

School-Based Management Leadership in Relation to Teachers' Organizational Commitment

Ronald G. Poticar

Abstract. This study aimed to determine the extent of School-Based Management (SBM) leadership as perceived by teachers and to examine its relationship with teachers' organizational commitment in Binugao District. Specifically, it assessed SBM leadership in terms of strategic direction and SIP alignment, operational efficiency and accountability, learning-focused supervision, and community participation and partnerships, as well as organizational commitment in terms of affective, continuance, normative, and professional commitment to school goals. A quantitative, cross-sectional correlational research design was employed involving 104 public school teachers. Data were gathered using a structured survey questionnaire and analyzed through mean, standard deviation, Pearson product-moment correlation, and multiple linear regression. Results revealed that SBM leadership and teachers' organizational commitment were both rated moderate. A significant moderate positive relationship was found between SBM leadership and teachers' organizational commitment, indicating that stronger SBM leadership practices were associated with higher levels of teacher commitment. Regression results showed that SBM leadership domains collectively explained a substantial proportion of the variance in teachers' organizational commitment. Among the domains, operational efficiency and accountability emerged as the strongest predictor, followed by community participation and partnerships. Strategic direction and SIP alignment and learning-focused supervision did not independently predict organizational commitment. Schools may strengthen clear operational systems, accountability practices, stakeholder engagement, and community partnerships to improve teacher commitment and sustain collaborative school governance.

KEY WORDS

1. School-Based Management leadership
2. teachers' organizational commitment
3. operational efficiency
4. community participation
5. school governance

Date Received: April 18, 2026 — Date Reviewed: April 21, 2026 — Date Published: May 19, 2026

1. Introduction

School-Based Management (SBM) remains a central governance reform in the Philippine basic education system because it promotes decentralization, shared accountability, participatory decision-making, and stakeholder collaboration. Under the SBM framework, school heads, teachers, parents, and community partners are expected to work together in identifying school priorities, implementing improvement plans, monitoring progress, and sustaining learner-centered programs. The Department of Education's SBM framework emphasizes lead-

ership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability and continuous improvement, and resource management as interrelated mechanisms for improving school performance and learner outcomes (Department of Education, 2012). Effective SBM leadership is important because it shapes teachers' daily work experiences. When leadership practices are clear, participatory, transparent, and supportive, teachers are more likely to feel valued and involved in the school community. These conditions may strengthen organizational commitment, which refers to teachers' emotional attachment, perceived need to remain, sense of obligation, and professional dedication to school goals. Conversely, weak communication, unclear roles, limited consultation, uneven workload distribution, and poor operational systems may reduce morale and weaken commitment. Recent international and local studies support the connection between leadership and teacher commitment. Distributed leadership has been associated with teacher commitment through improved well-being and reduced workload stress (Bellibaş, Chen, Gümüş, 2024). Philippine studies have also shown that school leadership, work-life balance, school culture, and job satisfaction are related to teacher commitment and engagement (Largo, Bellino, Bellino, Naparota, 2024; Quines Arendain, 2023). Within SBM, leadership practices such as strategic planning, stakeholder engagement, resource alignment, and instructional supervision provide the organizational conditions through which teachers may develop stronger loyalty and willingness to contribute. In Binugao District, SBM is implemented through the collaboration of school heads, teachers, parents, and stakeholders. However, teachers and schools continue to encounter constraints such as limited resources, communication gaps, heavy workloads, insufficient professional development, and sustainability issues in school programs. These conditions make it necessary to examine how SBM leadership re-

lates to teachers' organizational commitment in the district. The study therefore determined the perceived extent of SBM leadership, assessed teachers' organizational commitment, tested the relationship between the two variables, and identified which SBM leadership domains significantly influenced teachers' organizational commitment.

1.1. Review of Related Literature—This study was anchored on Distributed Leadership Theory and Organizational Commitment Theory. Distributed Leadership Theory explains that leadership is not limited to the formal school head but is distributed across people, roles, routines, and organizational structures (Gronn, 2002; Spillane, 2006). This theory is appropriate for SBM because school improvement depends on the coordinated participation of school leaders, teachers, parents, and community partners. In the present study, distributed leadership is reflected in the four SBM leadership domains: strategic direction and SIP alignment, operational efficiency and accountability, learning-focused supervision, and community participation and partnerships. The dependent variable was grounded in Meyer and Allen's organizational commitment model, which presents commitment as affective, continuance, and normative in nature (Allen Meyer, 1990; Meyer Allen, 1991). Affective commitment refers to emotional attachment and belongingness. Continuance commitment refers to the perceived cost of leaving the organization. Normative commitment refers to the moral obligation to remain and contribute. The present study also included professional commitment to school goals to capture teachers' willingness to align instructional practice, collaboration, and school improvement work with institutional priorities. Literature on SBM emphasizes that leadership quality determines whether decentralization becomes meaningful or remains only procedural. Studies on Philippine SBM implementation have shown that school-head leader-

ship, stakeholder participation, resource flexibility, and instructional leadership are associated with stronger school processes and outcomes (Ang, Adlit, Docdoc, Comerros, Lagnason-Pacheco, 2025; Baylon, Manla, Mahinay, 2025; Morales, Manalastas, Santos, de Guzman, 2023; Verbo, Fernando, Cabrera, 2023). Research on SIP implementation also highlights that school plans must be translated into concrete actions, evidence-use routines, and resource decisions to become effective (VanGroningen, Meyers, Antwi Adjei, Marianno, Charis, 2023). Teacher commitment literature like-

wise shows that teachers are more likely to remain committed when school leadership supports well-being, reduces unnecessary workload, recognizes teachers' work, and promotes shared purpose. Authentic, distributed, and transformational leadership have been linked to higher commitment because they build trust, efficacy, and professional attachment (Bellibaş et al., 2024; Xu Pang, 2024). Thus, SBM leadership may be viewed as an organizational resource that supports commitment by improving clarity, support, participation, and accountability.

2. Methodology

This study used a quantitative cross-sectional correlational design. The design was appropriate because the study measured the association between SBM leadership and teachers' organizational commitment at a single point in time without manipulating any variable. Correlational research is useful for determining the strength and direction of relationships among variables in educational settings where naturally occurring leadership conditions are studied (Cohen, Manion, Morrison, 2021; Creswell Creswell, 2023). The respondents were 104 public school teachers in Binugao District. Simple random sampling was used, subject to inclusion criteria requiring teachers to have at least three consecutive years of full-time teaching experience in their current school and direct participation in school-level activities such as Learning Action Cells, committee work, school improvement planning, or community partnership activities. These criteria ensured that the respondents had sufficient exposure to SBM processes and organizational routines. Data were gathered using a structured two-part survey questionnaire. The first part measured SBM leadership across four domains: strategic direction and SIP align-

ment, operational efficiency and accountability, learning-focused supervision, and community participation and partnerships. The second part measured teachers' organizational commitment across affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment, and professional commitment to school goals. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale, where higher scores indicated stronger evidence of the practice or commitment. The instrument underwent expert review, cognitive checking, and pilot testing. Reliability analysis yielded an acceptable Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.718. Before data gathering, the researcher secured the necessary permissions from the Schools Division Office, district supervisor, and school heads. Informed consent was obtained from all teacher-respondents. Participation was voluntary, confidentiality was maintained, and data were reported only in aggregate form. The data were encoded, checked for completeness, and analyzed using mean, standard deviation, Pearson product-moment correlation, and multiple linear regression. The hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 level of significance.

3. Results and Discussion

Table 1 shows that SBM leadership was generally rated moderate, with an overall mean of 3.13. Learning-focused supervision obtained the highest domain mean ($M = 3.20$), followed by strategic direction and SIP alignment ($M = 3.15$), community participation and partnerships ($M = 3.14$), and operational efficiency and accountability ($M = 3.01$). The results indicate that SBM leadership practices were present in the district but were not yet consistently strong across all dimensions. The item-level patterns suggest that schools had strengths in communicating SIP/AIP progress, using LAC

sessions and peer learning, managing compliance documentation, and aligning partnership activities with SIP priorities. However, weaknesses were noted in translating school priorities into classroom-level teaching and learning targets, using monitoring tools, budgeting and resource-request procedures, conducting regular classroom supervision, and involving parents, School Governance Councils, and community partners in planning. These results imply that SBM leadership in the district needs stronger execution systems, not merely reporting systems.

Table 1. Extent of School-Based Management Leadership

Domain	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Strategic Direction and SIP Alignment	3.15	0.23	Moderate
Operational Efficiency and Accountability	3.01	0.23	Moderate
Learning-Focused Supervision	3.20	0.12	Moderate
Community Participation and Partnerships	3.14	0.25	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.13	0.21	Moderate

Table 2 shows that teachers' organizational commitment was also rated moderate, with an overall mean of 3.11. Continuance commitment and professional commitment to school goals both obtained the highest domain mean ($M = 3.18$), followed by affective commitment ($M = 3.05$) and normative commitment ($M = 3.03$). These findings show that teachers recognized practical reasons for staying and showed some alignment with school goals, but their emotional attachment, pride, moral responsibility, and willingness to exert additional effort still needed strengthening. Teachers rated

highly the indicators related to speaking positively about the school, considering school support as a reason to continue serving, recognizing loyalty as part of professional obligation, and monitoring learner progress for school improvement. However, lower scores were observed in pride in school membership, emotional connection, moral responsibility, and voluntary extra effort. These results suggest that commitment was present but needed to be deepened through stronger support, recognition, shared purpose, and meaningful teacher participation.

Table 3 presents the relationship between SBM leadership and teachers' organizational commitment. The Pearson correlation result

revealed a significant moderate positive relationship between the two variables, $r = 0.396$, $p < .001$. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating

Table 2. Extent of Teachers' Organizational Commitment

Dimension	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Affective Commitment	3.05	0.26	Moderate
Continuance Commitment	3.18	0.13	Moderate
Normative Commitment	3.03	0.23	Moderate
Professional Commitment to School Goals	3.18	0.14	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.11	0.19	Moderate

that there is no significant relationship between SBM leadership and teachers' organizational commitment was rejected. This result means that stronger SBM leadership practices were associated with higher levels of teacher commitment. In practical terms, when teachers perceived leadership as more organized, account-

able, participatory, and connected to school improvement, they tended to report stronger organizational commitment. This supports the view that leadership is not merely administrative but also motivational, relational, and organizational in effect.

Table 3. Relationship Between SBM Leadership and Teachers' Organizational Commitment

Variables	r-value	p-value	Interpretation	Decision
SBM Leadership and Teachers' Organizational Commitment	0.396	<.001	Significant	Reject H_0

Table 4 presents the regression results. The four SBM leadership domains collectively explained 43.6 % of the variance in teachers' organizational commitment, $R^2 = 0.436$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.413$. The model was statistically significant, $F(4, 99) = 19.103$, $p < .001$. This indicates that SBM leadership domains, taken together, significantly predicted teachers' organizational commitment. Among the four domains, operational efficiency and accountability emerged as the strongest significant predictor, $B = 0.272$, $\beta = 0.506$, $p < .001$. Community participation and partnerships also significantly predicted organizational commitment, $B = 0.225$, $\beta = 0.461$, $p = .002$. Strategic direction and SIP alignment, B

$= -0.144$, $\beta = -0.265$, $p = .068$, and learning-focused supervision, $B = -0.114$, $\beta = -0.116$, $p = .231$, did not independently predict organizational commitment in the regression model. The findings imply that teachers' commitment in Binugao District was most strongly influenced by how well schools organized responsibilities, reduced unnecessary duplication, maintained accountability, and connected stakeholders to school improvement work. Although strategic direction and learning-focused supervision remain important, their effects may have been reduced because implementation was inconsistent or because their benefits depend on stronger operational systems and stakeholder support.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Table 4. *Regression Analysis of SBM Leadership Domains Predicting Teachers' Organizational Commitment*

Predictor	Unstandardized <i>B</i>	Standardized β	<i>p</i> -value	Interpretation
Strategic Direction and SIP Alignment	-0.144	-0.265	.068	Not significant
Operational Efficiency and Accountability	0.272	0.506	<.001	Significant predictor
Learning-Focused Supervision	-0.114	-0.116	.231	Not significant
Community Participation and Partnerships	0.225	0.461	.002	Significant predictor

Note. *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; β = standardized beta coefficient. Predictors with $p < .05$ were considered significant.

4.1. Conclusions—The study concluded that SBM leadership and teachers' organizational commitment in Binugao District were both at a moderate level. SBM leadership practices were evident through progress communication, collaborative learning structures, documentation management, and partnership alignment. However, improvement is needed in translating SIP priorities into classroom action, strengthening monitoring systems, improving resource processes, institutionalizing classroom supervision, and deepening stakeholder participation. The study also concluded that teachers demonstrated commitment through positive representation of the school, practical reasons for continued service, loyalty, and participation in school goals. However, the moderate ratings show that their pride, emotional attachment, sense of moral responsibility, and willingness to exert additional discretionary effort need further support. The significant correlation confirmed that stronger SBM leadership is associated with stronger teacher commitment, while the regression findings showed that operational efficiency and accountability, followed by community participation and partnerships, were the most influential leadership domains.

4.2. Recommendations—School heads may prioritize clearer operational systems by improving role clarity, documentation flow, monitoring tools, budgeting procedures, resource requests, and accountability mechanisms. These systems should reduce confusion, protect instructional time, and help teachers focus on teaching and learner support. Schools may strengthen stakeholder participation by giving parents, School Governance Councils, community partners, and teachers more meaningful roles in planning, implementation, monitoring, and feedback. Participation should move beyond consultation and become a shared responsibility for learner support and school improvement. Public Schools District Supervisors may provide targeted technical assistance on SIP/AIP implementation, operational accountability, school monitoring tools, and partnership management. DepEd officials may continue programs that reduce non-teaching burdens, strengthen school governance structures, and build the capacity of school heads and teacher-leaders. Future researchers may use qualitative or longitudinal designs to examine why strategic direction and learning-focused supervision did not independently predict organizational commitment in this study.

5. References

- 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>
- Ang, J. V., Adlit, M. F., Docdoc, V. A., Comeros, J. S., & Lagnason-Pacheco, L. L. (2025). School-based management implementation and educational outcomes in Philippine public schools: An explanatory sequential inquiry. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 9(4), 2625–2644. <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i4.6611>
- Baylon, C., Manla, E., & Mahinay, R. B. (2025). School-based management practices and academic performance: Evidence from Philippine schools. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(1). <https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2025/1/36693.pdf>
- Bellibaş, M. Ş., Chen, J., & Gümüş, S. (2024). The impact of distributed leadership on teacher commitment: The mediation role of teacher workload stress and teacher well-being. *British Educational Research Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3944>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2021). *Research methods in education* (9th ed.). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Department of Education. (2012). Implementing guidelines on the revised School-Based Management framework, assessment process and tool [DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012].
- Department of Education. (2022). Implementing guidelines on the establishment of School Governance Council [DepEd Order No. 026, s. 2022]. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/>
- Department of Education. (2024). Immediate removal of administrative tasks of public school teachers [DepEd Order No. 002, s. 2024]. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/>
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(4), 423–451. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(02\)00120-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00120-0)
- Largo, Y. M. B., Bellino, S. G., Bellino, L. B. G., & Naparota, L. C. (2024). School heads' leadership skills and teachers' work engagement in the Department of Education: Evidence from Piñan District, schools division of Zamboanga del Norte. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 9(6). <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.96.45>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89.
- Morales, R. R., Manalastas, A. S., Santos, B. L. G., & de Guzman, P. P. (2023). Exploring instructional leadership of School-Based Management Level II schools. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 4(10), 2798–2814. <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.4.1023.102825>
- Quines, K. A., & Arendain, A. M. (2023). Satisfaction at work, work-life balance, school culture and teachers' organizational commitment: Evidence from Davao Region Philippines. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 10(4), 34–60.
- Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
- VanGronigen, B. A., Meyers, C. V., Antwi Adjei, R., Marianno, L., & Charris, L. (2023). The design and characteristics of School Improvement Plan templates. *AERA Open*, 9, 23328584231168378. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584231168378>

- Verbo, R. J. C., Fernando, A. I., & Cabrera, W. C. (2023). Principals' leadership style towards the implementation of decentralized school-based management in selected secondary public schools in Mandaluyong City, Philippines. *International Journal of Economics Development Research*, 4(1), 48–72. <https://doi.org/10.37385/ijedr.v4i1.970>
- Xu, Z., & Pang, N. S.-K. (2024). Promoting teachers' organizational commitment: The effects of authentic leadership, teachers' well-being and social-emotional competence. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(10), 862. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14100862>