



Leadership Style and Work Motivation: Their Relationship to Organizational Commitment of Contract-of-Service Instructors in a Philippine State University

Article History:

Initial submission:	01 November 2025
First decision:	08 November 2025
Revision received:	18 April 2026
Accepted for publication:	25 April 2026
Online release:	11 May 2026

Eden Marie C. Magallones¹, ORCID No. 0009-0003-4731-0487
Christel Eve J. Maquiling¹, ORCID No. 0009-0000-65190-4705
Charlene C. Omas-as¹, ORCID No. 0009-0006-6773-5222
Regine Louise Pagas¹, ORCID No. 0009-0007-1747-9408
Allyssa G. Castronuevo², ORCID No. 0009-0003-7957-4604
Jolina B. Andaleon², ORCID No. 0009-0003-9621-9751
Hazelyn H. Dela Cruz², ORCID No. 0000-0003-1363-7417
Joseph S. Callanta³, ORCID No. 0000-0001-5807-0851

¹Bachelor of Science in Psychology, Cavite State University-Silang Campus, Indang, Cavite, Philippines

²Faculty, Department of Arts & Sciences, Cavite State University-Silang Campus, Indang, Cavite, Philippines

³Chairperson, Department of Arts & Sciences, Cavite State University-Silang Campus, Indang, Cavite, Philippines

Abstract

Faculty members in higher education are expected to excel in teaching, research, and professional development, thus, requiring effective leadership, motivation, and organizational commitment. Most newly hired employees seek regularization to secure stable employment and benefits that allow them to remain with the company long-term. However, contract-of-service employees are excluded from these opportunities, highlighting a significant and concerning disparity. In the Philippines' local universities and colleges (LUCs), many educators work under contract-of-service (COS) arrangements characterized by short-term contracts and defined roles. This study employed a quantitative correlational design to examine the relationships among the variables. Data were collected from 300 contract-of-service instructors across all Cavite State University campuses using standardized instruments: the Vannsimpco Leadership Survey for leadership style, the Work Motivation and Satisfaction Questionnaire for work motivation, and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire for organizational commitment. Results indicated that autocratic-transformational leadership was the most dominant leadership style perceived by the participants. Moreover, participants reported moderate work motivation and slightly high organizational commitment levels. Furthermore, a weak but statistically significant positive relationship was identified between organizational commitment and various leadership styles, including autocratic-transactional, democratic-transformational, democratic-transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire. Additionally, work motivation showed a weak negative significant relationship with factors like work content, promotion, and recognition but a weak positive significant relationship with general aspects. Importantly, leadership style did not predict organizational commitment, but work motivation did. These findings suggest that improving work motivation could enhance organizational commitment. Campus administrators and higher-ups are encouraged to use these insights to strengthen faculty commitment. Future studies should involve a broader participant pool, include other state universities, and refine variable correlations to produce more comprehensive findings.

Keywords: leadership style, work motivation, organizational commitment, contract-of-service instructors, state universities



Copyright © 2026. The Author/s. Published by VMC Analytik Multidisciplinary Journal News Publishing Services. Leadership Style, Work Motivation, And Their Relationship to Organizational Commitment of Contract-Of-Service Instructors in a Philippine State University © 2026 Eden Marie C. Mag, Christel Eve J. Maquiling, Charlene C. Omas-as, Regine Louise Pagas, Allyssa G. Castronuevo, Jolina B. Andaleon, Joseph S. Callanta and Hazelyn H. Dela Cruz is an open access article licensed under [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). This permits the copying, redistribution, remixing, transforming, and building upon the material in any medium or format for any purpose, even commercially, provided that appropriate credit is given to the copyright owner/s through proper and standard citation.

INTRODUCTION

Every newly hired employee wants to become regularized in their line of work, secure tenure, and obtain benefits that will enable them to stay

with the company longer. This is something that contract-of-service employees are not able to do, which raises serious concerns. As of 2022, 648,215 government employees were under contract or on a job order, according to the

Inventory of Government Human Resources. Kilusang Mayo Uno (KMU), a labor organization, claims that over twenty-five (25) million workers are on contracts, which accounts for 60% of all hired workers. These figures indicate that a substantial proportion of Filipino workers are excluded from civil service laws, rules, and regulations. Contract-of-service employment has thus become widely recognized as a pervasive practice, particularly within public universities (Dabu, 2022), largely as a response to shortages in regular teaching positions funded by the national budget and increasing student enrollment.

Within this broader national context, it is important to study how contractual employment manifests in higher education institutions at the local level. In the Philippines, higher education institutions are classified into three types: State Universities and Colleges (SUCs), Local Colleges and Universities (LCUs), and Private Higher Education Institutions. Among these, SUCs comprises 558 campuses in the Philippines, including satellite campuses. SUCs are any public institution of higher learning created by an Act passed by the Congress of the Philippines, fully funded by the national government as determined by the Philippine Congress (International Affairs Service, Commission on Higher Education). According to Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Chairman J. Prospero de Vera III, in 2023, it is reported that more than 50 percent of enrollees are now applying in state universities and colleges (SUCs) (Mateo, 2023). At the regional level, CALABARZON, particularly the province of Cavite host the highest number of SUCs, with 15 universities, including the satellite campuses. A total of 11 out of these 15 universities are of Cavite State University campuses including its main campus: Indang, Rosario, Naic, Cavite City, Carmona, Imus, Trece, Silang, Tanza, Bacoor, and General Trias. Therefore, Cavite State University is the largest SUC operating in Cavite; thus, this is where the study was conducted. Focusing on this institution allows for a more detailed examination of how contractualization and institutional factors interact in shaping teacher's experience.

Even within short-term or contractual employment arrangements, their commitment to their organization is necessary, as it can affect not just the knowledge students acquire but also the instructor's own motivation, drive, and passion for teaching. In a study by Prempeh and Kim (2022), organizational management encourages and inspires teachers through motivation such as to help them grow in awareness which can be included in a non-monetary motivation, to increase their level of commitment. Furthermore, Dahliana and Purba (2020) stated that work motivation positively affects organizational commitment. Regarding leadership style and work motivation, Baidi et al. (2020) stated that leadership style directly affects work motivation; thus, improving leadership style will motivate employees. In addition to that, Aboudahr and Jiahli (2019) stated that there was a positive relationship between school-distributed leadership and teachers' organizational commitment. It indicates that a leadership style contributes significantly to a teacher's organizational commitment. When it comes to autocratic leadership style, Boye (2023) stated that it is more prevalent among head teachers than transactional and democratic leadership styles. On the other hand, as per (Zhang et al., 2023), it was found out that Laissez-faire leadership is universally considered to be the most ineffective leadership style. However, Espia (2023) stated in a local study that Laissez-Faire leadership is moderately evident among school administrators. Transformational leadership assumes that institutions require a significant change, and follower's desire personal and close connections with their leaders. A systematic review by Algothani and Mydin (2022) stated that transformational leadership is essential to teachers' organizational commitment to schools. Leaders who practice transactional leadership are typically task-oriented and focused on managing their followers, maintaining the chain of command, and achieving results rather than driving change. In a study by Junaid et al. (2023), employees' organizational commitment mediated the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership

styles. Even the majority perceive transactional as not a realistic style. Still, studies support that it affects organizational commitment. The local study of Morales (2022) was aimed to provide school leaders with information related to transformational leadership to create an action plan in relation to teacher work motivation.

Despite the wealth of research on leadership styles, the most effective leadership approach in universities in the Philippines particularly for Contract of Service (COS) instructors remains largely unexplored. Understanding how leadership styles influence Contract of Service (COS) instructors' work motivation and organizational commitment is crucial, as these factors may directly affect teaching quality, student learning outcomes, and the overall development of the teaching-learning process. Further to that, the extent to which work motivation influences organizational commitment among these instructors remains uncertain, necessitating further investigation. Thus, the study aims to determine the relationship between leadership style, work motivation, and organizational commitment of contract-of-service instructors in Cavite State University. By exploring these relationships, this study seeks to provide valuable insights that can help university administrators, particularly deans and department heads, implement effective leadership strategies that foster a more engaging and supportive work environment. A deeper understanding of how leadership styles, whether transformational, transactional, autocratic, democratic, or laissez-faire impact work motivation and commitment can lead to targeted interventions that enhance faculty retention, job satisfaction, and teaching effectiveness.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Democratic Leadership Style. Democratic leaders seek feedback and involve subordinates in decision-making. Studies by (Aboudahr & Jiali 2019) show a positive link between democratic leadership and teacher commitment. While in Turkey, Ethiopia, and Cameroon, it increased organizational

commitment (Cilek, 2019) In the Philippines, democratic leadership in Catholic schools resulted in high teacher commitment (Magallanes & Dioso, 2020). Similar correlations are observed in higher education institutions internationally (Agarwal & Mukherjee, 2020; Zamin & Hussin, 2021).

Autocratic Leadership Style. Autocratic leadership is characterized by the leader holding centralized decision-making authority, whereas democratic leadership emphasizes collaboration and the inclusion of subordinates in decision-making processes. Boye (2023) and Lumumba et al. (2021) found it prevalent in African schools. Ayele (2022) noted it had no impact on affective commitment but influenced normative and continuance commitment. Contextual assessment across various education levels is recommended to verify these results.

Laissez-faire Leadership Style. In a laissez-faire leadership framework, leaders presume that employees understand their roles and are capable of executing tasks autonomously, allowing the leader to take a hands-off approach. Though often viewed as ineffective (Zhang et al., 2023), some studies (Donkor et al., 2021) found it positively affects job performance. However, most research (Kern & Selamat, 2022; Robert & Vandenberghe, 2020) links it negatively with organizational commitment. Mixed findings call for further studies in varying regions and times.

Transformational Leadership. Transformational leadership is based on the premise that organizations need substantial change, and that followers seek meaningful and close relationships with their leaders. Several studies (Algothani & Mydin, 2022; Gyeltshen, 2019; Madjid & Samsudin, 2021) report positive effects on teacher commitment in countries like Bhutan, Indonesia, and Turkey. Others (Amzat et al., 2023) found no significant impact, showing cultural differences might play a role.

Transactional Leadership. Transactional leadership emphasizes task completion, strict

adherence to hierarchy, and goal achievement over organizational change. Though often undervalued, studies (Junaid et al., 2023; Ramli, 2019; Halim et al., 2021) confirm its positive effect on organizational commitment. Contrastingly, Gardner (2018) reported no significant relationship in government employees, indicating mixed results that warrant further study.

Work Motivation. Motivation influences classroom success and institutional performance. Morales (2022) emphasized the role of transformational leadership in boosting teacher motivation. Motivation arises from internal/external sources and is crucial for work productivity. Studies (Naile & Selesho, 2014) show leadership styles directly affect teacher performance and motivation. Although some studies (Mahzan & Nordin, 2021) found only moderate links between leadership style and motivation, more research is needed, especially on structural leadership.

Organizational Commitment. Organizational success depends on committed employees. Motivation significantly affects commitment (Jufriadi & Kusuma, 2020; Bytyqi, 2020). Teachers who are highly committed improve school performance. Studies (Celep, Bülbül, & Tunç, 2000, as cited in Ateş & Türk, 2022) stress the importance of teacher commitment in educational organizations. While motivation is strongly linked with all three components of organizational commitment affective, continuance, and normative (Rachman, 2022). Future research should include additional variables to further explore this relationship.

METHODS

Design. The study utilized correlational design. According to Bhandari (2022), a correlational research design investigates relationships between variables without the researcher controlling or manipulating any of them. In this study, the design was used to determine the relationship that exists between leadership style and work organizational commitment, and work motivation and organizational

commitment of contract-of-service instructors. Furthermore, in predictive design, the goal of the investigation is to determine prediction capability of a given variable (IvyPanda, 2023). In this study, the design was used to determine if leadership styles predict organizational commitment of the participants and if work motivation predicts the organizational commitment of the participants. The data was analyzed using JAMOVI version 2.4. The significance level was set at 0.05.

Population and Sampling. The participants of the study consist of contract-of-service instructors exclusively employed at Cavite State University campuses, with no other part-time jobs. Following the guidelines of Borg and Gall (1979, as cited in Delice, 2010), survey research generally requires 100 samples per major subgroup and 20 to 50 samples per minor subgroup. Therefore, approximately 100 participants were initially planned for inclusion. Cluster sampling technique was employed to select the participants from the population. However, due to the large population size, the researcher utilized G power. Power analysis was conducted using G*Power software to determine the appropriate sample size (Faul et.al., 2009), which indicated that a total of 368 instructors would be required, assuming an effect size of 0.03 (between small and medium), an alpha level of 0.05, and a statistical power of 0.80.

Instrumentation and Data Gathering Process. To answer the study's specific objectives, the researchers employed multiple standardized instruments. The Vannsimpco Leadership Survey (VLS) was used to assess the participants' leadership styles; the Work Motivation and Satisfaction Questionnaire measured participants' work motivation; and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) evaluated the level of organizational commitment. After obtaining the necessary approvals, the paper-and-pen questionnaires were distributed with an informed consent letter outlining the study's objective, voluntary participation, and confidentiality. Only participants who provided consent take part in

the survey. Collected data were then encoded, analyzed using statistical software, and securely stored to ensure anonymity and confidentiality, with access limited to the researchers.

Vannsimpco Leadership Survey (VLS).

Vannsimpco Leadership Survey (VLS), a hybrid-based survey employing questions to combine leadership qualities into relevant categories, was developed by Barry A. Vann, Jennifer A. Simpson, and Aaron N. Coleman of the University of the Cumberlands, in collaboration with SBS Swiss Business School in 2014. The instrument includes 27 items categorized into nine leadership types: transactional, democratic, autocratic, autocratic-transformational, autocratic-transactional, democratic-transformational, democratic-transactional, transformational, and *laissez-faire* (delegative). Its wording enables the assessment of how staff and subordinates perceive their supervisors' leadership styles. VLS was used to determine the most dominant leadership style of the participants and to examine its relationship with organizational commitment. Responses were measured in a 5-point Likert scale, Strongly Disagree was equivalent for 1 point, Disagree for 2 points, Neutral for 3 points, Agree for 4 points, and Strongly Agree for 5 points. The reliability of the VLS was evaluated using correlation coefficients, specifically Pearson's Product Moment Correlation (r). According to Vann et al., (2014), reliability was confirmed through this method. In the pilot study, the VLS was administered twice to the same participants, and the correlation between the two sets of scores yielded a high reliability coefficient ($r[108] = .91, p < .001$).

Work Motivation and Satisfaction Questionnaire.

The instrument used to assess participant's work motivation and its relationship with organizational commitment was adapted from the Work Satisfaction and Motivation Questionnaire attributed to De Beer (1987). This instrument is commonly cited in literature as being conceptually aligned with Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which distinguishes

between intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors. The questionnaire included 39 items under eight dimensions—Work Content, Payment, Promotion, Recognition, Working Conditions, Benefits, Personal, and General. These dimensions are consistent with Herzberg's conceptualization of motivators and hygiene factors. Leadership and supervision-related aspects were not emphasized in the present adaptation. Responses were rated on a three-point Likert scale. True was equivalent for 1 point, not sure for 2 points, not true for 3 points. The scoring procedure for the Work Motivation and Satisfaction Questionnaire was based on participants' responses across the eight identified categories. Each item was rated on a three-point Likert scale with the following response options: 1 -True, 2 -Not sure, and 3 -Untrue. Higher scores were interpreted as indicating lower levels of perceived satisfaction or motivation. Each participant's total score was computed and interpreted according to the corresponding range of scale values. Scores ranging from 1.00 to 1.66 were interpreted as "Highly Satisfied," indicating that respondents expressed strong satisfaction with their company's reward system. Scores between 1.67 and 2.33 were classified as "Moderately Satisfied," reflecting a moderate level of satisfaction toward organizational rewards. Finally, scores from 2.34 to 3.00 were interpreted as "Dissatisfied," suggesting a low level of satisfaction with the existing reward system. These verbal interpretations correspond to the participants' overall motivation levels and serve as indicators of how satisfied or dissatisfied they are with the rewards and recognition they receive in their workplace.

The reliability of the instrument was supported by previous studies that reported high internal consistency of the subscales associated with the De Beer (1987)-based framework. Reported Cronbach's alpha values for related dimensions ranged from acceptable to excellent levels (approximately $r = .75$ to $.93$), indicating good reliability across motivational factors such as payment, promotion, working conditions, recognition, and personal factors. Overall, the

instrument demonstrates acceptable content and face validity as it measures key constructs of work motivation and job satisfaction commonly recognized in organizational psychology literature.

Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. The questionnaire for organizational commitment was developed by Porter and Smith in 1970, it was utilized to determine the level of organizational commitment among participants, as well as examine the predictive relationship of leadership style and work motivation on organizational commitment. The test consisted of 15 items that appeared to tap the three aspects of the definition of organizational commitment: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. The response format employs a 7-point Likert scale with the following anchors: strongly disagree, moderately disagree, slightly disagree, neither agree nor disagree, slightly agree, moderately agree, strongly agree. The organizational commitment questionnaire, the instrument demonstrated strong internal reliability and validity. Cronbach's alpha values ranged from 0.82 to 0.93, with a median of 0.90, indicating high internal consistency. Item correlations on the commitment scale ranged from 0.36 to 0.72, with a median of 0.64, and test-retest reliability values ranged from 0.53 to 0.75. The instrument also showed predictive validity, as it consistently related to employee turnover, absenteeism, tenure, and job performance in the expected direction. Furthermore, convergent validity across six different samples ranged from 0.62 to 0.74, with a median of 0.70, exceeding discriminant validity correlations ($r = 0.52$ vs. 0.42). Overall, these results confirm the OCQ's reliability and consistent validity.

Data Analysis. The researchers conducted data analysis using statistical methods in Jamovi version 2.4, ensuring accurate and comprehensive results. Leadership style, work motivation, and organizational commitment were assessed using the mean, which provides a precise average reflecting the significance of each observation, and standard deviation, which measures the variation from the mean.

Relationships between variables were analyzed using Pearson's r , a widely used method for assessing relationships between variables (Walk & Rupp, 2022). Additionally, Multiple Linear Regression was employed to examine the predictive relationships between multiple independent variables and a dependent variable.

Ethical Considerations. Before conducting the survey, a formal letter requesting permission was provided to the research personnel, coordinators, and the university president, who granted approval through a signed agreement. Prior to participation, respondents provided informed consent, ensuring their voluntary involvement. All responses remained anonymous, and the collected data were handled with strict confidentiality.

RESULTS

Most Dominant Leadership Style. Table 1 shows that autocratic-transformational leadership ($M = 4.41$, $SD = 0.65$) emerged as the most dominant leadership style among participants, ranking highest among all categories. This was followed closely by democratic-transactional ($M = 4.39$, $SD = 1.01$).

Other styles observed in descending order were transactional ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 0.67$), democratic ($M = 4.30$, $SD = 0.66$), democratic-transformational ($M = 4.27$, $SD = 1.01$), autocratic ($M = 4.22$, $SD = 0.68$), transformational ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 1.01$), autocratic-transactional ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 0.99$), and laissez-faire ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 1.13$).

Table 1
Most Dominant Leadership Style

Variables	Mean	SD	Rank
Transactional	4.33	0.67	3
Democratic	4.30	0.66	4
Autocratic	4.22	0.68	6
Autocratic -Transformational	4.41	0.65	1
Autocratic - Transactional	3.92	0.99	8
Democratic - Transformational	4.39	1.01	2
Democratic - Transactional	4.27	1.01	5
Transformational	4.16	1.01	7
Laissez-faire	3.82	1.13	9

Legend: 1.00-1.75 (Very Low); 1.76- 2.50 (Low); 2.51-3.25 (Moderate); 3.26-4.00 (High); 4.01-5.00 (Very High)

Based on the given scale, most leadership styles were interpreted as very high, while autocratic-transactional and laissez-faire were interpreted as high. This indicates that the prevailing leadership style among participants involved maintaining authority over key organizational decisions, goals, and directions while also empowering subordinates to pursue their own objectives. By fostering a supportive and motivating work environment, leaders were able to facilitate effective change and promote organizational transformation.

Work Motivation of Participants. The findings in Table 2 revealed that contract-of-service instructors were generally satisfied with their teaching roles. They expressed high satisfaction with aspects such as recognition (M = 1.51, SD = 0.54), work conditions (M = 1.45, SD = 0.52), and personal fulfillment (M = 1.22, SD = 0.50). However, moderate satisfaction was reported in areas like payment (M = 1.93, SD = 0.55), promotion opportunities (M = 1.71, SD = 0.64), benefits (M = 1.98, SD = 0.68), and general aspects of work (M = 2.12, SD = 0.77), including their relationship with administrators and thoughts about alternative employment. Overall, while instructors felt positively about their work and environment, moderate satisfaction in compensation and career growth suggests room for improvement.

Table 2
Work Motivation of Participants

Variables	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Work Content	1.46	0.27	Highly Satisfied
Payment	1.93	0.55	Moderately Satisfied
Promotion	1.71	0.64	Moderately Satisfied
Recognition	1.51	0.54	Highly Satisfied
Work Condition	1.45	0.52	Highly Satisfied
Benefits	1.98	0.68	Moderately Satisfied
Personal	1.22	0.50	Highly Satisfied
General	2.12	0.77	Moderately Satisfied
Work Content	1.46	0.27	High Highly Satisfied
Overall Mean	1.67	0.56	Moderate

Legend: 1.00-1.66 (Highly Satisfied); 1.67-2.33 (Moderately Satisfied); 2.34-3.00 (Dissatisfied)

Level of Organizational Commitment. This signifies that contract-of-service instructors will slightly highly commit to the organization given the benefits they offer. According to Jufriadi and Kusuma (2020), employees'

organizational commitment is strongly influenced by their level of motivation.

Table 3
Level of Organizational Commitment

Variables	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Organizational Commitment	4.72	1.43	Slightly High Commitment

Relationship of Autocratic – Transformational Leadership Style and Organizational Commitment. Table 4 shows the relationship between autocratic – transformational leadership style and organizational commitment. Data analysis revealed that $r = -0.091$, $p = 0.115$, implying that there was a negative but not significant relationship between the most dominant perceived leadership style which is autocratic-transformational leadership style and organizational commitment, thus the null hypothesis is retained.

The result contradicted the findings of Ratican's (2020) study, which suggested that adopting an autocratic-transformational leadership style would increase employee satisfaction and prevent them from leaving the company.

Table 4
Relationship of Autocratic – Transformational Leadership Style and Organizational Commitment

Variables	Pearson's r Value	p value	Interpretation
Autocratic- Transformational	-0.091	0.115	Retain Ho
Organizational Commitment	No correlation		

Note: Retain H_0 if p-value is > 0.05 ; Reject H_0 if p-value is < 0.05 .

Relationship of Work Content Motivation and Organizational Commitment. Table 5 shows the relationship between work content motivation and organizational commitment. Data analysis revealed that, $r = -0.182$, $p < 0.05$ implying that there was a weak and negative relationship between work content motivation and organizational commitment. It could be inferred that the null hypothesis is rejected.

The study found that contract-of-service instructors' organizational commitment tended to decrease as the complexity of their work increased. This is reflected in item four of the

questionnaire, which states, “My work is easy,” receiving the highest mean score, with most respondents indicating that it was not true. This suggests that the majority of participants perceive their work as challenging, which may influence their likelihood of leaving or staying in the organization, resulting in a weak relationship between work content and organizational commitment. Conversely, Pongpeng and Pongpeng (2022) reported that employees with high motivation related to their work content were more likely to exhibit strong organizational commitment.

Table 5
Relationship of Work Content Motivation and Organizational Commitment

Variables	Pearson's <i>r</i> Value	<i>p</i> value	Interpretation
Work Content Motivation	-0.182	0.002	Reject H_0
Organizational commitment	Negative Weak		

Note: Retain H_0 if p -value is > 0.05; Reject H_0 if p -value is < 0.05.

Relationship of Payment Motivation and Organizational Commitment. Table 6 reveals the computed $r = -0.106$, $p = 0.067$ between payment motivation and organizational commitment. As shown in the table, the variables were greater than the alpha value of 0.05 thus, interpreted as no correlation between the two variables. The study's findings indicate that contract-of-service instructors' commitment to the organization is not solely guaranteed by financial compensation, which serves as an extrinsic motivator.

Table 6
Relationship of Payment Motivation and Organizational Commitment

Variables	Pearson's <i>r</i> Value	<i>p</i> value	Interpretation
Payment Motivation	-0.106	0.067	Retain H_0
Organizational commitment	No correlation		

Note: Retain H_0 if p -value is > 0.05; Reject H_0 if p -value is < 0.05.

The study's findings ran contrary to those of Solong et al. (2021), suggesting that extrinsic motivation such as a high salary was correlated

with organizational commitment, with employees' commitment increasing as organizational commitment increased.

Relationship of Promotion Motivation and Organizational Commitment. Table 7 below shows the relationship between promotion motivation and organizational commitment. Data analysis revealed that, $r = -0.165$, $p < .001$ implying that there was a weak and negative relationship between promotion motivation and organizational commitment.

Table 7
Relationship of Promotion Motivation and Organizational Commitment

Variables	Pearson's <i>r</i> Value	<i>p</i> value	Interpretation
Promotion Motivation	-0.165	0.004	Reject H_0
Organizational commitment	Negative Weak		

Note: Retain H_0 if p -value is > 0.05; Reject H_0 if p -value is < 0.05.

In this study, higher scores on the promotion motivation scale reflect participants' dissatisfaction with promotion opportunities, meaning they feel that opportunities for advancement are limited or even nonexistent. The negative correlation indicates that contract-of-service instructors who are less satisfied with their chances for promotion also tend to show slightly lower commitment to the organization. As observed in the item 22 of the questionnaire states, “I will be promoted within the next two years,” received the highest mean, with most respondents answering, “not sure.” This reflects the reality that promotion opportunities for contract-of-service instructors in state universities are limited or uncertain. Corresponding to that, Pongpeng and Pongpeng (2022) reported that employees showed higher organizational commitment when motivated by the organization's promotion system, highlighting a discrepancy with the current study's findings.

Relationship of Recognition Motivation and Organizational Commitment. Table 8 reveals the computed $r = -0.186$, $p < .05$ between recognition motivation and organizational commitment,

which was less than the alpha value of 0.05 thus, interpreted as a weak and negative correlation between recognition motivation and organizational commitment therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. Since the p-value is less than the alpha level of 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating a statistically significant relationship. In this study, higher score on the recognition motivation scale indicate unsatisfied recognition motivation, meaning participants feel that they do not receive enough acknowledgement or praise for their work. The negative weak correlation suggests that contract-of-service instructors who experience lower satisfaction with recognition tend to have slightly lower organizational commitment.

Table 8
Relationship of Recognition Motivation and Organizational Commitment

Variables	Pearson's r Value	p value	Interpretation
Recognition Motivation	-0.186	0.001	Reject Ho
Organizational commitment	Negative Weak		

Note: Retain Ho if p-value is > 0.05; Reject Ho if p-value is < 0.05.

Item 25 of the questionnaire states, "I am praised regularly for my work," had the highest mean, with most participants responding, "not sure." This may suggest the perception that recognition earned by participants are inconsistent and lacking. Thus, these findings suggest that simply receiving recognition occasionally is not a strong factor in influencing contract-of-service instructors' decision to remain committed to the organization. Similarly, Pongpeng and Pongpeng (2022) reported that employees' organizational commitment increases when they are motivated by recognition.

Relationship of Work Condition Motivation and Organizational Commitment. The results in Table 9 indicate a weak negative relationship between work conditions and organizational commitment among Contract-of-Service (COS) instructors ($r = -0.171$, $p = 0.003$). Since the p-value is less than the alpha level of 0.05, the null

hypothesis is rejected, indicating a statistically significant relationship. The negative correlation suggests that as unfavorable work conditions increases, organizational commitment tends to slightly decrease, although the strength of this relationship is weak.

Table 9
Relationship of Work Condition Motivation and Organizational Commitment

Variables	Pearson's r Value	p value	Interpretation
Work Condition Motivation	-0.171	0.003	Reject Ho
Organizational commitment	Negative Weak		

Note: Retain Ho if p-value is > 0.05; Reject Ho if p-value is < 0.05.

Specifically, item number 30 of the questionnaire, which states, "I am never overworked," received the highest mean, with the majority of participants responding untrue. This indicates that the majority of COS instructors perceive themselves as overworked, which may negatively influence their commitment to the organization. However, because the correlation is weak, work conditions alone do not strongly determine organizational commitment, but they may contribute to instructors' plan to stay or leave.

These findings align with the study of Moonsri (2018), which highlights that job satisfaction related to work conditions plays a role in organizational commitment. In this context, when COS instructors perceive their workload as excessive or their working conditions as unfavorable, their commitment to the institution tends to decline. This highlights the importance of improving work conditions as a supportive factor in fostering organizational commitment among contract-based faculty members.

Relationship of Benefits Motivation and Organizational Commitment. Table 10 reveals the computed $r = -0.102$, $p = 0.077$ between benefits motivation and organizational commitment, which was greater than the alpha value of 0.05 thus, interpreted as no correlation between the two variables.

Table 10
Relationship of Benefits Motivation and Organizational Commitment

Variables	Pearson's rValue	p value	Interpretation
Benefits Motivation	-0.102	0.077	Retain Ho
Organizational commitment	Negative Weak		

Note: Retain Ho if p-value is > 0.05; Reject Ho if p-value is < 0.05.

The study's findings made it clear that contract-of-service instructors' commitment to the company is not always ensured by benefits, which is seen as an extrinsic incentive and discusses salary. Contradictory to the study of Ibrahim (2023), employee perks were found to be favorably related to organizational commitment. Employees that received beneficial advantages were more committed.

Relationship of Personal Motivation and Organizational Commitment. The results in Table 11 shows a weak negative relationship between personal motivation and organizational commitment among contract-of-service instructors ($r = -0.264$, $p = 0.001$). Since the p-value is less than the alpha level of 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating that the relationship is statistically significant.

The negative correlation suggests that contract-of-service instructors who experience lower satisfaction with personal motivation tend to have slightly lower organizational commitment, although the relationship is weak. Higher scores on the personal motivation scale may indicate unsatisfied personal motivation, meaning that the participants feel their personal needs such as being assigned work aligned with their qualifications, skills, or preferred department are not fully met. Items 35 and 36 of the questionnaires, which state, "I am given work in accordance with my qualifications and skills" and "I work in the department of my choice," both obtained the highest mean scores, with most participants responding true. This suggests that when contract-of-service instructors' personal motivation is not fully satisfied, their commitment to the organization tends to be slightly lower.

Table 11
Relationship of Personal Motivation and Organizational Commitment

Variables	Pearson's rValue	p value	Interpretation
Personal Motivation	-0.264	0.001	Reject Ho
Organizational commitment	Negative Weak		

Note: Retain Ho if p-value is > 0.05; Reject Ho if p-value is < 0.05.

In comparison, Desa et al. (2021) found that individuals' personal values significantly influenced organizational commitment, suggesting a positive relationship between the two variables. The present study also found a significant relationship between personal motivation and organizational commitment; however, the relationship was weak and negative. This may suggest that contextual factors, such as employment status and job security, may influence how personal motivation relates to organizational commitment among contract -of-service instructors.

Relationship of General Motivation and Organizational Commitment. The data in Table 12 reveal that the computed $r = .117$, $p = 0.044$ between general motivation and organizational commitment was less than the alpha of 0.05, thus interpreted as a weak and positive relationship between general and organizational commitment. In this study, higher scores on the general motivation scale reflect unsatisfied general motivation, meaning participants feel less motivated overall. On the other hand, the positive correlation suggests that contract-of-service instructors with lower general motivation tend to have a slightly higher organizational commitment, although the strength of this relationship is weak.

These findings suggest that, while general motivation may have a slight influence on organizational commitment, it is not a strong predictor on its own. Similarly, Bytyqi (2020) reported that motivation has a positive influence on organizational commitment. Furthermore, Ateş and Buluç (2015) emphasized that intrinsic motivation is a strong predictor of overall motivation, which may help

explain the positive, though limited, association observed in the present study.

Table 12
Relationship of General Motivation and Organizational Commitment

Variables	Pearson's <i>r</i> Value	<i>p</i> value	Interpretation
General Motivation	0.117		
Organizational commitment	Positive Weak	0.044	Reject Ho

Note: Retain Ho if *p*-value is > 0.05; Reject Ho if *p*-value is < 0.05.

Leadership Style as Predictor of Organizational Commitment. A regression analysis was conducted to determine if leadership style predicts organizational commitment. The results in Table 13 indicate that none of the leadership style factors significantly predicted organizational commitment: autocratic-transactional ($B = -0.04$, $t = -0.29$, $p = 0.776$), democratic-transformational ($B = 0.24$, $t = 1.01$, $p = 0.313$), democratic-transactional ($B = 0.18$, $t = 0.68$, $p = 0.499$), transformational ($B = -0.08$, $t = -0.41$, $p = 0.685$), and laissez-faire ($B = 0.02$, $t = 0.14$, $p = 0.888$). These findings suggest that leadership style does not serve as a significant predictor of organizational commitment.

Table 13
Leadership Style as Predictor of Organizational Commitment

Predictor	Beta Coefficient (<i>B</i>)	T	<i>p</i> value
Autocratic-Transactional	-0.037	-0.285	0.776
Democratic-Transformational	0.237	1.011	0.313
Democratic-Transactional	0.179	0.677	0.499
Transformational	-0.079	-0.406	0.685
Laissez-Faire	0.015	0.141	0.888

Although some leadership styles displayed positive beta coefficients, indicating a potential positive direction of influence, these effects were not strong enough to reach statistical significance. This suggests that variations in leadership style, by themselves, do not meaningfully predict organizational commitment among contract-of-service instructors.

These findings contradict Donkor (2021), who reported that transformational and laissez-

faire leadership styles were significant predictors of organizational commitment. The discrepancy may be attributed to differences in organizational context, employment status, or contractual arrangements, which may limit the influence of leadership style on commitment among contract-of-service instructors.

Work Motivation as Predictor of Organizational Commitment. A regression analysis was conducted to determine if work motivation predicts organizational commitment. The results in Table 14 indicate that personal motivation ($B = -0.63$, $t = -2.96$, $p = <0.05$) is negatively associated with organizational commitment and general motivation ($B = 0.30$, $t = 2.81$, $p = <0.05$) is positively associated with organizational commitment. On the other hand, work content ($B = -0.27$, $t = -0.81$, $p = 0.42$), promotion ($B = 0.01$, $t = 0.05$, $p = .95$), recognition ($B = -0.20$, $t = -0.99$, $p = .33$), and work condition ($B = -0.06$, $t = -0.28$, $p = .779$) are not significantly related with organizational commitment.

Table 14
Work Motivation as Predictor of Organizational Commitment

Predictor	Beta Coefficient (<i>B</i>)	T	<i>p</i> value
Work Content	-0.274	-0.805	0.421
Promotion	0.008	0.045	0.964
Recognition	-0.195	-0.985	0.326
Work Condition	-0.058	-0.280	0.779
Personal	-0.633	-2.963	0.003

It is necessary to note that higher scores on the motivation scales indicate unsatisfied motivation. Thus, the negative correlation with personal motivation suggests that contract-of-service instructors with higher dissatisfaction in personal motivation tend to have lower organizational commitment. Conversely, the positive relationship with general motivation indicates that the participants with higher dissatisfaction in general motivation are slightly more committed, although the effect is modest.

Overall, the findings suggest that specific aspects of work motivation: personal and general, can predict organizational

commitment, while other factors do not show a significant effect.

The results are consistent with the findings of Rao (2020), who reported that work motivation significantly predicts the three components of organizational commitment. In the context of the present study, where higher scores indicate unsatisfied motivation, these findings suggest that lower satisfaction with work motivation is associated with slightly lower organizational commitment, whereas higher satisfaction may correspond to higher commitment.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that the autocratic–transformational leadership style was the most dominant among contract-of-service instructors, followed closely by democratic–transactional leadership and democratic–transformational leadership styles. This suggests that instructors prefer leaders who maintain authority over organizational decisions while simultaneously empowering subordinates and fostering a supportive work environment that facilitates change and transformation. However, despite its prevalence, the autocratic–transformational leadership style demonstrated a negative but non-significant relationship with organizational commitment ($r = -0.091$, $p = 0.115$), and regression analysis confirmed that none of the leadership styles significantly predicted commitment. This suggests that leadership style alone may not strongly influence the contract-of-service instructor commitment to the organization, which contrasts with prior studies highlighting transformational or laissez-faire leadership as significant predictors (Donkor, 2021; Ratican, 2020).

In terms of work motivation, participants reported high satisfaction with intrinsic aspects of their roles, such as work content, recognition, work conditions, and personal fulfillment, while moderate satisfaction was observed in extrinsic factors, including payment, promotion, benefits, and general work considerations.

Overall, contract-of-service instructors displayed moderate satisfaction, highlighting the importance of intrinsic motivators in contract-based employment where extrinsic rewards and career advancement may be limited. Correspondingly, participants exhibited slightly high levels of organizational commitment ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 1.43$), suggesting that professional fulfillment, recognition, and meaningful engagement in teaching activities contribute more substantially to commitment than financial or career advancement incentives.

The study also revealed a complex relationship between work motivation and organizational commitment. Weak negative relationships were observed between organizational commitment and most motivational dimensions: work content, payment, promotion, recognition, work conditions, benefits, and personal motivation, suggesting that dissatisfaction in these areas is associated with slightly lower commitment.

Conversely, general motivation displayed a weak positive relationship, indicating that overall satisfaction or broader motivational factors may moderately enhance commitment. Regression analysis further confirmed that personal and general motivation significantly predicted organizational commitment, with personal motivation negatively associated ($B = -0.63$, $p = 0.003$) and general motivation positively associated ($B = 0.30$, $p = 0.005$). Other motivational dimensions, including work content, payment, promotion, recognition, and work conditions, did not significantly predict organizational commitment.

These findings are partially consistent with prior research, such as Rao (2020), who reported that work motivation significantly predicts organizational commitment, emphasizing that increases in motivation can enhance commitment. Collectively, the results highlight that individual motivational factors, particularly personal and general motivation, play a more decisive role than leadership style in shaping organizational commitment among contract-of-service instructors.

Conclusion. This study was conducted from October 2023 to December 2023. This study aimed to determine the most dominant leadership style and work motivation of contract-of-service instructors and ascertain if there is a significant relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment and work motivation and organizational commitment, and if leadership style and work motivation could be considered as predictive factors of organizational commitment. The result revealed the most dominant perceived leadership style among contract-of-service instructors was found to be autocratic-transformational. The participants demonstrated a high level of work motivation, with aspects such as work content, recognition, work condition, and personal motivation rated at high levels. Organizational commitment among the participants was found to be slightly high, suggesting that contract-of-service instructors maintain a moderate commitment to their organization. The study explored the relationships between various leadership styles (e.g., transactional, democratic, autocratic) and organizational commitment. It was revealed that autocratic-transformational leadership styles also showed no significant correlation with organizational commitment.

Furthermore, the study conducted regression analyses to explore whether leadership styles and work motivation could predict organizational commitment. Surprisingly, the results indicated that leadership styles were not significant predictors of organizational commitment. On the other hand, aspects of work motivation, specifically personal motivation and general motivation, were significant predictors. Personal motivation showed a negative relationship, suggesting that dissatisfaction with personal needs slightly decrease organizational commitment, whereas general motivation was positively associated, indicating that overall job satisfaction slightly increase organizational commitment. Other motivational factors showed weak or non-significant relationships with organizational commitment.

Each variable had evidently proved that they were significantly correlated and not correlated with others. Overall, the study concludes that while contract-of-service instructor prefer hybrid leadership styles, these do not directly influence their organizational commitment. Instead, specific facets of work motivation particularly personal motivation and general motivation play a more decisive role in shaping organizational commitment. These findings highlight the importance of fostering intrinsic satisfaction, recognition and supportive work conditions to enhance organizational commitment in contract-based academic settings.

Recommendations. The following recommendations and suggestions were formed based on the conclusion and findings of the study. For the university administrators, focus on enhancing the work motivation of contract-of-service instructors, particularly personal and general motivation, as these factors were found to significantly predict organizational commitment. Efforts may include aligning work assignments with instructors' qualifications and preferences, providing professional development opportunities, fostering meaningful engagement in teaching activities, and implementing consistent recognition of achievements. Although participants preferred hybrid leadership styles, the study indicated that leadership style does not significantly influence organizational commitment, highlighting the need to prioritize intrinsic and general motivators over leadership approaches.

For future researchers, it is recommended to employ larger and more diverse sample of participants to gather more data. Recommending also to use other questionnaires appropriate for measuring the leadership style that does not rely solely on the preferences of respondents. Moreover, to extend the study at other local and private universities to determine whether similar patterns exist across different institutional contexts.

Furthermore, exploring the relationships between sub-dimensions of work motivation and organizational commitment, as well as additional contextual factors, may provide a more comprehensive understanding of the determinants of commitment among contract-of-service instructors.

Additionally, look for a tailored-fit and recent questionnaire that measures the work motivation of contract-of-service instructors with a lesser number of items.

Author contributions. Allyssa Castronuevo: Conceptualization, Writing-revision | Eden Marie Magallones: Conceptualization, Introduction | Christa Leve Maquiling: Conceptualization, Related literature | Regina Louise Pagas: Data collection | Charlene S. Omas-as: Results analysis | Jolina Andaleon: Finalization | Joseph Callanta: Conceptualization, Approval of final version | Hazelyn Dela Cruz: Ethics, References.

Conflict of interest. Though the institution partially funded the study, the authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding source. This study was partially funded through alumni support of Cavite State University-Silang Campus.

Artificial intelligence use. AI-assisted language editing was used for the final revision of the manuscript. All content was reviewed and approved by the authors.

Ethics approval statement. Ethical approval was sought from Cavite State University - Silang Campus prior to data collection.

Data availability statement. All data supporting the findings of this study are included within the manuscript and its supplementary materials.

Acknowledgement. The authors sincerely appreciate the support of Cavite State University in making this undertaking possible.

Publisher's disclaimer. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the publisher. The publisher disclaims any responsibility for errors or omissions.

REFERENCES

- Aboudahr, S. M., & Jiali, L. (2019). The relationship between distributed leadership and teachers' organizational commitment in Guangzhou city, China. *Journal of Educational and Management Studies*, 9(1), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.51475/jems.2019.1>
- Algothani, M., & Mydin, A. A. (2022). The influence of transformational leadership style on teachers' organizational commitment: A systematic literature review. *Multicultural Education*, 8(1), 94-104. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5860613>
- Amzat, I. H., Masrum, S. N., Ahmadu, T. S., Hamed, A., & Mohd Amirrudin, S. N. (2023). Principal leadership style and teacher commitment mediated by teacher wellbeing in Islamic schools in Malaysia. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management*, 11(2). <https://adum.um.edu.my/index.php/MOJEM/article/view/43139>
- Ateş, O. T., & Buluç, B. (2015). The Relationship between the Emotional Intelligence, Motivation and Organizational Commitment of Primary School Teachers. *Middle Eastern & African Journal of Educational Research*, (17), 31-49. https://web.archive.org/web/20181222164126/http://www.majersite.org/issue17/17_3.pdf
- Ateş, Ö. T., & Türk, Ö. (2022). The relationship between teachers' motivation and organizational commitment: The mediating role of perceived principal management style. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 5(2), 222-235.

- <https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1993.05.04.617>
- Ayele, G. (2022). Leadership styles of principals and teachers' organizational commitment in Bale Zone secondary schools. *Hill Publishing*. <https://wap.hillpublisher.com/ArticleDetails.aspx?cid=997>
- Baidi, P., Putra, H. R., & Junaidah. (2020). The effect of leadership style and work motivation on work productivity for teachers in all state junior high schools of Surakarta. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(3D), 67-72. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.081710>
- Bhandari, P. (2022, August 16). Correlational research: When & how to use. *Scribbr*. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/correlational-research/>
- Boye, R. M. (2023). Nature of leadership style employed by head teachers in public basic schools in the Ledzokuku Municipality. *Journal of Engineering Applied Science and Humanities*, 8(2), 98-107. <https://doi.org/10.53075/ljmsirq/65923363>
- Bytyqi, Q. (2020). The impact of motivation on organizational commitment: An empirical study with Kosovar employees. *Prizren Social Science Journal*, 4(3), 24-32. <https://doi.org/10.32936/pssj.v4i3.187>
- Dabu, C. (2022, September 8). Lawmaker alarmed over rising number of contractual, job-order employees in government. *INQUIRER.net*. <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1660823/lawmaker-alarmed-over-rising-number-of-contractual-job-order-employees-in-govt>
- Cilek, A. (2019). The effect of leadership on organizational commitment: A meta-analysis. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 14(4), 554-564. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v11i4.4244>
- Dahlia, D., & Purba, S. (2020). The effect of work motivation and organizational commitment on teacher's work ethics. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Research of Educational Administration and Management (ICREAM 2019), Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 40-42. Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200130.135>
- Delice, A. (2010). The Sampling Issues in Quantitative Research. *Kuram Ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri*, 10(4), 2001-2018. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ919871.pdf>
- De Beer, M. (1987). 'n Ondersoek na die rol wat arbeidsomset in die bedryf speel met spesifieke verwysing na werkbevrediging en werksmotivering [Unpublished master's dissertation]. University of the Free State, Bloemfontein.
- Desa, N. M., Hasmi, M. A. H. A., & Idris, S. (2021). Personal values and organizational commitment among administrative employees of a public university. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 11(7), 333-344. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.1.2021.117.333.344>
- Donkor, F., Dongmei, Z., & Sekyere, I. (2021). The mediating effects of organizational commitment on leadership styles and employee performance in SOEs in Ghana: A structural equation modeling analysis. *SAGE Open*, 11(2), 21582440211008894. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211008894>

- Espia, M. R. (2023). Change management strategies and leadership styles of school administrators: Their effect on the teachers' organizational commitment. *Central European Management Journal*, 31(2), 1007–1015. <https://doi.org/10.57030/23364890.cemj.31.2.104>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(4), 1149–1160. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>
- Gardner, A. (2018). *The relationship between organizational commitment and transformational and transactional leadership styles in government contract employees* (Doctoral dissertation). Liberty University. <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/1959>
- Gyeltshen, L. (2019). Principals' transformational leadership style and organizational commitment of teachers in middle secondary schools of Bhutan. *Educational Management and Innovation Journal*, 2(2), 72–85. <https://so01.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/emi/article/download/169584/138357/603333>
- Ibrahim, S. A. N. S. (2023). Stimulus of employee benefits and compensation on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science*, 5(6), 2036–2041. https://www.irjmets.com/uploadedfiles/paper/issue_6_june_2023/41899/final/fin_irjmets1686724284.pdf
- IvyPanda. (2023). *Correlational research: Explanatory and predictive designs*. <https://ivypanada.com/essays/correlational-research-explanatory-and-predictive>
- Jufriadi, F., & Kusuma, T. M. (2020). The Effect of Work Motivation on Job Performance through Improving Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment as Mediators: Study in Pt. Bank Aceh Syariah Sigli. *International Journal of Scientific and Management Research*, 3(3), 357 – 368. https://ijsmr.in/doc/ijsmr_01_6888_88.pdf
- Junaid, M. A., Rafique, S., Nasir, M., Junaid, K., & Junaid, I. (2023). The mediating role of organizational commitment between leadership style and employee job performance. *Pakistan Journal of Medical & Health Sciences*, 17(2), 105. <https://doi.org/10.53350/pjmhs2023172105>
- Halim, N., Hassan, A., Basri, R., Yusof, A., & Ahrari, S. (2021). Job satisfaction as a mediator between leadership styles and organisational commitment of teachers in Malaysia. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 17(2), 61–71. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v17i2.13398>
- Kern, G. L., & Selamat, M. N. (2022). Relationship between leadership style, self-esteem, and organizational commitment among students from research universities in Malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 12(10), 1731–1745. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v12-i10/15387>
- Lumumba, K. P., Simatwa, E. M. W., & Jane, K. (2021). Influence of leadership style on organizational performance of primary teachers training colleges in Lake Victoria Region of Kenya. *Creative Education*, 12(9), 2228–2251. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2021.129170>
- Madjid, A., & Samsudin, M. (2021). Impact of achievement motivation and transformational leadership on teacher performance mediated by organizational

- commitment. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 2(3), 123–137. <https://doi.org/10.12738/jestp.2021.3.008>
- Magallanes, V. M., & Dioso, D. P. D. (2020). Leadership style practices of principals and organizational commitment profile of employees of diocesan Catholic schools. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 3(2), 39–40. <https://doi.org/10.52006/main.v3i2.156>
- Mahzan, F. A., & Nordin, N. M. (2021). The relationship between transformational leadership practiced and the level of job satisfaction among lecturers in MARA Professional College, Malaysia. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 17(3), 154–161. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v17i3.14511>
- Mateo, J. (2023, May 31). More students applying in SUCs. *The Philippine Star*. <https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2023/05/31/2270324/more-students-applying-sucs>
- Moonsri, K. (2018). The influence of job satisfaction affecting organizational commitment of the small and medium business employee. *Asian Administration and Management Review*, 1(1), 138–146. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3263262>
- Morales, J. C. (2022). Transformational leadership and teacher work motivation in private educational institutions. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 105(1), 578–614. <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1001051720223687>
- Naile, I., & Selesho, J. M. (2014). The role of leadership in employee motivation. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(3), 175–182. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n3p175>
- Pongpeng, P., & Pongpeng, T. (2022). Relationship between employee motivation and organizational commitment of employees in private corporations. *International Conference on Management Science, Innovation and Technology*, 177–182. http://www.ijbts-journal.com/images/main_1366796758/ZU22_28_%20Preecha%20Pongpeng%20.pdf
- Prempeh, A.A. & Kim, J. (2022). The Impact of Leadership Style on Teachers' Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research Studies*, 2(8), 330–339. <https://doi.org/10.55677/ijssers/V02I08Y2022-02>
- Rachman, M. M. (2022). The impact of motivation on performance: The role of organizational commitment. *Jurnal Manajemen Teori dan Terapan*, 15(3), 376–393. <https://doi.org/10.20473/jmtt.v15i3.37848>
- Ratican, S. (2020). Assessing the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction. *Journal of Management Research*, 12(3), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jmr.v12i3.16912>
- Robert, V., & Vandenberghe, C. (2020). Laissez-faire leadership and affective commitment: The roles of leader-member exchange and subordinate relational self-concept. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 36(4), 533–551. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-020-09700-9>
- Solong, A., Wekke, I. S., Aras, D., Makbul, M., & Maulana, A. (2021). Correlation Between Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation to Employee Performance Through Commitment and Organizational Culture. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*.

- <https://www.ieomsociety.org/china2021/papers/118.pdf>
- Rao, V. V. (2020). A study on employees' commitment and work motivation – A psychological perspective as a determinant of organizational and professional commitment. *ICTACT Journal on Management Studies*, 6(4), 1297–1303.
<https://doi.org/10.21917/ijms.2020.0182>
- Vann, B. A., Coleman, A. N., & Simpson, J. A. (2014). Development of the Vannsimpco Leadership Survey: A delineation of hybrid leadership styles. *SBS Journal of Applied Business Research*, 3, 28–39.
https://jabr.sbs.edu/vol3/02_Vann-Coleman-Simpson.pdf
- Walk, M. J., & Rupp, A. A. (2022). Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Research Design*. Sage.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071812082.n439>
- Zamin, S. A., & Hussin, F. (2021). Heads of departments' leadership styles, work climate and organizational commitment enhance the job performance of university lecturers. *The Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 27(2), 1850–1858.
<https://cibgp.com/index.php/1323-6903/article/view/1090>
- Zhang, J., Wang, Y., & Gao, F. (2023). The dark and bright side of laissez-faire leadership: Does subordinates' goal orientation make a difference? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1077357.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1077357>
- Agarwal, P., & Mukherjee, S. (2020). How do the principals' democratic leadership styles contribute to teacher performance? *Journal of Educational and Learning Studies*, 3(1), 30–34.
<https://doi.org/10.32698/0942>
- Ramli, Y., Soelton, M., Magito, M., & Khotimah, N. (2019). The role of transactional leadership towards organizational commitment. *International Journal of Business and Applied Social Science*, 5(5), 35–47.
<https://doi.org/10.33642/ijbass.v5n5>