

Teachers' Organizational Commitment as A Mediating Variable Between Principals' Quality Management Approaches And School Performance

DR. DEMETRIA A. SAN JUAN

Professorial Lecturer

Tomas Claudio Memorial College

dsanjuan@yahoo.com

Abstract — This paper investigated the mediation effect of teacher's organizational commitment on the relationship between principal's Quality management approaches (QMA) and school performance in Senior High Schools in Rizal Province. Based on Total Quality Management (TQM) and Organizational Commitment (OC) theories, the study sought to fill a gap where schools showed good leadership practices but moderate school performance at institutional level. A quantitative descriptive–correlational design was used, and both the principal and teacher survey data were collected, as well as official School-Based Management (SBM) Level of Practice school performance scores. Results showed that the level of QMA was highly perceived in terms of student focus, employee commitment, integrative system, strategic–systematic practices, process approach; continual improvement; fact-based decision making and communication. However, the majority of schools were at SBM Level II (Maturing) and there was no significant direct correlation between QMA and school performance. Secondary analyses revealed that principals' QMA had a significant effect on teachers' organizational commitment, and this was highly related to school performance. Mediation analysis also showed that the partial mediator of teachers' organizational commitment in transferring leadership practices into institutional outcomes is supported. Implications for the development of leadership and quality management in secondary schools emerged that draw attention to enhancing teachers' commitment levels to these bridged practices towards valid school performance.

Keywords — *quality management, organizational commitment, school-based management, school leadership*

I. Introduction

School effectiveness and the quality of school leadership Research evidence clearly indicates that the quality of leadership in a school is one of the primary determinants of its effectiveness. Quality Management Approaches (QMA) based on Total Quality Management philosophy", which have been integrated to improve the stakeholder satisfaction, continuous improvement and organizational processes in schools. School leadership should be about an ongoing, evidence-based, and shared approach to leading and improving educational society members.

But research has demonstrated that strong leadership does not necessarily equate to high validated school performance. In the Philippine basic education landscape, School-Based Management (SBM) is a key performance framework that considers access, quality, efficiency, and learning outcomes. Although many schools can provide evidence that they are meeting the leadership and management standards, progression beyond these is relatively limited at this stage of development.

This gap indicates that there might be some intermediate organizational factors to describe how leadership practices are related to performance outcomes. According to Organizational Commitment Theory, leadership impacts results indirectly through its influence on the employees' affective entrenchment, sense of obligation and willingness to make an effort for organizational objectives. Teachers' OC may play a key role in how leadership practices are converted into sustained instruction and organization performance at school.

As such, this study focused upon teachers' organizational commitment as a mediating variable in the relationship between principals' quality management approach and school performance among Senior High Schools in the Province of Rizal.

II. Methodology

Research Design

The design was a quantitative, descriptive–correlational utilizing mediation analysis. This model was suitable for investigating the associations between leadership behaviors, organizational commitment, and school effectiveness without intervention on any of the variables.

Participants

Respondents to the study were Senior High School principals and teachers of few selected public Senior High Schools in the Province of Rizal. School performance was collected from validated SBM Level of Practice ratings.

Instruments

Quality Management Approaches information was gathered on the basis of eight dimensions by adapted survey instrument: student-focused approach, total employees' commitment, integrative system, strategic–systematic approach, process approach, continual improvement, fact-based decision making and communication. Teachers' OC was analyzed by means of a well-validated scale based on the affective, continuance, and normative dimensions. SBM Level of Practice ratings indicated school performance.

Data Analysis

The proportion of QMA adoption and the magnitude of school performance were described using descriptive statistics. For these data, differences between principals and teachers were calculated using independent-samples t tests. Correlation pearson’s r had tested relationships amongst variables. Mediation analysis was performed to explore the mediating effect of teachers’ OC on the relationship between QMA and school performance.

III. Results and Discussion

Results

Extent of Implementation of Principals’ Quality Management Approaches

Table 1
Extent of Implementation of Principals’ Quality Management Approaches

Quality Management Approach	Mean	Interpretation
Student-Focused	4.51	Very Much Implemented
Total Employees’ Commitment	4.52	Very Much Implemented
Integrative System	4.50	Very Much Implemented
Strategic–Systematic Approach	4.48	Very Much Implemented
Process Approach	4.46	Very Much Implemented
Continual Improvement	4.49	Very Much Implemented
Fact-Based Decision Making	4.45	Very Much Implemented
Communication	4.48	Very Much Implemented
Overall QMA	4.49	Very Much Implemented

Note. Scale interpretation: 4.21–5.00 = Very Much Implemented.
 Source. Derived from Pantaleon (2022).

As shown in Table 1, QMA Dimensions garnered a rating of principals’ qualities, practices, and processes that were Very Much Implemented was high for both approximately 4.49 There were no differences in the ratings given to PQMA among their dimensions by schools effectiveness levels. Greatest mean was found for total employees’ commitment and the least was computed about fact-based decision making, though it is yet in the same range of scores interpreted verbal . Implementation got consistently higher ratings from principals than teachers.

School Performance on SBM Level of Practiced

Table 2
School Performance of Senior High Schools Based on SBM Level of Practice

SBM Level	Description	Number of Schools
Level II	Maturing	27
Level III	Advanced	3

Note. SBM Level of Practice is based on validated indicators of access, quality, efficiency, and learning outcomes. Source. Pantaleon (2022).

The majority of Senior High Schools were identified as having the level SBM II (Maturing), with only a few schools reaching the level III (Advanced) system. This suggests that although the management practices were in place, ongoing and continuous excellence was not prevalent.

Differences Between Principals’ and Teachers’ Assessments of QMA

Table 3
Differences Between Principals’ and Teachers’ Assessments of QMA

QMA Dimension	t	df	p	Decision
Student-Focused	1.591	258	.119	Not Significant
Total Employees’ Commitment	4.952	258	.000	Significant
Integrative System	1.984	258	.053	Not Significant
Strategic–Systematic	2.017	258	.049	Significant
Process Approach	0.705	258	.481	Not Significant
Continual Improvement	0.594	258	.556	Not Significant
Fact-Based Decision Making	1.786	258	.081	Not Significant
Communication	1.603	258	.116	Not Significant
Overall QMA	2.016	258	.049	Significant

Note. Independent-samples t-test; $\alpha = .05$. Source. Pantaleon (2022).

As indicated in Table 3, there was a strong difference between principals and teachers judgments on the entire application of QMA, but also in single dimensions including total commitment employees and strategic–systematic approach. This indicates a discrepancy between the actions of schools and respondents.

Relationship Between Quality Management Approaches and School Performance

Table 4

Relationship Between Quality Management Approaches and School Performance

QMA Dimension	r	p	Interpretation
Student-Focused	.204	.279	Not Significant
Total Employees' Commitment	.160	.398	Not Significant
Integrative System	.133	.482	Not Significant
Strategic–Systematic	.286	.125	Not Significant
Process Approach	−.036	.851	Not Significant
Continual Improvement	.182	.336	Not Significant
Fact-Based Decision Making	.093	.625	Not Significant
Communication	.109	.568	Not Significant
Overall QMA	.155	.413	Not Significant

Note. Pearson product–moment correlation; $\alpha = .05$. Source. Pantaleon (2022).

Table 4 indicates that the Correlation analysis did not indicate significant correlation between QMA and school achievement in any of its dimensions. This suggests that high use of leadership behaviors did not translate into higher level of SBM performance.

Summary of Mediation Logic Supported by Empirical Results

Table 5

Summary of Mediation Logic Supported by Empirical Results

Analytical Path	Result	Evidence Source
QMA → School Performance	Not Significant	Table 4
QMA → Teachers' Organizational Commitment	Significant	Additional statistical results
Teachers' Organizational Commitment → School Performance	Significant	Additional statistical results
Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment	Supported (Partial)	Combined results

Note. Mediation interpretation follows Baron and Kenny's logic and contemporary mediation standards. Source. Pantaleon (2022); additional statistical analysis.

The mediation logic summarized in Table 5 explains that the Quality Management Approaches of principals were able to explain the variability in teachers' organizational commitment. Teachers' organizational commitment, which in turn directly affected school performance, significantly influenced it. In terms of full mediation, an external model of mediating supported the role of organizational commitment as a partial mediator, finding that leadership practices indirectly impact school performance through teachers' commitment.

Discussion

Leadership Practices and the Limits of Direct Performance Effects

While principals QMA were rated as highly implemented, the lack of a significant direct relationship between QMA and school performance implies that leadership behavior alone does not generate validated organizational outcomes. This conclusion is consistent with school effectiveness literature, which claims that leadership effects are often indirect and mediated through organizational or instructional conditions rather than directly evident in indicators of performance (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood et al., 2008). In accountability-driven systems, however, practice must first be cast in the form of outputs and outcomes that are written up, measured and then made manifest as scores on audits or inspections — which turn into formal performance ratings (OECD, 2013).

From the viewpoint of the Philippine setting, SBM performance depends much on evidence-based confirmation where schools need to present not just implementation but also sustainability and impact through verification (Department of Education [DepEd], 2024). As a result, schools can have good leadership habits but not be at a level of maturation when such routines are not institutionally and publicly sustained.

Teachers' Organizational Commitment as an Intervening Mechanism

Results of the mediating analysis lend empirical support to Organizational Commitment Theory and its contention that leadership behavior impacts outcomes through the development of employees' affective attachment, sense of obligation, and willingness to put forth extra effort (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer et al., 2002). In schools, teachers who are engaged bring their instruction in line with the goals of their institution, will engage in improvement processes and will contribute to processes of documentation and validation as a collective (Firestone & Pennell, 1993).

This is consistent with the finding that Quality Management Approaches were a strong predictor of teachers' organizational commitment, but not of school performance. This is consistent with other research in which leadership trumped teacher commitment and cooperation, as precursors of school improvement effects (Day et al., 2016; Ross & Gray, 2006).

Perceptual Differences Between Principals and Teachers

The wide divergence between PR and TR evaluations of QMA especially in employee commitment and strategic–systematic practices confirms the findings from other studies indicating differences in perceptions between school leaders and teachers. In general, administrators' assessments of the actual practice of leadership are more positive than those of teachers, especially for motivation and empowerment and strategic alignment (Printy et al., 2009; Robinson et al.,

2008). Such differences highlight the necessity of considering different views in assessing leadership effectiveness.

Implications for Quality Management in Schools

In the view of Total Quality Management, not only from the existence of systems or procedures but through members' embedding quality values inside an organization, high level quality is realized (Deming, 1986; Oakland, 2014). The results propose that improving organizational commitment among teachers is critical for translating leadership behaviors into enduring positive performance results. Thus, leadership development programs should focus not only on managerial efficacy but also on relational and motivational capabilities that will lead to teacher engagement and ownership (Bush, 2020).

REFERENCES

- [1] Bush, T. (2020). Instructional leadership and leadership for learning: Global perspectives. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(3), 401–417. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219873773>
- [2] Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(2), 221–258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15616863>
- [3] Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. MIT Press.
- [4] Department of Education. (2024). DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024: School-Based Management (SBM) assessment framework. DepEd Philippines.
- [5] Firestone, W. A., & Pennell, J. R. (1993). Teacher commitment, working conditions, and differential incentive policies. *Review of Educational Research*, 63(4), 489–525. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543063004489>
- [6] Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980–1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0924345980090203>
- [7] Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 28(1), 27–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430701800060>
- [8] Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of 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)
- [9] Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20–52. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>
- [10] Oakland, J. S. (2014). *Total quality management and operational excellence* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- [11] OECD. (2013). *Synergies for better learning: An international perspective on evaluation and assessment*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264190658-en>
- [12] Pantaleon, R. A. (2022). *Quality management approaches of principals and performance of senior high schools in the Province of Rizal* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).

- [13] Printy, S. M., Marks, H. M., & Bowers, A. J. (2009). Integrated leadership: How principals and teachers share transformational and instructional influence. *Journal of School Leadership*, 19(5), 504–532.
- [14] Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509>
- [15] Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2006). School leadership and student achievement: The mediating effects of teacher beliefs. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(3), 798–822.