05$)

Fitted Regression Model: Organizational Effectiveness = 2.047 + 0.484 (transformational)

The results above indicated a significant model (ANOVA $F=51.598$, $p=.000$), suggesting that transformational leadership styles significantly explain the variance in organizational effectiveness among respondents. Moreover, the adjusted R^2 value of .274 or 27.4% indicated a provision for the descriptive influence of the model. Furthermore, with a per-unit increase in transformational leadership styles, there was a 0.484 increase in Organizational Effectiveness. Therefore, the null statement, which states that the school head's transformational leadership style does not significantly predict organizational effectiveness, was rejected since the p-value was less than the level 0.05.

3.10 Predicting Organizational Effectiveness Based on the School Heads' Transactional Leadership Styles

Table 10 presents the linear regression analysis used to predict organizational effectiveness based on the school heads' transactional leadership styles.

Table 10. Linear regression analysis of predicting organizational effectiveness by school heads' transactional leadership styles

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients, β	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	2.714	0.235		11.556(0.000)	
X ₁ : Transactional	0.317	0.060	0.419	5.327(0.000)	Significant

Note: Adjusted $R^2=.170$ ANOVA for Regression: $F=28.373$, $p=.000$.
Significant ($p<.05$), Not significant ($p>.05$)

Fitted Regression Model: Organizational Effectiveness = 2.714 + 0.317 (Transactional)

The results revealed a significant model (ANOVA $F=28.373$, $p=.000$), suggesting that transactional leadership styles significantly explain the variance in organizational effectiveness among respondents. Moreover, the adjusted R^2 value of .170 or 17.0% indicated a provision for the descriptive influence of the model. Furthermore, with a per-unit increase in transformational leadership styles, there was a 0.317 increase in Organizational Effectiveness. Therefore, the null statement, which states that the school head's transactional leadership style does not significantly predict organizational effectiveness, was rejected since the p-value was less than the level 0.05.

3.11 Predicting Organizational Effectiveness Based on the School Heads' Authoritarian Leadership Styles

Table 11 presents the linear regression analysis to predict organizational effectiveness based on the school heads' authoritarian leadership styles.

Table 11. Linear regression analysis of predicting organizational effectiveness by school heads' authoritarian leadership styles

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients, β	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	3.996	0.144		27.752(0.000)	
X ₁ : Authoritarian	-0.009	0.038	-0.020	-0.234(0.815)	Not Significant

Note: Adjusted R²=-0.007 ANOVA for Regression: F=0.055, p=.000.
Significant (p<.05), Not significant (p>.05)

Fitted Regression Model: None

The results indicated a non-significant model (ANOVA F=.055, p=.815), suggesting that authoritarian leadership styles do not contribute to explaining the variance in organizational effectiveness among respondents. Moreover, the adjusted R² value of -.007 or -0.7% indicated a weak influence of the model. Thus, the null statement, which states that the school head's authoritarian leadership style does not significantly predict organizational effectiveness, was rejected since the p-value was greater than the level of 0.05.

3.12 Predicting Organizational Effectiveness Based on the School Heads' Democratic Leadership Styles

Table 12 presents the linear regression analysis used to predict organizational effectiveness based on the school heads' democratic leadership styles.

Table 12. Linear regression analysis of predicting organizational effectiveness by school heads' democratic leadership styles

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients, β	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.			
(Constant)	2.691	0.197		13.681(0.000)	
X ₁ : Democratic	-0.325	0.050	0.490	6.483(0.000)	Significant

Note: Adjusted R²=-.234 ANOVA for Regression: F=42.035, p=.000.
Significant (p<.05), Not significant (p>.05)

Fitted Regression Model: Organizational Effectiveness = 2.691 + 0.325 (Democratic)

The results indicated a significant model (ANOVA F=42.035, p=.000), suggesting that democratic leadership styles significantly explain respondents' variance in organizational effectiveness. Moreover, the adjusted R² value of .234 or 23.4% indicated a provision for the descriptive influence of the model. Furthermore, with a per-unit increase in democratic leadership styles, there was a 0.325 increase in Organizational Effectiveness. Therefore, the null statement, which states that the school head's democratic leadership style does not significantly predict organizational effectiveness, was rejected since the p-value was less than the level 0.05.

3.13 Predicting Organizational Effectiveness Based on the School Heads' Occupational Commitment and Leadership Styles

Table 13 presents the multiple regression analysis that predicts organizational effectiveness based on the school heads' occupational commitment and leadership styles with the results of unstandardized and standardized coefficients.

Unstandardized Coefficients (B)

These coefficients represent the change in the dependent variable for a one-unit change in the unstandardized predictor variable, holding all other predictors constant. Facilitating a shared vision and mission: B=0.169; Building trusting relationships: B=0.100; Communicating effectively: B=0.504. For example, a coefficient of 0.504 for "Communicating effectively" means that for each one-unit increase in this variable, the dependent variable increases by 0.504 units.

Table 13. Linear regression analysis of predicting organizational effectiveness by school heads' occupational commitment and leadership styles

Model 1

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.	β		
(Constant)	0.712	0.227		3.139(.002)	Significant
X ₁ :Facilitating a shared vision and mission	0.169	0.056	0.169	3.032(.003)	Significant
X ₂ :Building a trusting relationship	0.100	0.033	0.166	3.042(.003)	Significant
X ₃ :Communicating effectively	0.504	0.057	0.666	8.799(.000)	Significant
X ₄ : Being visible and accessible	0.057	0.030	0.102	1.870(.006)	Significant
X ₅ : Transformational	0.135	0.050	0.147	2.688(.008)	Significant
X ₆ : Transactional	0.249	0.054	0.329	4.609(.000)	Significant
X ₇ : Authoritarian	-0.014	0.020	-0.032	-0.702(.484)	Not Significant
X ₈ : Democratic	0.125	0.034	0.188	3.712(.000)	Significant

Note: Adjusted R²=.749 ANOVA for Regression: F=50.868, p=.000.
Significant (p<.05), Not significant (p>.05)

Fitted Regression Model: Organizational Effectiveness = 0.712 + 0.169 (Facilitating a shared vision and mission) + 0.100 (Building a trusting relationship) + 0.504 (Communicating effectively) + 0.057 (Being visible and accessible) + 0.135 (Transformational) + 0.249 (Transactional) + 0.125 (Democratic)

Standardized Coefficients (Beta, β)

These coefficients are the unstandardized coefficients adjusted by the standard deviations of the variables. They allow comparison of the relative importance of each predictor variable. Facilitating a shared vision and mission: β =0.169. Building trusting relationships: β =0.166. Communicating effectively: β =0.666. The standardized coefficient of 0.666 for "Communicating effectively" indicates that it has a stronger relationship with the dependent variable compared to the other predictors, which have lower standardized coefficients. The p-values indicated the statistical significance of each predictor in the model. Facilitating a shared vision and mission: p=0.002. Building trusting relationships: p=0.003. Communicating effectively: p=0.000. Since all p-values were below 0.05, each predictor is statistically significant. This means that there is strong evidence to suggest that these variables have a meaningful impact on the dependent variable. Given the significance of all the predictors, the study interpreted the results more confidently: Facilitating a shared vision and mission: Unstandardized coefficient (0.169) suggested a modest positive impact on the dependent variable. The standardized coefficient (0.169) indicated relatively low importance compared to "Communicating effectively." Building trusting relationships: The unstandardized coefficient (0.100) suggests a smaller positive impact. The standardized coefficient (0.166) also indicates relatively low importance but slightly higher than "Facilitating a shared vision and mission." The unstandardized coefficient (0.504) suggested a substantial positive impact on the dependent variable. The standardized coefficient (0.666) indicated that this variable had the highest relative importance among the predictors. Thus, given the statistical significance of all variables, Communicating effectively stands out as the most influential predictor with a high unstandardized and standardized coefficient, indicating a strong and significant impact on the dependent variable. The results in Model 1 indicated a statistically significant model (ANOVA F=50.868, p=.000), suggesting that independent variables of occupational commitment significantly contribute to explaining the variance in leadership styles among respondents. The adjusted R² value of .749 or 74.9% indicated a provision for the descriptive influence of the model.

Table 14 presents the results of the regression model, which includes five predictors: occupational commitment, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, authoritarian leadership, and democratic leadership.

Table 14. Multiple regression analysis of predicting organizational effectiveness by school heads' occupational commitment and leadership styles

Model fit 2

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.	β		
(Constant)	0.716	0.219		3.140(.001)	Significant
X ₁ :Occupational Commitment	0.215	0.030	0.421	5.517(.000)	Significant
X ₂ : Transformational	0.131	0.045	0.141	2.512(.004)	Significant
X ₃ : Transactional	0.300	0.061	0.341	4.700(.000)	Significant
X ₄ : Authoritarian	-0.015	0.016	-0.030	-0.700(.481)	Not Significant
X ₅ : Democratic	0.130	0.037	0.190	3.756(.000)	Significant

Note: Adjusted R²=.767 ANOVA for Regression: F=53.899, p=.000.
Significant (p<.05) Not significant (p>.05)

The model fit, designated as Model 2, provides insights into these predictors' relative importance and significance. Unstandardized Coefficients (B) these coefficients represent the amount of change in the dependent variable for a one-unit change in the predictor variable, holding all other predictors constant. For instance, an unstandardized coefficient of 0.300 for "Transactional" leadership means that for each one-unit increase in this variable, the dependent variable increases by 0.300 units. Standardized Coefficients (Beta, β) are the unstandardized coefficients adjusted by the variables' standard deviations, allowing for comparing each predictor variable's relative importance. The standardized coefficient of 0.421 for "Occupational commitment" indicated that it has the strongest relationship with the dependent variable compared to the other predictors. The p-values indicated the statistical significance of each predictor in the model. A p-value less than 0.05 is typically considered statistically significant, suggesting strong evidence against the null hypothesis, posing that the coefficient is zero (no effect). Since all p-values were below 0.05, each predictor was statistically significant. The significance of all the predictors with interpreted results: Unstandardized coefficient (0.215) suggested a positive impact on the dependent variable. The standardized coefficient (0.421) indicated the highest relative importance among the predictors. Transformational: Unstandardized coefficient (0.131) suggests a positive impact. The standardized coefficient (0.141) was relatively less important than other predictors. Transactional: The unstandardized coefficient (0.300) suggested a substantial positive impact on the dependent variable. The standardized coefficient (0.341) indicated a high relative importance, second to occupational commitment. Authoritarian: The unstandardized coefficient (0.015) suggested a minimal positive impact. The standardized coefficient (0.030) indicated the lowest relative importance among the predictors but is still statistically significant. Democratic: Unstandardized coefficient (0.130) suggested a positive impact. The standardized coefficient (0.190) indicates a moderate relative importance. Furthermore, per-unit increase in Occupational Commitment in terms of Facilitating a shared vision and mission, there is a 0.169 increase in Organizational Effectiveness, per-unit increase in Occupational Commitment in terms of Building a trusting relationship, there is a 0.100 increase in Organizational Effectiveness, per-unit increase in Occupational Commitment in terms of Communicating effectively, there is a 0.504 increase in Organizational Effectiveness, per-unit increase in Occupational Commitment in terms of Being visible and accessible, there is a 0.057 increase in Organizational Effectiveness, per-unit increase in Leadership styles in terms of Transformational style, there is a 0.135 increase in Organizational Effectiveness, per-unit increase in Leadership styles in terms of Transactional style, there is a 0.249 increase in Organizational Effectiveness, and per-unit increase in Leadership styles in terms of Democratic style, there is a 0.125 increase in Organizational Effectiveness. Therefore, the null hypothesis that Occupational Commitment and Leadership Style do not significantly predict Organizational Effectiveness was rejected since the p-value was less than 0.005.

Table 15. Regression analysis of predicting organizational effectiveness by school head's occupational commitment and leadership styles Model fit 3

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t-value (p-value)	Interpretation
	B	S.E.	β		
(Constant)	.819	.310		4.132(.000)	Significant
X ₁ :Occupational Commitment	.215	.030	.421	5.517(.000)	Significant
X ₂ :Leadership Styles	.178	.020	.189	2.982(.001)	Significant

Note: Adjusted R²=.83 ANOVA for Regression: F=60.119, p=.000.
Significant (p<.05), Not significant (p>.05)

$$\hat{Y} = .819 + 0.215 X_1 + 0.178 X_2$$

where:

\hat{Y} = Organizational Effectiveness

X₁ = Occupational Commitment

X₂ = Leadership Styles

The regression analysis results for predicting organizational effectiveness based on the school heads' occupational commitment and leadership styles revealed several important insights. The model fit is robust, with an adjusted R² of .83, indicating that 83% of the variance in organizational effectiveness is explained by the predictors included in the model. The ANOVA for the regression shows an F-value of 60.119 with a p-value of .000, demonstrating that the overall model is statistically significant and provides a good fit for the data. Occupational commitment (X₁) emerges as a significant predictor with an unstandardized coefficient (B) of .215 and a standardized coefficient (β) of .421. The t-value is 5.517 with a p-value of .000, underscoring a strong positive relationship between occupational commitment and organizational effectiveness. This implied that higher levels of occupational

commitment among school heads lead to greater organizational effectiveness. On the other hand, leadership styles (X2) also significantly predict organizational effectiveness, though with a smaller impact. The unstandardized coefficient (B) is .178, and the standardized coefficient (β) is .189, with a t-value of 2.982 and a p-value of .001. This indicated that while effective leadership styles positively influence organizational effectiveness, their impact is less pronounced than occupational commitment.

4.0 Conclusion

This study delved into the intricate dynamics of organizational effectiveness, occupational commitment, and leadership styles within educational settings, focusing on school principals' perspectives. The study disclosed the school heads' strong commitment to their roles and their adoption of multifaceted leadership practices such as transformational, transactional, and democratic styles. These committed and diverse leadership approaches were found to influence the overall effectiveness of educational institutions significantly. The study drew upon theoretical frameworks like the Three-Component Model to elucidate the interplay between commitment dynamics and organizational effectiveness. At the same time, the Management by Objective System underscored the predictive role of leadership styles in achieving organizational goals. These insights underscored the pivotal role of leadership in fostering positive organizational climates that foster collaboration, innovation, and continuous improvement.

Given the findings, educational institutions may prioritize leadership training programs for school heads, enhancing skills in vision-building, communication, conflict resolution, and strategic decision-making tailored to address specific needs and challenges. Educational stakeholders may encourage school heads to adopt collaborative leadership practices, involving stakeholders in decision-making and fostering trust, transparency, and shared ownership through training programs and support mechanisms. Regular feedback and evaluation of leadership practices and organizational effectiveness are crucial for educational policymakers and administrators to foster a culture of learning and adaptability.

5.0 Contributions of Authors

The authors distributed and did the editing, writing, supervising, data analysis, and encoding tasks and collectively reviewed and approved the final manuscript. Both authors conceived and designed the study, formulated the research questions, and designed the study protocol. Author 1 collected and encoded the data. Author 2 helped with the analysis and interpretation of the data. Author 1 wrote the initial draft, while Author 2 contributed to the subsequent revisions. Both Authors provided final approval for publication.

6.0 Funding

This research was conducted independently and received no specific grant or funding from any agency.

7.0 Conflict of Interests

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

8.0 Acknowledgment

The researchers express their heartfelt gratitude to the Almighty Father for His unwavering guidance and blessings throughout this research endeavor.

9.0 References

- Ahmed, T., Haider, A., & Alvi, B. (2021). Impact of transformational and transactional leadership styles on employee performance with mediating effect of affective commitment: A study of banking sector of Pakistan. *Global Management Sciences Review*, 6(1), 1-11. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gmsr.2021\(VI-I\).01](https://doi.org/10.31703/gmsr.2021(VI-I).01)
- Almatrooshi, B., Singh, S. K., & Farouk, S. (2016). Determinants of organizational performance: A proposed framework. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 65(6), 844-859. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-02-2016-0038>
- Bit, B. (2021). Organizational Commitment among Government and Private Secondary School Teachers: A Comparative Study. *International Journal of Advances in Engineering and Management (IJAEM)*, 3(1), 179-182. https://ijaem.net/issue_dcp/Organizational%20Commitment
- Chou, M., Cheng, J., & Cheng, Y. (2016). Operating Classroom Aesthetic Reading Environment to Raise Children's Reading Motivation. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4, 81-97. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.040111>
- Coşkun, B., Kautaş, 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>
- Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221-258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863>
- Day, C., Sun, J., & Grice, C. (2023). Research on successful school leadership. *International Encyclopedia of Education (Fourth Edition)*, 62-72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818630-5.05024-7>
- Hallinger, P., & Lee, M. (2013). Mapping instructional leadership in Thailand: Has education reform impacted principal practice? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(1), 6-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143213502196>
- Karl, K. A. (1997). Managers as facilitators: A practical guide to getting work done in a changing Workplace. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 11(4), 100-102. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1997.9712024846>
- Kasalak, G., Güneri, B., Ehtiyar, V. R., Apaydin, Ç., & Türker, G. Ö. (2022). The relation between leadership styles in higher education institutions and academic staff's job satisfaction: A meta-analysis study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1038824>
- Khalifa, M. A., Gooden, M. A., & Davis, J. E. (2016). Culturally Responsive School Leadership: A Synthesis of the Literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 1272-1311. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316630383>
- Keskes, I., Sallan, J., Simo, P., & Fernandez, V. (2018). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of leader-member exchange. *Journal of Management Development*, 37, 00-00. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-04-2017-0132>

- Kilay, A. L., Simamora, B. H., & Putra, D. P. (2022). The influence of e-payment and e-commerce services on supply chain performance: Implications of open innovation and solutions for the digitalization of micro, small, and medium enterprises (Msmes) in indonesia. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 8(3), 119. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc8030119>
- Mulford, W., Silins, H., & Leithwood, K. (2004). *Educational leadership for organisational learning and improved student outcomes*. Springer Netherlands.
- Olaso, A.F., & Baja, R.M. (2019). Professional Accountability of Secondary School Heads Towards Quality Assurance. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications*, 3(9), 118-134.
- Olcum, D., & Titrek, O. (2015). The effect of school administrators' decision-making styles on teacher job satisfaction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 1936-1946. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.575>
- Raharja, S., Mat Nashir, I., & Andriani, D. (2022). The effect of principals' transformational leadership and organizational culture on teacher performance. *Jurnal Kependidikan Penelitian Inovasi Pembelajaran*, 6, 152-162. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jk.v6i2.49456>
- Rivera, F. (2021). The leadership styles of school heads in Bayugan north and northwest districts and the efficiency of teachers. *SMCC Higher Education Research Journal*, 8(1), 148-161.
- Solà-Martin, A. (2010). Conflict resolution in Western Sahara. *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, 9(3), 117-140. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ajcr.v9i3.52181>