

An Investigation into Principals' Instructional Leadership and Lecturers' Organizational Commitment Within the Community Colleges in Jamaica

Cerease Nevins-Bennett and Andre Martin

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to examine the relationship between lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership and lecturers' views of their organizational commitment (OC) within the community colleges in Jamaica. Quantitative data were collected using a questionnaire that adopted the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale and the Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment. A total of 170 lecturers participated in the survey, which used total population sampling, a purposive sampling technique. The Social Exchange Theory, Organizational Commitment Model, and Instructional Leadership Model provided theoretical frameworks for the study. Results of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation showed an overall low but positive association between principals' instructional leadership and lecturers' organizational commitment. Defining the college mission was positively correlated with affective and normative commitment but negatively with continuance commitment. Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis indicated that defining the college mission, managing instructional programs, and creating a positive college climate predicted affective and continuous commitment. However, creating a positive college climate was the only predictor of normative commitment. The study concluded that principals' instructional leadership is necessary within the community colleges and was associated with lecturers' organizational commitment.

Keywords: Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Normative Commitment, Organizational Commitment, Principal Instructional Leadership.

Published Online: May 31, 2023

ISSN: 2736-4534

DOI: 10.24018/ejedu.2023.4.3.670

C. Nevins-Bennett, Dr. *
Turks and Caicos Islands Community
College, Turks and Caicos Islands
(e-mail: cereasebennett@gmail.com)

A. Martin, Dr.
The University of the West Indies, Open
Campus, Jamaica
(e-mail: andre.martin@open.uwi.edu)

**Corresponding Author*

I. INTRODUCTION

In a dynamic educational environment, lecturers' commitment and students' success are determined by acts of leadership (Xiao & Wilkins, 2015). The commitment of lecturers to the job is considered an essential tool for the proper functioning of institutions (Farid *et al.*, 2014) and human capital development necessary for future growth and advancements within the country (Ekundayo & Oluwafunke, 2020). Institutions must play an essential role in maintaining their lecturers (Imran *et al.*, 2017), who perform at their best when their levels of commitment to the job are high. It is believed that the extent to which principals' instructional leadership functions are conducted within the institutions is an issue that affects the level of commitment among lecturers on the job (Ekundayo & Oluwafunke, 2020). This problem is worth investigating because our understanding of the roles of principals within community colleges is incomplete.

Instructional leadership is the process by which principals use their professional knowledge and role as leaders to

oversee the instructional teaching-learning process within the institution to get successful results and academic quality (Bin Mat Ail *et al.*, 2015). Organizational commitment is a set of psychological, behavioural intentions and attitudes of the employee to become emotionally attached, feel obligated, and have a sense of loyalty to the job, with a strong urge to remain on the job (Bashir & Gani, 2019). Employees may remain on the job because they feel involved, emotionally attached, and can identify with the institution (Mazari, 2018). They may also remain on the job because leaving will be costly as time and effort have been spent on the job; or may be obligated to remain on the job because of their moral beliefs or organizational loyalty.

The commitment of lecturers must be understood and nourished before it leads to various consequences, such as high lecturer turnover, reduced productivity, reduced job satisfaction, engagement, and demotivation (Grego-Planer, 2019). Though a debatable concept, the instructional leadership process must ensure that principals' leadership skills are enhanced and sustained (Qian *et al.*, 2017). This is because the principals' role, characteristics, traits, talents, and leadership styles shape their attitude towards

instructional leadership and propel the success of both lecturers and students (Qian *et al.*, 2017). Leithwood and Seashore-Louis (2012) stated, “to date, we have not found a single documented case of a school improving its student achievement record in the absence of talented leadership” (p. 3). As effective leaders, principals must play an active role in the quest for improved institutional practices, goal attainment, and the creation of suitable learning climates. BinBakr and Ahmed (2015) support the notion that the education institution's success depends on the extent to which the effective leader develops the commitment of its employees. Effective instructional leadership thus has a positive impact on organizational commitment (Pranitasari, 2020).

Within the broader Caribbean educational context, Fullerton-Rawlins (2003) claims that instructional leaders ensure that faculty remain committed when provided with professional development, given resources, guided by clearly defined goals, and provided a positive climate. These leadership behaviours, when fully articulated, allow for organizational growth (Mohammed & Hankebo, 2019). Hutton (2015) endorses the belief that principals in developing countries such as Jamaica focus on a wide array of responsibilities that measures the performance of the school they lead.

The extant literature showed various relationships between principals' instructional leadership and lecturers' organizational commitment. Sarikaya and Erdogan (2016) findings suggested that of the various dimensions of instructional leadership, principals' behaviour for sharing and setting goals within the institution had a high correlation with lecturers' organizational commitment, whereby their behaviours of supporting and providing professional development to lecturers showed a low correlation. Kiral and Suçiçeği (2017) also found that the correlation between principals' instructional leadership and affective commitment was high but low in relation to normative commitment. Mazari (2018) stated that demographic variables such as employee tenure and age influence employees' affective commitment. Studies have also indicated that the gender of principals impacts lecturers' commitment to the job. A study conducted in Kuala Lumpur among lecturers showed that lecturers rated women principals to have moderate IL, and thus moderate organizational commitment levels exist among lecturers (Mannan, 2019).

II. THE PROBLEM

Lecturers in higher education institutions are experiencing lower levels of organizational commitment (Bashir & Gani, 2020) because of principals removing instructional leadership duties from their daily work-life (Shaked 2018). Employees' commitment is the driving force behind the colleges' and students' success; however, low levels of commitment lead to reduced belongingness, affiliation, and obligation of employees towards their organization (Velma *et al.*, 2018). Principals are challenged to take on instructional leadership roles within their institution; thus, the perceived absence or presence of these principal instructional leadership roles has been said to affect the

commitment of lecturers (Sarikaya & Erdogan, 2016). Since not much is known about how principals' instructional leadership job functions predict lecturers' commitment to the community colleges in Jamaica, additional research is needed in this area (Zahed-Babelan *et al.*, 2019). It is believed that the extent to which principals' instructional leadership job functions are conducted within the institutions is an issue that affects the level of commitment among lecturers on the job (Ekundayo & Oluwafunke, 2020).

III. THE PURPOSE

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to examine the association between principals' instructional leadership and lecturers' organizational commitment (OC) within the community colleges in Jamaica. Principals' instructional leadership represents the college's mission, managing the instructional program and developing the college learning climate, while the lecturer's organizational commitment reflects the lecturer's feelings, attitude, and loyalty to the job.

IV. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESIS

To investigate the association between principals' instructional leadership and lecturers' organizational commitment, the following research questions and hypothesis were developed:

1. Are there any statistically significant relationships between lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership and lecturers' organizational commitment to the job?

H₀₁: There are no statistically significant relationships between lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership and lecturers' organizational commitment to the job.

H_{a1}: There are statistically significant relationships between lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership and lecturers' organizational commitment to the job.

2. What dimensions of principal instructional leadership best predict lecturer organizational commitment?

H₀₂: The dimensions of principal instructional leadership do not predict lecturers' organizational commitment.

H_{a2}: The dimensions of principal instructional leadership predict lecturers' organizational commitment.

V. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Instructional Leadership Model

The Instructional Leadership Model was developed by Hallinger and Murphy (1985) and outlined the job functions of the principal that were necessary to ensure students' success and lecturers' outcomes (Hallinger *et al.*, 2018). Instructional leadership (IL) has many definitions; Hallinger *et al.* (2018) conceptualized it as a model regarding the classroom practices of faculty to achieve and improve the

institutions' outcomes. Seobi and Wood (2016) conceptualized instructional leadership through the notion of action leadership as a "leadership style based on the democratic values of autonomy, equal opportunity, belonging, and self-realization" (p. 2).

The Instructional Leadership Model (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986) provides an understanding of how colleges may be improved through the provision of quality instruction to promote lecturers' and students' success with the aid of the principal as the head of the institution (Ng, 2019). The model conceptualized the classroom practices of faculty to achieve and improve the institutions' outcomes. The Instructional Leadership model proposed that the principals as instructional leaders must execute their roles along three dimensions of defining the college mission, managing instructional programs, and creating a positive college climate. These dimensions allow the principals to set goals and values of the institution to develop instructional and strategic goals (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Instructional leadership allows the principals to create a culture of growth, improvement, rewards, and engagement in stimulating and monitoring activities (Hallinger *et al.*, 2018). Özdemir *et al.* (2020) stated that the principal must then perform their duties to provide leadership, instructional guidance, supervision, and provide a conducive work environment. These, they say, are necessary components for the organization's growth and development (Özdemir *et al.*, 2020). Defining the college mission is the first dimension of instructional leadership which entail the principals' role in working collaboratively with staff to create the college goals and values (Hallinger & Wang, 2015). This dimension includes two important job functions that drive the institution, they are framing the college goals and communicating the college goals. Framing the college goals is the process of collaboratively setting clear and appropriate goals for instructional and college development (Hallinger & Heck, 2010); while communicating the college goals allows for the dissemination of goals previously created to the stakeholders to be accepted as legitimate college-wide goals (Hallinger & Wang, 2015). Managing instructional programs is the second dimension of instructional leadership, which deals with how instructions are coordinated and controlled within the college (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). This dimension is divided into three job functions of supervising and evaluating instructions, coordinating curriculum, and monitoring students' progress. The supervision and evaluation of instructions role requires the instructional leader is to ensure that the college's goals are transformed into college practices, this is done through observations, classroom visitations, and visits to the instructional or virtual classroom in the case of online learning (Hallinger & Wang, 2015). Curriculum coordination relates to the alignment of the colleges' curriculum, program structures, and syllabi with the instructional assessments and achievement tests given by lecturers (Hallinger & Wang, 2015). Monitoring student's progress is a job function that enables the college leader to monitor students' progress by using the results from coursework pieces, students' projects, continuous assessments, and standardized tests (Hallinger & Heck, 2010).

Creating a positive college climate is the third dimension of instructional leadership which requires that leaders develop a culture that allows for the continuous improvement of the institution and where students' and lecturers' rewards are supported by their purpose and best practices (Hallinger, 2010). This includes five job functions of protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, providing incentives for lecturers, providing incentives for learners, and maintaining high visibility. Protecting the instructional time requires the instructional leader to create policies to reduce pedagogy interruptions (Hallinger & Heck, 2010). The promotion of professional development allows the instructional leaders to provide faculty with the opportunity to develop professionally to improve instructions (Hallinger & Huber, 2012). The provision of incentives for learners allows for the creation of a college climate that is conducive to learning, one that gives rewards for students' academic achievements and students work improvements (Hallinger *et al.*, 2018). The provision of Incentives for lecturers allows for the provision of various incentives, promotions, and recognition to lecturers for the purpose of motivating them (Hallinger *et al.*, 2018). Maintaining high visibility requires the principals' presence on the college campus and in classrooms to increase interaction with students and lecturers (Hallinger & Huber, 2012).

The instructional leadership model stated that principals have the power over the instructional matters of the institution that is exerted by lecturers (Gupta, 2015). Thus, principals are expected to foster best instructional practices, which will increase the lecturer's commitment to the job (Glanz *et al.*, 2017). The idea is that once goals are framed and communicated, lecturers are professionally developed, and the curriculum is streamlined; lecturers will be more inclined to perform their tasks and feel a sense of belongingness and affection for the college (Gupta, 2015).

B. Organizational Commitment Model

As a multidimensional model, the organizational commitment model proposed by Meyer and Allen (1984) measures organizational commitment using three domains: the affective commitment (AC), normative commitment (NC), and continuance commitment (CC) (Meyer & Allen, 1984). Affective commitment is the "employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in an organization" (Meyer & Allen, 1984, p. 389). They are a set of robust and positive attitudes of the employees toward the organization and where employees exhibit loyalty to goals and shared values (Mendez *et al.*, 2015). Lecturers who exhibit affective commitments to the job must have an affinity for the job and be willing to identify with the goals and values of the institution (Sarıkaya & Erdogan, 2016). Normative commitment is the commitment based on "a sense of obligation to the organization" (Allen & Meyer, 1996, p. 253). While continuance commitment is associated with the behavioural approach (Gupta *et al.*, 2015) and is "the extent to which employees feel committed to their organizations when they consider the costs of leaving the organization" (Anari, 2012, p. 259).

The three forms of organizational commitment may not be developed among employees at the same level of their tenure within the institution; however, research has found that affective commitment is the most valuable and may be developed at any time (Singh & Gupta, 2015). Lecturers with a high level of affective commitment usually exhibit positive attitudes towards the organization as it is value-driven and will work harder to achieve great results and organizational success (Grego-Planer, 2019). It is stated that employees are more in tune with their work when their levels of organizational commitment have heightened (Maiti & Sanyal, 2018). Thus, it can be argued that a highly committed employee will have an improved level of "satisfaction, responsibility, and loyalty to the job" (Maiti & Sanyal, 2018, p. 3). This, according to Maiti and Sanyal (2018), impacts their job performance, work quality, and promotes positive behaviours. Though Meyer and Allen (1984) did not provide a thorough definition of commitment, they purported that all three components were "a psychological state that links the employee to the organization," without explaining psychological state (p. 372).

The behavioural and attitudinal approach to organizational commitment may be used to explain the psychological behaviours of lecturers within the colleges. The attitudinal approach to organizational commitment is a unidimensional approach that measures affective commitment in explaining the nature of the lecturer's identification with the college that will equally connect both their individual and organizational goals and values (Menezes *et al.*, 2015). Proponents of the attitudinal approach to organizational commitment believe that lecturers' commitment to staying on the job and positive outcomes were based on their work experiences, how they viewed the college, and personal attributes (Palmer *et al.*, 2014). When the lecturers are highly committed, identification of their values and goals along with that of their college becomes paramount (Majid & Ibrahim, 2017). The lecturers may also have a strong need for belongingness to the organization, expressing their desires to go above and beyond their duties on the job (Majid & Ibrahim, 2017). While it is agreed that the lecturers' perception of the college's values is the strongest predictor of employee commitment to the job, a lack of lecturer's commitment will result in negative consequences affecting their productivity and students' achievement (Majid & Ibrahim, 2017).

The behavioural view of organizational commitment sees the lecturers as placing side-bets. The lecturers would place 'side bets' when they assess the cost of leaving compared to the benefits of remaining on the job (Shanker, 2013). In other words, employees' commitment to stay on the job is anchored by the association between their behaviours and perceptions, which will help to reinforce future behaviours (Gurley *et al.*, 2016). Behavioural commitment is a unidimensional approach measured by continuance commitment (Menezes *et al.*, 2015). Using the behavioural approach to explain lecturers' organizational commitment to various actions within the organization, the lecturer would reach a state of commitment by engaging in behaviours that would be difficult to rescind (Palmer *et al.*, 2014). Mowday and McDade (1979) stated that this course of action would

lead to the lecturer being committed if actions are clear, if there is shared knowledge, actions are necessary, and situations exist that make it a challenge to be withdrawn (Majid & Ibrahim, 2017).

C. *The Social Exchange Theory and the Psychological Contract Theory*

Psychological contracts involve the cognitive-level structures of the individual employees that influence how they think about their exchange relationships between themselves and their employers (Rousseau *et al.*, 2013). The psychological contract theory may be used to explain further the behavioural approach to the organizational commitment of the lecturers (Rousseau *et al.*, 2013) because it denotes what the lecturers believe they owe their principals in exchange for what the principals owe them (Jiang *et al.*, 2015). The lecturers view the contract as affecting their time and commitment in exchange for their employment in general, remuneration, and employment opportunities (Wei *et al.*, 2015). The role of the principal in executing their instructional leadership job functions is a way of providing effective leadership, which Chen and Wu (2017) believes is an important component that will lead to lecturers' commitment to the job (Rousseau *et al.*, 2013). Additionally, where there are limited principal instructional leadership functions, this results in changes in the employee-employer relationship viewed by the lecturers as a breach of the psychological contract (Salazar-Fierro & Bayardo, 2015). This negatively impacts lecturers' organizational commitment to the job.

The Social Exchange Theory is the sociological arm of the psychological contract theory (Petersitzke, 2009). Seen as a voluntary behaviour, as it is believed that the employees become committed when they receive the kind of behaviours they anticipate from their principals in exchange for their output; therefore, it is based on mutual obligation (Yigit, 2016). Within the context of social exchanges, Blau (1964) and Homans (1950) stated that employees believe in maximizing gains and minimizing losses. Social exchanges are eminent within the college environment as lecturers with high continuance commitment stand to weigh their costs and benefits, thereby choosing to maximize benefits whenever instructional leadership practices are fulfilled (Bashir & Gani, 2020). The employees believe that this reciprocity of behaviour forms "trust and commitment" (Yigit, 2016, p. 31). Employees will be more obligated to reciprocate when they are happy and supportive in exchange for rewards and benefits from their employers (Chen & Wu, 2017). Effective instructional leadership may improve lecturers' perceptions of reciprocal exchanges and psychological contracts (Chen & Wu, 2017).

VI. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. *Association Between Lecturer Organizational Commitment and Instructional Leadership*

To increase faculty commitment, the right principals must be hired, the institution's mission is effectively communicated, lecturers undergo proper training, and there is organizational justice (Maiti & Sanyal, 2018). The level of commitment of lecturers on the job will affect the quality

of the teaching-learning processes, the institutional culture, and students' achievement (Maiti & Sanyal, 2018). When a lecturer is happy, engaged and given the support of their instructional leader, that lecturer will be more committed and thinks less about leaving the job (Ford *et al.*, 2019). It was stated that:

the working conditions of a school are wide-ranging in scope but generally refer to school leadership and administrative support; the degree of the professional community and shared governance; work and school-related stressors such as high-stakes accountability policies; and resources for teaching and learning all affect teacher organizational commitment (Ford *et al.*, 2019, p. 616).

Lecturers at community colleges may spend up to 18 hours per week lecturing; however additional time is spent on areas of special responsibility such as student mentorship and the coordination of student affairs and extra-curricular activities (Delello *et al.*, 2018). Delello *et al.* (2018) further stated that there needs to be instructional leadership support for lecturers in their pedagogical efforts and preparation. In a study conducted by Valliamah *et al.* (2016) that examines the perception of teachers in relation to the instructional leadership of their principals, it was revealed that the highest mean score related to defining the school mission ($M = 4.03$), followed by managing instructional program ($M = 3.84$) and creating a positive school climate ($M = 3.20$).

Kaya and Selvitopu (2017) declared that committed lecturers would work hard and do whatever is necessary on the job to promote students' outcomes. Studies from the extant literature showed a positive relationship between principals who collaborated in their instructional responsibilities and lecturers' organizational commitment (Consoy & Polatcan, 2019). This act of shared leadership was positively associated with the affective and normative commitment of teachers (Consoy & Polatcan, 2019). Neiningner *et al.* (2010) refer to this as team commitment and warn that colleges that fail to accomplish this will have issues with the sustainability of lecturers, programs, and students. Bashir and Gani (2020), in a study conducted among 427 lecturers in an Indian university, revealed that their lecturers had higher levels of continuous commitment ($M=4.0$, $SD=0.68$) as they examined the costs and benefits of remaining on the job (Bashir & Gani, 2020, p. 12).

Overall quantitative studies conducted among 113 lecturers in Malaysia using simple random sampling concluded that the strength of the association between instructional leadership and teacher's organizational commitment was moderate (" $r = 0.480$, $p = 0.000$ ") (Bin Mat Ail, 2015, p. 1852). This relationship suggests that an increase in principals' instructional leadership slightly increases lecturers' commitment (Akoglu, 2018). This was confirmed by Valliamah *et al.* (2016), who stated that all the ten subcategories of instructional leadership maintained a moderate level of correlation (from $r = 0.311$ to $r = 0.444$) with teacher organizational commitment. Valliamah *et al.* (2016) results indicated that the involvement of teachers within the institution is in keeping with their duties and responsibilities rather than a mere acceptance of its goals. This result, they say, "challenges the involvement of teachers in decision making of school mission, goal or

managing instruction – thus teacher commitment is not influenced by the mission of the institution" (Valliamah *et al.*, 2016, p. 125). Boyce and Bowers (2018) conducted a meta-analysis on principal instructional leadership and found that there is limited evidence to suggest that principals' influence has a negative effect on lecturers' commitment. The instructional leadership dimension of defining the college mission is associated with lecturers' affective commitment (Nkhukhu-Orlando *et al.*, 2019). When lecturers are involved in goal setting, they feel a sense of purpose, emotional involvement, and identification with the organization, thus heightening their affective commitment (Nkhukhu-Orlando *et al.*, 2019).

VII. METHODOLOGY

A quantitative non-experimental correlational research design was used in this study to empirically test whether instructional leadership functions undertaken by principals predicted lecturers' organizational commitment. The correlational design was used to identify the predictive relationship among the research variables. This research design is suitable for examining differences among variables, associations, and relationships (Cook & Cook, 2008).

A. Population, Sample, and Sampling Method

The study's accessible population comprised 234 lecturers from two community colleges within Jamaica. The community colleges were purposefully selected for this study because they provided the same secondary (K-10-12) and post-secondary (CCCJ) studies to students within their respective parishes. The accessible population comprised full-time and adjunct lecturers within the two community colleges and not the polytechnic colleges that operate under the Council of Community Colleges of Jamaica and the Ministry of Education. All participants met the criteria for inclusion in the study, however, only 170 completed the questionnaire, ($N = 234$, $S = 170$).

Total population sampling, a purposive sampling technique, was used to gather data from the study participants. This is a non-probability sampling method that uses the entire population based on predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria; in this case, the population is the sample (Etikan *et al.*, 2016). Total population sampling allows for analytical generalization regarding the study population being investigated. Though a qualitative concept, analytical generalizability is more often included in quantitative studies (Polit & Beck, 2010). The Survey instruments were sent to the entire population of 234 lecturers in the two community colleges and lecturers were given an equal chance to participate in the study.

B. Eligibility Criteria for Inclusion in the Study

To be included in the study, (1) full-time and adjunct lecturers must be employed by the community colleges for one year or more under the current principal. (2) the lecturers must possess at minimum, a bachelor's degree if lecturing at the associate degree, diploma, and CXC ordinary levels (K-10-12), and a master's degree if lecturing at the bachelor and postgraduate diploma levels.

C. Instrumentation

Data were collected using a single questionnaire that is comprised of three parts. Part 1 of the questionnaire consists of seven items relating to the demographic factors of the lecturers. This was used to gather information on the gender, age range, number of years working at the college at the end of the current year, years of teaching under the current principal, the level lecturing at the college, lecturer status, and the highest level of educational attainment.

Part 2 adopted the teachers' version of the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) developed by Hallinger and Murphy (1985). The PIMRS survey was used to gather data on the principals' actions in conducting their instructional leadership functions within the Community Colleges in Jamaica. The teachers' version of the PIMRS consisted of 50 behavioural statements that described the job function of the principals over the past academic year based on the outlook of the lecturers. Hallinger *et al.* (2013) identified the three dimensions and ten job functions of the scale. Each of the ten subscales was represented by five behavioural statements within the three dimensions having high reliability of 0.70 and over. The Responses ranged from 1 to 5 using a five-point Likert Scale to indicate the regularity of the observed behaviours of the principals. On the scale 1 = Almost never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = frequently, and 5 = almost always.

Part 3 adopted the Three-Component Employee Commitment Survey (TCM) developed by Meyer *et al.* (1990). The TCM survey consisted of 18 questions and was used to measure lecturers' affective, normative and continuance commitment to the job. The items in the TCM were represented on a 7-point Likert scale with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = undecided, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = agree, and 7 = strongly agree. Each commitment dimension was measured by six items on the scale, which, according to Allen and Meyer (1993), are reliable and validated, with reliabilities over 0.70. Four items on the TCM scale that were negatively worded required reverse coding (items 3, 4, 5, and 13); Jozsa and Morgan (2017) stated that using negative items on a questionnaire may increase the scale's validity.

The content validity of the PIMRS and TCM were obtained by using two college principals and one secondary school principal who have worked in the community college for more than 15 years as a senior lecturer and campus director. A content validity rating scale was used to determine validity.

D. Data Collection Procedure

The data collection process began after ethical approval was granted from the University of the West Indies Ethics Committee. Before ethical approval, introductory letters seeking permission were sent to the Ministry of Education and Information Jamaica, Planning and Research Division. A letter was also sent to the Council of Community Colleges of Jamaica informing them of the intent to conduct the research. The various community colleges were contacted to introduce the research and to solicit information regarding their ethical requirements and protocols for access and data collection.

Permission was obtained from Professor Philip Hallinger to use the PIMRS and from the copyright owner World Discoveries at Western University to use the TCM.

E. Data Analysis Procedures

Data analysis involves the collection, inspection, transforming, and interpretation of data through analytic reasoning to determine the relationship and solve research problems (Creswell, 2014). The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.0 was used to analyze the data. In analyzing the data, descriptive and inferential statistics were used. Frequencies and percentages were generated for the demographic characteristics of the study participants. Descriptive statistics of means and standard deviations were used in the analysis of data.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r), and Multiple regression were used to analyze relationships and make predictions. All test assumptions were checked before the parametric tests were conducted. Prior to the application of the various statistical tests, raw data was prepared for analysis. Data were checked and properly labelled into nominal, ordinal, or scale variables. The variables principal instructional leadership and organizational commitment were transformed and averaged into continuous variables in SPSS.

F. Ethical Considerations

The researcher underwent ethical training through the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) by completing 22 courses and two electives in research ethics. A CITI certification was received. The researcher was guided by the general rules of the Belmont Report that dealt with the basic ethical principles of respect for person, beneficence, and justice for the protection of human subjects throughout the research process.

VIII. RESULTS

This study captured data from 170 participants from two community colleges in Jamaica. The questionnaires were sent to a total of 234 participants with an overall response rate of 73%. Forty-one or 24.12% of the participants who responded to the questionnaire were lecturers from College A, and 129 (75.88%) were lecturers from College B Table I shows the demographic characteristics of the participants.

The sample of participants consisted of 52 (30.6%) male and 118 (69.4%) female respondents ($N=170$). A total of 101 (59.4%) lecturers were below 40 years of age, representing the highest frequency. Sixty-nine (40.6%) participants were aged 40 years and above. The highest level of educational attainment of the lecturers was a doctoral degree, with eight (4.7%) holding this qualification. One hundred and fifty-two (89.4%) held a master's degree, six (3.5%) held a bachelor's degree, and four (2.4%) held some sort of professional certification. One hundred and fifty participants (88.2%) were full-time lecturers, while 20 (11.8%) were adjunct lecturers within the community colleges.

TABLE I: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LECTURERS

Demographic variables	Categories	<i>n</i>	%
Gender	Male	52	30.6
	Female	118	69.4
Age Range	39 and below	101	59.4
	40 and above	69	40.6
Highest Educational Attainment	Bachelor's degree	6	3.5
	Master's degree	152	89.4
	Doctoral degree	8	4.7
	Professional Certification	4	2.4
Years of Experience at end of the school year	1-4 years	36	21.2
	5-9 years	66	38.8
	10-15 years	50	29.4
	More than 15 years	18	10.6
Lecturer Status	Full-time	150	88.2
	Adjunct	20	11.8
Years Working with Current Principal	1-4 years	48	28.3
	5-9 years	92	54.1
	10-15 years	30	17.6
	CXC (CSEC/CAPE)	23	13.5
Level Lecturing	Certificate/Diploma	39	22.9
	Associate degree	56	32.9
	Bachelor's degree	52	30.6
	Total	170	100

Twenty-three (13.5%) of the participants lectured at the ordinary and advanced levels (CXC-CSEC/CAPE), 39 (22.9%) lectured at the certificate and diploma levels, 56 (32.9%) lectured at the associate degree level, and 52 (30.6%) lectures at the bachelor's degree level.

Thirty-six (21.2%) lecturers had 1-4 years of experience at the end of the current school year, 66 (38.8%) had 5-9 years of experience, 50 (29.4%) had 10-15 years of experience, and 18 (10.6%) had more than 15 years of experience at the end of the current school year.

A. Association Between the Three Dimensions of PIL and the Dimensions of Organizational Commitment

Table II shows the results for the Pearson Product Moment Correlation. Overall, there was a positive but low correlation between the lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership and lecturers' commitment, ($r = 0.175$, $p = 0.023$). Table II also shows a low but negative relationship between lecturers' ratings of the principals' instructional leadership dimension of defining the college mission and continuance commitment ($r = -0.387$, $p = 0.000$). This association was, however, positive for affective and normative commitment. The dimension of managing instructional programs has a low but positive correlation with continuance commitment ($r = 0.250$, $p = 0.001$); however, this dimension was not correlated with affective and normative commitment. The dimension of creating a positive college climate was negatively correlated with continuous commitment ($r = -0.283$, $p = 0.000$) but positively correlated with affective and normative commitments.

B. Multiple Regression of Lecturers' Organizational Commitment with the Three Dimensions of PIL

A standard multiple regression was run to determine what components of the three dimensions of the principals' instructional leadership best predicted lecturers' affective, continuous, and normative commitment. Three Models were obtained and shown in Table III.

In Model 1, the three predictor variables of defining the college mission, managing instructional program, and creating a positive college climate had significantly predicted lecturers' affective commitment, $F(3, 166) = 13.99$, $p = 0.000$, $R^2 = 0.202$. The Model explained 20.2% of the variation in lecturers' affective commitment.

The best predictor of affective commitment is creating a positive college climate ($B = 0.480$). In Model 1, the regression equation for predicting affective commitment is given in (1).

$$\text{Lecturers' Affective Commitment} = 0.456 \times DTCM - 0.361 \times MIP + 0.480 \times CPCC + 2.247 \quad (1)$$

In model 2, the three predictor variables of defining the college mission, managing the instructional program, and creating a positive college climate had significantly predicted lecturers' continuance commitment $F(3, 166) = 24.12$, $p = 0.000$, $R^2 = 0.304$. The model explained 30.4% of the variation in lecturers' continuance commitment. The function of managing instructional programs is the best predictor of continuance commitment ($B = 0.746$). In Model 2, the regression equation for predicting continuance commitment is given in (2).

$$\text{Lecturers' Continuance Commitment} = -0.641 \times DTCM + 0.764 \times MIP - 0.321 \times CPCC + 5.032 \quad (2)$$

In Model 3, the three predictor variables of defining the college mission, managing the instructional program, and creating a positive college climate were regressed against normative commitment. Only the dimension of creating a positive college climate significantly predicted normative commitment, $F(3, 166) = 4.258$, $p = 0.005$, $R^2 = 0.071$. The Model explained 7.1% of the variation in normative commitment. In Model 3, the regression equation for predicting normative commitment is given in (3).

$$\text{Lecturers' Normative Commitment} = 0.321 \times CPCC + 5.032 \quad (3)$$

TABLE II: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LECTURERS' RATING OF THE THREE DIMENSIONS OF PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Dimensions	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. DTCM	3.0	0.66	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. MIP	3.0	0.56	0.262**	-	-	-	-	-
3. CPCC	2.8	0.58	0.537**	0.265**	-	-	-	-
4. ACS	4.0	1.1	0.367**	-0.044	0.357**	-	-	-
5. CCS	4.3	1.1	-0.387**	0.250**	-0.283**	-0.302**	-	-
6 NCS	4.4	0.91	0.151*	-0.012	0.252**	0.277**	0.120	-

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

TABLE III: MULTIPLE REGRESSION RESULTS REGARDING THE PREDICTION OF LECTURER AFFECTIVE, CONTINUANCE AND NORMATIVE COMMITMENT FROM THE THREE DIMENSIONS OF PIL

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Affective commitment					
Model 1					
Constant	2.247	0.519	-	4.325	0.000
Defining the College Mission (DTCM)	0.456	0.137	0.276	3.325	0.001
Managing Instructional Programs (MIP)	-0.361	0.142	-0.185	-2.55	0.012
Creating a Positive College Climate (CPCC)	0.480	0.155	0.258	0.258	0.002
Continuance commitment					
Model 2					
Constant	5.032	0.475	-	10.586	0.000
Defining the college mission	-0.641	0.126	-0.397	-5.11	0.000
Managing instructional programs	0.764	0.130	0.401	5.90	0.000
Creating a positive college climate	-0.321	0.142	-0.176	-2.27	0.024
Normative commitment					
Model 3					
Constant	3.516	0.472	-	7.456	0.000
Defining the college mission	0.052	0.125	0.037	0.417	0.677
Managing instructional Programs	-0.148	0.129	-0.090	-1.15	0.252
Creating a positive college climate	0.401	0.140	0.256	2.86	0.005

IX. DISCUSSION

Research Question 1 investigated whether there were significant relationships between lecturers' ratings of principals' instructional leadership and lecturers' views of their commitment to the job. Within the current study, there was an overall significant low but positive association between principals' instructional leadership and lecturers' organizational commitment within the colleges. This finding is in keeping with Boyce and Bowers (2018), who conducted a meta-analysis on principal instructional leadership and found that there was limited evidence to suggest that principals' influence has a negative association with lecturers' commitment. A low association between PIL and LOC means that there were other factors significantly influencing lecturers' commitment other than principals' instructional leadership. Tai *et al.* (2021) suggested that lecturers' commitment to the organization could be significantly influenced by factors such as job characteristics, leadership styles, organizational justice, relationship with employers, and income.

A. Association Between Defining the College Mission and Lecturers' Organizational Commitment

The PIL dimension of defining the college mission had a low positive correlation with affective and normative commitment but a low negative correlation with continuance commitment. The associations were statistically significant but low. The social exchange theory may be used to explain the findings of this study. The lecturers who gave high ratings for the principals' instructional leadership dimensions did so because they believed they were getting the required support from their principals.

When the principals were perceived as executing, supervising, and delegating instructional duties that benefitted the lecturers, lecturers, in turn, felt a sense of loyalty and obligation, which resulted in an increase in their affective commitment (Chou, 2016). The dimension of defining the college mission means that the goals of the colleges are framed and communicated so that lecturers can use them in planning and developing their own instructional goals. Once lecturers can identify with these goals, their affective commitment will increase.

In addition, a negative correlation between defining the college mission and continuance commitment implies that an indirect relationship exists. It means that the lecturers' obligation to remain on the job has decreased when the goals of the organization have been framed and communicated. This is because the cost of remaining on the job may have outweighed the benefits.

B. Association Between Managing Instructional Program and Lecturers' Organizational Commitment

The principal instructional leadership dimension of managing instructional programs had a low but positive correlation with continuance commitment. Managing instructional programs was not associated with affective and normative commitment among the community college lecturers. This means that the principals provide leadership and clarify their duties by carefully supervising lecturers, the program of study, and students. This resulted in a positive change in the lecturers' obligatory behaviours, propelling them to work harder and remain on the job because of the time invested in the college.

C. Association Between Creating a Positive College Climate and Lecturers' Organizational Commitment

The PIL dimension of creating a positive college climate was negatively correlated with continuous commitment but positively correlated with affective and normative commitments. The perceived loss of the lecturers would be high if lecturers decided to leave the college for another job that does not present a positive climate as with the present college. The threat of loss among the lecturers was what committed lecturers to the college and explained the negative association. Affective commitment among lecturers should be nurtured as it is a critical component in increasing loyalty and reducing organizational consequences.

D. The Dimensions of PIL that Best Predicts Lecturers' Organizational Commitment

Research question 2 sought to find out "what components of principal instructional leadership best predict lecturers' organizational commitment?" In this study, three models were generated, each time using the three dimensions of PIL as predictors of lecturers' organizational commitment. In Model 1, all three predictors were regressed against affective commitment. The study showed that the three dimensions of defining the college mission, managing instructional programs, and creating a positive college climate significantly predicted the college lecturers' affective commitment. The dimension of creating a positive college climate best predicted affective commitment. When the principal creates a positive college climate, they develop a culture where students' and lecturers' rewards are supported by their purpose and best practices, in addition to developing a culture that allows for the continuous improvement of the college (Hallinger, 2010). This will affect lecturers' affective commitment as they get more emotionally attached to the college, believe in themselves, and set high achievable goals. This finding was surprising as defining the college mission would appear to be a better predictor of affective commitment. Affective commitment relates to following a specific direction for action and achievement of organizational goals; therefore, it was more in sync with the function that related to goal setting and communication.

In Model 2, all three predictors were regressed against continuance commitment. Results showed that the three dimensions of PIL defining the college mission, managing instructional programs, and creating a positive college climate significantly predicted lecturers' continuance commitment. The dimension of managing instructional programs best predicted continuance commitment. Managing the institution's instructional program involves the principal working collaboratively with teachers to evaluate, develop, implement, and coordinate the curriculum, in addition to monitoring students' success (Hallinger *et al.*, 2018). The lecturers, according to the OC model/theory, would place "side bets" to determine the cost and benefits of leaving the college. Lecturers would stand to lose the time and effort spent in developing and updating curriculum, in preparing for teaching and learning and preparing students for academic achievements. The cost associated with leaving the college would be to forego their pedagogical/instructional investments.

In Model 3, only the dimension of creating a positive college climate significantly predicted normative commitment. Normative commitment starts to internalize or develop from the entry-level and the recruitment process within the organization and through socialization (Lai *et al.*, 2014). The social exchange theory explains that when an instructional climate provides for the lecturers in a way that supports their professional development, instructional development, and provides incentives, employees feel valued. This value-instilled behaviour creates a feeling of obligation and indebtedness, and the lecturers will believe that they owe the college for their development.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

This study focused on the association of principals' instructional leadership and lecturers' commitment to the community colleges in Jamaica. Based on the nature of the community colleges, instructional leadership is instrumental to lecturers as it is associated with their affective, normative, and continuous commitment. Because of the dynamism and differences in the community college environment compared to the school systems, it is recommended that a model of instructional leadership be developed for community colleges within Jamaica. Borrowing from Hallinger and Murphy's model of instructional leadership, a comprehensive model could be developed using the extant literature and qualitative grounded theory. The model adopted for this study includes a dimension called defining the college mission: with the principals' job function of framing the college goals and communicating the college goals. However, communication is unidimensional. Feedback from faculty relating to the college goals should be facilitated and acted upon by the principal. In addition, dimension three, which relates to creating a positive college climate, is lacking. The dimension should include the function of establishing a standard for lecturing and students' outcome or lecturer collaboration. It is recommended to add a dimension that relates to eternal communication and partnership. This should incorporate the principal functions of establishing external-internal lecturer-student exchanges by building alliances with other tertiary institutions and creating educational and pedagogical policies. These will strengthen instructional leadership and benefit faculty and students. Qian *et al.* (2017) propose that by creating policies and incorporating collaboration, instructional leadership will be improved and, by extension, organizational commitment.

A. Recommendations for Future Research

The findings of the current study are the driving factors behind the recommendations for future research. Six recommendations have been proposed for this study: (1) for future research, the researchers may conduct a mixed-method study with the same community college population, (2) expand the study by incorporating the roles of other instructional leaders, (3) reorganize the study to include the principals' perspective of instructional leadership (4) develop an instrument that is more fitting for instructional leadership in the Caribbean context, and (5) replicate the study among different categories of colleges.

XI. CONCLUSION

Research question 2 used the Pearson product moment correlation to examine the association between lecturers' ratings of their PIL and lecturers' views of their OC. Overall, a low association was obtained for the study variables. Creating a positive college climate was associated with affective and normative commitment; therefore, it was expected to be its best predictor. Managing instructional programs was positively correlated with continuance commitment; thus, it was expected to be the best predictor. Providing incentives for lecturers was correlated with all three dimensions of organizational commitment. Rewards and incentives increase lecturers' commitment. Research question 2 used the multiple regression analysis to determine the best predictors of lecturers' organizational commitment. The best predictor of affective commitment is creating a positive college climate; managing instructional program was the best predictor of continuance commitment and creating a positive college climate was the only significant predictor of normative commitment. Noteworthy is that lecturers were not provided with many incentives, professional development, or principal presence felt leading to the cost outweighing the benefits for lecturers.

Adding to the body of knowledge is the finding that within the community colleges, the ratings of the principals in their leadership function of coordinating the curriculum and monitoring students' progress had no association with the lecturers' affective, normative and continuance commitment. Thus, changes in the lecturers' commitment were not brought on because of these functions. Contrary to the belief of most writers is that instructional leadership is distributed among lecturers within the higher education environment, with the principal playing almost no role. New knowledge from this research showed that at the community college level, lecturers believe that overall, PIL is necessary as it is related to their identification, attachment, and involvement with the college.

REFERENCES

- Akoglu, H. (2018). User's guide to correlation coefficient. *Turkish Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 18(3), 91-93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tjem.2018.08.001>.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Organizational commitment: Evidence of career stage effects. *Journal of Business Research*, 26(1), 49-61. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(93\)90042-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(93)90042-N).
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 49(3), 252-276. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0043>.
- Anari, N. (2012). Teachers: Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 24(4), 256-269. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13665621211223379>.
- Bashir, B., & Gani, A. (2019). Testing the effects of job satisfaction on organizational commitment. *Journal of Management Development*, 39(4), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-07-2018-0210>.
- Bashir, B., & Gani, A. (2020). Correlates of organizational commitment among university teachers in India: An empirical investigation. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Management, Research, and Innovation*, 16(1), 7-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2319510X19872632>.
- Bin Mat Ail, N., Bin Taib, M., Jaafar, H., Mohamed Salleh, W., & Bin Omar, M. (2015). Principals' instructional leadership and teachers' commitment in three Mara Junior Science Colleges in Pahang, Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 191(1), 1848-1853. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.512>.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Justice in social exchange. *Sociological Enquiry*, 34(2), 193-206. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1964.tb00583.x>.
- Boyce, J., & Bowers, A. (2018). Toward an evolving conceptualization of Instructional leadership as leadership for learning. Meta-narrative review of 109 quantitative studies across 25 years. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 56(2), 161-182. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-06-2016-0064>.
- Chen, T., & Wu, C. (2017). Improving the turnover intention of tourist hotel employees: Transformational leadership, leader-member exchange, and psychological contract breach. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(7), 1914. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-09-2015-0490>.
- Chou, P. (2016). Social exchange relationship and employee attitudes toward newly introduced information system. *European Scientific Journal*, 12(25), 163-184. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2016.v12n25p163>.
- Cook, B. G., & Cook, L. (2008). Nonexperimental quantitative research and its role in guiding instruction. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 44(2), 98-104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451208321565>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Delello, J. A., McWhorter, R. R., & Marmion, S. L. (2018). Understanding the productivity of faculty members in higher education. *International Journal of Management in Education*, 12(2), 154-178. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJME.2018.10009661>.
- Ekundayo, H. T., & Oluwafunke, O. (2020). Work incentives and job commitment among university lecturers in Ekiti State. *International Journal of Education, Learning and Development*, 8(6), 20-29.
- Farid, H., Izadi, Z., Arif Ismail, I., & Alipour, F. (2014). Relationship between quality of work life and organizational commitment among lecturers in a Malaysian public research university. *The Social Science Journal*, 52(1), 54-61. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2014.09.003>.
- Ford, T., Olsen, J., Khojasteh, J., Weir, J., & Urick, A. (2019). The effects of leader support for teacher psychological needs on teacher burnout, commitment, and intent to leave. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 57(6), 615-634. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-09-2018-0185>.
- Fullerton-Rawlings, J. (2003). Principals as instructional leaders: An annotated bibliography. *Caribbean Curriculum*, 10, 64-86.
- Glanz, J., Shaked, H., Rabinowitz, C., Shenhav, S., & Zaretsky, R. (2017). Instructional leadership practices among principals in Israeli and US Jewish schools. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 26(2), 132-153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105678791702600203>.
- Grego-Planer, D. (2019). The relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors in the public and private sectors. *Sustainability*, 11(6395), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su1126395>.
- Gupta, A. (2015). Job involvement, organizational commitment, professional commitment, and team commitment. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 22(6), 1192-1211. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-01-2014-0007>.
- Gurley, K., Anast-May, L., O'Neal, M., Dozier, R. (2016). Principal instructional leadership behaviors: Teacher vs. self-perceptions. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 11(1), 1-16. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1103651>.
- Hallinger, P. (2010). Developing instructional leadership. In P. Hallinger (Ed.), *Developing successful leadership* (pp. 61-76). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9106-2_5
- Hallinger, P., Adams, D., Harris, A. & Jones, M., S. (2018). Review of conceptual models and methodologies in research on principal instructional leadership in Malaysia: A case of knowledge construction in a developing society. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 56(1), 104-126. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-03-2017-0025>.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (2010). Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. *School Leadership and Management*, 30(2), 95-110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632431003663214>.
- Hallinger, P., & Huber, S. G. (2012). School leadership that makes a difference: International perspectives. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 23(4), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2012.681508>.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985) Assessing the instructional management behaviour of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86, 217-247. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1086/461445>
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, F. (1986). *Instructional leadership in effective schools*. Reports – Research Information Analysis.
- Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. (2015). *Assessing instructional leadership with the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale*. Springer Publications.
- Hallinger, P., Wang, W., & Chen, W. (2013). Assessing the measuring properties of the principal instructional management rating scale: A

- meta-analysis of reliability studies. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 49(2), 272-309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X12468149>.
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behaviour as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63, 597-606. <https://doi.org/10.1086/222355>
- Hutton, D. (2015). Governance, management, and accountability: The experience of the school system in the English-speaking Caribbean countries. *Policy Futures in Education*, 13(4), 500-517. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210315572652>.
- Imran, R., Alilil, K., & Mahmoud, A. B. (2017). Teacher's turnover intentions: Examining the impact of motivation and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 31(6), 828 - 842. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-05-2016-0131>.
- Jiang, L., Probst, T. M., & Benson, W. I. (2015). Organizational context and employee reactions to psychological contract breach: A multilevel test of competing theories. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 38(3), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X15579288>.
- Jozsa, K., & Morgan, G. (2017). Reversed items in Likert scales: Filtering out invalid responders. *Journal of Psychological and Educational Research*, 25(1), 7-25.
- Kaya, M., & Selvitopu, A. (2017). Leadership and organizational commitment in educational context: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Ziya Gokalp Faculty of Education*, 31, 719-728. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14582/DUZGEF.1822>
- Kiral, E., & Suçiçeği, A. (2017). The relationship between teachers' perception of school principals' instructional leadership and organisational commitment level. *International Journal of Psycho-Educational Sciences*, 6(1), 95-109.
- Lai, T. H., Luen, W. K., Rahman, A., Chai, L. T., & Ling, L. W. (2014). School principal leadership styles and teacher organizational commitment among performing schools. *The Journal of Global Business Management*, 10(2), 67-75.
- Leithwood, K. A. & Seashore-Louis, K. (2012). *Linking leadership to student learning*. Jossey-Bass.
- Maiti, R. B., & Sanyal, S. N. (2018). Optimizing the role of organizational commitment: A qualitative study in the school education sector. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 26(4), 669-690. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-06-2017-1183>
- Majid, M., & Ibrahim, A. (2017). Measurement of organizational commitment and factors influencing the level of commitment of employees: An empirical investigation of higher education system. *International Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 7(1), 14-18.
- Mannan, F. (2019). The relationship between women principal instructional leadership practices, teacher organizational commitment and teacher professional community practice in secondary schools in Kuala Lumpur. In *Instructional leadership to the fore: Research and evidence* (pp. 1-10). University of Malaya Press.
- Mazari, M. R. A. (2018). Antecedents of employees' affective commitment in the context of public private partnership. *Organization Theory Review*, 2(2), 64-83. <https://dx.doi.org/10.32350/OTR.0202.04>
- Mendez, M. J., Howell, J. P., & Bishop, J. W. (2015). Beyond the unidimensional collective leadership model. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 36(6), 675-696. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-11-2013-0141>.
- Menezes, I., Antonio Bastos, V., Duran, V., Veloso, T., & Almeida, K. (2015). Organizational commitment: Towards an integrated concept linking the attitudinal and behavioral approaches. *International Journal of Management Sciences*, 6(4), 204-217.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the side-bet theory of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(3), 372-378. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.69.3.372>.
- Meyer, J., Allen, N. & Gellatly, I. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(6), 710-720. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.75.6.710>.
- Mohammed, Z., & Hankebo, D. (2019). Instructional leadership practices in the primary schools of Siltie Zone, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Current Research*, 11(11), 8509-8516. <https://doi.org/10.24941/ijcr.36971.11.2019>.
- Mowday, R. T., & McDade, T. W. (1979). Linking behavioral and attitudinal commitment: A longitudinal analysis of job choice and job attitudes. *Academy of Management*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.1979.4975862>.
- Ng, F. S. D. (2019). Instructional leadership. In B. Wong, S. Hairon, P. Ng, (Eds.), *School leadership and educational change in Singapore* (pp. 7-30). Springer Texts in Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74746-0_2.
- Nkhukhu-Orlando, E., Brown, B., Wilson, D. R., Forchheh, N., Linn, J. G., & Fako, T. T. (2019). The affective commitment of academics in a university in Botswana. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 11(2), 12-19. <http://doi.org/10.5897/IJEAPS2019.0595>.
- Özdemir, G., Şahin, S., & Öztürk, N. (2020). Teachers' self-efficacy perceptions in terms of school principal's instructional leadership behaviours. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 16(1), 25-40. <https://dx.doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2020.228.3>.
- Palmer, D., Hermond, D., & Gardiner, C. (2014). Principals' leadership practices and mathematics pass rate in Jamaican high schools. *Administrative Issues Journal: Education, Practice, and Research*, 4(2), 35-47. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5929/2014.4.2.1>.
- Petersitzke, M. (2009). Theoretical basis of psychological contracts. In *Supervisor Psychological Contract Management* (pp. 61-90). Gabler. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-8349-8194-3_3.
- Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2010). Generalization in quantitative and qualitative research: Myths and strategies. *International journal of Nursing Studies*, 47(1), 1451-1458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2010.06.004>.
- Pranitasari, D. (2020). The influence of effective leadership and organizational trust to teacher's work motivation and organizational commitment. *Media Ekonomi dan Manajemen*, 35(1), 75-91. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24856/mem.v35i1.1257>.
- Qian, H., Walker, A., & Lee, X. (2017). The west wind vs the east wind: Instructional leadership model in China. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(2), 186-206. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JEA-08-2016-0083>.
- Rousseau, D., Tomprou, M., & Montes, S., D. (2013). Encyclopedia of management theory: Psychological contract theory. Sage Publications. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452276090.n199>.
- Salazar-Fierro, P., & Bayardo, J. M. (2015). Influence of relational psychological contract and affective commitment in the intentions of employee to share tacit knowledge. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 3(3), 300-311. <http://doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2015.33030>.
- Sarikaya, N., & Erdogan, C. (2016). Relationship between the instructional leadership behaviors of high school principals and teachers' organizational commitment. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(3), 72-82. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1089789>.
- Shaked, H. (2018). Why principals sidestep instructional leadership: The disregarded question of schools' primary objective. *Journal of School Leadership*, 28(1), 516-538. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105268461802800404>.
- Shanker, M. (2013). Organizational commitment and employees' intention to stay in Indian companies: Factor analytical approach. *Journal of Psychosocial Research*, 8(2), 199-208.
- Shukla, S. (2018, April 16-17). *Variables, hypothesis, and stages of research 1*. Interdisciplinary Conference on Social Science Research: Capacity building programme for social science faculty members. New Delhi, India.
- Singh, A., & Gupta, B. (2015). Job involvement, organizational commitment, professional commitment, and team commitment. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 22(6), 1192-1211. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-01-2014-0007>.
- Singh, B., & Singh, A. (2015). Strategies for analyzing quantitative data in research. *International Journal of Engineering Sciences & Management Research*, 2(8), 1-5. <http://www.ijesmr.com>.
- Tai, T. D., Singh, M., & Hieu, V. M. (2021). Factors affecting lecturers' commitment to their university: A study in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. *Webology*, 18, 71-91. <https://doi.org/10.14704/WEB/V18I03/WEB18021>.
- Valliamah, S., Kadajah, D., Subramanian, S. (2016). Reality on instructional leadership and commitment of teachers: A preliminary study. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 3, 123-127.
- Velma, J. A., Vijay, N., & Arasu, A. V. (2018). A study on reasons for lack of commitment among schoolteachers in government schools in North Kancheepuram District. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 118(9), 545-554.
- Wei, X., Ma, L., Zhang, Z., Showail, S. J., Jiao, J., & Wang, X. (2015). Understanding psychological contract breach due to labour costs reduction: Contingent upon employee sex and managerial control. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(4), 679-701. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12092>.
- Xiao, J., & Wilkins, S. (2015). The effects of lecturer commitment on student perceptions of teaching quality and student satisfaction in Chinese higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 31(1), 98-110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2014.992092>.
- Yigit, I. (2016). The effect of organizational commitment on the social exchange and organizational socialization: A study in research and

practice hospital of Kocaeli University. *Kafkas University Economics and Administrative Sciences Faculty*, 7(12), 25-50.
<https://doi.org/10.9775/kauibfd.2016.002>

Zahed-Babelan, A., Koulai, G., Moeinikia, M., Sharif, A. R. (2019). Instructional leadership effects on teachers' work engagement: Roles of school culture, empowerment, and job characteristics. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 9(3), 137-156.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.181>



Dr. Cerease Nevins-Bennett earned her Doctor of Education in Higher Educational Leadership from the University of the West Indies, a Master of Science in Organizational Studies (UWI Mona), a Master of Science in Accounting (UWI, Mona), and a Bachelor of Education in Business with Computer Studies (The University of Technology, Jamaica).

Dr. Nevins-Bennett has published articles in various international journals in the areas of job satisfaction, worker motivation, counterproductive work behaviour, and organizational change.



Dr. Andre Martin is a Doctoral Research Supervisor at the University of the West Indies, open Campus. He earned his Ph.D in Educational Leadership and Administration from the University of the West Indies (Cave Hill), A Master of Education in Educational Leadership and Administration from the University of the West Indies (Cave Hill), and a Bachelor of Business Administration from the Metropolitan

College of New York.