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Abstract

Currently, most of the administrators are facing problems of applying suitable leadership style in their administration, reported by the Educational Work Unit. Therefore, applying suitable leadership may assist administrators to solve the confusion due to the overlapping of work occurred in work practice, administration, and ordering or commanding among the top level of management team work unit. The Path-Goal Theory was used as the main theory to support this study. The objectives of this study were to investigate the leadership styles of school administrators that affecting teacher effectiveness. This study employed quantitative method survey design using questionnaire as an instrument. Simple random sampling technique was utilized in this study. A total of 254 administrators and teachers from schools under the Office of Kalasin Primary Educational Service Area 1 were involved as respondents. Data was analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean value, standard deviation, correlation Pearson product moment, and multiple regression Stepwise method. Findings showed that there are two types of leadership styles of school administrators, namely supportive leadership and participative leadership styles which have significantly affecting teacher effectiveness. In addition, both leadership styles have been jointly predicted teacher effectiveness at 56.80 percent at the significance level as 0.01. In conclusion, in order to increase teachers' working effectiveness, administrators should promote, practice, and improve these two leadership styles, namely supportive leadership and participative leadership styles regularly.
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1. **Introduction**

The current transformation of technology information has caused the flow of communication to be world boundless that affecting traditional paradigm to face the challenges of various types of crisis (Paitoon, 2002). This transformation definitely would have major impact on human development. In Thailand, human development and strength of grass root economic are the two significant strategies for solving social crisis. Education system is the major mechanism to support these strategies. Hence education management has to play important roles in solving the occurred problems not only for the sake of Thai society development but also aimed to develop human resource at national level (Saowanee, 2005). As a result, it is a key responsibility for educational administrators to manage school organizations efficiently according to educational policies as well as educational administration and management system.

2. **Problem statement**

Currently, Educational Work Unit is facing various problems particularly in leadership practices. This might be due to various stages of overlapping work arisen from administration work model and management technique that create confusion in the work practice, administration, and ordering or commanding among the high level of work unit (Somjit, 2009). Consequently, Path-Goal Theory was a significant theory to explain the different types of leadership style that needed to solve the problems anticipated by subordinates. For instance, coercive leadership found to be effective when the organizational goals were anticipated as vague or unclear after taken into account the work characteristic. Meanwhile, supportive leadership would be suitable when the work task was repetitive whereas participative leadership would be appropriate when the work tasks were unclear, subordinates preferred freedom, and work accomplishment found to be challenging (House’s path goal theory in Razik, 2001).

3. **Research objectives**

The following are the main objectives of this study:

a) To study the leadership styles of school administrators and teacher effectiveness.

b) To study the relationship between leadership styles of school administrators and teacher effectiveness.

c) To study the impact of leadership styles of school administrators on teacher effectiveness.

4. **Research Methodology**

A total of 254 respondents consist of 127 school administrators and 127 teachers under the Office of Kalasin Primary Educational Service Area 1 are selected equally by utilizing sample size determined by Krejcie and Morgan’s (1970) sample size table with 95 per cent of reliability has been taken into account. Meanwhile, simple random sampling is employed.

The instrument used in this research is a set of questionnaire. Leadership styles of school administrator consist of directive, supportive, achievement oriented and participative leadership according to House’s path goal theory. However, teacher effectiveness comprised of four domains. They are job satisfaction, team working, organizational commitment, and student’s quality.

This questionnaire was then sent to a panel of experts for comments and feedbacks. The panel of experts was selected using the criteria based on their expertise in the area of leadership and holding administrative position as principal for validation purpose. From the feedbacks returned by the panel, some modifications were made to the original instrument.

Descriptive statistic including frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation was utilized in this study. Furthermore, inferential statistic like Pearson’s correlation coefficients used to explain the relationship between leadership styles of school administrator and teacher effectiveness. Finally multiple regression Stepwise method was used to determine the leadership styles of school administrator that teacher effectiveness in primary schools under the Office of Kalasin Primary Educational Service Area 1. It is an Educational Work Unit that plays the roles in
providing the Basic Education for being congruent as well as served within the Educational Policy by focusing on instructional management.

5. Conceptual Framework

The variables in this study are elucidated in Figure 1. The variables include leadership styles of school administrator and teacher effectiveness. The independent variable is leadership styles of school administrators. The types of leadership style consist of directive leadership, supportive leadership, achievement oriented leadership, and participative leadership. These four types of leadership style are recommended by House’s path-goal theory.

Teacher effectiveness acts as the dependent variable and it measures four domains of teacher effectiveness. The principals and teachers’ perception of leadership styles of school administrator is important as it affects the extent of teacher effectiveness. The four domains of teacher effectiveness are job satisfaction, team working, organizational commitment, and student quality. The four domains of teacher effectiveness are predicted to be associated with leadership styles. Figure 1 illustrates the conceptual framework for this study. This framework also predicts that all types of leadership style promote teacher effectiveness.

6. Findings

6.1. Perception level of agreement on four types of leadership style

Table 1 shows the mean scores and standard deviations of the level of agreement on four types of school administrators’ leadership style by respondents. As indicated in Table 1, the mean scores for the four types of leadership style ranged from 4.01 to 4.18. The highest perception level of agreement was supportive leadership style (mean = 4.18, standard deviation = 0.56). The next highest was participative leadership style (mean score = 4.10, standard deviation = 0.67). This is followed by achievement-oriented leadership style (mean score = 4.03, standard deviation = 0.62). The lowest mean score was directive leadership style (mean score = 4.01, standard deviation = 0.56).

| Leadership styles of school administrator | Mean value | Standard deviation | Level |
|------------------------------------------|------------|--------------------|-------|
| Supportive leadership                    | 4.18       | 0.56               | High  |
| Directive leadership                     | 4.01       | 0.56               | High  |
| Achievement-oriented leadership          | 4.03       | 0.62               | High  |

Table 1. The level of leadership styles.
6.2. Teacher Effectiveness

Table 2 presents the mean scores and standard deviation of the four domains of teacher effectiveness. As shown in Table 2, the mean scores ranged from 4.12 to 4.32. This shows that, the highest level of teacher effectiveness was job satisfaction domain (mean = 4.32, standard deviation = 0.60). Both teacher effectiveness domains namely team working and organizational commitment obtained the same level of effectiveness (mean = 4.29) but different standard deviation as 0.60 and 0.57 respectively. The domain that least performed by teachers was student quality (mean = 4.12, standard deviation = 0.50). Therefore, based on Table 2, it can be concluded that teachers, in actual situation, were performing highly all the four domains of effectiveness.

Table 2. The level of teacher effectiveness.

| Teacher effectiveness         | Mean value | Standard deviation | Level   |
|-------------------------------|------------|--------------------|---------|
| Job satisfaction              | 4.32       | 0.60               | High    |
| Team working                  | 4.29       | 0.60               | High    |
| Organization commitment       | 4.29       | 0.57               | High    |
| Student quality               | 4.12       | 0.50               | High    |

6.3. Correlation between each type of leadership style and teacher effectiveness

Table 4 presented the Pearson correlation coefficient between the four types of leadership style and teacher effectiveness. Based on De Vaus’s (2002) interpretation of correlation coefficients in Table 3, the correlation results between the four types of leadership style and teacher effectiveness showed a significant relationship (p<0.01), with strength of association varying from moderate to substantial, substantial to very strong, as well as very strong and positive.

Table 3. Designation strength of association based on size of correlation coefficients.

| Strength of association       | Negative       | Positive       |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Low to moderate               | -0.29 till -0.10 | 0.10 till 0.29 |
| Moderate to substantial       | -0.49 till -0.30 | 0.30 till 0.49 |
| Substantial to very strong    | -0.69 till -0.50 | 0.50 till 0.69 |
| Very strong                   | -0.89 till -0.70 | 0.70 till 0.89 |
| Near perfect                  | -0.99 till -0.90 | 0.90 till 0.99 |
| Perfect relationship          | -1.00          | 1.00           |

As indicated in Table 4, teacher effectiveness was significant, positive and very strong correlated with supportive leadership (r = 0.729; p<0.01). In addition, it was substantial to very strong correlated with participative leadership (r = 0.676; p<0.01) and achievement-oriented leadership (r = 0.544; p<0.01). Finally, teacher effectiveness was moderate to substantial correlated with directive leadership (r = 0.367; p<0.01). This means that, to a great extent, an increase in the supportive leadership is associated with an increase in the level of teacher effectiveness; and to a substantial to very strong extent, an improvement in participative and achievement-oriented leadership is associated with an increase in the teacher effectiveness. However, directive leadership had the weakest association with teacher effectiveness.
Table 4. Correlation coefficient between types of leadership style and teacher effectiveness.

| Variables                        | X1  | X2  | X3  | X4  |
|----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Teacher effectiveness (Y)        | 0.729** | 0.367** | 0.544** | 0.676** |
| Adaptive organizational culture (X1) | 1.00 | 0.490* | 0.665** | 0.756** |
| Result-based organizational culture (X2) | 1.00 | 0.692** | 0.545** |
| Clan organizational culture (X3)  | 1.00 | 0.789** |
| Bureaucratic organizational culture (X4) | 1.00 |

6.4. Significant predictor for teacher effectiveness

To identify the significant predictor for teacher effectiveness, a Stepwise regression and analysis was carried out. In this analysis, the four types of leadership style were treated as predictor variables, while teacher effectiveness was treated as the dependent variable. The purpose of estimating this regression equation was to identify the types of leadership style that have significant impact on teacher effectiveness that is the types of leadership style which constitute the predictors for teacher effectiveness.

In this analysis, the size of the standardized coefficient ($\beta$) directly indicates the importance of these predictors relative to one another. In the context, supportive leadership ($\beta = 0.509$) was the most important predictor, followed by participative leadership ($\beta = 0.292$), in that order. As shown in Table 5, the summary statistics of the estimated regression equation show the variables for which the coefficients are statistically significant. In conclusion, the two variables account for 56.8 percent of variation in the dependent variable.

Table 5. Multiple regression of leadership styles and teacher effectiveness.

| Variables                      | B   | $\beta$ | t   | p-value |
|--------------------------------|-----|---------|-----|---------|
| Constant                       | 1.484 | -       | 9.526 | 0.001** |
| Supportive leadership (X1)     | 0.450 | 0.509   | 8.030 | 0.001** |
| Participative leadership (X4)  | 0.218 | 0.292   | 4.603 | 0.001** |
| $R = 0.754$, $R^2 = 0.568$, SE_b = 0.332, F = 21.188

The following multivariate linear regression model shows the relationship between the predictor variables on the dependent variable.

Unstandardized score: $\hat{Y} = 1.484 + 0.450(X_1) + 0.218(X_4)$

Standardized score: $\hat{Y} = 0.509(X_1) + 0.292(X_4)$

7. Discussion

The findings of this study revealed that supportive leadership was at the highest agreement level. It might be because of school work normally consisted of clear structure and repetitive. Supportive leadership found to be utilized in encouraging the teachers to work as well as personal life. Therefore, school administrators should be friendly to their teachers by praising and encouraging them especially on important occasions. They have to be mercy, kind, and understand teachers’ feelings. According to House’s theory, leaders have to increase confidence but decrease anxiety of their followers. They should eliminate the undesirable work situation, pay attention to their followers’ welfare and needs. On top of that, leaders have to create positive climate by treating their followers fairly, respectfully, and democratically.

Participative leadership is suitable to apply in school administration when administrators are facing vague and unclear work situation. In order to promote participative leadership, school administrators should assign teachers to
participate in decision making process, listen to teachers’ opinions and encourage them to discuss in group. Sometimes, school administrators have to determine challenging objectives for the teachers to participate. They should know how to stimulate teachers to search for innovative way to improve and develop their work continuously. Since the policy of the Office of Kalasin Primary Educational Service Area 1 is to enhance teachers and administrators to participate in various projects, school administrators and teachers have to learn to work together for improvement. Consequently, teachers will gain expertise and self-confidence in work development through their participation. Hopefully, teachers will be able to work independently without waiting for administrators’ instruction or command. Although directive leadership was in the last order, school administrators also need to use directive leadership when there is new program or policy by instructing the work technique to the teachers.

Teachers in this study found to be highly satisfied. They are satisfied because of their administrators supported and encouraged them to further study. They also participated in training or field trip study for promotion purposes. According to change management, school organizations will be success if teachers have knowledge of teaching topic and student-centered technique. Teachers have to participate in determining school direction based on the National Education Act 1999 and the Revised Issue (the Second Issue) 2002, the participation process and creation of good working atmosphere.

Teachers attempted to develop themselves in improving their knowledge and teaching methods or techniques by attending seminar until they did not have time to take care of their students with full efficiency can be one of reason to explain student quality was low. This was supported by Koonnaree’s (2009) study. Koonnaree revealed that direct and indirect influence of high organizational commitment of teachers’ transformational leadership would cause students’ low quality.

The finding of the relationship between types of leadership style and teacher effectiveness indicates that the correlation coefficient is positively related. In summary, among the four types of leadership style, supportive leadership style had the strongest association with teacher effectiveness while directive leadership style had the weakest association with teacher effectiveness. This is possible due to administrators who utilize supportive leadership will help teachers to overcome their work problems thus teachers will have morale in working which will lead to their working effectiveness. This can be explained by Two-factors theory whereby motivator factor as the direct related factor to serve psychological need which caused the work practitioners to be satisfied with their job including work success, recognition, work progress, work characteristic, and responsibility. The hygiene factor was the factor prevented the unsatisfactory in work which was related to the work environment including policy and work administration of organization, control and command, and relationship with superordinate and co-workers.

The two types of leadership style have predictive power of 0.568 which is significantly at 0.01. Therefore the two types of leadership style are able to predict the outcomes of teacher effectiveness, with supportive leadership affects the most on teacher effectiveness. In other word, administrators who provide support for teachers and let them participate in decision making will cause teachers increase working effectiveness. This is supported by Waro’s (2006) study. Waro found that leadership factor that affecting school effectiveness was the situational factor, administrators’ behavior and background. It was also supported by Contingency leadership theories that effective leadership was based on many factors, such as leaders’ characteristics, leadership behavior, and related situation as important factors for administrators to implement their duties smoothly. It was congruent with Sureeporn’s (2006) study. Sureeporn found that the behaviors of supportive leaders, participatory leaders, and coercive leaders were the predictors of teacher motivation in their work practices.
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