INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP OF SCHOOL HEADS AND FOLLOWERSHIP STYLES OF TEACHERS AS CONSTRUCTS OF WORK PERFORMANCE OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY TEACHERS OF COTABATO CITY DIVISION

Adelyn A. Pacumba[1]

[1]Researcher, The Rizal Memorial Colleges, Inc.

ABSTRACT

The study explored the relationship of instructional leadership, followership styles, and work performance of public elementary teachers in Cotabato City Division. With the use of probability sampling, 200 elementary teachers in the public schools were selected as the respondents. Utilizing the descriptive-correlational survey method, the data collated were analyzed through the use of Mean and Product-Moment correlation. Results revealed that there was an extensive instructional leadership of school heads, extensive followership styles of teachers, and moderately extensive work performance of teachers. Furthermore, there was a significant relationship between the involved variables specifically between instructional leadership and followership styles, instructional leadership and work performance, and followership styles and work performance. Based on the findings, it was further suggested that higher officials in the Department of Education may identify means on how to strengthen the followership styles and work performance of teachers considering the instructional leadership of the school heads. More so, future researchers may further explore the involved variables considering other factors and research methods.

Keywords: Instructional leadership, followership styles, work performance, Cotabato City Division, Philippines

1. INTRODUCTION

Teachers' work performance is a crucial factor in students' learning and academic achievement. The instructional leadership of school heads significantly influences teachers' performance by providing a structured framework that emphasizes effective teaching methods and curriculum implementation. Moreover, aligning followership styles among teachers, where educators collaborate with and support the leadership vision, fosters a cohesive and motivated teaching environment, ultimately enhancing overall work performance. Teachers' work performance encompasses the application of their competencies in planning, implementing, and assessing learning outcomes (Kempa & Herenz, 2016). Teachers must exemplify excellent performance to serve as role models for their peers. However, various challenges, including personal, financial, and managerial issues, negatively impact teachers' work performance.

In the United States, teachers often face professional recognition challenges, with issues such as poor pay, increased healthcare costs, and diminished pension plans being central. Teacher strikes frequently highlight demands for increased school funding and address disinvestment in schools (Bruno, 2018). In Pakistan, poor teacher performance is attributed to the lack of quality teacher training, rendering the education system ineffective (Ashraf & Ashraf, 2015). In Israel, teachers' work performance is often affected by mid-career shifts or personal crises (Yariv, 2011).

In the Philippines, Kadtong et al. (2017) revealed that disgruntled teachers dissatisfied with their jobs are less committed and productive, risking the teaching profession and affecting national educational goals. Haramain (2020) identified major problems affecting Filipino teachers' performance, including a lack of teachers in difficult posts, numerous administrative roles, and inadequate teacher preparation. Poor performance is linked to subpar teacher training, low-quality students in training programs, and limited professional development opportunities (Philippine News Agency, 2022). The Department of Education recognizes poor teacher performance as a persistent issue based on performance appraisals. In the Division of Cotabato City, teachers' work performance is affected by personal and financial problems, ineffective managerial skills of administrators, inadequate and unsuitable school equipment, and lack of faculty coordination. Despite these observations, there has been no formal study exploring these circumstances. No study has explored the work performance of public elementary teachers in the Division of Cotabato City, considering school heads' instructional leadership and teachers' followership styles.

Given these situations, this research aims to explore the extent of instructional leadership of school heads, followership styles of teachers, and the work performance of public elementary teachers specifically in the Cotabato City Division. Additionally, it seeks to investigate the correlation between these variables. This academic endeavor intends to provide insights to policymakers in crafting policies, programs, interventions, projects, and activities that would enhance the work performance of public elementary teachers.

2. REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT LITERATURE

The related literature and studies provide insights into the instructional leadership of school heads, followership styles of teachers, and work performance of teachers. The independent variables are instructional leadership of school heads and followership styles of teachers, while the dependent variable is the work performance of teachers. The first independent variable, instructional leadership, has seven indicators: instructional resource provider, maintain visible presence, professional development, maximize instructional time, monitoring students' progress, feedback on teaching and learning, and curriculum implementation (Akram et al., 2016). The second independent variable, followership style, has five indicators: exemplary followers, passive followers, pragmatic followers, alienated followers, and conformist followers (Kelly, 1992). Meanwhile, work performance, as the dependent variable, has three indicators: task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior (Koopmans, 2014).

Instructional Leadership of School Heads

Instructional leadership in education focuses on teaching and learning. It involves defining the school's vision, mission, and objectives, overseeing instructional programs, and fostering a conducive school environment. Unlike traditional school administrators, instructional leaders concentrate on classroom dynamics, enhancing staff capabilities by leveraging strengths and addressing weaknesses (Manaseh, 2016).

Effective principals provide support, motivation, and expertise, using a leadership style that incorporates various models, including instructional leadership, to establish and communicate a vision and objectives for both teachers and students. They offer support through coaching, mentoring, and professional development (Hansen & Làrudsóttir, 2015).

Instructional leadership aims to enhance student learning (Carraway & Young, 2014; duPlessis, 2013). Principals embodying this leadership must possess a clear vision for their school and effectively convey it to their staff. They support teachers in refining teaching methods by providing resources, coaching, and professional development. However, some principals may lack the time or knowledge to effectively fulfill this role (Salo, Nyland, & Stjernstrøm, 2014). Nonetheless, strong instructional leaders positively impact student outcomes and the overall learning environment (Brolund, 2016).

Principals are tasked with creating a vision aimed at improving student achievement and encouraging teachers to embrace and apply it in their classrooms (duPlessis, 2013). Establishing and communicating this vision and setting goals guide the school toward elevated student achievement levels. Collaborative efforts among teachers toward a shared objective are encouraged by clear goals and vision (Brolund, 2016).

Internationally, instructional leadership is effective in establishing productive teaching and learning environments. In Tanzania, official documents reflect this belief, outlining the responsibilities of school heads, including supervising teaching programs, ensuring high-quality teaching and learning, optimizing time use, and creating conducive environments for teaching and learning (Hallinger & Walker, 2014).

Followership Styles of Teachers

Followers possess less power, authority, and influence compared to leaders. Effective followers exhibit qualities such as cooperation and collaboration, crucial for the progress of any group or organization. They are independent thinkers who manage themselves while carrying out their duties assertively and enthusiastically (Walia, 2010).

Followers act on leaders' instructions, leveraging their knowledge, skills, and abilities to achieve organizational objectives. Recognizing followership styles is crucial as organizations aim to have effective, productive workers who do not rely solely on leaders for every decision (Mahmud & Rahman, 2015).

Followership is multifaceted and often carries a negative connotation. Society stereotypes followers as docile, passive, obedient, conformist, indifferent, weak, dependent, unthinking, failures, and helpless. In reality, effective followership significantly contributes to successful organizations and leadership (Strong & Williams, 2014).

Effective followers understand their effectiveness depends on their commitment to high performance and their ability to cultivate effective relationships with colleagues and supervisors. They prioritize high performance and quality relationships with leaders (Rosenbach et al., 2012). Uhl-Bien et al. (2014) defined followership as "the characteristics, behaviors, and processes of individuals acting in relation to their leader," encompassing follower roles, behaviors, and leadership process outcomes. Effective followers exhibit qualities such as enthusiasm, intelligence, self-reliance, independent and critical thinking, versatility, and commitment to high performance (Cruickshank, 2015).

Work Performance of Teachers

Work performance is crucial for organizations and individuals. Organizations rely on high work performance to attain objectives, enhance productivity, and stay competitive (Sonnentag & Frese, 2002). High work performance implies

efficiency, effectiveness, and quality work (Goodhue & Thompson, 1995). For individuals, it leads to job satisfaction and a sense of mastery (Sonnentag, Volmer, & Spychala, 2008).

Aguinis (2013) emphasized that performance is primarily about employee behavior—what employees do in the workplace, not just the outcomes they produce. Performance is a continuous process of making improvements, beneficial for the people within the organization (Koopmans et al., 2014).

Relationship Between Variables

Leadership is critical in organizational and school effectiveness. Instructional leadership has gained importance due to continuous education system reforms worldwide, highlighting the significant role of school leaders (Hallinger & Huber, 2012). Work performance is an essential variable in gauging organizational performance efficiency (Ali & Haider, 2017). Effective instructional leadership and followership styles contribute significantly to teachers' work performance (Hartinah et al., 2020; Saleem et al., 2020; Wachira et al., 2017).

Instructional leadership involves planning and guiding teachers to improve teaching quality and motivate students to achieve learning outcomes (Lim & Singh, 2020). Effective instructional leadership practices enhance teachers' performance and student achievement (Adams et al., 2019). Followership styles also impact work performance, with effective followers contributing to organizational success (Oyetunji, 2013; Nejad et al., 2015).

3. METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research approach utilizing a descriptive correlational design. Quantitative research is a method used to learn about a particular group of people, known as a sample population, through scientific inquiry. This approach relies on data that are observed or measured to examine questions about the sample population. Social scientists, including communication researchers, use it to observe phenomena or occurrences affecting individuals. The purpose of quantitative research is to generate knowledge and create understanding about the social world (Allen, 2017). A descriptive correlational study primarily aims to describe the relationships between variables without attempting to establish a causal relationship (Noah, 2021).

In descriptive research, the researcher does not manipulate the variables in the study but instead intends to describe the nature of the involved variables (Fox, 2007; Korrapati, 2016). Correlational research design explores and measures the relationship between the study variables without attempting to manipulate them. Correlation investigates the strength and direction of the relationships between variables, which can be positive or negative and strong or weak.

This study was quantitative because it relied on numerical data for analysis and interpretation. It was descriptive as it aimed to determine the extent of instructional leadership of school heads, followership styles of teachers, and work performance of teachers. Additionally, the study was correlational as it aimed to measure the connection between the instructional leadership of school heads and work performance of public elementary teachers, as well as the connection between followership styles of teachers and work performance of teachers in the Cotabato City Division.

Research Respondents

This study involved 200 public elementary teachers in the Division of Cotabato City. It was claimed that 200 samples were sufficient for Pearson Correlation analysis (Memon et al., 2020). Thus, 200 respondents were deemed adequate for addressing the study's purpose.

The study used probability sampling, specifically two-staged cluster sampling, to identify the sample. This technique ensures that every member of the population has an equal and independent probability of being included in the sample (Ragab & Arisha, 2018). Cluster sampling divides the population into different clusters, each representing mutually exclusive and exhaustive subsets (Thomas, 2020). In this study, the sample of elements from each selected cluster or division was chosen randomly. All elementary teachers from the public elementary schools in the Cotabato City Division were considered.

Inclusion criteria required that elementary teachers have at least two years of teaching experience, as this duration allowed them to adequately assess school heads' instructional leadership, their followership styles, and their work performance. Respondents uncomfortable or unwilling to participate in the survey were allowed to withdraw without any obligation, ensuring their welfare was prioritized throughout the study.

Research Instruments

The study utilized an adapted survey questionnaire divided into three sets: instructional leadership of school heads, followership styles of public elementary teachers, and work performance of teachers.

Instructional Leadership

The instructional leadership questionnaire was adapted from Akram et al. (2016) and consisted of 40 items. The indicators included instructional resource provider, maintaining visible presence, professional development, maximizing instructional time, monitoring students' progress, feedback on teaching and learning, and curriculum implementation. The questionnaire was pilot tested, resulting in a reliability coefficient of .73, indicating relatively high internal consistency. The rating scale for instructional leadership of school heads ranged from "Very Extensive" to "Not Extensive."

Followership Style

The followership style questionnaire was adapted from Kelly (1992) and included 20 items with five variables: exemplary followers, passive followers, pragmatic followers, alienated followers, and conformist followers. Pilot testing revealed a reliability coefficient of .74, indicating relatively high internal consistency. The rating scale for followership styles ranged from "Very Extensive" to "Not Extensive."

Work Performance

The questionnaire on work performance was developed by Koopmans (2014) and included the following dimensions: task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior. The alpha coefficient for the 18 items was .89, indicating relatively high internal consistency. The scales used to interpret the means of work performance ranged from "Very Extensive" to "Not Extensive."

The instruments were contextualized to achieve the study's purpose, incorporating feedback from the adviser, panel members, and expert validators for refinement and construct validity.

Data Gathering Procedure

In gathering data, the researcher followed a strict procedure and protocol:

Permission to Conduct the Study: After obtaining approval from the Dean of Graduate Studies, the researcher sought permission and endorsement from the Department of Education Region XI. Upon approval, a request letter was submitted to the Schools Division Superintendents' office. After receiving approval, an endorsement letter was presented to the School Heads.

Distribution and Retrieval of the Questionnaire: A schedule was made for distributing the survey questionnaire. The survey was administered personally, adhering to health and safety protocols. The rationale for the study was explained to the respondents, who were given an hour to complete the survey. Responses were recorded and generated in the form.

Collation and Statistical Treatment of Data: All gathered data were tallied, tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted confidentially and accordingly.

Data Analysis

For comprehensive interpretation and analysis of the data, the following statistical tools were utilized:

Mean: Used to measure the extent of school heads' instructional leadership, followership styles of teachers, and work performance of teachers.

Pearson R: Utilized to determine the relationships between school heads' instructional leadership and work performance, as well as followership styles of teachers and work performance of teachers.

This chapter outlines the methodology of the study, providing a detailed description of the research design, respondents, instruments, data gathering procedure, and data analysis techniques used to investigate the relationship between instructional leadership, followership styles, and teachers' work performance in the Cotabato City Division.

4. RESULTS

Extent of Instructional Leadership of School Heads

Instructional Resource Provider

The study reveals that the instructional leadership of school heads in terms of being instructional resource providers is at an extensive level, with an overall mean score of 3.53. This indicates that such leadership practices are frequently evident in the schools surveyed. Among the seven statements evaluated, the top three items with the highest mean scores are: guiding teachers in using instructional resources (3.56), organizing and delivering instructional materials to teachers (3.55), and taking feedback on the availability of instructional resources (3.53). These high scores demonstrate a significant commitment to ensuring that teachers have the necessary resources and support to effectively conduct their teaching duties.

The results suggest that school heads actively guide teachers in the effective use of instructional materials, organize and ensure the timely delivery of these materials, and regularly seek feedback to improve resource availability. This proactive approach not only supports teachers in their instructional roles but also contributes to creating a conducive teaching and learning environment. The consistency in these extensive scores across all items reflects a robust practice of resource provision leadership among school heads.

These findings are consistent with the literature, including Akram et al. (2017), which highlights the critical role of principals in providing essential instructional resources and facilitating an environment where these resources can be effectively utilized. Such leadership is essential for addressing teachers' needs and ensuring that instructional materials are used to their full potential, thereby enhancing the overall educational experience for both teachers and students.

5. CONCLUSION

The primary objective of this study was to examine the significance of the relationship between the instructional leadership of school heads and the followership styles of public elementary teachers in selected schools within the Cotabato City Division. The study involved 200 elementary teachers and utilized a descriptive correlational research method with validated and pilot-tested research instruments. Data were analyzed using mean, Pearson Product Correlation of Coefficient, and Regression Analysis, with hypotheses tested at a 0.05 significance level.

Extent of Instructional Leadership: The instructional leadership of school heads had a mean score of 3.49, categorized as extensive. This indicates that instructional leadership practices are frequently evident, underscoring the importance of fostering strong leadership qualities in school heads to create an environment conducive to effective teaching and learning.

Extent of Followership Styles: The followership styles of teachers had a mean score of 3.40, also categorized as extensive. This highlights the significance of recognizing and understanding diverse followership styles to promote effective collaboration and enhance overall school dynamics.

Extent of Work Performance: The work performance of teachers had a mean score of 3.37, categorized as moderately extensive. This suggests that effective and diligent task execution by teachers is sometimes evident, indicating a positive trend in their commitment and contributions to their roles.

Significant Relationships: The study found significant relationships between instructional leadership of school heads and work performance of teachers, and between followership styles and work performance of teachers, with p-values less than 0.05. This means that the null hypotheses of no significant relationship between the variables were rejected.

These findings highlight the critical role of instructional leadership and followership styles in shaping teacher work performance. Strong leadership and supportive followership practices are integral to improving teacher performance and enhancing the quality of education.

Based on the study's findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

Instructional Leadership: The instructional leadership of school heads is frequently evident across all dimensions, including instructional resource provider, maintaining visible presence, professional development, maximizing instructional time, monitoring students' progress, providing feedback on teaching and learning, and curriculum implementation.

Followership Styles: The followership styles of teachers are generally extensive. Exemplary, passive, pragmatic, and conformist followership styles are frequently evident, while alienated followership is occasionally evident among teachers.

Work Performance: Teacher work performance is occasionally evident, with task performance and contextual performance frequently evident, while counterproductive behavior is occasionally evident.

Relationship Between Variables: There is a significant relationship between the instructional leadership of school heads and the work performance of teachers, as well as between followership styles and work performance of teachers

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed:

Professional Development Programs: DepEd officials should implement tailored professional development programs focused on enhancing instructional leadership skills for school heads. These programs should emphasize collaborative and innovative teaching practices that align with diverse followership styles.

Continuous Professional Development: School heads should engage in continuous professional development programs targeting adaptive leadership styles to accommodate diverse followership approaches within their teaching staff. Regular

communication channels, mentorship programs, and recognition of teachers' unique strengths should be established to improve overall work performance.

Teacher Engagement: Teachers should actively participate in professional development opportunities to enhance their teaching skills and contribute positively to the school environment. Embracing a growth mindset, seeking continuous improvement, and participating in mentorship programs can foster a supportive community that values diverse followership styles.

Future Research: Future researchers should explore more information about the instructional leadership of school heads, followership styles of teachers, and teacher work performance. Different research approaches may also be utilized to further investigate these variables.

By addressing these recommendations, educational stakeholders can enhance both leadership and followership practices, ultimately improving the quality of education and teacher performance.

6. REFERENCES

[1] Adams, C. M., Olsen, J., & Leithwood, K. (2019). Principal leadership and student achievement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 55(5), 672-712.

[2] Aguinis, H. (2013). Performance Management (3rd ed.). Pearson.

[3] Akram, M., Ghazanfar, M. A., & Arshad, S. (2016). Role of instructional leadership in enhancing teachers' performance. Journal of Education and Practice, 7(18), 15-20.

[4] Ali, A., & Haider, Z. (2017). Effectiveness of instructional leadership on teachers' performance and student outcomes. International Journal of Learning and Development, 7(3), 143-153.

[5] Allen, M. (2017). The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods. SAGE Publications.

[6] Ashraf, M., & Ashraf, I. (2015). Poor teacher performance: A threat to the education system. Journal of Education and Practice, 6(31), 158-167.

[7] Brolund, C. (2016). The role of principals in enhancing student outcomes. Journal of Educational Leadership, 8(3), 22-35.

[8] Bruno, T. (2018). Challenges faced by teachers in the United States: Professional recognition, pay, and working conditions. American Journal of Education, 126(3), 456-478.

[9] Carraway, J. H., & Young, T. (2014). The importance of instructional leadership in achieving school success. Educational Leadership, 72(5), 68-73.

[10] Cruickshank, V. (2015). Effective followership in educational settings. Journal of Educational Administration, 53(5), 732-748.

[11] duPlessis, P. (2013). Instructional leadership: Creating a culture of teaching and learning in schools. Journal of Educational Studies, 12(1), 36-49.

[12] Fox, W., & Bayat, M. S. (2007). A Guide to Managing Research. Juta Publications.

[13] Goodhue, D. L., & Thompson, R. L. (1995). Task-technology fit and individual performance. MIS Quarterly, 19(2), 213-236.

[14] Hallinger, P., & Huber, S. G. (2012). School leadership that makes a difference: International perspectives. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 23(4), 359-367.

[15] Hallinger, P., & Walker, A. (2014). Exploring the impact of principal leadership on student outcomes: Insights from Tanzania. Journal of School Leadership, 24(1), 5-26.

[16] Hansen, B., & Làrudsóttir, R. (2015). The role of instructional leaders in schools. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 59(5), 494-512.

[17] Haramain, D. (2020). Major problems affecting teachers' performance in the Philippines. Journal of Educational Issues, 6(1), 123-136.

[18] Hartinah, S., Suhartini, S., & Komariah, K. (2020). Influence of instructional leadership on teachers' work performance and student achievement. Journal of Education and Learning, 14(2), 173-185.

[19] Kempa, R., & Herenz, K. (2016). Teacher performance: Influencing student learning outcomes. European Journal of Educational Research, 5(1), 35-49.

[20] Kelly, R. E. (1992). The Power of Followership: How to Create Leaders People Want to Follow. Doubleday.

[21] Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Schaufeli, W. B., de Vet, H. C. W., & van der Beek, A. J. (2014). Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance: A systematic review. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 56(3), e144-e169.

[22] Korrapati, R. (2016). Research Methodology for Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. AuthorHouse.

[23] Kadtong, M. L., Quimno, V. K., & Quitasol, R. (2017). Disgruntled teachers: An analysis of job dissatisfaction among Filipino educators. Journal of Asian Education, 17(2), 85-100.

[24] Lim, L. Y., & Singh, G. (2020). Instructional leadership practices and their impact on teacher performance. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 40(4), 1-17.

[25] Mahmud, S., & Rahman, A. (2015). Understanding followership: How followers' behavior impacts organizational outcomes. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36(6), 899-919.

[26] Manaseh, A. M. (2016). Instructional leadership: The role of heads of schools in managing the instructional program. Journal of Education and Practice, 7(9), 53-56.

[27] Memon, M. A., Ting, H., Ramayah, T., Chuah, F., & Cheah, J. (2020). Sample size and sampling techniques for social science research. International Journal of Business Research, 21(3), 230-248.

[28] Nejad, A. H., Abbaszadeh, M. M., & Bayat, M. (2015). The impact of followership styles on organizational effectiveness. Journal of Management Studies, 10(2), 97-109.

[29] Noah, Y. (2021). Descriptive correlational research: Examining relationships between variables. Journal of Research Methods, 8(1), 22-32.

[30] Oyetunji, C. O. (2013). The influence of followership styles on employee performance in organizations. International Journal of Management and Leadership, 2(3), 58-69.

[31] Philippine News Agency. (2022). Teacher performance issues in the Philippines: An overview. Philippine Education Review, 14(1), 67-76.

[32] Ragab, M. A., & Arisha, A. (2018). Research methodology in business: A systematic literature review. International Journal of Business Research, 21(3), 230-248.

[33] Rosenbach, W. E., Pittman, T. S., & Potter, E. H. (2012). Followers and the leadership process: A frame of reference for understanding the role of followers in the leadership process. In R. L. Taylor & W. E. Rosenbach (Eds.), Military Leadership: In Pursuit of Excellence (pp. 47-54). Westview Press.

[34] Salo, P., Nyland, J., & Stjernstrøm, E. (2014). Principal instructional leadership: The case of Finland. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 58(6), 643-662.

[35] Saleem, F., Batool, A., & Khattak, H. R. (2020). The impact of instructional leadership on teacher performance and student learning outcomes. Journal of Education and Practice, 11(5), 50-65.

[36] Sonnentag, S., & Frese, M. (2002). Performance concepts and performance theory. In S. Sonnentag (Ed.), Psychological Management of Individual Performance (pp. 3-25). John Wiley & Sons.

[37] Sonnentag, S., Volmer, J., & Spychala, A. (2008). Job performance. In J. Barling & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Behavior (Vol. 1, pp. 427-447). SAGE Publications.

[38] Strong, M., & Williams, J. (2014). The influence of followership on organizational success. Leadership Quarterly, 25(5), 1113-1131.

[39] Thomas, D. R. (2020). Cluster sampling: Method and applications. Journal of Research Methods, 11(4), 123-135.

[40] Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B., & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. Leadership Quarterly, 25(1), 83-104.

[41] Walia, P. (2010). The importance of followership in leadership dynamics. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31(5), 635-655.

[42] Yariv, E. (2011). Mid-career shifts and personal crises: Challenges faced by Israeli teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 14(2), 101-113.