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Abstract: This descriptive and regression research was conducted to determine the influence of empowerment on organizational behaviors of 215 teachers in Catholic Higher Education Institutions in the Philippines. The results revealed that Catholic teachers have high levels of teacher empowerment. Specifically, they have very high level of status, professional growth, self-efficacy, and impact and high level of decision-making and autonomy in scheduling. Meanwhile, they also have high level of organizational behaviors. Furthermore, three of the subscales of teacher empowerment tend to predict almost all dimensions of organizational behaviors of teachers in the school. The research concludes that Catholic Higher Education teachers are empowered to their organization as they feel respected, have opportunities for professional growth, feel efficient and effective in the classroom, and have the capacity to influence students and the school life. However, they do not have enough avenues to be involved in the decision-making process of their institution and do not have enough freedom and opportunities to choose their own schedules and teaching loads. Furthermore, they exhibit positive organizational behaviors in their institutions as manifested in their strong attachment to their organization, high level of involvement to their work, harmonious relationship with their supervisors and middle level managers. Also, they exhibit discretionary actions that goes beyond their functions, and have a desire and passion to continue and uphold the teaching profession.
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Introduction

Human persons are the pivots of work in the productive venture. They are considered as the most important assets in any organization (Gabcanova, 2011; Burma, 2014; Fulmer & Ployhart, 2013). This explains why organizations take initiatives to make sure that their employees work effectively and efficiently. Human beings offer new and innovative ideas, and thereby, wealth for the benefit of both employers and employees.

This is also true in educational settings. Teachers play a very important role in the success of every educational institution especially in pursuit of quality education and instruction to its primary client: The students. Furthermore, various studies revealed and affirmed that teachers are considered as one of the most valuable human resources in any educational institution (Omebe, 2014; Datta, Guthrie, & Wright, 2005). In fact, teachers are considered as nation builders because the strength of every profession in every country grows out of the knowledge and skills that teachers help to instill to the children and students (Duncan, 2016). Also, the quality of a school system rests on the quality of its teachers (Acquaah, 2004).

With the above-mentioned roles and responsibilities of teachers, it is important then that they should be empowered. Teacher empowerment in education cannot be underestimated (Calibayan, 2015). Empowerment is defined as the competence of teachers to take charge of their personal and professional development and growth and to resolve their own problems while the school systems create opportunities for competence to be developed and displayed, increase the capacity to distribute roles in decision-making as well as to increase opportunities for meaningful collective participation from teachers (Short, Greer, & Melvin, 1994). Teacher empowerment consists of six dimensions, namely status, professional growth, self-efficacy, decision making, impact, and autonomy in scheduling (Rinehart & Short, 1994).

Several studies and literatures had concluded that empowerment has a significant and positive impact and effect on teachers’ organizational behaviors (Madiha & Abualrob, 2012; Calibayan, 2015; Somech & Bogler, 2002). Teachers’
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organizational behaviors are actions and attitudes of teachers towards one another and towards the educational institution (Babu & Venkatesh, 2016; Thurlings, Evers & Vermeulen, 2015). Positive organizational behavior among teachers should be promoted and embraced in all educational institutions since its purpose is to create an environment that is geared towards the sustainability and improvement of the organization (Cartwright & Cooper, 2014; Demir, 2015). The different dimensions of teachers’ organizational behaviors include organizational commitment (Wall & Rinehart, 1998; Bogler & Somech, 2004; John & Taylor, 1999; Fu & Deshpande, 2014), professional commitment (Pfeffer, 1994; Hackman & Lawler, 1971), organizational citizenship behavior (Duke & Gansander, 1990; Taylor & Bogotch, 1994), supervisory support (Ellen, Ferris, & Buckley, 2013; Nijman, 2014), and job involvement (Hallberg & Schaufell, 2006). Hence, teacher empowerment can lead to positive organizational behavior and could eventually play an important role in organizational success and stability (Bogler & Somech, 2004).

However, most of the studies on teacher empowerment and its relationship to the different organizational behaviors of teachers had only been conducted in primary and secondary school settings (Sweetland & Hoy, 2000; Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2005; Boglech & Somech, 2004; Marks & Louis, 1997; Garuba, 2004). Limited literature and studies are available on teacher empowerment that had been conducted in educational tertiary settings (Calibayan, 2015; Campbell, Cook, & Dornan, 1995). Furthermore, majority of studies on teacher empowerment are mostly conducted in the public and government owned schools (Menon & Christou, 2002; Shen, 1997; Sham, 1998) especially in developing countries, such as the Philippines (Calibayan, 2015; Tuazon, 2016). Studies conducted on teacher empowerment and its relationship to the different organizational behaviors of teachers in private schools are limited. It is important then to establish teacher empowerment and organizational behavior among teachers in private schools such as Catholic Educational Institutions (Pearson & Moowaw, 2005; Natale, 1993). In fact, many differences can be seen between private and public schools in the Philippines like low salary of private school teachers compared to public schools, poor work benefits and no security of tenure despite existing labor laws and regulations in the private schools (Sambalud, 2014). Furthermore, most of the private schools in the Philippines do not have benefits that public-school teachers usually enjoy (Batugal, 2009). Also, teachers perceived private schools as avenues and training grounds to gain experience before going to public schools which offer competitive salary. In the end, teachers leave the institution, and this situation will have adverse effects in the management and supervision of private schools. With these, retention and turnover of teachers from private schools such as Catholic Educational Institutions are growing area of concern (Wells, 2015; Mason & Matas, 2015), emphasizing the need of exploring different institutional and teacher related factors (Hartiff, 2015; Tehseen & Hadi, 2015; Zhang & Zeller, 2016) such as empowerment and teachers’ organizational behavior (Mcinerney, Ganotice, King, Mrsh, & Morin, 2015; Wells, 2015).

The present situation and problems facing private and Catholic Higher Education institutions in the Philippines reveal a fast turnover of teachers that may have negative effects to the management of schools and quality of delivery of education to students (Castano & Cabanda, 2007; Belen & Cordova, 2007). In fact, with the implementation of the K-12 curriculum in the Philippine Educational System, public schools are becoming more attractive to teachers due to higher compensations and benefits which is becoming a threat to private and Catholic schools (Cafirma & Lozada, 2017). As a result, even senior and seasoned teachers, especially in the college department, leave the organization (Bernardo, Ganotice, & King, 2015). This research, then, aimed to describe the influence of teacher empowerment on organizational behaviors of Catholic Higher Education Institutions in the Philippines.

**Dimensions of Teacher Empowerment**

The different dimensions of teacher empowerment (Short & Rinehart, 1992) include:

1. Decision-Making – This relates to the participation of teachers in critical decisions that directly affect their work;
2. Professional Growth – It refers to teachers’ assessment that the school in which they work provide them with avenues and opportunities to grow professionally;
3. Status – This is teachers’ assessment that they have professional respect and admiration from colleagues;
4. Self-Efficacy – refers to teachers’ beliefs that they have the capacity and competency to help students learn;
5. Autonomy – a dimension of empowerment referring to teachers’ beliefs that they can control certain aspects of their work;
6. Impact – refers to teachers’ assessment that they have an effect and influence on school life.

**Teachers’ Organizational Behaviors**

Meanwhile, organizational behavior of teachers is defined as actions and attitudes of teachers towards one another and toward the educational institution as a whole (Babu & Venkatesh, 2016; Thurlings, Evers & Vermeulen, 2015). In this study, organizational behavior of teachers consists of five dimensions which are organizational commitment, professional commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, supervisory support, and job involvement.
The dimensions of Teachers’ Organizational Behaviors (Bogler & Somech, 2004) include:

1. Organizational Commitment. This is conceptually characterized by an identification with and involvement of the teacher in the school (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Organizational commitment has three domains: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment.
   a. Affective commitment. This refers to the teacher’s emotional attachment to identification and involvement in the organization.
   b. Continuance commitment. This refers to the awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization.
   c. Normative commitment. This reflects the teacher’s feeling of obligation to continue employment with the organization.

2. Professional Commitment. This refers to teachers’ job involvement and on the importance of work to them in general (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965).
   a. Teacher Professionalism Commitment. This refers to the commitment of the teacher to the teaching profession.
   b. Professional Commitment to Teaching Work. This refers to the commitment of the teacher to do the demands of the teaching profession.

3. Organizational Citizenship Behavior. This refers to discretionary behaviors that go beyond existing role expectations and are directed toward the individual, the group, or the organization as a unit (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2000).

4. Supervisory Support. This concept refers to the employee’s beliefs that supervisor values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Shanock & Eisenberg, 2006).

5. Job Involvement. This concept means an individual’s psychological identification with a job (Kanungo, 1982).

Method

This research employed a scientific approach in research using descriptive and regression methods to determine the influence of teacher empowerment on organizational behaviors of teachers among Catholic Higher Education Institutions in the Philippines.

The participants of this research comprised of tertiary teachers of the four Catholic Higher Education Institutions in the Philippines. Participants were selected using a stratified random sampling (n=215).

Table 1. Profile of the Respondents

| Profile                        | Frequency (n=215) | Percentage (100.00) |
|--------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Gender                         |                  |                     |
| Male                           | 76               | 35.30               |
| Female                         | 139              | 64.70               |
| Age                            |                  |                     |
| 26 – 30 years old              | 19               | 8.80                |
| 31 – 35 years old              | 38               | 17.70               |
| 36 – 40 years old              | 69               | 32.10               |
| 41 – 45 years old              | 49               | 22.80               |
| 46 – 50 years old              | 22               | 10.20               |
| 51 – 55 years old              | 15               | 7.00                |
| 56 – 60 years old              | 3                | 1.40                |
| Highest Educational Attainment|                  |                     |
| Bachelor's Degree Holder       | 2                | 0.90                |
| With Master’s Degree Units     | 7                | 3.30                |
| Master's Degree Holder         | 74               | 34.40               |
| With Doctorate Degree Units    | 86               | 40.00               |
| Doctorate Degree Holder        | 46               | 21.40               |
| Academic Rank                  |                  |                     |
| Assistant Instructor           | 5                | 2.30                |
| Instructor                     | 9                | 4.20                |
| Senior Instructor              | 62               | 28.80               |
| Assistant Professor            | 70               | 32.60               |
| Associate Professor            | 49               | 22.80               |
| Professor                      | 20               | 9.30                |
Table 1. Continued

| Monthly Salary          | Sample Distribution |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| 30,000.00 and below    | 44                  |
| 30,001.00 – 40,000.00  | 59                  |
| 40,001.00 – 50,000.00  | 60                  |
| 50,001.00 – 60,000.00  | 40                  |
| 60,001.00 – 70,000.00  | 12                  |
|                       | 20.50               |
|                       | 27.40               |
|                       | 27.90               |
|                       | 18.60               |
|                       | 5.60                |

Sample distribution by sociodemographic variables chosen for this research was 64.7% female and 35.4% male teachers. Meanwhile, majority of the participants are in their middle adulthood with age range from 31 – 45 years old. Along their highest educational attainment, majority of the participants hold a master’s degree (74.4%), while 21.4% are doctorate degree holders, and 4.2% are bachelor’s degree holders. Moreover, in terms of their academic rank, 2.3% are assistant instructors, 4.2% are instructors, 28.8% are senior instructors, 32.6% are assistant professors, 22.8% are associate professors, and 9.30% are full professors. Finally, in terms of their field of specialization, 25.1% belongs to the Teacher Education and Liberal Arts, 21.4& are under the Accountancy, Business, and Hospitality Management, 30.2% belongs to the Engineering, Technology, and Architecture Department, and 23.3% are from the Health and Natural Sciences Area.

Instruments

Instrument for Teacher Empowerment. Teacher empowerment was measured using the School Participant Empowerment Scale developed by Short and Rhinehart (1992), consisting of 38 items which were answered on a 4-point scale (scored from 4 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree) measures teachers’ overall beliefs of empowerment.

Instrument for Organizational Commitment. Organizational commitment was measured using the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed and modified by Allen and Meyer (1990). Organizational commitment is composed of three dimensions which are affective, normative, and continuance organizational commitment. The tool consisted of 24 items which were answered on a 4-point scale (scored from 4 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree).

Instrument for Professional Commitment. Professional commitment was measured using a 15-item questionnaire modified by Ibrahim and Iqbal (2015). The questionnaire consists of two dimensions: (1) Teaching professionalism (5 items) which was based on McMahon and Hoy’s (2009) professionalism in teaching and commitment of teaching work (10 items) developed based on Lodahl and Kejner’s Scale (1965) on professional commitment. (2) A 4-point scale was used (scored from 4 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree) to determine the professional commitment of the participants.

Instrument for Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Organizational citizenship behavior was measured using a 23-item scale developed and validated in the school context by Somech and Drach-Zahavy (2000). A 4-point scale (scored from 4 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree) was used.

Instrument for Supervisory Support. Supervisory Support was measured using the Perceived Supervisory Support Scale of Rhoades, Eisenberger, and Armeli (2001). The responses to this 4-item survey were on a 4-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree).

Instrument for Job Involvement. Job involvement was measured using a ten-item Job Involvement Scale developed by Kanungo (1982). The said survey determines the extent to which an individual identifies psychologically with his/her job. Answers to items were recorded on a 4-point scale (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4= strongly agree).

Reliability test was conducted prior to the conduct of data gathering to determine the validity and suitability of the instruments of the research.

Table 2. Reliability Values of Research Questionnaires

| Research Variables          | Cronbach Alpha Reliability Values | Decision |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|
| Teacher Empowerment         | .890                             | Reliable |
| Organizational Commitment   | .972                             | Reliable |
| Professional Commitment     | .885                             | Reliable |
| Organizational Citizenship Behavior | .885                       | Reliable |
| Supervisory Support         | .992                             | Reliable |
| Job Involvement             | .952                             | Reliable |

Data Analyses

Weighted mean and standard deviation were used to determine the teacher empowerment based on the six area indicators and the organizational behaviors of the participants along the five dimensions.
The scale of interpretation for the variables being measured to assess the level of teacher empowerment and the organizational behaviors of the participants of the Catholic Higher Education institutions followed this range which was taken from Robinson, Shaver, and Wrightsman (1999):

| Range      | Description       |
|------------|-------------------|
| 3.25 – 4.00| Very High Level (VH) |
| 2.50 – 3.24| High Level (H)     |
| 1.75 – 2.49| Low Level (L)      |
| 1.00 – 1.74| Very Low Level (VL) |

Multiple Regression Analysis was used to determine which of the six dimensions of teacher empowerment best predict teachers’ organizational behaviors in schools.

**Results and Discussion**

**Teacher Empowerment of Catholic Higher Educational Institutions in the Philippines**

| Dimensions of Empowerment | Mean | Standard Deviation | Qualitative Description |
|---------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Status                    | 3.46 | 0.34083            | Very High Level         |
| Professional Growth       | 3.32 | 0.38523            | Very High Level         |
| Self-Efficacy             | 3.44 | 0.30918            | Very High Level         |
| Decision Making           | 2.67 | 0.42819            | High Level              |
| Impact                    | 3.25 | 0.46982            | Very High Level         |
| Autonomy in Scheduling    | 2.58 | 0.54992            | High Level              |
| **Overall Mean**          | **3.12** | **0.41386**      | **High Level**          |

Table 3 presents the level of teacher empowerment of teachers of Catholic Higher Education institutions in the Philippines. It can be seen from the results that teachers have a very high sense of status. This means that teachers believe that they experience professional respect from their profession and from their institution and earned admiration from their colleagues. In the Philippines, there is a very high regard and respect of students, teachers, and the community to teachers teaching in higher education (Aguado, Garcia, Laguador, & Deligero, 2015). A substantial number of literatures stressed that teachers can earn respect from students and from their colleagues if they really have the mastery of knowledge and demonstrate their expertise (Bogler & Somech, 2004). Furthermore, teachers have a very high sense of status because they function in a professional environment, and the school treated them as professionals. Previous literatures claimed that teachers working in a more supportive workplace and organization improve their effectiveness and efficiency more over time than teachers working in less supportive environment (Avalos, 2011; Tschannen-Moran, 2009; Johnson, Kraft, & Papay, 2012).

Meanwhile, it can also be seen from the table that teachers are highly empowered because they have a very high level of professional growth. This means that Catholic Schools provide opportunities for their teachers to grow in their profession and in their career by providing professional growth activities that cater to the needs of their teachers. Previous studies and literatures pointed out that those teachers with very high level of professional growth continue to grow professionally and expand their competencies and skills in their work in their institution (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Hairon & Dimmock, 2012; Hadar & Brody, 2010). In the context of Higher Education Institutions in the Philippines, it has been a mandate for HEIs to assure that their teachers grow in the profession through professional development activities (Kabilan, 2013). With this mandate, schools provide their teachers equal opportunities to grow professionally through attendance to seminars and workshops locally and internationally, research presentations and publications to international and peer reviewed journals especially indexed in ISI/SI journals, membership to professional organizations, academic seminars and in-service trainings and programs. With professional growth as an important dimension of teacher empowerment, many important school effectiveness can be seen especially in the delivery of quality education and instruction to students (Mukeredzi, 2013; Kramarski & Michalsky, 2009).

Meanwhile, the table also reveals that teachers have a very high level of self-efficacy. This means that Catholic teachers in the Philippines believe that they possessed the required skills and competencies in helping students learn and are able to enhance and nurture curricula for students. With this, teachers believed that they help their students to become independent learners, they have the ability to get things done, they are making difference, they are effective, and they are empowering students. The findings of the present study coincide with the results of previous study that self-efficacy is one of the highest assessments given by teachers among the different dimensions of teacher empowerment (Ruble, Usher, & McGrew, 2011; Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008; Somech & Bogler, 2004). This can be attributed to the fact that self-efficacy is one of the major functions of a teacher. In the educational settings, self-efficacy consists of different dimensions such as instruction, motivating students, adapting education to individual students’ needs, keeping discipline, cooperating with colleagues, and coping with changes and challenges (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010). Moreover, many researchers noted that teacher’s very high level of self-efficacy affects teachers’ behavior and pedagogical actions...
positively as well as their perceptions of the consequences of such actions (Chacon, 2005; Rastegar & Memarpour, 2009; Viel-Ruma, Houchins, Jolivette, & Benson, 2010). With the present result, it can be shown that teachers have the ability to deliver quality instruction to students. Another aspect of self-efficacy that is important in the context of higher education institutions is the feeling of mastery of teachers in both knowledge and practice (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Bandura, 2006). Hence, it can be deduced from previous literatures that the quality of graduates also lies on the very high level of self-efficacy among teachers. It is evident in the result of the present study that teachers assessed themselves as masters and experts in their own fields. It can also be stressed out that the quality of the institution and graduates that schools have lies also on the very high level of self-efficacy of teachers.

Furthermore, the table also shows that teachers have a very high level of teacher empowerment along impact. This shows that teachers believe that they affect and influence school life positively. The process and practice of collaboration of teachers with the different stakeholders of the institution (Pearson & Moomaw, 2005) are greatly manifested. Teachers are given opportunities to teach other teachers and have a capacity to share innovative ideas regarding classroom instruction and the learning process in general. Furthermore, they are also given an opportunity to grow and to have an impact through collaboration with other teachers and even their heads of offices. It can be seen in the results collaboration plays a very important role for teachers to have an impact to their institution. In the 21st century setting, collaboration is considered as a very important skill that teachers should possess (Riveros, 2012; Sullivan, Kiovsky, Mason, Hill & Dukes, 2015; Dede, 2010). Through collaboration among teachers, literatures stressed that its effects are essential to help teachers build professional learning communities to help them take more ownership in improving their academic work and further promote mutual learning (Berry, Daughrey, & Wieder, 2009). Also, it is a way to help teachers address and identify the structural and systematic inequalities built into their institutions (Levine & Marcus, 2007).

It can be shown in the table that teachers are highly empowered along two subscales of teacher empowerment which are decision making and autonomy in scheduling. The results of the present study coincide with majority of studies conducted along teacher empowerment that decision-making and autonomy are the two dimensions with lowest assessments as perceived by teachers (Harpell & Andrews, 2010; Lee, Yin, Zhang, & Jin, 2011; Batra, 2009; Boey, 2010). In terms of decision making, the level of empowerment of teachers is high. This means that the involvement of teachers in the decision-making process of the institution is of high level.

In general, the level of teacher empowerment of teachers is high. This further means that teachers are empowered because they are immersed in a professional environment, given opportunities to grow in their profession, feel effective and efficient in their teaching, and have the capacity to influence their institution positively. The findings coincide with the results of previous studies showing the same results and interpretations (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Calibayan, 2015; Boey, 2010; Levine & Marcus, 2007; Chacon, 2005).

Organizational Behaviors of Teachers of Catholic Higher Educational Institutions in the Philippines

Table 4 presents the organizational behaviors of teachers. As shown in the table, teachers have high level of affective organizational commitment. This means that teachers have a high sense of emotional attachment to their identification and involvement in their institution. This result coincides with previous studies conducted in Catholic Schools regarding affective organizational commitment (Branson, 2008; Chew & Chan, 2008). The kind of affective organizational commitment that Catholic teachers feel can be attributed to the kind of organizational culture schools have. Many studies have shown that organizational culture plays a very important role in the affective organizational commitment of teachers (Ravasi & Schultz, 2006). Moreover, since teachers have a high level of affective organizational commitment, they feel like spending the rest of their career in their present organization. This result negates the findings of previous studies that many full-time teachers from private institutions opt to leave their organization due to relational and affective work-related problems (Loeb, Darling-Hammond & Luczak, 2013; Harris & Adams, 2007). Furthermore, the result of the current study confirms the claim of many previous literatures that many teachers opt not to leave Catholic Institutions because of the holistic approach that Catholic Schools offer to their employees (Lovat,
In terms of the normative organizational commitment of teachers, it was found out that their commitment is also high. This means that teachers opt not to leave the organization because they believe that they have obligations that they need to fulfill in their respective institutions. Previous literature shows teachers tend to stay in the organization due to strong cultural and familial ethics which constitutes to normative organizational commitment (Newstrom, 2011). This can be seen through the vision and mission of each institution that is being shared to its employees and to teachers (Finegan, 2000). This means that teachers tend to stay in the institution because they feel a sense of obligation of communicating the vision and mission of the institution to stakeholders especially to the students. This may hold true to Catholic Schools in general in which Catholic teachers have a strong commitment to their institution since they share the same vision and mission guided with their personal values that coincides with the teachings of the Catholic Church. With this, they maintain their membership and commitment to the organization. Previous studies on normative commitment identified some factors that affect employees’ normative commitment which were also revealed in the study such as teachers availed scholarships and study leaves and professional development activities that enhanced their career growth such as exposure to national and international seminars and conferences (John & Taylor, 1999; Nagar, 2012). This premise suggests that employees who availed these packages feel obliged to have return service to their institution, and it would be unethical if they leave their organization now without finishing their contracts with their institution.

Meanwhile, in terms of supervisory support as an indicator of organizational behavior in the school setting, it can be seen in the table that teachers feel that they have high level of support from their supervisors. This means that teachers believe their supervisors care about their opinion, care about their well-being, consider their goals and values, and most importantly show concern very much to them. Literatures are faithful with the claim that since supervisors act as agents of the organizations, their evaluation are often conveyed to upper management, and these become the overall views of the administrators (Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Arneli, 2001; Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2013). With this, since supervisors represent the school administrators (Pazy & Ganzach, 2009; Neves, 2011), it can be stressed that the support that teachers feel to their supervisors also reflects the kind of support that they feel from their school administrators.

It can also be seen from the table that teachers have high levels of involvement in their job. This means that Catholic School teachers are attached psychologically to their job. Hence, their behavior towards the organization is positive. Specifically, teachers believed that one of the most important things that happened to them has something to do with their work in the institution. Also, they considered their job as central to their existence, and as result, they already feel attachment to their work. Previous literatures revealed that teachers with high involvement in their job resulted to higher motivation and also have a positive effect to job performance and efficiency (Khan, Jam, Khan & Hijazi, 2011). Moreover, because of their high involvement in their work, they tend to put more effort into their jobs and perform better in the organization (Tuazon, 2016). Furthermore, as revealed in the study of Brown and Leigh (2006), teachers with high involvement in their work feel attached personally to their chosen profession and feel the obligation to fully immerse themselves to their work with a sense of self-fulfillment and accomplishment of their jobs.

In terms of the organizational citizenship behavior among teachers, the results revealed that their manifestation of OCB is high. This means that teachers exhibit actions that go beyond their existing functions. Specifically, they do actions that benefit the school, colleagues, parents, and the community. All these things that are discretionary are not enforceable requirements of their role and their job descriptions (Bogler & Somch, 2004). In the educational setting, OCB can be manifested through helping behaviors, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development (Santos, 2015). The study confirms the results of previous studies on the high level of OCB among teachers (Alvarez, 2013; Calibayan, 2015; Yen & Niehoff, 2004; Santos, 2015). With the results, it can then be noted that Catholic Higher Education teachers embrace the organizational values of loyalty, volunteerism, willingness, and cooperation which are results of OCB. Previous studies showed that high level of OCB among teachers are expected to establish and positive and long-term relationships with their organization (Moorman & Hardland, 2002; Santos, 2015).
The table also shows that teachers have high levels of commitment to the profession. Specifically, teachers chose to be teachers in their own accord, and they feel proud of it. Also, it is important to note that teachers believe that the values of teaching profession are very important and their desire to continue teaching is still evident even though there will be low economic return. Hence, the findings imply that teachers identify themselves to the teaching profession and accept the values of the profession. Previous literatures stressed out that commitment to the profession among teachers means acceptance to the school goals and value, willingness to excel and give more time on behalf of the organization, and strong desire and passion to continue in the school’s organization (Reyes, 1990; Delima, 2015).

Finally, Catholic teachers are also professionally committed to teaching work. Literatures are strong in stressing out that the quality of instruction lies on the commitment of teachers in the demand of teaching profession (Calibayan, 2015). Furthermore, the commitment of teachers in the demands of teaching and the profession may result into higher ching work. Literatures are strong in stressing out

Influence of Teacher Empowerment on Organizational Behaviors

| Variables                  | Affective Organizational Commitment | Continuance Organizational Commitment | Normative Organizational Commitment | Supervisory Support | Job Involvement | Organizational Citizenship Behavior | Teacher Professionalism Commitment | Commitment to Teaching Work |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                           | r²                                  | p                                      | r²                                  | p                   | r²                                      | p                                  | r²                                      | p                                      |
| Status                    | .028                                | .013*                                  | .202                                | .040*               | .008                                    | .206                               | .004                                    | .186                                   |
| Professional Growth       | .161                                | .000*                                  | .034                                | .007*               | .059                                    | .000*                              | .012                                    | .110                                   |
| Self-Efficacy             | .108                                | .000*                                  | .055                                | .001*               | .063                                    | .000*                              | .027                                    | .016*                                  |
| Decision Making           | .059                                | .000*                                  | .042                                | .003*               | .021                                    | .035*                              | .018                                    | .047*                                  |
| Impact                    | .125                                | .000*                                  | .093                                | .000*               | .057                                    | .000*                              | .044                                    | .002*                                  |
| Autonomy in Scheduling    | .002                                | .530                                   | .003                                | .448                | .003                                    | .760                               | .023                                    | .025*                                  |

*a. Status as a Predictor of Teachers’ Organizational Behaviors

The table shows the predictors of teachers’ organizational behaviors along status as a subscale of teacher empowerment. It can be seen on the table that status as a dimension of teacher empowerment predicts teachers’ affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, teacher professionalism commitment, and professional commitment to teaching work. Hence, the high sense of status of teachers predicts five organizational behaviors. Furthermore, the findings reveal that teachers with high sense of status in their work and in their organization tend to feel committed to their organization, tend to invest more on discretionary actions that go beyond their work, and more committed to the profession than those teachers with a lower level of status recognition. Teachers who believe that they have professional respect and admiration from their colleagues will have higher tendency to contribute to their institutions (Lin, Hung, & Cheng, 2015). Their contribution will be stressed through greater organizational commitment which manifests an intention not to leave the organization, practice OCB by helping their co-teachers, students, and the school as a whole, and greater passion and commitment to their profession as teachers (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Calibayan, 2015).

b. Professional Growth as a Predictor of Teachers’ Organizational Behaviors

In terms of professional growth as a predictor of teachers’ organizational behaviors among teachers, it is shown in the table that this subscale of teacher empowerment predicts teachers’ affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment, normative organizational commitment, job involvement, organizational citizenship behavior, teacher professionalism commitment, and professional commitment to teaching work. This means that teachers with high levels of professional growth, which characterizes a nurturing working environment that promotes professional growth and development, believe that they contribute to their organization through greater organizational commitment, involve themselves to their work, and manifest high level of OCB, and greater commitment and passion to
the teaching profession. Hence, the more the institution provides opportunities for professional growth, the more they perform better for good of the organization and the profession. The findings coincide with the results of previous literature emphasizing the important role of professional growth as a predictor of teachers’ organizational behaviors (Bogler & Somech, 2004).

c. Self-Efficacy as a Predictor of Teachers’ Organizational Behaviors

The table further shows that self-efficacy as a dimension of teacher empowerment predicts all areas of organizational behaviors of teachers which include affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment, normative organizational commitment, supervisory support, job involvement, organizational citizenship behavior, teacher professionalism commitment, and professional commitment to teaching work. It is important to note that among the different predictors of teacher-empowerment, self-efficacy is the one that can predict all indicators of teachers’ organizational behaviors. Teachers who have high expectations to perform effectively and efficiently in schools will result into greater organizational commitment, carry out discretionary activities beyond the formal ones, feel committed and passionate to the teaching profession, carry out activities and feel more involved to their job, and have higher tendency to have a harmonious relationship with supervisors and department heads. Furthermore, the findings may relate to the self-efficacy concept developed by Bandura (1977) in which teachers who reported higher levels of self-efficacy manifest more positive organizational behaviors in the educational setting.

d. Decision-Making as a Predictor of Teachers’ Organizational Behaviors

The table reveals that decision making as a predictor of teacher empowerment predicts affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment, normative organizational commitment, supervisory support, organizational citizenship behavior, and professional commitment to teaching work. This means that teachers who are involved in decision-making process in the institution tend to exhibit greater commitment to the organization as they become more emotionally attached and tend to continue in their service to the institution. Furthermore, they tend to build harmonious relationship with their supervisors, manifest desire to work beyond their normal functions, and, finally, have a great desire to continue in the teaching profession. Several studies have shown that, indeed, decision making as a dimension of teacher empowerment creates a positive impact on teachers’ organizational behavior especially along organizational commitment, professional commitment, and OCB (Calibayan, 2015; Bogler & Somech, 2004; Yangaiya & Abubakar, 2015).

e. Impact as a Predictor of Teachers’ Organizational Behaviors

In terms of impact as a dimension of teacher empowerment, it predicts teachers’ affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment, normative organizational commitment, supervisory support, job involvement, and professional commitment to teaching work. It is important to note that most of the studies conducted on teacher empowerment revealed that impact as a dimension does not predict any teacher’s organizational behaviors in the schools. In the present study, it was found out that impact predicts organizational commitment, supervisory support, job involvement, and professional commitment. Hence, teachers who have the capacity to influence students’ lives and the school environment have higher tendency to manifest high levels of commitment to the organization, can build a stronger relationship with supervisors and administrators, have higher manifestation of involving himself to his job, and have a higher desire to continue in the teaching profession (Cohen & Kol, 2002; Whitaker, 2003; Blau, 2010).

f. Autonomy in Scheduling as a Predictor of Teachers’ Organizational Behaviors

Autonomy in scheduling as a dimension of teacher empowerment predicts supervisory support and job involvement. It is important to note that among the six dimensions of teacher empowerment, autonomy in scheduling has the least number of organizational behaviors. This coincides with the results of previous literatures conducted on teacher empowerment. In the present study, autonomy in scheduling predicts only two organizational behaviors. Hence, Catholic teachers who have the capacity to choose their teaching schedules and workloads may result to a better relationship and support from their supervisors and have higher tendency to involve themselves in their work.

Conclusions

The results of the present study have several and important implications for theory and further research. First, the study concludes that empowered teachers exhibit positive organizational behaviors in schools. They are empowered to their organization as they feel respected, have opportunities for professional growth, feel efficient and effective in the classroom, and have the capacity to influence students and the school life. However, they do not have enough avenues to be involved in the decision-making process of their institution and do not have enough freedom and opportunities to choose their own schedules and teaching loads. It is also concluded that teachers exhibit positive organizational behaviors in their institutions as manifested in their strong attachment to their organization, high level of involvement to their work, harmonious relationship with their supervisors and middle level managers. They exhibit discretionary actions that go beyond their functions and have a desire and passion to continue and uphold the teaching profession. Furthermore, three of the subscales of teacher empowerment which are professional growth, self-efficacy, and status critically predict teachers’ organizational behaviors in schools.
Second, since limited studies had been conducted looking into how teacher empowerment influence organizational behavior among teachers in the Catholic Schools, the present study, therefore, extends this line of inquiry by examining the influence of teacher empowerment to specific important teachers’ organizational behaviors such as affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment, normative organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, job involvement, and professional commitment. The results confirms previous studies that indeed high levels of teacher empowerment that play a very vital role in the sustainability and development of private and Catholic Schools as it address problems on employee and teacher retention and turnover and enhancement of organizational culture.

Third, one of the major contributions of this study is that it addresses major gaps in literature since no research studies have systematically examined the influence of teacher empowerment on teachers’ organizational behaviors in a single study in educational settings. Based on the findings of this present study, one can already see the high influence of teacher empowerment to teachers’ organizational behaviors in school setting taking Catholic Higher Education Institutions in the Philippines as a case study. From this perspective, educational managers and administrators can use the information arising out of the findings of the present study to come up with strategies and initiatives to further improve programs and activities focusing on promoting and developing teachers’ organizational behaviors. Furthermore, in terms of theoretical perspective, the study gave insights on how teacher empowerment affects and influences teachers’ organizational behaviors.

Possible extension of this study is to investigate other important teacher and school related factors and variables which teacher empowerment dimensions can predict. This may include teachers’ job satisfaction, faculty efficiency and productivity, work values and leadership, work spirituality and religiosity, and other important variables. This is to shed light how teacher empowerment really affects teacher and school effectiveness.
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