Research Paper   **Open** **Access**

School Leadership Behaviors of School Heads in Relation to Teachers' Work Performance and Organizational Commitment in Selected Secondary Schools in the Philippines

Allan P. Medul
Department of Education
Santa Cruz, Zambales, Philippines
Carlos Ponce C. Ventura and Elizabeth N. Farin
President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Zambales, Philippines

ABSTRACT:- This study aimed to determine the relationship between school leadership behaviors of School Heads in relation to teachers' work performance and organizational commitment in selected Secondary Schools in the Division of Zambales, Philippines. The quantitative Descriptive research design method was used. Questionnaire and documentary analysis were used in gathering the data. Respondents were the two hundred eightypublic secondary school teachers in selected secondary schools in Schools Division of Zambales. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used for the analysis and statistical treatment of data.

Results showed that the teacher-respondents perceived the school heads in public secondary schools in Schools Division of Zambales "often" demonstrate school leadership behavior as to initiating structure and considerationand "agreed" on their organizational commitment as to affective, continuance, and normative commitments. There was a significant difference in the school leadership behavior of school heads as perceived by the teachers when grouped according to dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. There was asignificant difference in Organizational Commitment of teachers as to affective commitment when grouped according to civil status; significant to employment status as to continuance commitment; significant on civil status and employment as to normative commitment. There was a very low positive correlation between school leadership behavior of school heads and teachers' work performance, andthere was a low positive correlation between school leadership behavior of school heads and teachers' organizational commitment. It isrecommended that school heads may explore motivational and good leadership behaviors in order to sustain the level of work performance and strengthen the organizational commitment of teachers. The results necessitated the crafting of a model in identifying dimensions of school leadership behaviors as to initiating structure and consideration that need to be redefined in order to sustain the level of work performance of teachers and further increase organizational commitment of teachers as to affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment.

Keywords: Leadership Behavior, Work Performance, Organizational Commitment, Secondary Schools

I.   INTRODUCTION

Education is widely recognized as an indicator of development. One of the basic purposes of education is to produce trained human resource which can overcome development impediments of a given country. To achieve this, there should be a committed workforce in the sector. Employees of leaders with good behavior commit their time, energy and efforts to work which result in high productivity (Scott, 2014).

The Philippine School System is going through a massive change (Ferres, Firns&Travaglione, 2020). There is a shift from traditional learning to advanced computer and information technology mode of learning delivery. According to McKay (2012), school leaders experience enormous tension to change the way they behave so that they remain competitive. Burack (2020) further proposes that the behavioral change is motivating

school heads to fit their organization's structure, culture and management processes to the demands of the external environment. Internally the change is viewed as motivating the implementation of participative management and employee involvement processes, which lead to high employee commitment to the organization and higher performance. According to Travaglione (2000), this is taking place in a context where corporate restructuring and downsizing have likely changed the traditional psychological contract between employees and employers.

The last decade, with its tumultuous changes in school leaders' behaviors, left many employees emotionally detached from their workplace. Manion (2014) states that accelerating change, increasing organizational challenges and crises, workforce shortages and mounting environmental pressures make the need for committed and fully engaged employees more important ever. Gaining commitment of employees to needed or desired organizational initiatives and their work, is a challenged faced by all (Manion, 2014).

According to Felstead, Gallie and Green (2011), an important current thinking in the last decade has emphasized the need for a shift from control to commitment as the central objective of management employment policies. The late 1980's and early 1990's saw a growing advocacy of leadership behaviors and new philosophies of management, proposing a shift from control to commitment as the focal concern of management policies and leadership behaviors among managers and leaders. According to Oberholzer (2011) it is apparent that the nature of the workforce is changing. Trends include change in leadership behavior, increasing levels of education, increased professionalism, and decreasing organizational loyalty among the workforce. These trends may not be independent – that is, school leadership behavior, increasing levels of education and professionalism may contribute to generally reduced work performance, commitment and loyalty to employers.

As the Philippine School System faces increasing competitive challenges, a strategy that will develop well-performed, committed and loyal employees holds the promise of exceptional returns in education (Chambers, 2018). According to Camilleri (2012) commitment is one of the great engines of success. The leadership behaviors of school heads can influence teachers' outcomes, such as work performance and commitment to the school. They held regard that for employees to be satisfied in the school, they must perceive the school leadership behaviors as positive. It can be pointed out that school leadership behavior stands as the centre from which all other factors of teachers' work performance and commitment are derived. In some educational institutions, leadership behavior may be transformed that may affect work performance and commitment; thus, this study is to be conducted.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

This study employed descriptive research with documentary and survey analysis. The descriptive method does not merely accept the gathering of data and tabulation of results but also includes interpretation and evaluation of what has been described in the questionnaire. Calmorin& Calderon (2003) justify that a descriptive method signifies the gathering of data regarding the present situation. The justification was likewise made by Aquino (1993) when he said that the descriptive method includes data to test the hypothesis and the answer to the questions concerning the present status of the study.

Respondents and Location of the Study

The respondents involved in the study were the two hundred eighty (280) public school teachers of selected Secondary Schools in the Schools Division of Zambales.

A probability sampling technique was used in the selection of respondents. As such, the researcher utilized random selection in identifying respondents from selected secondary schools in Schools Division of Zambales.

Research Instrument

The main tool that the researcher used in the data gathering process was the questionnaire and documents for the teacher's performance. To measure the leadership behaviors of school heads, the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was used which was adopted from Halpin and Winner (1952). The tool consists of two dimensions of leadership behavior, the initiating structure, and consideration. A combination of these two dimensions indicates the leadership behavior pattern of school heads. Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire is composed of short descriptive statements of ways in which leaders may behave. To measure the organizational commitment of teacher-respondents, the Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS) was used, this scale was developed by Balfour and Wechsler (1996) which uses items to measure

three dimensions of overall organizational commitment based on affiliation or pride in the organization, commitment based on identification with the organization, commitment based on the satisfactory exchange with the organization resulting in appreciation of the individual by the organization; thus measure the commitment of teachers in terms of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment.

III.   RESULTS

**Table 1 Level of Work Performance Rating of Public Secondary School Teachers
in Schools Division of Zambalesfor S.Y. 2019-2020**

Descriptive Equivalent	IPCRF Rating	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Outstanding	4.500-5.000	199	71.10
Very Satisfactory	3.500-4.499	81	28.90
Satisfactory	2.500-3.499	0	0.00
Unsatisfactory	1.500-2.499	0	0.00
Poor	1.499 & below	0	0.00
Total		280	100.00
Mean = 4.53 (Outstanding)			

Table 1 reflects the level of work performance of the teacher- respondents as "Outstanding" as manifested with a great number of 81 or 28.90%. The computed mean was 4.53 with the qualitative equivalent of "Outstanding" performance.

**Table 2 School Leadership Behavior of School Heads as Perceived By
School Heads as to Initiating Structure and Consideration**

	A. Initiating Structure	Mean	Descriptive Equivalent	Rank
1	Representation	3.52	Often	4
2	Demand Reconciliation	3.39	Occasionally	6
3	Tolerance of Uncertainty	3.47	Often	5
4	Persuasiveness	3.57	Often	3
5	Initiation of Structure	3.91	Often	1
6	Tolerance of Freedom	3.86	Often	2
	Average Mean	**3.62**	**Often**	
	B. Consideration			
1	Role Assumption	3.06	Occasionally	6
2	Comfort	3.87	Often	3
3	Production Emphasis	3.64	Often	5
4	Predictive Accuracy	3.75	Often	4
5	Integration	4.11	Often	1
6	Superior Orientation	3.94	Often	2
	Average Mean	**3.73**	**Often**	
	Grand Mean	**3.68**	**OFTEN**	

Table 2 indicates that teacher-respondents perceived the school heads "often" demonstrate school leadership behavior as to consideration as manifested by its average mean of 3.73, particularly on integration. While initiating structure obtained a mean of 3.62 especially on-demand reconciliation.

Table 3 Test of Difference on School Leadership Behavior of School Heads as Perceived by Teacher-Respondents when Grouped According to Initiating Structure and Consideration

Initiating Structure /Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Representation	280	984.40	3.52	1.21
Demand Reconciliation	280	949.60	3.39	0.59
Tolerance of Uncertainty	280	970.60	3.47	0.44
Persuasiveness	280	1000.40	3.57	0.52
Initiation of Structure	280	1095.40	3.91	0.58
Tolerance of Freedom	280	1079.70	3.86	0.52

Source of Variation	SS	Df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	64.40	5	12.88	19.97	2.2E-19	2.21
Within Groups	1079.60	1674	0.64			
Total	1144.00	1679				

Decision: Reject Null Hypothesis (Significant)

Consideration/Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Role Assumption	280	855.40	3.06	0.58
Comfort	280	1082.50	3.87	0.43
Production Emphasis	280	1020.50	3.64	0.49
Predictive Accuracy	280	1051.40	3.75	0.52
Integration	280	1150.60	4.11	0.55
Superior Orientation	280	1104.20	3.94	0.50

Source of Variation	SS	Df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	188.02	5	37.60	73.51	9.98E-70	2.22
Within Groups	856.41	1674	0.51			
Total	1044.43	1679				

Decision: Reject Null Hypothesis (Significant)

Table 3 reflects that teacher-respondents agreed-on the level of organizational commitment of the teachers, particularly on the normative commitment.

Table 4 Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation to determine Relationship between School Leadership Behavior of School Heads and Teachers' Work Performance

Sources of Correlations		School Leadership Behavior	Teachers' Work Performance	Decision / Interpretation
School Leadership Behavior	Pearson Correlation	1	0.235**	Very Low Positive Relationship Reject Ho
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000	
	N	280	280	
Teachers' Work Performance	Pearson Correlation	0.235**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000		
	N	280	280	
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Table 4 shows that there is a significant difference on the school leadership behaviors of school heads as perceived by the teachers on the various dimensions specified on the initiating structure and considerations.

Table 5 Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation to determine Relationship between School Leadership Behavior of School Heads and Organizational Commitment of Teachers

Sources of Correlations		School Leadership Behavior	Teachers' Organizational Commitment	Decision / Interpretation
School Leadership Behavior	Pearson Correlation	1	0.308**	Low Positive Relationship Reject Ho
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000	
	N	280	280	
Teachers' Organizational Commitment	Pearson Correlation	0.308**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000		
	N	280	280	
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Table 5 describes that there was a very low positive correlation between the school leadership behavior of school heads and teachers' work performance. The result signifies that there is a significant relationship between the school leadership behavior of school heads and teachers' work performance.

Discussion

Teachers with optimal performance can significantly impact the future of their students or young generation and achieve educational goals Cascio (2013). According to Schermerhorn, Hunt, and Osborn (2016), performance is one's work result or success rate as a whole over a certain period of time in performing tasks compared to various possibilities, such as work standards, targets or criteria which have been predetermined and agreed. Performance is used to highlight the manifestations of knowledge, understanding, and development of ideas, concepts, and skills that can be observed. This indicates that the school leadership behavior of School heads as to Initiating Structure was unable to equally demonstrate the same level of behavior to demand reconciliation area as therefore resulting on the findings of teachers' work performance and organizational commitment. Bundang (2017) concluded in her study that school leaders should initiate a climate of a workplace inspiring and setting values for their team. A great leader tries out his/her idea to the group to motivate others to share as well. A great leader is always open to sharing and looks for the next great idea to make things work out better. They are not afraid to take a chance and support the team to drive the idea forward.

The findings clearly signify that school heads occasionally get confused on the demands made to their position. The job expectations for school principals are enormous and compel principals to take on many roles, including the role of teacher, psychologist, social worker, facilities manager, assessment expert, educational visionary, diplomat, mentor, PR director coach, and cheerleader (Lunenberg, 2011). Beriales, et. al (2017) argued that leadership roles are unquestionably demanding because they are often a fraught juggling act-torn between delivering expectations, meeting strategic goals and keeping teams productive and motivated. Few school leaders can juggle conflicting demands with ease. This is because some people don't really like being managed. It implies that they are a resource controlled and used by others as they see fit. People like to think they have choices around work and to some extent they do.This implies that teachers agree on moral responsibility to stay in the profession (Meyer & Allen, 1993; Bagraim, 2013; Ware &Kitsantas, 2017). It is the sense of their obligation towards the profession to uphold the value (Maheshwari, 2017). The adoption of the goals and values of the school constitutes the basis for teachers' commitment to the school. Cohen (2013) saw it as one's attitude, which includes effect, belief, and behavioral intention toward one's work. Several variables can determine the level of teachers' commitment to the school. This includes the interaction between teachers, the relationship between teacher and student, the quality of work done by the teachers, and the working environment (Celep, 2010).Teacher-respondents also based their commitment on the benefits and costs that is related to staying in the profession (Nazari&Emami, 2012). It is the extent to which they believe that they must remain in the teaching profession because of lack of alternatives or possible disruptions resulting from leaving their jobs (Ware &Kitsantas, 2017). Numerous studies reported that initiating structure leadership behavior of school heads makes a difference. McRel's (2013) studies on school effectiveness reported that leadership of school heads varies on several defining characteristics that made up the school system. Accordingly, it is important to understand the varying role and different leadership styles of school leaders in restructuring differently the school systems.School leaders demonstrate different leadership traits to improve educational outcomes. With an increase in accountability and policy changes, the notion of leadership consideration behavior of school heads changed. An increase in accountability, management, and other factors brought

another transition with school leadership behaviors which signifies differences (Hallinger, 2016).It means that as the school leadership behavior of school heads gets greater, the level of teachers' work performance increases. Hallinger and Heck (2016) investigated the relationship of principals' behavior and teachers' performance. The studies indicated positive indirect effects of principal leadership and teachers' performance consistently found that effect impacting the school's goals. Findings indicate that principal leadership that was geared towards the development of school-wide purpose seemed to make a difference on teachers' performance. Likewise, there was a low positive correlation between school leadership behavior and teachers' organizational commitment. Scott (2014) stated that employees who have good relationships with school heads commit their time, energy, and efforts to work which reflected in their commitment

IV.   CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The teacher-respondents have outstanding work performance as indicated in their IPCRF during the Academic Year 2019-2020. Teachers also perceived that their school heads often demonstrate school leadership behavior and teachers agreed on their commitment to the organization. Significant differences on various dimensions of leadership behaviors of school heads were noted on initiating structure and considerations. Likewise, there were significant differences in the organizational commitment of teachers as to affective commitment when grouped according to civil status; continuance commitment when grouped according to employment status; and normative commitment when grouped according to civil status and employment status. Very low positive correlation between school leadership behavior of school heads and teachers' work performance; and between school leadership behavior of school heads and teachers' organizational commitment were deduced. With this, a model was crafted based on the findings to redefine in order to sustain the level of Work Performance of teachers and further increase their Organizational Commitment.

School heads may explore motivational behaviors to sustain the level of work performance and strengthen the organizational commitment of teachers. Sustain the level of work performance rating of teachers through providing them positive support and motivation. School heads may adhere to have strategic managerial practices and apply the different dimensions of good leadership behaviors as to representation, demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of structure, tolerance and freedom, role assumption, comfort, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, and superior orientation. School administrators are encouraged to implement programs and activities to show support and give due credit to teachers related to their professional growth, promotional activities, and incentives in order to strengthen their commitment to their organization. Since the organizational commitment of teachers is affected either by their employment status or civil status, the feeling of obligation to continue employments due to the fact that they need employment to sustain their family needs and they need employment.

REFERENCES

[1]. Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63, 1-18.

[2]. Bagraim, J.J. (2013). The dimensionality of professional commitment. SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 29 (2), 6-9.

[3]. Balfour, D., & Wechsler, B. (1996). Organizational commitment: Antecedents and outcomes in public organizations. Public Productivity & Management Review, 256-277.

[4]. Beriales, M., Permocillo, D., Bartizo, C. & Porras, C. (2017). Level of Satisfaction of application. California: Sage

[5]. Bundang, L. (2017). A study on the qualities and efficiency of teachers in some selected schools in the division of Cavite. Unpublished Master Thesis.   National Teachers College. Quiapo, Manila. 160pp.

[6]. Burack, J.A. (2020). Adolescent wellness: In the eye of the beholder. In Cicchetti, E, Rappaport, J, Sandler, I. &Weissberg, R. P. (Eds.). The promotion of wellness in children and adolescents. Washington DC Child Welfare League of America Press.

[7]. Calmorin, L. & Calderon, M. (2003). Methods of Research, Thesis Writing and Applied Statistics.

[8]. Camilleri, E. (2012). Some antecedents or organizational commitment. Results from an information systems public sector organization. Bank of Vallatta Review, 25 1-29.

[9]. Cascio, W.F. (2013). Managing Human Resource: Productivity, *Quality of Work life*, Profits. Singapore: McGraw-Hill International Editors.

[10]. Celep, C. (2010). Teachers' Organizational Commitment in Educational Organizations. Trakya University. Edime, Turkey. National Forum of Teacher Education Journal, 1 (IOE), 93) Eric No: ED452179.

[11]. Chambers, E.G. (2018). Winning the war for talent. Workforce, 77, (12), 50-56.

[12]. Cohen, A. (2013) 2nd ed. Multiple commitments in the workplace: An integrative approach. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[13]. Felstead, A. Gallie, D. & Green, F. (2011). Employer Policies and Organizational Commitment in Britain. Journal of Management Studies, 37 (6), 1081-1101.

[14]. Ferres, N., Firns, I &Travaglione, A. (2020). Attitudinal differences between generation Z and older employees. International Journal of Organizational Behavior, 6 (3), 320-333.

[15]. Hallinger, P. and Heck, R.H. (2016). Collaborative leadership and school improvement:understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. School Leadership andManagement, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 95-110.

[16]. Halpin, A.W. (1957). Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Mimeo Columbos: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

[17]. Maheshwari, A. (2017). Implications of human resource practice and other structural factors on commitment of public medical professional. India.

[18]. Manion, J. (2014). Urture a culture of retention. Nursing management, 35, (4), 23-29

[19]. McKay, S. (2012). Teaching as a Profession. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[20]. Nazari, K &Emami, M. (2012). Analysis of relation between organizational commitment and professional commitment. Elixir Human Res. Mgmt 51 (2012) 10661-10664.

[21]. Scott, M. (2014). Perceptions of Fundamental Job Characteristics and their level of Job Satisfaction. Mississippi State University Extension Service Agents. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 18(3):251-268.

[22]. Travaglione, A. (2000). Human resource strategy during turbulent change: Managing Organizational Downsizing. In Travaglione, A. & Marshall, V. (Eds.) Human Resource Strategies: An applied approach. Roseville. Irwin McGraw-Hill.

[23]. Ware, H. &Kitsantas, A. (2017). Teachers and collective efficacy beliefs as predictor of professional commitment. Journal of Educatioanl Research, 100(5), 303-310.

President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Zambales, Philippines
Allan P. Medul, Carlos Ponce C. Ventura and Elizabeth N. Farin