ORGANIZATIONAL MINDFULNESS OF SCHOOL HEADS AND WORK ENGAGEMENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

Kristiana Jill A. Barro,
Elias G. Cuevas[i]
Professional Schools,
University of Mindanao,
Davao City, Philippines

Abstract:
The purpose of this study is to determine which domain of organizational mindfulness of school heads significantly influences the work engagement of teachers. To do so, the study employed the non-experimental quantitative research design employing the descriptive-correlational technique, and N=134 randomly selected teachers from different elementary schools of Matanao II District in Davao del Sur, Philippines were the research participants. Weighted mean and standard deviation, Pearson r and multiple linear regression analysis are the statistical tools employed in analyzing and interpreting the data. Analysis reveals that both organizational mindfulness of school heads and work engagement of teachers were of a high level. The study was able to establish the significance of the relationship between organizational mindfulness of school heads and the work engagement of teachers. Lastly, despite both mindful behavior of school heads that best influence work engagement of teachers.

Keywords: education, organizational mindfulness, work engagement, teachers, descriptive-correlation research, Philippines

1. Introduction

Several issues of teachers consist of being stripped of their rights in practicing academic freedom and being reprimanded by their school heads for personal initiatives in teaching are already not uncommon in the daily affairs of every school. Teachers call it a *"denigration of their right to participate in the determination of school goals and policies and in the exercise of professional judgment about what and how to teach"* (Lee & Nie, 2014; Lee, Yin, Zhang & Jin, 2011). Teachers decry administrators for failing to provide experiences for all teachers to grow as leaders, not even open to numerous options for individual and school growth. These lead to a loss of teachers' engagement in work and personal disposition (Pyle, Wade-Woolley & Hutchinson, 2011).

---

[i] Correspondence: email elicuevas@umindanao.edu.ph. kristianajill.barro@deped.gov.ph

With the problems met by a teacher at school, it is undeniable that his/her success in the job depends on a lot of crucial factors – one of such is how school heads run the institution. For decades, several educational researchers have probed on how leadership shapes the school's direction – only to find out that leadership is not only by theory, but also by practice. It is said that how the school heads run the academia literally contributes on how teachers are engaged in their jobs and how they perform inside the classroom in the delivery of quality teaching and learning services (Peterson, 2015). This is called *"being mindful"*, wherein school heads go to a walkthrough on the day-to-day affairs of the teachers as well as the learners.

When school heads become mindful of the state and condition of their faculty members, teachers become effective in the dispensation of their services (Rodriguez, 2015). It was revealed that organizational mindfulness could possibly develop an increase in engagement and resilience among teachers (Kelly, 2012), reduction of personal stress, and higher chances of contributing to effective decision-making. Moreover, certain studies (Albrecht, Albrecht, & Cohen, 2012; Dane, 2011; Weick & Sutcliffe, 2015) maintained that strong organizational mindfulness increases the strong potential on the effectiveness of school organizations.

Even with these pronouncements, the research topic is still new for the researcher. While several studies and literature have been done and written pertaining to measuring leadership among school heads, quite a few dared to investigate their mindfulness and its effect on to work engagement of teachers, since there is a lack of local perspective on the thesis. Moreover, the researcher has never come across a study that dealt with the relationship between organizational mindfulness of school heads and the work engagement of teachers in the public elementary school setting. With the aim of adding to the scholarly works pertaining to this topic, this research was proposed to determine which domain of organizational mindfulness of school heads best and significantly influences the work engagement of teachers. Specifically, it dealt with the following objectives: (1) To assess the level of organizational mindfulness of school heads in terms of mindful behavior and collective efficacy; (2) To determine the level of work engagement of teachers in terms of vigor, dedication, and absorption, (3) To ascertain the significant relationships between organizational mindfulness of school heads and work engagement of teachers; and (4) To determine which domain of organizational mindfulness of school heads that best and significantly influence work engagement of teachers.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Organizational Mindfulness

The mindfulness concept was considered a famous issue in social psychology. In the past years, several researchers have introduced this concept in various organizational studies by exploring mindfulness within the organization. Mindfulness was defined as *"the quality of bearing in mind or bringing to mind; it is the state of recollecting, the state of*

remembering, the state of nonfading, the state of non-forgetting" (Ndubisi, 2014; Jordan & Johannessen, 2014; Rerup & Levinthal, 2014). Another definition describes how mindfulness focuses on the current situations while paying attention to its operational details and demonstrates willingness in considering alternative standpoints and interest in devoting to and understanding failures (Ndubisi, 2012). Mindfulness in industrial perception was conferred on individual and organizational levels. The individual-level emphasizes the capability "*to focus one's attention on the tangible characteristic of one's behaviour, therefore, disregarding the abstract, premeditated, high-level self-thoughts that might restrict in ratifying complex and automatic behaviors*" (Brown, Ryan & Creswell, 2007).

Additionally, mindfulness embraces sensitivity to its surroundings, openness to new ideas, awareness and consideration of various perceptions in problem-solving, attention to details, skills in perceptive classification (Bayraktar & Ndubisi, 2014), awareness of the involvement in the constant process of living (Gunaratana, 2002) or awareness of and receptive consideration of experiences, relevant events and realities (Brown, Ryan, & Creswell, 2007), self-control and awareness, contraceptive and self-regulatory capacity, openness to innovation (Brown et al., 2007), and capability in dealing with malleable respond to relative cues.

Organizational mindfulness embraces the combined concept of constant analysis of prevailing expectations, capacity and willingness to conceive new expectations that go over with unprecedented events, incessant enhancement and organization of expectations, a more distinct appreciation of perspective and approaches to work with, and recognition of innovative scope and perspective that enhances functioning and foresight (Dane, 2011; Dane & Brummel, 2014; Weick & Sutcliffe, 2006). It was also referred to as the association and involvement of every individual's mindfulness in generating new knowledge and implication that will benefit them and their organization in achieving congruity between their goals and objectives (Malhotra, Lee & Uslay, 2012). Organizational mindfulness has been an emerging perspective of being the reason why an organization change, learn and adapt (Rerup & Levinthal, 2014) and mindful organizing (Vogus & Sutcliffe, 2012). However, organizational mindfulness was given limited complement to empirical studies (Dane, 2015; Dane, 2011; Smith & Scarbrough, 2011). Mindfulness was also defined as a quality concentration that allows an individual to minimize the errors and address immediately the unexpected circumstances (Rerup & Levinthal, 2014). Moreover, mindfulness served to be a skill comprising of anticipation which pertains to the prevention of unexpected problems and resilience which means managing unexpected problems in a flexible way (Weick & Sutclifee, 2007). Studies (e.g., Flook, Goldberg, Pinger, Bonus & Davidson, 2013; Ruedy & Schweitzer 2010; Weick & Putnam, 2006) revealed that organizational mindfulness significantly lessens work stress, and burnout, increasing teaching efficacy, the aspect of impermanence and it does significantly contribute to organizational decision-making.

Over the past few decades, the demands placed on teachers have changed dramatically (McCown, Reibel & Micozzi, 2010). Federal accountability, state-mandated assessments, and increasingly diverse student populations are only a few of the

challenges that many educators encounter. These changes and challenges have profound effects on the professional behaviors of teachers and the expectations they have for their students (Albrecht, Albrecht & Cohen, 2012; Crane, Kuyken, Hastings, Rothwell & Williams, 2010; Jennings, 2015).

Teachers respond in several approaches to these organizational pressures, and the way they elucidate and overcome challenges sometimes relies on their social capabilities apparent in the organization (Hyland, Lee & Mills, 2015; Roeser, Schonert-Reichl, Jha Cullen, Wallace, Wilensky, & Harrison, 2013; Williams & Kabat-Zinn, 2013). An emerging body of literature proposes that social factors might persuade one's performance. Hence, the faculty's collective efficacy and the school's mindfulness characteristics are considered mechanisms that encourage further exploration (Kearney, Kelsey & Herrington, 2013).

Past research in collective efficacy has focused on the outcomes of the organization (Bandura, 1993; Goddard, Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001; Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002). However, school leaders who wish to create an organizational culture that supports teachers and promotes academic achievement may find it beneficial to investigate those factors that influence collective efficacy in the school setting (Viafora, Mathiesen & Unsworth, 2015). School culture is shaped by a variety of forces including teacher and student perceptions, community participation, and historical academic achievement. Schools with a tradition of poor academic achievement are generally populated by teachers who believe that it is impossible for classroom instruction to overcome environmental factors such as lack of family involvement, behavioral problems, and low supplemental educational services.

Conversely, there are schools where teachers perceive shortcomings as opportunities for growth and professional learning. They reflect on the unique attributes of each group of students, seek out additional sources of information, and modify and adjust their practices as needed. Their behaviors demonstrate mindful approaches to teaching (Gröschner, Seidel, Pehmer & Kiemer, 2014; Rechtschaffen, 2014; Viafora, Mathiesen, & Unsworth, 2015). Indeed, these teachers are willing to make changes because they believe they can impact the success of their students. In essence, these teachers are efficacious; they believe they can do the job. Thus, many teachers, to affect greater student success, unknowingly exhibit the qualities of both mindfulness and efficacy (Vogus & Sutcliffe, 2012).

Also, several studies described organizational mindfulness as the degree to which a specific organization can evaluate threats that might surface and capture every aspect in order for them to respond promptly and effectively to avoid system failures and unwanted events (Crane et al., 2010; Flook et al., 2013, Weick & Sutcliffe, 2015). Collective mindfulness is manifest in organizations by the ability of the workforce to be sensitive to changes in the work environment, continuously updating the way in which they think and perceive things, and by appreciating the importance of context (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2006).

Mindful behavior of school heads was put to emphasis by previous studies which were found to give a positive effect on teachers' mindfulness too, thereby, as an effect, decreasing students' study-related anxiety (Bakosh, Snow, Tobias, Houlihan & Barbosa-Leiker, 2016; Singh, Lancioni, Winton, Karazsia & Singh, 2013; Johnson & Golombek, 2016). Mindfulness is an act of awareness of what the present experience is (Killingsworth & Golbert, 2010) or restraining undesired experiences (Kang, Gruber & Gray, 2013).

The characteristics of mindful behavior emerged in early studies of social interaction involving the issues of dependency, helplessness, and control (Davenport & Pagnini, 2016; Maynard, Solis & Miller, 2015; Kearney, Kelsey & Herrington, 2013). These studies revealed that perceived purposeful behaviors may be mindless responses to stimuli based solely on prior exposure to information or premature cognitive commitment. Mindfulness is the antithesis of this automatic response behavior. It implies empirical awareness during which the observer is actively engaged in processing information. In addition, multiple perspectives are considered, context is evaluated, and a variety of responses are possible. Bodner (2000) expanded the definition of individual mindfulness to include four categories: engagement, novelty-seeking, flexibility and novelty producing. Information is reassessed and meaning is reconstructed because of contextual variations. It is this ability to identify discrepancies based on environmental factors that allow the individual to reassess previously created constructs and maintain an open and flexible approach to information processing.

Quite a few studies (Goldberg, Wielgosz, Dahl, Schuyler, MacCoon, Rosenkranz & Davidson, 2016; Quickel, Johnson & David, 2014; Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001) examined the construct of mindfulness, albeit as the concept applies to high-reliability organizations (HRO). They identified five processes promoted by mindful organizations: preoccupation with failure, reluctance to simplify, sensitivity to operations, commitment to resilience, and deference to expertise. In the same manner, Hoy (2003) applied this organizational framework to education. He identified two dimensions that characterize school mindfulness: faculty mindfulness and principal mindfulness. The behaviors of both dimensions are further filtered and conceptualized via the five processes developed by Weick and Sutcliffe (2001). Hoy's work also draws connections between the constructs of mindfulness and teacher efficacy. Both are characterized by resilience in the face of failure, and a flexible approach to problem-solving.

The research on school mindfulness was extended by examining specific factors that enable schools to function as effective organizations (Keller, Ruthruff, Keller, Hoy, Gaspelin & Bertolini, 2017; Tracy, Miller & Tarter, 2014). To that end, they sought to operationalize school mindfulness by creating the School Mindfulness Scale (M-Scale) based on the theoretical premises of Langer (1992) and Weick and Sutcliffe (2001). Thus, the Mindfulness Scale (M-Scale) measures five properties of school mindfulness- a focus on mistakes, reluctance to simplify, sensitivity to teaching and learning, commitment to resilience, and deference to expertise in problem-solving. Additional research has identified school mindfulness as a critical component in effective school organizations. It has been linked to trust, enabling school structures, and collective efficacy as one of the

major factors contributing to the creation of successful schools (Hoy, Gage & Tarter, 2006; Gage, 2003).

On another note, collective efficacy was considered in most school reform and improvements as a factor of educational transformation. Collective efficacy was defined as a teacher`s perception of school about the positive effect of teachers` effort on students learning (Goddard, Goddard, Sook Kim, & Miller, 2015; Hampson & Jowett, 2014; Salanova, Rodriguez-Sanchez, Schaufeli, & Cifre, 2014). Collective efficacy was found to promote leadership school capacity (Angelle, Nixon, Norton & Niles, 2011). Goddard and Goddard (2001) highlighted that collective efficacy deals with the belief in teachers that the faculty can execute and organize the required action to contribute to positive influence on students, thus, collective efficacy was associated with the students` academic achievement.

Collective efficacy stems from social cognition research conducted by Bandura (1997). Human agency, or action, is motivated by several factors including personal experiences, vicarious experiences, reflection, and social persuasion. Accordingly, personal efficacy is the belief that a specific goal is achievable. Individuals perform in accordance with their beliefs as to the possible outcomes resulting from such actions. Therefore, individuals who believe that certain goals can be realized are naturally more motivated to perform the necessary actions to achieve these outcomes (Moolenaar, Sleegers & Daly, 2012; Klassen, Usher & Bong, 2010; Klassen, 2010). On the other hand, should an individual doubt that such a goal is attainable; they will be less motivated to overcome obstacles and engage in activities that will promote goal attainment (Viel-Ruma, Houchins, Jolivette & Benson, 2010).

Presently, individuals rarely function in isolation. Therefore, the study of personal efficacy has evolved to include the concept at the organizational level. Collective efficacy refers to the perception that the group can act to fulfill the goals of the organization (Calik, Sezgin, Kavgaci & Cagatay Kilinc, 2012; Klassen & Chiu, 2010; Lee, Zhang & Yin, 2011). Put simply, the stronger the belief in collective efficacy, the more an organization is able to achieve (Bandura, 2000).

Several researchers adapted the construct of collective efficacy to educational organizations (Goddard, Hoy & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2000). They defined teacher collective efficacy as the perceptions of academic personnel that their hard work and that of other faculty personnel and staff will positively influence their students. The results of several studies reveal a positive connection between collective efficacy and student achievement (Goddard, 2002; Goddard, Hoy & Woolfolk Hoy, 2000; Goddard, Sweetland, & Hoy, 2000; Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002).

The positive consequences of collective efficacy were identified which include student`s performance improvement, decreasing negative effects on the teacher or parent relationship enrichment and commitment to the work environment, and socioeconomic status (Calik, Sezgin, Kavgac, & Cagatay Kilinc, 2012; Lee, Zhang, & Yin, 2011; Viel-Ruma, Houchins, Jolivette, & Benson, 2010). Moreover, teachers with higher collective efficacy tend to join in more academic dialogues (Lim & Eo, 2014). A study revealed that

a 1-point increase in the collective efficacy of schools corresponds to an 8.5 increase of the academic achievement of students' scores (Goddard et al., 2000).

Moreover, individual teachers deploy their skills and mastery confidently if they were influenced by the essence of stronger collective efficacy (Brinson & Steiner, 2007). On the other hand, if principals attempt to implement a new program in the instruction which is already a failure in the past possess a poor disposition of collective efficacy. Also, if teachers are involved in the school`s decision making on policies, the more the teacher is empowered and the more the school showed collective efficacy (Gibbs & Powell, 2012; Kurt, Duyar, & Çalik, 2011; Stephanou, Gkavras & Doulkeridou, 2013).

2.2 Work Engagement

Work engagement embraces fulfilling, constructive and affective-motivational disposition of work-related contentment that is in contrast with the concept of job burnout implies. Engaged employees exhibit enthusiasm and are dynamically engaging with their responsibilities (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter & Taris, 2008). Several researchers have agreed that engagement includes the energy dimension and its identification (Karatepe, 2013; Leroy, Anseel, Dimitrova & Sels, 2013; Tims, Bakker, Derks, & Van Rhenen, 2013). Therefore, engagement was branded through the depiction of vigor and strong apperception of one's responsibility.

Work engagement depicts a motivational impression. Engaged employees might feel obliged in striving toward challenging objectives because of their will to succeed. This concept goes beyond reacting to immediate situations. One might accept personal commitment in order to achieve these goals (Shimazu, Schaufeli, Kamiyama, & Kawakami, 2015; Lu, Wang, Lu, Du, & Bakker, 2014; Strom, Sears, & Kelly, 2014). Furthermore, work engagement resonates with employees' personal energy. While they do not just demonstrate enthusiasm, engaged employees actively apply the same energy in their workplace without holding back. Their energy is not just reserved for something significant, but they embrace that today's work warrants their personal energy (Ghadi, Fernando & Caputi, 2013).

Additionally, work engagement reflects concentrated engagement in the workplace. Engaged employees always keep an eye on something relevant and are keen on details while instigating the essence of stimulating circumstances (Kovjanic, Schuh & Jonas, 2013; Bakker & Sanz-Vergel, 2013; Yeh, 2013). Also, engaged employees felt absorbed with the work that they lose track of their time and their reaction to distractions are diminishing (Yalabik, Popaitoon, Chowne, & Rayton, 2013).

Management might make a difference. Employees' responses to norms structures, practices and organizational policies influence their probability to experience engagement. An established work environment inspires employees to maintain a consistent range of work engagement (Agarwal, 2014; Gagne, 2014; Rayton & Yalabik, 2014). With these demonstrations, work engagement can survive in an environment that exhibits a stable connection between individual and corporate standards (Kim, Kolb, & Kim, 2013).

Meanwhile, companies incorporate their principles with employees, inspiring their allegiance. On the other hand, companies are responsive to the values employees bring to their work (Trepanier, Fernet, Austin, Forest & Vallerand, 2014; De Bruin & Henn, 2013; Brough, Timms, Siu, Kalliath, O'Driscoll, Sit & Lu, 2013). They maintain sufficient flexibility to accommodate a variety of approaches to their complex challenges. They manage human resources in a more approachable and responsive approach that appreciates individuals' diverse contributions to the enterprise (Alessandri, Borgogni, Schaufeli, Caprara, & Consiglio, 2015).

Work engagement significantly influences employees' performance. The vigor and attention integral to work engagement permit every employee to demonstrate their full potential (Demerouti, Bakker & Gevers, 2015; Steger, Littman-Ovadia, Miller, Menger, & Rothmann, 2013; Quiñones, Van den Broeck & De Witte, 2013). This energetic focus improves the characteristic of their primary work accountabilities. Employees possess the capability and motivation to focus wholly on the workload (Biggs, Brough & Barbour, 2014).

In general, work engagement apparently describes burnout contrariwise. In contrast with employees that experienced burnout, engaged employees are spirited and are affectively connected with their responsibilities and they view themselves as capable of dealing with demands (Choi, Tran & Park, 2015; Barkhuizen, Rothmann & Vijver, 2014; Caesens & Stinglhamber, 2014). Conclusively, engagement is an optimistic, rewarding, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigour, dedication, and absorption (Timms, Brough, O'Driscoll, Kalliath, Siu, Sit & Lo, 2015).

One acceptable way to measure engagement is vigor. Vigor was defined as the positive sense of physical strength, affective energy, and cognitive enthusiasm that emerges to respond to a person's assessment of the work done (Dane & Brummel, 2014). A recent study suggests that employee vigor was an important predictor of organizational citizenship behavior (Gonçalves, Nene, Sousa, Santos, & Sousa, 2016; Carmeli, McKay & Kaufman, 2014; De Simone, 2014).

Good organizational individuals go beyond what has been dictated in their job descriptions to assist other employees and enhance their role and function within the organization (Mackey, Perrewe & McAllister, 2017; Schullery, 2013; Burns & Machin, 2013). It is also seen as a vital element to stimulate creative and proactive engaging behaviors relevant to the organization (Banihani, Lewis & Syed, 2013).

Moreover, vigor was perceived as the opposite of emotional exhaustion amongst the dimension labeled energy. Low levels of energy tend to indicate a high exhaustion level, whereas high levels of energy indicate a high amount of vigor. Further, research has largely theorized work engagement as a relatively firm variable because of the sustained presence of particular work and organizational features (Michishita, Jiang, Ariyoshi, Yoshida, Moriyama & Yamato, 2017; Schaufeli & Salanova, 2014; Wefald, Mills, Smith & Downey, 2013). Nevertheless, individuals may experience different levels of energy at the end of the day. Sometimes an individual can leave their workplace at the end of the day and still be full of energy. Other days, one may not have any energy left

and does not know how to deal with the responsibilities associated with family life (Oerlemans & Bakker, 2013).

Also, one of the three attributes or hallmarks of work engagement is dedication. On fire, purpose-driven, dedicated employees are often the first to show up and the last to leave work (Noe, Clarke & Klein, 2014; Sackett & Walmsley, 2014; Montero-Marín, Prado-Abril, Carrasco, Asensio-Martinez, Gascon, & García-Campayo, 2013). Sometimes, they have to be reminded to quit working and go home. It is hard for them to break away, they love what they do so much (Bakker, Oerlemans & Brummelhuis, 2013).

Additionally, dedication depicts care as something at the maximum level. If employees show dedication, they will provide everything they could – all their energy – to a task, assignment, or cause. This is a significant characteristic to embody in the workplace (Heggen & Terum, 2013). Whenever a setback occurs, not fully dedicated individuals might stay down, feel disappointed and quit their job, instead of moving up and dealing with the challenges. Dedication to their jobs advances employees to achieve promotion, objectives and the capability to adapt to the difficult characteristic of other employees. These life skills are significant for employed individuals especially in dealing with their job and reaching their highest potential. This is also important for a firm to generate a more positive work environment and ensure business success (Vich, 2015; Bourdage, Wiltshire & Lee, 2015; Ganta, 2014).

However, dedication might affect negatively as superiors may constantly disperse employee responsibilities that are tough and challenging centered on employees' history with the completion of duties, problem-solving characteristics and positive attitude (Petchsawang & McLean, 2017; Einarsen, Skogstad, Rorvik, Lande & Nielsen, 2016; Littman-Ovadia, Oren & Lavy, 2013). Employers value a certain employee though because of its dedication, which is articulated in its timeliness, handling tasks when co-employees are on leave, dealing with tough responsibilities and facing unhappy clients and investors (Moran, 2015). But still, too much dedication is a serious health offense. Failure to prioritize a healthy balance is not just bad for the employees; it is bad for employers too. It was pointed out that overworking will exhaust an employee and would frequently commit costly mistakes (Shaw, Besen, Pransky, Boot, Nicholas, McLellan & Tveito, 2014).

Moreover, another dimension of work engagement is absorption. Absorption indicates a feeling of detachment from the environment, a high extent of attention given to a job and an absence of conscious awareness regarding the time spent on a particular job (Rayton & Yalabik, 2014; Bakker, 2014; Karatepe, 2013). Similarly, it was stated that absorption is the attentiveness and being occupied with an individual's work, hence passing time is imperceptible and it will be hard for an individual to be detached from their job. Likewise, having job experience is pleasurable for some individuals. It is gratifying that several individuals do not take it as an issue to wage high expenditures to acquire job experience (Airila, Hakanen, Schaufeli, Luukkonen, Punakallio & Lusa, 2014). Other people consider that absorption is compulsory in the workplace, especially in the business world, however, the reality is that this kind of explicit interpretation can upset

contracts instead of solving them. Once an employee is anxious about an issue, they take the risk of instigating negative insinuations not just for themselves, but also for their strategy, customers, co-workers, and colleagues (Yalabik, Popaitoon, Chowne & Rayton, 2013; Leroy, Anseel, Dimitrova & Sels, 2013; Tims, Bakker, Derks & Van Rhenen, 2013). As an outcome, employees are encouraged to avoid getting too excited about a particular project and spend spare time investigating it thoroughly (Costa, Passos & Bakker, 2014). It was also stated that eagerness inspires an employee to perceive themselves as a person who considers making an intuition regarding their boss' disposition. Too much enthusiasm is not recommended, especially when an employee must deal with customers (Shimazu, Schaufeli, Kamiyama & Kawakami, 2015; Strom, Sears & Kelly, 2014; Lu, Wang, Lu, Du & Bakker, 2014). However, this does not mean that employees should not be passionate, but they must also be more cautious in not crossing the path between eagerness and enthusiasm. Once an employee is demonstrating calmness and positivity, other employees will be pleased with their interest (Ghadi, Fernando & Caputi, 2013).

The abovementioned literature indeed confirmed the importance of organizational mindfulness of school heads in the performance of teachers in their roles at school. Several theoretical precepts were gleaned as to a school head's being mindful will positively create an impact in the school setting, with teachers as the primary point of reference. The literature also revealed that organizational mindfulness is positively related to several variables. The link to teacher empowerment will be explained in the subsequent section of the review.

2.3 Correlation of the Two Variables

Research has demonstrated that organizational mindfulness is crucial to the practices, actions and skills that have an impact on work engagement. For this reason, a greater understanding of how organizational management relates to the work engagement of teachers is essential because it can lead to professional development in teaching practice (Ganad, 2014) that has a significant influence on the learning progress of their students (Steger, Littman-Ovadia, Miller, Menger & Rothmann, 2013).

Similarly, various research agreed upon the idea between the relationships of the two variables in which they mentioned that the teaching profession is always evident to those satisfied with their works. With this proposition, teachers who are satisfied with their profession are displaying positive work engagement which helps develop students holistically (Montero-Marín et al., 2013). Additionally, studies (Timms, Brough, O'Driscoll, Kalliath, Siu, Sit & Lo, 2015; Trepanier, Fernet, Austin, Forest & Vallerand, 2014) agreed that organizational mindfulness has been associated with work engagement including the effectiveness, further stressing that great management consistently employs their organizations to accomplish outstanding performance. Management establishes an atmosphere where their staff take responsibility for their commitment and creates work environments that motivate profitability and productivity.

Research suggests that the most significant factor to persuade work engagement and retention of employees is the mindfulness of an organization. Good management is

important in determining the success of retaining engaged employees; bad management on the other hand is often referred to as the cause why employees quit their job (Mackey, Perrewe & McAllister, 2017; Schullery, 2013; Burns & Machin, 2013). Furthermore, good management manifests proficiency in advising employees of the required and expected outcome, setting priorities, and empower a suitable level of responsibility, and providing appropriate assessments based on employees' performance. Good managers are identified as approachable, good listeners, fair, and preserve established relationships with colleagues (De Bruin & Henn, 2013; Brough, Timms, Siu, Kalliath, O'Driscoll, Sit & Lu, 2013).

Moreover, the stakes of engagement are enormous. It affects the bottom line, creativity and innovation, the quality of products and services, the image and reputation of the company, absenteeism, turnover, and talent attraction, as well as the well-being of the workforce. Some organizations, however, do succeed in creating a stimulating and positive environment where employees enjoy their work, are productive and achieve outstanding results (Doshi & McGregor, 2015; Maylett & Warner, 2014; Wagner, 2006).

3. Material and Methods

This study employed a non-experimental design utilizing the descriptive correlation technique of research. Descriptive-correlation research design will be used to explain the subject phenomenon and to articulate what variables, conditions and attributes were present (Johnson, 2001). Moreover, this kind of research is concerned with how what is or what exists is related to some preceding event that has influenced or affected a present condition or event (Kothari, 2004). Specifically, this study utilized a correlational research approach since the study established the relationship between the organizational mindfulness of school heads and the work engagement of teachers.

The study was conducted in all public elementary schools in the second School District of Matanao, a second-class municipality in the Province of Davao del Sur. The municipality is bounded by Digos City and Hagonoy in the east, Bansalan in the north, the municipality of Columbio in North Cotabato in the east and south by Kiblawan. It has 21 schools belonging to the Matanao II district. Representation of respondents was possible using simple random sampling. A simple random sampling is meant to be an unbiased representation of a group. It is the simplest and most common method of selecting a sample, in which the sample is selected unit by unit, with an equal probability of selection for each unit at each draw (Singh, 2003). Of the 203 teachers, the sample size has a 5% margin of error and a 95% confidence level is 134. Hence, the sample of N=134 teachers was randomly selected from the schools involved in the study. Additionally, participants were classified as any public-school teacher regardless of demographic characteristics and shall be working at least six (6) months to ensure a better assessment of organizational mindfulness and work engagement of teachers in their respective units. No private school teachers and those who did not meet the number of service lengths

were included. All those who qualified were given the option to withdraw in their participation.

The researcher adapted existing survey instruments in crafting the questionnaire. The first part is the scale adapted from the study of Hoy, Gage and Tarter (2006), which consists of two indicators: mindful behavior and collective efficacy. On the other hand, the second part is the Work Engagement Scale developed by Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova (2006) to measure the level of work engagement among teachers. The scale consists of three indicators: vigor, dedication, and absorption.

As to the interpretation and analysis of the data, mean and standard deviation were used to describe the levels and variability of organizational mindfulness of school heads and the work engagement of teachers. Meanwhile, Pearson r was used to determine the significance of the relationship between organizational mindfulness of school heads and work engagement of teachers, and multiple linear regression was used to determine the coefficient of determination or the magnitude of the relationship of organizational mindfulness toward school heads and work engagement of teachers. All analyses were done in IBM-SPSS version 20.

4. Results and Discussion

Shown in Table 1 is the level of organizational mindfulness of school heads with an overall mean of 4.01 with a descriptive rating of high which means that the situation relative to organizational mindfulness of their school heads is most of the time manifested. As shown in Table 1, the mindful behavior of school heads obtained the highest mean of 4.13 among the two indicators which was verbally described as high. On the other hand, collective efficacy obtained an overall mean score of 3.91 which was described as high.

Table 1: Perceived level of organizational mindfulness of school heads

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Level
Mindful Behaviour	4.13	0.34	High
Collective Efficacy	3.91	0.29	High
Overall	4.01	0.26	High

The high level of organizational mindfulness of school heads as perceived by public school teachers can be attributed especially to the high level of assessment placed by the same in terms of mindful behavior. This can be best exemplified when school heads can communicate with a clear and positive vision for the future, developing goals that are easily understood, among other salient exemplifications. This is akin to the pronouncements of Viafora, Mathiesen, and Unsworth (2015), who reported that there are schools whose school teachers perceive shortcomings as opportunities for growth and professional learning. In addition, Groschner, Seidel, Pehmer and Kiemer (2014) provided an essential reflection on school heads possessing the desirable level of mindful behavior – that they reflect on the unique attributes of each group of students, seek out

additional sources of information, and modify and adjust their practices as needed. The high level of mindful behavior explicated in this study is reflective of the expectations of Vogus and Sutcliffe (2012), stating that teachers believe they can do the job especially when their heads exude trust and confidence in their abilities. They further verbalized that an attempt to affect greater student success should be a matter of possessing the qualities of both mindfulness and efficacy. More so, the study revealed a high level of collective efficacy, which is a bit lesser in terms of the higher level of importance assigned to mindful behavior. Such a high level of collective efficacy among school heads is parallel to the pronouncements of Goddard and Goddard (2001), whose study averred that collective efficacy deals with the belief of teachers that the faculty can execute and organize the required action to contribute positive influence on students. In this regard, the collective efficacy of school heads of public elementary schools can be associated with students' academic achievement.

Shown in Table 2 is the level of work engagement of teachers with an overall mean of 4.03 which has a verbal description of high, which means that the teacher can do the task most of the time. Among the enumerated indicators, dedication obtained the highest mean score of 4.25, with a verbal description of high. This is characterized by being strongly involved in one's work, and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge of being proud of the work that they do, their job is challenging, their job inspires, enthusiastic, they find work full of meaning and purpose. Following the stated indicator above, vigor got a mean score of 4.05 with a verbal description of high, which is characterized by high energy levels and mental resilience, with the willingness to invest effort in one's work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties. This is manifested further by teachers who expressed that they feel like going to work, feeling very resilient in their job mentally, always persevering at work even when things do not go well, feeling bursting with energy at work, feeling strong and vigorous at work, and being capable of continuing work for very long periods at a time. Lastly, the least-rated indicator but having a high mean rating of 3.83 was absorption. This means that teachers are engaged in their work fully concentrated and happily engrossed in their labor, whereby time passes quickly, and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work.

Table 2: Level of work engagement of public-school teachers

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Level
Vigor	4.05	0.38	High
Dedication	4.25	0.39	Very High
Absorption	3.83	0.37	High
Overall	4.03	0.23	High

The high level of work engagement among public elementary school teachers can be supported primarily by the very high assessment of dedication, and secondarily, in terms of vigor and absorption, they show at work. This very high level of dedication can be manifested in the likes of teachers feeling pride, enthusiasm, and a sense of being

challenged in the workplace, and being inspired to do things better at work, among others. This is akin to the statements of Macey and Schneider (2008) and May, Gilson, and Harter (2004), who reported that engaged employees have high levels of energy, are enthusiastic about their work, and are often fully immersed in their job so that time flies. Moreover, the very high assessment of teachers on dedication corroborates with the postulations of Schaufeli et al. (2002), who averred that a dedicated employee is strongly involved in his or her work and experiences a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge. In fact, the very high level of importance of dedication at work is indicative that public elementary school teachers seemed to feel involved at work and enjoy working in their stationed elementary schools.

Moreover, Table 3 displays the results of the test of significance on the relationship between the variables involved in the study. The overall correlation had a computed $r=0.397$, $p<0.01$, hence significant. This rejects the first null hypothesis, stating no significant relationship between organizational mindfulness of school heads and work engagement of teachers. Doing a pairwise correlation among the measures of both variables, it can be gleaned that the indicators of organizational mindfulness of school heads and work engagement of teachers revealed the computed r values ranging from 0.170 to 0.350, $p<0.01$. As specifically evident in the table, mindful behavior is significantly related to overall work engagement with computed $r=0.340$, $p<0.01$. Collective efficacy was also correlated with overall work engagement with $r=0.317$, $p<0.01$. In addition, mindful behavior is significantly related to vigor ($r=0.346$, $p<0.01$) but did not significantly correlate to dedication and absorption, having p-values greater than 0.05. Collective efficacy, on the other hand, is significantly related with vigor ($r=0.229$, $p<0.01$), dedication ($r=0.170$, $p<0.05$) and absorption ($r=0.175$, $p<0.05$).

Table 3: Pearson correlation analysis of organizational mindfulness
of schools heads and work engagement of public school teachers

Organizational Mindfulness	Work Engagement			Overall WE
	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	
Mindful Behaviour	.346**	.117	.143	.340**
	(.000)	(.177)	(.100)	(.000)
Collective Efficacy	.229**	.170*	.175*	.317**
	(.008)	(.050)	(.043)	(.000)
Overall OM	.350**	.172*	.191*	.397**
	(.000)	(.047)	(.027)	(.000)

** p<0.01 * p<0.05

Table 4 exhibits the regression analysis showing the predictive ability of organizational mindfulness of school heads on the work engagement of teachers. The analysis shows that when the indicators of organizational mindfulness of school heads were regressed on overall work engagement, it generated an F-value of 12.279, $p<0.01$. The R^2 value of 0.158 indicates that 15.8% of the variance of work engagement of teachers can be attributed to the two regressors, holding other variables constant. This means that 84.2% of the variation can be attributed to other variables not covered in this study.

Additionally, the unstandardized beta coefficient of mindful behavior has a higher value of 0.184, $p<0.01$. It can be inferred that an increase in mindful behavior by one point will increase work engagement by 0.184. On the other hand, an increase in collective efficacy also by one point tends to increase the work engagement of teachers by 0.178. The overall analysis, therefore, rejects the second null hypothesis, stating none of the indicators of organizational mindfulness of school heads significantly influence the work engagement of teachers.

Table 4: Significance of the influence of organizational mindfulness indicators on work engagement

Regressors	B	β	t	Sig.
Mindful Behavior	0.184	0.258	2.984	0.003**
Collective Efficacy	0.178	0.222	2.573	0.011*

R²	0.158	** p<0.01 * p<0.05
ΔR²	0.145	
F	12.279	
p-value	< 0.01	

The significance of the relationship between organizational mindfulness of school heads and work engagement of public elementary school teachers indicates that at certain confidence, how school heads mind the school organization they are heading is related to the extent of teachers' engagement in working at school. The extent of such a relationship is considered weak, which portends that organizational mindfulness and work engagement are aligned concepts that can be related to certain circumstances. These observations seemed to cohere with the pronouncements of Steger, Littman-Ovadia, Miller, Menger and Rothmann (2013), purporting that organizational mindfulness is a crucial factor to the organization, as it insinuates certain practices, actions and skills which have an impact on work engagement of people in the organization. They also claimed that a greater understanding of how organizational management relates to the work engagement of teachers is essential because it can lead to professional development in teaching practice that has a significant influence on the learning progress of their students.

In addition, the study confirms the link of organizational mindfulness as a measure of good leadership with the effectiveness of people working for the organization. In fact, the findings confirmed the pronouncements of Burns and Machin (2013), who averred that having good management enables informed employees. Having been informed, they effectively engage themselves at work, making themselves aware of what is required and expected from them. In addition, they claimed that leaders of an organization – a teaching organization in this context – are responsible for making employees become effective at work by providing feedback on their performance, providing opportunities for their development, delegating appropriate levels of responsibility, and setting priorities.

Moreover, the mindful behavior of school heads relates to work engagement, particularly the vigor of teachers at work. This aligns with the pronouncements of Michishita et al. (2017), who averred those high levels of energy at work indicate a high amount of vigor. They attribute this to the continued presence of favorable job and organizational environment brought about by organizational leaders who project mindful behavor to the welfare of each employee. In addition, Schaufeli and Salanova (2014) noted that while the established link may not be true in most organizations, highlighting that there might be other relevant sources of vigor aside from the mindfulness of school heads. They added that everyone may experience different levels of vigor at the end of the day, and to attribute this to leadership alone could be a faulty line of reasoning.

Finally, the link between collective efficacy and work engagement is analogous to the pronouncements of Goddard, Hoy, and Woolfolk-Hoy (2000), who mentioned that collective efficacy is the sum of efforts of the faculty as a whole that could provide a positive effect on teachers' well-being and engagement in work. With teachers found to be highly engaged in performing their functions, student achievement can be attained. This is also parallel to the proposition of Montero-Marín et al. (2013), who verbalized that teachers who are satisfied with the leadership of their school heads through the latter's ability to establish collective efficacy tend to display positive work engagement, which helps develop student holistically.

5. Recommendations

The overall level of organizational mindfulness of school heads which is derived primarily from school heads possessing mindful behavior means that public elementary school teachers see that their school heads possess certain practices or attitudes that are evidently shown most time. In fact, it is sufficient to say that school heads are very good in terms of being mindful of the affairs of their school. With this, the Department of Education – Division of Davao del Sur through its Schools Division Superintended could utilize the findings of the study during school heads' meetings and summits, where the research shall be used as input towards the improvement of services as well as leadership practices. High-level items in each of the dimensions of organizational mindfulness shall likewise be reviewed for maintenance or further improvement to the same high – or better yet, very high – level. In addition, the high level of work engagement stemmed from a very high level of dedication. High levels of vigor and absorption, on the other hand, necessitate room for improvement of public elementary school teachers in terms of work engagement. Activities that bolster dedication among teachers, which include activities that make them happy and enjoy working in their posts shall be encouraged.

This study also revealed that the organizational mindfulness of school heads significantly relates to work engagement. With this, it is recommended that elementary school administrators and those in authority in the Department shall take into consideration the feedback of school teachers on the brand and kind of leadership their

school heads possess in administering the daily affairs at school. The involvement of teachers in terms of decision-making must be given due consideration by Department of Education officials in the performance review of every school. Moreso, the two indicators of organizational mindfulness are found to significantly influence the overall work engagement of public elementary school teachers, having mindful behavior best explains the variance of work engagement. To this effect, principals and district coordinators shall regularly espouse during faculty meetings an open channel of communication for teachers to subscribe. They shall likewise be open for feedback and allow teachers to elevate personal concerns that they deem to affect them in the workplace.

With organizational mindfulness significantly influencing work engagement in the combined influence of its two indicators, further studies are encouraged to determine the consistency of the results in another locale, in a bigger locale, or in another context.

6. Conclusion

This treatise revealed a high level of organizational mindfulness in both mindful behavior and collective efficacy. On the other hand, the overall level of work engagement of public elementary school teachers is high, as reflected in the domains of vigor and absorption, yet very high on dedication.

In their combined capacities, the two measures of organizational mindfulness of school heads (mindful behavior and collective efficacy) have a causal relationship with the overall work engagement of public elementary school teachers. In fact, the significant influence of the regressors indicates that an increase in mindful behavior and collective efficacy each by one unit causes a simultaneous increase in work engagement of public elementary school teachers, holding all other variables constant. However, there are other factors or variables that also explain it.

Moreover, there exists a significant link between the organizational mindfulness of school heads as perceived by teachers and their work engagement. This affirms the pronouncements of Macey and Schneider (2008) on work engagement, pointing out that work engagement is above and beyond simple satisfaction with the employment arrangement or basic loyalty to the organization. It is in this context that the study, found a significant link between school heads being mindful of the organization – to the faculty specifically – and the manner of behavior of teachers at work. In addition, the weak relationship posed by organizational mindfulness indicates that there exist other significant factors or variables that could better account for or explain teachers' work engagement.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

About the Authors

Kristiana Jill A. Barro is a public elementary school teacher (Teacher 1) of the Department of Education, stationed in a public elementary school in the Schools Division of Davao City. She is a candidate for a Master of Arts in Education (Educational Management).

Dr. Elias G. Cuevas is a College Professor 1 of the University of Mindanao Professional Schools and the coordinator of its Matanao external studies. He also works full time in the Department of Education, stationed in a senior high school in the Schools Division of Digos City.

References

Agarwal, U. A. (2014). Linking justice, trust and innovative work behaviour to work engagement. *Personnel Review, 43*(1), 47-73.

Airila, A., Hakanen, J. J., Schaufeli, W. B., Luukkonen, R., Punakallio, A., & Lusa, S. (2014). Are job and personal resources associated with work ability 10 years later? The mediating role of work engagement. *Work & Stress, 28*(1), 87-105.

Albrecht, N., Albrecht, P., & Cohen, M. (2012). Mindfully teaching in the classroom: A literature review. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *37*(12), 1-14.

Alessandri, G., Borgogni, L., Schaufeli, W. B., Caprara, G. V., & Consiglio, C. (2015). From positive orientation to job performance: The role of work engagement and self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 16*(3), 767-788.

Angelle, P. S., Nixon, T. J., Norton, E. M., & Niles, C. A. (2011, November). Increasing organizational effectiveness: An examination of teacher leadership, collective efficacy, and trust in schools. In *annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA*.

Ashiba, (2010). Level of Empowerment of Teachers of Gifted Students in Schools of King Abdullah II for Excellence, Jordan. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, *5*(1), 262-269.

Bakker, A. B. (2014). Daily fluctuations in work engagement. European Psychologist. *European Psychologist*. Advance online publication. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000160.

Bakker, A. B., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2013). Weekly work engagement and flourishing: The role of hindrance and challenge job demands. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 83*(3), 397-409.

Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress, 22*(3), 187-200.

Bakosh, L. S., Snow, R. M., Tobias, J. M., Houlihan, J. L., & Barbosa-Leiker, C. (2016). Maximizing mindful learning: mindful awareness intervention improves elementary school students' quarterly grades. *Mindfulness*, *7*(1), 59-67.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, *28*(2), 117-148.

Bandura, A. (2000). Cultivate self-efficacy for personal and organizational effectiveness. *Handbook of Principles of Organization Behavior, 2*, 11-21.

Barkhuizen, N., Rothmann, S., & Van de Vijver, F. J. (2014). Burnout and work engagement of academics in higher education institutions: Effects of dispositional optimism. *Stress and Health, 30*(4), 322-332.

Biggs, A., Brough, P., & Barbour, J. P. (2014). Enhancing work-related attitudes and work engagement: A quasi-experimental study of the impact of an organizational intervention. *International Journal of Stress Management, 21*(1), 43.

Bodner, T. E. (2000). On the assessment of individual differences in mindful information processing: A thesis (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University).

Brinson, D., & Steiner, L. (2007). Building Collective Efficacy: How Leaders Inspire Teachers to Achieve. Issue Brief. *Center for comprehensive school reform and improvement*.

Brough, P., Timms, C., Siu, O. L., Kalliath, T., O'Driscoll, M. P., Sit, C. H., & Lu, C. Q. (2013). Validation of the Job Demands-Resources model in cross-national samples: Cross-sectional and longitudinal predictions of psychological strain and work engagement. *Human Relations, 66*(10), 1311-1335.

Brown, K. W., Ryan, R. M., & Creswell, J. D. (2007). Mindfulness: Theoretical foundations and evidence for its salutary effects. *Psychological inquiry*, *18*(4), 211-237.

Burns, R. A., & Machin, M. A. (2013). Employee and workplace well-being: A multi-level analysis of teacher personality and organizational climate in Norwegian teachers from rural, urban and city schools. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 57*(3), 309-324.

Calik, T., Sezgin, F., Kavgaci, H., & Cagatay Kilinc, A. (2012). Examination of Relationships between Instructional Leadership of School Principals and Self-Efficacy of Teachers and Collective Teacher Efficacy. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 12*(4), 2498-2504.

Carmeli, A., McKay, A. S., & Kaufman, J. C. (2014). Emotional intelligence and creativity: The mediating role of generosity and vigor. *The Journal of Creative Behavior, 48*(4), 290-309.

Chan, W. Y., Lau, S., Nie, Y., Lim, S., & Hogan, D. (2008). Organizational and personal predictors of teacher commitment: The mediating role of teacher efficacy and identification with school. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(3), 597-630.

Choi, S. B., Tran, T. B. H., & Park, B. I. (2015). Inclusive leadership and work engagement: Mediating roles of affective organizational commitment and creativity. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 43*(6), 931-943.

Costa, P. L., Passos, A. M., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). Team work engagement: A model of emergence. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 87*(2), 414-436.

Crane, R. S., Kuyken, W., Hastings, R. P., Rothwell, N., & Williams, J. M. G. (2010). Training teachers to deliver mindfulness-based interventions: Learning from the UK experience. *Mindfulness, 1*(2), 74-86.

Dane, E. (2011). Paying attention to mindfulness and its effects on task performance in the workplace. *Journal of Management*, *37*(4), 997-1018.

Dane, E., & Brummel, B. J. (2014). Examining workplace mindfulness and its relations to job performance and turnover intention. *Human Relations*, *67*(1), 105-128.

Davenport, C., & Pagnini, F. (2016). Mindful learning: a case study of Langerian mindfulness in schools. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7.

De Bruin, G. P., & Henn, C. M. (2013). Dimensionality of the 9-item Utrecht work engagement scale (UWES-9). *Psychological Reports, 112*(3), 788-799.

De Simone, S. (2014). Conceptualizing wellbeing in the workplace. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 5*(12), 118-122.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Gevers, J. M. (2015). Job crafting and extra-role behavior: The role of work engagement and flourishing. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 91*, 87-96.

Doshi, N., & McGregor, L. (2015). Primed to perform. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Einarsen, S., Skogstad, A., Rørvik, E., Lande, Å. B., & Nielsen, M. B. (2018). Climate for conflict management, exposure to workplace bullying and work engagement: a moderated mediation analysis. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 29*(3), 549-570.

Flook, L., Goldberg, S. B., Pinger, L., Bonus, K., & Davidson, R. J. (2013). Mindfulness for teachers: A pilot study to assess effects on stress, burnout, and teaching efficacy. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, *7*(3), 182-195.

Gage III, C. Q. (2003). *The meaning and measure of school mindfulness: An exploratory analysis* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University).

Gagné, M. (Ed.). (2014). The Oxford handbook of work engagement, motivation, and self-determination theory. Oxford University Press, USA.

Ganad, R. T. (2014). A structural model of school effectiveness of public elementary school administrators in Southern Mindanao, Philippines. *Southeast Asian Interdisciplinary Research Journal, 2*(1), 102-124.

Ganta, V. C. (2014). Motivation in the workplace to improve the employee performance. *International Journal of Engineering Technology, Management and Applied Sciences, 2*(6), 221-230.

Gibbs, S., & Powell, B. (2012). Teacher efficacy and pupil behaviour: The structure of teachers' individual and collective beliefs and their relationship with numbers of pupils excluded from school. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *82*(4), 564-584.

Goddard, R. D. (2001). Collective efficacy: A neglected construct in the study of schools and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *93*(3), 467.

Goddard, R. D., & Goddard, Y. L. (2001). A multilevel analysis of the relationship between teacher and collective efficacy in urban schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *17*(7), 807-818.

Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, *37*(2), 479-507.

Goddard, R. D., Sweetland, S. R., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). Academic emphasis of urban elementary schools and student achievement in reading and mathematics: A multilevel analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 36*(5), 683-702.

Goddard, R., Goddard, Y., Sook Kim, E., & Miller, R. (2015). A theoretical and empirical analysis of the roles of instructional leadership, teacher collaboration, and collective efficacy beliefs in support of student learning. *American Journal of Education, 121*(4), 501-530.

Goldberg, S. B., Wielgosz, J., Dahl, C., Schuyler, B., MacCoon, D. S., Rosenkranz, M., & Davidson, R. J. (2016). Does the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire measure what we think it does? Construct validity evidence from an active controlled randomized clinical trial. *Psychological Assessment*, *28*(8), 1009.

Goncalves, G., Nené, D., Sousa, C., Santos, J., & Sousa, A. (2016). The workaholism as an obstacle to safety and well-being in the workplace. *Occupational Safety and Hygiene, 4*, 81-85.

Gröschner, A., Seidel, T., Pehmer, A. K., & Kiemer, K. (2014). Facilitating collaborative teacher learning: the role of "mindfulness" in video-based teacher professional development programs. *Gruppendynamik und Organisationsberatung*, *45*(3), 273-290.

Gunaratana, V. H. M. (2002). *Mindfulness in Plain English*. Berkerly, CA, USA: Wisdom.

Hampson, R., & Jowett, S. (2014). Effects of coach leadership and coach–athlete relationship on collective efficacy. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 24*(2), 454-460.

Heggen, K., & Terum, L. I. (2013). Coherence in professional education: does it foster dedication and identification?. *Teaching in Higher Education, 18*(6), 656-669.

Hoy, W. K. (2003). An analysis of enabling and mindful school structures: Some theoretical, research and practical considerations. *Journal of Educational Administration, 41*(1), 87-109.

Hoy, W. K., Gage III, C. Q., & Tarter, C. J. (2006). School mindfulness and faculty trust: Necessary conditions for each other?. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *42*(2), 236-255.

Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., & Sweetland, S. R. (2002). The development of the organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *The High School Journal, 86*(2), 38-49.

Hoy, W. K., Sweetland, S. R., & Smith, P. A. (2002). Toward an organizational model of achievement in high schools: The significance of collective efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(1), 77-93.

Hyland, P. K., Lee, R. A., & Mills, M. J. (2015). Mindfulness at work: A new approach to improving individual and organizational performance. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *8*(4), 576-602.

Jennings, P. A. (2015). Early childhood teachers' well-being, mindfulness, and self-compassion in relation to classroom quality and attitudes towards challenging students. *Mindfulness*, *6*(4), 732-743.

Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2016). Mindful L2 teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on cultivating teachers' professional development. London, UK: Routledge.

Jordan, S., & Johannessen, I. A. (2014). Exploring Organizational and Institutional Challenges to Mindfulness. *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of Mindfulness*, 424-442.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal, 33(4), 692-724.

Kang, Y., Gruber, J., & Gray, J. R. (2013). Mindfulness and de-automatization. *Emotion review*, *5*(2), 192-201.

Karatepe, O. M. (2013). The effects of work overload and work-family conflict on job embeddedness and job performance. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 25*(4), 614-634.

Kearney, W. S., Kelsey, C., & Herrington, D. (2013). Mindful leaders in highly effective schools: A mixed-method application of Hoy's M-scale. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *41*(3), 316-335.

Keller, J., Ruthruff, E., Keller, P., Hoy, R., Gaspelin, N., & Bertolini, K. (2017). "Your Brain Becomes a Rainbow": Perceptions and Traits of 4th-Graders in a School-Based Mindfulness Intervention. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 1-22.

Kelly, C. (2012). OK, Google, take a deep breath. *New York Times* (April 27, 2012). Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/29/technology/google-course-asks-employees-to-take-a-deep-breath.html.

Kim, W., Kolb, J. A., & Kim, T. (2013). The relationship between work engagement and performance: A review of empirical literature and a proposed research agenda. *Human Resource Development Review, 12*(3), 248-276.

Klassen, R. M. (2010). Teacher stress: The mediating role of collective efficacy beliefs. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *103*(5), 342-350.

Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *102*(3), 741.

Klassen, R. M., Usher, E. L., & Bong, M. (2010). Teachers' collective efficacy, job satisfaction, and job stress in cross-cultural context. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *78*(4), 464-486.

Kothari, C. R. (2004). Research methodology: Methods and techniques. New Age International.

Kovjanic, S., Schuh, S. C., & Jonas, K. (2013). Transformational leadership and performance: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of basic needs

satisfaction and work engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 86*(4), 543-555.

Kurt, T., Duyar, I., & Çalik, T. (2011). Are we legitimate yet?: A closer look at the casual relationship mechanisms among principal leadership, teacher self-efficacy and collective efficacy. *The Journal of Management Development, 31*(1), 71-86.

Langer, E. J. (1992). Matters of mind: Mindfulness/mindlessness in perspective. *Consciousness and Cognition, 1*(3), 289-305.

Lee, A. N., & Nie, Y. (2014). Understanding teacher empowerment: Teachers' perceptions of principal's and immediate supervisor's empowering behaviours, psychological empowerment and work-related outcomes. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 41*, 67-79.

Lee, J. C. K., Zhang, Z., & Yin, H. (2011). A multilevel analysis of the impact of a professional learning community, faculty trust in colleagues and collective efficacy on teacher commitment to students. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(5), 820-830.

Leroy, H., Anseel, F., Dimitrova, N. G., & Sels, L. (2013). Mindfulness, authentic functioning, and work engagement: A growth modeling approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 82*(3), 238-247.

Lim, S., & Eo, S. (2014). The mediating roles of collective teacher efficacy in the relations of teachers' perceptions of school organizational climate to their burnout. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 44*, 138-147.

Littman-Ovadia, H., Oren, L., & Lavy, S. (2013). Attachment and autonomy in the workplace: New insights. *Journal of Career Assessment, 21*(4), 502-518.

Lu, C. Q., Wang, H. J., Lu, J. J., Du, D. Y., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). Does work engagement increase person–job fit? The role of job crafting and job insecurity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 84*(2), 142-152.

Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. Industrial and organizational Psychology, 1(1), 3-30.

Mackey, J. D., Perrewé, P. L., & McAllister, C. P. (2017). Do I fit in? Perceptions of organizational fit as a resource in the workplace stress process. *Group & Organization Management, 42*(4), 455-486.

Malhotra, N. K., Lee, O. F., & Uslay, C. (2012). Mind the gap: the mediating role of mindful marketing between market and quality orientations, their interaction, and consequences. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management, 29*(6), 607-625.

May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77(1), 11-37.

Maylett, T., & Warner, P. (2014). Magic: Five keys to unlock the power of employee engagement. Greenleaf Book Group.

Maynard, B. R., Solis, M. R., & Miller, V. (2015). Mindfulness-based interventions for improving academic achievement, behavior and socio-emotional functioning of primary and secondary students: a systematic review. *The Campbell Collaboration*.

McCown, D., Reibel, D., & Micozzi, M. S. (2010). Teaching mindfulness. *A practical guide for clinicians and educators. US: Springer*.

Michishita, R., Jiang, Y., Ariyoshi, D., Yoshida, M., Moriyama, H., Obata, Y., & Yamato, H. (2017). The introduction of an active rest program by workplace units improved the workplace vigor and presenteeism among workers. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 59*(12), 1140-1147.

Moolenaar, N. M., Sleegers, P. J., & Daly, A. J. (2012). Teaming up: Linking collaboration networks, collective efficacy, and student achievement. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*(2), 251-262.

Moran, K. A. (2015). *Teacher Empowerment: School Administrators Leading Teachers to Lead* (Doctoral dissertation, Youngstown State University).

Ndubisi, N. O. (2012). Mindfulness, reliability, pre-emptive conflict handling, customer orientation and outcomes in Malaysia's healthcare sector. *Journal of Business Research, 65*(4), 537-546.

Noe, R. A., Clarke, A. D., & Klein, H. J. (2014). Learning in the twenty-first-century workplace. *Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav., 1*(1), 245-275.

Oerlemans, W. G., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). Burnout and daily recovery: A Day reconstruction study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 19*(3), 303.

Petchsawang, P., & McLean, G. N. (2017). Workplace spirituality, mindfulness meditation, and work engagement. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion, 14*(3), 216-244.

Peterson, K. J. (2015). *Mindful instructional leadership practices of elementary principals in Washington State*. Washington State University.

Pyle, A., Wade-Woolley, L., & Hutchinson, N. L. (2011). "Just listen to us": The Role of Teacher Empowerment in the Implementation of Responsiveness to Intervention. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 57*(3), 258-272.

Quickel, E. J., Johnson, S. K., & David, Z. L. (2014). Trait mindfulness and cognitive task performance: Examining the attentional construct of mindfulness. *SAGE Open, 4*(4), 2158244014560557.

Quiñones, M., Van den Broeck, A., & De Witte, H. (2013). Do job resources affect work engagement via psychological empowerment? A mediation analysis. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones, 29*(3), 127-134.

Ray, J. L., Baker, L. T., & Plowman, D. A. (2011). Organizational mindfulness in business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 10*(2), 188-203.

Rayton, B. A., & Yalabik, Z. Y. (2014). Work engagement, psychological contract breach and job satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25*(17), 2382-2400.

Rechtschaffen, D. (2014). *The way of mindful education: Cultivating well-being in teachers and students*. WW Norton & Company.

Rerup, C., & Levinthal, D. A. (2014). Situating the concept of organizational mindfulness: the multiple dimensions of organizational learning. In *Mindful Change in Times of Permanent Reorganization* (pp. 33-48). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Rodriquez, J. A. S. (2015). *Mindful instructional leadership: The connection between principal mindfulness and school practices*. Washington State University.

Roeser, R. W., Schonert-Reichl, K. A., Jha, A., Cullen, M., Wallace, L., Wilensky, R., & Harrison, J. (2013). Mindfulness training and reductions in teacher stress and burnout: Results from two randomized, waitlist-control field trials. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *105*(3), 787.

Ruedy, N. E., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2010). In the moment: The effect of mindfulness on ethical decision making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *95*, 73-87.

Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21(7), 600-619.

Salanova, M., Rodríguez-Sánchez, A. M., Schaufeli, W. B., & Cifre, E. (2014). Flowing together: A longitudinal study of collective efficacy and collective flow among workgroups. *The Journal of Psychology, 148*(4), 435-455.

Schaufeli, W., & Salanova, M. (2014). Burnout, boredom and engagement at the workplace. In *An Introduction to Contemporary Work Psychology, First Edition*. John Wiley & Sons.

Schullery, N. M. (2013). Workplace engagement and generational differences in values. *Business Communication Quarterly, 76*(2), 252-265.

Shaw, W. S., Besen, E., Pransky, G., Boot, C. R., Nicholas, M. K., McLellan, R. K., & Tveito, T. H. (2014). Manage at work: a randomized, controlled trial of a self-management group intervention to overcome workplace challenges associated with chronic physical health conditions. *BMC Public Health, 14*(1), 515.

Shimazu, A., Schaufeli, W. B., Kamiyama, K., & Kawakami, N. (2015). Workaholism vs. work engagement: The two different predictors of future well-being and performance. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 22*(1), 18-23.

Singh, S. (2003). Advanced Sampling Theory with Applications: How Michael "Selected" Amy (Vol. 2). Springer Science & Business Media.

Steger, M. F., Littman-Ovadia, H., Miller, M., Menger, L., & Rothmann, S. (2013). Engaging in work even when it is meaningless: Positive affective disposition and meaningful work interact in relation to work engagement. *Journal of Career Assessment, 21*(2), 348-361.

Stephanou, G., Gkavras, G., & Doulkeridou, M. (2013). The role of teachers' self-and collective-efficacy beliefs on their job satisfaction and experienced emotions in school. *Psychology, 4*(03), 268.

Strom, D. L., Sears, K. L., & Kelly, K. M. (2014). Work engagement: The roles of organizational justice and leadership style in predicting engagement among employees. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 21*(1), 71-82.

Timms, C., Brough, P., O'Driscoll, M., Kalliath, T., Siu, O. L., Sit, C., & Lo, D. (2015). Positive pathways to engaging workers: work–family enrichment as a predictor of work engagement. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 53*(4), 490-510.

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., Derks, D., & Van Rhenen, W. (2013). Job crafting at the team and individual level: Implications for work engagement and performance. *Group & Organization Management, 38*(4), 427-454.

Tracy, J. C., Miller, P., & Tarter, C. J. (2014). Mindfulness, structure, and effectiveness. *Catholic Schools in the Public Interest: Past, Present, and Future Directions*, 129.

Trépanier, S. G., Fernet, C., Austin, S., Forest, J., & Vallerand, R. J. (2014). Linking job demands and resources to burnout and work engagement: Does passion underlie these differential relationships?. *Motivation and Emotion, 38*(3), 353-366.

Viafora, D. P., Mathiesen, S. G., & Unsworth, S. J. (2015). Teaching mindfulness to middle school students and homeless youth in school classrooms. *Journal of child and family studies, 24*(5), 1179-1191.

Viel-Ruma, K., Houchins, D., Jolivette, K., & Benson, G. (2010). Efficacy beliefs of special educators: The relationships among collective efficacy, teacher self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 33(3), 225-233.

Vogus, T. J., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2012). Organizational mindfulness and mindful organizing: A reconciliation and path forward. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11*(4), 722-735.

Wefald, A. J., Mills, M. J., Smith, M. R., & Downey, R. G. (2013). Vigorous Groups? An Examination of Vigor at the Dimension Level and Its Relationship to Work Attitudes in Teams. *Psychology Research, 3*(6), 330.

Weick, K. E., & Putnam, T. (2006). Organizing for mindfulness: Eastern wisdom and Western knowledge. *Journal of management inquiry, 15*(3), 275-287.

Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2006). Mindfulness and the quality of organizational attention. *Organization Science, 17*(4), 514-524.

Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2015). Managing the unexpected: sustained performance in a complex world. John Wiley & Sons.

Weick, K., & Sutcliffe, K. (2001). Managing the unexpected: Assuring high performance in an age of uncertainty. San Francisco: Wiley.

Weick, K., & Sutcliffe, K. (2007). Managing the unexpected: Resilient performance in an age of uncertainty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Williams, J. M. G., & Kabat-Zinn, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Mindfulness: Diverse perspectives on its meaning, origins and applications*. Routledge.

Wittink, D., & Bayer, L. (1994). *Statistical analysis of customer satisfaction data: results from a natural experiment with measurement scales*. Working Paper 94-04, Cornell University Johnson Graduate School of Management.

Yalabik, Z. Y., Popaitoon, P., Chowne, J. A., & Rayton, B. A. (2013). Work engagement as a mediator between employee attitudes and outcomes. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24*(14), 2799-2823.

Yassine-Diab, N., Monnier, N., & Lavinal, F. (2014). Pilot study on university English teachers' professional autonomy in France. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 22(2), 110-125.

Yeh, C. M. (2013). Tourism involvement, work engagement and job satisfaction among frontline hotel employees. *Annals of Tourism Research, 42*, 214-239.