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ABSTRACT

This study sought to look into the mediating role of teachers’ self-efficacy on the relationship between authentic leadership and work engagement among 312 teachers in Kiblawan North and South District, Division of Davao del Sur. This research used a non-experimental design utilizing the descriptive correlation technique. The statistical tools used were mean, Pearson r, and path analysis using AMOS. As data sources, reliable research instruments on teachers’ self-efficacy, authentic leadership, and work engagement were used. The research shows that authentic leadership has a high level, work engagement has very high level, and teachers’ self-efficacy has a very high level also. Using Pearson r, the results revealed significant that there are significant relationships between authentic leadership and teachers’ self-efficacy, teachers’ self-efficacy and work engagement, and authentic leadership and work engagement. Utilizing path analysis, the study’s findings suggested that teachers’ self-efficacy partially mediates the relationship between authentic leadership and work engagement. Moreover, it is significantly pointed out that the overall impact of the teachers’ self-efficacy on their work engagement is mediated by another variable not included in the model, authentic leadership, and can either be direct or indirect. This implies that authentic leadership influences teachers’ self-efficacy which in turn influences work engagement.

INTRODUCTION

Workplace disengagement results from external and internal pressures on teachers to perform well and be responsible for excellent student outcomes. As a result, many teachers have encountered high burnout rates, and stress levels have led to some leaving the field. As a result, burnout became a popular topic in educational studies until recently, when the concept of positive psychology rekindled interest in job involvement. On the other hand, productivity levels are declining in many sectors of the global economy, which has been made worse partly by disengaged workers. Employee disengagement has a significant impact on an organization’s effectiveness and performance. (Allam, 2017; Barros, Costello, Beaman, Westover, & J.H, 2016; Bhebhe, 2020; Schaufeli, Salanova, González Romá, & Bakker, 2002).

Work engagement is vital since it involves a person’s relationship with their company. Employees’ upbeat attitudes and high levels of activity produce positive feedback regarding appreciation, accomplishment, and acknowledgment. Workplace stress benefits motivated individuals since it spurs them to be more productive and successful. When workers are content, they frequently feel content around their loved ones. This is not the case for workaholics, who put in extra effort because they enjoy what they do. Further, employees actively involved in their work on physical, cognitive, emotional, and other levels strongly connect to their jobs. Engagement at work is important and advantageous for both workers and companies. Finally, highly engaged employees are more likely to put up extra effort and are also shown to be more innovative and productive (Basáñez & Dagol, 2021; Landqvist & Schad, 2021).

The researcher combed through a lot of material to see if any elements could be linked to work engagement because she understood the significance of studies on the topic. The school principal’s genuine leadership was regarded to be the first crucial factor. Recent research has shown that authentic leadership increases teacher work engagement. It was discovered that authentic leadership strongly influenced both supervisory trust and psychological defense. The study found that through supervisor trust, indirect effects on work engagement from authentic leadership were statistically significant (Alazmi & Al-mahdy, 2020; e.g. Bird et al., 2009; Coxen, 2015; Kulophas et al., 2015). Teachers’ self-efficacy is another variable that drew the researcher's interest. Over time, work engagement and teacher self-efficacy were discovered to be related. It was also recognized that authentic leadership and teacher work engagement were linked. (Granziera & Perera, 2019).

On the other hand, the researcher is interested in learning how teachers’ self-efficacy influences how engaging authentic leadership is in the workplace. There is literature on the relationship between job engagement and genuine leadership. The majority of the study was conducted outside of academia, in a separate sector of the economy. Consequently, this study will help to provide new knowledge in the field of education.

The major goal of this study was to determine how teachers’ self-efficacy mediated the link between work engagement in public schools and the authentic leadership of school leaders.

The following goals are articulated in particular:

1. To define the degree of authentic leadership in terms of:
   1.1 Self-awareness;
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1.2 Relational Transparency; 
1.3 Balanced Processing; and 
1.4 Internalized moral perspective.

2. To ascertain the extent of Work Engagement in terms of: 
   2.1 Vigor; 
   2.2 Dedication; and 
   2.3 Absorption.

3. To measure the level of teachers' self-efficacy; 
4. To determine the significance of the relationship between: 
   4.1 authentic leadership and work engagement; 
   4.2 authentic leadership and teachers' self-efficacy; and 
   4.3 teachers' self-efficacy and work engagement; and 
5. To determine the significance of mediation of teachers' self-efficacy on the relationship between authentic leadership and work engagement.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section presents a variety of approaches, points of view, hypotheses, observations from studies publications, and useful views from various writers pertinent to the subjects covered by the study. The research aims are explicitly encouraged in this part, which is crucial for the study's ability to demonstrate understanding. The independent variable is authentic leadership with the indicators such as self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing, and internalized moral perspective (Northouse et al., 2010). The dependent variable is work engagement with indicators such as vigor, dedication and absorption (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). The mediating variable is the teacher's self-efficacy (Korkmaz & Unsal, 2016).

Authentic Leadership

In some workgroups and organizations, authentic leadership has become recognized as a potentially effective tactic for promoting positive employee attitudes. Authentic leadership is described as “a pattern of leader behavior that utilizes and encourages positive ethical standards as well as constructive psychological abilities environment” in order to promote greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, healthy information processing, and relational openness on the part of leaders working with followers, promoting positive self-development.” The concept of authenticity is “acting in accordance with one’s true self.” Moreover, authentic leadership has different attributes than authentic leadership. The attributes of the authentic leader, in conjunction with the significant other and the environment, are likely to influence and establish the leader, in conjunction with the significant other and the authentic leadership. The attributes of the authentic is “acting in accordance with one’s true self.” Moreover, authentic leadership is described as “a pattern of leader behavior that utilizes and encourages positive ethical standards as well as constructive psychological abilities environment” in order to promote greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, healthy information processing, and relational openness on the part of leaders working with followers, promoting positive self-development.” The concept of authenticity is “acting in accordance with one’s true self.”

Regardless of their gender or race, leaders who strongly identify with their ethnic grouping consider themselves to have authentic leadership qualities. It is assumed that striving to express an administrative job, which looks to be normal but is largely articulated as an aspiration, argument, or trust, is an attempt to personify a managerial job. Being an authentic leader requires a continuous effort to be oneself (Dzivhani, 2016; Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2016).

As a result, as Lehman et al. (2019) mentioned, it is critical to describe the origin of the authenticity characteristics: what does it mean to be actual, genuine, or true? Authentic leadership theory emphasizes a person's internal consistency: in their leadership role, a person is an authentic self. As a result, authentic leadership theory treats authenticity, integrity, and sincerity as interchangeable words. Outside of management research, however, there seems to be some agreement that these definitions are fundamentally opposed and should not be considered similar or interchangeable. For companies to maintain a competitive edge and be one step ahead of their rivals, having a good leader(s) is a real benefit (Alvesson & Einola, 2019).

In contrast to their predecessors, today's leaders face more nuanced problems, and it seems that they are luckier than their successors regarding the degree of difficulty they deal with. In addition, rather than external factors, these intrinsic principles become the most important foundation for managing a leader's behavior and attitudes (Liu et al., 2018; Ryan & Deci, 2003).

Further, it's crucial to see if a leadership style like authentic leadership, which doesn't rely on charismatic encouragement, will encourage constructive action by creating a secure leader-member relationship. Authentic leaders, Ilies et al. (2005) claim that since they respect a companion's' right to self-determination, which might support intrinsic worker motivation, are likely to have a favorable effect on followers' behavior. While authentic leadership does not include inspirational motivation, it might foster an environment where employees are less concerned about the consequences of the hazardous creative or change-oriented activity (Liu et al., 2018).

Significantly, real leadership can increase an assistant's intellectual attainability by having faith in the assistant's capacity to carry out their duties and persuading followers to recognize their abilities. When these acts are combined with an authentic leader's confidence, subordinates must be mentally ready to participate diligently in their job. As a result, authentic leaders would encourage high levels of job involvement because it increases their followers' intellectual meaning, availableness, and protection. (Shaquela, D. S., & Lyndon, A. Q. 2022).

According to the literature on the subject, authentic leadership and other leadership philosophies can sometimes overlap. On the other hand, earlier literature argues that authentic leadership has a unique theoretical foundation that sets it apart from other forms of leadership (Liu et al., 2018).
The latent construct comprises four factors: self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing, and internalized moral perspective. The first indicator is self-awareness. Deep understanding of one’s emotions, as well as of one’s qualities and flaws, attitudes and motivations, is necessary for developing self-awareness” (Caldwell & Hayes, 2016; Goleman et al., 2002). Those in positions of leadership who are more self-aware are better able to comprehend their principles and the circumstances that have influenced their lives. Leaders can choose how they would like to spend their lives, interact with others, and be evaluated for their accomplishments by being aware of these factors (Caldwell & Hayes, 2016; Covey, 2004; Richards, 2004).

Additionally, self-awareness aids individuals in creating a fundamental life objective that acts as a consistent encouragement for their objectives. Genuine leaders try to comprehend their strengths, weaknesses, resources, and situations. Leaders who can successfully control their emotions and impulses and use them to further their goals exhibit high levels of empathy. They can then use this empathy to construct a response that encourages the best kind of cooperative relationship (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Caldwell & Hayes, 2016).

The second indicator is relational transparency. To appreciate and cultivate honesty and openness in one’s intimate relationships, relational transparency is defined as “selective self-disclosure” (Gardner et al., 2005: 357; Kemister & Iszatt-white, 2018). A leader’s lack of relational transparency, which can be challenging to spot in companies, can lead to follower mistrust and “hiding” behavior, such as covering up mistakes or engaging in cover-ups. The value of a leader’s relational transparency, however, cannot be overstated in the hospitality sector because it can affect followers’ ethical behaviors, which can have important strategic repercussions in areas like sales and earnings growth as well as micro consequences, including credit card fraud, theft, and forgeries (Bernstein, 2012; cf. Kim & Brymer, 2011; Gatting et al., 2017).

On the other hand, relational transparency can also be challenging, primarily because there isn’t just one self that should be expressed clearly in interactions and relationships, but rather multiple, situationally formed selves. Although some people may “authentically” be ethically compassionate, reactive, and eager to get along, most people are not like chameleons. Instead, especially in work settings when partnerships are sometimes not of our choosing, we are social creatures and not collections of underlying psychological features. The majority of ethically effective and competent persons adjust their behavior in reaction to their surroundings and the people around them. Rules and standards are pervasive, and the majority of acting is predicated on roles, necessitating the transfer of the self to the backstage, while “client service smile,” managerial performance, or acting following sex, age, and ordered point are anticipated at organizations (Alvesson & Einola, 2019).

Moreover, experiences are rarely straightforward, and participants interpret and assess ‘clearness’ determined by their foundation, beliefs, attitudes, and logical weaknesses. Administrators and followers frequently judge their connection in a variety of contradictory means. According to research on the leader-member exchange, the way the partnership is evaluated has a low correlation (Alvesson & Einola, 2019; Erdogan & Bauer, 2014). The third indicator is balanced processing. Balanced processing is, by definition, just, or at the very minimum, preferable to “unbalanced” processing. Balanced processing is difficult to achieve in practice. Giving feedback is a challenging undertaking rife with government, social factors, and self-absorbed prejudice, as becomes clear upon closer inspection. It can be challenging to recognize how to assess somebody, provide an assessment, and interpret it, especially when the criticism is unfavorable and involves complex themes. Although the idea of objective juggling makes balanced processing sound appealing, it is not realistic. This is hardly in line with honesty (Alvesson & Einola, 2019; Alvesson & Kärreman, 2007; Tourish, 2013).

Furthermore, before making a decision, balanced processing is the degree to which the leader demonstrates that they critically analyze the relevant data and solicits the opinions of those who contradict their strongly held beliefs (Duncan et al., 2017; Walumbwa et al., 2008). The fourth indicator is internalized moral perspective. The capacity to internalize a moral perspective is a prerequisite for one’s capacity to control or regulate oneself. The principles of the organization, community, and society are internalized and integrated with moral values, and such self-arrangement is in harmony with them. Decisions are thus dependent on moral ideals that have been internalized. Having self-control, for instance, would mean being aware of how one’s actions and words affect other people (Purwanto et al., 2021).

Accordingly, a leader with an internalized moral outlook shows coherence between articulated core values and decisions, fairness, and a high degree of clinical practice. According to the study, leader is often guided by internal ethical principles, which they use to self-regulate their behavior. Leaders with these qualities will align their beliefs and behavior with internal moral values (Kasa, 2020; Walumbwa et al., 2008).

Moreover, authentic leaders are motivated by universal principles and expectations, and their actions and decisions reflect internalized values rather than community, organizational, or social pressures. It also makes choices based on its core values and shows beliefs compatible with behavior (Alvesson & Einola, 2019; Ribeiro et al., 2018; Walumbwa et al., 2008). Additionally, self-regulation is symbolized by an internalized moral outlook, in which one’s beliefs and moral principles influence one’s attitudes and acts. It also refers to a form of internalized and incorporated self-regulation (Chaudhary & Panda, 2018; Datta, 2015).

More specifically, authentic leaders’ internalized moral
perspective helps them to constantly match their actions with an internal (moral) compass such that others consider them to walk their talk (George, Sims, McLean, & Mayer, 2007; Leroy et al., 2012). Authentic leaders will aim for consistency in all of their personalities and related outward communications. Since authentic leaders are trustworthy communicators guided by their internalized moral perspective to ensure fairness in execution and that others perceive this equity, such coherence can be preserved even when HR activities are implemented differently (Gill et al., 2018).

To summarize, the authentic leader prioritizes grooming followers into leaders and is self-assured, cheerful, upbeat, resilient, moral/ethical, and future-focused. The authentic leader is loyal to oneself and demonstrates actions that favorably influence or shape followers into future leaders.

**Work Engagement**

Engagement in work is a mental condition in which an individual performing a job is fully absorbed in the task at hand, feeling energized and enthusiastic about it. This original idea stresses that committed people put in a lot of effort because they are passionate about what they do. Engagement in work is a feature of the job demands and services offered by the company, according to our Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory. In a formative mechanism where task orders and assets (the combination) are foreboding, and work/governmental success is the result, involvement is an intervening element (also known as a “moderator” or “throughout”). However, the JD-R principle recognizes that workers should be constructive and take steps to improve their working environment (Bakker, 2017).

Another reason for the popularity of the phrase “work engagement” is that it is a reliable indicator of significant employee, team, and organization results. Additionally, because they are open to new experiences, highly motivated workers are more likely to evolve into inventive thinkers with greater potential for entrepreneurship (Gawke et al., 2017; Orth & Volmer, 2017). Aside from these individual-level success effects, research has shown that committed employees are more likely to assist their coworkers. Teamwork engagement is positively associated with team success at the group level. Individuals who are completely absorbed in their job pursuit have high levels of vitality and enthusiasm and are immersed in their work activities. (Bakker et al., 2018; Costa et al., 2015; Tims et al., 2013).

Other scholars, on the other hand, suggest that focusing solely on day-to-day variations in work engagement could be an oversimplification of the complexities of work engagement. Since a person’s degree of work commitment may not be consistent over a working week, it may also be inconsistent over a single working day. It can vary from hour to hour (or even within shorter time intervals), similar to intra-day job performance fluctuations (Beal, Weiss, Barros, & MacDermid, 2005; Sonnentag, 2011).

In their meta-analysis, Knight et al. (2019) identified four “types” of work engagement interventions, individual qualities such as self-efficacy, resiliency, and optimism are enhanced by personal resource building; employment resource creation, which aims to improve positive aspects of the workplace such as autonomy, social support, input, and opportunities for advancement; via education and practical activities such as goal-setting and problem-solving in groups, leadership training helps managers improve their leadership skills; and individuals are also encouraged to participate in onsite mindfulness, stress management, or exercise/relaxation programs as part of health promotion, which focuses on improving their health and well-being and reducing stress (Knight et al., 2019).

Recently, there has been a steady increase in interest in studying teachers’ work engagement, as suggested by a 2018 study, motivated by a desire to gather evidence that shows a link between teachers’ behavior, beliefs, and emotional dimension and the results obtained by their students. A teacher’s job has various peculiarities that distinguish it from other occupations. According to recent studies, teaching is emotionally, physically, and intellectually demanding (MIU, 2020; Perera et al., 2018; Van Wingerden & Poell, 2019).

Similarly, research into this subject, specifically evaluating teacher work engagement, is still limited, despite the necessity for such knowledge. There is still a significant need to map teachers’ motivating and engagement patterns. Teachers’ involvement is typically measured as a mediator for other areas of a teacher’s life, such as satisfaction or wellness. As opposed to that, one of the components of work engagement is teaching and learning. These two processes are intertwined and involve an educator evaluating students’ learning needs, setting clear learning objectives, creating teaching and learning strategies, putting a work plan into action, and assessing instruction results. Attending to people’s needs, experiences, and feelings while providing targeted interventions to support their learning of particular concepts is the process of teaching (Basañes & Dagol, 2021; Colomeischi, 2017; MISU, 2020; Yerdelen et al., 2018).

Moreover, employees’ willingness to devote their efforts, persistence, participation, feeling of importance, enthusiasm, and pride in their job, as well as their willingness to invest their physical and mental energy into work, determine work engagement. Misu (2020) proposed that engaged employees are more productive at work because they are physically, emotionally, and intellectually engrossed in their job. Employees who are more engaged in their work experience psychological safety (workplace trust and security), a sense of purpose, well-being, and enjoyment (Frederick & VanderWeele, 2020; Kamaruzaman et al., 2022).

The first indicator is vigor. High stamina and energy when working, the ability to make significant efforts in doing work, and determination and perseverance in overcoming
job difficulties are all signs of a person's passion for their job. Each employee's vigor can have an impact on their success at work. The effect of completing a task is referred to as efficiency. If workers work with vigor, they can complete their tasks to the best of their abilities, resulting in increased productivity. Thus, it is possible to infer that vigor affects employee success. Staff who work with passion would be able to complete assignments to the best of their ability, resulting in improved productivity. As a result, it's possible to deduce that employee vigor affects their productivity. In contrast, Winowoda (2018) clarified that vigor has a major impact on employee success (Srie et al., 2021).

The second indicator is dedication. Employees' commitment is described as their enthusiasm for their jobs, pride in their work and the business they work for, and the motivation and challenges they face. Employees with a high commitment score are ecstatic about their job and proud of their employers. They see their job as a challenge that motivates them to do their best, resulting in increased employee success in the business. Meanwhile, employees with a low commitment score cannot perform their duties properly because they are not passionate and appreciative of their job and organization (Srie et al., 2021). The findings of Fauzi & Ed's (2016) study, which claims that dedication has a strong and positive impact on worker's performance and makes a significant contribution to power, is consistent with Fan & Cai's (2017) study, which found that dedication has a constructive and important impact on job performance and contextual performance. According to Al-dalahmeh et al. (2018), commitment greatly influences employee success (Srie et al., 2021).

The third indicator is absorption. Employees with full focus and fully immersed in their work are said to be absorbed. As workers are doing their jobs, they begin to lose track of time, making them feel like time goes by too quickly, making it impossible for them to get away from work. Employees with high absorption will focus fully on their work. This has the potential to affect their work results. Employees enjoy being active in their jobs, so time continues. Besides, they will find it difficult to disconnect from their job because they are fully absorbed in them. According to a study by Lewiuci et al. (2016), absorption has a partial positive and substantial impact on employee performance and a significant contribution impact. Similarly, Meilia and Setyowati's (2016) findings showed that absorption has a positive and important impact on results. Meanwhile, Meswantri & Aivaludin (2018) discovered that absorption has a major impact on employee success. At the Grand Inna Malioboro Hotel Yogyakarta, Winowoda (2018) discovered a similar thing: the absorption variable directly impacts employee efficiency (Srie et al., 2021).

More precisely, vigor refers to having a lot of energy and mental resilience when training, being able to put in the effort and persevering even when things get tough; being deeply interested in one's studies, and feeling a sense of meaning, passion, motivation, pride, and challenge are all examples of dedication. Absorption refers to being completely focused and happily engrossed in what one is doing, where time flies by, and it is difficult to tear oneself away from it (Carmona-halty et al., 2019; Schaufeli, 2017). To sum it up, by putting the K–12 programs into place, the Philippine Department of Education (DepEd) made a significant advancement. As a result, in addition to their regular obligation to provide high-quality instruction, teachers are also subject to additional demands. Teachers are on the front lines of the Department of Education's aims and objectives. Thus, as top-level managers, school officials are supposed to give them outstanding services. Teachers still have to meet the demands of their daily work, and their perception of the support provided impacts how engaged they are at work.

**Teachers' Self-Efficacy**

A teacher's targeted learning outcomes are more explicitly the focus of teacher self-efficacy to enhance their students' learning. Teacher effectiveness is associated with better academic results. Low teacher self-efficacy levels may restrict students' chances of succeeding in school. Several internal and external circumstances have an impact on self-efficacy. This entails having faith in one's capacity to achieve a task, imitating the actions of successful people, and seeking the aid of others. Moreover, the self-efficacy of teachers is influenced by their subject knowledge in the classroom, their ability to deal with behavioral issues, “learners’ scholastic adaptation, sequence of instructor's attitude and activities associated to classroom efficiency, and element influencing instructors’ intellectual welfare, including individual achievement, work fulfillment, and dedication.” Additionally, instructors need encouragement in their job. Self-efficacy values increase an instructor's morale, directly affecting the school community (Turkoglu et al., 2017).

Also, the Efficacy of the teachers is one of the most important motivating factors affecting professional activities such as career persistence, work satisfaction, and student participation and accomplishment. Regardless of the high number of learners enrolling in programs to become teachers in the past few years, instructor insufficiency still exists in many regions and subject areas (George, 2018; UNESCO, 2015). The Social Cognitive Career Theory directly links self-efficacy attitudes and job happiness. According to this viewpoint, self-efficacious instructors’ convictions that they can plan, organize and carry out particular teaching-related tasks necessary to attain desired degrees of success can encourage the building of a subsequent sense of fulfillment from commensurate successes (Granziera & Perera, 2019; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2010). Additionally, in this context, the teacher's self-efficacy confers to self-determination assessments of the ability to plan and implement the actions needed to complete teaching duty effectively. The teacher self-efficacy content
High-performing teachers are confident in their abilities, encourage pupils to pursue good goals, and focus on academic achievements. They are more excited to assign kids different activities to tackle their educational challenges. Effective teachers have additional work opportunities as well as job security. Self-efficacy is a critical cognitive trait that significantly impacts goal achievement. Teachers with higher education are more effective in helping pupils reach their goals (Hassan, 2019; Pell, Iqbal, & Sohail, 2010; Shaukat, 2011).

Further, in a contentious medium of education approaches, teachers’ self-efficacy is considered a fundamental construct that determines students’ accomplishment scores. Teachers optimize their abilities by putting greater effort into the classroom and providing students with accurate information. However, students continue to be undernourished and score lower on exams. Secondary school education in the public sector is deteriorating, and students are performing poorly. Teachers’ laziness is to blame for dropping students’ bad accomplishment scores. (Adu, Tadu, & Eze, 2012; Hassan, 2019; Kitti, 2014; Shamim, 2008).

Significantly, one of the elements is self-efficacy which influences a teacher’s effectiveness. Teachers with a strong sense of confidence in their teaching abilities will achieve greater success, but teachers with a poor sense of confidence in their abilities will be plagued by fear of failure. Teachers’ self-efficacy is critical in achieving their goals, duties, and approaches to instructional obstacles. Teachers with high self-efficacy welcome challenging activities as opportunities to master them, cultivate a strong sense of commitment, and bounce back quickly from failures, as opposed to teachers with low self-efficacy who shy away from challenging activities, perceive creative activities and situations as difficult, see most things negatively and lose faith in their abilities (Pedagogical & Knowledge, 2022).

Also, the teacher’s perspective of their teaching efficacy encompasses a wide range of ideas about their competence as educators and their capacity to positively impact students’ academic performance. These beliefs are connected to the classroom behaviors teachers exhibit, which clearly distinguishes between different teaching philosophies and approaches teachers use daily. This notion of oneself, known as self-efficacy, has a vital effect on teachers’ decisions regarding assignments and activities, on how hard they work and how persistent they are when facing problems, and even on how they feel when faced with challenging circumstances. (Gerald et al. 2022). The cognitive concept that mediates between knowledge and action is eventually accounted for by self-efficacy. This decides whether the acts are successful and other factors (Journal, Sciences, & Villard, 2016).

Significantly, the key to good teaching and student learning is teacher motivation. Among various motivational factors, teacher self-efficacy is acknowledged as an important indicator of effectiveness in the classroom. In other words, these beliefs influence how people see their chances of success, attribute responsibility for their achievements and failures, and maintain motivation in the face of setbacks. Additionally, self-efficacy impacts people’s perceptions of their ability to cope, emotion control techniques, and susceptibility to stress and depression. Finally, self-efficacy beliefs may affect people’s decisions at critical junctures in their lives, potentially influencing the direction of their lives and who they become (Burić & Kim, 2020; Künsting, Neuber, & Lipowsky, 2016).

To sum it up, effective leadership has long been regarded as critical to ensuring school success by introducing a vibrant atmosphere, providing sufficient support, and cultivating positive relationships and student achievement. Heads can provide effective leadership for achieving educational goals because of the importance of leadership in the community. Successful leaders have a good sense of self-respect and self-esteem and are mindful of their emotions, strengths, and weaknesses. Effective leaders maintain consistency, suppress negative feelings, demonstrate flexibility, and maintain dignity (Suliman et al., 2018). The cited works were extremely helpful in revealing potential connections between authentic leadership, work engagement, and teachers’ self-efficacy. These may also help the study’s introduction, results, and conclusions.

**METHODOLOGYS**

This study used a non-experimental quantitative research design that used the descriptive correlational research technique to collect data, thoughts, facts, and information relevant to the subject.

Descriptive non-experimental correlational design controlled the extent of a relationship between two or more variables (Goertzen, 2017). In this study, the correlation method is the best design to meet the study’s objectives and determine whether the hypothesis is accepted. Now, if the significance value is greater than .05, Ho is accepted and Ha is accepted. Hypothesis testing determines if the correlations can be strong or weak (Creswell & Poth, 2012).

Moreover, this study utilized the testing of mediation to investigate the three variables. In other words, it assessed the relationship between the predictor and the mediator variables and the relationship between the mediator and the criterion variables (Baron and Kenny, 1986). According to a straightforward mediation model, the relationship between an independent variable and an observed outcome can be explained by the influence of a third factor or mediator. When the direct link between the independent variable and the outcome is no longer significant after the mediator’s influence has been considered, the relationship is said to be fully mediated.
This is known as partial mediation, when the mediator explains some but not all of the relationship between the independent variable and the result. The indirect effect refers to the degree of mediation (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Thus, mediation analysis is not limited to linear regression but also logistic or polynomial regression and more (Shrout & Bolger, 2002).

The study is interested in examining the connections between authentic leadership and work engagement, as well as the connections between authentic leadership and teachers' self-efficacy; the connection between teachers' self-efficacy and work engagement; and the mediating effect of teachers' self-efficacy on the relationship between authentic leadership of school heads and work engagement among public schools in the municipality of Kiblawan.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Level of Authentic Leadership

Presented in Table 1 is the level of Authentic Leadership. Less than 1.00 was the standard deviation, which means there is the reliability of answers among respondents. The entire mean score, 4.18, was considered high. Particularly, the following factors showed that teachers had different levels of authentic leadership: self-awareness has a mean of 4.26, described as very high; internalized moral perspective has a mean of 4.23, also labeled as very high; balanced processing has a mean of 4.17 characterized as high, relational transparency has a mean of 4.05 with a descriptive level of high,

Table 1: Level of Authentic Leadership

| Indicators                        | SD  | Mean  | Descriptive Level |
|----------------------------------|-----|-------|-------------------|
| Self-awareness                   | 0.53| 4.26  | Very High         |
| Relational Transparency          | 0.52| 4.05  | High              |
| Balanced Processing              | 0.53| 4.17  | High              |
| Internalized Moral Perspective   | 0.49| 4.23  | Very High         |
| Overall                          | 0.42| 4.18  | High              |

indicates their high capability of communicating with others; this entails exchanging knowledge about one’s thoughts and feelings.

Level Work Engagement

Table 2 displays the degree of work participation at the public elementary schools in the Kiblawan North and South District. The entire mean score was 4.28, which is considered to be quite high. In particular, the following indicators showed the level of work engagement: dedication has a mean of 4.60, labeled as very high; vigor has a mean of 4.14 with an interpretation of high; and absorption has a mean of 4.11, characterized as high.

Data shows that a very high level of dedication to the work was evident, described as an important general aspect of a leader being manifested all the time. Also, it was observed that vigor was high, which means that the respondents are willing to put effort into work and are even persistent in facing the problems. Additionally, there was a high level of work engagement in absorption, described as the condition of employees who have full concentration and were absorbed in doing their work as a teacher is always evident.

Table 2: Level of Work Engagement

| Indicators | SD  | Mean  | Descriptive Level |
|------------|-----|-------|-------------------|
| Vigor      | 0.51| 4.14  | High              |
| Dedication | 0.46| 4.60  | Very High         |
| Absorption | 0.56| 4.11  | High              |
| Overall    | 0.42| 4.28  | Very High         |

Displayed in Table 3 is the level of teachers’ self-efficacy of public school teachers in Kiblawan North and South District. The mean percentage score of 4.52 was deemed to be extremely high. This suggests that the teachers’ self-efficacy is present or felt constantly. On the following questions in particular, teachers’ levels of self-efficacy were as follows: Arranging student acquisitions so that they can convey them to their actual life has a mean of 4.70 which has a descriptive equivalent of very high, For an effective teaching process, I begin the class with an interesting introduction (joke, memory) has a mean of 4.70 which means very high, Helping the students gain self-confidence through activities that make the students feel themselves comfortable has a mean 4.66
which means very high, Creating a problem state and help the students acquire information with their own effort has a mean of 4.66 which means very high, Emphasizing effective student participation in the class has a mean of 4.65 which has a descriptive equivalent of very high, Arranging the course by triggering various areas of intelligence (visual, audial, psychomotor etc.) so as to serve for individual differences has a mean of 4.60 which means very high, Trying to ask questions directed to comprehending the subjects has a mean of 4.56 which means very high, Helping the students acquire various thinking skills (critical, creative, problem solving etc.) through activities has a mean of 4.55 which means very high, Checking the readiness levels of students before beginning the subject in class has a mean of 4.54 which means very high, Trying to create a setting in which the students can express themselves freely has a mean of 4.52 which means very high, Thinking that effective use of time during the teaching process is important has a mean of 4.52 which means very high, Beginning the course after taking student attention to the subject has a mean of 4.51 which has a descriptive equivalent of very high, Striving for students to obtain information from different sources (encyclopedia, journals, the internet etc.) has a mean of 4.51 which means very high, Not moving to the next subject without giving feedback or making corrections has a mean of 4.46 which means very high, Trying to use my voice tone and body language effectively throughout the learning-teaching process has a mean of 4.41 which means very high, Arranging activities for increasing student motivation has a mean of 4.27 which means very high, Helping them learn how to learn by resorting to methods and techniques such as drama, role play and problem solving in the class has a mean 4.19 which means high, Arranging activities according to the needs and expectations of students has a mean of 4.16 which means high, Using various methods and techniques (fishbone, six thinking hats, speaking circle etc.) in my course has a mean of 4.15 which means high, Trying to related student acquisitions with daily life has a means of 4.11 which means high, Trying to use learning-teaching strategies, methods and techniques appropriately has a mean of 4.05 which has a descriptive equivalent of high, Using information and communication technologies (computer, projection the internet) in my course has a mean of 4.05 which means high, Carrying out activities (experiments, brainstorming, drama etc) to develop creative thinking has a mean of 4.04 which means high.

Emphasizing effective student participation in the class has a mean of 4.65, which has an equivalent descriptive level of very high; trying to ask questions directed to comprehending the subjects has a mean of 4.56 which means very high, and trying to use my voice tone and body language effectively throughout the learning-teaching process has a mean of 4.41 which means very high, Beginning the course after taking student attention to the subject has a mean of 4.51 which has a descriptive level of very high, Helping the students gain self-confidence through activities that make the students feel comfortable has a mean of 4.66 which means very high. Nonetheless, it can be extrapolated that the institution views teachers as valuable assets. In addition, the school made every effort to attract and retain the right individual for the right role at the right time and keep the professors engaged. Furthermore, it is clear that school leaders make sound decisions and can explain those using professional, ethical, and legal standards. School leaders, according to respondents, handle day-to-day activities in a way that fosters trust and confidence among school stakeholders. Furthermore, most of the time, proper review, monitoring, and evaluation processes can be inferred. School leaders can detect their impact on group dynamics, resulting in

Table 3: Level of Teachers Self-Efficacy

| Items                                                                 | SD  | Mean | Descriptive Level |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------|-------------------|
| Emphasizing effective student participation in the class.           | 0.57| 4.65 | Very High         |
| Trying to ask questions directed to comprehending the subjects.     | 0.55| 4.56 | Very High         |
| Trying to use my voice tone and body language effectively throughout the learning-teaching process. | 0.70| 4.41 | Very High         |
| Beginning the course after taking student attention to the subject. | 0.64| 4.51 | Very High         |
| Helping the students gain self-confidence through activities that make the students feel themselves comfortable. | 0.55| 4.66 | Very High         |
| Not moving to the next subject without giving feedback or making corrections. | 0.63| 4.46 | Very High         |
| Checking the readiness levels of students before beginning the subject in class. | 0.63| 4.54 | Very High         |
| Helping the students acquire various thinking skills (critical, creative, problem solving etc.) through activities. | 0.58| 4.55 | Very High         |
| Arranging the course by triggering various areas of intelligence (visual, audial, psychomotor etc.) so as to serve for individual differences. | 0.60| 4.60 | Very High         |
| Arranging activities according to the needs and expectations of students. | 0.73| 4.16 | High              |
| Arranging activities for increasing student motivation.             | 0.64| 4.27 | Very High         |
| Trying to relate student acquisitions with daily life.              | 0.66| 4.11 | High              |
| Arranging student acquisitions so that they can convey them to their actual life. | 0.50| 4.70 | Very High         |
| Trying to create a setting in which the students can express themselves freely. | 0.65| 4.52 | Very High         |
| Carrying out activities (experiments, brainstorming, drama etc) to develop creative thinking . | 0.79| 4.04 | High              |
Using various methods and techniques (fishbone, six thinking hats, speaking circle etc.) in my course. 0.77 4.15 High
Trying to use learning-teaching strategies, methods and techniques appropriately. 0.74 4.05 High
Using information and communication technologies (computer, projection of the internet) in my course. 0.52 4.52 Very High
Striving for students to obtain information from different sources (encyclopedia, journals, the internet etc.). 0.64 4.51 Very High
Creating a problem state and help the students acquire information with their own effort. 0.55 4.66 Very High
Helping them learn how to learn by resorting to methods and techniques such as drama, role play and problem solving in the class. 0.78 4.19 High
Thinking that effective use of time during the teaching process is important 0.65 4.52 High
For an effective teaching process, I begin the class with an interesting introduction (joke, memory). 0.50 4.70 Very High
Overall 0.38 4.52 Very High

effective collaboration with other school leaders, teachers, parents, and community members.

Correlations between Authentic Leadership and Work Engagement
The findings of the test to determine the association between authentic leadership and work engagement are shown in Table 4. The association was examined at a 0.05 level of significance following the hypothesis. The null hypothesis was rejected by the overall r-value of .667 and the p-value of 0.05. It implies that there’s a strong connection between engaging at work and true leadership. This suggests a connection between work engagement and the school leaders’ authentic leadership. Since the overall r-value is .533, the p-value for self-awareness is 0.05, the relational transparency r-value is .504, the balanced processing r-value is .577, and the internalized moral perspective r-value is .565, the result clearly shows that all indicators of authentic leadership are positively correlated on work engagement. The two variables have a positive correlation, according to the data. Moreover, figures show that all indicators of work engagement are significantly correlated with authentic leadership since the p-value is <0.05, and the overall r-value is .597 for vigor, .531 for dedication, and .512 for absorption. Hence the two variables are positively associated.

Table 4: Significance of the Relationship between the Authentic Leadership and Work Engagement

| Authentic Leadership | Work Engagement | | | |
|----------------------|----------------|---|---|---|
| Self-awareness       | Vigor 0.503*(0.000) | Dedication 0.412*(0.000) | Absorption 0.395*(0.000) | Overall 0.533*(0.000) |
| Relational Transparency | .448*(0.000)   | .352*(0.000)     | .429*(0.000)     | .504*(0.000)     |
| Balanced Processing  | .482*(0.000)   | .465*(0.000)     | .470*(0.000)     | .577*(0.000)     |
| Internalized Moral Perspective | .517*(0.000)   | .510*(0.000)     | .374*(0.000)     | .565*(0.000)     |
| Overall              | .597*(0.000)   | .531*(0.000)     | .512*(0.000)     | .667*(0.000)     |

*Significant at 0.05 significance level.

Correlations between Authentic Leadership and Teachers’ Self-Efficacy
Reflected in Table 5 were the results of the test of the relationship between authentic leadership and teachers’ self-efficacy. The table shows a positive correlation between the markers of authentic leadership and teachers’ self-efficacy, with an overall r-value of .811 and a p-value of 0.05, signifying the rejection of the null hypothesis. It implies a strong link between teachers’ sense of self-efficacy and authentic leadership. Specifically, the indicator self-awareness data show that it has a positive correlation with teachers’ self-efficacy because of its computed r-value of .669 with a p-value <0.05. The p-value result means a relationship between the self-awareness of authentic leadership and teachers’ self-efficacy among the respondents; teachers’ self-efficacy needs self-awareness in authentic leadership. Also, the other indicator, relational transparency, has an r-value of .606 with a p-value <0.05. This shows that relational transparency is positively associated with teachers’ self-efficacy. Besides, balanced processing got an r-value of .670 with a p-value <0.05, which shows that

Table 5: Significance of the Relationship between the Authentic Leadership and Teachers Self-Efficacy

| Authentic Leadership | Teacher Self-Efficacy Overall |
|----------------------|------------------------------|
| Self-awareness       | .669*(0.000)                 |
| Relational Transparency | .606*(0.000)               |
| Balanced Processing  | .670*(0.000)                 |
| Internalized Moral Perspective | .704*(0.000) |
| Overall              | .811*(0.000)                 |

*Significant at 0.05 significance level.
balanced processing is necessary for teachers’ self-efficacy. Internalized Moral Perspective got an r-value of .704 with a p-value < 0.05, which is significant for teachers’ self-efficacy. In short, it is a useful tool in attaining teachers’ self-efficacy.

**Table 6: Significance of the Relationship between the Teachers Self-Efficacy and Work Engagement**

| Teachers Self-Efficacy | Work Engagement |
|------------------------|-----------------|
|                        | Vigor | Dedication | Absorption | Overall |
| Overall                | .639* (0.000) | .684* (0.000) | .554* (0.000) | .759* (0.000) |

*Significant at 0.05 significance level

Significance, as stated in the hypothesis. The indicator vigor has a favorable correlation with instructors’ self-efficacy, according to statistics. The r-value is .639, and the 0.05 p-value. This shows that vigor is a large part of the teachers’ self-efficacy. Being efficient in a job requires adapting and dealing effectively with changes at work. Likewise, the other indicator, dedication, has an r-value of .684 with a p-value of <0.05. This demonstrates that dedication is favorably correlated with teachers’ self-efficacy. This implies that dedication plays a big part in achieving teachers’ self-efficacy. Also, absorption reveals an r-value of .554 with a p-value of <0.05. Still, the result is positively correlated to teachers’ self-efficacy. It is safe to assume that absorption greatly impacts teachers’ self-efficacy. The overall result reflects that work engagement is positively correlated to teachers’ self-efficacy, having an overall r-value of .759 with a p-value of <0.05. This rules out the null hypothesis, which claims no connection between work engagement and teachers’ self-efficacy.

**On the Mediating Effect of Teachers’ Self-Efficacy**

Table 7 displayed the path analysis on the mediating effect of teachers’ self-efficacy on the relationship between authentic leadership and work engagement, and the result is partially mediated. The data obtained in this table were results after conducting the SPSS AMOS. This table presents the direct effect of authentic leadership on teachers’ self-efficacy, teachers’ self-efficacy on work engagement and authentic leadership. Authentic Leadership and Teachers’ Self-Efficacy is the path a coefficient with an unstandardized regression coefficient of .119, standardized regression coefficient of .811, SE of .030, and a probability value less than 0.05. Below the significance level of 0.05 implies that these two variables have a significant relationship and a low or small standard error means that the estimate is more precise. Besides, the effect size or the impact of authentic leadership on teachers’ self-efficacy is 72 percent which completely disavows the null hypothesis. Thus, the path b coefficient is Teachers’ Self-Efficacy and Work Engagement, which has an unstandardized regression coefficient of .706, the standardized regression coefficient of .638, SE of .069, and a p-value less than 0.05, which means there is a strong conclusion to say that Teachers’ self-efficacy and Work Engagement are significant. The effect size of job satisfaction on organizational culture is 71 percent. And lastly, the path c coefficient shows the effect size of authentic leadership on work engagement. The data result has an unstandardized regression coefficient of .148 or 15 percent efficacy, a standardized regression coefficient of .150; the computed standard error is .062, and a p-value of .017, which is smaller than the significance alpha level of 0.05, which means that it is significant. Mathematically, this lends credence to the idea that engaged employees benefit from authentic leadership.

**Figure 1: Regression Weights on the Mediating Effect of Teachers’ Self-Efficacy on the Relationship between Authentic Leadership and Work Engagement**

https://journals.e-palli.com/home/index.php/ajmri
CONCLUSIONS
The following conclusions are formulated based on the findings of the study. There is strong evidence to reject the null hypotheses in favor of the alternative hypotheses. According to the research findings, authentic leadership and work engagement in the school have a high association. The result is in parallel to the theory of Self-Determination Theory, which states that highly psychologically empowered personnel are more likely to feel more competent, in control of their destiny, and have a greater impact on their surroundings, all of which will improve their willingness to drive proactive goal processes on their own.

In the same manner, the self-efficacy of teachers and authentic leadership are positively correlated. And there is a strong link between teachers’ self-efficacy and work engagement. This is in parallel with Bandura’s social-cognitive theory (1977), which stated that a person with high self-efficacy would purposefully select tough tasks, be prepared to devote more time and effort to achieve goals, and persevere regardless of the face of possible failure to fulfill individual or group objectives.

Finally, the study’s results suggest that the connection between authentic leadership and work engagement is influenced and partially mediated by teachers’ self-efficacy. Rather than a straightforward cause-and-effect relationship between authentic leadership and work engagement, the findings demonstrated that the former influences teachers’ self-efficacy, which affects the latter. The result is in parallel to the theory of Individual Adaptability Theory (I-ADAPT) by Ployhart and Blesie (2006), which claims that a person’s capacity for changing or adapting to various task, social, and environmental characteristics is represented by their ability, skill, disposition, willingness, and motivation.
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