



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY

Margaret Grogan,
Chapman University, United States

REVIEWED BY

Khalida Parveen,
Southwest University, China
Samson R. Victor,
Indira Gandhi National Tribal University, India

*CORRESPONDENCE

Jacqueline Kareem
✉ jacqueline.loleta@christuniversity.in

RECEIVED 22 February 2023

ACCEPTED 21 April 2023

PUBLISHED 11 May 2023

CITATION

Kareem J, Patrick HA, Prabakaran N, B V,
Tantia V, M. P. M. PK and Mukherjee U (2023)
Transformational educational leaders inspire
school educators' commitment.
Front. Educ. 8:1171513.
doi: 10.3389/educ.2023.1171513

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Kareem, Patrick, Prabakaran, B, Tantia,
M. P. M. and Mukherjee. This is an open-access
article distributed under the terms of the
[Creative Commons Attribution License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).
The use, distribution or reproduction in other
forums is permitted, provided the original
author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are
credited and that the original publication in this
journal is cited, in accordance with accepted
academic practice. No use, distribution or
reproduction is permitted which does not
comply with these terms.

Transformational educational leaders inspire school educators' commitment

Jacqueline Kareem^{1*}, Harold Andrew Patrick²,
Nepoleon Prabakaran², Valarmathi B¹, Veerta Tantia¹,
Pramod Kumar M. P. M.¹ and Ujjal Mukherjee²

¹School of Education, Christ University, Bengaluru, India, ²CMS Business School, Jain University, Bengaluru, India

Introduction: Transformational school leaders play an important role in promoting educational innovation and restructuring by creating a vision for the future, building a culture of collaboration, and empowering others to become leaders themselves. Through their leadership style, they inspire and motivate others to work towards a common goal, leading to positive change and growth within the educational system. The aim of this study is to measure the impact of transformational leadership on various types of commitment that school teachers have in Bengaluru, India.

Methods: A survey was conducted using standardised instruments to measure the leadership style of principals and personal commitment of teachers. The data was collected from 1,173 school teachers through a questionnaire and analysed using SPSS V23 statistical software.

Results: The study found that transformational leadership had a significant impact on the different types of commitment that teachers possess in school education. The three domains of commitment - commitment towards the institution, student development, and self-development - were positively influenced by transformational leadership.

Discussion: Transformational school leaders play an important role in promoting educational innovation and restructuring by creating a vision for the future, building a culture of collaboration, and empowering others to become leaders themselves. This study provides evidence that transformational leadership has a positive impact on different types of commitment among school teachers in Bengaluru, India. Leaders of school management are advised to take into account the three domains of commitment of their teachers to facilitate organisational learning through more integrative methods.

KEYWORDS

leadership styles, personal commitment, school education, student development, self-development

Introduction

Higher education is about experiencing challenges in managing growing societal expectations regarding skills and knowledge provided. At the same time, there is a lot of competition from other educational institutions across the globe. Today's dynamic educational system encourages faculty and students to achieve higher goals. Thus, there is an increasing demand for effective educational leadership. Themes for teacher development that are significant and crucial include leadership and teachers' involvement.

Researchers have examined teachers' perceived issues, beliefs, concerns, satisfaction and "reality shock" for many years (Veenman, 1984). Reasons for conducting this type of research spans from theoretical concerns with the psychological growth of teachers (Fuller, 1969; Fuller and Brown, 1975) to practical concerns with the structure of programmes for teachers' preparation and induction (Evans, 1976). In order to effectively accomplish the school's goals by motivating and directing the latter to work willingly, the individual-leaders' process of exerting influence on other people or groups plays a crucial role. School leadership shares characteristics with leadership applied to non-educational environments. Effective schools require good administration and leadership that collaborate and support one another. In this situation, the Principal oversees and spreads innovation and change in their capacity as leaders, constantly in close communication with the faculty at the school (Zacharo et al., 2018).

According to García-Morales et al. (2008), transformational leadership affects employees' attitudes, behaviours and general organisational assumptions. Typically, transformational as well as transactional leadership are investigated side by side in studies comparing leadership styles (Bass and Avolio, 1990; Judge and Piccolo, 2004; Masa'deh et al., 2016; Xie et al., 2019). Transformational leadership brings in a professional atmosphere, in which students, faculty, coaches, and counsellors perform better and innovate in the classroom. It provides a solution to the conflict in the system and the ability to transform and respond to the evolving needs of the education system. Human capital is the principal asset of any education system. It includes the knowledge and skills of different stakeholders, such as researchers, students, faculties and staff. Teachers' involvement in their work and schools will increase because of transformational leaders' actions in classrooms (Park et al., 2016).

Idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualised consideration (Bass and Avolio, 1994) are the main key elements of transformational leadership. An appropriate combination of these factors may improve productivity and efficiency and lead to a knowledge-based economy, managing and developing intellectual capital within the higher education system. Acknowledging the underlying change in the education system's transformational leadership is inevitable.

A thorough literature study on the connection between leadership and commitment in the workplace was conducted by Xie et al. (2019). It concluded that transformational leadership's impact on personal commitment is rarely compared to other leadership philosophies, such as genuine leadership, ethical leadership or servant leadership after synthesising the literature. However, studying emerging styles may enhance our understanding of its impact on different types of commitment that teachers possess.

The foundation of this study is taken from the full range leadership model given by Bass and Avolio (1994). Three different leadership philosophies—transformational, transactional, and *laissez-faire*—have been identified by Bass and Avolio (1994). His original theory comprised three categories of transformational behaviour (idealised influence, intellectual stimulation, and individualised consideration) as well as two types of transactional activities. The theory has been extended with transformational behaviour called inspired motivation, as well as transactional behaviour known as active management by exception (Bass and Avolio, 2004). An inspirational drive and idealised impact define charisma in leadership. The idealised influence behaviour is made up of two parts: the idealised influence behaviour and the idealised influence attributions. Developed from the original Full Range Leadership concept

(Bass and Avolio, 1994), the nine-factor model consists of idealised influence behaviour, idealised influence attributions, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration, contingent rewards, active management by exception, passive management by exception and *laissez-faire* (Bass et al., 2003).

Previous studies have shown that leadership styles affect the degree of organisational commitment of subordinates, which needs to be considered (Rowden, 2000; Lok and Crawford, 2004; Dale and Fox, 2008; Chen, 2021). Organisational commitment is a crucial factor in determining how employees behave at work, claim (Mowday et al., 1979). All educators should be encouraged to make a personal commitment to esteem, respect, appreciate and comprehend one another at educational institutions. "A personal commitment is unavoidable if one is to pursue change, as the process of change is rarely credible if the exponent refuses to embody that which he or she exhorts others to embrace" (Kendrick, 2001). Teachers' personal commitment is simply a collective commitment of teachers' commitment towards students' development, self-development and institutional development.

From the previous literature, it has been found that leadership styles have been studied with the organisational commitment of teachers, but there is a significant gap when it comes to different types of commitments that teachers possess in an organisation (Kendrick, 2001; Dale and Fox, 2008). The focus of this study is on conceptualisation of the transformational leadership styles of school principals, influence on commitment of teachers towards student development, self-development and institutional development. The study used a standardised questionnaire to gather data from schools to analyse the relationship between the constructs that contribute to development of better work environment for teachers towards the betterment of the self, students and institutions. More specifically, the study is motivated by the following research questions:

RQ1: Does transformational leadership style influence teacher's commitment towards self, students and institutional development?

Due to the increase in interest in studying transformational leadership styles and its relation to different commitments of teachers in an institution, the study aims to attain the following research objectives:

- To test the relationship between transformational leadership styles and teacher's commitment towards self, students and institutional development.
- To test the influence of transformational leadership styles on teachers' commitment towards the self, student and institutional development.

Review of literature

The social exchange theory and the social cognitive theory are the theoretical pillars of this investigation. The social exchange theory by Blau (1964) focuses on the exchange of resources and benefits between individuals in social interactions, where the behaviour is influenced by the expectation of recognition and rewards. The social cognitive theory by Bandura (1986) emphasizes the role of cognitive processes, such as observation and imitation, in shaping behaviour. Transformational leadership behaviours that are capsuled in social exchange theory and

social cognitive theory are likely to promote school teacher's commitment, trust, and gratitude as well as healthy social interaction and group dynamics. Employer-employee social interaction consists of a recurrent cycle of advantages and encouraging obligations to reciprocate (Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2000). The social exchange theory illuminates the social relationship between principals and teachers in this study by describing how teachers behave at work. Teachers will be more receptive to change if their leaders consistently inspire and support them in their work because they understand and value the support. They will therefore increase their commitment to teaching entrepreneurship.

A cluster of educational management models was identified by Bush (2010) based on four criteria: the degree of agreement on objectives, the idea of structure, the influence of the environment, and the best leadership strategies. Her next step was to relate six models to various leadership philosophies pertaining to education. Leaders in an organisation will motivate their people to achieve their objectives and prove how far the leaders delegated their authority to develop their followers' commitment towards their organisation. Their concern in interpersonal relationships and task-oriented behaviour demonstrates their leadership style (Mescon et al., 1985). Transformative and transactional leaders are moral role models who labour for the benefit of the group, organisation, and/or community. Transforming leaders are exalted (Burns, 1978). Transformative leaders could make an effort to change organisational culture (Yuwono et al., 2022), but transactional leaders frequently do not strive for such change and instead work within the existing culture (Burns, 1978).

According to Silins et al. (2002), transformational school leaders support educational innovation and restructuring by emphasising the development of a clear vision, fostering teamwork, and elevating followers to leadership positions. Transformative leadership was described by Bass and Avolio (1990) based on the actions of their followers. Such leaders are trusted, revered, and admired by their followers. Transformational leaders are able to win people's respect and trust. They change the status quo of the organisation through motivational behaviour and create a new vision for the future (Bakti and Hartono, 2022; Lyubykh et al., 2022). In their review study on educational leadership, Agosto and Roland (2018) primarily focused on transformative educational leadership. Separate commitments to teaching have been investigated by Bredeson et al., 1983. There have been initiatives to research the various commitment levels of instructors. A transformative leader raises employees' intrinsic value in order to increase their commitment to the organisation (Khasawneh et al., 2012). According to Firestone and Rosenblum (1988), teachers may be committed to teaching, their schools, or their students, and that their behavioural patterns differ depending upon which commitments are assessed. The study also came to the conclusion that wherever the teacher is committed, that area seems to flourish. If teachers supported students' personal growth and upheld a warm and supportive learning environment, the dropout rate would decline. Yu et al. (2002) research in Hong Kong's primary schools looks at the effects of a Principals' transformational leadership methods on teachers' commitment to change. The school environment, school structure, change techniques and school culture all served as mediating factors in the research. The findings point to transformational leadership having a high significant impact on mediating factors, making modest but substantial effects on teachers' commitment to change.

The supportive and democratic communication from the school principals were strongly correlated with the job attitude of teachers, which has a positive effect on the commitment of teachers (De

Nobile and Bilgin, 2022). The principals with transformational leadership style are supportive and hardworking leaders, who motivate teachers by means of constructive criticism and support in both personal and professional lives, to direct them towards task achievement (Barnová et al., 2022). The leaders of the school often communicate the vision and mission of the organisation to the staffs of the respective organisation, to ensure that the teachers are moving towards development of the organisation (Leithwood, 2021). In order to provide development for underserved students in their schools with more equal opportunities and results, transformational leaders must recognise and resolve the gaps between the present practices and beliefs held by their staff, by motivating them for self-development (Leithwood, 2021). Staff development is a crucial strategy for administrators, who want to successfully increase the balance in their schools. It is imperative to provide employees with opportunities to gain new skills, information and attitudes they will need to successfully improve equity in schools, as doing so will need many of these (Leithwood, 2021; De Nobile and Bilgin, 2022). Teachers who can communicate effectively in two dimensions will be able to solve problems on their own and develop as a result of the atmosphere their principals have created (Vinh et al., 2022). Employees will therefore have the chance to share their knowledge and grow as individuals (Puni et al., 2018). On a regular basis, superiors give their staff members feedback on how they are doing, so that the employees' skill and knowledge development is aided by positive feedback (Leithwood, 2021; Vinh et al., 2022).

Some of the major findings from previous literature address the leadership styles influencing institutional development, self-development and student development (Leithwood, 2021; Barnová et al., 2022; De Nobile and Bilgin, 2022); dimensions of leadership styles are vital determinants in making educators dedicated to their institution (Bass and Avolio, 1990; Parveen et al., 2022). Nazari et al. (2012) suggest that transformative leaders have a significant impact on their employees and are successful in enhancing employee commitment. According to Pihie et al. (2011), transformational leaders increase employee commitment by motivating individuals to use innovation and creativity in order to thrive within the organisation. The study suggested that transformational leadership influences teachers' commitment to the school's mission and to the professional learning community in both direct and indirect ways (Ross and Gray, 2006). Leithwood and Jantzi (2000) emphasized the positive effects of transformational leadership in education. They found that transformational leadership can lead to higher levels of commitment, ability, and motivation among teachers to develop new approaches to education. There is a general consensus that everyone finds transformative leadership gratifying. In reaction to transformative leadership conduct, followers everywhere reported similar levels of heightened satisfaction and also exhibited similar tendencies in their ability to identify such behaviour in their leaders (Kouzes and Posner, 2017; Van Dierendonck et al., 2017; Caza et al., 2021). Knowing from literature that leadership styles of the principal and the commitment of teachers in different perspectives are theoretically related in school education, the study has raised and tested the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1: Transformational leadership has a significant influence on commitment of school teachers towards self-development.

Hypothesis 2: Transformational leadership has a significant influence on commitment of school teachers towards student development.

Hypothesis 3: Transformational leadership has a significant influence on commitment of school teachers towards institutional development.

Method

Population and sampling

School teachers from government, private aided and private unaided schools in Bengaluru (urban) were included in the study. There were 6,146 schools in Bengaluru and 61,927 teachers (DISE-2010-11). A survey method was used in this exploratory study. School teachers in Bengaluru were the primary source of data collection. According to the type of school management, the population was divided into categories. Data from government teachers made up 19.9%, private aided teachers made up 33.1% and private, unaided teachers made up 47.1%. The profile of the respondents is detailed in [Table 1](#).

Research design

The study was conducted in Bengaluru city in Karnataka, India. Convenient and stratified sampling technique was used in the study. A valid questionnaire was used to collect data, which was quantitative. The respondents across types of schools were administered the questionnaire personally by researchers. Taking part in the survey was voluntary. A total of 1,555 teachers were targeted for the study, and 1,173 teachers' data was used to sample. The study used approximately 75.43% of the questionnaires administered. A confidentiality agreement was in place for all responses. Ethical clearance to conduct the study was obtained from the Institutional review board.

Measures

The Educational leadership style scale ([Kareem and Patrick, 2019](#)) is based on how teachers view them, supervisors, principals, and coordinators are asked to define the leadership style or styles that they use the most frequently. The four elements of transformational leadership are supportive (10 items), expectant (3 items), receptive (3 items), and corrective (3 items). There are 19 items in all. The educational leadership style scale was designed in Likert-type scale of 1 (Never) to 5 (Always). The Leadership Styles scale has a 0.906 total reliability score, which indicates strong internal consistency. The reliability of the individual factors is between 0.752 to 0.892, showing acceptable reliability due to moderate to high internal consistency ([Pallant, 2001](#)).

The three elements of commitment included in the Personal Commitment Scale ([Kareem and Srikantaswamy, 2014](#)) are commitment to self-development, commitment to intuitional

TABLE 1 Sample profile.

Demographics	Categories	Count	N%
Type of board	State	948	80.8%
	ICSE	177	15.1%
	CBSE	48	4.1%
Type of school	Government	370	31.5%
	Aided	374	31.9%
	Unaided/Private	429	36.6%
Gender	Female	970	82.7%
	Male	203	17.3%
Marital status	Married	881	75.1%
	Unmarried	292	24.9%
Age	<20 Yrs	6	0.5%
	21–25 Yrs	110	9.4%
	26–30 Yrs	280	23.9%
	31–35 Yrs	149	12.7%
	36–40 Yrs	138	11.8%
	41–45 Yrs	192	16.4%
	> 46 Yrs	298	25.4%
Educational qualification	Diploma	143	12.2%
	Graduation	528	45.0%
	Post-Graduation	377	32.1%
	Others	125	10.7%
Years of teaching experience	<2 Yrs	122	10.4%
	2–5 Yrs	273	23.3%
	6–10 Yrs	262	22.3%
	11–20 Yrs	219	18.7%
	> 20 Yrs	297	25.3%

development, and commitment to student development. There are a total of 18 items: 4 items measuring the self-development, 5 items measuring the intuitional development, and 9 measuring the student development. They are all uplifting statements. The personal commitment scale was designed in Likert-type scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) and has an outstanding internal consistency, as indicated by its overall reliability of 0.920. The reliability of the individual factors is between 0.841 to 0.939, suggesting excellent internal consistency, which led to acceptable reliability ([Pallant, 2001](#)).

Analysis

The SPSS Statistical Software, version 23.0, was used to import the data. The model was tested in context to examine the impact of transformation leaders on commitments of school teachers. The data was screened for missing values and normality. Acceptable kurtosis values ranged from 1 to -1 for all variables ([Sposito et al., 1983](#)). The data displayed an acceptable level of skewness between 2 and -2 . The reliability analysis was conducted on the instruments and it is represented by Cronbach's alpha ([Creswell, 2010](#)). The reliability

analysis of the scales is given in Table 2. According to Pallant (2001), Cronbach's alpha value above 0.6 is considered highly reliable and acceptable index (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). The data was subjected to t-test and ANOVA to check the differences among the demographic variable with respect to transformational leadership style and personal commitment.

To check if there are significant mean differences in perceived transformational styles across demographics ANOVA and *t*-tests were conducted (Table 3). There were significant differences in expectation, supportive and corrective styles across categories of State, ICSE and CBSE boards, the means of ICSE being greater. There were significant differences in expectation, supportive and corrective styles across categories of Government, Aided and Private schools, the means of private schools being greater. There were significant differences in recognition, expectation, supportive and corrective styles across categories of seven age groups, the means of 26–30 years' age group being greater. There were significant differences in recognition, and supportive styles across categories of educational qualifications, the means of Diploma holders being greater. There were significant differences in recognition, expectation, supportive and corrective styles across categories of teaching experience, the means of 2–5 years' group being greater for supportive and corrective style, the means of >20 years' group being greater for recognition style, and the means of <2 years' group being greater for expectation style. There were significant differences in recognition, expectation, supportive and corrective styles across Male and Female teachers, the means of females being greater. There were significant differences in recognition, expectation, supportive and corrective styles across Married and Unmarried teachers, the means of Unmarried teachers being greater.

To check if there are significant mean differences in personal commitment of teachers across demographics ANOVA and *t*-tests were conducted (Table 4). There were no significant differences in the dimensions of personal commitment across categories of State, ICSE and CBSE boards. There were significant differences in student and institutional development across categories of Government, Aided and Private schools, the means of aided schools being greater. There were significant differences in student, institutional, and self-development across categories of seven age groups, the means of >46 years' age group being greater. There were significant differences in student, institutional, and self-development across categories of educational qualification, the means of diploma holders being greater. There were significant differences in student, institutional, and self-development across categories of teaching experience, the means of

>20 years' age group being greater. There were significant differences in student, institutional, and self-development across Male and Female teachers, the means of females being greater. There were significant differences in self-development across Married and Unmarried teachers, the means of Unmarried teachers being greater.

Pearson's correlation analysis was used to determine the degree and direction of the relationship between transformational leadership styles of principals and commitment of teachers towards self-development, student development and institutional development. Multiple regression investigation was undertaken to check if transformational leadership's sub-dimensions considerably forecast the commitment of school teachers towards self-development, student development, and institutional development. Before proceeding with the multiple regression, the correlation between all variables of the study was reported (Table 2). The correlation values have satisfied the assumption that the variables were significantly correlated.

Hypothesis 1: Transformational leadership has a significant influence on the commitment of school teachers towards self-development.

The outcome of the regression analysis points to the four predictors of transformational leadership explicated (37.2%) of the variance ($R^2 = 0.372, p < 0.001$). Refer (Table 5, $p < 0.001$), which points out that the comprehensive model is forecasting the commitment of teachers towards self-development. It is found that Transformational Leadership's sub-dimensions: Corrective ($t(1172) = -2.673, p > 0.05$), Recognition ($t(1172) = 2.819, p < 0.01$), Expectation ($t(1172) = 7.445, p < 0.05$) and Supportive ($t(1172) = 6.045, p < 0.01$) forecast the commitment of teachers towards self-development. Hypothesis 1 is accepted and hence transformational leadership's sub-dimensions do significantly influence the commitment of school teachers towards self-development.

Hypothesis 2: Transformational leadership has a significant influence on the commitment of school teachers towards student development.

The outcome of the regression points to the four predictors of transformational leadership explicated (33.4%) of the variance ($R^2 = 0.334, p < 0.001$). Refer (Table 6, $p < 0.001$), which points out that the comprehensive model is forecasting commitment of teachers towards student-development. It is found that Transformational

TABLE 2 Cronbach's alpha, and Pearson's coefficient of correlation.

	Corr	Recog	Expec	Supp	Student	Institutional	Self
Corrective (Corr)	–						
Recognition (Recog)	0.306 ^a	–					
Expectation (Expec)	0.325 ^a	0.486 ^a	–				
Supportive (Supp)	0.443 ^a	0.650 ^a	0.527 ^a	–			
Student	0.153 ^a	0.386 ^a	0.384 ^a	0.440 ^a	–		
Institutional	0.246 ^a	0.421 ^a	0.366 ^a	0.562 ^a	0.592 ^a	–	
Self	0.229 ^a	0.456 ^a	0.472 ^a	0.535 ^a	0.691 ^a	0.602 ^a	–
Cronbach's Alpha	0.813	0.752	0.892	0.853	0.932	0.939	0.841

^aCorrelation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

TABLE 3 ANOVA and t-test results of transformational leadership styles.

Demographic variable		t value	F value
Type of board	Transformational – Recognition		0.821
	Transformational – Expectation		5.972 ^a
	Transformational – Supportive		4.097 ^b
	Transformational – Corrective		3.911 ^b
Type of school	Transformational – Recognition		2.115
	Transformational – Expectation		15.716 ^a
	Transformational – Supportive		4.105 ^b
	Transformational – Corrective		7.148 ^a
Age	Transformational – Recognition		6.254 ^a
	Transformational – Expectation		4.755 ^a
	Transformational – Supportive		8.532 ^a
	Transformational – Corrective		10.265 ^a
Educational qualification	Transformational – Recognition		6.719 ^a
	Transformational – Expectation		0.018
	Transformational – Supportive		3.989 ^a
	Transformational – Corrective		2.534
Teaching experience	Transformational – Recognition		10.503 ^a
	Transformational – Expectation		12.417 ^a
	Transformational – Supportive		13.688 ^a
	Transformational – Corrective		17.965 ^a
Gender	Transformational – Recognition	8.449 ^a	
	Transformational – Expectation	7.178 ^a	
	Transformational – Supportive	9.933 ^a	
	Transformational – Corrective	5.473 ^a	
Marital status	Transformational – Recognition	-3.092 ^a	
	Transformational – Expectation	-5.546 ^a	
	Transformational – Supportive	-5.906 ^a	
	Transformational – Corrective	-7.288 ^a	

^aSignificant at the 0.01 level.

^bSignificant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Leadership's sub-dimensions: Corrective ($t(1172) = -2.695, p < 0.01$), Recognition ($t(1172) = 3.696, p < 0.01$), Expectation ($t(1172) = 6.288, p < 0.05$) and; Supportive ($t(1172) = 7.806, p < 0.01$) forecast the commitment of teachers towards student-development. Hypothesis 2 is accepted and hence transformational leadership's sub-dimensions do significantly influence the commitment of school teachers towards student-development.

Hypothesis 3: Transformational leadership has a significant influence on the commitment of school teachers towards institutional development.

The outcome of the regression points to the four predictors of transformational leadership explicated (32.6%) of the variance ($R^2 = 0.326, p < 0.001$). Refer (Table 7, $p < 0.001$), which points out that the comprehensive model is forecasting the commitment of teachers towards institutional development. It is found that Transformational Leadership's sub-dimensions: Corrective ($t(1172) = -0.560, p > 0.05$),

TABLE 4 ANOVA and t-test results of Personal commitment of teachers.

Demographic variable		t value	F value
Type of board	Student development		1.185
	Institutional development		1.738
	Self-development		2.321
Type of school	Student development		12.745 ^a
	Institutional development		22.316 ^a
	Self-development		0.368
Age	Student development		17.621 ^a
	Institutional development		12.566 ^a
	Self-development		11.723 ^a
Educational qualification	Student development		10.481 ^a
	Institutional development		19.950 ^a
	Self-development		4.430 ^a
Teaching experience	Student development		34.247 ^a
	Institutional development		26.400 ^a
	Self-development		15.825 ^a
Gender	Student development	10.779 ^a	
	Institutional development	12.629 ^a	
	Self-development	9.419 ^a	
Marital status	Student development	1.169	
	Institutional development	0.016	
	Self-development	-5.919 ^a	

^aSignificant at the 0.01 level.

Recognition ($t(1172) = 2.348, p < 0.05$), Expectation ($t(1172) = 2.878, p < 0.05$) and Supportive ($t(1172) = 13.652, p < 0.01$) forecast the commitment of teachers towards institutional-development. Hypothesis 3 is accepted and hence transformational leadership's sub-dimensions do significantly influence the commitment of school teachers toward institutional development.

Discussions and implications

It is important to acknowledge that, while there was large sample, the participants represent a small fraction of all school teachers in India. It is also worth noting the limitations of quantitative studies based on self-reporting surveys and absence of qualitative data to explain relationships. Nevertheless, the study explored commitment of school teachers using a comprehensive set of variables such as self, student and institutional development, the likes of which have not been attempted previously.

The results showed that majority of the demographic variables show significant differences among the variables of transformational leadership styles. The transformational leadership style of school principals creates differences irrespective of their board, type of management, age, experience, gender and marital status of the teacher. The recognition does not differ among the type of board and school management, which shows teachers in both public and private schools irrespective of their boards are recognised equally by their principals, respectively. In case of commitment of school teachers, the

TABLE 5 Descriptive statistics, model summary, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and coefficient values of transformational leadership style (TLS) and its influence on teacher's commitment towards self-development (self).

		TLS	Sup	Corr	Recog	Expec	Self
	Mean	2.86	2.96	2.71	2.99	2.81	11.33
	SD	0.81	0.78	0.74	0.85	0.87	3.17
Model summary	R ²	0.372					
ANOVA	F	138.39**					
Coefficient	β		0.961	-0.304	0.334	0.775	
	T		6.045**	-2.673	2.819**	7.445**	

The authors.

** Denotes significance at 01 level; Sup-Supportive; Corr-Corrective; Recog-Recognition; Expec-Expectation.

TABLE 6 Descriptive statistics, model summary, Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and COEFFICIENT values of transformational leadership style (TLS) and its influence on teacher's commitment towards student-development (student).

		TLS	Sup	Corr	Recog	Expec	Student
	Mean	2.86					27.44
	SD	0.81					6.772
Model summary	R ²	0.334					
ANOVA	F	117.11**					
coefficient	β		0.637	-1.242	0.411	0.775	
	t		7.806**	-2.695**	3.696**	6.288**	

The authors.

** Denotes significance at 01 level; Sup-Supportive; Corr-Corrective; Recog-Recognition; Expec-Expectation.

TABLE 7 Descriptive statistics, model summary, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and coefficient values of transformational leadership style (TLS) and its influence on teacher's commitment towards institutional development (Institution).

		TLS	Sup	Corr	Recog	Expec	Institution
	Mean	2.86					13.47
	SD	0.81					3.80
Model Summary	R ²	0.371					
ANOVA	F	137.498**					
Coefficient	β		0.637	-1.242	0.411	0.775	
	t		13.652**	-0.560	2.348**	2.878**	

The authors.

** Denotes significance at 01 level; Sup-Supportive; Corr-Corrective; Recog-Recognition; Expec-Expectation.

demographic variables show significant differences among the commitment variables such as self, student and institution development but the type of board does not show any significant differences. The commitment of school teachers remains unbiased irrespective of the board they work.

The school management or principals who possess transformational leadership styles do significantly influence the commitment of teachers towards self-development, student development and institutional development, but the corrective sub-dimension of transformational leadership is found insignificant in terms of self and institutional development. Teachers in school education expect autonomy in their jobs, as they expect their bosses not to intervene in terms of correcting mistakes, addressing complaints and resolving conflicts in their interests and commitment towards institutional and self-development. But when it comes to student development, the interventions from their bosses are considered significant. Individualised attention is crucial for both

productivity and teachers' contentment with the principal (Bass and Avolio, 1994). In order to aid teachers in excelling at their tasks, the principal would support, encourage and empower them. Such a principal opens up fresh learning chances and raises the potential of their followers one step at a time (Bass et al., 2003). Transformational leaders encourage their followers to do more than the expected (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Guarana and Avolio, 2022). Principals of school can accomplish this in a number of ways: first, by educating teachers on the significance and value of task goals; second, by motivating them to put the organisation's needs ahead of their own; and third, by encouraging them to raise their high-level demands.

According to Owen et al. (2004) and Özaralli (2003), principals with transformational leadership styles recognise and cultivate shared values, empower others and persuade teachers to create more work overall, not just better quality work. They also encourage teachers to use their creativity to solve problems (Limsila and Ogunlana, 2008). It must be remembered that transformational leadership emphasizes

a leader's capacity for transformation. It involves transforming people by boosting their enthusiasm, solidifying their commitment, and giving them the tools they need to accomplish corporate goals (Yukl, 2010). Principals put the institution first and motivate followers to work toward those aims. They persuade followers to prioritise the interests of the group over their own (Lussier and Achua, 2007). They are able to motivate others to take challenges at work at their desire and grab opportunities to accomplish goals at a greater level (Yukl, 2010; Guarana and Avolio, 2022). A leader with inspirational motivation is thought to have high expectations for their followers. Such principals with leadership styles encourage and inspire their teachers by articulating a clear vision, coordinating professional and personal objectives, and viewing challenges as teaching opportunities (Gill, 2006). By giving their work purpose and challenge, this kind of leader also lifts their followers' spirits and inspires them to picture appealing future situations (Bass et al., 2003). They help teachers become more cooperative and motivate them to work harder than they would if they were only thinking about themselves (Northouse, 2022; Parveen et al., 2022). To boost organisational performance, leaders anticipate greater job commitment from staff members towards self and student development as well as the production of high-calibre work.

From the study, it is understood that the guidance from the principals is found to be significant when it involves students' stake, because by offering instructions on communicating corrective measures and suggestions in institutions, settings, oneself and others, transformational management strategies transform teachers and school systems to develop the welfare of the students. A leader who transforms lives motivates others to achieve unexpected or amazing results (Yasmin et al., 2019). Teachers do not expect or consider the same amount of guidance or measures from their principals when it comes to developing their own self and their school. This finding from our study stands consistent with Yasmin et al. (2019), saying that the transformational leadership style will have less or no impact on the performance of the teachers.

The focus of school principals possessing transformational leadership style is on involving the workforce by recognising and supporting their teachers. Rather than being a single, domineering person, the leader of the organisation allows his subordinates to participate in decision-making by outlining the numerous academic obligations or coursework that must be completed and how it can be successfully completed with the combined consent and assistance of all employees. The teachers' participation is the most effective approach to encourage them to take on the institution's many tasks and to provide them with a variety of options and choices, not because the management is ineffective, but to recognise their contribution to the teachers by supporting them in both personal and professional levels. It is also proved from our study, supporting the arguments from Saleem et al. (2020) and Lee et al. (2018).

Transformational recognition is a leader who recognises others' accomplishments and engages in developing others' potential; mostly in a moral and ethical manner (Saputra, 2022). Employees may feel compelled to be loyal to their employers when they realise how much money those employers have invested in their professional development and training, according to Colquitt et al. (2010). Teachers feel bad about leaving the institutions because of this commitment. Similar to how teachers feel when their institutions participate in humanitarian endeavours, they become more dedicated to the advancement of their institutions. According to Fornes et al. (2008),

congruency, fascinating work, clarity of purpose, equity and fairness, feedback and acknowledgment, empowerment, and autonomy are all preconditions for workplace commitment. Likewise, teachers who get recognised by the principals of the institution will be highly motivated, with aligned interest accordingly to the organisation, which will have expressed commitment towards the development of their own self, students and the institution as well.

Conclusion

The need for strong principal leadership and dedicated teachers is suggested by the evolving nature of schooling in order to meet the demands placed on academic institutions. Therefore, it is vital for school boards to look into the efficiency of leadership as well as the level of commitment among instructors, given the many changes and reforms in school education across many countries. Numerous research studies on the commitment of teachers and the leadership style used in schools have addressed the problems with Indian school systems. There have not been many studies on this subject done in Asia. There has also been little research on the leadership qualities and commitment of teachers in school-based institutions.

This research has investigated the effect of leadership styles of the school principal and various commitments of teachers on students, self and institutions. We have built on earlier research that mainly concentrated on evaluating the impact independently in several investigations. The study directly affects how leadership development plans are created. The study was conducted with regard to school instructors in Bengaluru, an Indian city. It would be intriguing to observe how dedication and leadership perform in different situations. What functions do leadership and dedication serve to advance higher education in other nations or in different fields? What impact does the type of academic education have on the elements that encourage advancement? The creation of leadership programmes across all education management boards would be significantly impacted by this kind of research.

Limitations and scope for future research

This study was conducted among teachers of Bengaluru schools. While the data represents the population well, the narrow focus of the population makes the results difficult to generalise. It is important to use caution when generalising the results to other educational institutions, such as colleges and schools, particularly in states with very different educational systems. The use of self-reporting and possible problems with the wording and order of the questions remains a limitation of this study, as is the case in much social science research (Podsakoff et al., 2003). As another potential source of common method bias in this research, teachers' information was used both for the independent and dependent variables.

The study identified a number of promising directions for future investigation. Since the findings show that leadership styles of the principal encourages advancement in commitment towards self, student and institutional development, more extensive qualitative investigations are required to evaluate effective leadership practice techniques. To determine how various student groups could be supported more effectively, more research on the time and resource

commitments of teachers is required. Further consideration is needed for the somewhat troubling complementing impact of remedial actions implemented by principals on teachers' commitment to students' growth. In-depth, qualitative investigations could be used to explore all these concepts. Furthermore, to examine the interaction between management support and teachers' own commitment to the organisation and pupils, longitudinal studies on the dynamics of school teachers' career trajectories during ongoing professional advancement are required.

Data availability statement

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

Ethics statement

The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by Research conduct and ethics committee Christ University. The patients/participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

References

- Agosto, V., and Roland, E. (2018). Intersectionality and educational leadership: a critical review. *Rev. Res. Educ.* 42, 255–285. doi: 10.3102/0091732x18762433
- Bakti, R., and Hartono, S. (2022). The influence of transformational leadership and work discipline on the work performance of education service employees. *Multicult. Educ.* 8, 109–125. Available at: https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=bfl0hJcAAAAJ&citation_for_view=bfl0hJcAAAAJ:YsMSGlbcy4C
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Barnová, S., Trellová, S., Krásna, S., Beňová, E., Hasajová, L., and Gabrhelová, G. (2022). Leadership styles, organizational climate, and school climate openness from the perspective of Slovak vocational school teachers. *Societies* 12:192. doi: 10.3390/soc12060192
- Bass, B. M., and Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Transformational Leadership Development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bass, B. M., and Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness: Through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Bass, B. M., and Avolio, B. J. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-5X Short*. Menlo Park, CA Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., and Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 88, 207–218. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.207
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. Wiley and Sons, New York, NY.
- Bredeson, V. P., Fruth, J. M., and Kasten, K. L. (1983). Organizational incentives and secondary school teaching. *J. Res. Dev. Educ.* 16, 52–58. Available at: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1984-13324-001>
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper and Row, Manhattan, NY.
- Bush, T. (2010). *Theories of Educational Leadership and Management (4th)*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Caza, A., Caza, B. B., and Posner, B. Z. (2021). Transformational leadership across cultures: follower perception and satisfaction. *Adm. Sci.* 11:32. doi: 10.3390/admsci11010032
- Chen, L. Y. (2021). Examining the effect of organizational culture and leadership behaviors on organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance at small and middle-sized firms of Taiwan. *J. Am. Acad. Bus.* 5, 432–438. Available at: <https://www.scribd.com/document/259009971/Examining-the-Effect-of-Organization-Culture-and-Leadership-Behaviors-on-Organizational-Commitment-Job-Satisfaction-And-Job-Performance>
- Colquitt, J., Wesson, M. J., and Lepine, J. A. (2010). *Organizational Behavior: Essentials for Improving Performance and Commitment*. McGraw-Hill Irwin, New York, NY.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J., and Kessler, I. (2000). Consequences of the psychological contract for the employment relationship: a large scale survey*. *J. Manag. Stud.* 37, 903–930. doi: 10.1111/1467-6486.00210
- Creswell, J. W. (2010). *Educational Research - Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research, (4th Ed.)*, Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Dale, K., and Fox, M. L. (2008). Leadership style and organizational commitment: mediating effect of role stress. *J. Manag. Issues* 20, 109–130. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40604597>
- De Nobile, J., and Bilgin, A. A. (2022). A structural model to explain influences of organisational communication on the organisational commitment of primary school staff. *Educ. Sci.* 12:395. doi: 10.3390/educsci12060395
- Evans, E. D. (1976). *Transition to Teaching*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Austin, TX.
- Firestone, W. A., and Rosenblum, S. (1988). The alienation and commitment of students and teachers in urban high schools. ERIC. Available at: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED294959>
- Fornes, S. L., Rocco, T. S., and Wollard, K. K. (2008). Workplace commitment: a conceptual model developed from integrative review of the research. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Rev.* 7, 339–357. doi: 10.1177/1534484308318760
- Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: a developmental conceptualization. *Am. Educ. Res. J.* 6, 207–226. doi: 10.3102/00028312006002207
- Fuller, F., and Brown, O. (1975). *Becoming a Teacher*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- García-Morales, V. J., Lloréns-Montes, F. J., and Verdú-Jover, A. J. (2008). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational performance through knowledge and innovation*. *Br. J. Manag.* 19, 299–319. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2007.00547.x
- Gill, R. (2006). *Theory and Practice of Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE.
- Guarana, L. C., and Avolio, B. J. (2022). Unpacking psychological ownership: how transactional and transformational leaders motivate ownership. *J. Leadersh. Organ. Stud.* 29, 96–114. doi: 10.1177/15480518211066072
- Judge, T. A., and Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 89, 755–768. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755
- Kareem, J., and Patrick, H. A. (2019). Educational leadership styles scale (ELSS): construction, validation and reliability analysis. *J. Organ. Behav.* 18, 50–67. Available at: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3793556>
- Kareem, J., and Srikantaswamy, J. (2014). Construction of teachers' personal commitment scale: validity and reliability analysis. *Indian Streams Res. J.* 3, 1–7. Available at: <http://oldisrj.lbp.world/Article.aspx?ArticleID=10470>
- Kendrick, M. (2001). Conviction, personal commitment and social change. In Queensland Advocacy Conference (pp. 10–15). Brisbane, QA: Queensland advocacy.

Author contributions

JK and HP contributed to conception and design of the study. JK, HP, and NP organized the database. JK and NP performed the statistical analysis. JK, HP, NP, VB, VT, UM, and PM wrote sections of the manuscript. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

- Khasawneh, S., Omari, A., and Abu-Tineh, A. M. (2012). The relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment. *Educ. Manag. Adm. Leadersh.* 40, 494–508. doi: 10.1177/1741143212438217
- Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. (2017). *The Leadership Challenge: How to Make Extraordinary Things Happen in Organizations* (6th). Hoboken, NJ, John Wiley & Sons.
- Lee, M. C., Idris, M. A., and Tuckey, M. (2018). Supervisory coaching and performance feedback as mediators of the relationships between leadership styles, work engagement, and turnover intention. *Hum. Resour. Dev. Int.* 22, 257–282. doi: 10.1080/13678868.2018.1530170
- Leithwood, K. (2021). A review of evidence about equitable school leadership. *Educ. Sci.* 11:377. doi: 10.3390/educsci11080377
- Leithwood, K., and Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *J. Educ. Adm.* 38, 112–129. doi: 10.1108/09578230010320064
- Limsila, K., and Ogunlana, S. O. (2008). Performance and leadership outcome correlates of leadership styles and subordinate commitment. *Eng. Constr. Archit. Manag.* 15, 164–184. doi: 10.1108/09699980810852682
- Lok, P., and Crawford, J. (2004). The effect of organisational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and Organisational commitment. *J. Manag. Dev.* 23, 321–338. doi: 10.1108/02621710410529785
- Lussier, R. N., and Achua, C. F. (2007). *Effective Leadership* (3rd). Thomson South-Western, Mason, OH.
- Lyubkyh, Z., Gulseren, D., Turner, N., Barling, J., and Seifert, M. (2022). Shared transformational leadership and safety behaviours of employees, leaders, and teams: a multilevel investigation. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 95, 431–458. doi: 10.1111/joop.12381
- Masa'deh, R., Obeidat, B. Y., and Tarhini, A. (2016). A Jordanian empirical study of the associations among transformational leadership, transactional leadership, knowledge sharing, job performance, and firm performance. *J. Manag. Dev.* 35, 681–705. doi: 10.1108/jmd-09-2015-0134
- Mescon, M. H., Albert, M., and Khedouri, F. (1985). *Management: Individual and Organizational Effectiveness*. Harper & Row, New York, NY.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., and Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 14, 224–247. doi: 10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1
- Nazari, K., Zaidatul Akmaliah, L. P., Ramli, B., and Khairuddin, I. (2012). An empirical investigation of lecturers' organizational commitment in technical and vocational colleges in Iran. *J. Arts Sci. Commer.* 3, 1–10. Available at: <https://www.proquest.com/openview/8b9d7323c882dfd9cd467b197681c325/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=556342>
- Northouse, P. G. (2022). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE.
- Nunnally, J. C., and Bernstein, I. R. (1994). *Psychometric Theory*, Ed. ke-3, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Owen, H., Hodgson, V., and Gazzard, N. (2004). *The Leadership Manual: Your Complete Practical Guide to Effective Leadership*. Prentice Hall Business, Hoboken, NJ.
- Özaralli, N. (2003). Effects of transformational leadership on empowerment and team effectiveness. *Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.* 24, 335–344. doi: 10.1108/01437730310494301
- Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS Survival Manual - A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows (Version 10)*, Buckingham Open University Press, London.
- Park, C. K., Lim, D. H., and Ju, B. (2016). "Transformational leadership and teacher engagement in an international context" in *Handbook of Research on Global Issues in Next-Generation Teacher Education* (Hershey PA: Information Science), 22–42.
- Parveen, K., Quang Bao Tran, P., Kumar, T., and Shah, A. H. (2022). Impact of principal leadership styles on teacher job performance: an empirical investigation. *Front. Educ.* 7, 1–12. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2022.814159
- Pihie, Z. A., Sadeghi, A., and Elias, H. (2011). Analysis of head of departments leadership styles: implication for improving research university management practices. *Procedia. Soc. Behav. Sci.* 29, 1081–1090. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.341
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., and Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 88, 879–903. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- Puni, A., Mohammed, I., and Asamoah, E. (2018). Transformational leadership and job satisfaction: the moderating effect of contingent reward. *Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.* 39, 522–537. doi: 10.1108/loj-11-2017-0358
- Ross, J. A., and Gray, P. (2006). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values: the mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy. *Sch. Eff. Improv.* 17, 179–199. doi: 10.1080/09243450600565795
- Rowden, R. W. (2000). The relationship between charismatic leadership behaviors and organizational commitment. *Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J.* 21, 30–35. doi: 10.1108/01437730010310712
- Saleem, A., Aslam, S., Yin, H. B., and Rao, C. (2020). Principal leadership styles and teacher job performance: viewpoint of middle management. *Sustainability* 12:3390. doi: 10.3390/su12083390
- Saputra, I. (2022). Principal's transformational leadership in education era 4.0: a literature review. *Int. J. Curr. Res.* 5:8. doi: 10.47191/ijcsrr/v5-i8-07
- Silins, H., Zarins, S., and Mulford, B. (2002). What characteristics and processes define a school as a learning organisation? Is this a useful concept to apply to schools? *Int. Educ. J.* 3, 24–32. Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234564901_What_Characteristics_and_Processes_Define_a_School_as_a_Learning_Organisation_Is_This_a_Useful_Concept_To_Apply_to_Schools#:~:text=with%20four%20factors,mission%3B%20and%2C%20Professional%20development.&text=characterise%20schools%20as%20learning%20organisations%20\(Louis%2C%201994\)](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234564901_What_Characteristics_and_Processes_Define_a_School_as_a_Learning_Organisation_Is_This_a_Useful_Concept_To_Apply_to_Schools#:~:text=with%20four%20factors,mission%3B%20and%2C%20Professional%20development.&text=characterise%20schools%20as%20learning%20organisations%20(Louis%2C%201994))
- Sposito, V. A., Hand, M. L., and Skarpness, B. (1983). On the efficiency of using the sample kurtosis in selecting optimal LP estimators. *Commun. Stat. Simul.* 12, 265–272. doi: 10.1080/03610918308812318
- Van Dierendonck, D., Sousa, M., Gunnarsdóttir, S., Bobbio, A., Hakonen, J., Pircher Verdorfer, A., et al. (2017). The cross-cultural invariance of the servant leadership survey: a comparative study across eight countries. *Adm. Sci.* 7:8. doi: 10.3390/admsci7020008
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Rev. Educ. Res.* 54, 143–178. doi: 10.3102/00346543054002143
- Vinh, N. Q., Hien, L. M., and Do, Q. H. (2022). The relationship between transformation leadership, job satisfaction and employee motivation in the tourism industry. *Adm. Sci.* 12:161. doi: 10.3390/admsci12040161
- Xie, Q., Wu, B., Li, J., Xu, C., Li, H., Luginbuhl, D. J., et al. (2019). Transsynaptic fish-lips signaling prevents misconnections between nonsynaptic partner olfactory neurons. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 116, 16068–16073. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1905832116
- Yasmin, F., Imran, M., and Sultana, M. (2019). Effects of principals' leadership styles on teachers' performance at secondary schools in Dera Ismail Khan. *Glob. Soc. Sci. Rev.* IV, 281–286. doi: 10.31703/gssr.2019(iv-i).37
- Yu, H., Leithwood, K., and Jantzi, D. (2002). The effects of transformational leadership on teachers' commitment to change in Hong Kong. *J. Educ. Adm.* 40, 368–389. doi: 10.1108/09578230210433436
- Yukl, G. A. (2010). *Leadership in Organizations*. Hoboken, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- Yuwono, H., Gunawan, D. R., Eliyana, A., Anggraini, R. D., Herlambang, P., and Jalil, N. I. (2022). Transformational leaders' approach to overcapacity: a study in correctional institutions. *PLoS One* 17:e0276792. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0276792
- Zacharo, K., Koutsoukos, M., and Panta, D. (2018). Connection of teachers' organizational commitment and transformational leadership. A case study from Greece. *Int. J. Learn. Teach.* 17, 89–106. doi: 10.26803/ijlter.17.8.6