

## School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Work Engagement in Public Elementary Schools

Magboo, Jonalyn A.<sup>1</sup>, Velasco, Cecilia Q.<sup>2</sup>, Lucilyn F. Luis<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Teacher I of Anastacia Elementary School- Tiaong, Quezon, Philippines

<sup>2,3</sup>Faculty Member of Laguna State Polytechnic University-San Pablo City Campus, Philippines

---

**ABSTRACT:** This study focused in finding out the school head's instructional leadership behavior and its impact to teacher's work engagement as perceived by the teachers. Public Elementary School teachers of Tiaong II District, Division of Quezon were chosen as the respondents of the study. The adapted and modified survey questionnaire by Philip Hallinger was utilized to measure the instructional behavior of the school heads and Schaufeli and Bakker (2003), the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) was used to measure the Teachers Work Engagement in terms of Vigor, Dedication and Absorption using the Likert Scaling of 1-5.

The result of the variables showed that there is a significant relationship between the Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teacher's Work Engagement in terms of (Vigor, Dedication and Absorption). However, the results implied that school leaders with instructional leadership style manifest behavior that is expected by the teachers and make them work with energy, enthusiasm, commitment and dedication at work.

Despite of this result, as for the recommendations, school heads may continue lead their teachers and do what is best for teachers and student's welfare. Also, teachers may continue showing enthusiasm, dedication and full of commitment with their work, duties and responsibilities for their student's development. School heads may also adopt the effective instructional leadership style and behavior to keep the teachers inspired, motivated, work with energy and dedicated with their work. However, school heads may lessen the extra-curricular and other activities and programs in the school for the teachers to continue work with energy, dedication and commitment.

**KEYWORDS:** Absorption, Dedication, Instructional Leadership Behavior, Teacher's Work Engagement, Vigor

---

### INTRODUCTION

Leadership is one of the most researched topics in organizational science and one of the most recent is employee engagement. The relationship between leadership and employee engagement, on the other hand, has received little attention. As human resource development (HRD) professionals are tasked with retaining, developing, and engaging employees because many organizations invest significant resources in doing so to create and collaborate with leaders in order to effectively implement those strategies Thus, a thorough understanding of the relationship and mechanism between leadership and engagement is required to advise leaders on how to best engage. Cultivate positive outcomes in your followers (Carasco-Saul, 2014; Kim & Kim, 2014, Zahed-Babelan et.al, 2019).

Leadership is increasingly seen as a critical factor in organizational and school effectiveness. The growing interest in instructional trend of continuous reforms of education systems around the world has resulted in the leadership demonstrated in recent decades. These modifications have resulted in a both the importance of the role of school leaders has grown dramatically individually as well as collectively (Hallinger & Huber, 2012), found numerous instances of positive findings regarding the role of the principal in school effectiveness.

The role of the principal has changed as school leadership has evolved. The principal has become more complicated and unclear. "Nothing is more important in the principal's role than to ensure the successful student learning than effective instructional leadership.

Nonetheless, despite its significance in promoting school effectiveness and serving the ultimate objective of the teaching and learning process at schools, Hallinger and Murphy, as cited by Yasser, et.al. (2015), asserts that principals do not devote a significant amount of time to managing their schools' instructional activities. Similarly, Smith and Andrews discovered the dichotomy of secondary principals who serve as building managers and Elementary school principals devote more time to instruction management to be inaccurate.

# **School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Work Engagement in Public Elementary Schools**

Work engagement is a matter of concern for leaders and managers in organizations across the globe; they recognize it as a vital element affecting organizational effectiveness (Welch, 2011).

Work engagement is most often defined as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption" (Schaufeli et al., 2002, Bakker, 2018). Individuals who are engaged in their work have high levels of energy, are enthusiastic about their work, and are completely immersed in their work activities. Work engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Employee engagement concerns the degree to which individuals make full use of their cognitive, emotional, and physical resources to perform role-related work.

Leadership research shows that certain leadership behaviors have a clear association with engagement. Trust in the leader, support from the leader, and creating a blame-free environment are considered to be components of psychological safety, a condition proposed by Kahn, which leads to employee engagement. However, few studies have attempted to provide evidence of association between leadership and employee engagement (Zahed-Babelan, 2019).

This suggests that school head's role is of great importance to the work engagement of the teachers. It significantly influences the performance and productivity of the teachers in the school. Thus, the study on the instructional behavior of the school heads and its possible effect on teacher's work engagement.

## **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

To find out the school heads' instructional leadership behaviour and its impact to teacher's work engagement as perceived by the teachers.

### **Research Design**

This study was descriptive-correlational design in nature. Descriptive-correlational studies describe the variables and the relationships that occur naturally between and among them. It predicts the variance of one or more variables based on the variance of another variable (s).

The process of descriptive research was gathering of data and tabulation of data. It was employed as the method of research to elicit responses from the subjects of the study through the use of questionnaire.

## **RESPONDENTS OF THE STUDY**

The respondents of the study were 233 public elementary school teachers of Tiaong 2 District, Division of Quezon.

### **Sampling Technique**

Stratified Random sampling techniques was used in choosing the respondents of the study. Adapted and modified survey questionnaire by Philip Hallinger for school head's instructional behavior and Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) UWES for teacher's work engagement. These adapted and modified questionnaire was used to measure all the variables presented in the paradigm.

### **Research Procedure**

In the conduct of the study, the researcher prepared first the instrument to be used in the survey. The two sets of instruments were submitted to the panel members and her adviser for approval. The two sets of survey questionnaire were adapted from the two experts Hallinger, Schaufeli and Bakker, however, it was modified and contextualized based on the Philippine setting. It was validated through Cronbach analysis and pilot testing for internal validity and reliability. Pilot testing was done by the 10 teachers not included in the study.

After the pilot testing, the researcher started the process of survey. The two sets of instrument were given to the chosen respondents of the study to find out their perceptions through google forms via google link.

Google link were distributed to the school leaders and teachers for approval. Through their school group conversations, the teacher or study participants had access to the Google connections. The respondents were informed of the method and goal of the study and assured of the privacy of their responses. The completed questions were collected using Google Forms and given to the statistician for statistical analysis.

### **Research Instrument**

To get the perceptions of the teachers toward the school head's instructional behavior, adapted and modified survey questionnaire by Philip Hallinger was utilized. It was composed of 11 sub variables that will measure the instructional behavior of the leader using LIKERT Scaling of 1 to 4. To measure the perception of the teachers toward work engagement was adapted from Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) Utrecht Work Engagement (UWES) measuring the vigor, dedication and absorption using the LIKERT Scaling too of 1 to 4.

# School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Work Engagement in Public Elementary Schools

## Statistical Treatment of Data

After the gathering of the data, it was subjected for statistical treatment. The researcher then tabulated, analyzed and interpreted the results with the assistance of the statistician and adviser in the refinement of the interpretation. For better analysis and discussions, the following statistical tools were used.

To get the level of perceptions of the respondents toward school head's instructional behavior and teacher's work engagement, mean and standard deviation was utilized.

To get the significant relationship and/or effect of instructional behavior to teacher's work engagement, Pearson Moment Correlation was used.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1. Perception of School Heads Level of Instructional Leadership Behavior in Framing the School Goals**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Participates in developing goals that seek improvement over current levels of academic performance	3.64	.508	Highly Observed
2. Plays a part in framing academic goals with target dates.	3.60	.526	Highly Observed
3. Contributes in framing the school's academic goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them.	3.59	.534	Highly Observed
4. Uses data on student academic performance when participating in developing the school's academic goals	3.66	.511	Highly Observed
5. Plays a role in developing goals that are easily translated into classroom objectives by teachers.	3.64	.498	Highly Observed
<b>Over all</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>0.516</b>	<b>Highly Observed</b>

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Almost Always/ Highly Observed; 2.50-3.49 Frequently/Observed; 1.50-2.49 Sometimes/Rarely Observed; 1.00-1.49- Never/Not Observed

Results show the respondent's perceptions on the instructional leadership behavior of their school heads in terms of school goals. Based on the figures above, in framing the school goals, it is highly observed by their leaders who participate in the goals of academic improvement with a mean 3.64, plays a part in the school's goals with a mean of 3.60 meet the subordinates to discuss the goals with 3.59 mean, used data on student's academic performance in developing academic goals with 3.66 mean and plays a vital role in developing goals translated in classroom objectives with 3.64 mean. Overall, the expected participation of the school heads in framing the school goals are highly observed by them with a mean of 3.62. This imply that the leaders of the respondents in their schools are perform their specific job well particularly when participating in developing the school's academic goals which is expected from an instructional leadership. Moreover, creating a positive culture in school and work alongside teachers to provide support and guidance in establishing best practices in teaching. Instructional leadership is considered top 2 in the 5 most effective leadership style (Brolund, 2016).

**Table 2. Perception of School Heads Level of Instructional Leadership Behavior in Communicating the School Goals**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Communicates school's academic goals to people at school.	3.70	.478	Highly Observed
2. Refers to the school's academic goals in informal settings with teachers.	3.58	.552	Highly Observed
3. Discuss the school's academic goals with teachers during faculty meetings.	3.68	.494	Highly Observed
4. Refers to the school's academic goals in curriculum planning with teachers.	3.67	.490	Highly Observed
5. Displays school's goals and it's should be in highly visible areas (for example, posters or bulletin boards indicating the importance of Reading Month).	3.61	.523	Highly Observed
6. Discuss the school's goals in pupils assemblies.	3.60	.558	Highly Observed
<b>Over all</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>Highly Observed</b>

Legend:3.50-4.00 Almost Always/ Highly Observed; 2.50-3.49 Frequently/Observed; 1.50-2.49 Sometimes/Rarely Observed; 1.00-1.49- Never/Not Observed

## School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Work Engagement in Public Elementary Schools

Table 2 presents the perceived responses of the teachers on the instructional leadership behavior of their school heads in terms of communicating with school goals got an overall mean result of 3.64 which is highly observed by the school leaders. It shows that communication is an important aspect for the school development goals where teachers and school heads develop a harmonious relationship to target the school goals for learners' development and school improvement. Based on the mean results, the indicator that get the highest mean of 3.70 is school leaders communicate school academic goals to people at school indicating that the leaders meet their people and discuss matters to them to keep them aware and participate in communicating of the school goals. Item indicator number 2 got the lowest mean though it still falls under highly observed interpretation with a mean of 3.58. This indicates that among the items that the leaders do, this practices got the less observed ones that is discussing the academic goals to teachers in informal setting. This means that discussion of academic goals is never done informally or in casual talks, mostly during formal meetings only.

One of the best aspect of instructional leadership behavior of school heads is that they can positively influence teacher's collaboration thus, positive communication with teachers bring better views on the school goals done on a table meeting (Ruano, et.al, 2021).

**Table 3. Perception of School Heads Level of Instructional Leadership Behavior in Supervising and Evaluating Instruction**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Conducts informal observations in classrooms on a regular basis (unscheduled formal observations at least five minutes, and may or may not involve written feedback or a formal conference. )	3.38	.67219	Observed
2. Ensures that the classroom objectives of teachers are consistent with the shared goals of the school.	3.55	.548	Highly Observed
3. Meets with teachers and other personnel to ensure that they are working toward the same objective.	3.63	.542	Highly Observed
4. Reviews student outputs when evaluating classroom instruction.	3.50	.588	Highly Observed
5. Evaluates teacher on academic objectives directly related to those of the school goals.	3.49	.588	Observed
6. Points out specific strengths and weaknesses in teacher instructional practices in post observation conferences.	3.52	.566	Highly Observed
7. Notes specific strengths and weaknesses of the teacher's instructional practices in written evaluation form.	3.49	.588	Observed
8. Notes specific instructional practices related to the stated classroom objectives in written evaluation form.	3.47	.588	Observed
<b>Over all</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>Highly Observed</b>

Legend:3.50-4.00 Almost Always/ Highly Observed; 2.50-3.49 Frequently/Observed;1.50-2.49 Sometimes/Rarely Observed; 1.00-1.49- Never/Not Observed

Based on the results in table 3 on how the respondents perceive the school heads instructional leadership behavior in terms of supervising and evaluating instruction, the highest item that highly observed by the school heads with a mean of 3.63 is meeting with the teachers and personnel to ensure that they are in sync working towards the same goal. It implies that the school heads always make sure that they have meetings to discuss matters regarding school goals. Through meetings, they can meet intellectually and point out the ideas that matters most to a successful achievement of the goals set forth by the school. However, indicator number 1 got the lowest mean which is "Observed" by the school heads with a mean of 3.38. This indicates that informal observation is seldom observed by the school heads. It also suggests that the school leaders prefer to have the formal observation so the teachers can be more prepared in the classroom when visited. However, the overall result of the table got a mean of 3.50 which is highly observed by the school leaders. Formal observations create positive atmosphere and it positively affects teacher efficacy (Xiarong and Marrion, 2021). That is why it has a lowest mean among the indicators observed by the school leaders.

**Table 4. Perception of School Heads Level of Instructional Leadership Behavior in Coordinating the Curriculum**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Contributes in making decisions regarding who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels.	3.58	.536	Highly Observed
2. Gathers results of school-wide testing when participating in making curricular decisions.	3.55	.540	Highly Observed

## School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Work Engagement in Public Elementary Schools

3. Ensures that the objectives of special programs are coordinated with those of regular classroom.	3.56	.547	Highly Observed
4. Monitors classroom curriculum to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives.	3.53	.565	Highly Observed
5. Assists in assessing the overlap between the school's curricular objectives and the achievement test(s) used for program evaluation.	3.50	.550	Highly Observed
6. Participates actively in the review and/or selection of curricular materials.	3.52	.566	Highly Observed
<b>Over all</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>Highly Observed</b>

Legend:3.50-4.00 Almost Always/ Highly Observed; 2.50-3.49 Frequently/Observed; 1.50-2.49 Sometimes/Rarely Observed; 1.00-1.49- Never/Not Observed

Table 4 presents the perceptions of the respondents on the level of instructional leadership behavior in terms of coordinating the curriculum. Based on the results shown on the table, all indicators received a highly observed response. The highest indicators got a mean of 3.58 where participate in the decision making about the people responsible in the curriculum across grade levels indicating that the school heads ensure that everything is well coordinated and organized. Brolund (2016) emphasized the school head's great deal of responsibility in the school from students, to teachers and parents, school leaders should be knowledgeable and supportive and contribute their ideas for the success of the goals.

Among the six indicators, item number 5 got the lowest mean of 3.50 which is assisting in the assessment of the overlap between the school's curricular objectives and the achievement test(s) used for program evaluation. This means that despite being highly observed by the school heads, there are certain times probably that the school leaders sometimes tend to overlook assisting teachers when objectives and results of student's achievement overlapped and issues arise. As school leaders, they are mostly result-oriented and objectives should coincide with the results of the student's performances, thus, leaders should always assist and help teachers in any undertaking related to goals and objectives of the school program and the results of student's performances. Overall, the in terms of coordinating curriculum got a highly observed mean of 3.54 indicating that the school leaders practice what is expected from them.

Bandura (1997), stated that instructional leadership practices by school leaders positively influence the teacher's sense of efficacy and thereby indirectly improve classroom instruction and student achievement.

**Table 5. Perception of School Heads Level of Instructional Leadership Behavior in Monitoring School Progress**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Meets teacher individually to discuss student academic progress.	3.54	.595	Highly Observed
2. Discuss the item analysis of tests with the teachers to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the instructional program.	3.47	.595	Observed
3. Uses test results to assess progress toward school goals.	3.54	.572	Highly Observed
4. Distributes test results in a timely manner.	3.59	.567	Highly Observed
5. Informs teacher of the school's performance results in written form (for example, in a memo or newsletter).	3.55	.579	Highly Observed
6. Informs pupil of the school's performance results.	3.61	.563	Highly Observed
7. Identifies pupil whose test results indicate a need for special instruction such as remediation or enrichment.	3.60	.557	Highly Observed
8. Assists in developing or finding the appropriate instructional program(s) for students whose test results indicate a need for special instruction.	3.59	.559	Highly Observed
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>Highly Observed</b>

Legend:3.50-4.00 Almost Always/ Highly Observed; 2.50-3.49 Frequently/Observed; 1.50-2.49 Sometimes/Rarely Observed; 1.00-1.49- Never/Not Observed

Table 5 presents the results of the respondent's perceptions in terms of monitoring school progress as observed by the school leaders. Based on the results, all the seven (7) indicators got a highly observed response from the teachers with an overall mean of 3.56 indicating that monitoring school progress is always or almost always practiced and/or observed by the school leaders. This is done to identify the strength and weaknesses of the school programs and analyze what is to be changed or done for the improvement of the school if necessary. Only item number 2 got the lowest mean of 3.47 which is frequently/ observed by the school leaders.

## School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Work Engagement in Public Elementary Schools

However, the overall result got a mean of 3.56 falls under a highly observed where the school leaders do their job in monitoring the school progress. Discussing the results of the tests of the students and analyzed it to identify the teacher's instruction weakness is expected from the school heads. However, sometimes, leaders trust their teacher's ability to improve, innovate their instructional competencies since they know well their students. That is the reason probably why item number two (2) got the lowest mean.

The goal of instructional leadership is for the school heads to work closely with teachers in order to increase student achievement as well as the performance of the teachers as part of their work engagement (Brolund, 2016).

**Table 6. Perception of School Heads Level of Instructional Leadership Behavior in Protecting Instructional Time**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Ensures that instructional time is not interrupted by public-address announcements.	3.52	.581	Highly Observed
2. Ensures that pupils are not called to the Office during instructional time.	3.50	.588	Highly Observed
3. Ensures that tardy pupils face specified consequences for missing instructional time.	3.41	.611	Observed
4. Ensures that tardy or truant pupils make up lost instructional time.	3.44	.600	Observed
5. Visits classroom to see that instructional time is used for learning and practicing new skills and concepts.	3.50	.574	Highly Observed
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>Observed</b>

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Almost Always/ Highly Observed; 2.50-3.49 Frequently/Observed; 1.50-2.49 Sometimes/Rarely Observed; 1.00-1.49- Never/Not Observed

Results above show the perceptions of the respondents towards protecting instructional time of the teachers. Based on the responses indicator number 1 got the highest mean of 3.52 which means it is highly observed by the school leaders since they value time of instruction to maximize the learning of the students. Thus, any announcements or maybe meetings should not affect the time of the teachers in teaching.

As to the lowest mean, indicator number three (3) got a mean of 3.41 which means that the school leaders frequently practice the discipline among students the value of time in school classes, thus certain repercussion is implemented by the school leaders but with certain limitation or leniency probably that is why it is frequently observed.

Overall, protecting instructional time got a frequently/observed by the school leaders with a mean of 3.48 indicating that school leaders practice the conventions of monitoring instructional time of the teachers. Instructional leadership practices have direct impact on teacher's efficacy as a result, monitoring teacher's instructional time is vital for the student's successful learning Xiarong & Marrion (2021).

**Table 7. Perception of School Heads Level of Instructional Leadership Behavior in Maintaining High Visibility**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Takes time to talk with students and teachers during recess and breaks.	3.46	.630	Observed
2. Visits classroom to discuss school issues with teachers and students.	3.47	.644	Observed
3. Attends or participates in co-curricular or extra-curricular activities.	3.58	.560	Highly Observed
4. Covers teacher's classes until a late or substitute teacher arrives.	3.29	.721	Observed
5. Provides direct instruction to students.	3.45	.608	Observed
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>0.63</b>	<b>Observed</b>

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Almost Always/ Highly Observed; 2.50-3.49 Frequently/Observed; 1.50-2.49 Sometimes/Rarely Observed; 1.00-1.49- Never/Not Observed

Table 7 presents the results of school leader's high visibility as perceived by the respondents. Spending time with teachers is important to have better communication, inevitably, school leaders are expected to maintain high visibility with their subordinates. Based on the overall mean of 3.45 it means that it is frequently/ observed by the school leaders. And among the 5 indicators, the highest mean of 3.58 which is school heads attend or participate in co- and extra-curricular activities of the school. This means that teacher and students always see their school heads during their activities and programs in the school. However, indicator number four (4) got the lowest mean of 3.29 which is the school heads cover teacher's classes until a late or substitute teacher arrives. This

## School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Work Engagement in Public Elementary Schools

result indicates that the school heads do not tolerate the tardiness of the teachers in the class that is why it only got a frequently observed response from the respondents. This implies that school leaders and teacher's collaboration is an effective style of school heads, they still need to make several efforts to take time and be with the teachers during school programs for better interpersonal communication and success of the school program of activities (Nurdiante and Nurdin, 2019).

**Table 8. Perception of School Heads Level of Instructional Leadership Behavior in Providing Incentives for Teachers**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Motivates superior performance by teachers in staff meetings, newsletters, and memos.	3.59	.559	Highly Observed
2. Compliments teacher privately for their efforts and performance.	3.58	.560	Highly Observed
3. Acknowledges special effort or performance by teachers in memoranda for their personal file.	3.52	.595	Highly Observed
4. Rewards special effort by teachers with opportunities for professional development (for example, new roles or in-service training).	3.49	.596	Observed
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>.578</b>	<b>Highly Observed</b>

Legend:3.50-4.00 Almost Always/ Highly Observed; 2.50-3.49 Frequently/Observed;1.50-2.49 Sometimes/Rarely Observed; 1.00-1.49- Never/Not Observed

Results of perceived instructional leadership behavior in terms of providing incentives for teachers got an overall mean of 3.55 which means it is highly observed or practice by the school heads. This implies that motivating teachers, staff to do things with quality matters to the school heads. Results also suggests that school heads compliment their teachers if necessary, acknowledges efforts thru letters or certificate of recognition and give rewards to teachers by giving them the opportunity to pursue either graduate programs and/or attendance to seminars and workshops that will enhance teacher's professionalism and teaching effectiveness. Only item number four (4) got a frequently/ observed or practiced by the school heads with a mean of 3.49 indicating that rewarding is not always done by the school heads but recognize and acknowledge when necessary.

The significance of recognition, rewards and acknowledgement for both the faculty and school adds credibility to the teaching staff throughout their communities (K12digest, 2022).

**Table 9. Perception of School Heads Level of Instructional Leadership Behavior in Promoting Professional Development**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Informs teachers' opportunities for professional development.	3.66	.528	Highly Observed
2. Selects in-service activities that are consistent with the school's academic goals.	3.58	.545	Highly Observed
3. Supports teacher requests to conduct researches opportunities that are directly related to the school's academic goals.	3.60	.541	Highly Observed
4. Distributes journal articles to teachers on a regular basis.	3.36	.630	Observed
5. Actively supports the use of skills in the classroom that are required during participation in professional organizations.	3.54	.572	Highly Observed
6. Ensures that instructional aides receive appropriate training to help students meet instructional objectives.	3.53	.595	Highly Observed
7. Arranges outside speaker to make presentations on instruction at faculty meetings.	3.46	.616	Observed
8. Provides time to meet individually with teachers to discuss instructional issues.	3.51	.596	Highly Observed
9. Sits in on School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) activities concerned with instruction.	3.64	.580	Highly Observed
10.Sets time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas on instruction or information from new in-service activities.	3.63	.565	Highly Observed
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>Highly Observed</b>

Legend:3.50-4.00 Almost Always/ Highly Observed;2.50-3.49 Frequently/Observed;1.50-2.49 Sometimes/Rarely Observed; 1.00-1.49- Never/Not Observed

Table 9 presents the results of the perceptions of the respondents on the school heads level of instructional leadership behavior in promoting professional development. Based on the results an overall mean of 3.55 indicates that the school heads highly observed

## School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Work Engagement in Public Elementary Schools

all the item indicators presented on the table. From the table above, the highest indicator is item number one (1) which is informing teachers opportunities for professional development with a mean of 3.66. This perception indicates that school heads encourages their teachers to pursue their professional development.

However, indicator number four (4) got the lowest mean of 3.36 meaning it is frequently/observed by the school heads. This response indicates that probably sometimes the school heads do not give or distribute journal articles to the teachers since no journals to give or not the priority of the school. Maybe because there are other things that the school heads do and reading article from journals can read on their own.

All the rest of indicators are all highly practiced by the school heads. This also implies that instructional leaders engaged in to intentionally support the teachers for the development of their effective teaching and learning in the schools (Le Fevre,2020) that is for the reason they promote professional development not only for pursuing graduate program but also sending them to attend, trainings, workshops, conferences and seminars.

**Table 10. Perception of School Heads Level of Instructional Leadership Behavior in Developing and Enforcing Academic Standards**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Sets high standards for the percentage of students who are expected to master important instructional objectives.	3.48	.573	Observed
2. Encourages teacher to start class on time and teach to the end of the period.	3.61	.540	Highly Observed
3. Makes known what is expected of students at different grade-level assemblies.	3.52	.558	Highly Observed
4. Enforces a promotion standard requiring mastery of grade-level expectations.	3.53	.565	Highly Observed
5. Supports teacher when they enforce academic policies (for example, on grading, homework, promotion, and discipline).	3.56	.555	Highly Observed
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>Highly Observed</b>

Legend:3.50-4.00 Almost Always/ Highly Observed;2.50-3.49 Frequently/Observed;1.50-2.49 Sometimes/Rarely Observed; 1.00-1.49- Never/Not Observed

Results on table 10 shows the perceived instructional leadership behavior in terms of developing and enforcing academic standards. Based on the data above, almost all indicators got a highly observed response with an overall mean of 3.54. Only one indicator got a mean of 3.48 which falls under frequently/ observed response. However, indicator number 2 got a highest mean which is highly observed too. The results suggest that as leaders, setting standards to achieve higher performance and achievement of the students is the goal of any school leaders. Thus, ensuring the quality instruction given to the students should be one of the min goals of the schools. And based on the overall results, the school leaders of the schools where the study was conducted are highly observing or practicing what is expected from them, that is ensure and maintain higher performance of the students. Hence, teacher's quality performance and engagement at work are also expected. Kabeta (2013), emphasized the effect of school leaders to the teacher's efficacy in the teaching and learning process in the classroom which leads to high student's performance.

**Table 11. Perception of School Heads Level of Instructional Leadership Behavior in Providing Incentives for Learning**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Recognizes pupil who do superior academic work with formal rewards such as honor roll or mention in the school's newsletter.	3.53	.595	Highly Observed
2. Uses assembly to honor students for their academic work and/or behavior in class.	3.54	.587	Highly Observed
3. Recognizes superior student achievement or improvement by seeing students in the office with their work products.	3.50	.596	Highly Observed
4. Contacts parent to communicate improved student performance in school.	3.54	.594	Highly Observed
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>Highly Observed</b>

Legend:3.50-4.00 Almost Always/ Highly Observed; 2.50-3.49 Frequently/Observed;1.50-2.49 Sometimes/Rarely Observed; 1.00-1.49- Never/Not Observed

Results from table shows the instructional leadership behavior of the school leaders in terms of providing incentives for learning. Based on the overall mean of 3.53, all the indicators got a highly observed response which indicates that the school heads are generous enough to recognize teacher's effort in making the students perform well in the class. Indicators 2 and 4 with the same

## School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Work Engagement in Public Elementary Schools

overall mean of 3.54 got a highly observed which means parents participation are part of learner's success which leads to have a better recognition on one's improvement. This recognition and/or incentives can be in form of certificates and other accolades acknowledging not only the teachers but the students as well. Effective school leaders also create incentives for teachers and students to increase the quality of classroom teaching and learning (Mehmet & Yan, 2017). Students will perform better when they are managed by professors who are driven by incentives and rewards.

**Table 12. Summary of the Tables in School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior**

Instructional Leadership Behavior	Mean	SD	VI
<b>Framing the School Goals</b>	3.62	0.516	Highly Observed
<b>Communicating the School Goals</b>	3.64	0.52	Highly Observed
<b>Supervising and Evaluating Instruction</b>	3.50	0.59	Highly Observed
<b>Coordinating the Curriculum</b>	3.54	0.55	Highly Observed
<b>Monitoring the School Progress</b>	3.56	0.57	Highly Observed
<b>Protecting Instructional Time</b>	3.48	0.59	Observed
<b>Maintaining High Visibility</b>	3.45	0.63	Observed
<b>Providing Incentives for Teachers</b>	3.55	0.578	Highly Observed
<b>Promoting Professional Development</b>	3.55	0.58	Highly Observed
<b>Developing and Enforcing Academic Standards</b>	3.54	0.56	Highly Observed
<b>Providing Incentives for Learning</b>	3.53	0.59	Highly Observed
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>0.570</b>	<b>Highly Observed</b>

Legend:3.50-4.00 Almost Always/ Highly Observed; 2.50-3.49 Frequently/Observed; 1.50-2.49 Sometimes/Rarely Observed; 1.00-1.49- Never/Not Observed

Table 12 presents the overall summary of results in school heads' instructional leadership behavior which got an overall mean of 3.54 which falls under highly observed. It shows that all the indicators got a highly observed and only two (2) indicators which is protecting instructional time and maintaining high visibility got an observed where teachers got more engaged on extracurricular activities and programs in school which may cause to lessen their focused on their instructional time and lessen their motivation in doing their work with compassion and persistence.

**Table 13. Perceived Level of Teacher's Work Engagement in terms of Vigor**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. At my work, I feel bursting with energy.	3.40	.533	Engaged
2. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous	3.44	.555	Engaged
3. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.	3.42	.583	Engaged
4. I can continue working for very long periods at a time.	3.40	.573	Engaged
5. At my job, I am very resilient, mentally	3.43	.521	Engaged
6. At my work, I always persevere, even when things do not go well.	3.47	.517	Engaged
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>Engaged</b>

Legend:3.50-4.00 Highly Manifested/ Highly Engaged;2.50-3.49 Manifested/Engaged; 1.50-2.49 Less Manifested/Less Engaged; 1.00-1.49- Not Manifested/Not Engaged

Table 13 presents the perceptions of the respondents towards their work engagement in terms of vigor. Based on the results, teachers frequently start their day at work with energy despite a number of extra work given to them aside from teaching in the classroom. They can take pressures at work, motivated to work every day and most of all looking forward to go to work with energy even at times things don't go well. The overall mean of 3.42 which falls under the category of engaged indicates that most of the teachers when their school heads perform their jobs efficiently and communicate with them, their intense energy to teach could not be measured because of commitment and dedication to their work. None of the indicators got a highly engaged response but still, the teachers show commitment at work which is essential to the evaluation of teacher's performance. As Zhang (2021) stated, that teacher's work engagement influences student's physical and mental growth as well as academic program implying that teacher's commitment, energy to work and dedication matters a lot. When a teacher comes to work with vigor, he/she spread positivity in the classroom and enjoy teaching and engaging with students (Basikin, 2020).

## School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Work Engagement in Public Elementary Schools

**Table 14. Perceived Level of Teacher's Work Engagement in terms of Dedication**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose	3.57	.521	Highly Engaged
2. I am enthusiastic about my job.	3.54	.533	Highly Engaged
3. My job inspires me	3.53	.557	Highly Engaged
4. I am proud of the work that I do.	3.60	.525	Highly Engaged
5. To me, my job is challenging.	3.60	.524	Highly Engaged
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>Highly Engaged</b>

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Highly Manifested/ Highly Engaged; 2.50-3.49 Manifested/Engaged; 1.50-2.49 Less Manifested/Less Engaged; 1.00-1.49- Not Manifested/Not Engaged

Table 14 shows the results of the perceptions of the respondents towards teacher's work engagement in terms of dedication. Based on the results above, all indicators are highly manifested and/or highly engaged by the teachers and got an overall mean of 3.57, where teachers looking at work as meaningful since they develop student's knowledge and skills to be ready for the school life ahead. In the same manner, they consider job as an inspiration and proud to be a teacher despite the challenges they face at work. Moreover, they work enthusiastically that gives them the energy to work effectively and efficiently, that is dedication. Overall, the teachers are mostly happy with their work and find teaching inspiring that makes them work with vigor, commitment and dedication. Dedication in work engagement shows enthusiasm and involvement at work, thus, a dedicated teacher is someone who is happy, passionate in whatever they are doing (Khaliffa, affnan, 2022). Based on the responses, they are totally dedicated teachers.

**Table 15. Perceived Level of Teacher's Work Engagement in terms of Absorption**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1. Time flies when I am working.	3.59	.502	Highly Engaged
2. When I am working, I forget everything else around me.	3.33	.600	Engaged
3. I feel happy when I am working intensely.	3.44	.547	Engaged
4. I am immersed in my work.	3.47	.525	Engaged
5. I get carried away when I am working.	3.36	.587	Engaged
6. It is difficult to detach myself from my job.	3.38	.592	Engaged
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>Engaged</b>

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Highly Manifested/ Highly Engaged; 2.50-3.49 Manifested/Engaged; 1.50-2.49 Less Manifested/Less Engaged; 1.00-1.49- Not Manifested/Not Engaged

Results on the perceptions of the respondent's work engagement in terms of absorption. Based on the data presented, only indicator one (1) got a highly engaged response with a mean of 3.59 indicating that in terms of working at school, it seems that time is too short for them when teaching showing they are concentrated on what they do, happily engrossed with work so that they feel time passes quickly (Basikin, 2022).

With the rest of the indicators, manifested/engaged by the respondents indicating that the teachers when working, they are focused, feel happy despite a number of work outside teaching, and feel concentrated on what they do. This implies that teacher's engagement in terms of absorption implies that the teachers in the study are all engaged concentrated, focused and feel strong and vigorous when teaching and work at school. Overall, teachers work engagement at work are engaged with a mean of 3.43 which also implies that teachers give their focus and full commitment in doing their task.

To support this, Robinson emphasized that absorption means that teachers engaged in their work, they are engrossed in it. The goal is not to get done with the work as soon as possible, but to do it in the best possible way (Robinson, 2022).

**Table 16. Summary of the Tables in Teachers' Work Engagement**

Teachers' Work Engagement	Mean	SD	VI
<b>Vigor</b>	3.42	0.55	Engaged
<b>Dedication</b>	3.57	0.53	Highly Engaged
<b>Absorption</b>	3.43	0.56	Engaged
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>Engaged</b>
Teachers' Work Engagement	Mean	SD	VI
<b>Vigor</b>	3.42	0.55	Engaged
<b>Dedication</b>	3.57	0.53	Highly Engaged
<b>Absorption</b>	3.43	0.56	Engaged
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>Engaged</b>

## School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Work Engagement in Public Elementary Schools

Legend: 3.50-4.00 Highly Manifested/ Highly Engaged; 2.50-3.49 Manifested/Engaged; 1.50-2.49 Less Manifested/Less Engaged; 1.00-1.49- Not Manifested/Not Engaged

Table 16 presents the overall summary result of the teachers' work engagement which got a mean of 3.47 and falls under engaged. It shows that teachers are dedicated and enthusiastic to do their work which is highly engaged and got a mean of 3.57. Vigor and Absorption got an engaged in result where teachers sometimes feel unmotivated and less on vigorous performance since there are lot of works and reports to do which is sometimes not necessarily and does not contribute in teacher's growth and improvement. All the discussions presented show that work engagement of the teachers are highly engaged. It implies that they feel committed, dedicated and concentrated in the work they do. These results are supported by studies and literature. In terms of school head's level of instructional leadership behavior, indicators are mostly highly manifested or engaged. That is the reason why teachers are also taking pride to work with school leaders who are supportive, communicate effectively and work well with the teachers and students.

**Table 17. Significant relationship between School Head's Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teacher's Work Engagement perceived by the respondents in terms Teacher's Work Engagement**

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR VARIABLES	TEACHER'S WORK ENGAGEMENT		
	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption
	R-value	R-value	R-value
1.Framing the School's Goals	.628**	.464**	.423**
2.Communicating the School's Goals	.642**	.490**	.459**
3.Supervising and Evaluating Instruction	.679**	.540**	.505**
4.Coordinating the Curriculum	.711**	.579**	.529**
5.Monitoring School Progress	.744**	.566**	.511**
6.Protecting Instructional Time	.726**	.553**	.495**
7.Maintaining High Visibility	.760**	.552**	.526**
8.Providing Incentives for Teachers	.721**	.529**	.511**
9.Promoting Professional Development	.793**	.549**	.513**
10.Developing and Enforcing Academic Standards	.782**	.558**	.518**
11. Providing Incentives for Learning	.793**	.549**	.513**

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Results on the test of significant relationship between the perceived instructional leadership behavior and the teachers work engagement in terms of vigor, dedication and absorption found to be significantly related at 0.01 level of significance. It can be seen from the variables of instructional leadership sub variables and work engagement variables; it is very evident that the leadership behavior affects or impacts the work engagement of the teachers.

The first variable that has significant relationship to teacher's work engagement is framing the school goals with an R-value of .628 for vigor, .464 for dedication, and .423 for absorption all are significantly related respectively. This results indicates that when the school leaders participate and contribute to the framing of the school's academic goals, the teachers will be motivated to go to work and be happy doing their job full of energy and concentrated. They too show commitment and dedication with all the job they do for the student's successful learning.

Variable communicating school goals found to be also significantly related to that work engagement in terms of vigor with an R-value of .642, dedication with .490, and absorption .459 respectively. This results indicates that the school leaders highly observed in communicating details of school's academic goals in informal settings aide from the meetings and conference with teachers, they still talk everything even in a casual manner just to show their support in the achievement of academic goals. Moreover, school leaders also discuss these goals to students for them to be aware of what the schools are expected from them. When school leaders frequently communicate with their subordinate's success of achieving the goals is possible. This is because instructional leadership positively influence teachers and communication with teachers bring better views on the school goals done on a table meeting (Ruano, et.al, 2021).

Supervising and evaluating instruction is also found to be significantly related to work engagement of the teachers in terms of vigor with an R-value of .679, dedication .540, and .505 for absorption all tested at 0.01 level of significance. This result indicates that the school leaders highly observed or practiced the supervision and evaluation of the teacher's instruction through observation, post-observation discussion of what to improve and what is commended by the school heads. It shows that based on the perceptions of the respondents, the school leaders perform their duties efficiently and effectively. This is supported by Xiarong and Marion (2021), that when school leaders observed the teachers formally, it creates positive atmosphere and lead the teachers to be more effective and give higher performance as expected by their leaders.

## School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Work Engagement in Public Elementary Schools

Coordinating the curriculum also found to be significantly related to work engagement in terms of vigor with an R-value of .711, .579 for dedication and .529 for absorption all tested at 0.01 level of significance respectively. This results implies that school leaders highly observed their duties in terms of participating in decision making, monitors classroom curriculum objectives and other curriculum related activities. It is significantly related to work engagement since school leaders have great influence to teachers. If the leaders are efficient enough to do their tasks, teachers become more engaged with their work because they are motivated and inspired by the leadership behavior of their heads. (Broulund, 2016) supported this when he emphasized that a responsible leader who contribute ideas and support teachers and students for the achievement of the goals have a great deal of influence or impact to teachers.

As to monitoring of school progress, it is also found significantly related to teacher's work engagement. The R-values of vigor with .744, dedication, .566, and absorption with .511 are all tested at 0.01 level of significance. This result implies that when school leaders monitor school progress and meet their teachers for the assessment and evaluation of the strength and weakness, it impacts teachers to improve more in their field and enhance their skills to make their instruction effective and bring learning success among students. Ruano (2021), emphasized that instructional leaders positively influence teachers to work collaboratively with them that resulted to successful academic achievement. Moreover, school heads leadership impacts teacher's work engagement because it makes them (teachers) perform their duties with vigor, dedication and absorption essential to the evaluation of teacher's performance.

In terms of protecting instructional time, R-values of .726 for vigor, .553 for dedication, and .495 for absorption found to be significantly related to each other. This result implies that when school leaders keep on monitoring the progress of the student's learning and show concern on the achievement of the students, the teachers show concern too and keep themselves focused and committed to work well and ensure the progress of the students through proper monitoring and ensuring that the instructional time is not interrupted of any sort. However, there are times that teachers work may overlap due to unnecessary activities and programs in school, and it may cause for the teachers to feel unmotivated and lessen their dedication on their working engagement. This also suggests that when school heads ensure the time spent in teaching is quality time, it reflects to teacher's work engagement (Xiarong and Marrion(2021).

As to maintaining high visibility, significant relationship was found to teacher's work engagement in term of vigor with .760 R-value, dedication with .552, and absorption with .526 all tested at 0.01 level of significance. This result implies that when school leaders are always visible and takes time to talk with students visit to discuss issues with teachers, it also influences teachers to work with energy, commitment and dedication. However, due to a number of extracurricular activities in school which are not that related in the teacher's performance, teacher's work engagement may lessen, feel unmotivated, and lack of commitment. When leaders keep on communicating each other and always present during school programs or even in co-curricular activities teachers are inspired to work and teach the students with their best (Nurdiantje and Nurdan, 2019).

As to providing incentives to teachers and work engagement, it is found to be significantly related to each other. This is very evident in the R-values results of vigor with .721, dedication with .529, and .511 for absorption, all tested at 0.01 level of significance. This result implies that when school leaders recognize the effort of the teachers even with commendation, compliments or certificates, teachers feel more motivated and dedicated to their job. Not because of the incentives but because they appreciate and see the commitment and love for work of the teachers which cannot be compensated with any material things in this world. Thus, school leaders should be generous in complementing their teachers to make them inspired and proud of their work.

K12digest (2022), stated that recognition and rewards for both faculty and school, adds credibility to the teaching workforce throughout the community.

In terms of promoting professional development and work engagement, results revealed that significant relationship exists based on the R-values of vigor with .793, dedication with .549, and .513 for absorption, all measured at 0.01 level of significance. This result implies that when school leaders support their teachers to grow professionally either attending seminars, workshops and training, including pursuing graduate program, it impacts the teachers to work better. The more the teachers participate in any professional activities, it guarantees that teachers will be more active, participative and work with pride and inspired to master their craft for the sake of their students. Thus, school leaders support matters in the work engagement of the teachers in the academe.

Developing and enforcing academic standards and teacher's work engagement found to be significantly related to each other based on the R-values results when tested at 0.01 level of significance. Based on the R-values of .782 for vigor, .558 for dedication and .518 for absorption, all tested at 0.01 level of significance respectively. Based on the results, it implies that when school leaders established or set standards for quality teaching and learning, teachers ensure that they are in consonance with the standards set forth. They will also enforce academic policies to attain higher results during performances. When leaders support the teachers in any academic endeavor, surely teachers will be as energetic and enthusiastic in teaching, likewise, in any curricular work concerning students. Kabeta (2013) emphasized the effect of school leaders to the teacher's efficacy in the teaching and learning process in the classroom which leads to high student's performance.

## School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Work Engagement in Public Elementary Schools

Lastly, providing incentives for learning and teacher's work engagement in terms of vigor with .793 R-value, dedication with .549 R-value and absorption with .513 R-value, all tested at 0.01 level of significance. Based on the results, it was found out significantly related. This result implies that when school leaders show appreciation to the academic work of the students, teachers feel proud and takes pride of their accomplishment as teachers of these excellent students. Honoring student's high academic performance is also recognizing the teachers teaching performance that somehow, it made them related for whatever success their students may have. If in case, students with difficulty arise, school leaders still have the decision to contact parents and seek their help to improve the performance of the students. Remember that students will perform better when they are recognized and managed by professors who are also driven by incentives and rewards and recognition. Effective school leaders also create incentives for teachers and students to increase the quality of classroom teaching and learning (Mehmet & Yan, 2017).

### CONCLUSION

Based on the findings as summarized, the following were concluded:

1. The school leaders highly observed the instructional leadership variables as perceived by the respondents, thus, they are good leaders of the schools.
2. The teachers in terms of work engagement performed well and highly practiced and/or observed what is expected from them to do. Their work engagement is high and full of vigor, dedication and commitment to work.
3. The instructional leadership behavior of the school leaders is highly significant to teacher's work engagement in terms of vigor, dedication and absorption. Thus, the hypothesis is rejected.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

From the drawn conclusions, the following recommendations were formulated:

1. School leaders may continue observe what they do at school and lead their people at its best since majority of the school leaders perform their duties and responsibilities as head of the institution.
2. Teachers may continue showing enthusiasm, energy and dedication at work whether the school heads manifest or not the duties and responsibilities assigned to them. Teachers performance matters when it comes to student's welfare.
3. School heads from other schools or higher institutions may adopt the instructional leadership style that considered most effective style of leading people to keep the teachers inspired, work with energy and motivated to their task without complain. Thus, they may continue practice or observe the duties and tasks assigned to them as leaders of the school.
4. School leaders may lessen the extracurricular activities in the school that may overlap teachers' work that also affect their working engagement and commitment to work.
5. Researchers may conduct studies similar to this one but using different leadership style in a wider scope.

### REFERENCES

- 1) Adel Zahed-Babelan<sup>1</sup>, Ghodratollah Koulaei<sup>2</sup>, Mahdi Moeinikia<sup>1</sup> and Ali Rezaei Sharif.(2019). Instructional Leadership Effects on Teachers' Work Engagement: Roles of School Culture, Empowerment, and Job Characteristics. *c e p s Journal* | Vol.9 | No 3 | Year 2019
- 2) Arnold B. Bakker, Simon Albrecht. (2019). Work Engagement; Current Trends. *Career Development International* ISSN: 1362-0436 Article publication date: 19 February 2018
- 3) Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- 4) Brolund, Liisa. (2016). Student Success Through Instructional Leadership. Published Research. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1230490.pdf> Elementary School Education in Bandung. Published Research. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, Volume 400
- 5) Gera, Navneet, Sharma RK, and Dr. Pankajsaini (2019). Absorption, Vigor and Dedication: Determinants of Employee Engagement in B- Schools. Published Research. *Indian Journal of Economics & Business*, Vol. 18, No.1 (2019) : 61-70
- 6) Goddard, Y. L., Goddard, R. D., and Tschannen-Moran, M. (2007). A theoretical and empirical investigation of teacher collaboration for school improvement and student achievement in public elementary schools *Teach. Coll. Rec.* 109 (4), 877–896.
- 7) Hallinger, P & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behaviors of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86, (2), 217-247.
- 8) Kabeta, Rachel M., Manchishi, P.C., Akakandelwa A. (2013). Instructional Leadership and Its effect on the Teaching and Learning Process: The case of Head Teachers in Selected Basic Schools in the Central Office of Zambia. Published Research.

## School Heads' Instructional Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Work Engagement in Public Elementary Schools

- 9) Khalifa, Affnan. (2020). What makes a dedicated teacher? An interview with Cambridge Dedicated Teacher Award winner, Khalifa Affnan. Published Article <https://www.cambridge.org/news-and-insights/insights/What-makes-a-dedicated-teacher>
- 10) Klein, Jennifer. (2020) Language Matters in Education: Putting Vigor over Rigor. Published Article. <https://www.principledlearning.org/post/language-matters-in-education-putting-vigor-over-rigor>
- 11) Le Fevre, D., Timperley, H., Twyford, K., & EII,F (2020). Instructional Leadership and why it Matters? Published Article. <https://theeducationhub.org.nz/instructionalleadershipandwhyitmatters#:text=Strong%20instructional%20leadership%20creates%20a%20high%20expectations%20social%20behaviour>.
- 12) Lia Nurdianti\*, Diding Nurdin. (2019). Instructional Leadership in Improving the Quality of University Teachers. Published Research. Bulletin of Education and Research outcomes: An analysis of the different effects of leadership types. Educational Psychology <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.721450> of University Teachers. Published Research. Bulletin of Education and Research April 2020, Vol. 42, No.1 pp. 167-1
- 13) Onyali, Loyce Chiedozi and Akinfolarin Akinwale Victor (2017). PRINCIPALS' PROVISION OF INCENTIVE FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS' IMPROVEMENT IN OYO STATE. Published Research. UNIZIK JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONGRADUATES VOL. 4 ISSUE 1, NOVEMBER 2017
- 14) Rapheal, Jeny. (2019). TEACHER ENGAGEMENT: WHAT WORKS? Published Article. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/teacher-engagement-what-works-drjeny-rapheal>
- 15) Robinson, Joe. (2022). The Three Engines of Employees Engagement. Published Article. Retrieved from <https://www.worktolive.info/blog/bid/354012/The-3-Engines-of-Employment-Engagement>.
- 16) Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the different effects of leadership types. Educational Administration Quarterly, 44(5),635-674.doi:10.1177/00316X08321509
- 17) Ruano, Julio Fregoria, Schurig Michael, Wittman, Eveline (2021). Instructional Leadership as a Vehicle for Teacher Collaboration and Student Achievement. <https://frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/feduc.2021.582773/full>
- 18) Sittar, Khadija. (2020). Relationship of Work Engagements and Job Performance
- 19) Uzma Sarwar<sup>1,2</sup>, Rameez Tariq<sup>3</sup> and Qi Zhan Yong. (2022). Principal's leadership style and its impact on teacher's performance at college level. Published Research. Frontiers Psychology. September 6,2022.
- 20) Xiaorong, and Russ, Marrion. (2021). Exploring how instructional leadership affects teacher efficacy: A multilevel analysis. Educational Management Administration & Leadership 2021, Vol. 49(1)188–207
- 21) Yasser, F. Hendawy Al-Mahdy<sup>1,\*</sup>, Amal, R. Al-kiyumi<sup>2</sup> (2015). Teachers' Perceptions of Principals' Instructional Leadership in Omani Schools. American Journal of Educational Research, 2015, Vol.3, No.12, 1504-1510
- 22) Yeung, Eva. (2019). Passionate Teaching: How to Inspire Students. Published Article. Retrieve from <https://bsd.education/passionate-teaching-and-inspired-learning>
- 23) Zhang, Danhui, Jingwen He, & Dingmen Fu. (2021). How Can We Improve Teacher's Work Engagement? Based on Chinese Experiences. Front. Psychol., 25 November 2021 Sec. Educational