

Transformational Leadership and Teachers' Performance as Mediated By Teachers' Commitment: Basis for an Action Plan

Jessica L. Jimenez., Riza B. Salipong, PhD

Bohol Island State University, Clarin Campus Poblacion Norte, Clarin, Bohol

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.11050005>

Received: 28 April 2026; Accepted: 04 May 2026; Published: 21 May 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between transformational leadership, teachers' organizational commitment, and teaching performance in selected schools in the Schools Division of Bohol using survey questionnaires and official IPCR ratings. Findings revealed that school heads are perceived as highly transformational (mean = 3.67, SD = 0.58), with Inspirational Motivation as the highest dimension (mean = 3.71, SD = 0.56), followed by Idealized Influence (mean = 3.70, SD = 0.58), Management by Exception (mean = 3.65, SD = 0.59), and Individualized Consideration (mean = 3.62, SD = 0.59). Teachers obtained a high level of organizational commitment (mean = 3.18, SD = 0.69), led by Affective Commitment (mean = 3.26, SD = 0.66), followed by Continuance Commitment (mean = 3.21, SD = 0.67) and General Commitment (mean = 3.05, SD = 0.73). Most teachers were rated Very Satisfactory (92.33%), with a few rated Outstanding (6.67%). Mediation analysis showed that organizational commitment does not significantly mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and teaching performance ($p = 0.409$), while transformational leadership has a significant direct effect ($p = 0.012$) and a significant total effect ($p = 0.003$). A weak but significant positive relationship was found between transformational leadership and teaching performance ($r = 0.25$, $p = 0.006$). The study recommends that school heads further strengthen recognition practices, feedback mechanisms, and supportive leadership behaviors through the implementation of an action plan that focused on strengthening transformational leadership to enhance teachers' commitment and performance; teachers should sustain active engagement and collaboration to maintain commitment and performance; school administrators and the Schools Division Office should enhance leadership and instructional capacity-building programs; and future researchers should explore additional mediating variables and expand the study scope to other divisions to further strengthen and validate the findings.

Keywords: Transformational Leadership, Teachers' Performance, Teachers' Commitment

INTRODUCTION

Education in the Philippines is guided by laws and policies that emphasize quality instruction, teacher professionalism, and effective school leadership. These legal frameworks provide a foundation for understanding why school leadership, particularly transformational leadership, is crucial for teacher commitment and instructional performance. However, based on informal interviews with co-teachers, teachers shared that the leadership styles of their school heads greatly affect their motivation, commitment, and classroom performance. Supportive leadership practices such as encouragement, clear communication, and professional guidance were described as motivating, while issues such as limited feedback, lack of recognition, and micromanagement were perceived to negatively influence teaching performance.

This study aims to examine the effect of transformational leadership on teachers' instructional efficacy, with teacher commitment as a mediating variable, among elementary school teachers in Getafe 1 and 2 District, DepEd Division of Bohol. The findings of this study are expected to provide practical insights for school heads and policymakers in improving leadership practices, strengthening teacher commitment, and enhancing instructional effectiveness. Hence, the researcher was motivated to determine the relationships between transformational leadership, teachers' performance and teachers' commitment of the school year 2025-2026.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study is anchored on different leadership theories and legal foundations that explain how school leadership influences teachers' performance and commitment.

The 1987 Philippine Constitution highlights the State's duty to provide quality education for all. It mandates that the educational system should be responsive to society's needs while fostering moral values, critical thinking, and responsible citizenship. Achieving these goals depends not only on teachers but also on school heads who guide, support, and motivate their staff.

In addition, Republic Act No. 10533, or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, stresses that school leaders—including principals and coordinators—must participate in professional development activities to improve school management and instructional delivery. This underscores the importance of transformational leadership, where school heads inspire, mentor, and support teachers to perform effectively.

Furthermore, the Education Act of 1982 (Batas Pambansa Blg. 232) emphasizes teachers' responsibilities, including accountability for student learning, alignment with school objectives, and commitment to ongoing professional growth. School heads play a key role in helping teachers meet these responsibilities by creating an environment that encourages dedication and effective teaching.

Likewise, DepEd policies further strengthen these expectations. DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017 introduced the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), providing a framework for teacher competencies, professional development, and performance evaluation. Complementing this, DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020 established the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), which defines the skills, values, and practices expected of effective school leaders. Both emphasize leadership that motivates, supports, and empowers teachers—core aspects of transformational leadership.

School leadership plays an important role in influencing teachers' performance and commitment. Understanding leadership theories helps explain how leaders can better support teachers. One key approach is transformational leadership, which focuses on inspiring and guiding teachers toward better outcomes. The Transformational Leadership Model by Leithwood (2006) explains that school leaders play an important role in encouraging and inspiring teachers. When school administrators support and motivate teachers, it helps improve teaching practices and student learning outcomes. This kind of leadership focuses on vision, support, and positive relationships within the school.

Another important theory is the Distributed Leadership Theory (Hickey et al., 2022), which emphasizes shared responsibility among school members. Leadership is not limited to one person but is spread across teachers and administrators. This approach promotes cooperation, teamwork, and shared accountability, which can strengthen teachers' involvement and commitment to their work.

In terms of practical outcomes, research consistently supports the positive effects of transformational leadership on teacher commitment and performance. Studies reveal that transformational leaders inspire emotional investment, improve job satisfaction, foster innovation, and enhance teaching effectiveness (Kareem et al., 2023; Uy et al., 2024; Firmansyah et al., 2022; Duraku & Hoxha, 2021). Teachers' engagement and organizational commitment are strengthened when leaders provide individualized support, cultivate collaborative school cultures, and encourage professional growth. In turn, these practices benefit both teacher performance and student outcomes.

In addition, teachers' performance is closely linked to both organizational commitment and leadership practices. Teachers who feel supported, valued, and empowered by their leaders are more likely to demonstrate higher levels of instructional effectiveness, creativity, and professional dedication. Transformational leadership, in particular, has been shown to positively influence teacher performance by fostering motivation, collaboration, and continuous professional growth (Firmansyah et al., 2022; Duraku & Hoxha, 2021). When educators experience high affective commitment, they are more engaged in planning lessons, adopting innovative teaching strategies, and improving student learning outcomes.

The reviewed studies indicate that transformational leadership significantly influences teachers' performance, particularly when strengthened by teachers' commitment. However, these effects require structured support and consistent application. Thus, an action plan is necessary to guide school leaders in applying transformational leadership practices and enhancing teachers' commitment to improve overall performance.

Statement of the Problem

The main goal of this study is to determine the mediating role of teachers' organizational commitment between the relationship of transformational leadership styles, and teaching performance of public elementary school teachers in Getafe 1 and 2 District, Division of Bohol, in the academic year 2025–2026. The findings of the study will be used to create a proposal for an action plan.

The research specifically aims to address the following questions:

1. To what degree do school heads' transformational leadership, as viewed by teachers, relate to the following: Individualized Consideration, Management by Exception, Inspirational Motivation and Idealized Influence?
2. What is the level of teachers' commitment to the organization in terms of the following indicators: Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, and General Commitment?
3. What is the level of teachers' Performance?
4. Does teacher organizational commitment mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and level of teachers' teaching performance?
5. What action plan can be proposed based on the findings?

Null Hypotheses

1. Teacher organizational commitment does not significantly mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and the level of teachers' teaching performance.

METHODOLOGY

Design

This study adopted a quantitative, non-experimental research design with mediation analysis to examine the relationships among transformational leadership, teachers' organizational commitment, and teaching performance. Moreover, the descriptive component was used to determine the levels of transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and teaching performance based on IPCR ratings. Meanwhile, the correlational component examined the strength and direction of the relationships among these variables.

Environment and Respondents

The study was conducted in the public elementary schools of the Getafe I and 2 Districts for the school year 2025-2026. Getafe is located in the Northern part of Bohol. It consisted of mainland barangays and island barangays.

The total number of respondents was 120 public elementary teachers of the Getafe 1 and 2 districts, where 62 elementary teachers of the Getafe 1 district and 58 elementary teachers of the Getafe 2 district in the school year 2025-2026. These teachers were chosen through stratified non-random sampling. From these clusters, stratified non-random sampling was used to choose specific schools, ensuring that each school within a cluster had an equal chance of being selected.

Instrument

The study used a structured questionnaire to gather data from teachers on three areas: school heads' transformational leadership, teachers' commitment, and teachers' performance. The instrument was based on validated tools to ensure it was reliable and appropriate for the school setting. The first part focused on

transformational leadership, including individualized consideration, management by exception, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence. Teachers rated each item using a four-point scale from “Not at all” to “Always.” The second part measured teachers’ commitment, covering affective, continuance, and general commitment, with responses ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” Negatively worded items were scored in reverse to maintain accuracy.

The final part measured teachers’ performance using their most recent IPCRF ratings for 2024–2025, which were taken from official records to ensure objectivity. After collecting the data, all responses were organized and analyzed. Overall, the questionnaire provided clear and reliable information that helped examine the relationship between school heads’ leadership, teachers’ commitment, and their performance.

RESULTS

This chapter presents the data gathered in this study, along with their analysis and interpretation. It focuses on examining how teachers perceive the transformational leadership practices of school heads, their level of organizational commitment, and their teaching performance based on IPCR ratings. This chapter also explores the relationships among these variables and determines whether organizational commitment plays a mediating role between leadership style and teaching performance. The results presented here serve as the basis for proposing an action plan to support and improve school practices.

1. Degree of School Heads' Transformational Leadership

This section presents how teachers perceived the transformational leadership of their school heads, focusing on key aspects such as individualized consideration, management by exception, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence. The data were analyzed using mean and standard deviation to determine the frequency and consistency of these leadership practices as observed by the teachers in the school setting.

Table 1 Degree of School Heads' Transformational Leadership n = 120

Dimensions	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Inspirational Motivation			
Composite Mean	3.71	0.56	Highly Transformational
Idealized Influence			
Composite Mean	3.70	0.58	Highly Transformational
Management by Exception			
Composite Mean	3.65	0.59	Highly Transformational
Individualized Consideration			
Composite Mean	3.62	0.59	Highly Transformational
Overall Composite Mean	3.67	0.58	Highly Transformational

Table 1 presents the degree of school heads’ transformational leadership as perceived by teachers across four dimensions: inspirational motivation, idealized influence, management by exception, and individualized consideration, using mean and standard deviation analysis. The overall composite mean of mean = 3.67 (SD = 0.58) indicates that school heads are generally perceived as highly transformational. This suggests that they can guide, motivate, and support teachers effectively in the school setting.

Among the four dimensions, Inspirational Motivation obtained the highest mean of mean = 3.71 (SD = 0.56), interpreted as highly transformational. The top three statements, ranked from highest to lowest, are: “carries out tasks and obligations in a disciplined manner” mean = 3.75 (SD = 0.54); “pays attention to expectations and input from the teacher” mean = 3.74 (SD = 0.56); and “encourages teachers to practice creative learning models” mean = 3.73 (SD = 0.52). These are followed by “pays attention to the teacher’s ideas” mean = 3.72 (SD = 0.57), “motivates to generate teacher enthusiasm and optimism” mean = 3.68 (SD = 0.58), and “spurs teachers to optimize their potential” mean = 3.63 (SD = 0.59). These findings indicate that school heads are highly effective in inspiring teachers, encouraging innovation, and fostering a shared sense of purpose.

This is followed by Idealized Influence, which obtained a mean of mean = 3.70 (SD = 0.58), also interpreted as highly transformational. The top three statements are: “implements discipline according to school rules” mean = 3.78 (SD = 0.56); “maintains conduciveness in the school environment” mean = 3.76 (SD = 0.58); and “prioritizes school interests” mean = 3.76 (SD = 0.55). These are followed by “devotes time for the benefit of the school” mean = 3.76 (SD = 0.57), “creates an atmosphere of togetherness in school” mean = 3.74 (SD = 0.59), “listens to teacher complaints related to learning” mean = 3.71 (SD = 0.59), “provides guidance to teachers” mean = 3.71 (SD = 0.59), “creates a conducive social atmosphere” mean = 3.69 (SD = 0.56), “provides a role model for teachers and employees” mean = 3.68 (SD = 0.62), “divides institutional tasks in a professional and proportional manner” mean = 3.67 (SD = 0.54), “can communicate well” mean = 3.66 (SD = 0.57), “guides teachers to develop their potential” mean = 3.63 (SD = 0.59), and “has a wide network and connections” mean = 3.54 (SD = 0.61).

Next, Management by Exception obtained a mean of mean = 3.65 (SD = 0.59), still within the highly transformational level. The top three statements are: “respects colleagues’ opinions” mean = 3.77 (SD = 0.56); “provides direction and guidance to teachers” mean = 3.70 (SD = 0.59); and “appreciates the abilities and talents of teachers” mean = 3.70 (SD = 0.56). These are followed by “increases knowledge to improve the quality of work” mean = 3.68 (SD = 0.60), “conducts deliberations with teachers regarding the problems faced” mean = 3.66 (SD = 0.56), “practices innovations based on developments in science and technology” mean = 3.63 (SD = 0.62), “provides freedom of expression” mean = 3.57 (SD = 0.62), and “receives criticism and suggestions from the teacher” mean = 3.50 (SD = 0.65).

Lastly, Individualized Consideration obtained the lowest mean of mean = 3.62 (SD = 0.59), although still interpreted as highly transformational. The top three statements are: “expresses gratitude to the teacher” mean = 3.73 (SD = 0.53); “understands the diversity of potential that teachers have” mean = 3.68 (SD = 0.58); and “praises the teacher’s performance” mean = 3.66 (SD = 0.56). These are followed by “gets to know the teacher individually” mean = 3.64 (SD = 0.55), “gets to know the teacher’s background” mean = 3.64 (SD = 0.56), “provides flexibility to teachers in carrying out their duties” mean = 3.63 (SD = 0.61), “provides an assessment of the teacher’s performance” mean = 3.62 (SD = 0.58), “knows the characteristics of each teacher” mean = 3.62 (SD = 0.61), “provides opportunities to participate in training outside of school” mean = 3.61 (SD = 0.61), “fosters teacher optimism regarding the future of students and schools” mean = 3.57 (SD = 0.58), “provides opportunities for teachers to solve problems” mean = 3.53 (SD = 0.63), and “gives awards to outstanding teachers” mean = 3.48 (SD = 0.69).

As the researcher, a semi-formal interview was also conducted with some of the respondents to further understand why Individualized Consideration received the lowest rating among the dimensions of transformational leadership. Based on their responses, some teachers shared that school heads may have limited time to give personal attention to every teacher because of heavy workloads and administrative responsibilities. Others mentioned that while support is present, it is not always consistently felt on an individual level. This may explain why the dimension received the lowest mean, despite still being rated highly transformational.

These findings indicate that school heads can balance supervision with support by guiding teachers while also encouraging participation and collaboration. This is supported by Hickey et al. (2022), who found that leadership practices that promote open communication and collaboration enhance teacher morale and a sense of belonging. Similarly, Kareem et al. (2023) and Uy et al. (2024) highlight that when school leaders provide guidance and act as role models, teachers become more motivated and committed to their work. However, the relatively lower rating in openness to criticism suggests that strengthening feedback mechanisms could further improve leadership effectiveness.

Lastly, Individualized Consideration obtained the lowest mean of 3.62 (SD = 0.59), although still interpreted as highly transformational. The top three statements are: “expresses gratitude to the teacher” (M = 3.73, SD = 0.53); “understands the diversity of potential that teachers have” (M = 3.68, SD = 0.58); and “praises the teacher’s performance” (M = 3.66, SD = 0.56). These are followed by “gets to know the teacher individually” (M = 3.64, SD = 0.55), “gets to know the teacher’s background” (M = 3.64, SD = 0.56), “provides flexibility to teachers in carrying out their duties” (M = 3.63, SD = 0.61), “provides an assessment of the teacher’s

performance” (M = 3.62, SD = 0.58), “knows the characteristics of each teacher” (M = 3.62, SD = 0.61), “provides opportunities to participate in training outside of school” (M = 3.61, SD = 0.61), “fosters teacher optimism regarding the future of students and schools” (M = 3.57, SD = 0.58), “provides opportunities for teachers to solve problems” (M = 3.53, SD = 0.63), and “gives awards to outstanding teachers” (M = 3.48, SD = 0.69).

These findings suggest that while school heads demonstrate strong personal support and understanding of teachers, recognition and empowerment practices may still need enhancement.

Overall, the findings indicate that transformational leadership is strongly practiced among school heads, particularly in motivating teachers and modeling positive behavior. This supports existing studies showing that transformational leadership improves teacher commitment and performance (Atan & Mahmood, 2019; Berkovich & Eyal, 2017; Peng et al., 2020). From a practical perspective, effective leadership goes beyond managing tasks; it involves inspiring, supporting, and building strong relationships with teachers. While the results are generally positive, there is still room for improvement in recognizing teachers’ efforts and encouraging open feedback, which can further strengthen teacher motivation and teaching performance.

2. Level of Teachers Commitment to the Organization

This section presents the level of teachers’ commitment to their schools, as outlined in the study’s objectives. It examined affective commitment, continuance commitment, and general commitment. The data were analyzed using mean and standard deviation to show the overall level and consistency of teachers’ commitment, providing a clear understanding of how their engagement may influence teaching performance and potentially mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and performance.

Table 2 Level of Teachers Commitment to the Organization n = 120

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Affective Commitment			
Composite Mean	3.26	0.66	High Commitment
Continuance Commitment			
Composite Mean	3.21	0.67	High Commitment
General Commitment			
Composite Mean	3.05	0.73	High Commitment
Overall Composite Mean	3.18	0.69	High Commitment

Table 2 presents the level of teachers’ organizational commitment across three dimensions: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and general commitment. The overall composite mean of 3.18 (SD = 0.69) indicates a high level of commitment, suggesting that teachers generally feel connected to their organization and are willing to contribute to its success.

Among the three dimensions, Affective Commitment obtained the highest mean of 3.26 (SD = 0.66), interpreted as high commitment. The highest-rated indicators include “feel that I am emotionally connected with this organization” mean = 3.39 (SD = 0.58), “think I am deeply feeling a full of affection to this organization” mean = 3.34 (SD = 0.60), and “would be happy resting my career in this organization” mean = 3.29 (SD = 0.68). Other items such as talking positively about the organization mean = 3.19 (SD = 0.76) and treating organizational problems as one’s own mean = 3.08 (SD = 0.69) further support this result.

The relatively low SD values show that responses are consistent, meaning most teachers share this strong emotional attachment. This suggests that teachers do not just stay because they must, but because they genuinely feel connected to the school. This supports the idea that when employees feel valued and emotionally invested, they become more engaged and committed (Kareem et al., 2023; Uy et al., 2024).

Next, Continuance Commitment obtained a mean of 3.21 (SD = 0.67), interpreted as high commitment. The top indicators include “staying with my organization right now is a matter of necessity and desire” mean =

3.33 (SD = 0.64), “afraid of what will happen if I leave my job today” mean = 3.28 (SD = 0.68), and “cannot leave my organization even if I wanted to leave right now” mean = 3.25 (SD = 0.70). These are followed by perceived costs of leaving mean = 3.14 (SD = 0.64) and limited job alternatives mean = 3.07 (SD = 0.71).

The slightly higher SD values here suggest more varied responses, meaning not all teachers feel the same level of necessity to stay. This indicates that while some teachers remain because of stability and security, others may not feel as strongly tied in this aspect. This aligns with the idea that commitment can also be influenced by practical considerations such as job security and limited alternatives (Yousef, 2017; Werf, 2020).

Lastly, General Commitment obtained the lowest mean of 3.05 (SD = 0.73), though still interpreted as high commitment. The highest-rated indicators include “willing to give my best to make this institution successful” mean = 3.67 (SD = 0.58), “willing to exert effort beyond normal expectations” mean = 3.62 (SD = 0.61), and “find that my values align with the organization” mean = 3.54 (SD = 0.59). These are followed by pride and concern for the organization, with means ranging from 3.21 (SD = 0.71) to 3.38 (SD = 0.68).

However, the negatively worded items such as “not that loyal to the company” mean = 2.05 (SD = 0.91), “feels it is a mistake working in this organization” mean = 2.02 (SD = 0.87), and “little to gain by staying long-term” mean = 2.44 (SD = 0.96) received low ratings, indicating disagreement. The higher SD values in these areas suggest differing opinions among teachers, pointing to some uncertainty about long-term commitment.

Overall, the results show that teachers are generally committed, especially in terms of emotional attachment and willingness to contribute. This supports findings that committed teachers are more engaged and likely to perform better in their roles (Firmansyah et al., 2022; Duraku & Hoxha, 2021).

These findings also suggest that organizational commitment may help explain how leadership influences performance. When teachers feel supported and connected to their school, they are more likely to stay motivated and perform well (Kareem et al., 2023; Uy et al., 2024).

3. Level of Teachers’ Individual Performance

Table 3 Level of Teachers’ Individual Performance (IPCR) n = 120

Adjective Rating	Numeric Rating	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Outstanding	4.500-5.000	8	6.67
Very Satisfactory	3.500-4.499	112	92.33
Satisfactory	2.500-3.499	0	0
Unsatisfactory	1.500-2.499	0	0
Poor	below 1.499	0	0

Table 3 presents the level of teachers’ Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) ratings in terms of frequency, percentage, and descriptive interpretation. The data were obtained from the official IPCRF records of teachers in the district file, with the consent of the teachers and approval from the Public Schools District Supervisor.

Results show that out of 120 teachers, 112 (92.33%) obtained a Very Satisfactory rating, while 8 (6.67%) achieved an Outstanding rating. No teachers were rated as Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, or Poor. This indicates that all teachers meet or exceed performance standards, with most performing at a consistently high level and a few demonstrating exemplary performance.

Overall, the distribution suggests a strong and consistent performance culture among teachers in Getafe Districts 1 and 2. The concentration of ratings within the Very Satisfactory range (3.500–4.499) reflects stable instructional performance, while the presence of Outstanding ratings (4.500–5.000) highlights cases of exceptional achievement. The absence of lower ratings further implies that teachers are effectively fulfilling their duties and responsibilities in the school setting.

These findings suggest that teachers’ performance may be supported by effective leadership practices that promote motivation, guidance, and professional growth. Transformational leadership has been associated with improved teacher performance by enhancing engagement and work commitment (Atan & Mahmood, 2019; Berkovich & Eyal, 2017). Likewise, leaders who provide direction and support contribute to better instructional effectiveness and productivity (White, 2018; Cherry, 2020).

In addition, the generally high IPCR ratings may also reflect strong organizational commitment among teachers, as committed employees are more likely to exert effort and align their work with institutional goals (Werf, 2020).

Overall, the results indicate a strong alignment between teacher performance and school expectations, suggesting that both leadership and commitment play important roles in sustaining high performance levels in the schools.

4. Mediation of Teachers’ Organizational Commitment to Transformational Leadership and Level of Teachers’ Teaching Performance

This section presents whether teacher organizational commitment mediates between transformational leadership and the level of teachers’ teaching performance. It examines how teachers’ commitment to their organization may help explain or strengthen the link between the leadership practices of school heads and teachers’ performance.

Table 4 Mediation of Teachers’ Organizational Commitment to Transformational Leadership and Level of Teachers’ Teaching Performance n = 120

Effect	Estimate	SE	Z	p-value	Interpretation	Decision
Indirect Effect	0.040	0.048	0.83	.409	Not significant	Do not reject H ₀
Direct Effect	0.252	0.100	2.52	.012	Significant	H ₀ rejected
Total Effect	0.292	0.097	3.01	.003	Significant	H ₀ rejected
Experience → Challenge	-0.522	0.380	-1.38	.169	Not significant	Do not reject H ₀
Challenges → Performance	-0.076	0.073	-1.03	.301	Not significant	Do not reject H ₀
Experience → Performance	0.252	0.100	2.52	.012	Significant	H ₀ rejected

Table 4 presents the mediation analysis examining the role of teachers’ organizational commitment in the relationship between transformational leadership and teaching performance among 120 teachers. The data were analyzed using mediation analysis through regression-based path analysis, where standard error (SE), Z-values, and p-values were used to test the significance of the indirect, direct, and total effects.

Results show that the indirect effect is not significant (Estimate = 0.040, SE = 0.048, Z = 0.83, p = .409), leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This indicates that organizational commitment does not significantly mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and teaching performance. In statistical terms, the mediation effect is not supported since the indirect path did not reach the required level of significance (p < 0.05).

On the other hand, the direct effect is significant (Estimate = 0.252, SE = 0.100, Z = 2.52, p = .012), resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis. This suggests that transformational leadership has a direct and statistically significant influence on teachers’ performance. The total effect is also significant (Estimate = 0.292, SE = 0.097, Z = 3.01, p = .003), confirming that overall, transformational leadership significantly predicts teaching performance.

For the path estimates, the relationship between experience and performance is significant (Estimate = 0.252, SE = 0.100, Z = 2.52, p = .012), while the paths from experience to challenge (p = .169) and challenges to performance (p = .301) are not statistically significant. These results indicate that the model was further tested using path analysis within the mediation framework, showing that only the direct pathway contributes meaningfully to performance.

The findings can be understood through the Transformational Leadership Theory of Leithwood (2006), which explains that school leaders influence teacher performance directly by providing vision, support, and motivation. The significant direct effect in this study reflects this idea, showing that leadership actions immediately affect teacher performance rather than being filtered through organizational commitment. However, future researchers may refine the mediation model by including job satisfaction and psychological empowerment as additional parallel mediators together with organizational commitment. While organizational commitment explains how transformational leadership may affect teaching performance, it is a broad concept and may not fully capture subtle changes in performance. Teachers may perform better not only because they are committed, but also because they are satisfied with their work and feel trusted and empowered. Including these variables may provide a clearer understanding of how transformational leadership improves teaching performance.

This result is also consistent with the 1987 Philippine Constitution (Article XIV, Section 1), which emphasizes the State's duty to ensure quality education. In practice, this responsibility is translated into school leadership actions that directly enhance teacher effectiveness and instructional quality.

Supporting empirical studies reinforce these findings. Firmansyah et al. (2022), using correlational and regression analysis, found that transformational leadership significantly improves teacher performance through motivation and engagement. Similarly, Duraku and Hoxha (2021) reported that leadership support has a direct positive effect on teachers' instructional effectiveness and job performance. These studies align with the present findings, where the direct pathway is statistically significant.

In addition, Cherry (2020) explains that transformational leadership operates through inspiration and motivation, while White (2018) highlights its role in shaping organizational culture and teacher productivity. These perspectives support the statistical results showing that leadership has a direct effect rather than a mediated one.

Overall, the findings show that transformational leadership significantly and directly influences teacher performance. The mediation analysis using regression-based path analysis (with SE, Z-test, and p-value interpretation) confirms that organizational commitment does not mediate this relationship. This emphasizes the importance of strong and visible leadership actions in improving teaching performance in schools.

DISCUSSION

After a thorough analysis of the study, the researcher came up with the following findings:

1. School heads are perceived as highly transformational (overall mean = 3.67, SD = 0.58), with Inspirational Motivation as the highest dimension (mean = 3.71, SD = 0.56), followed by Idealized Influence (mean = 3.70, SD = 0.58), Management by Exception (mean = 3.65, SD = 0.59), and Individualized Consideration (mean = 3.62, SD = 0.59).
2. Teachers obtained a high level of organizational commitment (overall mean = 3.18, SD = 0.69), with Affective Commitment as the highest (mean = 3.26, SD = 0.66), followed by Continuance Commitment (mean = 3.21, SD = 0.67), and General Commitment (mean = 3.05, SD = 0.73).
3. Most teachers were rated Very Satisfactory (92.33%), followed by Outstanding (6.67%), with no ratings under Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, or Poor.
4. Organizational commitment does not significantly mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and teaching performance (indirect effect $p = .409$), while transformational leadership has a significant direct effect ($p = .012$) and a significant total effect ($p = .003$) on teaching performance.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that school heads are perceived as highly transformational, teachers demonstrate a high level of organizational commitment, and most teachers are rated Very Satisfactory in their IPCR performance. Transformational leadership has a significant direct effect on teaching performance, while organizational commitment does not significantly mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and teaching performance. However, the study is limited to selected schools in Getafe Districts 1 and 2 and relies on self-

reported perceptions and existing IPCR records, which may not fully capture other influencing factors on performance. Moving forward, it is recommended that future studies explore additional mediating variables and expand the scope to other districts to further validate and strengthen these findings in relation to teaching performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are hereby offered:

1. School heads may continue strengthening transformational leadership practices by enhancing recognition of teachers' efforts, improving openness to feedback, and sustaining supportive and motivating leadership behaviors to further improve teaching performance.
2. Teachers must maintain and strengthen organizational commitment by actively participating in school activities, fostering collaboration, and consistently aligning personal professional goals with school objectives to sustain high performance.
3. School administrators and the Schools Division Office may provide continuous professional development programs focused on leadership enhancement, teacher motivation, and performance monitoring systems to further improve instructional quality.
4. Future researchers may conduct similar studies in other districts or larger populations and include additional variables such as job satisfaction, work environment, and motivation to further explain factors affecting teaching performance.

The Proposed Action Plan

Rationale

This Workplace Application Plan (WAP) is designed in response to the study findings indicating that transformational leadership, teacher organizational commitment, and teaching performance are positively related. While transformational leadership among school heads is already high, the study revealed that continued strengthening of leadership practices—particularly in motivation, recognition, and feedback—can further enhance teacher engagement and performance. Additionally, the high level of organizational commitment among teachers suggests that reinforcing a supportive and collaborative school environment can sustain and improve instructional outcomes.

This plan addresses gaps in sustaining leadership effectiveness, strengthening teacher commitment, and maximizing teaching performance through data-informed practices, aligned with the PPST, PPSSH, and RPMS frameworks. It is anchored on legal bases such as the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (RA 10533), which emphasizes leadership development, and DepEd Orders No. 42, s. 2017 (PPST), No. 24, s. 2020 (PPSSH), and No. 2, s. 2015 (RPMS), which highlight standards-based performance, leadership competencies, and results-based management.

This program aims to strengthen transformational leadership practices among school heads and improve teacher organizational commitment through structured mentoring, instructional supervision, and collaborative learning activities. It focuses on enhancing teachers' competencies in assessment design, data analysis, and instructional decision-making while reinforcing leadership behaviors such as motivation, recognition, and support.

Objectives

The following objectives guide this action plan:

Knowledge

- Apply transformational leadership principles in improving teacher performance
- Relate leadership practices to teacher commitment and instructional effectiveness
- Integrate standards-based frameworks such as PPST and PPSSH in school management practices

Skills

- Apply transformational leadership practices such as motivation, recognition, and support in actual school operations
- Conduct instructional supervision (COT) and provide appropriate technical assistance to teachers
- Develop, review, and validate classroom assessment tools aligned with curriculum standards
- Utilize assessment data in making instructional decisions and interventions

Attitude

- Demonstrate commitment to continuous improvement through reflective leadership practices
- Foster collaboration, openness, and trust among teachers in daily school operations
- Acknowledge and value teacher contributions to promote a supportive professional environment

Mechanics of Implementation

Blended modality (face-to-face coaching, LAC sessions, and online collaboration via meetings and shared documents)

Schedule of Implementation

From start to end date. This should not exceed 6 months.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The program shall be evaluated and monitored regularly through the checklist conducted by the school head to determine the implementation's strengths and weaknesses and address the areas of improvement.

Proposed Action Plan for Strengthening Transformational Leadership Practices and Teacher Commitment to Enhance Teaching Performance

Republic of the Philippines

Department of Education

REGION VII, CENTRAL VISAYAS

SCHOOLS DIVISION OF BOHOL

WORKPLACE APPLICATION PLAN

I. Proponent’s Profile

PROPONENTS NAME:	JESSICA L. JIMENEZ	POSITION:	TEACHER III
SCHOOL		SCHOOL ID:	
SDO AND REGION:	BOHOL/RO7	PD PROGRAM ATTENDED:	
COACH/MENTOR:		POSITION:	SCHOOL PRINCIPAL
ASSISTANT SCHOOLS DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT	MICHAEL NIEL G. OLAIVAR PHD	SCHOOLS DIVISION SUPERINTENDENT	FAY C. LUAREZ EDD, PHD-TM, CESO VI

II. PROGRAM/PROJECT PROFILE

Title	Strengthening Transformational Leadership Practices and Teacher Commitment to Enhance Teaching Performance	Type of Intervention	Professional Learning Community (PLC), Technical Assistance (TA), Coaching and Mentoring, and Instructional Supervision
Rationale	<p>This Workplace Application Plan (WAP) is designed in response to the study findings indicating that transformational leadership, teacher organizational commitment, and teaching performance are positively related. While transformational leadership among school heads is already high, the study revealed that continued strengthening of leadership practices—particularly in motivation, recognition, and feedback—can further enhance teacher engagement and performance. Additionally, the high level of organizational commitment among teachers suggests that reinforcing a supportive and collaborative school environment can sustain and improve instructional outcomes.</p> <p>This plan addresses gaps in sustaining leadership effectiveness, strengthening teacher commitment, and maximizing teaching performance through data-informed practices, aligned with the PPST, PPSSH, and RPMS frameworks. It is anchored on legal bases such as the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (RA 10533), which emphasizes leadership development, and DepEd Orders No. 42, s. 2017 (PPST), No. 24, s. 2020 (PPSSH), and No. 2, s. 2015 (RPMS), which highlight standards-based performance, leadership competencies, and results-based management.</p>		
Program/Project Description	<p>This program aims to strengthen transformational leadership practices among school heads and improve teacher organizational commitment through structured mentoring, instructional supervision, and collaborative learning activities. It focuses on enhancing teachers' competencies in assessment design, data analysis, and instructional decision-making while reinforcing leadership behaviors such as motivation, recognition, and support.</p> <p>The program includes coaching, CE/LAC sessions, classroom observations, item review and validation, and data-driven instructional planning. It is expected to improve the quality of classroom assessments, increase teacher engagement, strengthen professional collaboration, and ultimately enhance student learning outcomes.</p>		
Program Objectives	<p>Knowledge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply transformational leadership principles in improving teacher performance • Relate leadership practices to teacher commitment and instructional effectiveness • Integrate standards-based frameworks such as PPST and PPSSH in school management practices <p>Skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply transformational leadership practices such as motivation, recognition, and support in actual school operations • Conduct instructional supervision (COT) and provide appropriate technical assistance to teachers • Develop, review, and validate classroom assessment tools aligned with curriculum standards • Utilize assessment data in making instructional decisions and interventions <p>Attitude</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate commitment to continuous improvement through reflective leadership practices • Foster collaboration, openness, and trust among teachers in daily school operations • Acknowledge and value teacher contributions to promote a supportive professional environment 		
Delivery Platform	Blended modality (face-to-face coaching, LAC sessions, and online collaboration via meetings and shared documents)		
Timeline	From start to end date. This should not exceed 6 months		

III. Funding Details

Amount Needed:	Minimal / School-based funding (if applicable for materials, printing, and sessions)	Printing of materials/forms – 30% Training/LAC session logistics – 30% Monitoring and evaluation tools – 20%
Funding Source:	School MOOE / Division support / Local stakeholders (if applicable)	Miscellaneous (communication, documentation) – 20%

IV. ACTION PLAN

Milestone	Time Frame	Activities	Persons Responsible	Resources Needed	Success Indicators
Milestone 1: Strengthening Transformational Leadership Practices	Months 1–2	Orientation and capacity-building on transformational leadership focusing on motivation, recognition, and feedback	Schools Division Supervisor, School Heads	Training materials, modules, venue, presentation tools	At least 90% participation of school heads; improved leadership awareness based on post-test results
		Conduct PLC sessions on communication, collaboration, and teacher support	School Heads, Master Teachers	LAC session guides, reflection tools	Active participation and documented outputs per session
		Reflective coaching sessions for school heads based on instructional feedback	PSDS, School Heads	Coaching forms, observation results	Action points generated and implemented per coaching cycle
Milestone 2: Enhancing Instructional Supervision and Teacher Support	Months 3–4	Conduct Classroom Observation Tool (COT) with feedback and coaching	School Heads, Master Teachers	COT forms, observation rubrics	Improved teaching practices based on observation results
		Provide technical assistance on lesson planning, assessment design, and strategies	Master Teachers, School Heads	Lesson plan templates, curriculum guides	Improved quality of lesson plans and assessments
		Conduct mentoring sessions for peer-to-peer teacher support	Master Teachers	Mentoring guide, reflection sheets	Increased teacher engagement and collaboration
Milestone 3: Strengthening Classroom Practice (PPST Domains 4 & 5)	Months 5–6	Training on assessment development, validation, and alignment with curriculum	School Heads, Master Teachers	Training modules, curriculum guides	At least 90% of assessment tools aligned with learning competencies and validated as clear and appropriate
		Collaborative item analysis and data-driven instructional planning	Teachers, Master Teachers	Assessment data, analysis tools	Evidence of data-based instructional adjustments
		Peer teaching demonstrations and reflective teaching conferences	Teachers, School Heads	Observation tools, reflection forms	Improved teaching performance based on peer feedback

V. RISKS AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES

Identified Risk	Mitigation Measure
Possible teacher resistance to additional tasks or new practices → Conduct orientation, advocacy, and emphasize benefits of the program	Milestone 1: Review of validated assessment tools and peer review forms; monitoring through document analysis and mentor feedback
Time constraints due to overlapping school activities → Align activities with existing school programs and schedule efficiently	Milestone 2: Evaluation of COT results, PMCF outputs, and CE/LAC documentation; monitoring of collaboration and supervision practices
Limited participation in LAC sessions → Encourage participation through collaboration, incentives, and leadership support	Milestone 3: Review of item analysis reports and instructional adjustments; evaluation of learner performance data and TA effectiveness
Inconsistent implementation of assessment practices → Provide continuous coaching, monitoring, and feedback	Milestone 4: Analysis of pretest and posttest results, PMCF summaries, and development plans; verification of improved teacher performance and competencies

VI. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Milestone	Monitoring Tool Method	Timeline	Responsible Person
Milestone 1: Classroom Practice	Review of the Refined set of teachers; Review of Peer Review forms (documentation that systematic item review was applied)	1.5 months	Proponent, Mentor, School Head/Lead
Milestone 2: Supervising Item Design & Validation (PRACTICE)	Review of completed PMCF and COT reports (focusing on assessment design/collaboration competencies); Review of Documentation of CE/LAC discussions (PPST 4.4.2) Review of teachers Draft, Assessment Items and Peer Review forms	1.5 months	School Head/Leader, Mentor, Instructional Supervisor
Milestone 3: Monitoring Data-Informed Instructional Adjustment (PRACTICE)	Review of Teachers’ Item Analysis Reports; Review of Analyzed PMCF and COT results (focusing on data utilization, PPST 5.5.2) Review of IS/TA Accomplishment Report detailing support provided	1 month	Proponent, School Head, Instructional Supervisor, Mentor
Milestone 4: Consolidation, Reporting & Development Planning (CONSOLIDATE)	Collection and Analysis of Training Evaluation Results and Learning Evaluation Results (Pretest and Posttest data) Review of Consolidated PMCF/COT Summaries Verification of Documented Development Planning Agreement	2 months	School head/ leader, SDS, Approving Authority, Proponent

Declaration:

I hereby declare the information provided in this application is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

I agree that the Department of Education (DepEd) to be the co-owner of all the data gathered and the copyright of any publication of the use of these data.

Prepared by:	Signature:	Date:
(Name and Position of Proponent)		

Reviewed by:
(Name and Position of Mentor)
Recommending Approval:
ASDS
Approved by:
SDS

REFERENCES

1. 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines. (1987). <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/constitutions/1987-constitution/>
2. Article XIV of the 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippine The State shall protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality education at all levels, and shall take appropriate steps to make such education accessible to all. Accessed at <http://bitly.ws/LXfW>
3. Article XIV. (1987). *The 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines*. Retrieved from <http://bitly.ws/LXfW>
4. 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines. (1987).
5. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/constitutions/1987-constitution/>
6. Atan, J., & Mahmood, N. (2019). The role of transformational leadership style in enhancing employees' competency for organization performance. *Management Science Letters, 9*(13), 2191–2200. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2019.7.020>
7. Cherry, K. (2020a). Transformational leadership: A closer look. <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-transformational-leadership-2795313>
8. Cherry, K. (2020b). Leadership. <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-leadership-2795312>
9. DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015. Guidelines on the establishment and implementation of the results-based performance management system in the Department of Education. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
10. DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2010. National adoption and implementation of the National Competency-Based Standards for Teachers. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
11. DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017. National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
12. Firmansyah, A., Putra, F. I. F. S., & colleagues. (2022). *The role of transformational leadership and knowledge management and learning organization on vocational schools performance during digital era. Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 895341. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.895341>
13. Kareem, A. A., & Hussein, N. O. (2023). Transformational leadership and teacher performance. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 51*(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432211050975>
14. Werf, R. (2020). 3 Key Types of Organizational Commitment. Effactory, 1-4. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3fwtwKE>
15. White. (2018). What is transformational leadership? A model for motivating innovation? CIO, 1. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3ypydyk>