



A Thailand-based Comparative Study of Government and Private School Teachers' Perceptions of School Heads' Level of Instructional Leadership

Rhia Monica G. Nolasco ^a and Frederick Edward T. Fabella ^{b*}

^a Far Eastern University, Manila, Philippines.

^b FEU Roosevelt, Cainta, Rizal, Philippines.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJESS/2023/v49i21112

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/107591>

Original Research Article

Received: 01/08/2023

Accepted: 05/10/2023

Published: 09/10/2023

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the differences in perception of Filipino teachers employed in government and private school teachers based in Thailand of the instructional leadership of their respective school heads. 65 Filipino teachers volunteered to be the respondents of this study. Thirty-two (32) were teachers in government schools while thirty-three (33) were private school teachers. The Instructional Leadership Questionnaire (ILQ), which measures the respondent's perception of a school leader's 7 domains of instructional leadership, namely: Instructional Resource Provider (7 items), Maintain Visible Presence (6 items), Professional Development (7 items), Maximize Instructional Time (6 items), Monitoring Students' Progress (4 items), Feedback on Teaching Learning (5 items) and Curriculum Implementation (5 items) was administered on the respondents. In terms of instructional resource provider and curriculum implementation, similar scores were obtained by government and private school teachers. However, the private school teachers had

*Corresponding author: Email: erickfabella@yahoo.com;

higher ratings for their respective school leaders in the domains of Maintain Visible Presence, Professional Development, Maximize Instructional Time, Monitoring Students' Progress and Feedback on Teaching Learning. Statistically significant differences were established in the domains Professional Development and Monitoring Students' Progress. In both these domains, the means of the private school teachers were higher than those of the government teachers.

Keywords: Instructional leadership; filipino teachers; Thailand; English; education.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Thailand

“Thailand has developed socially and economically in an impressive way over the past forty years, going from a low-income to an upper middle-income nation in less than a generation. As a result of its prolonged high growth and impressive reduction in poverty, Thailand has received considerable attention as a development success story. Following the Asian Financial Crisis, Thailand's economy expanded at an average annual rate of 5% from 1999 to 2005 compared to 7.5% during the boom years of 1960 to 1996. Millions of jobs were produced by this growth, which enabled millions of people to escape poverty. Thailand has reduced poverty significantly, from 58% in 1990 to 6.8% in 2020, due to high growth rates and structural change. The COVID-19 pandemic, however, has hurt the economy and made the fundamental problems worse. The economy is predicted to have shrunk by 6.1% in 2020” [1].

1.2 Beginnings of Education in Thailand

“One of the few nations in the world that has never experienced colonization by Western nations is Thailand. As a result, the native education system has grown with a strong emphasis on Thai culture and values. However, in the early 19th century, Thailand began to modernize its educational system by incorporating aspects of Western educational methods. Thai language, mathematics, science, social studies, religion and culture, health and physical education, arts, careers and technology, and foreign languages make up the eight basic courses of Thailand's national curriculum” [2].

1.3 Current State of Thai Education

“Preschool education is available as an option in Thailand starting at age three. Primary level compulsory education begins at age six. Lower secondary and upper secondary schooling are both required till the age of fifteen. Six years of

primary school and three years of lower secondary school make up the nine-year basic education. The Thai academic year typically runs from May to March. More than 20 million students attend more than 30,000 educational institutions in Thailand. There are about 45,000 pre-primary institutions. Additionally, there are more than 30,000 elementary and lower secondary schools, but more than 2,600 upper secondary schools. Thailand is home to 170 foreign institutions, including international preschools and international schools. All around Thailand, there are 66,700 kids registered in international schools. Bangkok, the Thai capital, is home to over 100 international schools. The British Curriculum is offered in more than half of Thailand's international schools. Moreover, well-liked curricula are the American and International Baccalaureate curricula. There are additionally foreign language schools that offer Swiss, German, and French curricula” [2].

“Basic, vocational, and higher education are all under the direction of Thailand's national Ministry of Education (MOE). The majority of Thailand's public (and private) educational establishments are likewise governed by the MOE. The main issue with education in Thailand is the disparity between urban and rural educational options. According to research, this inequality has made it impossible to improve Thailand's educational system as a whole. Along with falling short of international and neighboring nation norms, student performance in Thai language, science, math, and English has also declined. Another issue with education in Thailand is the teaching system, which is plagued by shoddy progress monitoring, overcrowded classrooms, and a lack of seriousness in imparting knowledge” [2].

Thailand implemented educational reforms to become more learner-centric in 2001 and 2008. ICT has become more of a focus in the education sector as a result of this new strategy and the nation's push for digital transformation through the Thailand 4.0 program. Massive open online course systems (MOOCs) have been used to introduce e-learning systems in tertiary degree

programs, enabling students to access course materials at their own convenience. In an effort to keep up with the worldwide pace of educational technology, the nation placed a strong emphasis on e-learning. The government spent over 455.9 billion Thai baht on education in 2022. This was less than the prior year's total, which was almost 478.4 billion Thai baht. The progressive decline in education finance as a percentage of the nation's GDP demonstrates how government spending on education has fallen in recent years relative to other categories of spending [3].

1.4 Challenges of Thai Education

“Children confront significant obstacles to future career, earning potential, and dream fulfillment without access to high-quality education. They are less likely to engage in decisions that impact them and more likely to experience negative health consequences, which endangers their ability to influence society and themselves for the better. Access to education has greatly improved over the last ten years, and elementary school enrollment is now practically universal. At the secondary level, where enrollment in lower and upper secondary schools is 86 and 69 percent respectively, disparities are more pronounced. Children living with a disability, immigrants, or members of underprivileged communities make up the majority of those who are not in school” [4].

“International and national examinations show that basic literacy and numeracy skills are poor in the early grades, and math and science test scores plateau in the lower secondary level. The socioeconomic position of the student and whether Thai is spoken at home have a significant impact on their academic success. Rural students who attend schools with little resources are likewise less likely to succeed” [4].

1.5 COVID-19 and Thai Education

“Many students experience difficulties at school with regard to safety, inclusion, child engagement, and emotional health, which makes them feel disengaged and has an impact on their learning, attendance, and confidence. Additionally, nearly 13 million children and teenagers have lost learning time as because of school closures as a result of the lockdowns during the COVID-19 pandemic. Distance learning has become extremely difficult for many due to the prevalence of poor home internet access” [4].

1.6 Collaboration between Thailand and Philippines

“During a side meeting in October 2018 at the 10th ASEAN Education Ministers Meeting in Myanmar, the Philippine Education Secretary revealed that the inter-agency meeting on the proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on the government-to-government hiring of Filipino teachers was started by Thailand's Minister of Education. Filipino teachers are regarded as conscientious and fit in well with Thai culture. To improve the English proficiency of the youngsters in that region, she stated that they want to hire Filipino teachers to be deployed in the Eastern Economic Corridor (EEC) government schools, which are the three provinces on the eastern side of Bangkok” [5].

1.7 Filipinos Teaching English in Thailand

In Thailand, where English has been taught for years in schools, few locals are fluent in speaking it or understanding it. As a result, Filipinos are highly valued for their superior English language abilities in Thailand. Because they can make reasonably good money and transfer some of it home to support their families, many Filipinos choose to work in Thailand. The Philippine embassy in Bangkok estimates that 18,000 Filipinos work in Thailand, with many of them employed as teachers, nurses, or salespeople in businesses. About 3,000 foreign instructors, the majority of whom are Catholics from the Philippines and were previously teachers in Thailand, have been welcomed back when the limitations were eased as a result of the COVID-19 epidemic drop [6].

1.8 The Role of Instructional Leadership in Educational Improvement

One of the ways by which educational difficulties may be addressed, such as those Thai schools face, is by adopting instructional leadership. To increase the standard of instruction and learning, the departmental head (in a school context, the principal) and teachers must engage effectively. This is how the instructional leadership framework was created. One definition of instructional leadership is "a strong, directive leadership that directly addresses curriculum and instructional practices." It is thought that instructional leaders are responsible for the institution's effectiveness, particularly in terms of teaching and learning. The model, which has three primary elements (identifying mission,

managing instructional programs, and fostering a good culture), is extensively utilized due to its high validity and reliability [7].

The phrase "instructional leadership" has become part of the worldwide lexicon of educational leadership and management, leaving behind an enduring legacy of the effective schools' movement. In the first decade of the twenty-first century, the interest in instructional leadership that initially emerged in the United States in the 1980s has been reborn as "leadership for learning," a global phenomenon [8].

Leadership that promotes the advancement of teaching and learning is known as instructional leadership. Pedagogical leadership, learning-centered leadership, leadership for learning, and student-centered leadership are some of the labels used to describe it. It is closely related to the effort to enhance student learning. The enhancement of instruction serves as the driving force behind instructional leadership. It consists of: A commitment to learning, establishing learning objectives, having high expectations for students, establishing and promoting student learning goals, keeping track of students' progress, protecting instructional time, coordinating the curriculum, offering support for instruction, and encouraging teacher growth [9].

1.9 Benefits of Instructional Leadership

"The best kind of leadership practice for enhancing student learning outcomes is instructional leadership. The strongest impact on student learning has been shown to be via instructional leadership, according to syntheses of international studies on educational leadership. Numerous sizable international studies have demonstrated that, even after adjusting for other factors including the backdrop of the school and student demographics, principal instructional leadership still significantly contributes to variation in student accomplishment. Additionally, these meta-analyses that contrast various leadership styles reveal that instructional leadership is the best at raising student accomplishment in a variety of academic settings and levels" [9].

One study emphasizes the significance of leaders being lifelong learners, the ramifications for leadership development, and the significance of establishing and maintaining specific

organizational environments that support instructional leadership. It also claims that with the increased focus on organizational learning, instructional leadership is becoming more important [10].

"A study examined the role of primary school principals in instructional leadership (IL) from the perspective of principals in South Africa and their knowledge of IL within their specific educational setting. The findings indicated that most principals had a tough time juggling their administrative and teaching obligations. The study was done by conducting semi-structured interviews with six school principals. However, the bulk of the principals showed creative ways to deal with problems that prevented them from being leaders while they were learners. They were all still stuck in the middle of the old and new paradigms of instructional leadership, but they are aware of the positive effects that instructional leadership can have, even in small doses, on the development of learning communities and the professional growth of teachers, students, and themselves" [11].

"The same study demonstrates how instructional leaders have stepped into the traditional manager position of principals. IL took different forms for each of the principals, but it all continued to develop into shared instructional leadership and leader as learner. The principals needed to focus on being smart about using shared instructional leadership in order to advance their fundamental responsibility of encouraging excellent teaching and learning. The study has demonstrated that the fundamental goal of instructional leadership is to change the organization of the school such that both teachers and students can flourish" [11].

A rising corpus of international research indicates that the principal's instructional leadership is crucial for enhancing teaching and learning in classrooms. But instructional leadership is still poorly understood and outside of the principal's primary responsibilities in many parts of the world. Therefore, the idea that principals will serve as instructional leaders is a significant departure from conventional practice in many countries. In Thailand, where education reforms introduced in 1999 intended to alter modal approaches to teaching and learning as well as school administration, A study investigated the principal's evolving position as an instructional leader [12].

1.10 Instructional Leadership in Thailand

In order to evaluate changes in principal practice, the same study used surveys of principal instructional leadership taken both before and after Thailand's National Education Act 1999 was adopted. The findings imply that, in spite of new system requirements that principals serve as instructional leaders, the principal orientation in Thailand is substantially intact. The study recommends taking more deliberate, systematic approaches to assist principals in adapting to this change in their role [12].

A study in Thailand set out to develop and assess the reliability of the Influential Model of Instructional Leadership Affecting Students' Achievement in Small-Sized Secondary Schools. As a database for the analysis, school units were used in the research. 245 small-sized secondary schools from 6 areas of Thailand were included in the sample. The administrators of each school, 6 instructors chosen from each secondary grade, and 18 students chosen from each secondary grade made up each school's responses [13].

The same study which utilized structural equation modeling produced the following findings: 1) Instructional leadership of school administrators affects students' achievement indirectly and favorably by acting as mediators between classroom instruction, school atmosphere, and student trust, 2) Students' trust has the most direct and positive influence on students' achievement, followed by classroom instruction, while the school climate has a direct and negative impact on student achievement 3) Students' trust has the most direct and positive influence on students' achievement, followed by classroom instruction. The school climate, on the other hand, will directly and favorably impact student achievement if the relationship is mediated by classroom instruction [13].

1.11 The Need for Further Study on Instructional Leadership in Thailand

In view of the foregoing, it is evident that there is a scarcity of studies conducted in Thailand on whether or not instructional leadership is being knowingly and effectively implemented. The practice of instructional leadership or its lack thereof could impact the performance of Filipino teachers working in both government and private schools in Thailand. It is for these reasons that this study was undertaken.

Specifically, this study sought to address the following research questions:

1. What is the profile of the government and private teacher-respondents with respect to
 - 1.1 Sex;
 - 1.2 Age;
 - 1.3 Marital status;
 - 1.4 School level taught;
 - 1.5 Years of teaching experience; and
 - 1.6 Academic background?

2. What are the levels of perception of the government and private teacher-respondents of the instructional leadership of their respective school heads with respect to:
 - 2.1 Instructional Resource Provider;
 - 2.2 Maintain Visible Presence;
 - 2.3 Professional Development;
 - 2.4 Maximize Instructional Time;
 - 2.5 Monitoring Students' Progress;
 - 2.6 Feedback on Teaching Learning; and
 - 2.7 Curriculum Implementation?

3. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of government and private teacher-respondents of their respective school heads with respect to:
 - 3.1 Instructional Resource Provider;
 - 3.2 Maintain Visible Presence;
 - 3.3 Professional Development;
 - 3.4 Maximize Instructional Time;
 - 3.5 Monitoring Students' Progress;
 - 3.6 Feedback on Teaching Learning; and
 - 3.7 Curriculum Implementation?

2. METHODOLOGY

Through convenience sampling, 65 Filipino teachers based in Thailand volunteered to be the respondents of this study. Thirty-two (32) were teachers in government schools while thirty-three (33) were private school teachers.

2.1 The Respondents

There were 8 male and 24 female government school teachers and 6 male and 27 female private school teachers. The government school respondents' ages ranged between 25 to 44 with a mean age of 35.47 while the private school respondents' ages ranged between 23 to 59 with

a mean age of 37.55. There were 17 single, 11 married and 4 separated government school respondents. On the other hand, there 16 single, 14 married and 3 separated private school respondents. For the government school respondents, 3 taught in nursery, 13 taught in elementary, 6 taught in high school, 4 taught in senior high school and 6 taught in college. As for the private school respondents, 1 taught in nursery, 5 taught in kindergarten, 20 taught in elementary, 3 taught in high school, 2 taught in senior high school and 2 taught in college. With respect to academic backgrounds, for the government school respondents, 14 had bachelor's degrees only, 10 had master's units, 4 had master's degrees and 3 had doctorate units. As for the private respondents, 10 had bachelor's degrees only, 10 had master's units, 8 had master's degrees and 5 had doctorate units. More private school respondents had a greater length of teaching experience, some of them having taught over 21 years.

2.2 The Instrument

Permission was obtained from the authors of the Instructional Leadership Questionnaire (ILQ) to use the same, which is a 40-item, 5-point Likert scale instrument that measures the respondent's perception of a school leader's 7 domains of instructional leadership, namely: Instructional Resource Provider (7 items), Maintain Visible Presence (6 items), Professional Development (7 items), Maximize Instructional Time (6 items), Monitoring Students' Progress (4 items), Feedback on Teaching Learning (5 items) and Curriculum Implementation (5 items). The

instrument's creators discovered that the alpha dependability of the seven dimensions ranged from 0.78 to 0.87 and that the overall internal consistency of the 40 items was 0.95. Their findings revealed preliminary evidence of the instructional leadership questionnaire's validity and reliability for usage in educational contexts [14].

3. RESULTS

The following tables present the data collected and the statistical treatments applied on the same.

Table 3 shows the item weighted means of the ILQ responses by the respondents from both government and private schools in the domain of Instructional Resource Provider. The private school respondents have a higher total item weighted mean than the government school respondents.

Table 4 presents the item weighted means of the ILQ responses by the respondents from both government and private schools in the domain of Maintain Visible Presence. The private school respondents produced a higher total item weighted mean than the government school respondents.

Table 5 shows the item weighted means of the ILQ responses by the respondents from both government and private schools in the domain of Professional Development. The private school respondents have a higher total item weighted mean than the government school respondents.

Table 1. The domains of Instructional Leadership Questionnaire (ILQ)

Domains	Number of Items	Item numbers
1 Instructional Resource Provider	7	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,7
2 Maintain Visible Presence	6	8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
3 Professional Development	7	14,15,16,17,18,19, 20
4 Maximize Instructional Time	6	21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26
5 Monitoring Students' Progress	4	27, 28, 29, 30
6 Feedback on Teaching Learning	5	31, 32, 33, 34, 35
7 Curriculum Implementation	5	36, 37, 38, 39, 40

Table 2. Scale of interpretation for item weighted means of the responses to the ILQ

Range	Verbal Interpretation
1.000 – 1.800	Never
1.801 – 2.600	Rarely
2.601 – 3.400	Sometimes
3.401 – 4.200	Often
4.201 – 5.000	Always

Table 3. ILQ - Instructional resource provider

Item	Government Itemweighted mean N=32	Verbal Interpretation	Private Itemweighted mean N=33	Verbal Interpretation
1. Encourage teachers to use instructional materials freely.	4.375	Always	4.121	Often
2. Organize and deliver the instructional materials to teachers.	3.313	Sometimes	3.606	Often
3. Students have sufficient access to the instructional materials.	3.750	Often	4.212	Always
4. Teachers have sufficient access to instructional material.	3.781	Often	4.090	Often
5. Recommend resources in areas in which teachers need.	3.219	Sometimes	3.939	Often
6. Guide teachers in using instructional resources.	3.375	Sometimes	3.697	Often
7. Take feedback on availability of the instructional resources.	2.969	Sometimes	3.606	Often
Total Item Weighted Mean	3.540	Often	3.896	Often

Table 4. ILQ - Maintain visible presence

Item	Government Item weighted mean N=32	Verbal Interpretation	Private Item weighted mean N=33	Verbal Interpretation
8. Visit classes regularly to observe teaching and learning.	2.500	Rarely	3.333	Sometimes
9. Physically available for instructional issues.	3.063	Sometimes	3.667	Often
10. Personally attend co-curricular activities of the school.	4.094	Often	4.000	Often
11. Conduct meetings to discuss instructional matters.	3.031	Sometimes	3.667	Often
12. Discuss with teachers the matters related to the instruction.	3.375	Sometimes	3.545	Often
13. Visibly present in school for teachers and students.	3.906	Often	4.364	Always
Total Item Weighted Mean	3.328	Sometimes	3.76	Often

Table 6 presents the item weighted means of the ILQ responses by the respondents from both government and private schools in the domain of Maximize Instructional Time. The private school respondents produced a higher total item weighted mean than the government school respondents.

Table 7 shows the item weighted means of the ILQ responses by the respondents from both government and private schools in the domain of Monitoring Students' Progress. The private school respondents have a higher total item weighted mean than the government school respondents.

Table 8 presents the item weighted means of the ILQ responses by the respondents from both government and private schools in the domain of Feedback on Teaching Learning. The private school respondents produced a higher total item weighted mean than the government school respondents.

Table 9 shows the item weighted means of the ILQ responses by the respondents from both government and private schools in the domain of Curriculum Implementation. The private school respondents have a higher total item weighted mean than the government school respondents.

Table 5. ILQ - Professional development

Item	Government Item weighted mean N=32	Verbal Interpretation	Private Item weighted mean N=33	Verbal Interpretation
14. Available for teachers' professional development.	3.281	Sometimes	3.909	Often
15. Plan faculty meetings for professional development.	2.969	Sometimes	3.364	Sometimes
16. Arrange teachers' meetings to help them grow professionally.	2.750	Sometimes	3.394	Sometimes
17. Develop follow up plans for assessing professional development.	2.844	Sometimes	3.424	Often
18. Encourage teachers to take steps to solve instructional issues.	3.094	Sometimes	3.758	Often
19. Encourage teachers to improve their classroom practices.	3.094	Sometimes	3.788	Often
20. Plan professional development opportunities according to needs.	2.969	Sometimes	3.485	Often
Total Item Weighted Mean	3.000	Sometimes	3.589	Often

Table 6. ILQ - Maximize instructional time

Item	Government Item weighted mean N=32	Verbal Interpretation	Private Item weighted mean N=33	Verbal Interpretation
21. Ensure that all students are present in the class during class time.	3.281	Sometimes	4.030	Often
22. Protect classroom instructional time from outside interruptions.	3.313	Sometimes	3.879	Often
23. Encourage all teachers to come to class well-prepared and in time.	3.406	Often	4.000	Often
24. Use class time of teachers for regular meetings.	2.375	Sometimes	2.485	Rarely
25. Make sure that students are not allowed to go to the office during class.	3.031	Sometimes	3.424	Often
26. Solve issues related to discipline to maximize instructional time.	3.156	Sometimes	3.606	Often
Total Item Weighted Mean	3.093	Sometimes	3.571	Often

With respect to the domain of Instructional Resource Provider, the Welch's T-test computation results in Table 10 indicates that no significant difference exists between government and private school respondents.

Regarding the domain of Maintaining Visible Presence, the Welch's T-test computation results in Table 11 shows that no significant difference exists between government and private school respondents.

With respect to the domain of Professional Development, the Welch's T-test computation

results in Table 12 indicates that there is a significant difference between government and private school respondents. And because the mean of the private school respondents is higher, their perception of this domain is significantly higher than that of the government school respondents.

Regarding the domain of Maximizing Instructional Time, the Welch's T-test computation results in Table 13 shows that no significant difference exists between government and private school respondents.

Table 7. ILQ - Monitoring students' progress

Item	Government Itemweighted mean N=32	Verbal Interpretation	Private Itemweighted mean N=33	Verbal Interpretation
27. Meet teachers individually to discuss student progress issues.	2.469	Rarely	3.273	Sometimes
28. Discuss students' results with teachers for curricular strengths.	2.625	Sometimes	3.576	Often
29. Review students' work when evaluating classroom instruction.	2.813	Sometimes	3.667	Often
30. Ask the teachers to send the students' progress reports to parents.	2.750	Sometimes	3.606	Often
Total Item Weighted Mean	2.664	Sometimes	3.530	Often

Table 8. ILQ - Feedback on teaching learning

Item	Government Item weighted mean N=32	Verbal Interpretation	Private Item weighted mean N=33	Verbal Interpretation
31. Provide public praise to those teachers who perform well.	2.844	Sometimes	3.455	Often
32. Reinforce the teachers in staff meetings/newsletters/ memos.	2.938	Sometimes	3.485	Often
33. Praise outstanding students on their achievement publicly.	3.875	Often	4.000	Often
34. Communicate students' performance in parent teacher meetings.	3.406	Often	3.606	Often
35. Provide verbal and written feedback to teachers.	2.906	Sometimes	3.455	Often
Total Item Weighted Mean	3.194	Sometimes	3.600	Often

Table 9. ILQ - Curriculum implementation

Item	Government Item weighted mean N=32	Verbal Interpretation	Private Item weighted mean N=33	Verbal Interpretation
36. Ensure that teachers teach the required curriculum.	3.719	Often	3.909	Often
37. Encourage a lesson plan for making the curriculum effective.	3.469	Often	3.636	Often
38. Encourage teachers to engage their students in activities.	3.844	Often	4.061	Often
39. Meet teachers to get reports about curriculum implementation.	3.000	Sometimes	3.424	Often
40. Students' marks provide info about curriculum implementation.	3.563	Often	3.576	Often
Total Item Weighted Mean	3.519	Often	3.721	Often

Table 10. Comparison of perceptions on school head as instructional resource provider

Welch's T-test computation		
Group	Private	Government
Mean	3.89610389606	3.54017857141
SD	0.97236871994	0.65889805171
SEM	0.16926766749	0.11647782012
N	33	32
Intermediate values used in calculations:		
t = 1.7322		
df = 56		
standard error of difference = 0.205		
P value and statistical significance:		
The two-tailed P value equals 0.0887		
By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not quite statistically significant.		
Confidence interval:		
The mean of Private minus Government equals 0.35592532465		
95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.05568406116 to 0.76753471047		

Table 11. Comparison of perceptions on school head in maintaining visible presence

Welch's T-test computation		
Group	Private	Government
Mean	3.76262626258	3.32812500006
SD	1.05658509071	0.71652833749
SEM	0.18392785591	0.12666551159
N	33	32
Intermediate values used in calculations:		
t = 1.9456		
df = 56		
standard error of difference = 0.223		
P value and statistical significance:		
The two-tailed P value equals 0.0567		
By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not quite statistically significant.		
Confidence interval:		
The mean of Private minus Government equals 0.43450126251		
95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.01287054920 to 0.88187307422		

With respect to the domain of Monitoring Students' Progress, the Welch's T-test computation results in Table 14 indicates that there is a very significant difference between government and private school respondents. And because the mean of the private school respondents is higher, their perception of this domain is very significantly higher than that of the government school respondents.

Regarding the domain of Feedback on Teaching Learning, the Welch's T-test computation results in Table 15 shows that no significant difference exists between government and private school respondents.

With respect to the domain of Curriculum Implementation, the Welch's T-test computation results in Table 16 indicates that no significant

difference exists between government and private school respondents.

4. DISCUSSION

It can be seen in Table 1 that there are more females than males among those employed in private schools. The age range among private school teachers is wider and have a higher mean age than those in government schools. Most school teachers are single for both government and private school teachers. There are more private school teachers handling elementary and kindergarten. On the other hand, there are more teachers handling high school, senior high school and college students among government teachers. There are more private school teachers who have had over 10 years of teaching experience than government teachers. Finally,

more private school teachers have acquired doctorate units and master's degrees than government teachers.

provider and curriculum implementation received similar total item weighted means with overall ratings of *often*.

Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 present the item and total weighted means of the perceptions of government and private school teachers' perception of their respective school leaders' instructional leadership with respect to Instructional Resource Provider, Maintaining Visible Presence, Maximizing Instructional Time, Feedback on Teaching Learning and Curriculum Implementation.

However, in terms of their perception of respective school leaders' behavior of maintaining a visible presence, promotion of personnel professional development, promotion of maximizing instructional time, behavior of monitoring students' progress and behavior of giving feedback on teaching and learning, the private school teachers produced higher total weighted means with verbal interpretations of *often* while the government teachers produced total weighted means with verbal interpretations of *sometimes*.

For both government and private school teachers, the domains of instructional resource

Table 12. Comparison of perceptions on school head as promoter of professional development

Welch's T-test computation		
Group	Private	Government
Mean	3.58874458870	3.00000000000
SD	1.34333083201	0.97837042569
SEM	0.23384388241	0.17295309063
N	33	32
Intermediate values used in calculations:		
t = 2.0242		
df = 58		
standard error of difference = 0.291		
P value and statistical significance:		
The two-tailed P value equals 0.0476		
By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be statistically significant.		
Confidence interval:		
The mean of Private minus Government equals 0.58874458870		
95% confidence interval of this difference: From 0.00653821182 to 1.17095096557		

Table 13. Comparison of perceptions on school head in maximizing instructional time

Welch's T-test computation		
Group	Private	Government
Mean	3.57070707079	3.09374999997
SD	1.07853931485	0.92062926507
SEM	0.18774959578	0.16274579907
N	33	32
Intermediate values used in calculations:		
t = 1.9196		
df = 62		
standard error of difference = 0.248		
P value and statistical significance:		
The two-tailed P value equals 0.0595		
By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not quite statistically significant.		
Confidence interval:		
The mean of Private minus Government equals 0.47695707082		
95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.01972257663 to 0.97363671827		

Table 14. Comparison of perceptions on school head in monitoring students' progress

Welch's T-test computation		
Group	Private	Government
Mean	3.5303	2.6641
SD	1.3077	1.2241
SEM	0.2276	0.2164
N	33	32
Intermediate values used in calculations:		
t = 2.7581		
df = 62		
standard error of difference = 0.314		
P value and statistical significance:		
The two-tailed P value equals 0.0076		
By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be very statistically significant.		
Confidence interval:		
The mean of Private minus Government equals 0.8662		
95% confidence interval of this difference: From 0.2384 to 1.4941		

Table 15. Comparison of perceptions on school head in giving feedback on teaching learning

Welch's T-test computation		
Group	Private	Government
Mean	3.600	3.194
SD	1.307	0.948
SEM	0.227	0.168
N	33	32
Intermediate values used in calculations:		
t = 1.4377		
df = 58		
standard error of difference = 0.283		
P value and statistical significance:		
The two-tailed P value equals 0.1559		
By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not statistically significant.		
Confidence interval:		
The mean of Private minus Government equals 0.406		
95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.159 to 0.972		

Table 16. Comparison of perceptions on school head in curriculum implementation

Welch's T-test computation		
Group	Private	Government
Mean	3.721	3.519
SD	1.277	0.974
SEM	0.222	0.172
N	33	32
Intermediate values used in calculations:		
t = 0.7201		
df = 59		
standard error of difference = 0.281		
P value and statistical significance:		
The two-tailed P value equals 0.4743		
By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not statistically significant.		
Confidence interval:		
The mean of Private minus Government equals 0.202		
95% confidence interval of this difference: From -0.360 to 0.765		

Tables 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 show the Welch's T-test computations between the perceptions of government and private school teachers of their respective school leaders in terms of the 7 domains of instructional leadership. No significant differences were found between the perceptions of government and private school teachers of their perception of their respective school leaders with respect to Instructional Resource Provider, Maintaining Visible Presence, Maximizing Instructional Time, Feedback on Teaching Learning and Curriculum Implementation. However, statistically significant differences were found in the domains of Professional Development and Monitoring Students' Progress. In both these domains where significant differences were found, the means of the private school teachers were higher than those of the government teachers.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, it would appear that instructional leadership is more evident and felt by Filipino teachers working in Thai private schools.

Except for the respondents' perceptions of their respective school leaders' in terms of instructional resource provider and curriculum implementation, wherein similar scores were obtained by government and private school teachers using the ILQ, the private school teachers had higher ratings for their respective school leaders in the domains of Maintain Visible Presence, Professional Development, Maximize Instructional Time, Monitoring Students' Progress and Feedback on Teaching Learning.

Nevertheless, it was only in the domains Professional Development and Monitoring Students' Progress where statistically significant differences were established. And in both these domains, the means of the private school teachers were higher than those of the government teachers.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study provide a glimpse of the potential differences in the instructional leadership exhibited by government and private school heads. But because this study is limited by the sampling method and the sample sizes, a similar research of a more comprehensive and broader scale is recommended, which could provide a concrete basis for enhancement for the

educational institutions found to be in need of further improvement for the welfare of the teachers, the students and the educational system as a whole.

CONSENT AND ETHICAL APPROVAL

The researchers declare that this study strictly adhered to the ethics of research. Informed consent was obtained, freedom to withdraw at any time from the study was made known to the participants, their identities were anonymized, the participants were not exposed to any physical, psychological or social harm and the results were used for research purposes only. The researchers further ensured steps to prevent bias in the interpretation of the data. This research was self-funded and there was no conflict of interest in the conduct of the study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to express their deepest gratitude to the respondents of this study and to the authors of the Instructional Leadership Questionnaire (ILQ).

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Thailand Overview: Development news, research data [Internet]. 2023. Available: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/thailand/overview>
2. School education system in Thailand [Internet]. Education Destination Asia; 2023. Available: <https://educationdestinationasia.com/essential-guide/thailand/thailand-education-system> Accessed on 2023 Sept 29.
3. Thailand: Government spending on education [Internet]. Statista Research; 2022. Available: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1125601/thailand-government-spending-education/>
4. Education [Internet]. Available: <https://www.unicef.org/thailand/what-we-do/education> Accessed on 2023 Sept 29.
5. Hernando-Malipot M. Filipino teachers eyed for Thailand's English project [Internet]; 2019.

- Available:<https://mb.com.ph/2019/03/15/filipino-teachers-eyed-for-thailands-english-project/>
6. Filipino teachers set to return to Thailand - UCA News [Internet]. 2020. \ Available:<https://www.ucanews.com/news/filipino-teachers-set-to-return-to-thailand/89131>
 7. Munna AS. Instructional leadership and role of module leaders. *International Journal of Educational Reform*. 2021; 32(1):38–54. DOI:10.1177/10567879211042321
 8. Hallinger P. Developing Instructional Leadership. In: Davies B., Brundrett, M. (eds). *Developing Successful Leadership. Studies in Educational Leadership*. Springer, Dordrecht. 2010;11. Available:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9106-2_5
 9. Le Fevre D. Instructional leadership and why it matters - the education hub [Internet]; 2021. Available:<https://theeducationhub.org.nz/instructional-leadership-and-why-it-matters/>
 10. Southworth G. Instructional leadership in schools: Reflections and empirical evidence. *School Leadership and Management*. 2010;22(1):73–91. DOI:10.1080/13632430220143042
 11. Mestry R, Moonsammy-Koopasammy I, Schmidt M. The Instructional Leadership role of primary school principals. *Education as Change*. 2013;17(1). DOI:10.1080/16823206.2014.865990
 12. Hallinger P, Lee M. Mapping instructional leadership in Thailand. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. 2013;42(1):6–29. DOI:10.1177/1741143213502196
 13. Sotarot A, Buasuwan P, Sarnswang S, Lapanachokdee W. An influential model of instructional leadership affecting students' achievement in small-sized secondary schools under the Office of the Basic Education Commission in Thailand. *SSRN Electronic Journal*; 2018; DOI:10.2139/ssrn.3304840
 14. Akram M, Kiran S, Ilgan A. Development and validation of instructional leadership questionnaire. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*. 2017;6(1): 73–88. DOI:10.33844/ijol.2017.60435

© 2023 Nolasco and Fabella; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/107591>