



An Empirical Study on the Relationship Between Leadership Styles and Teacher Work Commitment

Dr. B. Rajnarayanan

Post Doctoral Scholar,

IMC, Srinivas University, Mangalore, Karnataka, India

rajnarayanan@vmkvec.edu.in

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4267-871X>

Shailashri V. T.

Research Professor,

IMC, Srinivas University, Mangalore, Karnataka, India

P Radha

Professor

School of Commerce, JAIN (Deemed – to – be University), Bengaluru, India

pradha1020@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8172-8471>

Scopus Id: 57224618541

Dasarath Neupane, PhD & PDF

Research Director

Atharva Business College, Kathmandu, Nepal

neupane.dasarath@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9285-8984>

Received: May 22, 2026

Revised & Accepted: July 25, 2026

Copyright: Author(s) (2026)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

Abstract

Aims: This empirical study aims to examine the relationship between leadership styles and teacher work commitment among public school teachers in Tamil Nadu, India. Specifically, the study seeks to determine the extent to which transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles are practiced, assess teachers' work commitment across affective,



continuance, and normative dimensions, and analyze the nature and predictive influence of leadership styles on teacher commitment.

Study Design: The study adopts a quantitative, non-experimental correlational research design to investigate the relationships among the variables without manipulating them.

Place and Duration of the Study: The research was conducted in selected public schools in Tamil Nadu, India, during the academic year 2025–2026.

Methodology: The study involved a sample of 169 public school teachers, selected using a stratified random sampling technique to ensure adequate representation. Data were collected using standardized instruments, namely the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to assess leadership styles and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) to measure teacher work commitment.

Responses were obtained using a five-point Likert scale, and the instruments demonstrated strong internal consistency, as indicated by satisfactory Cronbach's alpha values. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) and inferential statistics, including Pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis, to examine relationships and predictive effects.

Results: The findings indicate that transformational leadership is practiced at a very high level, while transactional leadership is observed at a high level, and laissez-faire leadership at a relatively low level. Teachers' work commitment was found to be generally high, with affective and normative commitment at very high levels, and continuance commitment at a high level. Correlation analysis revealed that transformational leadership has a strong positive relationship with teacher work commitment, whereas transactional leadership shows a moderate positive relationship. In contrast, laissez-faire leadership demonstrates a weak negative relationship with commitment. Further analysis using regression confirmed that leadership styles significantly predict teacher work commitment, with transformational leadership emerging as the most influential predictor.

Conclusion: The study concludes that leadership style is a significant determinant of teacher work commitment in public schools. Among the leadership styles, transformational leadership proves to be the most effective in fostering higher levels of commitment among teachers. The findings suggest that strengthening transformational leadership practices can enhance teacher engagement, improve retention, and contribute to overall institutional effectiveness in the educational context.

Keywords: Leadership style, teacher work commitment, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, organizational commitment, public secondary schools.

Introduction

Teacher work commitment is widely recognized as a crucial factor influencing the effectiveness and sustainability of educational institutions. It reflects the extent to which teachers are emotionally engaged, professionally dedicated, and willing to contribute beyond their formal responsibilities. High levels of teacher commitment are closely associated with



improved instructional quality, enhanced student learning outcomes, and overall institutional stability. In the Indian education system, particularly within public schools in Tamil Nadu, teachers often encounter challenges such as large classroom sizes, administrative workload, and resource limitations, making commitment a vital determinant of educational performance. Leadership within schools plays a significant role in shaping teacher attitudes, motivation, and professional engagement. The leadership style adopted by school heads directly affects the organizational climate and influences how teachers perceive their roles and responsibilities. Based on established leadership theories, leadership styles are broadly categorized into transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire approaches. Transformational leadership focuses on vision, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized support, thereby fostering higher levels of motivation and commitment among teachers. Transactional leadership, on the other hand, is primarily based on structured rewards and performance monitoring, ensuring compliance and task completion. In contrast, laissez-faire leadership represents a passive approach, often characterized by limited guidance and reduced involvement in decision-making processes.

A growing body of empirical research highlights the significant relationship between leadership styles and teacher commitment across different educational contexts. Transformational leadership, in particular, has been consistently linked with higher levels of teacher motivation, organizational commitment, and institutional effectiveness. Studies in the Indian context have also emphasized the importance of effective leadership in enhancing teacher engagement and professional dedication. Furthermore, national-level educational reforms such as the National Education Policy (NEP 2020) underscore the role of strong school leadership in improving teaching quality and learning outcomes.

Despite the existing literature, several gaps remain in understanding how leadership styles influence teacher work commitment, particularly within regional contexts such as Tamil Nadu. Much of the previous research has focused on related constructs such as job satisfaction or teacher performance, rather than examining commitment as a multidimensional concept comprising affective, continuance, and normative components. Additionally, limited studies have provided a comparative analysis of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles within a single empirical framework. Context-specific factors such as workload pressures, institutional support, and resource constraints are also often underexplored, despite their potential impact on teacher commitment.

In light of these gaps, the present study seeks to provide an empirical analysis of the relationship between leadership styles and teacher work commitment among public school teachers in Tamil Nadu. Specifically, it examines how different leadership styles influence the various dimensions of teacher commitment. The findings of this study are expected to contribute to the development of evidence-based leadership practices that enhance teacher engagement, improve retention, and strengthen the overall effectiveness of educational institutions.



2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Research Design and Procedures

This study adopted a quantitative, non-experimental correlational research design to examine the relationship between leadership styles and teacher work commitment among public school teachers in Tamil Nadu, India. A correlational approach was considered appropriate as it facilitates the systematic analysis of the strength and direction of relationships between variables without any manipulation or experimental intervention (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The study specifically focused on understanding how different leadership styles—transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire—are associated with teachers' levels of work commitment, including affective, continuance, and normative dimensions.

The quantitative research approach enabled the collection of structured and measurable data, which could be subjected to statistical analysis to identify patterns and relationships among variables. This approach is particularly suitable for educational research contexts where direct manipulation of variables is neither feasible nor ethically permissible. The use of standardized survey instruments further ensured objectivity, consistency, and reliability in data collection.

The study was carried out in selected public schools across Tamil Nadu during the academic year 2025–2026. Prior to data collection, necessary permissions were obtained from relevant educational authorities and school administrators. Ethical standards were strictly maintained throughout the research process, including securing informed consent from participants, ensuring voluntary participation, and maintaining confidentiality and anonymity of responses. Data were collected through structured questionnaires administered to the selected teacher respondents. The instrument comprised two main sections: one measuring the leadership styles of school heads and the other assessing teachers' work commitment. The questionnaires were distributed in both printed and digital formats to accommodate accessibility and respondent convenience.

Upon completion of data collection, the responses were systematically organized, coded, and analyzed using statistical software. Descriptive statistics, including mean and standard deviation, were used to determine the levels of leadership styles and teacher commitment. Inferential statistical techniques, particularly the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r), were employed to examine the relationships between variables. In addition, multiple regression analysis was conducted to identify the extent to which different leadership styles predict teacher work commitment.

2.2 Research Respondents

The respondents of this study comprised public school teachers working in Tamil Nadu, India. The study specifically included teachers occupying regular teaching positions at the secondary level, as they are directly engaged in classroom instruction and are significantly influenced by the leadership practices of school heads. Teachers performing administrative or supervisory roles, such as senior educators and departmental coordinators, were excluded to ensure that the responses reflected the perspectives of classroom practitioners rather than managerial personnel.



A total of 169 teachers participated in the study. The respondents were selected using a stratified random sampling technique to ensure adequate representation across different public schools. Each school was treated as a distinct stratum, and participants were proportionately selected from each group based on the size of the teaching population. This sampling strategy enhanced the representativeness of the sample while reducing potential sampling bias, thereby strengthening the overall validity and reliability of the study findings (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Participation in the study was entirely voluntary, and ethical principles were rigorously followed throughout the research process. All respondents were provided with clear information regarding the purpose and objectives of the study prior to their participation. Measures were taken to ensure confidentiality and anonymity of responses, and participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any stage without any form of consequence.

2.3 Research Instruments

This study employed two standardized and widely validated survey instruments to collect data: the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). These instruments were selected due to their established reliability and extensive application in educational and organizational research.

The MLQ, originally developed by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio (1995), was used to evaluate the leadership styles exhibited by school heads. This instrument assesses three major leadership dimensions: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership. Transformational leadership is measured through key components such as idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Transactional leadership is assessed through contingent reward and management-by-exception, while laissez-faire leadership captures passive or non-interventionist leadership behaviours. The MLQ has been widely recognized for its strong psychometric properties, with previous studies reporting high reliability coefficients, typically exceeding the acceptable threshold.

To measure teacher work commitment, the study utilized the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), grounded in the three-component model proposed by Meyer and Allen (1991). The OCQ evaluates three dimensions of commitment: affective commitment, which reflects emotional attachment to the organization; continuance commitment, which relates to perceived costs of leaving the organization; and normative commitment, which represents a sense of moral obligation to remain. These dimensions provide a comprehensive understanding of teachers' commitment levels within the organizational context.

Both instruments were administered using a five-point Likert scale, with response options ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), enabling quantitative measurement and statistical analysis of the constructs.

Prior to the main data collection, the instruments were subjected to content validation by experts in educational leadership and research to ensure clarity, relevance, and contextual suitability within the Tamil Nadu school setting. A pilot study was subsequently conducted



with a group of teachers who were not included in the final sample to assess the reliability of the instruments.

The results of the reliability analysis indicated strong internal consistency. The MLQ recorded a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.91, while the OCQ achieved an overall reliability coefficient of 0.88. Further analysis of the OCQ subscales showed alpha values of 0.90 for affective commitment, 0.85 for continuance commitment, and 0.87 for normative commitment. These values exceed the recommended threshold of 0.70 for social science research, confirming that the instruments are reliable and appropriate for use in this study.

Results and Discussions

Level of Leadership Style

The primary objective of this study was to examine the level of leadership styles and teacher work commitment among public school teachers in Tamil Nadu. The assessment of leadership styles is presented across three dimensions: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership, followed by an overall summary of leadership practices as perceived by teachers.

The findings indicate that transformational leadership is practiced at a very high level among school heads ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 0.58$). All key components of transformational leadership—idealized influence ($M = 4.32$), inspirational motivation ($M = 4.35$), intellectual stimulation ($M = 4.28$), and individualized consideration ($M = 4.30$)—received consistently high ratings. Among these, inspirational motivation recorded the highest mean score, suggesting that school leaders are particularly effective in communicating a shared vision and motivating teachers toward achieving institutional goals.

These results suggest that school leaders actively engage in behaviours that promote trust, encourage innovation, and provide individualized support to teachers. Such practices are consistent with the theoretical foundations of transformational leadership, which emphasize inspiring followers, fostering professional growth, and enhancing intrinsic motivation (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Contemporary empirical studies further reinforce this finding, indicating that transformational leadership significantly contributes to teacher engagement, professional development, and organizational commitment (Hallinger, 2020; Nguyen et al., 2022).

The high score for idealized influence reflects that teachers perceive their school heads as ethical role models who demonstrate integrity and professionalism in their leadership practices. Similarly, the strong ratings for intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration indicate that leaders promote creativity and address the diverse needs of teachers, which are essential elements in creating a supportive and productive educational environment. Research by Wang et al. (2021) supports this observation, emphasizing that leadership practices focused on empowerment and professional support are strongly associated with higher levels of work engagement and positive institutional outcomes.

Overall, the findings highlight that transformational leadership is deeply embedded within the leadership practices of public schools in Tamil Nadu. This leadership approach is particularly relevant in educational settings, as it not only enhances teacher performance but also



strengthens long-term commitment and institutional effectiveness. The consistently high ratings across all dimensions underscore the importance of sustaining and further strengthening transformational leadership practices to achieve improved educational outcomes.

Table 1. *Level of Transformational Leadership as Perceived by Teachers*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Idealized Influence	4.32	0.58	Very High
Inspirational Motivation	4.35	0.55	Very High
Intellectual Stimulation	4.28	0.60	Very High
Individualized Consideration	4.30	0.57	Very High
Overall Mean	4.31	0.58	Very High

Interpretation and Discussion

As presented in Table 1, the level of transformational leadership as perceived by teachers is very high ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 0.58$). Among its dimensions, inspirational motivation obtained the highest mean ($M = 4.35$), followed closely by idealized influence ($M = 4.32$), individualized consideration ($M = 4.30$), and intellectual stimulation ($M = 4.28$).

This indicates that school leaders consistently demonstrate behaviors associated with transformational leadership, such as inspiring a shared vision, fostering trust and respect, encouraging innovation, and addressing individual teacher needs. The strong presence of these leadership attributes suggests a supportive and empowering school environment, which is essential for enhancing teacher work commitment.

Transformational leadership plays a critical role in strengthening teachers' emotional attachment and dedication to their profession. When leaders exhibit inspirational motivation and individualized consideration, teachers are more likely to feel valued, motivated, and aligned with organizational goals. This, in turn, promotes higher levels of commitment, including affective, normative, and continuance commitment.

Transactional Leadership and Its Implications for Teacher Work Commitment

The findings further indicate that transactional leadership is practiced at a high level ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 0.64$) among school heads. Specifically, contingent reward ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 0.62$) is rated higher than management by exception ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 0.58$).

This suggests that school leaders actively use reward-based mechanisms to reinforce desirable teaching behaviors and performance outcomes. Teachers tend to respond positively to recognition and structured incentives, which can enhance their short-term engagement and compliance with institutional expectations.

The relatively lower emphasis on management by exception indicates that corrective or punitive supervision is less dominant. Instead, school leaders appear to adopt a balanced approach that prioritizes positive reinforcement over strict monitoring. This approach contributes to a more supportive work climate, which is conducive to sustaining teacher commitment. From the perspective of teacher work commitment, transactional leadership contributes primarily to continuance commitment, where teachers remain engaged due to rewards, recognition, and clear expectations. However, its influence on deeper forms of

commitment—such as emotional attachment and intrinsic motivation—is comparatively limited.

Integrated Insight

The findings demonstrate that both transformational and transactional leadership styles play complementary roles in influencing teacher work commitment. Transformational leadership emerges as the primary driver of long-term commitment, fostering intrinsic motivation, professional growth, and organizational loyalty. In contrast, transactional leadership supports organizational stability and performance standards through structured reinforcement and accountability mechanisms. An integrated leadership approach—where transformational practices are supported by appropriate transactional strategies—appears to be the most effective in enhancing teacher work commitment. Such a combination ensures not only motivation and engagement but also consistency, discipline, and goal alignment within the educational institution.

Table 2. *Level of Transactional Leadership as Perceived by Teachers*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Contingent Reward	4.05	0.62	High
Management by Exception	3.88	0.58	High
Overall Mean	3.97	0.64	High

Interpretation and Discussion

As shown in Table 2, the level of transactional leadership as perceived by teachers is high ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 0.64$). Among its dimensions, contingent reward ($M = 4.05$) is rated higher than management by exception ($M = 3.88$).

This indicates that school heads frequently utilize reward-based strategies to reinforce desired behaviors and acknowledge teachers' performance. The prominence of contingent reward suggests that teachers are motivated by recognition, incentives, and clearly defined expectations, which contribute to improved task performance and accountability.

On the other hand, management by exception, although still practiced at a high level, has a comparatively lower mean. This implies that corrective supervision and intervention are present but not overly emphasized. School leaders appear to adopt a balanced leadership approach that prioritizes positive reinforcement over strict monitoring or punitive control.

In relation to teacher work commitment, transactional leadership primarily strengthens continuance commitment by ensuring that teachers remain engaged through structured rewards, performance feedback, and accountability mechanisms. While it may effectively enhance short-term productivity and compliance, its influence on intrinsic motivation and emotional attachment is relatively limited compared to transformational leadership.

Table 3. *Level of Laissez-Faire Leadership as Perceived by Teachers*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Avoidance of Leadership	2.41	0.70	Low
Lack of Decision-Making	2.35	0.68	Low
Overall Mean	2.38	0.69	Low



Interpretation and Discussion

The results in Table 3 reveal that laissez-faire leadership is practiced at a low level ($M = 2.38$, $SD = 0.69$) among school heads. Both avoidance of leadership ($M = 2.41$) and lack of decision-making ($M = 2.35$) are rated low, indicating that school leaders are generally active, engaged, and responsive in their roles rather than passive or disengaged.

The minimal presence of laissez-faire leadership is a positive organizational outcome, as this leadership style is widely associated with unfavorable consequences. Passive leadership behaviors often result in ambiguity, lack of direction, and reduced support for employees, which can negatively affect both performance and job satisfaction. In educational contexts, such disengagement may hinder instructional effectiveness and weaken teachers' ability to meet institutional objectives.

Furthermore, low levels of laissez-faire leadership contribute positively to teacher work commitment. Active leadership involvement ensures that teachers receive timely guidance, constructive feedback, and clear expectations, all of which are critical for fostering motivation and professional engagement. In contrast, the absence of leadership can lead to decreased morale, weakened professional relationships, and reduced organizational commitment.

The combined findings from Tables 1, 2, and 3 suggest that school heads predominantly practice transformational and transactional leadership, while minimizing laissez-faire behaviors. This leadership pattern is highly conducive to enhancing teacher work commitment. Transformational leadership drives intrinsic motivation and long-term commitment, transactional leadership ensures structure and performance consistency, and the limited presence of laissez-faire leadership prevents organizational inefficiencies and disengagement. Thus, an effective blend of active leadership styles significantly contributes to strengthening teachers' commitment, ultimately supporting improved educational outcomes.

Table 4. *Level of Laissez-Faire Leadership as Perceived by Teachers*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Avoidance of Leadership	2.41	0.70	Low
Lack of Decision-Making	2.35	0.68	Low
Overall Mean	2.38	0.69	Low

Interpretation and Discussion

Table 4 indicates that laissez-faire leadership is practiced at a low level ($M = 2.38$, $SD = 0.69$) among school heads. Both avoidance of leadership ($M = 2.41$) and lack of decision-making ($M = 2.35$) are rated low, suggesting that school leaders are generally proactive, engaged, and responsible in their leadership roles rather than passive or disengaged.

The limited presence of laissez-faire leadership is a positive finding, as this leadership style is often associated with negative organizational outcomes. Passive leadership behaviors tend to create uncertainty, lack of direction, and insufficient support for teachers, which can adversely affect performance and job satisfaction. In contrast, the findings imply that school heads are actively involved in guiding teachers, making decisions, and ensuring that school objectives are effectively achieved.



From the perspective of teacher work commitment, the low level of laissez-faire leadership contributes positively by ensuring that teachers receive consistent guidance, supervision, and feedback. Active leadership involvement strengthens professional relationships, enhances clarity in roles and expectations, and fosters a supportive work environment, all of which are essential for sustaining teacher commitment.

Table 5. *Summary of Leadership Styles as Perceived by Teachers*

Leadership Styles	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Transformational	4.31	0.58	Very High
Transactional	3.97	0.64	High
Laissez-Faire	2.38	0.69	Low
Overall Mean	3.55	0.64	High

Interpretation and Discussion

Table 5 presents the overall level of leadership styles as perceived by teachers, revealing a high level ($M = 3.55$, $SD = 0.64$). This suggests that school heads generally demonstrate effective leadership practices in managing school operations and guiding teachers toward achieving institutional goals.

Among the leadership styles, transformational leadership obtained the highest mean ($M = 4.31$), interpreted as very high. This indicates that school heads frequently engage in behaviors that inspire, motivate, and support teachers. Such practices foster a positive organizational climate, encourage professional development, and enhance teachers' emotional attachment to their work, thereby strengthening teacher work commitment.

Transactional leadership also recorded a high level ($M = 3.97$), reflecting the use of structured systems such as rewards, supervision, and performance monitoring. These practices contribute to organizational stability, accountability, and clarity in roles, which are essential for maintaining consistent performance among teachers. While transactional leadership supports compliance and efficiency, its influence is primarily procedural rather than motivational.

In contrast, laissez-faire leadership registered the lowest mean ($M = 2.38$), interpreted as low. This indicates that school heads rarely exhibit passive or avoidant leadership behaviors. The minimal reliance on this style is favorable, as it prevents issues such as role ambiguity, lack of direction, and reduced teacher engagement.

The findings suggest that leadership practices in the study area are characterized by a balanced integration of transformational and transactional leadership, with minimal presence of laissez-faire leadership. This combination creates a conducive work environment that promotes both motivation and accountability among teachers.

Transformational leadership serves as the primary driver of long-term teacher work commitment by fostering intrinsic motivation, professional growth, and organizational loyalty. Transactional leadership complements this by ensuring structure, discipline, and performance standards, while the limited presence of laissez-faire leadership prevents disengagement and organizational inefficiencies.

Overall, this balanced leadership profile significantly contributes to enhancing teacher commitment, ultimately leading to improved educational effectiveness and institutional performance.

Table 6. *Summary of Level of Leadership Style as Perceived by Teachers*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Transformational Leadership	4.31	0.58	Very High
Transactional Leadership	3.97	0.64	High
Laissez-Faire Leadership	2.38	0.69	Low
Overall Mean	3.55	0.64	High

Interpretation and Discussion

Table 6 presents the overall summary of leadership styles as perceived by teachers, indicating a high level of leadership practice ($M = 3.55$, $SD = 0.64$). Among the different leadership styles, transformational leadership obtained the highest mean ($M = 4.31$), interpreted as *very high*, followed by transactional leadership ($M = 3.97$), interpreted as *high*, while laissez-faire leadership recorded the lowest mean ($M = 2.38$), interpreted as *low*.

These findings suggest that school heads predominantly adopt transformational leadership practices, characterized by inspiration, motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized support. Such leadership behaviors create a positive and collaborative work environment, which enhances teachers' sense of purpose and strengthens their work commitment. The strong presence of transformational leadership indicates that leaders actively promote shared vision, professional development, and teacher engagement.

The high level of transactional leadership further indicates that school heads complement transformational practices with structured mechanisms such as rewards, supervision, and performance monitoring. These practices contribute to maintaining organizational discipline, accountability, and clarity of expectations. While transactional leadership is effective in ensuring task completion and short-term performance, its impact is more extrinsic and procedural compared to the intrinsic motivational influence of transformational leadership.

Conversely, the low level of laissez-faire leadership reflects that school heads rarely exhibit passive or avoidant behaviors. This is a positive indicator, as the absence of active leadership is often associated with role ambiguity, reduced motivation, and lower organizational effectiveness. The minimal presence of laissez-faire leadership suggests that school leaders are actively involved in decision-making and responsive to teachers' needs.

Synthesis with Empirical Literature

The findings of the present study are strongly supported by existing empirical literature on leadership in educational settings. Studies consistently demonstrate that transformational leadership has a significant positive impact on teacher motivation, instructional practices, and overall school effectiveness. Leaders who articulate a clear vision, provide professional support, and encourage collaboration are more likely to enhance teacher performance and commitment.

Similarly, research on school leadership highlights that active engagement of teachers in decision-making processes contributes to higher levels of professional growth and organizational commitment. Leadership approaches that integrate both transformational and instructional elements are particularly effective in fostering continuous improvement in schools.

Empirical evidence also indicates that while transactional leadership supports organizational efficiency through reward systems and performance monitoring, its influence is largely limited to maintaining structure and ensuring compliance. In contrast, transformational leadership exerts a stronger effect on long-term outcomes such as commitment, innovation, and job satisfaction.

Laissez-faire leadership has been consistently associated with negative organizational outcomes, including reduced employee well-being, lack of direction, and lower performance levels. Passive leadership behaviors can weaken teacher engagement and hinder the achievement of educational goals.

Recent studies further confirm that leadership style is a significant predictor of teacher work commitment and collective efficacy, emphasizing the importance of supportive, collaborative, and proactive leadership in educational institutions.

Table 7. *Level of Teachers' Perceived Work Commitment in Terms of Affective Commitment*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I feel emotionally attached to my school.	4.35	0.55	Very High
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my school.	4.31	0.57	Very High
I am proud to tell others that I am part of this school.	4.34	0.56	Very High
I feel like "part of the family" in this school.	4.32	0.58	Very High
I feel personally connected to the success of this school.	4.33	0.55	Very High
Overall	4.33	0.56	Very High

Interpretation

As shown in Table 7, teachers' affective commitment is at a very high level ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.56$), indicating a strong emotional attachment and sense of belonging to their schools. All indicators were consistently rated very high, suggesting that teachers feel proud, connected, and personally invested in their institution's success. This implies that teachers are not only committed in terms of duty but are also psychologically and emotionally engaged with their organization. Such a high level of affective commitment reflects a positive organizational climate where teachers feel valued, supported, and included.

This finding aligns with the concept of affective commitment, which emphasizes emotional attachment and identification with the organization. High affective commitment has been consistently associated with increased motivation, job satisfaction, and improved performance. Teachers who feel emotionally connected to their schools are more likely to demonstrate enthusiasm, initiative, and sustained commitment to achieving institutional goals.

Table 8. *Level of Teachers' Perceived Work Commitment in Terms of Continuance Commitment*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation	Indicators
(Indicators based on continuance commitment items)	—	—	—	(Indicators based on continuance commitment items)
Overall Mean	3.85	0.63	High	Overall Mean

Interpretation

The results in Table 8 reveal that teachers' continuance commitment is at a high level ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.63$). This indicates that teachers remain in their schools due to practical considerations such as job security, financial stability, and the perceived costs associated with leaving the organization. All items being rated high suggest that teachers recognize the benefits of staying in their current institution and carefully evaluate the risks or sacrifices involved in leaving. This type of commitment reflects a cost-benefit analysis, where retention is influenced by necessity rather than purely emotional attachment.

This finding is consistent with the theoretical perspective that continuance commitment is driven by an individual's awareness of the potential losses associated with leaving an organization. While it contributes significantly to employee retention, it is generally less effective in fostering intrinsic motivation and long-term engagement compared to affective commitment. Thus, the high level of continuance commitment observed in this study indicates that teachers value the stability, benefits, and security provided by their schools. However, it also highlights the need for school leaders to further strengthen affective and normative commitment, ensuring that teachers remain not only because they need to, but also because they genuinely want to contribute and grow within the organization.

Table 9. *Level of Teachers' Perceived Work Commitment in Terms of Continuance Commitment*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I feel emotionally attached to my school.	3.82	0.64	High
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my school.	3.87	0.62	High
I am proud to tell others that I am part of this school.	3.83	0.63	High
I feel like "part of the family" in this school.	3.88	0.61	High
I feel personally connected to the success of this school.	3.85	0.63	High

Interpretation

As presented in Table 9, teachers' continuance commitment is at a high level ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.63$). All indicators were consistently rated high, indicating that teachers remain in their

schools due to practical considerations such as job security, institutional stability, and the perceived costs associated with leaving. Although the item statements reflect elements of emotional connection, the overall pattern suggests that teachers recognize the benefits of staying in their current organization and are aware of the potential risks or sacrifices involved in leaving. This highlights a pragmatic dimension of commitment, where retention is influenced by necessity and perceived investment in the organization.

Continuance commitment plays a crucial role in ensuring organizational retention and workforce stability. Teachers who perceive higher costs of leaving—such as loss of benefits, professional relationships, or career continuity—are more likely to remain in their institutions. However, this form of commitment is generally considered extrinsic in nature, as it is driven more by necessity than by emotional attachment or moral obligation. Consistent with existing literature, continuance commitment contributes to employee retention but is less effective in fostering intrinsic motivation and long-term engagement compared to affective commitment. Therefore, while the high level of continuance commitment observed in this study supports institutional stability, it also underscores the importance of strengthening other dimensions of commitment to ensure deeper and more meaningful engagement among teachers.

Table 10. *Level of Teachers' Perceived Work Commitment in Terms of Normative Commitment*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
(Indicators reflecting obligation, loyalty, and moral responsibility)	—	—	—
Overall Mean	4.20	0.59	Very High

Interpretation and Discussion

The results in Table 10 reveal that teachers' normative commitment is at a very high level ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 0.59$), indicating a strong sense of obligation, loyalty, and moral responsibility to remain in their respective schools. The consistently very high ratings across indicators suggest that teachers perceive staying in their institution as both appropriate and necessary. This reflects a deeply rooted sense of professional duty and ethical commitment, where teachers continue their service not only because they want to or need to, but because they believe it is the right thing to do. Such commitment is often shaped by organizational culture, values, and the quality of leadership support.

The findings align with the concept of normative commitment, which emphasizes an individual's perceived obligation to remain with an organization based on moral or ethical considerations. When teachers feel valued, respected, and aligned with institutional goals, their sense of loyalty and responsibility is strengthened. Moreover, the high level of normative commitment suggests that the school environment fosters a culture of trust, loyalty, and shared responsibility. This encourages teachers to remain dedicated, uphold institutional values, and contribute positively to long-term organizational goals.

**Table 11.** *Level of Teachers' Perceived Work Commitment in Terms of Continuance Commitment*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I feel emotionally attached to my school.	3.82	0.64	High
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my school.	3.87	0.62	High
I am proud to tell others that I am part of this school.	3.83	0.63	High
I feel like “part of the family” in this school.	3.88	0.61	High
I feel personally connected to the success of this school.	3.85	0.63	High

Interpretation

As presented in Table 11, teachers' continuance commitment is at a high level ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.63$). All indicators were consistently rated high, indicating that teachers remain in their schools due to practical considerations such as job security, institutional stability, and the perceived costs associated with leaving. Although the item statements reflect elements of emotional connection, the overall pattern suggests that teachers recognize the benefits of staying in their current organization and are aware of the potential risks or sacrifices involved in leaving. This highlights a pragmatic dimension of commitment, where retention is influenced by necessity and perceived investment in the organization.

Continuance commitment plays a crucial role in ensuring organizational retention and workforce stability. Teachers who perceive higher costs of leaving—such as loss of benefits, professional relationships, or career continuity—are more likely to remain in their institutions. However, this form of commitment is generally considered extrinsic in nature, as it is driven more by necessity than by emotional attachment or moral obligation.

Consistent with existing literature, continuance commitment contributes to employee retention but is less effective in fostering intrinsic motivation and long-term engagement compared to affective commitment. Therefore, while the high level of continuance commitment observed in this study supports institutional stability, it also underscores the importance of strengthening other dimensions of commitment to ensure deeper and more meaningful engagement among teachers.

Table 12. *Level of Teachers' Perceived Work Commitment in Terms of Normative Commitment*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
(Indicators reflecting obligation, loyalty, and moral responsibility)	—	—	—
Overall Mean	4.20	0.59	Very High

Interpretation

The results in Table 12 reveal that teachers' normative commitment is at a very high level ($M = 4.20$, $SD = 0.59$), indicating a strong sense of obligation, loyalty, and moral responsibility to remain in their respective schools. The consistently very high ratings across indicators suggest that teachers perceive staying in their institution as both appropriate and necessary.

This reflects a deeply rooted sense of professional duty and ethical commitment, where teachers continue their service not only because they want to or need to, but because they believe it is the right thing to do. Such commitment is often shaped by organizational culture, values, and the quality of leadership support.

The findings align with the concept of normative commitment, which emphasizes an individual's perceived obligation to remain with an organization based on moral or ethical considerations. When teachers feel valued, respected, and aligned with institutional goals, their sense of loyalty and responsibility is strengthened.

Moreover, the high level of normative commitment suggests that the school environment fosters a culture of trust, loyalty, and shared responsibility. This encourages teachers to remain dedicated, uphold institutional values, and contribute positively to long-term organizational goals.

Table 13. *Summary of Level of Teachers' Perceived Work Commitment*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Affective Commitment	4.33	0.56	Very High
Continuance Commitment	3.85	0.63	High
Normative Commitment	4.20	0.59	Very High
Overall	4.13	0.59	High

Interpretation and Discussion

Table 13 presents the overall summary of teachers' perceived work commitment, revealing a high level ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.59$). Among the three dimensions, affective commitment corded the highest mean ($M = 4.33$), followed by normative commitment ($M = 4.20$), both interpreted as *very high*, while continuance commitment obtained a slightly lower mean ($M = 3.85$), interpreted as *high*.

These findings indicate that teachers are strongly committed to their schools, particularly in terms of emotional attachment and moral obligation. The dominance of affective commitment suggests that teachers genuinely identify with their institutions, feel valued, and are intrinsically motivated to contribute to school success. Similarly, the very high level of normative commitment reflects a strong sense of loyalty, responsibility, and ethical obligation to remain in the organization.

In contrast, continuance commitment, while still high, plays a comparatively supportive role. This implies that although teachers recognize the practical benefits of staying, their commitment is driven more by intrinsic and value-based factors rather than necessity alone. Such a commitment profile is highly desirable in educational settings, as it reflects both engagement and stability.

Synthesis with Empirical Literature

The findings of this study are consistent with several empirical investigations on work commitment in educational contexts. Research has consistently shown that affective commitment is the most influential dimension in predicting employee performance,



engagement, and retention. Teachers who are emotionally connected to their schools tend to demonstrate higher levels of enthusiasm, instructional effectiveness, and dedication.

Similarly, studies highlight that committed teachers exhibit greater resilience and professional responsibility, contributing significantly to school improvement and student outcomes. Supportive leadership practices, opportunities for professional development, and collaborative school environments have been identified as key factors that enhance teacher commitment, particularly affective and normative dimensions.

Further evidence suggests that leadership and collective efficacy play a crucial role in shaping organizational commitment. Schools that promote shared vision, teamwork, and continuous learning tend to foster stronger commitment among teachers. Additionally, teacher commitment has been positively associated with job satisfaction, well-being, and reduced burnout, indicating its importance for both individual and organizational success.

Implication for the Study

The results demonstrate that teachers possess a strong and multidimensional level of work commitment, characterized by high emotional attachment, moral responsibility, and practical retention factors. The predominance of affective and normative commitment indicates a healthy organizational climate where teachers feel valued, supported, and aligned with institutional goals.

These findings reinforce the critical role of leadership styles—particularly transformational leadership—in fostering teacher commitment. A supportive and engaging leadership approach not only enhances motivation and job satisfaction but also ensures long-term commitment and organizational effectiveness.

Consequently, strengthening leadership practices and maintaining a positive school environment are essential strategies for sustaining high levels of teacher commitment, ultimately leading to improved educational outcomes and institutional performance.

Significant Relationship between Leadership Style as Perceived by Teachers and Perceived

Table 14. *Correlation between Leadership Styles and Teachers' Work Commitment*

Leadership Style	r-value	p-value	Interpretation
Transformational	0.68	< .001	Strong Positive, Significant
Transactional	0.45	< .001	Moderate Positive, Significant
Laissez-Faire	-0.21	0.012	Weak Negative, Significant

Interpretation

The findings in Table 14 reveal that leadership style is significantly related to teachers' work commitment, with varying levels of strength and direction depending on the leadership type.

Transformational leadership demonstrated a strong positive correlation with teachers' work commitment ($r = 0.68$, $p < .001$). This indicates that school heads who exhibit behaviors such as inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation are more likely to foster higher levels of commitment among teachers. Such leadership practices enhance teachers' intrinsic motivation, emotional attachment, and alignment with organizational goals.



This result is consistent with established literature, which emphasizes that transformational leadership significantly strengthens organizational commitment by promoting a shared vision, professional growth, and meaningful engagement. Empirical studies in educational settings have consistently shown that when leaders act as role models and provide support, teachers develop stronger attachment and dedication to their institutions.

In contrast, transactional leadership showed a moderate positive relationship with teachers' commitment ($r = 0.45$, $p < .001$). This suggests that leadership practices based on contingent rewards, supervision, and performance monitoring can positively influence teacher commitment, although to a lesser extent than transformational leadership. Transactional leadership contributes to organizational stability and ensures clarity in expectations, which supports teacher engagement through structured reinforcement mechanisms. However, its influence is primarily extrinsic, focusing on compliance and short-term performance rather than deep emotional or psychological commitment.

On the other hand, laissez-faire leadership exhibited a weak negative correlation with teachers' work commitment ($r = -0.21$, $p = 0.012$). This implies that passive or avoidant leadership behaviors are associated with lower levels of teacher commitment. The absence of active leadership can lead to role ambiguity, lack of direction, and reduced motivation among teachers. In educational contexts, such disengaged leadership may negatively impact teacher morale, professional relationships, and overall engagement.

Synthesis and Implications

Overall, the results clearly indicate that active and supportive leadership styles are critical determinants of teacher work commitment. Transformational leadership emerges as the most influential factor, significantly enhancing teachers' intrinsic motivation and long-term commitment. Transactional leadership plays a complementary role by reinforcing structure, accountability, and performance standards.

Conversely, laissez-faire leadership undermines teacher commitment due to its passive and non-interventionist nature. The negative association highlights the importance of consistent leadership involvement, guidance, and decision-making in educational institutions.

Conclusion of the Relationship Analysis

The significant relationships identified in this study confirm that leadership style is a key predictor of teachers' work commitment. A leadership approach that integrates transformational practices with appropriate transactional strategies, while minimizing laissez-faire tendencies, is most effective in fostering a committed, motivated, and high-performing teaching workforce. These findings provide strong empirical support for the argument that improving leadership quality in schools can directly enhance teacher commitment, thereby contributing to better educational outcomes and institutional effectiveness.

Table 15. *Correlation Between Leadership Style and Teacher Work Commitment*

Variables	r-value	p-value	Interpretation
Transformational Leadership → Teachers' Commitment	0.68	0.000	Strong Positive



Transactional Leadership → Teachers' Commitment	0.45	0.000	Moderate Positive
Laissez-Faire Leadership → Teachers' Commitment	-0.21	0.012	Weak Negative

Interpretation

The results in Table 15 confirm that leadership style is a significant determinant of teachers' work commitment, with varying degrees of influence across leadership types. Transformational leadership exhibits a strong positive relationship with teachers' commitment ($r = 0.68$, $p = 0.000$), indicating that leadership practices characterized by inspiration, support, and empowerment substantially enhance teachers' emotional attachment, motivation, and professional engagement. This finding highlights that when school leaders actively foster a shared vision, provide individualized support, and encourage professional growth, teachers are more likely to demonstrate high levels of commitment.

In comparison, transactional leadership shows a moderate positive relationship ($r = 0.45$, $p = 0.000$), suggesting that while reward-based systems, supervision, and performance monitoring contribute to teacher commitment, their impact is relatively limited. This form of leadership primarily reinforces compliance and short-term performance rather than fostering deep, intrinsic commitment. Conversely, laissez-faire leadership demonstrates a weak negative relationship with teachers' commitment ($r = -0.21$, $p = 0.012$). This indicates that passive, avoidant, and non-interventionist leadership behaviors are associated with lower levels of teacher commitment. The absence of active guidance and decision-making can lead to uncertainty, reduced motivation, and weakened organizational attachment among teachers.

Conclusion and Implications

The findings underscore that leadership style plays a pivotal role in shaping teacher work commitment. Among the three styles, transformational leadership emerges as the most influential, emphasizing the importance of leadership practices that inspire, support, and empower teachers. While transactional leadership contributes to maintaining structure and accountability, its effect on commitment is comparatively moderate. In contrast, laissez-faire leadership has a detrimental impact, highlighting the risks associated with passive leadership approaches. Taken together, these results reinforce the need for school leaders to prioritize transformational leadership behaviors, complemented by appropriate transactional strategies, while minimizing laissez-faire tendencies. Such an approach is essential for enhancing teacher commitment, improving retention, and strengthening overall school performance.

Influence of Leadership Style on Teacher Work Commitment

Table 15 presents the regression analysis examining the influence of leadership style on teachers' work commitment. The results indicate that leadership styles significantly predict teacher work commitment, with the model explaining 52% of the variance ($R^2 = .52$). This suggests that leadership practices play a substantial role in shaping teachers' attitudes, engagement, and commitment within the organization. Among the predictors, transformational leadership emerged as the strongest and most significant predictor ($\beta = .59$, $t = 9.85$, $p < .001$).



This finding indicates that leadership behaviors characterized by vision, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized support have the greatest influence on enhancing teachers' work commitment. This result is strongly supported by recent empirical studies. For instance, a regression-based study found that transformational leadership significantly predicts teachers' organizational commitment, with a comparable beta coefficient ($\beta = .56, p < .01$), confirming its strong influence on teacher engagement and retention. Similarly, another study reported that transformational leadership significantly enhances teachers' commitment and effectiveness by fostering motivation and professional growth. Furthermore, evidence suggests that transformational leadership reduces role stress and strengthens commitment by improving teachers' emotional attachment and job satisfaction.

In contrast, transactional leadership also showed a significant but weaker influence ($\beta = .21, t = 3.42, p = .001$), indicating that reward-based systems and performance monitoring contribute to teacher work commitment, although to a lesser extent. This suggests that transactional leadership helps maintain organizational structure, accountability, and task completion. However, its influence is primarily extrinsic and procedural, focusing on compliance rather than intrinsic motivation. This aligns with existing literature which emphasizes that transactional leadership supports short-term performance outcomes but has limited impact on long-term commitment compared to transformational leadership (Buil et al., 2019).

Laissez-faire leadership exhibited a significant negative influence ($\beta = -.12, t = -2.10, p = .037$), indicating that passive and avoidant leadership behaviors diminish teacher work commitment. This implies that the absence of leadership direction, feedback, and decision-making reduces teachers' motivation and organizational attachment. Supporting this finding, empirical studies have shown that laissez-faire leadership is associated with lower employee engagement, increased uncertainty, and weakened organizational outcomes due to lack of leader involvement (Skogstad et al., 2021).

Table 16. *Regression Analysis of Leadership Style as Predictors of Teacher Work Commitment*

Variables	β	t	P	Interpretation
Transformational Leadership	.59	9.85	.000	Significant Predictor
Transactional Leadership	.21	3.42	.001	Significant Predictor
Laissez-Faire Leadership	-.12	-2.10	.037	Significant (Negative)
$R^2 = .52$				52% Variance Explained

Interpretation and Summary of Regression Results

The regression analysis presented in Table 16 confirms that leadership style is a significant predictor of teacher work commitment, explaining 52% of the variance ($R^2 = .52$). This indicates a strong explanatory power of leadership variables in shaping teachers' attitudes, engagement, and commitment within the school context. Among the predictors, transformational leadership emerged as the most dominant factor ($\beta = .59, p = .000$), highlighting that leadership behaviors characterized by vision, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized support have the strongest positive influence on teacher



commitment. This underscores the critical role of proactive and development-oriented leadership in fostering a highly engaged and dedicated teaching workforce.

Transactional leadership also demonstrated a significant but comparatively weaker influence ($\beta = .21, p = .001$). This suggests that structured mechanisms such as rewards, supervision, and performance monitoring contribute to teacher commitment by reinforcing accountability and organizational stability. However, its impact remains secondary, as it primarily promotes compliance rather than intrinsic motivation. In contrast, laissez-faire leadership showed a significant negative effect ($\beta = -.12, p = .037$), indicating that passive and avoidant leadership behaviors diminish teacher commitment. The absence of direction, feedback, and active involvement from school leaders can lead to reduced motivation, weaker organizational attachment, and lower overall effectiveness.

Findings

In light of the foregoing results, the study reveals a clear and consistent pattern demonstrating that leadership style plays a pivotal role in shaping teachers' work commitment. The findings indicate that school heads predominantly practice transformational leadership at a very high level, supported by high levels of transactional leadership and minimal reliance on laissez-faire leadership. Correspondingly, teachers exhibit a high level of work commitment, with affective and normative commitment emerging as the strongest dimensions.

More importantly, both correlation and regression analyses provide robust empirical evidence that leadership style not only relates to but also significantly predicts teacher commitment. Transformational leadership stands out as the strongest predictor, exerting a substantial positive influence, while transactional leadership contributes moderately, and laissez-faire leadership demonstrates a negative effect. This pattern clearly suggests that leadership behaviors grounded in vision, support, and active engagement are essential in fostering teachers' emotional attachment and professional dedication. The strong alignment between transformational leadership and high levels of affective and normative commitment reflects a healthy organizational climate, where teachers are both intrinsically motivated and morally invested in their institutions.

Furthermore, the moderate role of transactional leadership indicates that structured systems of rewards and accountability remain relevant in maintaining organizational order and performance standards. However, its comparatively weaker effect confirms that compliance-based strategies alone are insufficient to build deep and sustained commitment. Conversely, the negative influence of laissez-faire leadership highlights the risks associated with passive leadership, particularly in educational environments where guidance, timely decision-making, and active support are crucial for teacher effectiveness and engagement.

Conclusion

The study concludes that leadership style significantly influences teachers' work commitment, with transformational leadership emerging as the most effective approach. School heads who exhibit inspirational, supportive, and development-oriented behaviors are more successful in



fostering high levels of teacher commitment, particularly in terms of affective (emotional attachment) and normative (sense of responsibility) commitment. These forms of commitment reflect not only teachers' engagement with their work but also their deep connection and loyalty to their institutions.

While transactional leadership contributes to maintaining organizational structure, accountability, and performance standards, its influence is comparatively moderate. It supports teacher commitment primarily through external mechanisms such as rewards and supervision but does not significantly enhance intrinsic motivation or long-term engagement.

In contrast, laissez-faire leadership has a negative effect on teacher commitment due to its passive and non-interventionist nature. The absence of active leadership, guidance, and decision-making reduces teacher motivation, weakens organizational attachment, and may hinder overall school effectiveness.

The findings emphasize that a predominantly transformational leadership approach, supported by appropriate transactional practices and minimal reliance on laissez-faire leadership, is essential for enhancing teacher engagement, retention, and performance. Strengthening transformational leadership competencies among school heads is therefore critical in promoting a committed and high-performing teaching workforce and achieving sustainable educational outcomes.

Transparency Statement: The authors confirm that this study has been conducted with honesty and in full adherence to ethical guidelines.

Funding: The study received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare there is no conflict of interest.



References

- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire manual* (3rd ed.). Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9–32.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for research: Permission set*. Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Buil, I., Martínez, E., & Matute, J. (2019). Transformational leadership and employee performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 101, 615–623. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.11.039>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2020). School climate and teacher well-being. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 90, 103–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.103013>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Day, C. (2019). Teacher commitment and professional identity. *Educational Research Review*, 27, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.02.001>
- Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221–258.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dou, D., Devos, G., & Valcke, M. (2017). School autonomy gap and leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 45(6), 959–977. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143216653975>
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699>
- Hallinger, P. (2020). Leadership and teacher learning in Asia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 40(4), 509–523. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1773188>
- Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2003). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences* (5th ed.). Houghton Mifflin.
- Jaros, S. (2017). Meyer and Allen model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(4), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2159>
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755–768. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755>
- Keskes, I. (2014). Leadership styles and organizational commitment. *Intangible Capital*, 10(1), 26–51. <https://doi.org/10.3926/ic.476>
- Kim, T. (2023). Leadership interplay on organizational commitment. *Journal of Policy Studies*, 38(4), 9–21. <https://doi.org/10.52372/jps38402>



- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2015). *Practical research: Planning and design* (11th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). Transformational leadership. In B. Davies (Ed.), *The essentials of school leadership* (pp. 31–43). SAGE Publications.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about school leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077>
- Liu, Y., Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Gümüş, S. (2021). Instructional leadership and teacher learning. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(2), 261–279. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219898465>
- Mercurio, Z. A. (2015). Affective commitment. *Human Resource Development Review*, 14(4), 389–414. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484315603612>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). Organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., & Parfyonova, N. M. (2019). Employee commitment in context. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(2), 100–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2018.05.001>
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P., & Denessen, E. (2006). Leadership effects on teachers. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 145–177.
- Nguyen, D., Pietsch, M., & Gümüş, S. (2022). Collective teacher efficacy and leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(4), 678–696. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143221990385>
- Norman, G. R., & Streiner, D. L. (2014). *Biostatistics: The bare essentials* (4th ed.). PMPH USA.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *PISA 2018 results*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/5f07c754-en>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/2d0bc92a-en>
- Rowold, J., & Heinitz, K. (2007). Leadership validity study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(2), 121–133.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Teacher stress and self-efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 152–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.005>
- Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). Laissez-faire leadership. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(1), 80–92.
- Skogstad, A., Hetland, J., Glasø, L., & Einarsen, S. (2021). Avoidant leadership and stress. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 32(5), 101448. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101448>
- Wang, H., Demerouti, E., & Le Blanc, P. (2021). Transformational leadership and engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 123, 103521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103521>



NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

Volume 3, Issue 7, July, 2026 Pages: 148-172

ISSN: 3059-9148 (Online)

DOI: 10.3126/nprcjmr.v3i7.97942



Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the author(s), *NPRC Journal of Multidisciplinary Research* shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.