The Influence of Organizational Climate and Organizational Work Commitment toward Leadership Styles of School Heads

Janelie R. Mabale*[1], Saturnino E. Dalagan, Jr. [2]

*[1]Doctor of Education Program. Faculty of Advanced and International Studies, Davao Oriental State University. City of Mati, Davao oriental, Philippines 8200

[2]Faculty of Taguibo Agricultural Vocational High School, Mati North District, Schools Division of Mati City 8200

*Corresponding author

*[1]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-4964-0791

[2]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0442-7744

Abstract: **This research aimed to explore the connection between the organizational climate and the work commitment of school heads, revealing how it affects their leadership styles within educational institutions. It utilized the quantitative method with 398 public school teachers with at least three years of service in the current station as the respondents. The study was conducted at the selected schools from eleven divisions in Region XI. The findings indicate that the organizational climate is at a very high level, while the degree of organizational commitment is also high. Moreover, results show that there is no significant association between organizational climate and organizational work commitment toward school head's leadership style. Although studies claimed that while leadership style may influence organizational climate and commitment, organizational climate and commitment's influence on leadership style is less significant and often inconsistent. Among the predictors of the leadership styles given in the study none of them are statistically significant. Moreover, future researchers may study other potential predictors maybe because predictors used in this study may not fully capture the factors that influence leadership styles. Likewise, they may also look into the impact of certain predictors on leadership styles is mediated by other factors, such as leader-follower interactions, employee engagement, or motivation.**

Keywords: **cluster sampling, correlational research design, leadership styles, organizational climate, organizational work commitment, Philippines.**

I. INTRODUCTION

In this era of competitive school environment, leading school organization is a crucial issue since organizations are permanently in a constant struggle to be increasingly competitive. School heads play a pivotal role in achieving organizational goals of the school, shaping the direction, culture and effectiveness of educational institutions. They are responsible for setting a clear vision and goals for the school, outlining its mission, values and educational objectives. They provide strategic direction and guidance to ensure the school's long – term success. Effective school heads prioritize instructional leadership, which involves fostering a culture of academic excellence, promoting innovative teaching practices, and supporting professional development opportunities for teachers to enhance student learning outcomes.

According to the Philippine Business for Education (PBEd) Report (2023) that educational leadership faces various challenges such as lack adequate resources, facilities, and infrastructure to support effective educational leadership practices. School heads did not receive adequate training or support in developing effective leadership styles, leading to challenges in effectively managing schools and promoting positive outcomes for students.

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 12, Issue 3, pp: (91-100), Month: May - June 2025, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Moreover, the education system in the Philippines is governed by various policies and regulations that may impact the autonomy and decision-making of educational leaders. Different school heads can adopt varying leadership styles, which can result in inconsistencies in decision-making, communication, and overall school management practices. Educational leaders face different challenges in promoting equity and inclusivity in education, particularly in addressing the needs of marginalized and underserved populations.

In addition, as reported by Xiao (2018) a mismatch between leadership styles and organizational climate will lead the school heads to struggle to adapt their leadership styles to the prevailing organizational climate within schools, leading to potential conflicts or inefficiencies in leadership practices. It can result in inconsistent communication, decision-making processes, negatively affect teacher morale, job satisfaction, and ultimately student outcomes, and overall management practices within schools, impacting the effectiveness of school leadership and creating barriers to achieving educational goals and objectives.

The success of the school organization has many factors involved but one which is essential is the organizational work commitment of school heads toward achieving goals of the school. Committed school heads are less likely to develop patterns of tardiness or to be frequently absent from work and less likely to leave the organization to explore other opportunities (Owens and Valesky, 2015).

Zainuddin (2020) organizational commitment levels have impacts on the way leaders manage the school. School heads' varying levels of organizational commitment exhibit different leadership styles that can influence decision-making processes, communication strategies, and overall school culture, potentially leading to inconsistencies and challenges in school management. School heads who demonstrate high levels of commitment to the organization may be more likely to inspire and motivate their team, leading to a positive work environment and improved outcomes for students.

Several studies conducted on school heads by Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber (2009); Trottier, Van Wart, and Wang, (2008); Yasir, Imran, Irshad, Mohamad, and Khan (2016) but it deals only with the relationship between two variables like organizational climate and leadership style and organizational work commitment and leadership style. However, studies on subjects/topics related to organizational climate and organizational work commitment toward leadership styles of school heads using convergent design are rare. The researcher found that there is lack of rigorous research in the previous literature. Some of these unexplored relationship of the three variables namely: organizational climate, organizational work commitment and leadership styles appear to be important and worthy of investigation in the context of this study. An empirical and methodological investigation of these issues is important because to achieve the goals of the different public schools in Region XI it needs leaders who will spearhead the transformation of the schools which cannot be achieved without an effective leadership. Furthermore, this study seeks to fill the gap which is using convergent design to determine the relationship between organizational climate and the organizational work commitment, shedding light on the impact to the leadership styles of school heads within educational institutions.

Statement of the Problem

This study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of the organizational climate of school heads in Davao Region?

2. What is the extent of the organizational work commitment in different secondary schools in Davao Region?

3. What is the level of leadership styles of school heads towards the organization?

4. What is the significant relationship between organizational climate and organizational work commitment to leadership style?

5. Do organizational climate and organizational work commitment significantly predict the leadership styles?

II. BODY OF ARTICLE

Research Design

This study applied correlational research design to examine the relationship of organizational climate and organizational work commitment towards the leadership styles of school heads. Quantitative measure is used to describe the strength, reveal associations and direction of a relationship between variables (Johnson and Brown, 2017).

Sampling

This study used cluster sampling to determine the 398 selected public school teachers as the respondents with at least three years of service in the current station from the eleven divisions of Region XI. Then from each of the division the respondents will be randomly selected from different schools within the division following the criteria.

Analysis

The mean was used to determine the status of the leadership styles of the School Heads in Davao Region as assessed by the participants, the extent of the organizational climate in different schools in Davao Region and the level of organizational work commitment of teachers towards the organization. If the data is not normally distributed, then adjustment will be made in terms of statistics.

Pearson r will be used to determine the level of organizational work commitment of teachers towards the organization.

The Multiple Regression Analysis will be used to validate if leadership style and organizational climate significantly predict the organizational work commitment.

III. RESULTS

The Organizational Climate of School Heads in Davao Region

Table 1. Level of Organizational Climate

Indicators	Mean	Sd	Description
Collegial Leadership	4.20	0.595	Very High
Professional Teacher Behavior	4.26	0.610	Very High
Achievement Press	4.27	0.547	Very High
Institutional Vulnerability	4.12	0.543	High
Overall	4.22	0.521	Very High

The level of organizational climate is very high (*Mean* = 4.22, *Sd* = 0.521) due to the very high level of responses. This indicates that the organizational climate is highly favorable from the perspective of the school heads. This also indicates that school heads generally agreed that their schools have a good atmosphere that supports their job.

The different indicators of organizational climate include collegial leadership, professional teacher behavior, achievement press and institutional vulnerability. The very high level of collegial leadership (*Mean = 4.20, Sd = 0.595)* among respondents implies that school heads believe there is a strong spirit of cooperation and teamwork among colleagues. They probably participate in group decision-making, have open lines of communication and feel supported by their colleagues. This is in line with the statement of Chen, et. al (2023) that schools with school heads exhibiting high levels of collegial leadership demonstrated significantly higher levels of teacher collaboration in curriculum development, instructional practices, and student support. This suggests that a collaborative leadership style directly fosters a culture of teamwork, shared responsibility among school staff and fosters a collaborative environment where decision-making is shared and respected among colleagues (McGrath, et.al, 2019).

In terms of professional teacher behavior, it shows a very high level of organizational climate having a *Mean = 4.26 and Sd = 0.610*. This denotes that the leaders of the schools believe that teachers behave in a very professional manner.

Moreover, results show that it is quite high in terms of achievement press *(Mean = 4.27, Sd = 0.547)* which suggests that the school heads believe that academic success is highly valued.

Lastly, result shows that the organizational climate has a high level of institutional vulnerability *(Mean = 4.12, Sd = 0.543)*. This suggests that the school heads consider the school as quite resilient and robust enough to overcome challenges. Notwithstanding any shortcomings the school most likely has efficient plans in place to deal with them and preserve a supporting learning environment.

The Organizational Commitment of Davao Region School Heads

Table 2. Level of Organizational Work Commitment

Statements	Mean	Sd	Description
Affective commitment	4.26	0.578	Very high
Continuance commitment	3.89	0.792	High
Normative commitment	4.04	0.713	High
Overall	4.06	0.627	High

From the table above, level of affective commitment is very high *(Mean = 4.26, Sd = 0.578)* this indicates that the school heads demonstrate a high level of affective commitment to their institution. They likely experience enthusiasm for their work.

Besides continuance commitment is high *(Mean = 3.89, Sd = 0.792)*. This suggests that the school heads' commitment to the institution is driven by factors such as significant investments in their position, including benefits and specialized skills. Furthermore, the result above shows that the normative commitment is high *(Mean = 4.04, Sd = 0.713)*. This implies that the school heads feel obligated to remain with their assigned institution. They might think it is the proper thing to do, or they might feel a moral need to stay faithful.

Thus, Table 2 shows that the level of organizational commitment is high *(Mean = 4.06, Sd = 0.627)*. This clearly indicates that the school heads have a strong commitment to their institution and its objectives. They exhibit a strong commitment to the goals of the institution, constantly going above and beyond to accomplish them.

Leadership Styles of School heads in Davao Region

Table 3. Distribution of the Perceived Leadership Styles of School Heads

Leadership Styles	Counts, n	Percent, %
Authoritative Leadership	14	24.6
Democratic Leadership	116	29.2
Laisse-faire Leadership	14	3.5
Multiple Leadership	74	18.6
Transactional Leadership	102	25.7
Transformational Leadership	67	16.9

Note: Details may not add up due to rounding

Table 3 shows the distribution of leadership styles among the school heads. The result shows that majority of the school heads were democratic *(n = 116, 29.2%)*. Subsequently, a cohort of school leaders identified as transactional leaders (n = 102, 25.7%) was noted, consistent with the findings of Hall and Thompson (2019), which indicate that transactional leadership is frequently employed by school heads who prioritize structure, regulations, and the attainment of short-term objectives. Additionally, a segment of the school leaders exhibits multiple leadership styles (n = 74, 18.6%), suggesting that a part of the total responses reflects the presence of two or more leadership approaches. Furthermore, there were transformational school leaders (n = 67, 16.9%), which supports the findings of Leithwood and Jantzi (2020) that, although transformational leadership proves to be effective, it is relatively rare in educational institutions. Lastly, a least portion of the total respondents' perceptions possess authoritative *(n = 24,6.0%)* and Laissez-faire *(n = 14,3.5%)* leadership styles, indicating these approaches are less commonly perceived among the school heads. This aligns with the research conducted by Douglas and Arnold (2017), which indicates that authoritative and laissez-faire leadership styles are rarely observed in educational settings and are linked to particular difficulties in achieving effective leadership.

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 12, Issue 3, pp: (91-100), Month: May - June 2025, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Relationship of Organizational Climate and Organizational Work Commitment towards Leadership Styles of School Heads

Table 4. Fisher Exact Test of Organizational Climate and Organizational Work Commitment towards Leadership Styles of School Heads

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	p
Leadership Styles	Organizational Climate	0.3548
	Organizational Work Commitment	0.2159

Table 4 shows that there is insufficient evidence to conclude that there is significant association between organizational climate and leadership styles *(p = 0.3548)* at *0.05* level of significance.

Likewise, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that there is significant association between organizational work commitment and leadership styles *(p = 0.2159)*.

Effects of Organizational Climate and Organizational Work Commitment on the Leadership Styles of School Heads

Table 5 shows the likelihood ratio test for the overall significance , indicating that there is insufficient evidence to conclude that at least one independent variable has a significant effect on leadership styles $(X_{10}^2 = 8.702, p = 0.561)$. Martin and Thomas (2019) finds insufficient evidence to conclude that certain variables, such as organizational climate and organizational commitment significantly affect leadership behaviors.

Table 5. Likelihood Ratio Test for Overall Significance

Model	*df*	*x^2*	*p*
Full Model	10	8.702	0.561

Consequently, the likelihood ratio test for individual significance verifies the likelihood ratio test for overall significance, given that there is insufficient evidence to conclude that organizational climate ($X_5^2 = 2.749, p = 0.739$) *a*nd organizational work commitment $(X_5^2 = 7.039, p = 0.218)$ do not have a significant effect on leadership styles.

Table 6. Likelihood Ratio Test for Individual Significance

Variable	df	*x^2*	*p*
Organizational Climate	5	2.749	0.739
Organizational Work Commitment	5	7.039	0.218

Furthermore, based on Wald's test of coefficients in Table 7, at 0.05 level of significance, none of the predictors are statistically significant in explaining variance in the dependent variable for any of the leadership styles, with p-values greater than 0.05.

Table 7. Wald's Test of Coefficients

Y - Level	Term	Coefficient	se	Wald's z	p
Authoritative	(Intercept)	-1.266	2.186	-0.579	0.563
Authoritative	Organizational Commitment	-0.068	0.401	-0.169	0.866
Authoritative	Organizational Climate	0.098	0.486	0.202	0.840
Democratic	(Intercept)	1.563	1.372	1.140	0.254
Democratic	Organizational Commitment	-0.344	0.253	-1.360	0.174
Democratic	Organizational Climate	0.065	0.306	0.214	0.831

Laissez-faire	(Intercept)	-0.678	2.741	-0.247	0.805
Laissez-faire	Organizational Commitment	-0.723	0.478	-1.512	0.131
Laissez-faire	Organizational Climate	0.444	0.618	0.718	0.473
Transformational	(Intercept)	-0.719	1.573	-0.457	0.647
Transformational	Organizational Commitment	0.085	0.291	0.291	0.771
Transformational	Organizational Climate	0.064	0.347	0.184	0.854
Transactional	(Intercept)	1.010	1.399	0.722	0.470
Transactional	Organizational Commitment	0.114	0.263	0.434	0.664
Transactional	Organizational Climate	-0.276	0.308	-0.896	0.371

Note: Reference level - Multiple Leadership Style = 0

IV. DISCUSSION

The Organizational Climate of School Heads in Davao Region

The findings of this study indicate a predominantly positive organizational climate among school heads in the Davao Region. This suggests that school leaders foster an environment that is conducive to professional growth, collaboration, and academic excellence. This is in line with the statement of Selamat et al., (2013) that school heads who felt supported by their staff and had an inclusive, transparent decision-making process were more likely to report a favorable organizational climate. Moreover, this perception was correlated with their positive attitudes toward their leadership role and overall satisfaction with their job. In addition, Simmons and Monroe (2021) showed that principals who worked in schools with a supportive organizational climate (e.g., positive relationships, adequate resources, trust, and collaboration) expressed high levels of agreement with statements about having a good work atmosphere. They also reported higher job satisfaction, which in turn positively impacted school performance.

However, the slightly lower score for institutional vulnerability indicates the need for continued efforts in fortifying institutional stability and mitigating external challenges. Moving forward, school heads should focus on sustaining collegial leadership, reinforcing professional behavior, and maintaining high achievement standards while addressing areas that may pose risks to institutional resilience. This is supported by the study of Hallinger and Heck (2021) which suggests that school leaders who prioritize academic success and create high expectations for teachers and students have a positive impact on student learning outcomes. Likewise, school leaders who focus on fostering a culture of high academic expectations significantly improve student outcomes (Leithwood and Jantzi, 2020). Hence, leaders who value academic success and implement strategies to promote academic rigor influence both teaching practices and student achievement (Robinson and Timperley, 2022).

This is in line with the statement of Day and Gu (2010) teachers in schools with supportive leadership demonstrate high levels of professional behavior and commitment. In addition, Hargreaves and Fullan (2021) noted that strong leadership creates an environment where teachers feel valued and are motivated to maintain high levels of professionalism in the classroom. Leaders who prioritize professional development, feedback, and collegial relationships are instrumental in shaping teachers' professional conduct (Blase and Blase, 2020).

The Organizational Commitment of Davao Region School Heads

The findings show that the level of organizational commitment among school heads in the Davao Region reflects a strong connection to their institutions. Their affective commitment, which relates to their emotional attachment and identification with the organization, demonstrates a deep sense of belonging and passion for their roles. This suggests that many school heads genuinely enjoy being part of their schools and are motivated to contribute to their institutions' success.

Additionally, school leaders who have a strong emotional connection to their schools are more inclined to demonstrate enthusiasm, encourage staff dedication, and aim for long-term objectives related to the success of the institution (Fisher and

Smith, 2018). Likewise, Lewis and Blackwell (2017) discover that leaders who have a strong emotional attachment to their organizations are more inclined to show enthusiasm and take actions that foster school improvement and positive change.

Meanwhile, their continuance commitment, which pertains to the perceived costs of leaving the organization, also indicates a significant level of attachment. This implies that school heads recognize the practical benefits of staying in their roles, such as career stability, financial security, or professional growth opportunities. While their commitment is not purely driven by emotion, they also acknowledge the personal and professional stakes involved in remaining with their institutions. This aligns with the observation made by Stone and Walker (2017) that school leaders exhibiting significant levels of continuance commitment are likely to remain in their positions as they recognize considerable advantages, such as chances for professional growth and job-related incentives, which create a high cost for departing.

Furthermore, their normative commitment, which is based on a sense of obligation to the organization, suggests that they feel a strong responsibility to fulfill their roles and stay loyal to their schools. This could stem from ethical values, professional expectations, or a sense of duty to the educational system and their stakeholders. This aligns with the assertion made by Williams and Johnson (2020) that school leaders frequently perceive it as their duty to stay with their institutions, even when confronted with difficulties. Similarly, school administrators frequently perceive their positions as essential to the well-being of the school and believe they have an ethical responsibility to uphold their dedication to the institution (Scott and Thomas, 2020).

Harris and Johnson (2020) emphasize that school leaders who have strong organizational commitment actively focus on aligning their leadership behaviors with the school's goals, consistently aiming to fulfill the institution's objectives. Moreover, school leaders who are highly dedicated to their schools' goals are significantly engaged in realizing the institution's aims, which they exhibit through remarkable effort, strategic planning, and promoting a culture of teamwork (Mitchel and Robinson, 2019). The findings highlight that school heads in the Davao Region exhibit a well-rounded commitment to their institutions, driven by both personal attachment and a sense of duty. Their dedication plays a crucial role in maintaining institutional stability and fostering a positive school environment.

Leadership Styles of School heads in Davao Region

The distribution of leadership styles among school heads reflects a preference for participatory, structured, and motivational approaches. Many leaders prioritize collaboration and shared decision-making, fostering an inclusive school environment. A significant portion also adopts a structured, performance-driven approach, ensuring accountability and efficiency. Some focus on vision-driven leadership, inspiring staff and promoting long-term growth. Additionally, a number of school heads demonstrate adaptability by integrating multiple leadership styles based on situational needs. Directive leadership is less common, while a hands-off approach is the least observed, indicating that most school heads prefer active involvement in school operations and decision-making. Research by Hallinger and Heck (2019) supports the idea that democratic leadership is the most common style among school administrators, particularly in environments where school leaders prioritize collaboration, inclusive decision-making, and the empowerment of teachers (McCaffrey and Smith, 2021). It is consistent with the findings of Hall and Thompson (2019), which indicate that transactional leadership is frequently employed by school heads who prioritize structure, regulations, and the attainment of short-term objectives.

Relationship of Organizational Climate and Organizational Work Commitment towards Leadership Styles of School Heads

The relationship between organizational climate, organizational work commitment, and leadership styles of school heads suggests that these factors do not exhibit a statistically significant association. This indicates that variations in leadership styles among school heads are not strongly influenced by the prevailing organizational climate or the level of commitment they demonstrate toward their institutions. Stewart and Adams (2019) indicate that although leadership style can impact climate, this effect is not always significant or direct. Additional elements, such as teachers' perceptions and external influences, add complexity to the relationship, implying a lack of sufficient evidence for a conclusive finding. Conversely, Smith and Brown (2019) finds that leaders functioning within a supportive, positive environment may be more inclined to adopt transformational or democratic approaches, whereas those in high-pressure or inflexible settings will resort to more transactional or autocratic methods.

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 12, Issue 3, pp: (91-100), Month: May - June 2025, Available at: **www.noveltyjournals.com**

The findings imply that school heads may adopt their leadership styles based on personal preferences, experiences, or external influences rather than being shaped directly by the working environment or their degree of attachment to the organization. While a positive organizational climate and high commitment levels are generally desirable for effective leadership, they do not necessarily determine the leadership approach a school head employs.

This suggests that leadership styles among school heads in the region may be shaped by other factors, such as individual leadership training, personal management philosophy, institutional policies, or contextual demands. The diversity in leadership approaches may also reflect the adaptability of school heads in responding to the unique challenges within their respective schools, rather than being constrained by the broader organizational conditions. Chen and Kao (2014) also observe that although certain research implies that leadership styles may impact organizational commitment, but there is inadequate proof to establish a significant reciprocal connection, particularly regarding the effect of commitment on leadership. Additionally, Kumar and Mahalingam (2013) suggest that the direct impact of organizational work commitment on leadership styles is neither substantial nor well-defined. They argue that other factors, like job characteristics or leadership experience, could have a more pronounced effect on leadership behavior. In addition, Lee and Chen (2016) explores the role of organizational commitment on leadership style, but finds that evidence for a strong reciprocal relationship is insufficient. The study argues that while leadership style may influence commitment, commitment's influence on leadership style is less significant and often inconsistent.

Furthermore, these findings highlight the complex nature of leadership dynamics, emphasizing that while a supportive work environment and commitment are important for school leadership, they do not directly dictate the leadership style a school head adopts.

Effects of Organizational Climate and Organizational Work Commitment on the Leadership Styles of School Heads

The overall significance of the model suggests that the included variables do not provide a strong explanatory power in predicting leadership styles. The results indicate that the model as a whole does not significantly differentiate or explain variations in leadership styles among school heads. This aligns with the findings of Robertson and Lee (2019), which indicate that there is a lack of substantial evidence supporting a meaningful connection between organizational climate and work commitment regarding leadership behavior.

This finding implies that the factors considered in the model may not have a substantial influence on leadership style selection. It is possible that leadership styles are shaped by other unexamined variables such as personal leadership philosophy, professional development experiences, or situational demands specific to each school context. Additionally, the absence of a strong relationship suggests that leadership behaviors may be more fluid and adaptable rather than strictly determined by organizational conditions or commitments.

The results highlight the complexity of leadership in educational settings, reinforcing the idea that leadership styles are influenced by multiple, possibly independent factors. It also suggests the need for further exploration into additional elements that may better explain variations in leadership approaches among school heads.

V. CONCLUSION

This study examined the organizational climate, organizational work commitment, and leadership styles of school heads in the Davao Region using both quantitative methods. The findings show that school heads generally experience a highly favorable organizational climate and demonstrate strong commitment to their institutions. Democratic leadership was found to be the most commonly observed leadership style.

The quantitative results revealed that school heads perceive their work environment as supportive, collegial, and focused on academic achievement. High levels of affective, continuance, and normative commitment suggest that school heads are emotionally connected to their schools, value their roles, and feel a sense of moral obligation to remain. A significant relationship between organizational climate and work commitment (p = 0.0005) indicates that a positive and supportive school climate contributes to higher levels of professional dedication.

However, no significant relationship was found between organizational climate or work commitment and leadership style. Despite this, the qualitative findings suggest that leadership styles are influenced more by the personal values and ethical beliefs of school heads rather than by organizational conditions alone. Teachers described their school heads as ethical, inclusive, and supportive leaders who build trust, promote collaboration, and communicate a clear vision.

REFERENCES

[1] Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 421-449.

[2] Brown, J. K., & Liu, V. H. (2021). The role of school climate in promoting resilience during times of crisis. *Journal of School Leadership and Management*, 41(3), 234-249. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2021.1894321

[3] Chen, S., et al. (2023). The Relationship Between Leadership Styles and Teacher Collaboration: A Quantitative Analysis. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 15, 2, 123-145.

[4] Douglas, C. M., & Arnold, N. S. (2017). Examining the use of authoritative and laissez-faire leadership styles in schools: A comparative study. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 42(3), 198-212.

[5] Fisher, L. D., & Smith, D. W. (2018). Commitment to educational leadership: Affective commitment and school leadership styles. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(6), 977-995. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218765458

[6] Hall, M. D., & Thompson, L. E. (2019). Transactional leadership in education: A study of leadership styles among school heads. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 45(3), 234-248.

[7] Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2019). School leadership: Exploring the various styles of educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 55(2), 167-188.

[8] Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2021). School leadership and academic achievement: The influence of principal leadership on student learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(1), 3-34. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20985347

[9] Harris, S. M., & Johnson, R. T. (2020). School leadership and organizational commitment: The role of school heads in achieving institutional goals. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 45(3), 123-145.

[10] Kumar, A., & Mahalingam, M. (2013). Work commitment and leadership styles: Does commitment drive leadership behavior? *International Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(1), 45-55.

[11] Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2020). The role of leadership in enhancing student achievement: A synthesis of research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(2), 234-270. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20922621

[12] Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2020). The role of transformational leadership in school improvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(2), 248-270.

[13] Lewis, K. P., & Blackwell, C. E. (2017). The role of affective commitment in school leadership: Enhancing enthusiasm and engagement. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 23(4), 453-470. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2017.1322311

[14] Martin, J. P., & Thomas, C. L. (2019). Evaluating the impact of leadership variables using the likelihood ratio test: An educational perspective. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management, 50*(2), 205-220.

[15] McCaffrey, T. L., & Smith, K. E. (2021). Leadership styles of school principals in the United States: Democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire approaches. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 38(4), 122-137.

[16] McGrath, C., Roxå, T., & Bolander Laksov, K. (2019). Change in a culture of collegiality and consensus-seeking: a double-edged sword. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 38(5), 1001–1014. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1603203

[17] Mitchell, D. L., & Robinson, P. J. (2019). Organizational commitment and school leadership: A study of school heads' dedication to institutional goals. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 47(5), 789-804.

[18] Moore, G. D., & Hall, A. P. (2018). Institutional vulnerability and resilience: The role of organizational climate in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 54(2), 286-322. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X17747697

[19] Nurharani Selamat, N. Z. (2013). The impact of organizational climate on teachers' job performance. *Educational Research eJournal*, 71-82.

[20] Owens, R. E., & Valesky, T. C. (2015). Organizational Behavior in Education: Leadership and School Reform. New York: Pearson.

[21] Public Education Network. (2023). PBEd Report 2023.

[22] Robertson, J. K., & Lee, T. S. (2019). Exploring organizational climate and work commitment as predictors of leadership behavior: A statistical perspective. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 33(4), 112-128.

[23] Robinson, V. M. J., & Timperley, H. (2022). Academic success and school leadership: Evidence from high-performing schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 60(4), 512-533. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-09-2021-0209

[24] Scott, L. F., & Thomas, W. H. (2020). School leadership and normative commitment: The ethical dimensions of educational leadership. *Journal of Educational Research*, 113(5), 435-449. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671. 2020.1727643

[25] Smith, J. D., & Brown, L. M. (2019). The influence of organizational climate on leadership styles: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(7), 925-945.

[26] Stewart, L. G., & Adams, P. B. (2019). Leadership styles and their influence on organizational climate: Evidence from educational institutions. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 32(4), 211-230.

[27] Trottier, T., Van Wart, M., & Wang, X. (2008). Examining the nature and significance of leadership in public organizations. *Public Administration Review, 68*(2), 321-334

[28] Williams, K. T., & Moore, R. D. (2017). Building resilience through organizational climate in schools: Exploring the role of leadership and staff collaboration. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 7(1), 45-62. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jeduresearch.2017.02.001

[29] Xiao, Yumin (2018). Research on technology leadership of principals [D]. Shanghai: Doctoral Dissertation of East China Normal University.

[30] Yasir M., Imran R., Irshad M. K., Mohamad N. A., Khan M. M. (2016). Leadership styles in relation to employees' trust and organizational change capacity: evidence from non-profit organisations. *SAGE Open*, 6(4).

[31] Zainuddin, M. H. (2020). Leadership Styles And Organizational Commitment Among Managers In Bahrain. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, Vol. 4, No. 10.