Pedagogy Review | 2026, Vol. 9, No.1, 85 – 102 | ISSN Online: 3028-1040 | ISSN Print: 3028-1059
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62718/vmca.pr-ijetas.9.1.SC-0926-015

OPEN ACCESS

Servant Leadership, Faculty Work Commitment, and Teaching Performance in Philippine Higher Education

Article History:

Initial submission:	20 September 2026
First decision:	28 September 2026
Revision received:	29 October 2026
Accepted for publication:	08 November 2026
Online release:	12 November 2026

Hermely A. Jalando-on, ORCID No. 0009-0008-6141-2240
Faculty, College of Business and Accountancy, Central Philippine University, Jaro, Iloilo City, Philippines

Abstract

This study examined how servant leadership relates to faculty work commitment and teaching performance in a private higher education institution in the Philippines. Using a descriptive-correlational design, data were collected from 162 faculty members in the 2023 to 2024 academic year with the Servant Leadership Questionnaire, the Three-Component Model Employee Commitment Survey, and the institution's multi-source Teacher Evaluation Scale, and analyzed with descriptive statistics, t-tests, analysis of variance, and Pearson correlation, with effect sizes and false discovery rate adjustment. Administrators were rated very high in servant leadership, particularly in behaving ethically and creating value for the community, and faculty reported high affective and normative commitment, a committed level of continuance commitment, and highly satisfactory teaching performance. Six of the seven servant leadership dimensions and the overall score correlated weakly but robustly with normative commitment (r = .17 to .24), consistent with prior findings on ethical and relational leadership (Aboramadan et al., 2021; Saepurohman & Satori, 2021). A small association with teaching performance (r = .19) was not robust to rank-based analysis or the exclusion of outliers, associations with affective commitment did not survive adjustment, and none was detected with continuance commitment. Female faculty reported higher affective and normative commitment than male faculty, and servant leadership ratings did not differ across profile groups. The findings may inform leadership development that emphasizes ethical conduct, care for faculty well-being, and support for faculty growth, while suggesting that servant leadership alone may not account for differences in instructional performance.

Keywords: servant leadership, faculty work commitment, teaching performance, higher education, academic leadership

Copyright @ 2026. The Author/s. Published by VMC Analytiks Multidisciplinary Journal News Publishing Services. Servant Leadership, Faculty Work Commitment, and Teaching Performance in Philippine Higher Education © 2026 by Hermely A. Jalando-on is an open access article licensed under Creative Commons Attribution (CC 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

Background of the Study. Leadership shapes organizational effectiveness in educational institutions, where professional competence, ethical standards, and interpersonal relationships are central to institutional success. Leadership is a dynamic process through which individuals influence others to achieve shared goals, motivate performance, and foster organizational growth (Khalid et al., 2021; Orogun, 2023). In higher education, academic administrators function not only as managers of institutional resources but also as facilitators of faculty development, student learning, and organizational culture (Bruns, 2018; Mahoe, 2024; Syamsuddin et al., 2024). In private higher education institutions specifically, leadership practices have been linked to faculty work commitment and teaching performance, which in turn bear on institutional quality and sustainability (Sudarman, 2019; Alonzo, 2024). Teaching performance refers to the quality and effectiveness of a faculty member's instructional and professional work, including content delivery, engagement of learners, and classroom management (Carlucci et al., 2019).

The Philippine Higher Education Context. Private higher education institutions (HEIs) are central to Philippine tertiary education, accounting for 53% of total enrollment in Commission on Higher Education (CHED) data reported by Ortiz et al. (2019). Their position has become more difficult since the Universal

Access to Quality Tertiary Education Act (Republic Act No. 10931, 2017) made tuition free in state and local universities and colleges. A process evaluation of the law noted a widening gap between public and private enrollment (Ortiz et al., 2019), and private enrollment grew far more slowly than public enrollment between 2009 and 2019, while the private share of institutions fell from 79% to 72% (Philippine Institute for Development Studies [PIDS], 2025). Because most private HEIs depend on tuition, retaining committed and effective faculty is a practical concern; in one Philippine college, employment status was the main predictor of faculty members' intention to stay (Catigbe, 2026).

Private HEIs also answer to two distinct quality systems: CHED's outcomes-based and typology-based regulatory quality assurance (Commission on Higher Education [CHED], 2012) and voluntary accreditation by non-governmental agencies, which CHED encourages separately from its regulatory functions (Commission on Higher Education [CHED], 2005). Many private institutions, including the one examined here, are also faith-based and mission-oriented, emphasizing ethical leadership and community service, values that align closely with servant leadership principles (Hawthorne, 2023); leadership approaches that emphasize ethical conduct and human-centered management are therefore of particular interest in this sector (Ross, 2023).

Theoretical Framework. This study draws on three complementary perspectives. Servant Leadership Theory (Greenleaf, 1970) frames the leader as a servant first, prioritizing followers' needs and fostering trust, collaboration, and ethical behavior; leaders who embody empathy, stewardship, and commitment to others' growth are theorized to improve organizational outcomes, including performance and satisfaction (Naveed et al., 2023; Mubin, 2022). Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) explains why this might happen: it frames leader-follower relationships as reciprocal exchanges of resources and support, in which followers who receive genuine investment from a leader tend to reciprocate with loyalty, effort, and commitment. Meyer and Allen's (1991, 1997) Three-Component Model then supplies the lens for the outcome side of that exchange, treating organizational commitment not as one attitude but three distinct ones, affective (emotional attachment), continuance (perceived cost of leaving), and normative (felt obligation to remain), each with different antecedents and different implications for retention and performance.

Read together, these perspectives predict that servant leadership's influence on commitment need not be uniform: because the Three-Component Model treats affective, continuance, and normative commitment as separate constructs, and because Social Exchange Theory ties reciprocity to the specific behaviors a leader enacts, servant leadership could plausibly be more closely related to one component of commitment, normative commitment in particular, given its emphasis on ethical conduct and moral reciprocity, than to the others. This framework provides a basis for examining whether servant leadership relates differently to the three components of commitment.

Research Gap and Purpose of the Study. International studies, including meta-analytic evidence, link servant leadership to employee outcomes such as job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and reduced burnout (Aboramadan et al., 2021; Kaur, 2018; Lee et al., 2020; Saepurohman & Satori, 2021). This evidence now includes teachers in Indonesia (Ram et al., 2024; Saepurohman & Satori, 2021) and academics in higher education (Aboramadan et al., 2021), yet reviews continue to call for research in a wider range of cultural and organizational contexts (Eva et al., 2019), and empirical research in non-Western and developing contexts remains limited (Mubin, 2022; Naveed et al., 2023). Philippine studies of leadership in private HEIs have described general or transformational leadership practices (Navia & Nasser, 2022), and few studies have related servant leadership to the

separable components of commitment in the Three-Component Model or to institutionally recorded teaching performance.

This leaves open a specific and practically consequential question for Philippine private higher education: which, if any, components of faculty commitment and performance are associated with servant leadership, as opposed to being more closely related to other institutional factors. Answering this matters because leadership development is costly, and administrators who assume servant leadership will uniformly accompany higher commitment and teaching quality may misjudge where development resources are most likely to be useful. This study addresses that gap by examining, with multidimensional instruments for both leadership and commitment, how servant leadership relates to faculty work commitment and teaching performance in a private higher education institution in the Philippines.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the levels of servant leadership among academic administrators, faculty work commitment, and teaching performance as perceived and recorded among faculty members?

2. Do these levels differ significantly when faculty members are grouped according to sex, age, employment status, years of service, educational attainment, and religion?

3. How is servant leadership related to faculty work commitment and teaching performance?

Significance of the Study. The findings contribute empirical evidence on servant leadership in Philippine higher education and offer academic administrators' information relevant to faculty commitment and institutional effectiveness. They may also inform the design of leadership development programs that emphasize ethical leadership, attention to faculty well-being, and support for faculty growth (Rusmulyani et al., 2022).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Servant Leadership in Higher Education. Servant leadership prioritizes service to others, emphasizing empathy, stewardship, and the development of followers' potential; leaders act as facilitators who meet followers' needs before pursuing personal or organizational interests (Mubin, 2022; Naveed et al., 2023; Summers, 2018). It has been linked to job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, reduced burnout, and psychological well-being (Kaur, 2018; Ram et al., 2024; Sihombing et al., 2024), largely through the trust and collaboration it fosters (Lapointe & Vandenberghe, 2018; Ragaisis, 2018). Scholars have also noted limits to its implementation, since excessive service orientation may lead to leader exhaustion and role overload (Friedman & Mizrachi, 2022; Mondy, 2023).

Servant Leadership and Faculty Work Commitment. Faculty work commitment refers to the psychological attachment and loyalty that educators develop toward their institution (Inegbedion, 2022). Meyer and Allen's (1991, 1997) Three-Component Model distinguishes affective commitment, an emotional attachment to and identification with organizational goals (Bouraoui et al., 2019; Kaplan & Kaplan, 2018); continuance commitment, based on the perceived costs of leaving (Maçães et al., 2022); and normative commitment, a sense of moral obligation to remain (Nazir & Islam, 2017). High commitment is associated with institutional stability, improved job performance, and reduced turnover intentions (Waly & Muafi, 2021; Jackson, 2022), while low commitment is linked to disengagement and diminished instructional quality. Meta-analytic evidence shows that the three components have different antecedents and correlates: affective commitment shows the strongest associations with work experiences such as organizational support and leadership, normative commitment shows a similar but weaker pattern, and continuance

commitment relates more closely to perceived alternatives and accumulated investments (Meyer et al., 2002).

Studies linking servant leadership to commitment have generally reported positive associations. Lapointe and Vandenberghe (2018) examined servant leadership in relation to the components of organizational commitment, and Sihombing et al. (2024) reported relationships among servant leadership, organizational commitment, and task performance in educational organizations. In higher education, Aboramadan et al. (2021) found that servant leadership was related to academics' work outcomes through job satisfaction. Social Exchange Theory suggests why these associations may differ by component: a leader's care, ethical conduct, and investment in followers' growth may create a felt obligation to reciprocate, which is closest in meaning to normative commitment, whereas continuance commitment depends more on economic considerations that leaders influence only indirectly (Blau, 1964; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Most prior studies, however, have treated commitment as a single construct or were conducted outside Philippine higher education, leaving open whether servant leadership relates similarly to all three components among Filipino faculty.

Servant Leadership and Teaching Performance. Teaching performance is a central indicator of educational quality, encompassing instructional competence, pedagogical skill, classroom management, assessment practice, and student engagement (Alexandre et al., 2023; Burleigh et al., 2023). It requires the ability to adapt instruction to diverse learners (Carlucci et al., 2019) and is typically evaluated through institutional appraisal systems and student feedback (Akdeniz & Korkmaz, 2023). Evidence on the influence of leadership on teaching performance is mixed. Studies of Indonesian teachers have reported positive associations with servant leadership (Ram et al., 2024; Saepurohman & Satori, 2021), and Ragaisis (2018) examined servant and transformational leadership in relation to faculty job satisfaction and performance in higher education, but other work emphasizes teachers' competencies, training, and job conditions (Alexandre et al., 2023; Burleigh et al., 2023), suggesting that any association with leadership may be indirect. Commitment has also been linked to job performance, most consistently for affective commitment (Meyer et al., 2002); the present study does not test this pathway but examines the direct associations of servant leadership with each outcome.

METHODS

Research Design. This study employed a descriptive-correlational design, appropriate for examining relationships among variables without manipulating them (Banerjee, 2019; Godby, 2023; Ross, 2023). Servant leadership and commitment were measured by survey, and teaching performance was drawn from the institution's evaluation system as reported by the participants.

Participants and Sampling. Participants were 162 faculty members of a private higher education institution in the Philippines in the 2023 to 2024 academic year. Eligible faculty had served the institution for at least six semesters, were 25 to 75 years of age, and were supervised by academic administrators (deans, principals, or academic directors) with at least three years in their current positions, which ensured sufficient interaction to assess leadership practices. The sampling frame of 273 qualified faculty was compiled from the faculty lists of the academic units, and a minimum sample of 162 was computed with Slovin's formula (95% confidence level, 5% margin of error). All 273 were invited, and 162 returned completed questionnaires (response rate 59.3%, no replacements), so the sample is a census invitation with voluntary response rather than a random sample. The participants were supervised by the 14 administrators who met the tenure requirement.

Because Slovin's formula addresses precision rather than power, a sensitivity power analysis was conducted. With $N = 162$ and a two-tailed α

of .05, the study had .80 power to detect $|r| \geq .22$, $d \geq 0.47$ for sex (56 male, 106 female), and $d \geq 0.49$ for employment status (115 full-time, 47 part-time); a correlation of .19 had approximately .68 power.

Research Instruments. The questionnaire collected each participant's profile and Teacher Evaluation Scale rating, followed by two standardized scales.

Servant leadership. Faculty rated their immediate academic administrator on the 28-item Servant Leadership Questionnaire (Liden et al., 2008), which measures seven four-item dimensions: conceptualizing, emotional healing, putting followers first, helping followers grow and succeed, behaving ethically, empowering, and creating value for the community. Items were rated on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree), and dimension and overall scores were item means, interpreted as 1.00 to 2.20 not employed, 2.21 to 3.40 moderately employed, 3.41 to 4.60 employed, 4.61 to 5.80 highly employed, and 5.81 to 7.00 very highly employed. The instrument has demonstrated construct validity and reliability across organizational contexts (Umanets & Song, 2023; Wulansari et al., 2021).

Faculty work commitment. Commitment was measured with the original 24-item Three-Component Model Employee Commitment Survey (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997), with eight items each for affective, continuance, and normative commitment rated on the same 7-point scale. Nine reverse-keyed items (four affective, two continuance, and three normative) were recoded before scoring, and component and overall scores were item means, interpreted as 1.00 to 2.20 not committed, 2.21 to 3.40 moderately committed, 3.41 to 4.60 committed, 4.61 to 5.80 highly committed, and 5.81 to 7.00 very highly committed. The model has been widely validated across cultures (Battal & Ibrahim, 2023).

Teaching performance. Teaching performance was measured by each faculty member's Teacher Evaluation Scale (TES) rating for the 2023 to 2024 academic year. The TES is the institution's online teacher rating scale, developed and administered by the university's Human Resource Development Office (Central Philippine University Human Resource Development Office [CPU HRDO], n.d.). It contains 36 items in three weighted domains of 12 items each: Teaching Competencies (33%; for example, setting achievable objectives, using appropriate evaluation tools, explaining with clarity, and maintaining a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning), Teacher's Personality and Interpersonal Relations (33%; for example, approachability, openness to constructive criticism, and participation in department and university activities), and Leadership (34%; for example, dedication to duties and the capacity to inspire confidence among peers). Each item is rated on a 5-point scale (5 = *very high extent*, 4 = *high extent*, 3 = *moderate extent*, 2 = *low extent*, 1 = *very low extent*). Ratings are provided by students, peers, the department head, and the faculty member, and the office combines them into a composite rating. Participants reported their 2023 to 2024 TES rating in the first part of the questionnaire. Following the office's interpretation, ratings of 4.51 to 5.00 were described as *highly satisfactory*, 4.00 to 4.50 *moderately satisfactory*, 3.00 to 3.99 *fair*, 2.00 to 2.99 *unsatisfactory*, and 1.99 and below *highly unsatisfactory*.

Validity and Reliability. Liden et al. (2008) confirmed the multidimensional structure of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, the Three-Component Model has received extensive empirical support across cultures (Allen & Meyer, 1996), and previous studies report alphas above .70 for both instruments (Alyahya et al., 2023; Wulansari et al., 2021). No published reliability or validity evidence is available for the TES, an institutional tool whose multi-source design reduces dependence on any single rater. In the present sample, Cronbach's alpha was .97 for the overall Servant Leadership Questionnaire and .72 to .93 across its dimensions (conceptualizing .92, emotional

healing .86, putting followers first .90, helping followers grow and succeed .90, behaving ethically .93, empowering .72, and creating value for the community .88), and .72 for the commitment survey (affective .68, continuance .70, and normative .65), with the affective and normative values slightly below the conventional .70 threshold.

Data Collection Procedure. After ethical clearance and an endorsement letter from the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, all 273 qualified faculty were invited by email and Facebook Messenger. Each participant first received an informed consent form explaining the study's purpose, the voluntary nature of participation, the confidentiality of responses, and the right to withdraw. The online questionnaire (Google Forms) was sent by email through the university's Office of Communications, and to some participants directly through Facebook Messenger; printed questionnaires were given to those who preferred them. Data were gathered in April 2024. Of the 164 questionnaires returned (112 online and 52 printed), two printed questionnaires were excluded because the reported years of service were inconsistent with the respondents' ages, leaving 162. Every response was encoded numerically and checked against the source before scoring.

Ethical Considerations. The study was reviewed and approved by the Central Philippine University Research Ethics Review Board (approval no. 2024-219-PG-JALANDO-ON) before data collection. Participation was voluntary: faculty were approached without coercion, could decline without giving a reason, and could withdraw at any time. Providing a name on the questionnaire was optional, and no other identifying information was required. Responses were treated as confidential in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173, 2012): electronic data were accessible only to the researcher, paper questionnaires were kept in a secured room, and the approved protocol provided for the permanent deletion of all questionnaires and data files after a 12-month retention period. Printed questionnaires were administered and retrieved by the researcher, and the online link was distributed through the university's Office of Communications rather than through the academic administrators whose leadership was being rated; participants were assured that individual responses would not be disclosed, and participants were given the researcher's contact information for any concerns.

Data Analysis. Data were analyzed using Python 3 with the SciPy statistical library. Frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations described the variables. Independent-samples *t*-tests compared groups by sex and employment status, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) compared groups by age, years of service, educational attainment, and religion, with Scheffé post hoc comparisons after significant omnibus tests. Pearson correlation examined the relationships of servant leadership with commitment and teaching performance. Significance was set at .05 (two-tailed), and effect sizes are reported as Cohen's *d* with 95% confidence intervals, eta squared (η^2), and 95% confidence intervals for correlations based on Fisher's *z*. The Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate (FDR) procedure (Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995) was applied within families of tests: the 18 composite profile comparisons, the 18 commitment-component comparisons, and the eight correlations for each outcome; the 40 correlations were also examined as one family. Results significant only before adjustment are treated as exploratory. Four item responses were missing (one in each of four questionnaires), and scale scores used the available items, so all 162 cases were retained. Because Shapiro-Wilk tests indicated that servant leadership and teaching performance were not normally distributed (both negatively skewed, skewness = -2.17 and -0.98) and four cases lay more than three standard deviations from the mean, each correlation was also checked with Spearman's ρ and with those cases excluded. Levene's test checked the equality of group variances, and Welch's tests served as a sensitivity check.

RESULTS

Profile of Faculty. As shown in Table 1, the faculty profile was predominantly female (65%) and full-time (71%), with the largest age group at 55 to 64 years (28%). Length of service was fairly evenly spread, with 37% having served 10 years or less. Educational attainment was split between bachelor's (39%) and master's (40%) degree holders, with 21% holding doctorates (including six with post-doctoral study), and religious affiliation was mainly Baptist (44%) or Roman Catholic (47%).

Table 1

Profile of Faculty Categorized According to Sex, Age, Employment Status, Years of Service, Educational Attainment, and Religion (N = 162)

Category	*f*	%
Sex		
Male	56	35
Female	106	65
Age		
25 to 34 years	28	17
35 to 44 years	38	23
45 to 54 years	40	25
55 to 64 years	45	28
65 years and above	11	7
Employment Status		
Full-time	115	71
Part-time	47	29
Years of Service		
10 years and below	60	37
11 to 20 years	43	27
21 to 30 years	45	28
Above 30 years	14	9
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	63	39
Master's Degree	65	40
Doctorate Degree	34	21
Religion		
Baptist	72	44
Roman Catholic	76	47
Others	14	9

Levels of Servant Leadership, Faculty Work Commitment, and Teaching Performance. Table 2 addresses the first research question. Administrators were rated as very highly employing servant leadership overall (M = 5.92, SD = 0.81), with five dimensions in the very highly employed range; behaving ethically was rated highest (M = 6.11) and putting followers first lowest (M = 5.69).

Overall work commitment was high (M = 4.95, SD = 0.55): affective (M = 5.54) and normative commitment (M = 4.98) were in the highly committed range, and continuance commitment was at the committed level (M = 4.35). Teaching performance was highly satisfactory (M = 4.59, SD = 0.25), with 80% of ratings between 4.20 and 4.86.

Table 2

Levels of Servant Leadership, Faculty Work Commitment, and Teaching Performance (N = 162)

Construct and dimension	*M*	*SD*	Descriptive rating
Servant leadership			
Conceptualizing	5.98	0.91	Very highly employed
Emotional healing	5.85	0.88	Very highly employed
Putting followers first	5.69	1.03	Highly employed
Helping followers grow and succeed	5.94	0.91	Very highly employed
Behaving ethically	6.11	0.96	Very highly employed
Empowering	5.78	0.80	Highly employed
Creating value for the community	6.09	0.84	Very highly employed
Overall	5.92	0.81	Very highly employed
Faculty work commitment			
Affective	5.54	0.76	Highly committed
Continuance	4.35	0.97	Committed
Normative	4.98	0.78	Highly committed
Overall	4.95	0.55	Highly committed
Teaching performance	4.59	0.25	Highly satisfactory

Note. *Servant leadership and work commitment were rated on 7-point scales (3.41-4.60 employed or committed; 4.61-5.80 highly employed or committed; 5.81-7.00 very highly employed or committed) and teaching performance on a 5-point scale (4.00-4.50 moderately satisfactory; 4.51-5.00 highly satisfactory).*

Servant Leadership, Faculty Work Commitment, and Teaching Performance by Faculty Profile. Tables 3 through 7 address the second research question. Overall servant leadership means by profile ranged from 5.62 (faculty aged 25 to 34) to 6.12 (faculty aged 65 and above; Table 3), and neither the overall nor any of the 42 dimension-level comparisons were significant (all p > .05).

Continuance commitment means by profile ranged from 3.83 (faculty aged 65 and above) to 4.58 (Roman Catholic faculty), and normative commitment means from 4.60 (faculty aged 25 to 34) to 5.36 (more than 30 years of service; Table 4).

Table 3

Mean Servant Leadership Ratings by Faculty Profile (N = 162)

Group	CON	EH	PFF	HFGS	BE	EMP	CVC	Overall
All faculty	5.98	5.85	5.69	5.94	6.11	5.78	6.09	5.92
Sex								
Male	5.99	5.88	5.70	5.95	6.14	5.85	6.07	5.94
Female	5.97	5.83	5.69	5.94	6.09	5.75	6.11	5.91
Age								
25 to 34 years	5.60	5.46	5.44	5.68	5.82	5.54	5.79	5.62
35 to 44 years	6.06	5.96	5.78	6.07	6.17	5.87	6.20	6.02
45 to 54 years	6.09	5.94	5.72	6.02	6.09	5.81	6.08	5.97
55 to 64 years	5.97	5.87	5.69	5.87	6.19	5.82	6.19	5.94
65 years and above	6.30	6.05	5.95	6.23	6.39	5.82	6.09	6.12
Employment status								
Full-time	6.02	5.89	5.70	5.95	6.11	5.74	6.16	5.94
Part-time	5.88	5.76	5.68	5.91	6.11	5.88	5.94	5.88
Years of service								
10 years and below	5.85	5.70	5.56	5.81	6.03	5.76	5.94	5.81
11 to 20 years	5.97	5.94	5.88	6.06	6.19	5.83	6.23	6.01
21 to 30 years	6.13	5.93	5.69	5.98	6.13	5.78	6.16	5.97
Above 30 years	6.07	5.95	5.70	6.00	6.20	5.77	6.12	5.97
Educational attainment								
Bachelor's degree	5.79	5.78	5.62	5.83	6.05	5.66	6.01	5.82
Master's degree	6.01	5.85	5.64	5.97	6.09	5.78	6.11	5.92
Doctorate degree	6.26	5.98	5.93	6.11	6.26	6.00	6.21	6.11
Religion								
Baptist	5.87	5.83	5.68	5.93	6.11	5.75	6.11	5.90
Roman Catholic	6.05	5.87	5.72	5.93	6.10	5.84	6.07	5.94
Others	6.12	5.86	5.59	6.05	6.16	5.64	6.14	5.94

Note. *Means on a 7-point scale. CON = conceptualizing; EH = emotional healing; PFF = putting followers first; HFGS = helping followers grow and succeed; BE = behaving ethically; EMP = empowering; CVC = creating value for the community. Values of 5.81 or higher fall in the very highly employed range; all others are highly employed.*

Table 4

Mean Faculty Work Commitment by Faculty Profile (N = 162)

Group	Affective	Continuance	Normative	Overall
All faculty	5.54 (0.76)	4.35 (0.97)	4.98 (0.78)	4.95 (0.55)
Sex				
Male	5.25 (0.84)	4.20 (1.13)	4.70 (0.84)	4.72 (0.59)
Female	5.69 (0.66)	4.43 (0.87)	5.12 (0.72)	5.08 (0.49)
Age				
25 to 34 years	5.47 (0.71)	4.31 (0.90)	4.60 (0.74)	4.80 (0.47)
35 to 44 years	5.61 (0.78)	4.53 (0.92)	4.97 (0.95)	5.04 (0.53)
45 to 54 years	5.59 (0.73)	4.50 (0.80)	5.07 (0.58)	5.05 (0.47)
55 to 64 years	5.47 (0.78)	4.21 (1.05)	5.10 (0.76)	4.93 (0.62)
65 years and above	5.56 (0.88)	3.83 (1.33)	5.11 (0.85)	4.83 (0.75)
Employment status				
Full-time	5.58 (0.75)	4.46 (0.90)	4.99 (0.76)	5.01 (0.52)
Part-time	5.43 (0.78)	4.07 (1.07)	4.94 (0.85)	4.81 (0.61)
Years of service				
10 years and below	5.58 (0.73)	4.47 (0.95)	4.90 (0.84)	4.98 (0.56)
11 to 20 years	5.47 (0.75)	4.44 (0.83)	5.00 (0.75)	4.97 (0.49)
21 to 30 years	5.52 (0.78)	4.08 (1.01)	4.94 (0.76)	4.85 (0.59)
Above 30 years	5.61 (0.87)	4.43 (1.21)	5.36 (0.66)	5.13 (0.59)
Educational attainment				
Bachelor's degree	5.52 (0.72)	4.52 (0.83)	4.98 (0.79)	5.00 (0.46)
Master's degree	5.58 (0.72)	4.35 (0.99)	4.97 (0.77)	4.97 (0.55)
Doctorate degree	5.49 (0.89)	4.04 (1.10)	4.99 (0.82)	4.84 (0.69)
Religion				
Baptist	5.66 (0.65)	4.17 (1.06)	5.07 (0.74)	4.97 (0.61)
Roman Catholic	5.44 (0.84)	4.58 (0.83)	4.93 (0.81)	4.98 (0.49)
Others	5.44 (0.78)	4.05 (0.96)	4.72 (0.83)	4.74 (0.58)

Note. *Values are M (SD) on a 7-point scale. Descriptive ratings: 3.41-4.60 committed; 4.61-5.80 highly committed. All values fall in these two ranges.*

Teaching performance was highly satisfactory in every group, with means from 4.54 to 4.68 (Table 5).

Table 5

Mean Teaching Performance by Faculty Profile (N = 162)

Group	*M* (*SD*)	Descriptive rating
All faculty	4.59 (0.25)	Highly satisfactory
Sex		
Male	4.60 (0.24)	Highly satisfactory
Female	4.58 (0.25)	Highly satisfactory
Age		
25 to 34 years	4.54 (0.28)	Highly satisfactory
35 to 44 years	4.56 (0.23)	Highly satisfactory
45 to 54 years	4.62 (0.21)	Highly satisfactory
55 to 64 years	4.58 (0.27)	Highly satisfactory
65 years and above	4.64 (0.23)	Highly satisfactory
Employment status		
Full-time	4.60 (0.24)	Highly satisfactory
Part-time	4.56 (0.25)	Highly satisfactory
Years of service		
10 years and below	4.54 (0.25)	Highly satisfactory
11 to 20 years	4.58 (0.26)	Highly satisfactory
21 to 30 years	4.62 (0.22)	Highly satisfactory
Above 30 years	4.68 (0.20)	Highly satisfactory
Educational attainment		
Bachelor's degree	4.56 (0.25)	Highly satisfactory
Master's degree	4.56 (0.26)	Highly satisfactory
Doctorate degree	4.68 (0.20)	Highly satisfactory
Religion		
Baptist	4.61 (0.25)	Highly satisfactory
Roman Catholic	4.57 (0.24)	Highly satisfactory
Others	4.55 (0.28)	Highly satisfactory

Note. *Teaching performance is the Teacher Evaluation Scale composite on a 5-point scale. Descriptive ratings: 4.00-4.50 moderately satisfactory; 4.51-5.00 highly satisfactory.*

Servant leadership did not differ across any profile variable (Table 6), and Welch's tests did not change this conclusion.

Teaching performance differed only by educational attainment, $F(2, 159) = 3.32$, $p = .038$, $\eta^2 = .040$, with doctorate holders ($M = 4.68$) rated higher than bachelor's and master's degree holders (both $M = 4.56$); no Scheffé pairwise difference was significant ($p = .064$ and .070), and the result did not survive FDR adjustment ($q = .231$).

Faculty work commitment differed by sex, $t(160) = 4.13$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.68$, 95% CI [0.35, 1.01], $q = .001$. At the component level (Table 7), female faculty reported higher affective ($M = 5.69$ vs. 5.25, $d = 0.60$, 95% CI [0.27, 0.93]) and normative commitment ($M = 5.12$ vs. 4.70, $d = 0.55$, 95% CI [0.22, 0.88]) than male faculty, both surviving

adjustment (q = .007 and .010), with no sex difference in continuance commitment (p = .165). Full-time faculty reported higher overall commitment (d = 0.37, p = .035) and continuance commitment (M = 4.46 vs. 4.07, d = 0.41, p = .018) than part-time faculty, but neither difference survived adjustment (q = .231 and .082). Continuance commitment also differed by religion, $F(2, 159) = 4.17$, p = .017, η^2 = .050, with Baptist faculty (M = 4.17) lower than Roman Catholic faculty (M = 4.58; Scheffé mean difference = -0.41, p = .036), but this did not survive adjustment (q = .082). Commitment did not differ by age, years of service, or educational attainment.

Table 6

Summary of Difference Tests for Servant Leadership, Faculty Work Commitment, and Teaching Performance by Faculty Profile (N = 162)

Profile variable	Servant leadership	Faculty work commitment	Teaching performance
Sex	$t(160) = 0.20$, p = .843 d = 0.03	$t(160) = 4.13$, p < .001 d = 0.68*†	$t(160) = 0.54$, p = .588 d = 0.09
Age	$F(4, 157) = 1.30$, p = .272 η^2 = .032	$F(4, 157) = 1.25$, p = .292 η^2 = .031	$F(4, 157) = 0.64$, p = .637 η^2 = .016
Employment status	$t(160) = 0.42$, p = .675 d = 0.07	$t(160) = 2.13$, p = .035 d = 0.37*	$t(160) = 0.93$, p = .352 d = 0.16
Years of service	$F(3, 158) = 0.66$, p = .579 η^2 = .012	$F(3, 158) = 1.13$, p = .339 η^2 = .021	$F(3, 158) = 1.79$, p = .152 η^2 = .033
Educational attainment	$F(2, 159) = 1.36$, p = .259 η^2 = .017	$F(2, 159) = 1.01$, p = .367 η^2 = .013	$F(2, 159) = 3.32$, p = .038 η^2 = .040*
Religion	$F(2, 159) = 0.05$, p = .952 η^2 = .001	$F(2, 159) = 1.18$, p = .309 η^2 = .015	$F(2, 159) = 0.74$, p = .481 η^2 = .009

Note. Composite scores were compared. * p < .05 before adjustment. † Remained significant after Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate adjustment across the 18 tests in this table.

Table 7

Profile Differences in Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment (N = 162)

Profile variable	Affective	Continuance	Normative
Sex	$t(160) = 3.64$, p < .001 d = 0.60*†	$t(160) = 1.40$, p = .165 d = 0.23	$t(160) = 3.33$, p = .001 d = 0.55*†
Age	$F(4, 157) = 0.29$, p = .885 η^2 = .007	$F(4, 157) = 1.61$, p = .175 η^2 = .039	$F(4, 157) = 2.14$, p = .078 η^2 = .052
Employment status	$t(160) = 1.14$, p = .256 d = 0.20	$t(160) = 2.38$, p = .018 d = 0.41*	$t(160) = 0.42$, p = .674 d = 0.07
Years of service	$F(3, 158) = 0.21$, p = .886 η^2 = .004	$F(3, 158) = 1.70$, p = .170 η^2 = .031	$F(3, 158) = 1.36$, p = .258 η^2 = .025
Educational attainment	$F(2, 159) = 0.20$, p = .821 η^2 = .002	$F(2, 159) = 2.72$, p = .069 η^2 = .033	$F(2, 159) = 0.01$, p = .993 η^2 = .000
Religion	$F(2, 159) = 1.63$, p = .199 η^2 = .020	$F(2, 159) = 4.17$, p = .017 η^2 = .050*[b]	$F(2, 159) = 1.43$, p = .242 η^2 = .018

Note. ** p < .05 before adjustment. † Remained significant after Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rate adjustment across the 18 tests in this table. [b] Scheffé: Baptist lower than Roman Catholic (p = .036); other pairs p = .163 and .907. The doctorate category includes six post-doctoral faculty.*

Relationships Among Servant Leadership, Faculty Work Commitment, and Teaching Performance. Table 8 addresses the third research question. Six of the seven servant leadership dimensions correlated positively, though weakly, with normative commitment: conceptualizing (r = .21, 95% CI [.06, .35], p = .008), emotional healing (r = .22, 95% CI [.07, .37], p = .004), putting followers first (r = .22, 95% CI [.07, .36], p = .005), helping followers grow and succeed (r = .24, 95% CI [.09, .38], p = .002), behaving ethically (r = .24, 95% CI [.09, .38], p = .002), and creating value for the community (r = .17, 95% CI [.02, .32], p = .028), as did overall servant leadership (r = .23, 95% CI [.08, .37], p = .003). These correlations remained significant after FDR adjustment within the normative commitment family (q = .007 to .033), and all except creating value for the community also remained significant when the 40 correlations in Table 8 were treated as one family (q = .030 to .039). They held in rank-based analyses (Spearman's ρ = .19 to .27, all p < .05) and with the four outlying cases excluded (overall r = .26, p < .001), and they correspond to 3% to 6% of shared variance. Empowering was not significantly related to normative commitment (r = .14, p = .080), although its rank-based correlation was significant (ρ = .19, p = .017).

Table 8

Correlations Among Servant Leadership Dimensions, Faculty Work Commitment, and Teaching Performance (N = 162)

Servant leadership	Affective	Continuance	Normative	Overall WC	Teaching performance
Conceptualizing	.16* (.046)	-.07 (.391)	.21*† (.008)	.13 (.098)	.21*† (.007)
Emotional healing	.13 (.094)	-.05 (.543)	.22*† (.004)	.14 (.077)	.17*† (.027)
Putting followers first	.13 (.090)	-.07 (.393)	.22*† (.005)	.13 (.107)	.16*† (.037)
Helping followers grow and succeed	.16* (.038)	-.12 (.140)	.24*† (.002)	.12 (.130)	.16*† (.041)
Behaving ethically	.20* (.013)	-.05 (.511)	.24*† (.002)	.17* (.028)	.25*† (.001)
Empowering	.08 (.342)	-.14 (.084)	.14 (.080)	.02 (.796)	.05 (.524)
Creating value for the community	.09 (.275)	-.06 (.444)	.17*† (.028)	.09 (.275)	.17*† (.027)
Overall servant leadership	.15 (.054)	-.09 (.277)	.23*† (.003)	.13 (.102)	.19*† (.015)

Note. *Pearson r with two-tailed p in parentheses. Overall WC = overall faculty work commitment. * p < .05. † Remained significant after Benjamini-Hochberg adjustment within its column (eight tests).*

Servant leadership was also associated with teaching performance (overall r = .19, 95% CI [.04, .33], p = .015), and six dimensions correlated with it (r = .16 to .25, q = .012 to .047). This association was not robust, however: the rank-based correlation was not significant (ρ = .14, p = .072), and with the four outlying cases excluded the correlation fell to r = .12, p = .118.

Three dimensions showed nominal associations with affective commitment (r = .16 to .20), none surviving adjustment ($q \geq .101$), and no dimension was related to continuance commitment. Overall servant leadership was not related to overall work commitment (r = .13, p = .102). Finally, overall work commitment was not related to teaching performance (r = -.08, p = .328), although continuance commitment showed a small negative association (r = -.16, p = .044).

DISCUSSION

Levels of Servant Leadership, Commitment, and Teaching Performance. Academic administrators were rated highly across all servant leadership dimensions, with the overall mean and five of the seven dimensions in the very highly employed range, consistent with previous work in educational settings (Kaur, 2018; Ram et al., 2024; Sihombing et al., 2024). The high ratings for behaving ethically and creating value for the community fit the institution's mission orientation and Hawthorne's (2023) emphasis on ethical leadership, while the lower rating for putting followers first may reflect competing demands on administrators' time, which the study did not measure. Because servant leadership and teaching performance ratings clustered near the tops of their scales, the variance available for detecting associations was restricted.

Differences by Faculty Profile. Servant leadership ratings did not differ across profile variables (Table 6), suggesting that faculty subgroups perceived their administrators similarly. The somewhat higher ratings among older faculty and doctorate holders (Table 3) were not significant and came partly from small subgroups. Teaching performance was also broadly similar across groups; the higher ratings of doctorate holders were small and did not survive adjustment for multiple tests.

The most robust profile difference was by sex: female faculty reported higher affective and normative commitment than male faculty, with medium effect sizes that remained significant after adjustment. Demographic variables, including gender, generally show weak associations with commitment (Meyer et al., 2002), and studies have treated gender mainly as a moderator of commitment relationships (Shin et al., 2020), with El Badawy et al. (2018) reporting only a minor moderating role; the difference therefore warrants replication, and the data do not indicate why it arose. The higher continuance commitment of full-time faculty is consistent with the Three-Component Model's view that continuance commitment reflects accumulated investments and the perceived cost of leaving (Meyer & Allen, 1991) and with Philippine evidence linking stable employment to intention to stay (Catigbe, 2026), but it did not survive FDR adjustment. The small religion-linked difference in continuance commitment (η^2 = .050) also did not survive adjustment and is not interpreted further.

Servant Leadership and Normative Commitment. The most consistent finding was the positive, though small, association between servant leadership and normative commitment, which held for six of the seven dimensions and the overall score and survived adjustment for multiple tests, rank-based analysis, and the exclusion of outlying cases. This is consistent with prior reports of positive associations between servant leadership and employee outcomes (Aboramadan et al., 2021; Saepurohman & Satori, 2021) and with Social Exchange Theory's premise that followers reciprocate a leader's investment in their welfare. In a mission-oriented institution, administrators' genuine concern and ethical integrity may leave faculty feeling morally obliged to reciprocate through sustained commitment and service. The cross-sectional design, however, cannot establish direction, since faculty who already feel obliged to the institution may also view their administrators more favorably, and the associations were small (r = .17 to .24, no more than about 6% of shared variance).

Weaker and Less Consistent Associations with Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, and Teaching Performance.

Servant leadership was only weakly and inconsistently related to affective commitment, and no association with continuance commitment was detected, in contrast with earlier studies (Lapointe & Vandenberghe, 2018; Sihombing et al., 2024). Three dimensions showed nominal associations with affective commitment that did not survive adjustment; because the study had adequate power only for correlations of about .22 or larger and the ratings had a restricted range, these results do not show that no relationship exists. The Three-Component Model offers one explanation: the components have different antecedents (Meyer et al., 2002), so a single leadership style need not relate equally to all three. Affective commitment may depend more on workload, compensation, professional autonomy, and institutional support (Waly & Muafi, 2021), and continuance commitment on the perceived cost of leaving and the availability of alternative employment (Maçães et al., 2022); consistent with this, continuance commitment varied with employment status rather than with leadership perceptions, although that difference was exploratory.

For teaching performance, the evidence was mixed. Servant leadership showed a small positive correlation with TES ratings ($r = .19$ for the overall score), consistent with studies of servant leadership and teacher performance (Ram et al., 2024; Saepurohman & Satori, 2021), but the association depended on a few unusually low ratings and was not significant in rank-based analysis, so it is better described as tentative. This caution fits the view that teaching performance depends heavily on pedagogical competence, subject mastery, and professional training (Alexandre et al., 2023; Burleigh et al., 2023). The TES is also a broad measure, combining student, peer, head, and self-ratings across instruction, interpersonal relations, and professional leadership, and its scores were concentrated near the top of the scale. Overall work commitment was unrelated to teaching performance, and the small negative association for continuance commitment suggests that faculty who stay mainly because leaving is costly are not rated more highly.

Practical Implications for Philippine Higher Education. Under the enrollment, quality assurance, and resource pressures facing private HEIs, leadership development that emphasizes ethical conduct, care for faculty well-being, and support for faculty growth may be worth considering where a sense of obligation to the institution's mission is valued. The findings do not indicate that such development would by itself relate strongly to affective or continuance commitment or to teaching performance, which may depend more on compensation, job security, and discipline-specific pedagogical support, so institutions may consider pairing it with these measures and evaluating each against its intended outcome.

Limitations. Several limitations qualify these findings. The sample was drawn from a single private higher education institution, so the results describe that context and may not generalize to public universities, other private institutions, or non-faith-based settings. Servant leadership and commitment were both measured through faculty self-report, which is subject to common-method bias and social desirability, particularly for questions about one's own administrators. The cross-sectional design captures relationships at a single point in time and cannot establish causal direction; already-committed faculty, for instance, may perceive their administrators more favorably. Teaching performance was represented by a single institutional composite that faculty reported on the questionnaire rather than one retrieved from institutional records, that includes a self-rating component, and for which no published reliability or validity evidence is available. Ratings on all three measures clustered toward the upper ends of their scales, servant leadership and teaching performance were markedly skewed, and this restriction of range may have attenuated correlations; the association with teaching performance in particular was sensitive to a few outlying cases. Faculty were nested under 14 academic administrators (about 12 faculty per administrator on average), so ratings of the same administrator are not independent, and

the analysis did not model this nesting. Because all qualified faculty were invited and 59.3% responded, the respondents were self-selected, and nonrespondents may have differed in their views of their administrators or their commitment, which limits generalization even within the institution. Several profile subgroups were small (for example, 11 faculty aged 65 and above, 14 faculty of other religions, and 6 post-doctoral faculty), which limits the precision of subgroup comparisons. Many tests were conducted; although FDR adjustment was applied, the affective commitment associations and the employment-status, religion, and education differences did not survive adjustment. Finally, the affective and normative commitment subscales had internal consistency slightly below .70, which may have attenuated their correlations.

Conclusion. This study examined the levels of servant leadership, faculty work commitment, and teaching performance in a private Philippine higher education institution, their differences by faculty profile, and the relationships of servant leadership with commitment and teaching performance. Administrators were rated very highly on servant leadership, particularly on ethical conduct and community engagement, and faculty reported strong affective and normative commitment, comparatively lower continuance commitment, and highly satisfactory teaching performance. Servant leadership perceptions did not differ by faculty profile, whereas female faculty reported higher affective and normative commitment than male faculty; the other profile differences did not survive adjustment for multiple tests. Six of the seven servant leadership dimensions and the overall score were weakly but consistently associated with normative commitment, the association with teaching performance was similarly small but not robust, associations with affective commitment did not survive adjustment, and no association with continuance commitment was detected.

Taken together, these results are consistent with the Three-Component Model and Social Exchange Theory as applied to academic leadership: servant leadership behaviors that express care, ethical conduct, and investment in faculty growth were most clearly associated with faculty members' sense of obligation to the institution, and much less clearly with their emotional attachment, their perceived cost of leaving, or their institutional teaching ratings. This pattern is more specific than the general expectation that servant leadership relates to a broad range of outcomes, and it suggests that the relationship may differ by commitment component. Because the associations were small, cross-sectional, and drawn from a single institution, they warrant further investigation, particularly through longitudinal and multi-institution studies, before they are used to guide decisions about leadership development.

Recommendations. The following recommendations are offered tentatively, given the small, cross-sectional associations observed, and each is linked to the finding that motivates it.

Faculty. Because normative commitment was the component most consistently associated with servant leadership, faculty may find value in engaging with administrators' mentoring, well-being, and ethics-related initiatives. Because the association with teaching performance was small and not robust, faculty may also continue to pursue discipline-specific pedagogical development.

Academic Administrators. Because putting followers first was the lowest-rated dimension (Table 2), administrators may consider setting aside structured time for individual faculty consultation. Because emotional healing, putting followers first, helping followers grow and succeed, and behaving ethically were among the dimensions most strongly associated with normative commitment (Table 8), leadership development could give particular attention to these behaviors. Given the lower affective and normative commitment of male faculty (Table 7), administrators may also examine with their faculty whether mentoring, recognition, and involvement in

decision making reach male and female faculty equally.

Human Resource Development Office (HRDO). Because the association between servant leadership and teaching performance was small and not robust (Table 8), HRDO may consider planning and evaluating leadership development and pedagogical training as separate initiatives. Because full-time faculty reported higher continuance commitment than part-time faculty in an exploratory comparison (Table 7), a review of part-time faculty contract terms and benefits may be worthwhile. HRDO could also document the reliability of the TES domains and rating sources so that future studies can use it with greater confidence.

Commission on Higher Education (CHED) and Other Private Higher Education Institutions (PHEIs). Because the evidence comes from a single institution and a cross-sectional design, it does not support national policy changes, but CHED may find value in encouraging multi-institution research on academic leadership and faculty commitment in private HEIs. Other PHEIs, particularly faith-based or mission-driven ones, may treat these findings as one point of reference for leadership development while validating the pattern in their own setting.

Future Researchers. Future researchers could use longitudinal designs to test whether servant leadership precedes changes in normative commitment, multi-institution samples to test whether the weaker associations replicate, and multilevel models that account for faculty nested under administrators, with teaching ratings retrieved from institutional records and analyzed by domain and rating source.

DISCLOSURES

Author contributions. (Not applicable)

Conflict of interest. The author declares no conflict of interest.

Funding source. This research received no external funding.

Artificial intelligence use. Grammarly was used to check grammar and spelling. Claude (Anthropic) was used to assist in structuring text, analyzing the encoded data, and checking reference details; the author reviewed, verified, and approved all content.

Ethics approval statement. This study was approved by the CPU-RERB, with approval number 2024-219-PG-JALANDO-ON.

Data availability statement. The data are not publicly available in order to protect participant confidentiality under the approved ethics protocol. The summary statistics supporting the findings are reported in the manuscript.

Acknowledgement. (Not available)

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

Aboramadan, M., Dahleez, K., & Hamad, M. H. (2021). Servant leadership and academics outcomes in higher education: The role of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 29*(3), 562-584. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-11-2019-1923

Akdeniz, A., & Korkmaz, M. (2023). Relationships between empowering leadership, supportive work environment and organizational commitment: Example of guidance and research centers (GRC). *Egitim Ve Bilim, 48*(216), 113-138. https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2023.11998

Alexandre, B. S., Bassi-Suter, M., & Forsdike, N. (2023). Contributing factors to marketing educators' teaching

performance: Insights from executive postgraduate programmes in Brazil. *RAUSP Management Journal, 58*(4), 266-285. https://doi.org/10.1108/RAUSP-10-2022-0233

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49*(3), 252-276. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0043

Alonzo, D. E. (2024). *How teacher leaders describe the influence of principal behaviors on organizational empowerment* [Doctoral dissertation]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Alyahya, M., Aliedan, M., Agag, G., & Abdelmoety, Z. H. (2023). The antecedents of hotels' green creativity: The role of green HRM, environmentally specific servant leadership, and psychological green climate. *Sustainability, 15*(3), 2629. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032629

Banerjee, T. (2019). Designing a primary survey-based research. In *Research methodology for social sciences*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367810344-9

Battal, F., & Ibrahim, A. (2023). How does cynicism mediate spiritual leadership and organizational commitment? The case of Turkish and Indonesian universities. *Ege Akademik Bakis, 23*(2), 315-330. https://doi.org/10.21121/eab.1186184

Benjamini, Y., & Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological), 57*(1), 289-300. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. John Wiley & Sons.

Bouraoui, K., Bensemmane, S., Ohana, M., & Russo, M. (2019). Corporate social responsibility and employees' affective commitment: A multiple mediation model. *Management Decision, 57*(1), 152-167. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-10-2017-1015

Bruns, J. W. (2018). Presidential job satisfaction: Variables that impact satisfaction in public and private higher education institutions. *Planning for Higher Education, 46*(2), 81-96.

Burleigh, C. L., Kroposki, M., Steele, P. B., Smith, S., & Murray, D. (2023). Coaching and teaching performance in higher education: A literature review. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, 12*(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-12-2021-0114

Carlucci, D., Renna, P., Izzo, C., & Schiuma, G. (2019). Assessing teaching performance in higher education: A framework for continuous improvement. *Management Decision, 57*(2), 461-479. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-04-2018-0488

Catigbe, C. M. (2026). Employment status as the primary predictor of faculty retention: A quantitative study in a local Philippine college. *Journal of Education and*

Learning Reviews, 3(1), Article e2671. https://doi.org/10.60027/jelr.2026.e2671

Central Philippine University Human Resource Development Office. (n.d.). *Teacher evaluation scale* [Online rating instrument]. Central Philippine University.

Commission on Higher Education. (2005). *Revised policies and guidelines on voluntary accreditation in aid of quality and excellence in higher education* (CHED Memorandum Order No. 1, Series of 2005).

Commission on Higher Education. (2012). *Policy-standard to enhance quality assurance (QA) in Philippine higher education through an outcomes-based and typology-based QA* (CHED Memorandum Order No. 46, Series of 2012).

El Badawy, T. A., Chinta, R., & Magdy, M. M. (2018). Does "gender" mediate or moderate the relationship between "quality of work life" and "organizational commitment"? Evidence from SMEs in Egypt. *Gender in Management, 33*(4), 332-348. https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-04-2017-0050

Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly, 30*(1), 111-132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004

Friedman, H. H., & Mizrachi, M. (2022). Humanity-centered leadership: Servant leadership with a worldview. *Analysis and Metaphysics, 21*, 25-41. https://doi.org/10.22381/am2120222

Godby, J. S. (2023). *A study of the relationship between factors of servant leadership and job satisfaction in Midwestern horticulture companies* [Doctoral dissertation]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.

Hawthorne, G. (2023). *A qualitative descriptive study of servant leadership attributes and practices* [Doctoral dissertation]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Inegbedion, H. (2022). Motivators of employee commitment at multinational organizations in emerging economies: Empirical evidence from Nigeria. *Humanities & Social Sciences Communications, 9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-022-01169-6

Jackson, T. (2022). Build employee commitment through shared purpose. *The Enterprise, 51*(50), 7.

Kaplan, M., & Kaplan, A. (2018). The relationship between organizational commitment and work performance: A case of industrial enterprises. *Journal of Economic and Social Development, 5*(1), 46-50.

Kaur, P. (2018). Mediator analysis of job satisfaction: Relationship between servant leadership and employee engagement. *Metamorphosis, 17*(2), 76-85. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972622518804025

Khalid, S., Wang, D., Sohail, A., Raza, W., Khalid, B., & Ur-Rehman, A. (2021). Empowering women at the higher institutional level: Analysis of business education and leadership training program. *Business, Management and Education, 19*(1), 150-169. https://doi.org/10.3846/bmee.2021.13355

Lapointe, É., & Vandenberghe, C. (2018). Examination of the relationships between servant leadership, organizational commitment, and voice and antisocial behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics, 148*(1), 99-115. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-3002-9

Lee, A., Lyubovnikova, J., Tian, A. W., & Knight, C. (2020). Servant leadership: A meta-analytic examination of incremental contribution, moderation, and mediation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 93*(1), 1-44. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12265

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(2), 161-177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006

Maçães, M., Ramos, A., & Román-Portas, M. (2022). The effects of organizational communication, leadership, and employee commitment in organizational change in the hospitality sector. *Communication & Society, 35*(2), 89-106. https://doi.org/10.15581/003.35.2.89-106

Mahoe, S. K. (2024). *Adopting agile leadership during the pandemic: A phenomenological study of university student affairs leaders* [Doctoral dissertation]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1), 61-89. https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage Publications.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*(1), 20-52. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842

Mondy, A. E. (2023). *To serve and deplete: Exploring outcomes of emotional exhaustion in servant leadership and the moderating role of self-leadership* [Doctoral dissertation]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Mubin, N. (2022). Revealing the role of job involvement and employee loyalty as mediation variables: The effect of servant leadership on employee performance in a plastic packaging company. *International Journal of Business Ecosystem & Strategy, 4*(3), 23-36. https://doi.org/10.36096/ijbes.v4i3.349

Naveed, A. F., Xiong, Z., Sultan, A. M., Ahmed, F., & Pervaiz, K. (2023). How does servant leadership nurture nurses' job embeddedness? Uncovering sequential mediation of psychological contract fulfillment and psychological ownership. *Journal of Nursing Management, 2023*. https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/7294334

Navia, J. M., & Nasser, T. T. (2022). Leadership practices among private higher education institutions: Basis for transformational leadership model. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research, 49*(1). https://doi.org/10.7719/jpair.v49i1.443

Nazir, O., & Islam, J. U. (2017). Enhancing organizational commitment and employee performance through employee engagement: An empirical check. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies, 6*(1), 98-114. https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-04-2016-0036

Orogun, D. O. (2023). Hybrid leadership in African Neo-Pentecostalism. *Religions, 14*(5), 632. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14050632

Ortiz, M. K. P., Melad, K. A. M., Araos, N. V. V., Orbeta, A. C., Jr., & Reyes, C. M. (2019). Process evaluation of the Universal Access to Quality Tertiary Education Act (RA 10931): *Status and prospects for improved implementation* (PIDS Discussion Paper Series No. 2019-36). Philippine Institute for Development Studies.

Philippine Institute for Development Studies. (2025, August 4). *Free tuition law puts pressure on private colleges: Experts* [Press release]. https://pids.gov.ph/details/news/press-releases/free-tuition-law-puts-pressure-on-private-colleges-experts

Ragaisis, J. A. (2018). *The influence of servant leadership and transformational leadership on faculty job satisfaction and performance in higher education* [Doctoral dissertation]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Ram, S. H., Daud, M., & Anwar, H. (2024). The effect of servant leadership on teacher performance and organizational citizenship behavior as mediation variables. *ITM Web of Conferences, 58*, 01007. https://doi.org/10.1051/itmconf/20245801007

Republic Act No. 10173. (2012). *Data Privacy Act of 2012*. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.

Republic Act No. 10931. (2017). *Universal Access to Quality Tertiary Education Act*. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.

Ross, P. D. (2023). *The efficacy of servant leadership in non-profit organizations during a pandemic* [Doctoral dissertation]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Rusmulyani, K., Yudana, I. M., Natajaya, I. N., & Dewa Gede, H. D. (2022). E-evaluation based on CSE-UCLA model refers to Glickman pattern for evaluating the leadership training program. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications, 13*(5). https://doi.org/10.14569/IJACSA.2022.0130534

Saepurohman, L., & Satori, D. (2021). The effect of servant leadership on teacher performance. In Proceedings of the 4th *International Conference on Research of Educational Administration and Management* (ICREAM 2020) (pp. 189-192). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210212.040

Shin, D., Garmendia, A., Ali, M., Konrad, A. M., & Madinabeitia-Olabarria, D. (2020). HRM systems and employee affective commitment: The role of employee gender. *Gender in Management, 35*(2), 189-210. https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-04-2019-0053

Sihombing, A. A., Nurhattati, N., Pabbajah, M., Ratnawati, H. D. P., Maigahoaku, F. D., & Fatra, M. (2024). Examining the relationship between servant leadership, organizational commitment, and task performance. *The International Journal of Educational Organization and Leadership, 31*(1), 23-46. https://doi.org/10.18848/2329-1656/CGP/v31i01/23-46

Sudarman, E. (2019). Facing a situation of uncertainty for the performance of higher education management through strengthening leadership power, external collaboration, and financial management in Jakarta, Indonesia.

International Journal of Education and Psychology in the Community, 9(1), 71-86.

Summers, K. L. (2018). *Motivations: Army civilian leadership approach antecedents*. Army Management Staff College, Army University.

Syamsuddin, S., Kadir, A. R., Alam, S., & Madris. (2024). Leadership in higher education in Indonesia: The case of the University of West Sulawesi. *UCJC Business and Society Review, (80)*, 128-159. https://doi.org/10.3232/UBR.2024.V21.N1.04

Umanets, Y., & Song, S. (2023). Examining servant leadership and burnout among NCAA student-athletes. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 15*(1), 115-136.

Waly, A. M., & Muafi, M. (2021). The effects of work-life balance and emotional intelligence on organizational commitment mediated by work engagement. *International Journal of Business Ecosystem & Strategy, 3*(2), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.36096/ijbes.v3i2.257

Wulansari, N. A., Kusuma, B. D. W., & Elianto, W. (2021). Linking transformational and servant leadership to employee creativity: The mediating role of thriving at work. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal, 27*(5), 1-12.