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Abstract
Teaching is one of the most important professions from the standpoint of human welfare. It is considered as one of the most exalted forms of social service. Teaching is also one of the most technical, difficult, and challenging professions (Acero, Javier, & Castro, 2000). Likewise, teaching is also considered a great opportunity. In the words of Gregorio (1986), no one should enter into this work without an appreciation of the great opportunity it offers for high service and gratifying achievement. This study aimed to examine teachers’ organizational commitments in terms of parent relationship, community service and mission and the school’s organizational climate in terms of administrative support, buffers, teaching help, school influence, and autonomy. It also aimed to determine the extent of influence of school climate on teachers’ organizational commitment. The respondents of the study were the 62 school administrators and 313 elementary school teachers. Descriptive-correlational method was used in the investigation. The data gathered was summarized, translated, and analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, weighted mean, standard deviation, ranks, t-test for independent samples, and multiple regression analysis. All computations were done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software and all tests of hypotheses was set at 0.05 level of significance. From the data gathered on the teachers’ organizational commitment, both respondents perceived that in general, teachers were committed; both respondents perceived that the school climates was very satisfactory; there was a significant difference between the school administrators and teachers’ perception on teachers’ organizational commitment. It was also found that age, educational attainment, teaching experience, school’s climate are potent factors that significantly influence the organizational commitment of teachers.
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Introduction

Teaching is one of the most important professions from the standpoint of human welfare. It is considered as one of the most exalted forms of social service. Teaching is also one of the most technical, difficult, and challenging professions. Likewise, teaching is also considered a great opportunity. In the words of Gregorio (1986), no one should enter into this work without an appreciation of the great opportunity it offers for high service and gratifying achievement.

In addition, Cariño (1992), espoused that the most important component of the educational system is the teacher. No educational reform can begin unless it begins first with the teacher. As stressed by Navarro (1988), the teacher has always been expected to prepare the young people to become useful, upright and active citizens in the community.

As observed, there were teachers who are non-participative to school activities. They tend to be mere spectators in the organization and serve as critique to school activities. Another observable factor is absenteeism displayed among teachers. Moreover, most teachers become business minded. They sell goods and other products in the school and oftentimes send their pupils to collect payments for the sold goods. Teaching becomes secondary or sideline. Another observed factor is organizational climate. Conflict between school administrators and teachers and among teachers themselves often not resolved. The no freedom of expression and no consultations, especially on planning and decision-making creates friction among superiors and subordinates. Small conflicts tend to reach the Ombudsman, or to radio broadcasting or to the favorite TV program “HOY GISING” or to the Division Grievance Committee without proper channel. These indicators can be attributed to teachers’ commitment and complacency. As Drucker (1977) stressed that effective manager, including teachers as committed managers of teaching and learning, focus on contribution they look up from their work and outward goals. They will ask what they can contribute to the realization of their goals and likewise determine what will significantly affect the performance and the results of the institution they serve.

Furthermore, Ornstein (1993) posited that commitment among school personnel is of paramount importance. Commitment is not mere compliance with an assigned professional commitment to their functions in the school organization. It serves as an alleviating factor for absenteeism, not being punctual in reporting to their classes, and indecency. It reflects the personal interpretation of work experience among teachers. It also believed that commitment is a significant factor to the improvement of school outcome, especially students’ academic achievement.

Hence, the present study tries to find out the teachers’ organizational commitment as influence by school climate.

Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to examine teachers’ organizational commitments as influenced by school climates. It sought answers to the following questions: (1) what is the level of teachers’ organizational commitment in terms of parent relationship, community service and school’s mission? (2) what is the school’s organizational climate in terms
of administrative support, buffers, teaching help, school influence, and autonomy? (3)
To what extent does school climate influence the teachers’ organizational commitment?

**Methodology**

To attain the research objectives, descriptive-correlational method was used in the investigation. The respondents of the study were the 62 school administrators which includes the principals, head teachers, and school in-charge of the sixty-two elementary schools and the 313 elementary school teachers which are randomly selected from the total 1,438 elementary school teachers.

In gathering the data, two sets of survey questionnaires were used: *organizational commitment questionnaire and school climate questionnaire*. The first questionnaire has 14-items which is subdivided into three groups: parent relationship; community service; and school’s mission. Meanwhile, the second questionnaire consists of five indicators namely: administrative support; buffers; teaching help; school influence; and autonomy adapted from the study of Riehl and Sipple (1996). As to the reliability of the instrument, the following are the Cronbach-alpha reliability coefficients: administrative support ($\alpha=0.88$); buffers ($\alpha=0.74$); teaching help ($\alpha=0.84$); school influence ($\alpha=0.77$); and autonomy ($\alpha=0.74$). From the different reliability indices, this instrument is said to be reliable. As to the statistical treatment, weighted mean, and regression analysis were used.

**Results & Discussion**

The following were the findings arranged according to the objectives of the study.

**A. Level of Teacher’s Organizational Commitment**

This part presents the level of teacher’s organizational commitment along parent relationship, community service, and school’s mission as viewed by the school administrators and teachers. The scale below was used to help describe the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Qualitative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.21-5.00</td>
<td>very highly committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.41-4.20</td>
<td>highly committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61-3.40</td>
<td>moderately committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.81-2.60</td>
<td>less committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00-1.80</td>
<td>not committed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.1. Parent Relationship**

Figure 1 shows the level of organizational commitment of teachers as to parent relationship. As shown, both school administrators and teachers agreed that “teacher discuss with parent the concern about the academic performance of their children every periodic term” based on the means scores of 3.97 and 4.29, respectively. However, school administrators viewed teachers as “highly committed” while teacher themselves viewed it as “very highly committed”. Moreover, both respondents scored lowest on the last indicator. However, they both
agreed that teachers were “moderately committed” in visiting homes of pupils whenever they are absent in the class. This can be seen by its mean scores of 2.94 and 3.30, respectively.

A.2. Community Service

Figure 2 presents the level of teacher’s organizational commitment as to community service. As shown, the school administrators and teachers has different views on teacher’s organizational commitment as to community service. The obtained mean score of 4.07 (school administrators) depicts that teachers were “highly committed” in leading the barangay and/or purok in clean and green program. Meanwhile, the mean score of 4.23 (teachers) signifies that teachers were “very highly committed” in rendering barangay and/or purok evaluation. The difference can be attributed to the fact that majority of the clean and green programs in the purok and barangay level are already implemented. To sustain its implementation, periodic monitoring and evaluation were done by the teachers as purok enablers. In addition, both respondents agreed that teachers were “highly committed” in serving during barangay and/or purok elections based on its means scores of 3.86 and 3.84, respectively. This indicator was scored lowest by both respondents because it is very obvious that teachers were often taken as board of election inspectors (BEI) during government elections.

A.3. School’s Mission

Figure 3 illustrates the level of organizational commitment of teachers as to fulfilling the school’s mission. The figure below describes that both school
administrators and teachers agreed that teachers were “very highly committed” in valuing school improvement. This can be seen by the following obtained mean scores of 4.47 and 4.57, respectively. This means that teachers deeply understand the school’s mission.

Furthermore, both respondents agreed that teachers were “highly committed” in following school rules even if it conflicts with their professional judgment as seen in its mean scores of 3.47 and 4.0, respectively. This indicator was scored lowest by both respondents because as observe in the actual practice teachers are given freedom to express their ideas and feelings before implementing the school rules.

Summary on the Level of Teacher’s Organizational Commitment

This part presents the summary on the level of teacher’s organizational commitment. As shown in figure 4, both respondents perceived that teachers were “very highly committed” with regards to the school mission as evidenced by its mean of 4.26. Meaning, this finding is actually observed among elementary teachers in the public schools. In addition, the obtained mean of 3.98 revealed that school administrators and teachers perceived that teachers were “highly committed” in performing community service. Respondents also perceived that teachers were also “highly committed” towards parent relationship as indicated by its mean of 3.76. This means that they have established a good relationship with their pupils’ parents. In general, both respondents agreed that teachers were “highly committed” in performing their roles in the organization. This finding is consistent with the findings of Riehl and Sipple (1996), Rosenholtz and Simpson (1990), and Turan (1998) in similar researches made. Their findings revealed that teachers very frequently practice the different components described under the three variables, namely: mission, community service, and parent relationship implying that teachers were organizationally committed.
B. School Climate

This portion reveals the schools’ climate as perceived by school administrators and teachers. This includes administrative support, buffers, teaching help, school influence, and autonomy. The scale below was used to help describe the data. Qualitative description\(^1\) was used for administrative support, buffers, school influence and autonomy while qualitative description\(^2\) was used to describe teaching help.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Description(^2)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Qualitative Description(^1)</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.21-5.00</td>
<td>very great extent</td>
<td>extremely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.41-4.20</td>
<td>great extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.61-3.40</td>
<td>fair extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.81-2.60</td>
<td>little extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00-1.80</td>
<td>very little extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.1. Administrative Support

Figure 5 describes the extent of administrative support given to the teachers. As shown, school administrators state that administrative support is given to teachers at “very great extent” as indicated by its mean scores of 4.71, 4.66, 4.57, 4.39, and 4.32 respectively. On the other hand, teachers state that administrative support is given but to a “great extent” only as indicated by its mean scores of 4.02, 3.95, 3.94, 3.91, and 3.86, respectively. The findings imply the both respondents agree that school administrators perform their role as instructional supervisors.
B.2. Buffers

Figure 6 illustrates the extent to which teachers have access to resources, have parental support, and are protected from unnecessary intrusions on their work. As shown, school administrators posit that a “great extent” was observed on teachers receiving great deal of support from parents for the work they do and provision of necessary materials such as textbooks, instructional supplies like chalk boards and chalk, and copy machines were readily available for teacher. This can be indicated by its mean scores of 3.92 and 3.63, respectively. This implies that parents through frequent homeroom PTA meetings supported teachers in accomplishing homeroom PTA projects and other instructional supplies. In addition, school administrators assert that there was “fair extent” on the routine duties of teachers such as lesson planning and paper works whether or not these tasks interfere with their teaching job as indicated by its mean score of 3.00. This implies that school administrators should take a closer look if lesson planning and paper works interfere in the teaching performance of teachers.

On the other hand, teachers assert that they received a “great extent of support from parents for the work they do as indicated by its mean score of 3.77. Moreover, teachers posit that routine task like lesson planning and paper works has “little extent” of interference with their teaching job as indicated by its mean score of 3.53 which is scored reversely. This means that this routine task is part and parcel of the teachers’ teaching job. As revealed by Boiser, et.al (2000) in their study “Task in the Classroom”, teachers prepared manuals and or lesson plans to meet the levels of pupils and make teaching effective.

Furthermore, teachers assume that there is “fair extent” as to the provision of needed materials such as textbooks, and instructional supplies for the teachers as indicated by its mean score of 2.95. This finding described that teachers were fairly provided with the needed materials. However, it is also true observation that teachers provide some instructional materials from their pockets, like photocopying the textbook or other supplemental materials because the provision is not enough to the actual number of pupils in the classroom.
### B.3. Teaching Help

Figure 7 reflects the responses of the respondents to the question, “to what extent has the following people: school administrators, learning area coordinators, and other teachers help improve and or solve instructional issues or class management problems?” As shown, school administrators assert that they themselves were “extremely helpful” in both improving classroom instruction and solving classroom problem. This is indicated by its mean score of 4.45. However, teachers describe school administrators “quite a bit helpful” as indicated by its mean score of 3.53. In general, this means that school administrators performed their role as instructional leaders in the school through their constant visit on teacher’s classroom, and extends help.

Moreover, school administrators assume learning area coordinators and other teachers were “quite a bit helpful” in providing teaching help to resolve instructional issues and or problems met by teachers as indicated by its means scores of 4.02 and 3.47. Meanwhile, teachers posit that learning area coordinators and their peers were “moderately helpful” in extending teaching help. This means that in general both respondents agreed that other teachers and learning area coordinators provided help especially to the new teachers in terms of classroom instruction and classroom problem like suggesting for the suitability of instructional devices to their pupils’ interest and help improve teachers’ teaching strategies and techniques.

This finding is quite consistent with the finding of Riehl and Sipple (1996). Their findings revealed that teachers received moderate help from their school administrators and learning area coordinators with regards to classroom instructional methods and problems. It is significant to mention that methods and behavior consistently relate to achievement (Biose, Devela, Jamora, Leuterio, Marononilla, Perez, and Saluba, 2000), thus school administrators and learning area coordinators should provide more than moderate extent of help to the teachers to ensure improvement of classroom instruction, method and management.
B.4. School Influence

Figure 8 describes the responses of the respondents to the question, “to what extent teacher's actual influence over school policy in the following areas: curriculum, decision making, discipline, ability grouping, and staff development?” It can be gleaned from the figure that school administrators postulate that teachers has a “very great extent” of influence in decision making policy as indicated by its mean score of 4.26. This finding is very true as observed in the field. Teachers always participates in planning and decision making for school activities and programs. In addition, school administrators assert that teachers has “great extent” of influence on discipline policy, content of in-service programs, setting policy on grouping pupil by ability, and in curriculum planning and implementation as indicated by the following mean scores of 4.10, 3.86, 3.81, & 3.61.

Meanwhile, teachers assume that they themselves has “great extent” of influence in planning on content of in-service programs, discipline policy, decision making, setting policy on ability grouping of pupils, and curriculum planning, as indicated by the following mean scores of 3.80, 3.77, 3.75, 3.73, & 3.72.

In general, both respondents agree that teacher has great extent of influence in school. They always participate in the making of school policy such as wearing of appropriate uniform or punctuality in reporting to school or utilization of elementary learning continuum (ELC) and or grouping pupils into sections either through grades or a series of test.
B.5. Autonomy

Figure 9 reveals the responses of the respondents to the question, “to what extent teachers have control over the selection of classroom discipline, textbook and instructional materials, course content, teaching techniques, and kind of homework to be assigned to the pupils.

As shown, the obtained mean of 4.31 depicts that teachers had a “very great extent” of control over pupils’ discipline. This finding can be supported by Assertive Approach Model of Discipline by Lee and Canter in which teachers insist on responsible behavior by their pupils (Boiser, Devela, Jamora, Maronilla, Perez and Saluba, 2000). This means that the teacher takes charge of the classroom immediately, sets the ground rules, and interacts with pupils in a calm and yet forceful way.

Moreover, figure 9 illustrates that both respondents agree that teachers had “great extent” of control in determining the amount of homework to be assigned, selecting teaching techniques, selecting content, topics, and skills to be taught, and selecting textbooks and other instructional materials as indicated by its mean scores that fall within the range 3.41-4.20. This means that classroom management of teachers is under control.

C. Extent of Influence of School Climate on Teacher’s Organizational Commitment

Table 1 presents the regression analysis to test if components of school climate predicts teacher’s organizational commitment. As shown, two predictor variables have significant contribution to the variation in teacher’s organizational commitment. These are school influence and autonomy. These can be observed by its t-values of 3.343 and 3.058 respectively with the corresponding p-values of .001 and .003 which are significant at .05. This finding is consistent with the findings of Riehl and Sipple (1996) that school climate variables were strongly associated with teacher commitment.

Moreover, the R squared value of .175 indicates that 17.5% of the variation in teacher’s organizational commitment are explained by the five predictor variables. In addition, as indicated by an F-value of 13.136 with a corresponding probability value
of 0.000, the regression model is therefore significant.

### Table 1 Regression Analysis Predicting Teacher’s Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Coefficient (B)</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.353</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>10.262</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support Buffer</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Help</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>1.268</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Influence</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.478</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>3.343</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .175$  
$F = 13.136$  
$Probability = .000$

### Conclusions

The general assessments of both respondents on the level of teachers’ organizational commitment ranges from highly committed to very highly committed. The level of administrative support, school influence, autonomy, and buffers that is, teachers’ access to resources, have parental support, and protection from unnecessary intrusions on their work, ranges from great to very great extent while the extent of teaching help from school administrators, learning area coordinators, and other teachers was quite a bit helpful. Moreover, the school’s climate has influence on teacher’s organizational commitment.
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