

International Journal of Educational Innovations

ISSN 3078-5677

International Journal of Educational Innovations
2027, Volume 3, Issue 1, 31-47
<https://doi.org/10.46451/ije.260710>

Received: 10 December 2025
Accepted: 1 July 2026
Published: 19 July 2026

Perceived Leadership Dispositions and Possible Impacts on Student and Teacher Engagement

Mable Chan
Hong Kong Baptist University, China
(Email: mablechan@hkbu.edu.hk)

Abstract

Understanding the impact of leadership dispositions on teacher and student engagement is crucial for enhancing leadership practices in education. This study investigates how leadership dispositions influence engagement levels among students and teachers, aiming to inform strategies that promote positive outcomes.

The research questions are: 1) Which leadership dispositions affect engagement levels of students and teachers in higher education?; and 2) How can leaders create an environment favourable for engagement?

10 teachers and 10 students participated. Data collection involved a questionnaire to assess engagement levels (Ghamoushi et al., 2022; Klassen et al., 2013; Maroco et al., 2016). Interview questions were adapted from the EDLDA tool (Wilson et al., 2020).

Findings reveal that students are less engaged than teachers. Participants acknowledged leadership's influence on morale, noting negative dispositions from leaders can have a profound effect. Beyond visionary and communication skills, positivity was crucial for effective educational leaders who believe in resolving problems. In addition to maintaining a positive environment and attitude towards colleagues, flexibility in decision-making based on situational factors was also highlighted. Leaders need to recognize when certain attitudes may not be suitable for all circumstances.

Keywords

Student engagement, teacher engagement, leadership dispositions

Introduction

There is emerging research on the specific traits and dispositions required for effective school leadership, which can garner respect from staff, students and the community, and have a

positive impact on student learning. According to the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015), Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) highlight the importance of leaders who can influence student learning by creating challenging yet supportive and caring learning environments. These strong leaders are also able to develop and support teachers, foster positive work conditions, and engage in meaningful activities both within and outside of the classroom.

While there is extensive literature on the impact of leadership on organizational culture (Alvesson, 2011; Bass & Avolio, 1993; Nabella et al., 2022; Paais & Pattiruhu, 2020) and performance (Lai et al., 2020; Li & Liu, 2022; Shen et al., 2020), as well as on employee performance (Iskamto et al., 2021; Top et al., 2020), there is a noticeable gap when it comes to the specific relationship between student and teacher engagement and leadership dispositions, which can refer to a set of personal qualities, characteristics, and attitudes that contribute to effective leadership (Borko et al., 2007; Taylor & Wasicsko, 2000; Villegas, 2007; Wilson et al., 2020). As leadership dispositions play a crucial role in guiding and inspiring educators and driving school improvement, this knowledge gap is important because it hinders our understanding of how leadership in educational settings influences both students and teachers, and how it may affect their engagement and ultimately their performance. By understanding how leadership dispositions may impact the level of student and teacher engagement, educational leaders can better understand how to create environments that enhance not only student learning but also improve teacher satisfaction and retention. Without this understanding, it becomes difficult for educational leaders to effectively shape their leadership dispositions to positively impact student and teacher engagement.

In this study, disposition is defined as observable behaviours that reflect a person's values and beliefs and can predict future patterns of behaviour. Taylor and Wasicsko (2000) describe disposition as personal qualities such as interests, values, beliefs, and attitudes that individuals possess. Building on this definition, Borko et al. (2007) emphasize that dispositions are closely linked to actions, representing a person's tendencies to behave in certain ways based on their beliefs. Likewise, Villegas (2007) defines dispositions as individuals' inclinations to act in accordance with their beliefs. According to Wilson et al. (2020), leadership dispositions play a critical role in improving student outcomes, supporting teacher development, and creating a positive work environment.

The value of the research in this area is significant. Careful study of the relationship between leadership dispositions and student and teacher engagement could offer insights that lead to more effective leadership practices in education. By understanding how various leadership behaviours may impact student and teacher engagement, educational leaders can better understand how to create environments that enhance not only student learning but also improve teacher satisfaction and retention. This, in turn, has the potential to positively impact overall student performance and lead to success.

The research questions are as follows:

1. What is the engagement level of students and teachers in higher education?
2. What leadership dispositions contribute to, or detract from, the engagement level of students and teachers in higher education?
3. How can leaders create and maintain an environment that is favourable for student and teacher engagement?

Methodology

To address the two research questions regarding the engagement levels of students and teachers, both quantitative and qualitative data were collected. Specifically, questionnaires were distributed to both student and teacher participants to determine their level of engagement in different aspects. Following the completion of the questionnaire, the participants were invited to partake in a one-hour interview aimed at addressing the research questions in depth.

Participants

10 teachers and 10 students were selected as participants. The selection of participants and sampling strategy for this study was crucial to ensuring representative and diverse perspectives. A small but representative sample of 10 faculty participants, including one English division head, one Chinese division head and other frontline teachers (ranging from Lecturers to Assistant Professors), was chosen from different local tertiary institutions (University of Hong Kong; The Hong Kong Polytechnic University; Hong Kong Baptist University; Hang Sang University; Hong Kong Metropolitan University; Lingnan University; and Technological and Higher Education Institute of Hong Kong) to capture a variety of viewpoints. Additionally, 10 students from different faculties and departments, including 2 PhD students and 8 fresh graduates who took compulsory EAP subjects with me in their first year, were selected to provide insights from a range of academic backgrounds.

Research ethics

Because of the involvement of human participants in the research study, it was essential to prioritize adherence to ethical principles, particularly in terms of human ethics. Upholding these ethical principles not only ensured the integrity and validity of the research findings (Dhakal, 2016), but also served to safeguard the rights and well-being of the participants (Ross et al., 2018). In this study, participants were required to provide informed consent and retain the right to withdraw from the study at any point without facing any repercussions. It was crucial that they were fully informed about the aims and objectives of the project, as well as the potential use of collected data for future research and publication purposes. They also had rights that must be respected, such as the assurance that their personal details would remain confidential and that they had the freedom to raise any concerns or questions about any aspect of the research procedure. For further details on participant consent and information, please refer to Appendix I for the consent forms and information sheet prepared for both student and teacher participants involved in my study.

Data collection

Two questionnaires had been adapted to comprehensively cover various aspects of student and teacher engagement (see Appendixes II & III for the questionnaires for students and teachers). The adapted questionnaires drew from previous research that looked into cognitive, emotional, social, affective, and behavioural aspects of teacher engagement (Ghamoushi et al., 2022; Hart et al., 2011), and aspects of student engagement, such as the number of courses taken, self-perceived academic achievement, intention to dropout, perceptions of instructional contexts, teacher support, peer support, parent support, and emotional functioning (Lam et al., 2014; Maroco et al., 2016). The questionnaires were adapted to make it more effective in addressing the research questions. One significant change was the adjustment of the Likert scale used to capture responses. The original scale, which ranged from 1 to 7, (e.g. 1: never; 2: almost never; 3: only occasionally; 4: sometimes; 5: usually; 6: almost always; 7: always), could present challenges in differentiating between categories like never/always and almost never/always, and could cause confusion to participants trying to interpret and apply the scale consistently. It had therefore been simplified to a 5-point scale ranging from 1-5, with 1 indicating strongly

disagree and 5 strongly agree. This modification made it easier for participants to provide responses based on their experiences and eliminated potential confusion between the original scale's distinctions. The student questionnaire assessed three engagement categories: Behavioural Engagement (BE), Cognitive Engagement (CE) and Emotional Engagement (EE); meanwhile, the teacher questionnaire included five categories: Emotional Engagement (EE), Social Engagement: Colleagues (SEC), Social Engagement: Students (SES), Cognitive Engagement (CE), and Agentic Engagement (EA), with some statements deleted to avoid repetition. For example, under *emotional engagement*, statements (No: 8: I am captivated by teaching; No. 11: I feel vigorous while teaching) that were deemed repetitive had been consolidated or simply removed. Additionally, new statements had been added to reflect contemporary issues such as engagement with technology/AI in teaching, as well as engagement with professional development opportunities. Two versions of each questionnaire had been prepared, with the statements in the participant version randomized to prevent the grouping of statements under the same engagement category, thus enhancing the unpredictability of answers.

In addition to the questionnaires, interviews were conducted to examine the responses provided by the participants in more detail. The interview questions were adapted from Wilson et al. (2020) which developed the Educational Leadership Disposition Assessment tool (EDLDA) using a systematic analysis of dispositional performance expectations. A total of 15 most preferred leadership dispositions were finally delineated (see Appendix IV). Based on this tool, participants (i.e. both students and teachers) were involved in sharing with the interviewer what they thought about the 15 leadership dispositions and the possible impacts on teacher engagement and student engagement.

Table 1

Interrater Reliability Correlation Coefficients for Leadership Dispositions

Disposition	Coefficient
Confidence	0.81
Determined	0.81
Vision	0.90
Driven	0.90
Conflict Resolution	1.00
Embraces Diversity	0.81
Relational	0.90
High Expectations	0.81
Positive Attitude	0.72
Effective Communication	0.81
Integrity	0.81
Positive Culture	0.90
Work Ethic	0.72
Adaptable	0.72
Self-Aware	0.81

Note. Sourced from “Examining educational leadership dispositions: A valid and reliable assessment of leadership dispositions” by Wilson, A., Almerico, G. M., Johnston, P., and Ensmann, S., 2020, *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 15(1), p. 25.

Data analysis

In terms of the quantitative data, SPSS 29.0 was used. The mean and standard deviation were calculated to provide an understanding of the level of student and teacher engagement. For the qualitative data collected from interviews, thematic analysis was employed to identify patterns and themes related to student engagement, teacher engagement, and the relationship between leadership dispositions and teacher/student engagement.

The combination of questionnaires, interviews, and careful participant selection provided a comprehensive understanding of the engagement levels of both students and teachers for higher education. By addressing these research questions, valuable insights could be gained to enhance engagement strategies and improve overall effectiveness within the educational setting.

Findings and Discussion

Engagement level of teachers

Quantitative data gathered from teachers revealed various levels of engagement in different categories. In terms of cognitive engagement, teachers reported a mean score of 4.18 for Cognitive Engagement (CE), indicating a high level of involvement in activities related to teaching. The statement with the highest mean in this category was “I exert myself to do well while teaching” (4.5), while the lowest was “While teaching, I put aside everything else” (3.7). In the Agentic Engagement (EA) category, with a mean score of 4.3, teachers showed a strong sense of taking principled actions to address problems in the classroom. The statement with the highest mean was “I take principled actions to deal with problems in my class” (4.5), while the lowest was “I make creative choices to make influential differences in my teaching practice” (4.1). Emotional Engagement (EE) had a mean score of 4.18, indicating a great reliance on personal and professional experiences to handle challenging situations. The statement with the highest mean in this category was “I rely on my personal and professional experiences to deal with challenging situations in my class” (4.6), while the lowest was “I cannot disconnect myself from teaching” (3.2). In terms of Social Engagement, both with colleagues and students, teachers showed a high level of involvement. Social Engagement: Colleagues (SEC) had a mean score of 4.02, with the statement “I provide assistance for my colleagues at institute” (4.3) scoring the highest, and “I pay attention to my colleagues’ problems at institute” (3.6) scoring the lowest. In Social Engagement: Students (SES), the mean score was 4.46, with the statement “I take into account my students’ problems in class” (4.7) scoring the highest, and “In class, I establish rapport with my students” (4.3) scoring the lowest. Overall, the quantitative data from teachers’ responses highlighted their high levels of engagement in different areas of teaching and the importance they placed on meaningful and significant interactions with colleagues and students. Despite the overall high mean values suggesting a significant level of engagement among teachers, it is noteworthy that teachers were apparently able to attain a work-life balance. The lowest means were reported for statements such as ‘I cannot disconnect myself from teaching’ and ‘While teaching, I put aside everything else’, indicating that teachers are capable of prioritizing a life outside of work without letting their job consume themselves entirely.

Based on the quantitative data obtained, it has been observed that teachers generally displayed a high level of engagement, driven by two main factors. The first factor revolved around the student-centric approach adopted by teachers, where they found fulfilment in witnessing the growth and improvement of their students. Another aspect contributing to high teacher engagement was their strong sense of responsibility and understanding of their role. One teacher indicated that meeting students’ learning needs was her responsibility and she was willing to dedicate extra time to arranging consultations with students for effective teaching and learning. Another teacher, serving as the Programme Leader of an undergraduate

programme, was also highly engaged. In that role, besides ensuring effective learning in the classroom, he must align the curriculum with internship and exchange opportunities, provide academic advice, and address other challenges students face in their learning journey. Furthermore, a significant number of teachers exhibited a high level of engagement with professional development, particularly in staying abreast of advancements such as AI tools in education.

Engagement level of students

The quantitative data presented in the study on student engagement reveals various means for Behavioural Engagement (BE), Cognitive Engagement (CE), and Emotional Engagement (EE). The mean score for BE was 3.88, for CE was 3.73, and for EE was 3.23. When looking at the statement with the highest and lowest means within each category, the statement with the highest mean for BE was “I usually do my homework on time” with a score of 4.4, while the lowest was “When I have doubts, I ask questions and participate in debates in class” with a score of 3. For CE, the statement with the highest mean was “If I do not understand the meaning of a word, I try to solve the problem, for example, by consulting a dictionary or asking someone else” with a score of 4.6, and the lowest was “I review my notes/materials after class” with a score of 2.8. In terms of EE, the highest mean statements were “I like being at school”, “I am interested in school work”, and “I discuss with my classmates the possible ways to improve our coursework/school,” all with a score of 3.4. The lowest mean statements were “My classroom is an interesting place to be” and “I do not feel very accomplished at this school”, both with a score of 3. Among all statements, the one with the highest mean was “If I do not understand the meaning of a word, I try to solve the problem, for example, by consulting a dictionary or asking someone else” with a score of 4.6, while the statement with the lowest mean was “I review my notes/materials after class” with a score of 2.8. Lastly, the statement with the highest standard deviation was “I talk to people outside of school on matters I learned in class” with a score of 1.3, while the lowest was a tie between “When I read a book, I ask myself questions to make sure I understand the subject I am reading about” and “I feel excited about school work,” both with a standard deviation of 0.45.

Among the 10 student participants, 2 were studying doctoral degrees and 8 were graduating from their undergraduate study. One PhD student shared that his engagement level was particularly high in regards to self-learning or autonomous learning. This was highly related to the demands of his PhD study: “As a PhD student, the major learning task is to find and explore a new field of study that is still under development, rather than relying heavily on classes, teachers, or textbooks. That’s why I rated high for items related to self-directed learning and problem-solving, while gave low scores to items related to sharing or discussing with others, because others may not be familiar with the field that I am studying.” Another PhD student also expressed having high levels of intrinsic motivation and a strong desire for learning, citing his age/maturity as contributing factors to his high engagement level. Two of the remaining 3 students attributed their high engagement levels to parental expectations, with one describing his mother as a “tiger mom” who held high standards for his academic performance, while the other referenced the high expectations of academic achievement within Asian family culture.

When comparing the average engagement levels of teachers (4.23) and students (3.6), it is evident that there was a notable disparity in the mean values. This suggests that teachers tended to have a higher level of engagement in comparison to students. It appears that students demonstrated high levels of engagement and enthusiasm in class. However, they exhibited a decreased inclination to engage in self-access learning out of class, which was a critical component that might have been overlooked during their primary and secondary education. It

may be necessary to introduce relevant policies or initiatives in higher education to address this issue before it becomes further entrenched.

Effectiveness of educational leaders and how they affect teachers' and students' level of engagement

Interview questions 2 and 3 required participants to evaluate the roles of educational leaders, for example, the Centre Director/Department Head and senior management, in terms of their impact on engagement level and the reasons behind their assessment. Despite the sensitive nature of the questions, the teacher participants tended to provide honest reflections. The majority of the teachers agreed that the Heads/Directors were particularly effective in performing the following responsibilities: (a) promoting specific pedagogies (e.g. flipped learning approach); (b) maintaining good relationships with Senior Management for effective communication and policy implementation; (c) trusting teachers with autonomy; (d) establishing a positive culture among staff and students; (e) acquiring broader perspectives (e.g. to support teachers in their work); and (f) being receptive to colleagues' concerns. However, there were also negative comments regarding the effectiveness of educational leaders, particularly in areas related to (a) communication with colleagues; and (b) fairness in evaluation and workload distribution. These shortcomings can have a direct impact on teacher morale and lead to high staff turnover, ultimately affecting student engagement.

Based on feedback from the student participants, it appears that the level of interaction with the Head and Senior Management was rather limited. Opportunities for students to engage with educational leaders were primarily restricted to student staff consultative meetings and briefing sessions at the beginning of the academic year. During these sessions, students might have a chance to meet with the Head. The primary impact of Head/Senior Management appears to have been in relation to the implementation of policy concerning students' well-being and benefits. For the 2 PhD students, this could impact aspects such as capstone/research projects, graduation, and career progression. While there were consultative meetings on important matters like faculty mergers or policies affecting students' research projects, graduation and career paths, the student participants expressed that their opinions were not taken into consideration.

Essential leadership dispositions and recommendations to refine leadership dispositions

In response to questions regarding the essential leadership dispositions that educational leaders should possess to effectively engage students and teachers, 4 main dispositions reported were: (a) being a role model, (b) being supportive; (c) visionary; and (d) effective communication and interactions. A role model is defined by characteristics such as respect for differences, inclusivity, passion, resourcefulness and professionalism. For students, effective communication and visionary leadership remain important. In addition, leaders should be able to resolve conflicts and demonstrate high integrity.

Upon being asked to rank the most important leadership dispositions based on the 15 leadership dispositions table (Wilson et al., 2020), teacher participants identified developing a positive culture as the most important disposition, followed by having a visionary perspective and effective communication skills. For student participants, possessing a visionary mindset was regarded as the most important trait, followed by effective communication and integrity. Additionally, both groups identified resolving conflicts, maintaining a positive attitude, and being adaptive as essential qualities for effective leadership.

Both student and teacher participants found visionary essential in a leader, referring to the

ability to anticipate future needs and address emerging trends efficiently. They both used the popularity of Artificial Intelligence (AI) as an example, with student participants criticizing the slow response from Senior Management in formulating regulations and policies for AI use, resulting in a lack of clarity of the purpose and boundaries of AI in learning. The importance of visionary leadership lies in its adaptability to circumstances, allowing leaders to adjust their vision accordingly. Effective communication was also identified by both groups as a crucial factor as leaders must articulate their vision clearly and engage stakeholders effectively for successful implementation of initiatives.

Though not covered in Table 1, various leadership dispositions were regarded by the participants as important, including charisma, empathy, personality (being optimistic), personal style of working (not picky, not focusing on trivial things), sensitivity to colleagues' stress level, time management skill, stress management skill, being caring, calm, fair, and resourceful.

Teachers expressed that effective leaders should be able to recognize the capabilities and limitations of their staff and delegate duties appropriately. However, there was a participant cautioning against excessive kindness, such as giving everyone an overly positive appraisal, as having overly high expectations and focusing excessively on tasks or outcomes could potentially lead to feelings of failure, demotivation and disappointment among staff.

When it came to improving leadership dispositions, both student and teacher participants believed that training was necessary despite the difficulty in shaping/changing innate traits such as personality, charisma, and vision. One teacher suggested incorporating this aspect into training programmes for pre-service teachers, while a PhD student argued that it should be an essential component of both undergraduate and/or postgraduate programmes. There were also specific suggestions about the use of case study approach, authentic examples and the inclusion of guest speakers with successful leadership experience to share their insights and success stories. When considering the content to be covered in the training programmes, communication emerged as a key aspect. One teacher suggested using psychological assessments (e.g. well-established ones like Big 5 personality model: <https://www.hogrefe.com/uk/shop/neo-personality-inventory-third-edition-uk.html>) to evaluate leadership dispositions, followed by coaching sessions. Another teacher emphasized the significance of public relations training, for leaders to effectively handle inquiries and comprehend the psychological impact of their responses on students and teachers. Additionally, a senior undergraduate student proposed implementing a mechanism to prevent potential abuse of power by educational leaders.

Having said that, training leaders may not be a simple task, as indicated by the contingency leadership theory developed by Fiedler (1978), which highlights the absence of a universal leadership style suitable for all circumstances. According to the contingency theory, it is imperative for a capable leader to maintain flexibility and adjust their style as required (Shenkar & Ellis, 2022). Therefore, educational leaders need to employ different leadership styles and adapt them based on the specific needs of a situation. In essence, a leader must demonstrate flexibility and the ability to adjust styles and approaches to fit different circumstances, a skill that may prove challenging to teach or train.

The findings of the study are consistent with existing literature that highlights the crucial influence of transformational leadership on shaping engagement levels. Transformational leadership is characterized by meaningful interactions between leaders and their followers in order to steer the followers towards achieving a "vision-based change" (Bass, 1985). This

concept is in line with the strong emphasis on communication skills as expressed by the students and teachers who participated in the study.

Conclusions

This study represents the first attempt to systematically analyse the engagement levels of students and teachers, as well as how leadership dispositions contribute to, or detract from, the engagement level of students and teachers in higher education. In addition to quantitative data, interviews were conducted that involved in-depth discussion with students and teachers regarding their engagement levels and experiences interacting with educational leaders. While there is a significant body of literature on leadership theories and models, there remains a research gap in specifically examining the importance of essential leadership dispositions within the context of education. By exploring the significance of essential leadership dispositions from the perspectives of both students and teachers, the research questions posed have the potential to illuminate this topic and offer valuable insights for further investigation. This contribution to the literature is crucial for advancing knowledge in the field and can lay the groundwork for future research projects.

The research findings reveal that when comparing the engagement levels of students and teachers based on quantitative data, both groups displayed engagement. However, the students appear to have been less engaged than the teachers, even though they were the top students selected by the researcher. Teachers showed significantly higher engagement levels with students compared to their fellow teachers (4.46 v. 4.02), indicating a strong teacher-student connection. Regarding student engagement, there was a notable difference between cognitive/behavioural (3.73/3.88) and emotional engagement levels (3.23), which seems that they were somewhat detached from schools and classrooms, yet still actively engaged in their academic learning.

The interviews conducted indicate that both groups viewed leadership dispositions as crucial in influencing students' learning outcomes and teachers' motivation to teach. Surprisingly, the students demonstrated a strong understanding of leadership and how a leader should conduct themselves in order to effectively engage students and teachers. They shared similar beliefs with the teachers that effective communication skills, a visionary mindset, conflict resolution abilities, a positive attitude, and adaptability were all essential qualities for a leader to possess. Although students might not believe that leadership dispositions directly impact their learning experience, they acknowledged that negative leadership behaviours could lead to disengaged or unhappy teachers, which might ultimately affect students as well.

Educational leaders should also employ specific strategies that involve developing positive relationships with teachers, demonstrating respect for them, and prioritizing both student and teacher engagement, in addition to having a thorough understanding of educational principles and pedagogy and engaging in self-reflection. Maintaining an open-minded approach to exploring new trends and staying informed in the field are regarded as equally important. Given the lower engagement level among teachers with their colleagues as indicated by the questionnaire results, educational leaders may need to take action to enhance the work environment for peer collaboration. It is also imperative for leaders to proactively seek ways to increase students' emotional engagement.

Both student and teacher participants noted that the morale of students and teachers could be significantly impacted by the negative dispositions of leaders. Participants highlighted the importance of positivity, with an effective educational leader viewed as one who trusts that

problems can always be overcome. Creating a positive environment and maintaining a positive attitude towards colleagues are also considered crucial components of effective leadership. In line with the contingency theory (Fiedler, 2015), which emphasizes flexibility in decision-making based on situational factors, it is important for leaders to recognize when certain attitudes or dispositions may not be suitable for all circumstances.

Regarding the limitations of the study, it is important to note the limited number of participants involved. It is recommended for future research to include a larger and more diverse pool of participants. Additionally, expanding the study to include primary and secondary school teachers would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of leadership dispositions on both students and teachers. As reported in the study, undergraduate and postgraduate participants did not perceive a direct impact of leadership styles on student learning. This differs from research conducted in secondary schools, which has shown a correlation between democratic/laissez-faire leadership styles and academic performance (John & Mkulu, 2020). This indicates a major distinction between educational leadership in secondary schools compared to higher education, a contrast that is worth exploring. According to the feedback from the participants, there is room for improvement in Table 1 due to the presence of some similar or repetitive leadership dispositions, such as work ethic, integrity, drive, and determination. The definitions provided for some dispositions might not be sufficiently clear. By expanding the participant pool to include a more diverse range of individuals from different educational backgrounds, including students and teachers, a revised and more exhaustive list of leadership dispositions can be compiled to facilitate a more in-depth comprehension.

References

- Alvesson, M. (2011). Leadership and organizational culture. *The SAGE handbook of leadership*, 151-164.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 112-121.
- Borko, H., Liston, D., & Whitcomb, J. A. (2007). Apples and fishes: The debate over dispositions in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(5), 359-364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487107309977>
- Dhakal, R. K. (2016). Responsible practice of research: Safeguarding research integrity and publication ethics. *Journal of Education and Research*, 6(2), 1-11.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1978). The contingency model and the dynamics of the leadership process. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 11, 59-112. Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60005-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60005-2)
- Fiedler, F. E. (2015). Contingency theory of leadership. In *Organizational Behavior 1* (pp. 232-255). Routledge.
- Ghamoushi, M., Zenouzagh, Z. M., & Hashamdar, M. (2022). Developing and validating a potential evaluation inventory to assess EFL teachers' engagement. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances*, 10(2), 145-181. <https://doi.org/10.22049/JALDA.2022.28016.1468>
- Hart, S. R., Stewart, K., & Jimerson, S. R. (2011). The student engagement in schools questionnaire (SESQ) and the teacher engagement report form-new (TERF-N): Examining the preliminary evidence. *Contemporary School Psychology: Formerly The California School Psychologist*, 15(1), 67-79.
- Iskamto, D., Srimulatsih, M., Ansori, P. B., Ghazali, P. L., Foziah, N. H. M., Arifin, J., & Bon, A. T. (2021). Analysis of relationship between leadership and employee performance at

- manufacture company in Indonesia. In *Proceedings of the 11th Annual International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*. Singapore: IEOM Society International (Vol. 8, pp. 3262-3269).
- John, U., & Mkulu, D. G. (2020). Influence of school heads' leadership styles on students' academic performance in public secondary schools in Nyamagana District, Mwanza, Tanzania. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 5(6), 2327-2340. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.56.71>
- Klassen, R. M., Yerdelen, S., & Durksen, T. L. (2013). Measuring teacher engagement: Development of the engaged teachers scale (ETS). *Frontline Learning Research*, 1(2), 33-52.
- Lai, F. Y., Tang, H. C., Lu, S. C., Lee, Y. C., & Lin, C. C. (2020). Transformational leadership and job performance: The mediating role of work engagement. *Sage Open*, 10(1), 2158244019899085.
- Lam, S. F., Jimerson, S., Wong, B. P., Kikas, E., Shin, H., Veiga, F. H., ... & Zollneritsch, J. (2014). Understanding and measuring student engagement in school: The results of an international study from 12 countries. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 29(2), 213.
- Li, L., & Liu, Y. (2022). An integrated model of principal transformational leadership and teacher leadership that is related to teacher self-efficacy and student academic performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 42(4), 661-678.
- Maroco, J., Maroco, A. L., Campos, J. A. D. B., & Fredricks, J. A. (2016). University student's engagement: Development of the University Student Engagement Inventory (USEI). *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 29(21), 1-12.
- Nabella, S. D., Rivaldo, Y., Kurniawan, R., Nurmayunita, N., Sari, D. P., Luran, M. F., & Wulandari, K. (2022). The influence of leadership and organizational culture mediated by organizational climate on governance at senior high school in Batam City. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 12(5), 119-130.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2015). *Professional standards for educational leaders*. http://npbea.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/ProfessionalStandards-for-Educational-Leaders_2015.pdf
- Paaais, M., & Pattiruhu, J. R. (2020). Effect of motivation, leadership, and organizational culture on satisfaction and employee performance. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(8), 577-588.
- Ross, M. W., Iguchi, M. Y., & Panicker, S. (2018). Ethical aspects of data sharing and research participant protections. *American Psychologist*, 73(2), 138-145. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000240>
- Shen, J., Wu, H., Reeves, P., Zheng, Y., Ryan, L., & Anderson, D. (2020). The association between teacher leadership and student achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100357>
- Shenkar, O., & Ellis, S. (2022). The rise and fall of structural contingency theory: A theory's 'autopsy'. *Journal of Management Studies*, 59(3), 782-818.
- Taylor, R. L., & Wasicsko, M. M. (2000). The dispositions to teach. In *Annual Meeting of the South Regional Association of Teacher Education*, Lexington, KY.
- Top, C., Abdullah, B. M. S., & Faraj, A. H. M. (2020). Transformational leadership impact on employees performance. *Eurasian Journal of Management & Social Sciences*, 1(1), 49-59.
- Villegas, A. M. (2007). Dispositions in teacher education: A look at social justice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(5), 370-380. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487107308419>
- Wilson, A., Almerico, G. M., Johnston, P., & Ensmann, S. (2020). Examining educational leadership dispositions: A valid and reliable assessment of leadership dispositions. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 15(1), 17-28.

Appendix I

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH (for students and teachers)

Perceived Leadership Dispositions and Possible Impacts on Student and Teacher Engagement

I _____ hereby consent to participate in the captioned research conducted by Dr Mable Chan.

I understand that information obtained from this research may be used in future research and published. However, my right to privacy will be retained, i.e. my personal details will not be revealed.

The procedure as set out in the attached information sheet has been fully explained. I understand the benefit and risks involved. My participation in the project is voluntary.

I acknowledge that I have the right to question any part of the procedure and can withdraw at any time without penalty of any kind.

Name _____ of
participant _____

Signature _____ of
participant _____

Name of researcher Mable Chan (Dr)

Signature of researcher Mable Chan (Dr)

Date _____

Information Sheet (for students and teachers)

Information about the project

The title of this project *Perceived Leadership Dispositions and Possible Impacts on Student and Teacher Engagement*.

The project is conducted by Dr Mable Chan, Senior Lecturer, Language Centre (mablechan@hkbu.edu.hk), Hong Kong Baptist University.

The study aims to explore and define the relationship between leadership dispositions and both student and teacher engagement. By understanding how leadership dispositions may impact student and teacher engagement, educational leaders can better understand how to create environments that enhance not only student learning but also improve teacher satisfaction and retention.

Participation

You are asked to participate in the project by filling in a questionnaire and joining a follow-up interview. Participation is voluntary and involves no risks. You have the right to withdraw at any time without any kind of penalty or disadvantage. Withdrawal would have no bearing at all on your studies. Only the principal investigator will know about your participation.

Using the information and ideas

The findings will be disseminated in journal articles, books, conference presentations, etc. Any information/ideas that you provide will be treated in the strictest confidence if they are included in a publication or presentation.

Appendix II

Teacher Engagement Questionnaire

This project aims to explore and define the relationship between leadership dispositions and both student and teacher engagement. By understanding how leadership dispositions may impact the level of student and teacher engagement, educational leaders can better understand how to create environments that enhance not only student learning but also improve teacher satisfaction and retention.

There are 44 statements in the questionnaire. Please circle the appropriate number beside each statement according to your level of agreement or disagreement. The Likert scale is from 1 to 5, where 1 represents 'Strongly Disagree' and 5 represents 'Strongly Agree'. If you strongly agree with a statement, circle 5; if you strongly disagree, circle 1. Use the numbers in between to indicate varying degrees of agreement or disagreement.

	Statments	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
Emotional Engagement (EE)						
1	I enjoy teaching greatly.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I feel enthusiastic about teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I am delighted while teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
4	Teaching is interesting for me.	1	2	3	4	5
5	While teaching, I am full of energy.	1	2	3	4	5
6	When I am teaching, time passes very	1	2	3	4	5

	quickly.					
7	I cannot disconnect myself from teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I am captivated by teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I always keep going even when things do not go well with teaching in my class.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I am satisfied with being a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I feel vigorous while teaching.					
12	I evaluate whether I have met the goals that I have set.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I initiate purposeful teaching-related actions in my class.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I respond anticipatorily to the emerging ambiguities and dilemmas in my class.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I try to critically form my responses to challenging situations in my class.	1	2	3	4	5
16	I search for innovative ideas to employ in my class.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I monitor my student's progress in class and provide them with my feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
18	I rely on my personal and professional experiences to deal with challenging situations in my class.	1	2	3	4	5
Social Engagement: Colleagues (SEC)						
19	I appreciate my relationships with my colleagues at institute.	1	2	3	4	5
20	I provide assistance to my colleagues at institute.	1	2	3	4	5
21	I pay attention to my colleagues' problems at institute.	1	2	3	4	5
22	I try to interact with my colleagues at institute.	1	2	3	4	5
23	At institute, I collaborate with my colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
Social Engagement: Students (SES)						
24	I take into account my students' problems in class.	1	2	3	4	5
25	I display an appreciation of my students' feelings in class.	1	2	3	4	5
26	I pay attention to my students' feelings in class.	1	2	3	4	5
27	In class, I establish rapport with my students.	1	2	3	4	5
28	In class, I am aware of my students' needs.	1	2	3	4	5

29	In class, I respect my students.	1	2	3	4	5
30	I facilitate discourse with my students and their parents.	1	2	3	4	5
31	I have a positive attitude toward my students.	1	2	3	4	5
Cognitive Engagement (CE)						
32	I work meticulously while teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
33	I devote myself while teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
34	I work vehemently while teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
35	I exert myself to do well while teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
36	While teaching, I put aside everything else.	1	2	3	4	5
37	I am resilient while teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
38	Teaching is meaningful and significant for me.	1	2	3	4	5
39	I reflect actively on my teaching practices and behaviors in class.	1	2	3	4	5
Agentic Engagement (EA)						
40	I enact the required changes in my teaching context.	1	2	3	4	5
41	I make creative choices to make influential differences in my teaching practice.	1	2	3	4	5
42	I take principled actions to deal with problems in my class.	1	2	3	4	5
43	I take advantage of available resources to promote my teaching quality.	1	2	3	4	5
44	I make responsible robust judgments about the value of my intention while taking action in my class.	1	2	3	4	5

Remark. Ghamoushi et al. (2022, pp. 159-161) identify different types of engagement that teachers experience in their professional roles, with a) emotional engagement (EE) referring to the level of emotional involvement teachers have while performing their teaching duties; (b) social engagement with colleagues (SEC) involving the relationships teachers have with their peers; (c) social engagement with students (SES) focusing on the interactions teachers have with their students; (d) cognitive engagement (CE) related to the amount of attention and effort teachers put into their teaching tasks; and (e) agentic engagement (AE) describing teachers' efforts to make planned decisions and choices to bring about meaningful changes in their teaching practices.

Note. Adapted from "Developing and validating a potential evaluation inventory to assess EFL teachers' engagement" by Ghamoushi, M., Zenouzagh, Z. M., and Hashamdar, M., 2022, *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances*, 10(2), 168-170.

Appendix III

Student Engagement Questionnaire

This project aims to explore and define the relationship between leadership dispositions and student engagement. By understanding how leadership dispositions may impact the level of student engagement, we can better understand how to create environments that enhance your learning.

There are 22 statements in the questionnaire. Please circle the appropriate number beside each statement according to your level of agreement or disagreement. The Likert scale is from 1 to 5, where 1 represents 'Strongly Disagree' and 5 represents 'Strongly Agree'. If you strongly agree with a statement, circle 5; if you strongly disagree, circle 1. Use the numbers in between to indicate varying degrees of agreement or disagreement.

	Statements	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
Behavioral Engagement (BE)						
1	I pay attention in class.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I follow school rules.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I usually do my homework on time.	1	2	3	4	5
4	When I have doubts, I ask questions and participate in debates in class.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I usually participate actively in group assignments.	1	2	3	4	5
Cognitive Engagement (CE)						
6	When I read a book, I ask myself questions to make sure I understand the subject I am reading about.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I talk to people outside of school on matters I learned in class.	1	2	3	4	5
8	If I do not understand the meaning of a word, I try to solve the problem, for example, by consulting a dictionary or asking someone else.	1	2	3	4	5
9	If I do not understand something I read and read it again.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I try to use the acquired knowledge in solving new problems.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I try to integrate subjects from different disciplines into my general knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I check my homework for errors.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I read other books or materials to learn more about the subjects we discuss in class.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I review my notes/materials after class.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I study at home even when I do not have assessment tests.	1	2	3	4	5
16	I try different means to explore topics learned in class (e.g. TV, YouTube videos, self-	1	2	3	4	5

	access work).					
Emotional Engagement (EE)						
17	I do not feel very accomplished at this school.	1	2	3	4	5
18	I feel excited about school work.	1	2	3	4	5
19	I like being at school.	1	2	3	4	5
20	I am interested in school work.	1	2	3	4	5
21	My classroom is an interesting place to be.	1	2	3	4	5
22	I discuss with my classmates the possible ways to improve our coursework/school.	1	2	3	4	5

Remark: According to Maroco et al. (2016) “Cognitive engagement is defined as the students’ investment and willingness to exert the necessary efforts for the comprehension and mastering of complex ideas and difficult skills. emotional engagement dimension reflects both the positive and negative reactions to teachers’ instructions, classmates and school, perceptions of school belonging, and beliefs about the value of schooling. behavioural engagement is defined in terms of student’s participation in classroom tasks, conduct, and participation in school-related extracurricular activities” (p. 2).

Note. Adapted from “University student’s engagement: development of the University Student Engagement Inventory (USEI)” by Maroco, J., Maroco, A. L., Campos, J. A. D. B., and Fredricks, J. A., 2016, *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 29(21), 5-8.

Appendix IV Interview Questions

1. Based on the responses provided in the questionnaire, it appears that your engagement level is notably high. Could you share with me a brief explanation of the factors contributing to this elevated level of engagement?
2. What is your assessment of the roles of the Centre Director and the senior management on your level of engagement with students and fellow educators (for teacher participants)/your study (for student participants)?
3. Please tell your interactions with educational leaders within your organization, assessing their effectiveness and the reasons behind your assessment?
4. Which specific leadership dispositions do you consider crucial for engaging students and teachers? Are there noticeable similarities or differences in the dispositions for engaging these two groups?
5. This is a table displaying the correlation coefficients for leadership dispositions in terms of interrater reliability. Do you agree that these are the most desirable attributes in educational leaders? Please select three of these dispositions to discuss based on your personal experiences.
6. Would you be able to rank the top five most preferred leadership dispositions?
7. Are there any additional dispositions that you believe should be included?
8. Are there any questions or comments that you would like to share regarding the table?
9. How do you believe negative leadership dispositions impact student and teacher engagement? Please give examples to support your explanation.
10. What recommendations would you propose to enhance leadership dispositions?