

EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE QUALITIES OF AN ADMINISTRATOR

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of

Immaculata University

By

Ann Mercedes Wudyka

In partial fulfillment

Of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education



**TITLE OF DISSERTATION DEFENSE**

**EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE QUALITIES OF AN ADMINISTRATOR**

**AUTHOR: Ann Mercedes Wudyka**

*S. Carol Anne Couchara, JHM Ed.D.*  
Chair

*Robert G. Bleis Ed.D.*  
Committee Member

*Stephen O. Toth Ed.D.*  
Committee Member

**ON BEHALF OF IMMACULATA UNIVERSITY**

*Marcia Parris Ed.D.*  
Marcia Parris, Ed. D.  
Dean, College of Graduate Studies

*Melissa Reed, Ed.D.*  
Melissa Reed, Ed. D.  
Chair, Education Division

DATE: June 20, 2023

Copyright © 2023  
by Ann Mercedes Wudyka  
All rights reserved.

## ABSTRACT

This study aimed to examine the effective and ineffective qualities of administrators and their influence on educators' performance. One hundred thirty-seven educators from across the United States and Canada participated in a researcher-designed online survey consisting of demographic questions, Likert-scale statements, two open-ended questions, and optional three interview questions, to which 12 educator participants responded. Three effective themes emerged: communication, educators valued as professionals, and leadership accessibility. Communication was establishing solid lines of communication between the administrator and educator. Educators portrayed as valued professionals were an integral component of effective administrative leadership. Accessibility was referred to as the administrator leading by example, being visual in the school building, being open to change, and setting straightforward tasks and expectations. An analysis of the data revealed that educators perceived communication as the most selected strongly effective administrative quality.

Additionally, three ineffective themes emerged: administrator's micromanagement, educators as non-valued professionals, and non-accessible administrators. Micromanagement was the establishment of solid control from the administrator over the educator. Educators portrayed as non-valued professionals were an integral component of ineffective administrative leadership. Non-accessible administrators were the absence of leadership and avoiding conflict. An analysis of the data revealed that educators perceived that making educators feel insecure about their work was the most selected strongly ineffective administrative quality.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my chairperson and advisor, Sister Carol Anne Couchara, IHM, I am forever grateful for your guidance, wisdom, and friendship. You have been a source of support and encouragement. Thank you for caring and praying for me. You are a treasure!

Special thanks go to my committee members, Dr. Robert Pleis and Dr. Stephen O'Toole, for your time and feedback throughout the dissertation process. I appreciate your assistance, sharing of your knowledge and experience. your feedback, wisdom, and support were extremely appreciated.

To my mother, Nancy Wudyka, thank you for helping me keep things in perspective and focused, always helping to keep my eyes on the prize and pointed straight ahead. You had confidence in me when I did not in myself and for that I will be forever grateful. I cannot express how much your love and support have meant to me throughout this process. You are the best mom and support system ever. Love you!!

To my brother, Edward Wudyka, thank you for your patience, having faith in me and encouraging me to pursue my educational goals. I have been blessed with the BEST brother.

To my Immaculata dissertation group, Kathleen Bruce, Kristin Meyers, and Janice Miller-Redd, I could not have done it without your support. We traveled this journey together, and were there to encourage, laugh with and calm each other down when we needed it. I feel privileged to have experienced this with all of you and you have all inspired me immensely.

To all my friends, the list is quite long, your love, prayers, and support made this journey easier. Thank you!!

## Table of Contents

SIGNATURE PAGE .....	ii
COPYRIGHT PAGE .....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	x
CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTIONS .....	1
Overview .....	1
Need for the Study .....	3
Statement of the Problem .....	5
Definition of Terms .....	6
Limitations .....	8
Research Questions .....	9
Summary .....	9
CHAPTER TWO – LITERATURE REVIEW .....	11
Introduction .....	11
Educator Morale .....	12
Job Satisfaction .....	15
Leadership .....	17
Leadership Qualities .....	19
Leadership Styles .....	21
Authoritarian Leadership Styles .....	21

Coercive Leadership .....	21
Authoritative Leadership .....	22
Pacesetting Leadership .....	23
Laissez-faire Leadership Styles .....	24
Laissez-faire Leadership .....	24
Affiliative Leadership .....	25
Coaching Leadership .....	25
Democratic Leadership Styles .....	27
Instructional Leadership .....	27
Situational Leadership .....	28
Servant Leadership Style .....	29
Summary .....	31
<b>CHAPTER THREE – METHODS AND PROCEDURES .....</b>	<b>33</b>
Introduction .....	33
Participants .....	33
Setting .....	34
Instruments .....	36
Surveys .....	36
Post-Survey Interview .....	37
Validity and Reliability .....	38
Design of Study .....	39
Procedures .....	39
Data Analysis .....	41

Summary .....	41
CHAPTER FOUR - RESULTS .....	43
Introduction .....	43
Compilation of Data .....	44
Demographic .....	44
Research Question One: Qualities of an Effective Administrator	48
Research Question Two: Qualities of an Ineffective Administrator	54
Research Question Three: Influence on Educators' Performance	57
Effective Administrator Qualities .....	57
Administration Communication .....	58
Educators Valued as Professionals .....	59
Administration Accessibility .....	60
Ranking Results of Effective Qualities from Participating	
Educators .....	61
Research Question Three: Influence on Educators' Performance	61
Ineffective Administrator Qualities .....	61
Micromanaged .....	62
Educators Non-Valued as Professionals .....	63
Administration Non-Accessible .....	64
Ranking Results of Ineffective Qualities from Participating	
Educators .....	65
Interview Questions .....	66
Summary .....	74



CHAPTER FIVE – DISCUSSION .....	75
Summary of the Study .....	75
Summary of the Results .....	76
Effective Qualities .....	76
Ineffective Qualities .....	78
Limitations .....	80
Relationship to the Research .....	81
Recommendations for Future Research .....	84
Conclusions .....	85
REFERENCES .....	87
APPENDICES .....	111
APPENDIX A: EDUCATORS’ QUESTIONNAIRE .....	111
APPENDIX B: EDUCATORS’ INTERVIEW QUESTIONS .....	114
APPENDIX C: EDUCATORS’ QUESTIONANNAIRE PANEL SCORE SHEET	115
APPENDIX D: RERB APPROVAL .....	121

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4.1: Participating Educators' Current Professional Role .....	45
4.2: Participating Educators' Years as an Educator .....	45
4.3: Participating Educators' Years Working with Current Administrative Leadership .....	46
4.4: Participating Educators' Current Employment Location by Region (State)	47
4.5: Participating Educators' Current School Classification .....	48
4.6: Participating Educators' Likert Scale Responses for Effective Qualities of An Administrator .....	53
4.7: Participating Educators' Likert Scale Responses for Ineffective Qualities of An Administrator .....	57
4.8: Participating Educators' Likert Scale Responses in Rank Order of Effective Administrative Qualities .....	61
4.9: Participating Educators' Likert Scale Responses in Rank Order of Ineffective Administrative Qualities .....	65



## Chapter One – Introduction

### Overview

School administrators must have been aware of the factors that affected educators (Rowland, 2008). Administrators were the people who most influenced the culture of a school and needed to use their actions to set the tone of what is expected by the staff in the school (Buenvinida & Tamayo, 2020). School administrator succession were an inevitable changed process in all school systems (Aravena, 2022). The changed were in power relationships, school culture, and working climate that affected educator morale/performance and job responsibilities, among other aspects (Lee, 2015). Thus, school administrator succession was essential to social and cultural dynamics within schools (Aravena, 2022). As school administrator succession change occurred, the aims of reform and the intrinsic motivation of participants must be aligned (Lim, 2021).

Educator morale/performance was an issue that affected every stakeholder in education (Heick, 2020). Bosso (2017) noted that teaching was generally characterized and regarded as a vocation, and educators tended to feel a sense of moral purpose connected to their work, values, emotions, interactions, and sense of self. Fullan (2011) indicated a sense of purpose, passion and self-esteem seemed to have been strongest when educators were able to act in accordance with values, have agency within the environment, and were intrinsically motivated, though the presence of demanding external pressures often resulted in the opposite outcome. Bassett et al. (2014) revealed that when educators were limited in the capacity to carry out the moral mission or daily realities chipped away at intrinsic motivational forces, lower levels of morale/performance and motivation resulted. Bosso (2017) concluded that educators'

professional identities were influenced by the larger educational environment; among other factors, educator morale, motivation, and performance reflected the many dynamics within that setting.

Wuench (2022) identified that over the past several years, employees across the United States and around the world have been dealing with low morale/performance in the workplace. Bosso (2017) found that the overwhelming majority of 24 State Educators of the Year expressed that their motivation, morale, performance, and professional identity were strongly associated with a belief in the moral purpose of their work and nearly all the educators firmly articulated that their passion for teaching was a central feature. Sainato (2022) noted that a California educator observed that morale was low amongst educators, and it felt like the whole city was fighting over politics, and no one cared about what educators were going through in the classroom. Mohler (2021) reported that five educators within a central Virginia school district spoke out during the public comments portion of the June school board meeting, expressed feelings of frustration and underappreciation. Flannery (2018) documented that a Louisiana middle-school educator was removed from a school board meeting in handcuffs after asking questions about the superintendent's salary raise; the educator urged educators, parents, and students across the United States to go to school board meetings, ask questions, and be vocal.

Educator job satisfaction has had many important and far-reaching implications (Toropova et al., 2020). Kunter et al. (2013) noted that a satisfied educator's well-being were less susceptible to stress and burnout. Colie et al. (2012) concluded that educators who were content with the job also felt better and offered higher instructional quality and better learning support for their students. Blömeke et al. (2017) identified that content

educators demonstrated stronger job commitment/performance and were less prone to leave the profession, which was especially crucial in current times.

Mangin (2021) concluded that high educator morale/performance was important for the overall well-being of the educator and when educators had low morale/performance, they did not do their job to the best of their abilities. Due to this importance, maintaining educator morale/performance should have been a key focus of administrators and educators (Noddings, 2014). A lack of support from schools' administrators was an issue that negatively influenced educator morale/performance (Bradford & Braaten, 2018). Bosso (2017) concluded that in response to many of the changes and challenges brought about by the shifting educational leadership, educators' morale/performance was affected.

### **Need for the Study**

This study was conducted to add to the body of research related to both effective and ineffective qualities of administrators and the influence on educator's performance. Research indicated that high stress correlates with lower morale/performance, and teaching has been reported as one of the most stressful jobs in the nation (Rios, 2021). Kurtz (2020) explored the Education Week Research Report from August 2019 and illustrated that educator morale was at 71%. In further examination, Kurtz (2020) reported that it had dropped to 56% in March of 2020. In November 2020, Education Week Research Center administered an online survey with 1,630 educators responding, and 84% of educators and administrators said educator morale was lower now than before the pandemic (Kurtz, 2020). Rios (2021) highlighted that educator morale was on the decline long before the start of the Covid-19 pandemic—and while the pandemic has

exacerbated the problem, even a return to “normal” would not address the root of the issue. Rios (2021) reported that in 2012 that nearly 70% of the more than 7,200 K-12 educators were not engaged in their jobs, compared to 73% in 2020.

Lee et al. (2019) stated that administrative leadership roles were widely reported as essential mediations to foster advancement, modernization, changes, and innovations in teaching and learning practices. Day and Sammons (2016) conveyed that school leadership was inextricably linked to the everyday school operation as the key driver of change and success or failure. Effective leadership that consistently aligned school missions and visions with actions were the cornerstone to build successful schools (Werang & Lena, 2014). Solomon and Steyn (2017) identified that administrator leadership qualities were greatly influenced by various factors, such as, leader personalities, socioeconomic environment, and school climate; thus, qualities of leadership vary according to cultural and geographical differences. Saleem et al. (2020) concluded that three basic leadership styles mostly adopted by principals were autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire. Hosseingholizadeh et al. (2021) reported that the use or blend of various leadership styles in certain situations, i.e., democratic, autocratic, task-oriented, collegial, or transformational, enabled school leadership to instigate school improvement and reform.

Hearn (2013) indicated that leadership style and job satisfaction seemed to go conjointly with the roles and functions of educator morale. According to Bogler (2005), the leadership style of the school administrator had a powerful influence on the environment of the school and the attitudes of the educators and staff. Administrators who demonstrated the ability to handle changing environments showed greater

improvements in the satisfaction of educators (Yang, 2013). Morris et al. (2020) identified that a lack of support from the leaders in an educational setting caused a deterioration of staff morale/performance. If educators were not reassured that they would be supported if challenges arose, they felt vulnerable and avoided innovative practices (Heick, 2020). Administrators often believed that having an open-door to their office made them approachable, but this was not always how it was seen by educators in the school (Morris et al., 2020). Mangin (2021) stated that when educators did not feel like they were trusted to help in decision-making, they believed their expertise was not valued. Demircioglu (2021) stated that effective performance, work motivation, and contentment level of employees constituted factors of great importance for all institutions, especially educational organizations.

### **Statement of the Problem**

This qualitative study aimed to examine educators' perceptions regarding the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how it influenced the educator's performance. Rowland (2008) suggested that educators were a vital part of the educational system and the largest professional body in a school, had the most contact with students throughout the day, and had the power as a group and as individuals. Watson (2019) noted that school administration influenced an educator's level of morale/performance and influenced the change in an educator's level of morale/performance throughout the school year.

Swisher (2022) identified that educators' morale/performance could be the driving force behind that educator's level of effectiveness and when educators felt confident about their teaching abilities, and the administrative leadership, the level of



morale/performance would be high. The reverse is also true: when educators had negative feelings about their job, it affected their teaching ability and relationships with administrative leadership (Will, 2022). Will (2022) examined the completed research of an assistant professor at Kansas State University who remarked that educator morale/performance was different at the beginning of the school year compared to early spring from April to May.

Rios (2021) stated that 75% of educators said that the education today made it difficult for educators to be their best in the classroom and a record 73% of educators did not feel valued in 2020, an increase of nearly 10% from 2018. Job stress was often associated with educator morale and, while teaching was challenging and a satisfying career, it was a major source of stress (Shavuka, 2020). Job stress that had not been successfully managed caused feelings of energy depletion or exhaustion, increased mental distance from one's job, or feelings of negativism or cynicism related to one's job, and reduced professional efficacy (Weiss, 2020). Steyn (2014) opined that low levels of satisfaction and morale lead to reduced educator productivity and burnout, which was associated with a loss of concern for, and detachment from, the people with whom one works. Low morale/performance decreased excellence in one's profession, which resulted in depression and illness of educators (Shavuka, 2020).

### **Definition of Terms**

For the qualitative study, the following definitions were used:

*Administrator:* Manages the running and functioning of schools. They may hire and supervise teachers, create, and manage budgets, direct educational programming, design curriculum, and oversee recordkeeping. More specifically, education

administrators were often responsible for the following tasks, and more: evaluating and standardizing their school or school district's curriculum; communicating with families; planning institutional events; conducting evaluations of teaching staff; supporting faculty members with training and providing guidance through goal-setting and enrichment; and ensuring that a school or school district was in compliance with local, state, and federal education standards (University of Bridgeport, 2022).

*Educator:* A person employed to deliver skills and learning experiences to students in a school setting (Robinson, 2010).

*Educator Morale:* The professional interest and happiness that an educator displayed towards the achievement of individual and group goals for a specific job or task (Lyons, 2017).

*Educators:* Teachers, Assistant Teachers, Librarians, Guidance Counselors, Aides, and School Staff.

*Elementary Schools:* A school usually consisting of grade K-5 (Robinson, 2010).

*High School:* A school especially in the United States. usually included grades 9–12 or 10–12 (Merriam-Webster, 2022).

*Job Performance:* Relates to how individuals perform in their job duties. In addition to training and natural ability (like dexterity or an inherent skill with numbers), job performance was impacted by workplace environment factors including physically demanding tasks, employee morale, stress levels, and working extended hours (Workplace Testing, 2020).

*Job Satisfaction:* A pleasurable or positive emotional state resulted from the appraisal of one's job or job experience (Robinson, 2010).

*Leadership:* The ability of an individual or a group of individuals to influence and guide followers or other members of an organization. Leadership involved making sound -- and sometimes difficult -- decisions, creating and articulating a clear vision, establishing achievable goals, and providing followers with the knowledge and tools necessary to achieve those goals (Pratt, 2017).

*Leadership Style:* There are different types of leadership styles and that some leaders have a dominant single style, while other leaders use different styles in different situations or with different followers. Commonly identified leadership styles include affiliative, authoritative, coaching, coercive, charismatic, democratic, innovative, command and control (or bureaucratic), laissez-faire, pacesetter (or transactional), servant, situational and transformational (Pratt, 2017).

*Micromanaging:* is a manager who closely observes and controls the work of the team members they work with. They may feel the need to control aspects of their employees' work and decision-making to an extreme degree (Herrity, 2023)

*Middle School:* A school usually consisted of grade 6 – 8 (Lyons, 2017).

*Morale:* A feeling, state of mind, a mental attitude, and emotional attitude (Robinson, 2010) and the interest one took in achieving individual and group goals within a given organization (Guinta, 2020).

## **Limitations**

Conclusions were drawn with the knowledge that all findings were open to interpretation. The data collected was limited to the fall/winter semester of the school calendar, with the knowledge that performance shifts from season to season and year to year. The data collected came from an extensive poll of educators from all over the

country and Canada, not one specific school district. The geographic locations of rural, suburban, and urban educators, resulted in varied experiences which caused fluctuation in the outcomes. The surveys and interview questions centered on the educators' perceptions regarding the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and the influence it had on the educator's performance. It is important to capture educators' feelings, experiences, and perspectives, respondents had a predisposition regarding the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how it influenced the educator's performance. The data collected was survey statements, open-ended questions, and personal interviews. Some interviews were conducted with the researcher's colleagues, thus creating an inherent limitation as well as personal biases may exist and influence the study.

### **Research Questions**

Based on the need for additional research about effective and ineffective administrator qualities, this study attempted to answer the following questions based on the perceptions of educators:

1. What were the qualities of an effective administrator?
2. What were the qualities of an ineffective administrator?
3. How do the effective and ineffective qualities of an administrator influence the educator's performance?

### **Summary**

This chapter provided a brief synopsis of the basis and direction of this study. This qualitative study aimed to examine the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how they influenced the educator's performance. Gunn (2018) stated

that schools were stressful places to work, and that perpetual stress took a serious toll on the educators. Furthermore, Gunn (2018) noted that it is normal to see a fluctuation in educator morale/performance and spikes in educator stress throughout the year, especially, during busy times, between vacations, at the end of the year, or during periods of change.

According to Welch (2014), the standpoint of teaching education had changed a great deal over the last 60 years, and that had an ancillary effect on the administrative leadership. Rowland (2008) stated that administrative leadership impacted many of the dynamics that guided a school and one of the most important and significant was the effect a building administrator had on educator morale/performance. Successful relationships were built on a foundation of trust, mutual respect, and open communication (Cross & Parker, 2004). Schnackenberg and Tomlinson (2016) stated that when one of the parties was reliant on the other for job security and growth, such as the association between administrators and educators, relationships were more complex and not always easy to navigate.

The research suggested that it was necessary to examine the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how it influenced the educator's performance. Literature related to educator morale/performance, school administrators and leadership qualities/styles were discussed in Chapter Two.

## Chapter Two – Literature Review

### Introduction

At the heart of the educational system is the daily work of three and half million public school educators (Snyder et al., 2016). Senechal et al. (2016) stated that educators design the lessons, deliver the instruction, assess learning, work collaboratively with colleagues, school leaders, and parents, build critical relationships with students and create communities within classrooms and schools. Point et al. (2008) maintained that ultimately the educators are tasked with achieving the broad goals of public education.

Goings et al. (2018) conveyed that the current state of the teaching workforce does not provide an encouraging picture. In a recent journal article, Will (2022) stated that according to the Merrimack College Educator Survey conducted between January 9 and February 23, 2022, the results painted a picture of a disillusioned, exhausted workforce, and more than half of educators are not satisfied with their jobs. In the Merrimack College Educator Survey referenced, more than half of educators said they likely would not advise their younger selves to pursue a career in teaching. Zamarro et al. (2021) documented that dissatisfaction among educators has also become evident through news and social media, where it has become common for educators to speak out publicly about their struggles with direction. Govindarajan (2012) asserted that educators were vital to the educational system's success; however, educators were stretched to the limit. Educators say their jobs have gotten harder as they grapple with constantly changing education reforms (Will, 2019).

Brion (2015) revealed that researchers have struggled for decades to identify specific elements in education and their impact on employee productivity/needs. Meeks

(2020) maintained that the basic needs of an educator must be met before experiencing success and self-fulfillment. Maslow (1968) stated that when the highest level of needs has been met, productivity does not decrease; instead, it increases to seek further fulfillment in one's life. Fray et al. (2022) revealed that the literature on educator morale/performance, reflecting the general ambiguity, never reached a consensus definition. This chapter reviews related literature and was divided into several relevant sections regarding educator morale/performance, job satisfaction, administrative leadership and leadership styles.

### **Educator Morale**

Although educator morale may be defined in multiple ways, O'Reilly (2020) defined morale as "the professional interest and enthusiasm a person displays towards the achievement of individual and group goals in a given job situation" (Slide 2). Goldstein (2015) defined educator morale as a sense of satisfaction derived from personal and organizational needs. Chambers (2015) asserts that "a combination of positive or negative sentiments, behavior and spirits contribute to a general feeling of satisfaction" (p.7). Govindarajan (2012) identified morale as a set within the framework of the organizational theory with an individual's progression toward achieving organizational tasks and his or her perceived job satisfaction within the entire organization. Barksdale (2022) asserted that it is fair to say that morale has different meanings across different types of activity and employment, and there are many definitions for morale. However, it is undeniable that those dissatisfied with the workplace have low morale, and those who are satisfied with their workplace exhibit high morale (Barksdale, 2022). In a recent study, Lüleçii and Çorukii (2018) noted a significant difference in the morale levels of

primary and middle school educators and primary and high school educators. Lüleçii and Çorukii (2018) asserted that primary school educators have a higher level of morale than middle and high school educators.

Din et al. (2019) stated that successful teaching and learning require the active participation of educators with confidence and a positive attitude. Confidence speaks to self-efficacy, the belief in oneself to perform duties to produce results and is a significant criterion for assessing educator morale (Barksdale, 2022). As a result, it is vital to ensure that educators are supported in all their endeavors (Bantwini, 2018). Govindarajan (2012) observed that boosting educator morale had benefited both the educators and the learners, and ultimately, the school also benefited. High educator morale has led to increased learner achievement, whereas low educator morale has resulted in low productivity and educator burnout (Bantwini, 2018). Sivakumar and Arun (2019) indicated that educator morale is associated with job pride, outlook, and emotions an educator has within a workplace setting. How educators view themselves, their roles, and the level at which the organization meets their needs determines their morale (Mboweni & Taole, 2022).

McCallum (2021) expressed that although educators can take steps individually to preserve their professional satisfaction and morale, they must also be nurtured, supported, and valued by the broader school community. Govindarajan (2012) found that by treating educators in ways that empower them, such as involving them in decisions about policies and practices and acknowledging their expertise, administrators could help sustain educator morale. Gadson (2018) reported that effective administrative leadership could also strengthen educator morale by actively standing behind educators, serving as guardians of educators' instructional time, assisting educators with student discipline



matters, allowing educators to develop discipline codes, and supporting educators' authority in enforcing policy. When educators are provided with what they need to remain inspired and enthusiastic in the classroom, students and educators will be the beneficiaries (Govindarajan, 2012).

Nolan and Stitzlein (2011) stated that while high morale indicates contentment, belongingness, success, and personal and group value, low morale correlates with frustration, distress, hostility, and helplessness. Liebenberg (2017) noted that demands negatively impact educator morale, which harms their performance. Low educator morale indicates that basic human needs are unmet (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Educators may lose morale because they feel inequitable decisions and policies are based on arbitrary criteria (Senechal et al., 2016). Fink (2014) reported that educators with low morale display signs that include: increased absenteeism, conflicts with co-workers, insubordination, decreased productivity, disorganized and unkempt work environments, routinely complaining about seemingly minor work-related issues and increased complaints regarding the educator's behavior. Picincu (2021) noted that low staff morale is often the reason behind hostile behavior in the workplace, and the conflict can take an emotional toll on staff members, leading to stress, anger, and poor communication. Some school administrators acknowledge educators' low morale (Chambers, 2015) and believe extrinsic rewards for educators will improve educator morale (Dornyei & Ushioda, 2013). Joo et al. (2012) concluded that school leaders should know the importance of considering the individual educator characteristics, beliefs, and needs to increase morale before beginning a performance-based rewards system.

Research in the field of educator morale demonstrates the importance of individual and communities of educators in every school as they hold power to create schools that substantially better the quality of the lives of their students and future generations (Thapa et al., 2013). Chambers (2015) asserts that “a combination of positive or negative sentiments, behavior and spirits contribute to a general feeling of satisfaction” (p.7). When individuals’ needs and aspirations are met, they have a positive outlook which will increase their morale (Mboweni and Taole, 2022). Aspects of teaching which are profoundly satisfying or deeply dissatisfying impact morale/performance and job satisfaction positively or negatively (Morris, 2019).

### **Job Satisfaction**

Nigama et al. (2018) stated that job satisfaction combines emotional and psychological experience at work. Toropova et al. (2020) noted that educator job satisfaction has many important and far-reaching implications. As the congruence between personal needs and organizational goals is one of the three factors affecting morale, morale is not uni-directional; job satisfaction and educator morale may impact each other (Brion, 2015). Lüleci and Çorukii (2018) summarized that job satisfaction and morale significantly influenced the performance, efficiency, and climate in organizations. It can be said that the excellence of educator performance and the development of teaching quality in schools are related to increased job satisfaction (Lüleci & Çorukii, 2018). Job satisfaction is an important concept that is not only related to an individual but is relevant to society’s well-being (Nigama et al., 2018).

Msuya (2016) stated that schools need satisfied and motivated educators who can work effectively and efficiently to attain school goals. Brion (2015) explained that a

person is motivated by certain factors to work toward achieving organizational goals. If the person can meet goals and personal needs, he or she should feel job satisfaction (Brion, 2015). Job satisfaction helps educators become efficient, zealous, high-performing, problem-solvers, high-perceivers, and effective communicators to provide their maximum contribution to society (Lüleçii & Çorukii, 2018). Bota (2013) contributed that when educators get satisfaction from their work, they display positive attitudes and behaviors. Berberoglu (2018) similarly concluded that if employees positively perceive the work climate, they tend to have higher levels of organizational commitment. Good education is impossible without good teaching; good teaching mainly depends on educators' job satisfaction (Safari & Rashidi, 2015).

Lüleçii and Çorukii (2018) presented that educators who cannot acquire satisfaction from their jobs display negative attitudes and behaviors, which causes stress and increases ineffectiveness by depressing the staff's psychology. Various studies have shown that when workers lack a clear definition of the actions necessary to fulfill a specific role, their levels of job satisfaction are likely to be negatively affected (Gkolia et al., 2014). Gkolia et al. (2014) detailed that ambiguity is when educators are unclear and uncertain about their administrative leadership's expectations for behavior or performance within their role. Altınkurt and Yılmaz (2014) noted that low job satisfaction leads to alienation from the job, the meaninglessness of the job for themselves, aggressive reactions, resistance to change, and similar adverse consequences. Belias and Koustelios (2014) explained that poor or unsupportive relationships with administrative leadership resulted in job dissatisfaction.

Administrative leadership, good and bad, is paramount to educator job satisfaction factors (Baluyos et al., 2019). Moreover, influential educational leaders, particularly principals, are the primary shapers of their educator's morale (Daniëls et al., 2019). Geiger and Pivovarova (2018) stated that supportive school leaders and those who experienced positive collaborative experiences were less likely to have low job satisfaction. Positive interactions between educators and administrative leaders may not be solely responsible for a positive work outlook (Baluyos et al., 2019). However, such may lead to other favorable work conditions contributing to educators' job satisfaction (Baluyos et.al, 2019).

### **Leadership**

Ofrita (2022) discovered that the success of education in schools is primarily determined by the school administrator leading and making decisions to support educator morale. According to Supriyatno (2021), leadership is a person's ability to influence, coordinate, mobilize, motivate, and direct people in various educational institutions so that the implementation of education and teaching can be more efficient and effective in achieving educational and teaching goals. Uno (2017) supported that leadership is the ability to influence a group to achieve the expected goals.

Ofrita (2022) stated that in the role of a leader, the school administrator must pay attention to the needs and feelings of the people who work for them so that the love of teaching and discipline is maintained. Kolzow (2014) implied that leadership has three main functions: assert authority, take responsibility by setting goals for the organization, and accept the success or failure of the organizations they lead. Indeed Editorial Team (2022) reported that influential leaders are essential to any organization: they can help

build strong teams within a school, have strong interpersonal and communication skills, and help remove obstacles for their team. Seppälä and Cameron (2022) explained that good leadership was contagious, inspiring colleagues to apply positive leadership traits in their work. Forbes Coaches Council (2017) provided that leaders can establish trust with their educators, which includes being open and honest about changes that will impact them; effectively communicating by talking to them, not at them; having an open-door policy, and then following up; and being willing to pitch in to help. Littleford (2007) pointed out, “Displaying effective human relations is a key to leadership on every level.” (p. 43).

Chambers (2015) asserted that supported educators tend to perform at the highest level for school success. Evers (2011) used an educator survey to measure the opinions of public-school educators’ morale as defined by a relationship with administrative leadership and job satisfaction. This same study by Evers (2011) indicated that educator morale was low because educators disagreed with administrative leadership. Chambers (2015) discovered that administrative leadership could be responsible for low morale. Leithwood et al. (2009) noted that educators’ judgments tend to be influenced by the administrative leaderships’ caring and supportive behavior, linking administrative leadership to an environment of learning. Green (2014) stated that additional support from administrative leadership improved educator morale, and educators viewed work overload (e.g., non-teaching duties and excessive paperwork) a cause of job dissatisfaction. Welch (2014) concluded that educator satisfaction increased when administrative leaders decreased the stressors of daily workloads, which promoted positive morale.

Indeed Editorial Team (2022) noted that a positive framework approach is needed to effectively lead educators and administrative leaders. As a result, the Indeed Editorial Team (2022) found that adopting a leadership style helps determine how to make decisions, what goals to prioritize, and how to interact with others. In the same article by Indeed Editorial Team (2022), the authors explain that when the right leadership style is chosen for the situation, the style may be able to solve complex problems, resolve conflicts quickly, and change the course of a school or even transform educational systems. Cunningham et al. (2015) noted that the leadership styles for school administrators are divided into three categories: authoritarian, laissez-faire, and democratic. The art of leadership is flexible, whereby the leader selects and uses the correct style. (EBA, 2022). The leader must assess the leadership style that would fit the organization best (Abdul & Syaiful, 2017).

Nolan and Stitzlein (2011) stated that during stressful times and low morale a shared distributed leadership among the educators and administrative leaders should be used to improve morale and provide motivation and support. Fullan (2011) noted that the administrative leader's support had impacted educator morale more than any other factor. Chambers (2015) explained that educators who experience job satisfaction when motivated by supportive administrative leaders could improve educator morale.

### **Leadership Qualities**

Good administrative leaders help guide and make the essential large-scale decisions (Leading Effectively Staff, 2022). Robbin (2019) stated that, from the beginning, having clear expectations of all constituents is vital. Having predictable behavior, norms, and routines allows people to know what is available to them and what

to expect of all people in the school (Dowd, 2018). A common misconception is that individuals are just naturally gifted with leadership skills, but the truth is that leadership qualities, like other skills, can be acquired with time and practice (CFI Team, 2022). CFI Team (2022) stated that administrative leaders help motivate others, provide guidance, build morale, and initiate action. Administrative leaders have several qualities that make them effective leaders: be visible, develop empathy, clear communication, adapt, and respect all (Robbin, 2019).

Robbins (2019) stated that to model positive behavior and lead by example, the administrative leader needs to be actively involved in the school by being visible in person (classrooms, hallways, bus lanes and events), online, and through communications. A leader needs to demonstrate empathy; being willing to help and understand the other person's motivations and views (Leading Effectively Staff, 2022). This is often the "test" that solidifies the trusting bonds, and these strong relationships allow people to be better collaborators, as they are able to support each other to grow (Robbin, 2019). CFI Team (2022) noted that leaders are excellent communicators, able to explain problems and solutions clearly and concisely. Leaders know when to talk and when to listen (Leading Effectively Staff, 2022). The administrator needs to understand that change is inevitable and be ready, willing, and prepared to adjust plans as events are occurring (Robbins, 2019). Leading Effectively Staff (2022) stated that treating people with respect on a daily basis is one of the most important things a leader can do, and it will ease tensions and conflict, create trust, and improve effectiveness.

## **Leadership Styles**

Leadership is important in education, not only influencing the learner's results and the relationship between educator and learner, but also seeking to maintain a good learning atmosphere, develop personality in a broad sense, develop teamwork perspectives, improve the educational process, and strengthen the school leader's and teacher's education (Daučianskaitė & Žydžiūnaitė, 2020). Nowadays a plethora of administrators use a variety of leadership styles, but all this is like a hidden form (Talalienė & Šečkuvienė, 2015). Every style of leadership is specific and has its own qualities, distinguishing the differences and similarities that prevail in them (Daučianskaitė & Žydžiūnaitė, 2020). Different leadership styles may affect organizational effectiveness or performance (Nanjundeswaraswamy & Swamy, 2014). Educational leadership is distinguished by common work, the pursuit of common goals between the educator and the student, and the process of sharing education (Daučianskaitė & Žydžiūnaitė, 2020). The purpose of the following pages is to analyze the various leadership styles and identify the qualities associated with each style.

### **Authoritarian Leadership Styles**

#### ***Coercive Leadership***

Coercive leadership is a command-and-control style that relies on forcing people to do what you tell them, whether they want to or not (Kohlrieser, 2016). Leadership (2021) stated that coercive leaders are known for their competitive spirit and being mentally and psychologically demanding. Goleman, an expert in the field of leadership theory, defines a coercive leader as one that is characterized by demanding unquestioning obedience from subordinates, which are not consulted about what needs to be done or



how things should be done; instead, they are told what to do and how to do it (Leadership, 2021).

Coercive leaders are typically very persuasive; however, they can be challenging because they might not always have others' best interests in mind and are usually for short-term gains only (interObservers, 2022). Miller (2022) stated that in exceptional cases, coercive leadership might be necessary for an organization or group's long-term survival or stability; one of the most noted situations is when a company, country, or organization faces security threats.

### ***Authoritative Leadership***

Authoritative leaders typically make choices based on their ideas and judgments, rarely accept followers' advice, and involve absolute, authoritarian control over a group (Cherry, 2022). Flynn (2019) stated that authoritative leadership is gained through punishment, threats, demands, orders, rules, and regulations. An authoritative leadership style works best when executing absolute control in a time of battle or crisis is necessary (Corddry, 2020). EBA (2022) examined that leaders in those situations must make difficult decisions, communicate, and execute a strategy with an unwavering focus. Cherry (2022) stated that there are benefits to using this authoritarian leadership, and it is most appropriate when tasks must be completed with great urgency. Setting straightforward tasks and expectations while making the decisions seems a logical step, as often there is no time for discussion (Cherry, 2022). Under such conditions, one needs structure and discipline to get the job done (Corddry, 2020).

Zylfijaj et al. (2014) stated that the authoritarian leadership style would not motivate the subordinates. Leaders are believed to be controllers who expect subordinates

to act according to the leader's specifications (Zylfijaj et al., 2014). During this leadership style, it was essential to have one clear voice giving directions (Corddry, 2020). Wang et al. (2019) explained that the authoritarian leader came up with a solution that was not too inventive; therefore, it lowered the follower's devotion to the chores. EBA (2022) noted that long-term use can also build resentment, whereby those team members are never given a chance to grow, resulting in the feeling of being undervalued and distrusted. Chu (2014) stated that prior studies indicated that supervisors' authoritarian behavior aroused four negative aspects: authority and control, looking down on the subordinate competence, image building, and didactic behavior, which means placing demands on specific achievement and conduct.

### ***Pacesetting Leadership***

Jasper (2018) stated that pacesetting leadership is best described as leading by example. Pacesetting leaders generally set high expectations and demand quick results (Sharma, 2016). Indeed Editorial Team (2018) maintained that this leadership style works best when a business or department needs a fast response from a team that's already motivated and skilled at doing their jobs. Nevertheless, pacesetting leaders risk losing their teams and reducing innovation when using this style too extensively, and it does not work when employees need training or coaching (Jasper, 2018).

Goleman (2000) noted that the pacesetting style destroys the climate, employees feel overwhelmed by the demands for excellence, and their morale drops. Guidelines for working may be evident in the leader's head, but she/he does not state them clearly; she/he expects people to know what to do and even thinks, "If I have to tell you, you are the wrong person for the job" (Goleman, 2000). Jasper (2018) concludes that work

becomes not a matter of doing one's best along a clear course but second guessing what the leader wants. As for rewards, the pacesetter either gives no feedback on how people are doing or jumps in to take over when she/he thinks they are lagging (Jasper, 2018). Furthermore, if the leader should leave, people feel directionless, and commitment dwindles because people have no sense of how their efforts fit into the big picture (Goleman, 2000).

### **Laissez-faire Leadership Styles**

#### ***Laissez-faire Leadership***

Leaders who pursue laissez-faire leadership are generally seen as ineffective and even detrimental to follower performance (Wong & Giessner, 2016). STU Online (2014) stated that laissez-faire leadership is a passive leadership style in which leaders avoid interaction with their followers by keeping long social distances and avoiding confronting problems by ignoring followers' needs. Wong and Giessner (2016) noted that avoiding legitimate responsibilities is a central tenet of this leadership style, which is often regarded as "the absence of leadership." Lee (2020) supported that laissez-faire leadership is "the avoidance of intervention" directed at the leader's lack of commitment to recognizing or accommodating followers' needs for development or well-being.

Iqbal et al. (2021) found that the laissez-faire style is considered at the end of the democratic-style spectrum. Laissez-faire leadership can thus be manifested in a lack of presence, resulting in lower perceived leader effectiveness (Wong & Giessner, 2016). Laissez-faire leaders delegate decision-making powers to followers and create learning opportunities for followers (Lee, 2020). The style becomes effective when employees are highly skilled and motivated (Iqbal et al., 2021).

### ***Affiliative Leadership***

Lindberg (2022) stated that affiliative leadership is wholly focused on the people and relationships in an organization. Goleman (2000) noted that among the most influential business thinkers, the hallmark of the affiliative leader is a “people come first” attitude. The leader’s primary task is to ensure harmony and friendship in the workplace; this leads to happy employees but can, at the same time, lead to poor performance (Lindberg, 2022). Nevertheless, its exclusive focus on praise can allow poor performance to go uncorrected and leave employees in a quandary (Goleman, 2000).

Goleman (2000) noted that affiliative leadership focuses on resolving team conflicts, so all team members feel positively connected. Team tensions often prevent organizations from achieving their goals (Lindberg, 2022). Harappa (2021) detailed that managers must analyze their goals, knowledge, experiences, and personality to assess how they can lead their teams better by strengthening relationships and connecting with each team member emotionally. Lopaze (2022) found that affiliative leaders can be beneficial when a team is in deep crisis or turmoil and a new team needs to emerge. Furthermore, affiliative leadership is extra beneficial when shaping a new team from scratch since it creates trust and a sense of belonging that can weld the team members together in a productive way (Harappa, 2021).

### ***Coaching Leadership***

The coaching leadership style (CLS) is characterized by collaboration, support, and guidance (Lee, 2020). Ibarra and Scoular (2019) noted that coaching leaders focus on bringing out the best in their teams by guiding them through goals and obstacles. CLS is integral to several established leadership theories (Berg & Karlsen, 2016). Berg and

Karlsen (2016) reported that CLS helps employees develop personally and with a long-term perspective. Henson (2013) noted that CLS builds confidence, promotes individual competence, and contributes to developing a strong commitment to common goals. The leader supports and challenges colleagues with the intent of helping them achieve individual development goals (Lee, 2020). CLS is most effective when managers want to help employees build lasting personal strengths (Berg & Karlsen, 2016). Lee (2020) noted that CLS leaders develop and improve their leadership effectiveness by using self-coaching to solve their problems; the result is more confidence and self-control among managers practicing CLS. Henson (2013) found another outcome, leaders cope better with stress. Benincasa (2012) argued that a CLS has almost no effect when employees are not open to feedback or unwilling to learn.

Berg and Karlsen (2016) concluded that leaders who succeed with CLS have empathy for and trust in others, less need for control and directing, a desire to help others develop, openness to feedback and personalized learning, and a belief that most people want to learn. Sutton (2021) noted that leaders also have confidence that these outcomes can be achieved through incremental learning, not through a “sink or swim” strategy, and these thoughts and attitudes form the basis of a coaching mindset. CLS is highly effective in environments where people lack the skills or knowledge to reach a shared vision or have become jaded and tired over time (Eden Project, 2018). Coaching leaders must learn to communicate well and move away from a hierarchical approach to engagement (Lee, 2020). Coaching involves explicit trust in employees (Eden Project, 2018). Berg and Karlsen (2016) stated that employees feel that they have the necessary responsibility, autonomy, and competence. Overall, CLS is a change in focus: rather than simply

targeting results, and its goal is to empower individuals and teams to be the best versions of themselves (Sutton, 2021).

## **Democratic Leadership Styles**

### ***Instructional Leadership***

Gumus et al. (2016) stated that instructional leadership style dominated the educational field from 1980 to 1993 and then again from 2004 to 2014. Instructional leadership refers to leadership practices that involve planning, evaluating, coordinating, and improving teaching and learning (Smith et al., 2017). Kwan (2019) found that from 2004-2014, the focus shifted back to instructional leadership, considering increasing accountability vested in schools to improve student learning and outcomes. The earlier conception of instructional leadership generally consisted of mostly administrator-centered instructional monitoring activities (Gumus et al., 2016). Day and Sammons (2016) identified that the five instructional leadership dimensions were: leading through promoting and participating in educator learning and development; establishing goals and expectations; planning, coordinating, and evaluating teaching and the curriculum; strategic resourcing; and ensuring an orderly and supportive environment.

Instructional leadership is a model of school leadership in which the administrator works alongside educators to provide support and guidance in establishing best practices in teaching (Smith et al., 2017). Administrators employing this leadership model communicate with their staff and set clear goals for student achievement (Bogler et al., 2013). Carraway and Young (2014) noted that in this model, educators are supported by the administrator, who provides coaching and mentoring to those who require it and professional development opportunities that allow educators to explore best practices in

teaching. The goal of instructional leadership is for the administrator to work closely with educators to increase student achievement (Brolund, 2016). Lashway (2002) concluded that instructional leadership is distributed across the school community, with administrators, superintendents, educators, and policymakers having complementary responsibilities.

Bottoms and O'Neill (2001) characterized the administrator as the "chief learning officer" who bears "ultimate responsibility for success or failure of the enterprise." As the person ultimately responsible for the school's success, an instructional leader must be adept at uniting the staff and students to create new ideas and teaching methods (Indeed Editorial Staff, 2022). Shepard (2021) noted that administrators must lead educators to produce tangible results on ambitious academic standards and create a dependable team that works together to create a more effective and positive learning environment. Tabrizi and Rideout (2019) asserted that instructional leadership is more than simply communicating expectations: time should also be spent observing, participating in, and leading classrooms to provide practical examples of those expectations.

### ***Situational Leadership***

Situational leadership is a flexible, adaptable style of leadership that determines whether a leader is more directive or supportive based on their followers' individualized needs (Miller, 2022). Team Asana (2021) stated that situational leadership is a style of leadership where leaders consider the readiness level of the team members they serve and the uniqueness of every situation. The situational leadership approach can help one develop relationships with team members by customizing the leadership style to their development level (Tabrizi & Rideout, 2019). Each team member requires a different

level of hands-on and communication-based leadership; it is up to oneself to assess one's team members' skills, confidence, and motivation and determine what leadership style to use (Team Asana, 2021). Miller (2022) stated that all team members differ in their abilities, confidence levels, and motivation levels at work. If the same level of leadership style is used for everyone, some team members will enjoy the leadership while others will feel underserved (Tabrizi & Rideout, 2019). The situational leadership method is flexible and allows one to customize the leadership style to meet everyone's needs (Team Asana, 2021).

According to Wyld (2010), situational leadership brings attention to the role of the follower. This leadership style is about being flexible and allowing the follower to be successful in the working environment (Mwai, 2011). In a situational leadership model, a leader should be able to place emphasis on the task and more or less on the relationship with the people he is leading, depending on what is needed to get the job done successfully (Mwai, 2011).

### **Servant Leadership Style**

The dichotomous nature of servant leadership has the capacity to lead to a general misunderstanding of what the concept entails (Gandolfi et al., 2017). A confusion is thus quite possible due to an incorrect understanding of the roles of a leader and a servant (Gandolfi & Stone, 2018). Servant leaders are as proactive, ambitious, and driven as any other leader (Spears, 2010). They just have a different focus and set of motivation that guide their leadership and decision making (Spears, 2010). In fact, what differentiates servant leadership from other styles of leadership is the primary focus on the follower first (Stone et al., 2004).



Leaders have traditionally been valued for their communication and decision-making skills (Spears, 2010). Gomez (2022) stated that although these are also important skills for the servant leader, they need to be reinforced by a deep commitment to listening intently to others. The servant leader strives to understand and empathize with others (Spears, 2010). People need to be accepted and recognized for their special and unique spirits (Witt, 2018). One of the great strengths of servant leadership is the potential for healing oneself and one's relationship to others (Spears, 2010). Witt (2018) stated that many people have broken spirits and have suffered from a variety of emotional hurts and need trust from their leader.

Spears (2010) noted that general awareness, and especially self-awareness, strengthens the servant-leader. The servant leader seeks to convince others, rather than coerce compliance (Witt, 2018). Servant leaders seek to nurture their abilities to look at a problem or an organization from a conceptualizing perspective, which means that one must think beyond day-to-day realities (Spears, 2010). Foresight is a characteristic that enables the servant leader to understand the lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequence of a decision for the future (Gandolfi & Stone, 2018). The servant leader recognizes the tremendous responsibility to do everything in his or her power to nurture the personal and professional growth of employees and colleagues (Spears, 2010). Gomez (2022) stated that servant leadership requires building relationships between co-workers. Servant leadership offers great hope for the future in creating better, more caring, institutions (Gandolfi & Stone, 2018).

## Summary

In this chapter, a review of literature has examined educator morale, leadership, leadership traits and leadership styles. Strasser (2012) interviewed administrators to gain insights into how building administrators can positively affect teacher morale. A few qualities that arose time and again were educators must be treated with respect; they must be given the opportunity to make decisions that affect their lives in the classroom, and they must believe their administrator is a person of integrity and character who fully supports educators (Strasser, 2012). Kongnyuy (2015) indicated, “Motivation is very instrumental in personnel management . . . Principals should therefore use various means to boost educators’ morale so as to improve on teachers’ professional output” (p. 117). Mbownei and Taole (2022) stated that more attention is given to ensuring that educator morale is enhanced for educational goals to be realized.

Any strong organization needs a point person that maintains, manages, and inspires everyone to meet the vision and mission of the group (Robbin, 2019). The role of administrator leader is to provide strategic direction in the school system (Dowd, 2018). An administrative leader needs his/her educators to believe in the leader’s ability to lead and must do everything possible to make sure teacher morale is high. McGrath (2022) stated that there are no silver bullets or simple solutions. Acknowledgment and honest dialogue around these challenges is essential to building morale (Lalzary, 2022).

Administrators have various leadership styles to select from their resources. The administrator needs to utilize the correct leadership style at any given time during the day. The literature suggested a common correlation between administrative leadership style and its impact on teacher morale. Webb (2014) cautioned that “when adopting a

particular leadership style, the leaders should make sure that the style chosen is the one that most effectively achieves the group's common goals while still meeting the individual needs of the members" (p. 33). Germano (2010) commented that leadership is directly connected to organizational success as well as having a positive effect on organizational relationships. According to Bass and Bass (2008) good leaders are not born, they are made. As a result, good leadership is an essential ingredient in an organization's success. A further study must be completed to add to this body of research about effective and ineffective administrator qualities and its influence on educator performance. Chapter Three described the methodology and design of this proposed study.

## **Chapter Three – Methods and Procedures**

### **Introduction**

Researchers had struggled for decades to identify specific elements of administrative leadership and the influence it had on educator morale/performance (Brion, 2015). Senechal et al. (2016) stated that employees who had high job satisfaction were healthier and happier in their work life, and they felt happier in their life outside of work, too. Gu and Day (2013) studied resilience in looking at the effects that administrative leadership qualities had on educators at varying stages in their career. Educator resilience was influenced by professional identity, the commitment of the individuals and their peers, and the quality of the support from school leadership (Earp, 2022). This qualitative study examined educators' perceptions regarding the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how it influenced the educator's performance.

This chapter outlined the methodology used in the study. These methods included the following: (a) a detailed description of the participants who were included in the study, (b) the setting in which the study was conducted, (c) the instruments used to collect data, (d) the design of study, and (f) the process by which the data was analyzed.

### **Participants**

The participants in this study were elementary, middle school, and high school educators. The participants were members from two social media groups. The members of each social media group were educators located throughout the United States and Canada. To join the social media group, each member was screened by filling out a pre-made Google form for each specific group. The Google forms asked for place of

employment and a school email. The administrator team of each social media group validated the information within 24 hours and approved membership. Both social media groups screened comments and posts carefully.

The first group had over 180,000 members and was created in 2017. It was one of the leading group sites for information on technology, innovation, curriculum, assessment, and research. The second group had over 40,000 members and was created in 2015. This group was created as a place for educators to assist each other with best practices and tips.

One hundred thirty-seven educators participated in the online survey. Seventy-two (52.6%) educators indicated they were teachers, and sixty-three (46.0%) educators indicated they were special education teachers. One (.7%) educator indicated they were a guidance counselor, and one (.7%) educator indicated they were a school nurse. Zero educators indicated librarians and school psychologists as job titles. A total of six (4.4%) educators indicated they were male, and 131 (95.7%) educators indicated they were female. Information regarding the level in which the educator taught was not collected. Sixteen (11.7%) educators reported their age range of 22 to 30, and thirty-seven (27.0%) educators reported their age range of 31 to 40. Forty-eight (35.0%) educators reported their age range of 41 to 50, and thirty (21.9%) educators reported their age range of 51 to 60. Six (4.38%) educators reported an age range of over 61.

### **Setting**

The setting for the study was the location of each individual educator from the two social media groups. The social media groups have members located throughout the United States and Canada. Forty-five (38.8%) educators indicated that their current

employment location is in the Midwestern region (North Dakota (1), South Dakota (0), Nebraska (2), Kansas (2), Missouri (7), Minnesota (3), Wisconsin (3), Michigan (6), Illinois (8), Indiana (3), Kentucky (1), West Virginia (1), Ohio (6)) of the United States. Forty-two (30.7%) educators indicated that their current employment location is in the Northeastern region (Maryland (5), Delaware (1), New Jersey (2), Pennsylvania (20), New York (8), Rhode Island (0), Connecticut (2), New York (8), Massachusetts (3), Vermont (0), New Hampshire (1), Maine (0)) of the United States. Sixteen (11.7%) educators indicated that their current employment location is in the Pacific region (Washington (3), Oregon (1), California (10), Hawaii (0), Alaska (2)) of the United States. Twelve (8.75%) educators indicated that their current employment location is in the Southern region (Arkansas (1), Louisiana (1), Alabama (0), Mississippi (1), Georgia (3), Florida (3), South Carolina (1), North Carolina (1), Tennessee (0)) of the United States. Eleven (8.0%) educators indicated that their current employment location is in the Southwestern region (Arizona (0), New Mexico (0), Texas (11), Oklahoma (0)) of the United States. Five (3.6%) educators indicated that their current employment location is in the Western region (Montana (0), Idaho (2), Colorado (0), Nevada (2), Utah (1), Wyoming (0)) of the United States. Lastly, six (4.3%) educators indicated that their current location is outside the United States in Canada.

One hundred-nineteen (86.86%) educators indicated working in a public-school environment. Eight (5.84%) educators indicated working in a private school environment. Three (2.19%) educators indicated working in a charter school environment. One (0.73%) educator indicated that they work in a cyber school environment. Four (2.92%) educators

indicated working in a parochial school environment. Two (1.46%) educators indicated working in a different school environment.

### **Instruments**

According to Creswell (2015), a qualitative research study involved collecting data from a group of participants to obtain their views and perspectives. There were two types of instruments designed by the researcher to collect data. The online survey included demographic questions, Likert-style statements, and open-ended questions (Appendix A). The post-survey interview questions (Appendix B) were conducted in-person/zoom/phone call with willing participants. These instruments were developed to ascertain the educators' perceptions regarding the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how it influenced the educator's performance. The questions were evaluated and approved by a panel of experienced educators. The survey, open-ended and interview questions were piloted and timed using five retired educators.

### ***Survey***

Phillips (2017) stated that the best use of a survey was to explore the opinions and emotions of the individual participants. This study included a researcher-designed survey comprised of demographic questions, Likert-scale statements, and open-ended questions. The survey was distributed to the elementary, middle, and high school level educators..

The educator survey consisted of 11 demographic questions and 25 Likert-scale statements. Demographic survey questions ascertained the following from each participant: current professional, gender, current age, years as an educator, highest educational level, years in your current school as an educator, years working with current administrative leadership, current employment location by region (state), school

classification, and school location. Twenty-five Likert scale statements followed with the following options for answers: strongly effective, effective, ineffective, and strongly ineffective. Survey statements 1 through 5, 9, 10, 14 through 16, and 21 through 25 were designed to elicit responses relevant to research question number one. Survey statements 6 through 8, 11 through 13, and 17 through 20 were designed to elicit responses relevant to research question number two.

The participants answered two open-ended questions. Open-ended question number one elicited responses that answered research questions number one and three. Open-ended question number two elicited responses that answered research questions number two and three. The open-ended questions developed to ascertain the educators' perceptions regarding the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how it influenced the educator's performance. The survey instrument was piloted by five retired teachers. The survey took approximately 9 - 15 minutes to complete.

The researcher developed a survey using SurveyMonkey. Social Media posts were posted on the two social media sites. The researcher employed SurveyMonkey as the data collection vehicle which helped ensure teacher participation. Its ease of use, design, and teacher familiarity with the product were instrumental in the decision, as well as its reputations for ensuring that the data collected would remain confidential and anonymous.

### ***Post-Survey Interviews***

The post-survey interview acted as a second measurement instrument to provide more in-depth data with individuals willing to participate. The post-survey interviews



were conducted by the researcher and allowed participants to expand upon their survey responses. The post-survey interview consisted of three questions for educators.

The three post-survey interview questions were designed to elicit responses that sought to quantify each of the three research questions the dissertation addressed. Post-survey interview question number one elicited response that answered research questions number one and two. Post-survey interview question number two elicited response that answered research question number three. Post-interview question number three elicited response that allowed the researcher to acquire supplemental data.

As in the survey and open-ended questions in Appendix A, there was some overlap in post-survey interview questions, as well as those questions that would be educator specific. The interviews were conducted by the researcher in a face-to-face zoom call or phone call that took approximately 15 minutes. The data was collected during the post-survey interview by the researcher summarizing that interviewee responses and writing the responses immediately. Post-survey opened questions allowed educators to offer additional and enhanced meaningful feedback to their initial responses and combined with the survey allowed for proof of triangulation of data that added concrete information to the analysis.

### **Validity and Reliability**

To further ensure reliability and validity of the survey, the researcher obtained feedback from a panel of experienced educators. The panel consisted of educators who have obtained Doctorates in Education this ensured that the surveys were aligned with the research questions and purpose of the study (Appendix C). Creswell (2015) stated that validity occurs when evidence showed the test results are aligned with the proposed

intent. The experienced panel of educators did not participate in the study but reviewed the Likert-scale survey statements, open ended and interview questions using a 3-2-1 rating system. A rating of three meant that the statement/question correlated to the designated research question; two meant that the statement/question suggested modification towards the designated research question; and one meant that the question did not correlate to the designated research question. Survey revisions were made based on the feedback of the panel of experienced educators, as well as on the feedback of the dissertation committee and chair. Questions were rewritten and/or modified to ensure validity and reliability within the survey and interview questions.

### **Design of the Study**

A qualitative research study explored a research problem to gain a deeper understanding and examination of a phenomena and guided by research questions to gain better understanding of a problem (Creswell, 2015). This study utilized a qualitative research design. Specifically, this qualitative study examined educators' perceptions regarding the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how it influenced the educator's performance.

### **Procedure**

The proposal for this study was brought before the Research Ethics Review Board of Immaculata University (Appendix D) and permission was granted to move forward with the study in December 2022. On the first day of the proposed data collection period, the social media flyers were posted on the two social media group pages being used in the survey. The social media flyers were posted every five days to the social media group pages. After tenth day of the proposed period, the social media flyers were posted every

two days until the end of the twenty-first day. This allowed for several opportunities for recruitment of the online survey to social media groups.

The flyers asked participants to click on the SurveyMonkey link. Immediately after participants clicked the link for SurveyMonkey, information about the survey and consent was on the initial page. Once the participant read through all the information, they had the choice to not continue with the online survey by closing out of the survey or clicking on the “I agree” button.

The online survey was constructed of 11 demographic questions, 25 Likert-scale statements and two open-ended response questions. The online survey instrument was developed to ascertain the educators’ perceptions regarding the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how it influenced the educator’s performance. The online survey instrument took approximately 9 - 15 minutes to complete.

At the end of the survey portion, participants had another choice to be a part of the interview portion of the research. The consent for the interview was posted on the last page following the two open-ended questions. Participants willing to participate in an interview provided contact information and consented for the researcher to schedule participants’ interviews at their convenience. The interviews acted as a second instrument and provided more in-dept data. Interviews were conducted with individuals willing to participate and allowed participants to expand upon their survey responses. The interview consisted of three questions for educators. As in the survey and open-ended questions, there was some overlap in interview questions, as well as those questions that were educator specific. During the interview process, the researcher took notes as each

response is given. A thank you was relayed to all interview participants following the completion of the interviews. The interview took approximately 15 minutes.

### **Data Analysis**

Data was collected during this qualitative study to analyze educators' perceptions regarding the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how it influenced the educator's performance. The responses, provided by each participating educator, were coded into themes which included the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator.

Data consisted of responses to Likert-scale statements, open-ended questions, and post-survey interviews. The surveys were scored as follows: A Likert scale condensed each survey statement into four categorical areas. Open-ended question elaborated on specific effective and ineffective qualities of an administrator. Post-survey interviews consisted of three questions pertaining to qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how it influenced the educator's performance. Participants' interview responses provided opportunities for further elaboration on survey questions.

### **Summary**

This qualitative study examined educators' perceptions regarding the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how it influenced the educator's performance. The study took place with educators located across the United States and Canada. A total of 137 educators participated in the online survey and open-ended questions portion of the study and 12 educators participated in the post-survey interview by zoom or phone call. Three methods were used to collect data, including a Likert-scale

survey, open-ended questions and a zoom or phone call interview, that allowed for the triangulation of data.

This chapter discussed and described the subjects, setting of the study, the instruments that were used to collect data, and included a description of the procedure, as well as an explanation of how the data was analyzed upon collection. The findings of the study were reported in Chapter Four.

## Chapter Four – Results

### Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how they influenced the educator's performance. Data was collected with three researcher-created instruments: an online survey, open-ended questions, and a post-survey interview. A panel of experienced educators approved the survey and interview questions. The surveys and interviews were designed to generate responses to three research questions based about effective and ineffective qualities of administrators.

The teacher survey, administered online through SurveyMonkey, was accessed by 137 participants (N=137). The 137 participants chose to respond to all the survey and open-ended questions. The first eleven questions on the survey were developed to ascertain specific demographic information about each participant. These included inquiries to receive data regarding each participant's age and gender, education level, how many years they taught at their current schools, and the number of years working with their current administrator.

Twenty-five Likert-scale questions followed the demographic inquiries. They included the following options: strongly effective, effective, ineffective, and strongly ineffective. The online survey ended with two open-ended questions. The 25 survey and the two open-ended questions were designed to elicit responses to the three research questions. Survey statements are reported under the "Survey" section under "Compilation of Data" and are grouped by research question. Responses to open-ended survey

questions are reported in the “Open-Ended Questions” section under “Compilations of Data and are grouped by each question as well.

At the end of the teacher survey, there were three optional interview questions which were designed by the researcher and were approved by a panel of experienced educators. The interview questions were used to analyze and identify patterns in educators’ perceptions of the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how it influenced the educator’s performance. Twelve participants (N=12) participated in the interview portion of the study. The participants were coded using a number system. Answers were reported in the “Interview” section under the “Post-Survey Interview Section” and were completed to represent emerging themes and patterns.

### **Compilation of Data**

#### ***Demographic***

Table 4.1 illustrates the data collected from the first demographic question on the online survey. The question asked participating educators to indicate their current professional role. Seventy-two (52.6%) educators indicated they were teachers, and sixty-three (46.0%) educators indicated they were special education teachers. One (.7%) educator indicated they were a guidance counselor, and one (.7%) educator indicated they were a school nurse. Zero educators indicated librarians and school psychologists as job titles.

Table 4.1  
*Participating Educators' Current Professional Role*

Current Professional Role	Participants (%)
Teacher	72 (52.6%)
Special Education Teacher	63 (46.0%)
Guidance	1 (.7%)
Librarian	0 (0%)
School Nurse	1 (.7%)
School Psychologist	0 (0%)

Note: *Participant Response (N=137)*

Demographic question number four on the educator survey requested participating educators to share how many years they were as educators. Nineteen (13.9%) educators indicated that they had been an educator for 0 to 5 years, and twenty-one (15.3%) educators indicated that they had been an educator for 6 – 10 years. Twenty-one (15.3%) educators indicated that they had been an educator for 11 – 15 years, and seventy-six (55.5%) educators indicated that they had been an educator for more than 15 years. Table 4.2 represents the participating educators' years as an educator.

Table 4.2  
*Participating Educators' Years as an Educator*

Educators' Years Range	Participants (%)
0 – 5 years	19 (13.9%)
6 – 10 years	21 (15.3%)
11 – 15 years	21 (15.3%)
15 + years	76 (55.5%)

Note: *Participant Response (N=137)*



In demographic question number seven, educators were asked to indicate the number of years they have worked with their current administrative leadership. One hundred ten (80.2%) educators have worked with their current administrative leadership for 0 – 5 years. Twenty-six (18.98%) educators have worked with their current administrative leadership for 6 – 10 years. One (0.73%) educator has worked with their current administrative leadership for 11 – 15 years, and zero (0.00%) participants have worked with their current administrative leadership for 15-plus years. Table 4.3 represents the number of years an educator has worked with their current administrative leadership.

Table 4.3

*Participating Educators' Years Working with Current Administrative Leadership*

Educators' Years Working with a Current Administrator Leadership	Participants % (N)
0 – 5 years	110 (80.29%)
6 – 10 years	26 (18.98%)
11 – 15 years	1 (.73%)
15 + years	0 (0.00%)

Note: *Participant Response (N=137)*

Demographic question eight asked participating educators to provide their current employment location by state/region in the United States. Forty-five (38.8%) educators indicated that their current employment location is in the Midwestern region (North Dakota (1), Nebraska (2), Kansas (2), Missouri (7), Minnesota (3), Wisconsin (3), Michigan (6), Illinois (8), Indiana (3), Kentucky (1), West Virginia (1), Ohio (6)) of the United States. Forty-two (30.7%) educators indicated that their current employment location is in the Northeastern region (Maryland (5), Delaware (1), New Jersey (2),

Pennsylvania (20), New York (8), Connecticut (2), New York (8), Massachusetts (3), New Hampshire (1)) of the United States. Sixteen (11.7%) educators indicated that their current employment location is in the Pacific region (Washington (3), Oregon (1), California (10), Alaska (2)) of the United States. Twelve (8.75%) educators indicated that their current employment location is in the Southern region (Arkansas (1), Louisiana (1), Mississippi (1), Georgia (3), Florida (3), South Carolina (1), North Carolina (1)) of the United States. Eleven (8.0%) educators indicated that their current employment location is in the Southwestern region (Texas (11)) of the United States. Five (3.6%) educators indicated that their current employment location is in the Western region (Idaho (2), Nevada (2), Utah (1)) of the United States. Lastly, six (4.3%) educators indicated that their current location is outside the United States in Canada. The data is displayed in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4

*Participating Educators' Current Employment Location by Region (State)*

<u>Educators' Current Employment Location by Region (State)</u>	<u>Participants % (N)</u>
Pacific Region (Washington (3), Oregon (1), California (10), Alaska (2))	16 (11.7%)
Western Region (Idaho (2), Nevada (2), Utah (1))	5 (3.64%)
Southwestern Region (Texas (11))	11 (8.03%)
Southern Region (Arkansas (1), Louisiana (1), Mississippi (1), Georgia (3), Florida (3), South Carolina (1), North Carolina (1))	12 (8.76%)
Midwest Region (North Dakota (1), Nebraska (2), Kansas (2), Missouri (7), Minnesota (3), Wisconsin (3), Michigan (6), Illinois (8), Indiana (3), Kentucky (1), West Virginia (1), Ohio (6))	45 (32.8%)
Northwest Region (Maryland (5), Delaware (1), New Jersey (2), Pennsylvania (20), New York (8), Connecticut (2), New York (8), Massachusetts (3), New Hampshire (1))	42 (30.7%)
Canada (6)	6 (4.38%)

Note: *Participant Response (N=137)*

Table 4.5 illustrates the data that was collected from the ninth demographic question. The question asked participating educators to indicate their current school classification. One hundred-nineteen (86.86%) educators indicated working in a public-school environment. Eight (5.84%) educators indicated working in a private school environment. Three (2.19%) educators indicated working in a charter school environment. One (0.73%) educator indicated that they work in a cyber school environment. Four (2.92%) educators indicated working in a parochial school environment. Two (1.46%) educators indicated working in a different school environment.

Table 4.5

*Participating Educators' Current School Classification*

Educators' Current School Classification	Participants % (N)
Public School Environment	119 (86.86%)
Private School Environment	8 (5.84%)
Charter School Environment	3 (2.19%)
Cyber School Environment	1 (0.73%)
Parochial School Environment	4 (2.92%)
Other School Environment	2 (2.92%)

Note: *Participant Response (N=137)*

***Research Question One: Qualities of an Effective Administrator***

The following statements on the survey 1 through 5, 9, 10, 14 through 16, and 21 through 25 were designed to elicit responses relevant to research question number one.

In survey statement number one, participating educators were asked if the following statement of communication (exceptional listening and lines and methods of communication are well developed and maintained) was an effective or ineffective

quality in an administrator. In responding to this statement, 97 (70.80%) educators found it strongly effective, and 25 (18.25%) educators found it effective. Ten (7.30%) educators found it to be ineffective, and five (3.65%) educators found it to be strongly ineffective.

Participating educators were asked to analyze survey statement two: the administrator quickly acts on daily issues and follows up that day to ensure the issues are resolved. Was this an effective or ineffective quality of the administrator? In responding to the statement, 83 (60.58%) educators found this quality strongly effective. Thirty-two (23.36%) educators found this quality to be effective. Thirteen (9.49%) educators found this quality ineffective, and nine (6.57%) educators found this quality to be strongly ineffective.

Survey statement three inquired whether leading by example was an effective or ineffective quality of an administrator. Seventy-three (53.28%) educators found this quality to be strongly effective. Forty-two (30.66%) educators indicated that this quality was effective. Nine (6.57%) educators indicated that this quality was ineffective. Thirteen (9.49%) educators indicated that this quality was strongly ineffective.

In survey statement number four, participating educators were asked if the following statement of no micromanaging was an effective or ineffective quality in an administrator. In responding to this statement, 64 (46.72%) educators found it to be strongly effective and 51 (37.23%) educators found it to be effective. Eleven (8.03%) educators found it to be ineffective and eleven (8.03%) educators found it to be strongly ineffective.

Survey statement five asked the participating educators to respond to whether openness to change is an effective or ineffective quality for an administrator. In

responding to the statement, 62 (45.26%) educators found this quality strongly effective. Fifty-eight (42.34%) educators found this quality to be effective. Ten (7.30%) educators found this quality to be ineffective, and seven (5.11%) educators found this quality to be strongly ineffective.

In survey statement number nine, participating educators were asked if the following statement of setting straightforward tasks and expectations was an effective or ineffective quality in an administrator. In responding to this statement, 46 (33.58%) educators found it strongly effective, and 75 (54.74%) educators found it effective. Ten (7.30%) educators found it to be ineffective, and six (4.38%) educators found it to be strongly ineffective.

Participating educators were asked to analyze survey statement ten: one clear voice giving directions was this an effective or ineffective quality of an administrator. Responding to the statement, 50 (36.50%) educators found this quality strongly effective. Sixty-one (44.53%) educators found this quality to be effective. Fifteen (10.95%) educators found this quality ineffective, and eleven (8.03%) educators found this quality to be strongly ineffective.

Survey statement 14 asked participating educators whether encouraging collaboration and resolving team conflicts is an effective or ineffective quality of an administrator. In responding to the statement, 62 (45.26%) educators found this quality to be strongly effective. Fifty-eight (42.34%) educators found this quality to be effective. Twelve (8.76%) educators found this quality to be ineffective, and five (3.65%) educators found this quality to be strongly ineffective.

Educators were asked to evaluate survey statement 15, specifically about utilizing data and resources and whether it is an effective or ineffective quality for administrators. Forty-nine (35.77%) educators found this quality to be strongly effective. Seventy (51.09%) educators indicated that this quality was effective. Eleven (8.03%) educators indicated that this quality was ineffective. Seven (5.11%) educators indicated that this quality was strongly ineffective.

In survey statement number 16, participating educators were asked if the statement of being visual in the school building was an effective or ineffective quality in an administrator. In responding to this statement, 75 (54.74%) educators found it to be strongly effective, and 52 (37.96%) educators found it to be effective. Six (4.38%) educators found it to be ineffective, and four (2.92%) educators found it to be strongly ineffective.

Participating educators were asked to analyze survey statement 21: administrators with a strong personality was this an effective or ineffective quality of an administrator. In responding to the statement, 12 (8.76%) educators found this quality strongly effective. Seventy-seven (56.20%) educators found this quality to be effective. Thirty-eight (10.95%) educators found this quality ineffective, and eleven (8.03%) educators found this quality to be strongly ineffective.

Survey statement 22 asked participating educators whether holding educators accountable is an effective or ineffective quality of an administrator. Responding to the statement, 30 (21.90%) educators found this quality strongly effective. Eighty-nine (64.96%) educators found this quality to be effective. Fourteen (10.22%) educators found

this quality ineffective, and four (2.92%) educators found this quality to be strongly ineffective.

Participating educators were asked to analyze survey statement 23: cares about all educators (Knows more than the basic information about the educator), was this an effective or ineffective administrator quality. In responding to the statement, 77 (56.20%) educators found this quality strongly effective. Thirty-nine (28.47%) educators found this quality to be effective. Eleven (8.03%) educators found this quality ineffective, and 10 (7.30%) educators found this quality strongly ineffective.

Educators were asked to evaluate survey statement 24, specifically about ensuring an orderly and supportive environment and whether it is an effective and ineffective quality for administrators. Seventy-three (53.28%) educators found this quality to be strongly effective. Forty-three (31.39%) educators indicated that this quality was effective. Fourteen (10.22%) educators indicated that this quality was ineffective. Seven (5.11%) educators indicated that this quality was strongly ineffective.

In survey statement number 25, participating educators were asked if the following statement: considered the readiness level of the team members they serve as an effective or ineffective quality in an administrator. In responding to this statement, 52 (37.96%) educators found it strongly effective, and 68 (49.64%) educators found it effective. Eleven (8.03%) educators found it to be ineffective, and six (4.38%) educators found it to be strongly ineffective.

Table 4.6 illustrates the individual survey statements and responses regarding the following research question: What are the qualities of an effective administrator? Survey statements 1 through 5, 9, 10, 14 through 16, and 21 through 25 pertained to the above

research question, and specifically discussed the topic of effective qualities of an administrator.

Table 4.6  
*Participating Educators' Likert Scale Responses for Effective Qualities of an Administrator*

Survey Question/Statement	SE	E	I	SI
1. Communication (Exceptional listener and lines and methods of communication are well developed and maintained.)	97 (70.80%)	25 (18.25%)	10 (7.30%)	5 (3.65%)
2. Acts quickly on daily issues and follows up that day to make sure the issues are resolved.	83 (60.58%)	32 (23.36%)	13 (9.49%)	9 (6.57%)
3. Leads by example.	73 (53.28%)	42 (30.66%)	9 (6.57%)	13 (9.49%)
4. No Micromanaging	64 (46.72%)	51 (37.23%)	11 (8.03%)	11 (8.03%)
5. Open to change.	62 (45.26%)	58 (42.43%)	10 (7.30%)	7 (5.11%)
9. Setting straightforward tasks and expectations.	46 (33.58%)	75 (54.74%)	10 (7.30%)	6 (4.38%)
10. One clear voice giving directions	50 (36.50%)	61 (44.53%)	15 (10.95%)	11 (8.03%)
14. Encourages collaboration along with resolving team conflicts	62 (45.26%)	58 (42.34%)	12 (8.76%)	5 (3.65%)
15. Utilize Data and Resources	49 (35.77%)	70 (51.09%)	11 (8.03%)	7 (5.11%)
16. Visual in the school building	75 (54.74%)	52 (37.96%)	6 (4.38%)	4 (2.92%)
21. Strong personality	12 (8.76%)	77 (56.20%)	38 (27.74%)	10 (7.30%)
22. Holds educators accountable	30 (21.90%)	89 (64.96%)	14 (10.22%)	4 (2.92%)
23. Cares about all educators. (Knows more than the basic information about the educator.)	77 (56.20%)	39 (28.47%)	11 (8.03%)	10 (7.30%)
24. Ensuring an orderly and supportive environment	73 (53.28%)	43 (31.39%)	14 (10.22%)	7 (5.11%)
25. Considered the readiness level of the team members they serve	52 (37.96%)	68 (49.64%)	11 (8.03%)	6 (4.38%)

Note: Participant Response (N=137)



***Research Question Two: Qualities of an Ineffective Administrator***

Survey statements 6 through 8, 11 through 13, and 17 through 20 were designed to elicit responses relevant to research question number two.

Participating educators were asked to analyze survey statement six: educators need to be watched, or they will not do their job. Responding to the statement, one (0.73%) educator found this quality strongly effective. Nineteen (13.87%) educators found this quality to be effective. Fifty-six (40.88%) educators found this quality ineffective, and 61 (44.53%) educators found this quality strongly ineffective.

Survey statement seven inquired whether making the educators feel insecure about their work was an effective or ineffective quality of an administrator. Five (3.65%) educators found this quality to be strongly effective. Fourteen (10.22%) educators indicated that this quality was effective. Fourteen (10.22%) educators indicated that this quality was ineffective. One hundred four (75.91%) educators indicated this quality was strongly ineffective.

Survey statement eight asked the participating educators to respond to the quality of command, control, and demand is an effective or ineffective quality for an administrator. In responding to the statement, three (2.19%) educators found this quality strongly effective. Fifteen (10.95%) educators found this quality to be effective. Thirty-five (25.55%) educators found this quality ineffective, and 84 (61.31%) educators found this quality to be strongly ineffective.

In survey statement number 11, participating educators were asked if the statement of no feedback was an effective or ineffective quality in an administrator. Responding to this statement, five (3.65%) educators found it strongly effective, and 15

(5.84%) educators found it effective. Forty (29.20%) educators found it to be ineffective, and 84 (61.31%) educators found it to be strongly ineffective.

Participating educators were asked to analyze survey statement 12: absence of leadership was this an effective or ineffective quality of an administrator. In responding to the statement, six (4.38%) educators found this quality strongly effective. Eight (5.84%) educators found this quality to be effective. Twenty-five (18.25%) educators found this quality ineffective, and 98 (71.53%) educators found this quality strongly ineffective.

Survey statement 13 asked participating educators does setting high expectations and demanding quick results and effective or ineffective quality of an administrator. Responding to the statement, ten (7.30%) educators found this quality strongly effective. Forty-two (30.66%) educators found this quality to be effective. Seventy (51.09%) educators found this quality ineffective, and 15 (10.95%) educators found this quality to be strongly ineffective.

Educators were asked to evaluate survey statement 17, specifically about avoiding conflict and whether it is an effective or ineffective quality for administrators. Five (3.65%) educators found this quality to be strongly effective. Thirty-six (26.28%) educators indicated that this quality was effective. Fifty-nine (43.07%) educators indicated that this quality was ineffective. Thirty-seven (27.01%) educators indicated that this quality was strongly ineffective.

In survey statement number 18, participating educators were asked if the following statement of seeing only what is wrong was an effective or ineffective quality in an administrator. In responding to this statement, seven (5.11%) educators found it to

be strongly effective, and seven (5.11%) educators found it to be effective. Thirty-six (26.28%) educators found it ineffective, and 87 (63.50%) educators found it to be strongly ineffective.

Participating educators were asked to analyze survey statement 19: administrators taking all the credit and controlling everything was this an effective or ineffective quality of an administrator. In responding to the statement, six (4.38%) educators found this quality strongly effective. Nine (6.57%) educators found this quality to be effective. Twenty-one (15.33%) educators found this quality ineffective, and 101 (73.72%) educators found this quality to be a strongly ineffective.

Survey statement 20 asked participating educators to focus exclusively on the goal of an effective or ineffective quality of an administrator. In responding to the statement, four (2.92%) educators found this quality strongly effective. Twenty-two (16.06%) educators found this quality to be effective. Eighty-seven (63.50%) educators found this quality ineffective, and 24 (17.52%) educators found this quality to be a strongly ineffective.

Table 4.7 illustrates the individual survey statements and responses regarding the following research question: What are the qualities of an ineffective administrator? Survey statements 6 through 8, 11 through 13, and 17 through 20 pertained to the above research question, and specifically discussed the topic of effective qualities of an administrator.

Table 4.7  
*Participating Educators' Likert Scale Responses for Ineffective Qualities of an Administrator*

Survey Question/Statement	SE	E	I	SI
6. Educators need to be watched or they won't do their job.	1 (0.73%)	19 (13.87%)	56 (40.88%)	61 (44.53%)
7. Makes the educators feel insecure about their work.	5 (3.65%)	14 (10.22%)	14 (10.22%)	104 (75.91%)
8. Command, control, and demanding.	3 (2.19%)	15 (10.95%)	35 (25.55%)	84 (61.31%)
11. No feedback	5 (3.65%)	8 (5.84%)	40 (29.20%)	84 (61.31%)
12. Absence of leadership	6 (4.38%)	8 (5.84%)	25 (18.25%)	98 (71.53%)
13. Set high expectations and demand quick results.	10 (7.30%)	42 (30.66%)	70 (51.09%)	15 (10.95%)
17. Avoiding conflict.	5 (3.65%)	36 (26.28%)	59 (43.07%)	37 (27.01%)
18. Seeing Only What's Wrong	7 (5.11%)	7 (5.11%)	36 (26.28%)	87 (63.50%)
19. Taking All the Credit and controlling everything	6 (4.38%)	9 (6.57%)	21 (15.33%)	101 (73.72%)
20. Focusing Exclusively on the Goal.	4 (2.92%)	22 (16.06%)	87 (63.50%)	24 (17.52%)

Note: Participant Response (N=137).

### **Research Question Three: Influence on Educator's Performance**

#### *Effective Administrator Qualities*

Once participating educators completed answering the 25 survey questions, they were asked to answer two open-ended questions. The purpose of this question was to identify how effective qualities of an administrator influences the educator's performance. Participating educators were to select a strongly effective or effective quality statement that they answered in the online survey and describe the influence it had on their performance. The following statements on the survey 1 through 5, 9, 10, 14 through 16, and 21 through 25 were designed to elicit responses relevant to the effective aspect of the research question number three. Relative to the question, three themes

emerged, communication, valued as professionals, and accessibility. Communication was the establishment of strong lines of communication between the administrator and educator. Educators portrayed as valued professionals were integral components for effective administrative leadership to practice. Accessibility was referred to as the administrator leading by example, visible in the school building, open to change and setting straightforward tasks and expectations.

### **Administration Communication**

According to the Likert scale survey questions data, communication was the highest rated effective quality of an administrator. The data pertaining to this open-ended question revealed that formal and informal communication, the understanding of expectations and responsibilities allowed educators to be more successful. Two educators commented that communication in any job is the key to success. Another educator stated that when communication is good, the administrator understands what is going well and areas of struggle.

A number of educators agreed that when the administration acted quickly, it shows support and respect for the educators' issues and concerns. One educator stated that having excellent communication changed the atmosphere in the building away from fear toward a collaborative environment. Three educators responded that one clear voice giving directions was their strongly effective and effective quality that influenced the educators' performance. Several educators responded that communication allows the ability to be open and honest with the administration and allows educators to ask questions and grow.

### **Educators Valued as Professionals**

According to the open-ended survey data for question one, educators being valued as professionals was an effective quality that administrators should practice. Several educators stated that when the administrator is popping into classrooms to support, allowing the teacher to go to the bathroom, sub, welcome students at the door, have hard conversations, allow time to communicate with them, have an open-door policy and it makes staff feel supported. Eight educators responded that encouraging collaboration along with resolving team conflicts positively influenced the educators' performance. Several educators responded that it makes educators feel safe and valued when there is an orderly and supportive environment. A number of educators explained that when people felt valued, supported, heard, and cared for as a person, they will do more and genuinely changed the educators' attitude toward teaching.

Various educators responded that utilizing educators' talents and encouraging collaboration has had a positive impact because teachers feel invested in problem-solving. Several educators found that when educators are held accountable, it makes the educator job smoother and there is less resentment. A number of educators responded that a formed relationship with the administrator allows for better performance in the classroom. Several educators responded that educators are people, not just teachers, and mental health matters and when administration takes the time to get to know and care about those around them, they earn respect. One educator responded that an administrator who understands that educators have a family and obligations outside the building is powerfully effective on educator morale.

### **Administration Accessibility**

According to the open-ended survey data for question one, accessibility was referred to as the administrator leading by example, visual in the school building, open to change and setting straightforward tasks and expectations. Several educators found that seeing an administrator present in the building makes the difference and it signals that the administration is present and knows what is happening in their building. An educator responded that the administrator being visual helps the educator believe in themselves, so it is better at servicing the students. Another educator commented that it lets them know the administrators are there for the educator. A number of educators stated that the administrator being visual strengthens the performance and support in the classroom and out.

A few educators found that when administration set expectations it influenced their performance because they knew what was expected of them so that they could focus on that. Another educator mentioned that when expectations are set, they felt they were a valuable team member, which kept them motivated to do their best work. Several educators found that being micromanaged kept the educator from performing the best because of always being worried. Another educator stated that trying new things and being creative allowed for reflection when things are not working. Several educators stated that administrators being open to change helped empower staff to give feedback that is meaningful and has the potential to bring about change. Several educators learned to count on colleagues for support and encouragement during the open change.

A number of educators found that administrators utilizing data and resources allowed educators to change the pace of the curriculum to work better for the students in

the classroom once data was presented. Several educators responded that weekly data meetings with the grade level team helped keep a focus on gaps in learning. Another educator felt a part of the environment and support from all stakeholders.

### **Ranking Results of Effective Qualities from Participating Educators**

In further analysis of the data, Table 4.8 represents the Likert survey statements by the percentage of importance of the effective qualities of an administrator by the participating educators.

*Table 4.8 Participating Educators Likert Scale Responses in Rank Order of Effective Administrative Qualities*

Rank	Effective Administrative Qualities	Overall
1	Visual in the school building	92.7%
2	Communication	89.1%
3	Setting straightforward tasks and expectations.	88.3%
4	Open to change.	87.6%
4	Encourages collaboration along with resolving team conflicts	87.6%
4	Considered the readiness level of the team members	87.6%
7	Holds educators accountable	86.9%
7	Utilize Data and Resources	86.9%
9	Cares about all educators.	84.7%
9	Ensuring an orderly and supportive environment	84.7%
11	Leads by example.	83.9%
11	No Micromanaging	83.9%
11	Acts quickly on daily issues	83.9%
14	One clear voice giving directions	81.0%
15	Strong personality	65.0%

Note: *Participant Response (N=137).*

### **Research Question Three: Influence on Educator's Performance**

#### ***Ineffective Administrator Qualities***

Once participating educators completed answering the 25 survey questions, they were asked to answer two open-ended questions. The purpose of this question was to identify how ineffective qualities of an administrator influences the educator's performance. Participating educators were to select a strongly ineffective or ineffective



quality statement that they answered in the online survey and describe the influence it had on their performance.

The following statements on the survey 6 through 8, 11 through 13, and 17 through 20 were designed to elicit responses relevant to the ineffective aspect of the research question number three. Relative to the question, three themes emerged, administrators micromanage, educators non-valued professionals, and administrators non-accessible. Micromanage was the establishment of strong control from the administrator over the educator. Educators portrayed as non-valued professionals were integral components for ineffective administrative leadership to practice. Non-accessible was referred to as the administrator's absence of leadership and avoiding conflict.

### **Micromanaged**

According to the open-ended survey data for question two, several educators expressed that being watched made them feel doubtful, inadequate as a professional, and takes away their power as a teacher. A number of educators highlighted that a toxic working environment of demand and control had terrible outcomes for the school staff and students. One educator explained that they worked for a principal that was inflexible on everything. It was his way or no way. Twenty-six educators left the building at the end of the year.

One educator found that when an administrator is not open to new ideas unless it is their idea, and they take credit for everything, the educator's performance goes down. Several educators expressed that if the admin takes credit for what the teachers do, the admins lose respect from the faculty. A number of educators explained that educators all have their styles and preferences, and credit needs to be given to teachers when they do

an excellent job. Being recognized makes them feel suitable for their efforts. Two educators commented that a lack of proper support could create a hostile work environment and affect the mental status of the faculty.

One educator described that you would not get the appropriate information from anything if you only focused on the “goal.” Several educators commented that only looking at outcomes missed the journey to get the students to current successes and diminished the hard work of both students and staff to make little but significant progress. Two educators expressed that when their leadership team focused on one goal, other problems would arise.

### **Educators Non-Valued as Professionals**

According to the open-ended survey data for question two, educators non-valued professionals were referred to educators being made to feel unsure, receive no feedback, and administrators seeing only what was wrong. Several educators described that when a principal makes you feel insecure in your work, it is hard to know if you are meeting their expectations. It creates a toxic environment to work in. One educator described that an administrator only praised a select group of teachers in their inner circle and the evaluations of others only gave generic praise and focused on shortcomings. Teachers and staff need to hear specific praise about work while constructively pointing out areas for improvement. Another educator observed that an administrator would enter the room three to four times a week and take over my lessons, my students started to ask why the principal was teaching and not me.

Several educators detailed that not having timely feedback on submitted work, evaluations and observations, and data forms brings on a feeling of defeat, incompetence,

and no energy to do the job well. A number of educators stated that we all do so much that is right; it is detrimental to see only flaws. It makes for a poor school culture with broken colleague relationships, faculty trust issues, fearful teachers, and teachers leaving the district. Another educator described that while effective educators, we are also humans who will always have areas that need improvement. If the administrator wants the educator to have some buy-in to what they are saying, you must tell some of the things that are effective too. One educator commented that high expectations and quick results increases stress and pressure to perform.

### **Administration Non-Accessible**

According to the open-ended survey data for question two, administration being non-accessible were referred to absent leadership and avoiding conflict. Several educators maintained that an admin who is never present, does not communicate, fails to listen, and allows others to take over has proven ineffective. One educator commented that a lack of leadership is a massive hole in the foundation of a school that eventually grows over time. It is contagious when people see a lack of leadership and take advantage of the worst. Schools need consistent guidance.

Another educator indicated that not only does it create a stigma that teachers should be the authority figures, but students do not see a positive role model of a principal. Several educators explained that when there is no leadership, more behavioral problems are not dealt with, making it hard for a teacher to teach because there are no consequences. One educator stated that it is confusing and frustrating when there is no leadership. It is frustrating when the educators have questions/concerns/issues, and there is no one to count on.

A number of educators indicated that administrators told them whatever they wanted to hear. This resulted in everyone having different information, which caused mass confusion. Two educators stated that their previous administrator did everything to avoid conflict or perceived conflict with parents. This led to the administrator treating the staff terribly and never backing them up. Another educator expressed that when administration avoids conflict it makes the educator feel undervalued. Another educator expressed that a previous administrator avoided conflict at all costs. This pitted teachers against one another, giving parents control in the classroom that they should not have had and a lack of boundaries. Several educators maintained that when an administrator tries to avoid conflict, it creates an inconsistent system for staff and students. This causes frustrations and feelings of unfairness among individuals and causes the overall system to erode.

### **Ranking Results of Ineffective Qualities from Participating Educators**

In further data analysis, Table 4.9 represents the Likert survey statements by the percentage of importance of the ineffective qualities of an administrator by the participating educators.

*Table 4.9 Participating Educators Likert Scale Responses in Rank Order of Ineffective Administrative Qualities*

Rank	Ineffective Administrative Qualities	Overall
1	No feedback	90.5%
2	Absence of leadership	89.8%
2	Seeing only what's wrong	89.8%
4	Taking all the credit and controlling everything	89.1%
5	Command, control, and demanding.	86.9%
6	Makes the educators feel insecure about their work.	86.1%
7	Educators need to be watched or they won't do their job.	85.4%
8	Focusing exclusively on the goal.	81.0%
9	Avoiding conflict	70.1%
10	Set high expectations and demand quick results.	62.0%

Note: *Participant Response (N=137).*

## Interview Questions

After the participating educators had completed the survey and open-ended question, they had the opportunity to sign up for three additional interview questions. Thirty participants signed up to participate in the interview process. After reaching out to each participant three times, twelve educators were interviewed. The three questions were designed to allow the interview participants the opportunity to enhance and clarify their perspectives while allowing the researcher an opportunity to gather additional insights.

The first interview question asked what leadership qualities does your current administrator use with faculty and do you find them to be effective or ineffective?

Interviewee number one is an educator from Chicago, who finds the administrator very ineffective. She does not have any leadership qualities, and that is part of the problem. She does not use protocols or routines to look at data or other pieces of information. Also when there is an issue, she makes broad generalization statements to the entire staff about it, and the staff is left wondering. When staff brings up concerns to her, they get attacked. She does not involve the community or stakeholders in decisions.

Interviewee number nine is an educator from Pennsylvania who described their new principal as patient and effective. The principal has built a positive relationship with her, and it has only been three weeks. He got to know her on the first day. They sat down, and he wanted to know about her and learn more details.

Interviewee number 12 is an educator from Pennsylvania who described their current principal. "The principal gets along well with almost all the staff there because she understands they have a life and a family. She cannot expect them to do things she could not do herself."

Interviewee number 16 is an educator from Alabama who responded about her current administration situation. “We are in much flux right now. The administrators use lots of good communication skills and need more micromanagement.”

Interviewee number 23 is an educator from Pennsylvania who described her current administration. “A combination of micromanaging and hands on depends on the situation. Micromanaging small details that questions are professionally ineffective. The hands-off approach on important things like discipline and guidance issues is ineffective.”

Interviewee number 29 is an educator from Pennsylvania who described her current administration. “She is serious, but at the same time, she interjects community-building fun activities that are low-stress, but they make us laugh. That is helpful. I appreciate that she goes the extra mile, but I am not a game player, so I do not always participate. Some people enjoy it, so I appreciate her thinking of these things.”

Interviewee number 37 is an educator from California who described her current situation. “Our current administration has had some turnovers. We have had two program specialist directors leave to go either to another job. So that left a vast vacuum. Acting administrators are micromanaging, and that is not effective at all.”

Interviewee number 59 is an educator from New York who responded about her current administrator. “She includes us in decision-making, which I find effective. She is very good with positive feedback. She does not micromanage us. She gives us a project and will check in about it, but she is not there every day, where are you on this.”

Interviewee number 116 is an educator from Pennsylvania who describes her current administrator. “When he knows what your strength is and allows you to do your

job. He allows us to work with the teachers when there is an issue instead of him trying to micromanage. He trusts us to do our job. This has happened over time because I do not feel like he always did that.”

Interviewee number 130 is an educator from Pennsylvania who responded about her current administrator. “My current administrator is very effective. She listens first. She is very flexible. She seeks out the things that we need, like professional development. She finds the very best and sends us there. She makes me feel very safe.”

Interviewee number 136 is an educator from Pennsylvania who described her current administrator. “Building level communication is open and keeps me in the loop of things, and I find that effective. They do not micromanage me. I can go to them for help, and they are supportive and back me up or guide me.”

Interviewee number 137 is an educator from Pennsylvania who responded about her current administrator. “She communicates well over e-mail. Her communication style is short and to the point, intimidating but effective. She trusts me to do my job; if I am doing my job right, she will fight for me. I do not want to go as far as backing me up because if a school board member or another administrator is arguing back and forth, I think she would end up going with them. She means business, do your job, and stay out of her way.”

The second interview question asked the interviewee to describe how the administrator’s leadership quality influenced your performance.

Interviewee number one elaborated, “I get little to no feedback on the things that I need to get feedback on. I’m hoping to grow and need to know where areas that need improvement. I feel super confident and know my stuff, it then gets picked apart and it’s

for little to no reason and not constructively. Then it makes me feel very defensive and stressed out. It makes it hard to do things and collaborate with colleagues. Colleagues are all feeling defensive.”

Interviewee number nine stated “If you think that your leader believes in you, you're going to want to perform better for them. I mean specifically with the new principal of course I want to impress him, so if something went well, I'm going to let him know about it right away. Might not tell him as much as something went bad but you can learn from that too. I think you want to please them if you respect them.”

Interviewee number 12 responded, “Principal reaches out to each one of her teachers and ask them almost every day how they are doing, how they are feeling and what's going on with their families. She's opened the door to these teachers where they feel comfortable enough where they can go and can say to her I really need help with this or I need help with that. She's got herself spread thin because there's a hell of a lot of kids and there's a whole lot of staff in there, but she really cares about every single one of them.”

Interviewee number 16 feels more empowered to do what I need to in my classroom because my every move is not being questioned.

Interview number 23 said, “There are times when she is reluctant to approach the administration with issues because of the way they've handled it in the past or often not handled something in the past. Means that I have found myself spending more and more time dealing with non-instructional issues.”



Interviewee number 29 commented that they are solid and dependable, so I feel confident. I feel that they support us and trust in us so that keeps me wanting to do my best right.”

Interviewee number 37 shared that she is incredibly overwhelmed because right now it is IEP season and I've got four 30-day IEP's that are now due and no administrator to attend the meeting. They're all booked, and we're only allowed to book IEPs during the hours of 2:45 and 3:45 time frames. I'm having to dial-up admin to say you don't know me, I don't know you, and you don't know the kids, but can you please just check this box and be here. I'm getting out of compliance on my IEP's because I can't have admin present.”

Interviewee number 59 said that I will say that I am more confident to try new things. I feel like I have a safety net. I feel valued that I can bring my ideas and genuinely feel like I'm being listened to too. The culture that she creates is celebrated.”

Interviewee number 116 describes that “He has faith in you to do your job, I'm going to make sure I do it well. If he were second guessing everything that I was doing, I think that would make me nervous. Then I wouldn't do it as well as I would, and it would make me mad. I think the fact that he trusts me to do my job, gives me the incentive to do it well.”

Interviewee number 130 commented that “I look up to her because of that I want to do better. I'm constantly trying to learn more, and I feel very free to ask her questions. I asked her to repeat something like I've just had a lot of trouble figuring out and she has explained the same thing to me 20 times without blinking an eye. She has chipped in and done some of the work herself.”

Interviewee number 136 replied that “I’ll say that their leadership qualities allow me to have a mutual respect so that makes me feel like I want to do the best job. I make sure that I follow through on everything and work a little harder. I don’t want to disappoint them.”

Interviewee number 137 “I’ve always been a person that does my job and tries to stay out of the way. I want her to respect me, so I think I will work harder knowing that she’s such a ninja. She won’t accept anything else.”

The third interview question asked the interviewee what leadership qualities they would like to see in their current administrator to practice.

Interviewee number one said “My current administrator needs to be a better delegate of tasks around the school. Things can be done in a focused, planned, and intentional way. Have her be the manager of the people and delegate to those instead of trying to run around and do it all.”

Interviewee number nine commented, “Mutual respect so you’re on the same team. A mutual respect for each other’s position and each other’s opinion. Setting up norms when you have a meeting for what is normal behavior for a typical meeting so that everyone can be heard. I think that’s important, like feeling that your voice is heard and that you’ve made an impact and like open communication back and forth. Leaders need to walk in the steps of their teachers. Administrators seem very far removed from the education realm of the classroom and so it’s hard for them to relate to teachers. See administrators more in the classroom experiencing what’s going on.”

Interviewee number 12 said “My vice principals need to start thinking about what the teachers are trying to accomplish and to look at it from the teacher’s perspective. The

administrator must be specific on details and what they would like from these people and not to keep changing them if you've been in that situation.”

Interviewee number 16 said “The downfall of having non micromanagement is that there's very little feedback. So better feedback.”

Interviewee number 23 commented, “I think one would be acknowledging our experience and professionalism. Trusting our abilities when we say something needs to change or something is an issue, understanding that we have probably already exhausted all our resources to solve that problem prior to reaching out and treating it with a level of seriousness. They can remove things from our plate instead of continuing to add to them with no explanation.”

Interviewee number 29 responded “I'd like them to be visible through the day. I'd like them to show interest in the kids even if it's that they can't be interested in every kid. I'd like them to model every student every day. I'd like them to model interest, I know they can't possibly be, but I want them to have that in their mind that they're actively demonstrating.”

Interviewee number 37 commented, “I would like them to continue doing what they're doing right now in the sense that I was hired late. The year had already started yet they were adamant that they were going to give me those two weeks with my department chairs to be able to have training. I am 25 years of education but regardless of all that they wanted to dedicate those two weeks and making me in line with all the programs. They offered all the ins and outs of what's going on, shadowing other teachers in their classrooms to observe what they're doing, they took a lot of thought, energy and effort into making sure that I was as prepared as possible at the end of that two weeks. I have

never experienced that anywhere I worked. They really wanted to make sure that we had as much information as possible to be ready. Recently they had the online lawyers come to a zoom meeting with the special education teachers and talk about how to carefully write an IEP. So they're training and preparation is deeply appreciated.”

Interviewee number 59 responded, “I feel like she probably could be a little bit more critical in terms of offering feedback but that's also my own anxiousness. I'm not doing something that or the way that she wants it, I want to know right away.”

Interviewee number 116 said “He's starting to do this, but I would like him to stand up to the district supervisors. When it comes to things in his building for example, some things that are district required but there are other things that he could say no. This is his building and we're doing it this way. I know my kids and I know my teachers and I think he's finally starting to do that, but I would like him to take charge over his building more.”

Interviewee number 130 stated, “I would like her to be firmer with her own boss. I think she does a great job with us, but I think she can't figure out how to communicate our needs to the next level or she communicates them, and they get shot down.”

Interviewee number 136 stated, “One I think of is to get them to slow down a little bit. I want to say I feel that sometimes they're so busy with what they do, even though communication is good, sometimes it's hard to track them down and get an answer if you need it.”

Interviewee number 137 responded, “Once in a while a little personality would be nice. Slow down and ask how my week was or act like she cares about something going

on. I would like a sense of feeling a part of something and I'm not just there to say yes ma'am.”

### **Summary**

The data presented throughout this chapter were the results of a survey conducted through SurveyMonkey, an online survey tool and post-survey educator interviews. Twenty-five Likert-scale questions followed the demographic inquiries. They included the following options: strongly effective, effective, ineffective, and strongly ineffective. The online survey ended with two open-ended questions. The 25 survey and the two open-ended questions were designed to identify responses to three research questions based about effective and ineffective qualities of administrators. The post-survey voluntary educator interviews consisted of three open-ended questions. One hundred thirty-seven participants (N=137) participated in the online survey and were open-ended and twelve participants completed the interview portion of the study. Results will be further discussed in Chapter Five.

## Chapter Five – Discussion

### Summary of the Study

This qualitative study was designed to examine the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how they influence the educator's performance. The three research questions that guided this study were designed to investigate an educator's perception of the effective and ineffective qualities of an administrator, and how those qualities influenced their performance as an educator by answering survey statements, open-ended questions, and optional interview questions directly.

The study's participants were compiled from two social media groups specific to the education field. One hundred thirty-seven educators across the United States and Canada participated in the online survey and open-ended questions, and 12 of those educators volunteered to continue with the post-survey interview.

The first eleven questions on the survey were developed to ascertain specific demographic information about each participant. Twenty-five Likert-scale questions were used to conduct a portion of the study through an online survey; this instrument concluded with two open-ended questions, each aligned explicitly to one of the three research questions. In addition, the respective interview question also aligned with the research questions.

Survey results were compiled and organized according to each research question. Both raw numbers and percentages were reported, representing each educator's responses to each survey question. Open-ended questions were organized according to the research question, and then data was analyzed. Interview responses were organized and analyzed according to research questions to identify patterns or themes further.

## **Summary of the Results**

All participants were educators located across the United States at different professional levels. The data were analyzed relevant to the three-research question, which was this study's premise. The results are described below.

There were 137 educator participants in this study. A total of six (4.4%) educators indicated they were male, and 131 (95.7%) educators indicated they were female. Seventy-two (52.6%) educators indicated they were teachers, and sixty-three (46.0%) educators indicated they were special education teachers. One (.7%) educator indicated they were a guidance counselor, and one (.7%) indicated they were a school nurse.

A total of 63 (45.99%) educators have been in their current school for 0 – 5 years as an educator. Thirty-nine (28.47%) educators have been in their current school for 6 – 10 years, and ten (7.30%) participants have been there for 11 – 15 years as an educator. Twenty-five (18.25%) educators have been in their current school for 15-plus years as an educator.

The educators who participated in the study had a variety of administration experiences. One hundred ten (80.2%) educators have worked with their current administrative leadership for 0 – 5 years. Twenty-six (18.98%) educators have worked with their current administrative leadership for 6 – 10 years. One (0.73%) educator has worked with their current administrative leadership for 11 – 15 years, and zero (0.00%) participants have worked with their current administrative leadership for 15-plus years.

### ***Effective Qualities***

The results of this study showed that educators had perceptions of what constituted effective administrative qualities and the influence they had on their

performance. An analysis of the data revealed that educators perceived communication as the most selected strongly effective administrative quality. Ninety-seven (70.80%) educators who responded to survey question one showed that communication is the number one criterion for effective leadership. These survey responses were supported by open-ended survey responses from educators who stated that formal and informal communication allowed educators to be more successful when knowing what was happening in their building. Interviewees noted the influence an effective building communicator had on the educator. One educator specifically commented that their current situation is in flux, and the rotating administrators are using lots of good communication skills to keep the building staff abreast of current events; this allows for a beneficial work environment. Another educator responded that having excellent communication changed the atmosphere in the building away from fear toward a collaborative environment.

Another data analysis revealed that the administrators being visual was the top effective quality when strongly effective and effective data were combined; 127 out of 137 educators found this to be true. Several educators found that seeing an administrator in the building makes a difference, and it signals that the administration is present and knows what is happening in the building. One interviewee described their administrator's relationship with her building: "The principal reaches out to each of her teachers and asks them, almost every day, how they are doing, how they are feeling, and what is going on with their families. She has opened the door to these teachers, where they feel comfortable enough; they can tell her, "I need help with this, or I need help with that."



The interviewee feels respected when entering the building and is willing to go above and beyond.

Three themes emerged from the data collected from the 137 educators relating to the effective qualities of an administrator; communication, educators valued as professionals, and accessibility of the administrators. The theme of communication comprised the Likert statements; communication, acting quickly on daily issues and following up that day to ensure the issues are resolved, and one clear voice giving directions. The theme of educators valued as professionals consisted of Likert questions that pertained to caring about all educators, feeling safe and valued in an orderly and supportive environment, utilizing educators' talents, and encouraging collaboration. The theme of administration accessibility consisted of Likert questions that pertained to leading by example, visible in the school building, not being micromanaged, utilizing data, having a strong personality, being open to change, and setting straightforward tasks and expectations. An analysis of the three themes independently, where the specific Likert scale statements were combined, communication had a total of 348 out of 411 (85%), educators valued as professionals had a total of 468 out of 548 (85%), and administrator accessibility had a total of 806 out of 959 (84%) as strongly effective and effective.

### ***Ineffective Qualities***

The results of this study showed that educators had perceptions of what constituted ineffective administrative qualities and the influence they had on their performance. An analysis of the data revealed that educators perceived that making educators feel insecure about their work was the most selected strongly ineffective

administrative quality. One hundred four (75.91%) educators who responded to survey question two showed that making educators feel insecure about their work is the number one criterion for ineffective leadership. These survey responses were supported by open-ended survey responses from educators who stated that feeling insecure about their work made them feel doubtful and inadequate as professionals and took away their creditability. An educator responded that being made insecure about their work made them feel less part of the faculty and building community which students and parents recognized.

Another data analysis revealed that no feedback from the administrator was the ineffective top quality when strongly ineffective and ineffective data were combined; 124 out of 137 educators found this to be true. Several educators found that receiving no positive or negative feedback brought on feelings of defeat and no energy to do the job well. One interviewee described that not receiving any feedback made her second guess her decisions within the classroom and the poor effect it had on the learning environment. As an educator, she wanted to continue to grow, but with the lack of feedback, it was tough to move in any direction.

Three themes emerged from the data collected from the 137 educators relating to ineffective qualities of an administrator: micromanaged, educators non-valued professionals, and administration non-accessible. The theme of micromanagement comprised the Likert statements; educators being watched, administrators being controlling and demanding, high expectations with quick results, admin taking all the credit and focusing only on the goal communication. The theme of educators being non-valued as professionals consisted of Likert questions that pertained to educators being

made to feel insecure, receiving no feedback, and administrators seeing only what was wrong. The theme of administration non-accessible consisted of Likert questions that pertained to the absence of leadership and avoiding conflict. An analysis of the three themes independently, where the specific Likert scale statements were combined, micromanaged had a total of 554 out of 685 (81%), educators non-valued as professionals had a total of 365 out of 411 (89%), and administration non-accessible had a total of 219 out of 274 (81%) as strongly ineffective and ineffective.

### **Limitations**

There were three limitations to this study. One limitation of this study was the time of year the study was conducted. Educators responded to the study during winter break. At this time of year, educators could be overwhelmed with school and home before the holiday season.

The second limitation of the study was the participant post-interview size compared to the number of online survey participants. Thirty-six educators inquired about being part of the post-survey interview, and only twelve educators participated. The limitation was mainly due to the scheduling and time differences between the educators. Each of the twenty-four educators that did not participate was contacted three times for a possible interview time.

The third limitation of the study was to add an open option among the effective and ineffective choices on the online survey. This would allow participants more freedom to answer the statements instead of it being effective or ineffective.

## **Relationship to the Research**

The research and review of data were to examine the qualities of an effective and ineffective administrator and how they influenced the educator's performance. Brion (2015) revealed that researchers have struggled to identify specific educational elements and their impact on employee productivity/needs for decades. Meeks (2020) maintained that the basic needs of an educator must be met before experiencing success and self-fulfillment. Maslow (1968) stated that when the highest level of needs has been met, productivity does not decrease; instead, it increases to seek further fulfillment in one's life. As a result, it is vital to ensure that educators are supported in all their endeavors (Bantwini, 2018). Sivakumar and Arun (2019) indicated that educator morale is associated with job pride, outlook, and emotions an educator has within a workplace setting.

As evidenced by the results of this study, one of the themes that revolved around the data was educators' being valued as professionals. The Likert questions that pertained to this theme were whether the administrator cares about all educators, makes the educator feel safe and valued in an orderly and supportive environment, utilizes the educators' talents, and encourages collaboration. By combing the data from those Likert question responses, educators valued as professionals had 468 out of 548 (85%). Leading Effectively Staff (2022) stated that treating people with respect daily is one of the most important things a leader can do, and it will ease tensions and conflict, create trust, and improve effectiveness.

Indeed Editorial Team (2022) reported that influential leaders are essential to any organization: they can help build strong teams within a school, have strong interpersonal

and communication skills, and help remove obstacles for their team. McCallum (2021) expressed that although educators can take steps individually to preserve their professional satisfaction and morale, they must also be nurtured, supported, and valued by the broader school community. Govindarajan (2012) found that by treating educators in ways that empower them, such as involving them in decisions about policies and practices and acknowledging their expertise, administrators could help sustain educator morale.

As evidenced by the results of this study, one of the themes that revolved around the data was administration accessibility. The Likert questions that pertained to this theme were leading by example, visible in the school building, not micromanaging, utilizing data, having a strong personality, being open to change, and setting straightforward tasks and expectations. By combining the data from those Likert question responses, administrator accessibility had 806 out of 959 (84%).

The findings associated with this study supported the conclusions Gadson (2018) reported that effective administrative leadership could also strengthen educator morale by actively standing behind educators, serving as guardians of educators' instructional time, assisting educators with student discipline matters, allowing educators to develop discipline codes, and supporting educators' authority in enforcing policy. When educators are provided with what they need to remain inspired and enthusiastic in the classroom, students and educators will be the beneficiaries (Govindarajan, 2012).

Forbes Coaches Council (2017) provided that leaders can establish trust with their educators, which includes being open and honest about changes that will impact them; effectively communicating by talking to them, not at them; having an open-door policy,

and then following up; and being willing to pitch in to help. Eighty-seven percent of the participating educators found that an administrator open to change was the fourth highest effective quality. Robbins (2019) stated that to model positive behavior and lead by example, and the administrative leader needs to be actively involved in the school by being visible in person (classrooms, hallways, bus lanes, and events), online, and through communications. As evidenced in this study, 92.7% of the educators found the administration being visual in the building was the number one ranked effective quality in an Administrator. Several participating educators from the study commented that when administrators are visible and actively involved, the entire school community has a more positive vibe. Students know who the administrator is and what their role is in the building. The administrator must understand that change is inevitable and be ready, willing, and prepared to adjust plans as events occur (Robbins, 2019).

Liebenberg (2017) noted that demands negatively impact educator morale, which harms their performance. Low educator morale indicates that basic human needs are unmet (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Picincu (2021) noted that low staff morale is often the reason behind hostile behavior in the workplace, and the conflict can take an emotional toll on staff members, leading to stress, anger, and poor communication. Research in the field of educator morale demonstrates the importance of individuals and communities of educators in every school as they hold the power to create schools that substantially better the quality of the lives of their students and future generations (Thapa et al., 2013).

As evidenced by the results of this study, the absence of leadership was found to be 89.8% ineffective for educators. Participating educators in the study commented that

when the administration is absent, the faculty has no accurate guidance, and the school atmosphere becomes toxic. Various studies have shown that when workers lack a clear definition of the actions necessary to fulfill a specific role, their levels of job satisfaction are likely to be negatively affected (Gkolia et al., 2014). Belias and Koustelios (2014) explained that poor or unsupportive relationships with administrative leadership resulted in job dissatisfaction. In this study, 86.1% of participating educators felt that administrators who make them feel insecure about their work were ineffective for the educational environment.

Mbownei and Taole (2022) stated that more attention should be given to enhancing educator morale for educational goals to be realized. Germano (2010) commented that leadership is directly connected to organizational success as well as having a positive effect on organizational relationships. According to Bass and Bass (2008), good leaders are not born but made. As a result, good leadership is an essential ingredient in an organization's success.

### **Recommendation for Future Research**

The focus of this study was the educators' perception of effective and ineffective administrator qualities and how they influenced the educator's performance. This study solidified that the research implied that educators' perceptions of effective and ineffective administrator qualities had influenced the educator's performance positively and/or negatively. Further research in this area is recommended.

This study could be extended to explore administrators' perceptions regarding their effective and ineffective qualities they use and how they influence the climate of their school building. A focus on administrators and how they view themselves in the role

as an administrator. The data may serve as a drive to address recognizable deficiencies that may exist in terms of pre-service administrators.

Educators could use this information to promote quality training in administrative certification programs. The information could be used to assess the qualities of future administrators. Further research could show current and future administrators how to recognize the qualities that influence and make their teachers feel supported and empowered as valued as a colleague and not mere employees. Effective administrators are a combination of actions and behaviors and are an ongoing process.

### **Conclusion**

The study sought to examine the educators' perceptions of effective and ineffective administrator qualities and the influence they had on the educator's performance. Likert-scale survey questions, open-ended questions, and interview questions were utilized in alignment with the three research questions to provide direction and triangulation of the research.

Overall, this study represents a small portion of educators throughout the United States; the findings support the position that effective and ineffective administrative qualities influence how an educator responds to their daily educational environment. The educators possessed the ability to distinguish which quality was effective and ineffective in their educational environment. Not one Likert-scale quality was 100% chosen as effective or ineffective. Specifically, the educators used previous interactions with administrators to guide them in answering which administrative quality was effective and ineffective in their environment.



The study confirmed that educators want to be treated respectfully and like human beings. Most participating educators want to be seen as an essential part of the educational environment rather than another number. Finally, the study reveals that participating educators want to focus on building and enhancing relationships with their administrators. This relationship should be built on respect, trust, support, and collaboration.

## References

- Abdul, R., & Syaiful, K. (2017). *Kepemimpinan Pendidikan dan Budaya Mutu*. Zahir Publishing. <http://digilib.uinkhas.ac.id/id/eprint/3144>
- Altinkurt Y., & Yılmaz K. (2014). Öğretmenlerin mesleki profesyonelliği ile iş doyumları arasındaki ilişki. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 4(2), 57-71.
- Aravena, F. (2022). Principal succession in schools: A literature review (2003–2019). *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(3), 354–370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220940331>
- Baluyos, G., Rivera, H., & Baluyos, E. (2019). Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Work Performance. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 7, 206-221. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2019.78015>
- Bantwini, D. (2018). District officials' perspectives regarding factors that impede the attainment of quality basic education in a province in South Africa. *International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education*, 47(6), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2018.1526200>
- Barksdale, T. (2022). *A sense of belonging: An examination of the impact of leadership behaviors on teacher morale in rural middle schools*. [Doctoral Dissertation, Gardner-Webb University College of Education]. Digital Commons. <https://digitalcommons.gardner-webb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1092&context=education-dissertations>
- Bass, B., & Bass, R. (2008). *The bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial application*. Free Press.
- Bassett, K., Behrstock-Sherratt, E., Jacques, C., & Olson, D. (2014). *From good to great:*

*Exemplary teachers share perspectives on increasing teacher effectiveness across the career continuum.* American Institutes for Research, National Network of State Teachers of the Year.

[http://www.gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/Good\\_to\\_Great\\_Report.pdf](http://www.gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/Good_to_Great_Report.pdf).

Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014). Organizational culture and job satisfaction: A review *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 4(2), 132-149.

<https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/366682>

Benincasa, R. (2012). *6 leadership styles, and when you should use them.* Fastcompany.

<http://www.fastcompany.com/1838481/6-leadership-styles-and-when-you-shoulduse-them>

Berberoglu, A. (2018). Impact of organizational climate on organizational commitment and perceived organizational performance: empirical evidence from public hospitals. *Health Services Research*, 18, 2-9.

<https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/track/pdf/10.1186/s12913-018-3149-z.pdf>

Berg, M.E., & Karlsen, J.T. (2016). A study of coaching leadership style practice in projects. *Management Research Review*, 39(9), 1122-1142.

Blömeke, S., Houang, R., Hsieh, F. J., & Wang, T. Y. (2017). Effects of job motives, teacher knowledge and school context on beginning teachers' commitment to stay in the profession: A longitudinal study in Germany, Taiwan, and the United States. *International handbook of teacher quality and policy*, 374–387.

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315710068>

Bogler, R. (2005). Satisfaction of Jewish and Arab teachers in Israel. *Journal of Social*

*Psychology*, 145(1), 19-33. <https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.145.1.19-34>

Bogler, R., Caspi, A., & Roccas, S. (2013). Transformational and passive leadership an initial investigation of university instructors as leaders in a virtual learning environment. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 41(3), 372-392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143212474805>

Bosso, D. (2017). *Teacher morale, motivation and professional identity: Insight for educational policymakers from state teachers of the year* (Teacher Researcher Policy Series). National Network of State Teachers of the Year. <https://www.nnstoy.org/wpcontent/uploads/2017/05/Teacher-Researcher-Policy-Paper-David-Bosso-May-2017.pdf>

Bota, O. (2013). Job satisfaction of teachers. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 83, 634 – 638.

Bottoms, G., & O'Neill, K. (2001). *Preparing a new breed of school principals: It's time for action* (ED464388). ERIC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED464388.pdf>

Bradford, C., & Braaten, M. (2018). Teacher evaluation and the demoralization of teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 75, 49-59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.05.017>

Brion, S. (2015). *Teacher Morale*. [Doctoral Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University The Graduate School College of Education]. Pennsylvania State University Libraries. [https://etda.libraries.psu.edu/files/final\\_submissions/10546](https://etda.libraries.psu.edu/files/final_submissions/10546)

Brolund, L. (2016). Student success through instructional leadership. *BU Journal of Graduate Studies in Education*, 8(2), 42-45.

Buenvinida, L. P., & Tamayo, R. G. (2020). School heads leadership and attributes and

teachers' morale: Its implication [sic] to school performance. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 76(6), 661-670.

<https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.76.8507>

Carraway, J. H., & Young, T. (2014). Implementation of a districtwide policy to improve principals' instructional leadership: Principals' sensemaking of the skillful observational and coaching laboratory. *Educational Policy*, 29(1), 230-256.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904814564216>

CFI Team (2022). Leadership traits: What makes an effective leader. *CFI*.

<https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/careers/soft-skills/leadership-traits-list/>

Chambers, D. M. (2015). *Elementary school teacher perceptions of factors influencing teacher morale* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Walden University.

<https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2581&context=dissertations>

Cherry, K. (2022). *Autocratic leadership: Key characteristics, strengths, and weaknesses of autocratic leadership*. Very Well Mind. <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-autocratic-leadership-2795314>

<https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-autocratic-leadership-2795314>

Chu, L. (2014). The moderating role of authoritarian leadership on the relationship between the internalization of emotional regulation and the well-being of employees. *Leadership*, 10(3), 326-343.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715013498403>

Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2012). School climate and social-emotional

learning: Predicting teacher stress, job satisfaction, and teaching efficacy. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(4), 1189-1204. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029356>

Corddry, L. (2020, December 30). What is autocratic leadership? *NSLS*.

<https://www.nsls.org/blog/what-is-autocratic-leadership#:~:text=What%20Is%20an%20Autocratic%20Leader,or%20seek%20input%20from%20others>

Creswell, J. (2015). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson Education, Inc.

Cross, R., & Parker, A. (2004). *The hidden power of social networks*. Harvard Business.

Cunningham, J., Salomone, J., & Wielgus, N. (2015). Project management leadership style: A team member perspective. *International Journal of Global Business*, 8(2), 27-54.

<https://www.proquest.com/openview/bd6e5f8fe839ef55b4b5aa7410f84f06/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2032032>

Daniëls, E., Hondeghem, A., & Dochy, F. (2019). A review on leadership and leadership development in educational settings. *Educational Research Review*, 27, 110-125.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.02.003>

Daučianskaitė, A. & Žydžiūnaitė, V. (2020). Differences and Similarities between Coaching, Instructional and Educational Leadership Styles. *Acta Educationis Generalis*, 10(3).

Day, C., & Sammons, P. (2016). *Successful school leadership* (ED565740). ERIC.

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED565740.pdf>

Demircioglu, M. A. (2021). Sources of innovation, autonomy, and employee job

- satisfaction in public organizations. *Public Performance Management Review*. 44, 155–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2020.1820350>
- Din, M., Malik, H. D., & Afzal, S. (2019). Influence of demographics on self-perceived morale of public and private secondary school teachers. *Journal of Educational Research*, 22(1),72-85. <https://bit.ly/3G3JhUH>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2013). *Teaching and researching: Motivation*. Routledge.
- Dowd, M. (2018). Duties and responsibilities of school principals. *CHRON*.  
<https://work.chron.com/duties-responsibilities-school-principals-7885.html>
- Eba. (2022). *The Six Leadership Styles for effective Team Performance*. EBA  
<https://www.educational-business-articles.com/six-leadership-styles/>
- Eden Project. (2018). *What is coaching leadership?* Eden Project.  
<https://www.edenproject.com/learn/for-organisations/creative-leadership/what-is-coaching-leadership>
- Evers, C. (2011). *A relational study of elementary principals' leadership traits, teacher morale, and school performance*. [Doctoral Dissertations, The University of Southern Mississippi]. The Aquila Digital Community.  
<https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations/426>
- Fink, N. (2014, July 3). The high cost of low morale. *Adult and Graduate Education at Roberts Wesleyan College*. <https://go.roberts.edu/bid/183778/the-high-cost-of-low-morale-by-nicole-fink#:~:text=Employees%20with%20low%20morale%20will,complaints%20in%20regards%20to%20the>
- Flannery, M E, (2018). 'Be vocal,' urges teacher arrested at school board meeting. *NEA*

Today. <https://www.nea.org/advocating-for-change/new-from-nea/be-vocal-urges-teacher-arrested-school-board-meeting>

Flynn, S. I. (2019). *Authoritarian, Democratic, and Laissez-Faire Leadership*. Salem Press Encyclopedia.

Forbes Coaches Council. (2017). 12 ways managers can establish a trusting relationship with employees. *Forbes*.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbescoachescouncil/2017/04/28/12-ways-managers-can-establish-a-trusting-relationship-with-employees/?sh=3832ee1fc297>

Fray, L., Jaremus, F., Gore, J., Miller, A., & Harris, J. (2022). Under pressure and overlooked: the impact of COVID-19 on teachers in NSW public schools.

*The Australian Educational Researcher*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-022-00518-3>

Fullan, M. (2011). *Change leader: Learning to do what matters most*. Jossey-Bass/Wiley.

Gadson, C. E. (2018). *Perceptions of Principal Leadership on Teacher Morale*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina]. Scholar Commons.

<https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/5042>

Gandolfi, F. & Stone, S. (2018). Leadership, leadership styles, and servant leadership.

*Journal of Management Research*, 18(4). 261-269.

Gandolfi, F., Stone, S., & Deno, F. (2017) Servant leadership: An ancient style with 21st

Century relevance. *Review of International Comparative Management*, 18(4).

350–361.

Geiger, T., & Pivovarova, M. (2018). The effects of working conditions on teacher



retention. *Teachers and Teaching*, 24(6), 604-625.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2018.1457524>

Gkolia, A., Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014). Teacher's job satisfaction and self-efficacy: A review. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(22), 321-342.

Goings, R., Brandehoff, R., & Bianco, M. (2018). *To diversify the teacher workforce, start early*. ASCD, 75(8). <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/to-diversify-the-teacher-workforce-start-early>

Goldstein, A. (2015). *Teachers' perceptions of the influence of teacher collaboration on teacher morale* [Doctoral dissertation, Walden University]. Scholar Works. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/223>

Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(2), 78-90.

Gomez, A. (2022). *What is servant leadership and how can it empower you team?* BetterUp Blog. <https://www.betterup.com/blog/servant-leadership-what-makes-it-different#:~:text=The%20servant%20leadership%20style%20is,that%20their%20voices%20are%20heard.>

Govindarajan, K. (2012). Teacher morale. *International Journal of Behavioral Social and Movement Sciences*, 1(2), 57-61. <http://www.ijobsms.in/v1s2p8.pdf>

Green, G. R. (2014). *Study to investigate self-reported teacher absenteeism and desire to leave teaching as they relate to teacher-reported teaching satisfaction, job-related stress, symptoms of depression, irrational beliefs, and self-efficacy*. Educational Psychology Commons. Paper 319. [http://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc\\_etds/319](http://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/319)

Guinta, C. (2020). *Transformational leadership: School climate and teacher morale in a*

*secondary school setting*. [Doctoral Dissertation, Northeastern University].  
Northeastern University Library.

<https://repository.library.northeastern.edu/files/neu:m0463802k/fulltext.pdf>

Gumus, S., Bellibas, M., Esen, M., & Gumus, E. (2016). A systematic review of studies on leadership models in educational research from 1980 to 2014. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1). 25–48.

[https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1741143216659296?casa\\_token=4mIS7IgrekAAAAA:H3E-fozt855W4LussheyjPwaSFnC9jogCFpR94gmP2h2k3P2GHdUOITZoKvaVc3ezwvjmhr3gUAN](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1741143216659296?casa_token=4mIS7IgrekAAAAA:H3E-fozt855W4LussheyjPwaSFnC9jogCFpR94gmP2h2k3P2GHdUOITZoKvaVc3ezwvjmhr3gUAN)

Gunn, J. (2018, July 2). *Real ways school leaders can build morale and reduce stress in schools*. Teaching Channel. <https://www.teachingchannel.com/blog/build-morale-reduce-stress-in-schools>

Harappa. (2021). *Affiliative leadership style: definition & example*. Harappa.

<https://harappa.education/harappa-diaries/affiliative-leadership/#:~:text=A%20globally%20famous%20example%20of,affiliative%20eaders%20in%20the%20world.>

Hearn, D. V. R. (2013). *Principal leadership styles, faculty morale, and faculty job satisfaction at selected elementary schools*. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi]. Aquila.

<https://aquila.usm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1247&context=dissertations>

Heick, T. (2020). *How has teaching changed in the last 10 years?* TeachThought.

<https://www.teachthought.com/the-future-of-learning/teaching-has-changed/>

- Henson, R. (2013). *How coaching as a leadership style boosts morale*. Manage Lite Training. <http://blog.manageelitetraining.com/coaching-boosts-morale/>
- Herrity, J. (March 2023). *Micromanager definition: 25 Signs and how to deal with one*. Indeed – Career Guide. <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/micromanager>
- Hosseingholizadeh, R., Sharif, A., & Kerman, N. T. (2021). A systematic review of conceptual models and methodologies in research on school principals in Iran. *Journal Education Administrator*, 59, 564–581. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-12-2020-0253>
- Ibarra, H., & Scoular, A. (November-December 2019). *The leader as coach: How to unleash innovation, energy, and commitment*. Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org/2019/11/the-leader-as-coach>
- Indeed Editorial Team. (2018). *Leadership Skills: Definitions and Examples*. Indeed. <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/resumes-cover-letters/leadership-skills>
- Indeed Editorial Team. (2022) *What is instructional leadership? definition and examples*. Indeed. <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/instructional-leadership>
- interObservers. (2022). *What is coercive leadership? (Let's talk about coercive leader)*. interObservers. <https://interobservers.com/what-is-coercive-leadership/>
- Iqbal, Z., Abid, G., Arshad, M., Ashfaq, F., Athar, M.A., & Hassan, Q. (2021) Impact of authoritative and laissez-faire leadership on thriving at work: The moderating role of conscientiousness. *Health Psychology Education*, 11, 667–685. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe11030048>

- Jasper, L. (2018). Building an adaptive leadership style. *Strategic Finance*, 99(9), 54-61.
- Joo, H., Lee, S., & Jung, S. (2012). Performance-based reward for teachers: Teachers' perceptions of their motivation. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 15, 1-9.  
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/993157654?accountid=1315877>
- Kohlrieser, G. (2016). *5 leadership styles in a nutshell: Which style of leader do you need to be for high performance?* International Institute for Management Development.  
<https://www.imd.org/contentassets/ad2e83293ec84408886614c4a553b9e4/tc051-16---leadership-styles-pdf.pdf>
- Kolzow, D. (2014). *Leading from within: Building organizational leadership capacity*. IEDC Online.  
[https://www.iedconline.org/clientuploads/Downloads/edrp/Leading\\_from\\_Within.pdf](https://www.iedconline.org/clientuploads/Downloads/edrp/Leading_from_Within.pdf)
- Kongnyuy, P. (2015). Motivation and changing fortunes in teachers' output: Empirical evidence from selected secondary schools in North West Region of Cameroon. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(5), 111-118.
- Kunter, M., Klusmann, U., Baumert, J., Richter, D., Voss, T., & Hachfeld, A. (2013). Professional competence of teachers: Effects on instructional quality and student development. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(3), 805-820.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mareike-Kunter-2/publication/257326797\\_Professional\\_Competence\\_of\\_Teachers\\_Effects\\_on\\_Instructional\\_Quality\\_and\\_Student\\_Development/links/552e63580cf2acd38cb9327f/Professional-Competence-of-Teachers-Effects-on-Instructional-Quality-and-Student-Development.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mareike-Kunter-2/publication/257326797_Professional_Competence_of_Teachers_Effects_on_Instructional_Quality_and_Student_Development/links/552e63580cf2acd38cb9327f/Professional-Competence-of-Teachers-Effects-on-Instructional-Quality-and-Student-Development.pdf)

- Kurtz, H. (2020). *Educator morale, school job applicants declining, survey shows*. Education Week. <https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/educator-morale-school-job-applicants-decliningsurveyshows/2020/11#:~:text=Of%20those%20three%20groups%2C%20teachers,from%2056%20percent%20in%20March.>
- Kwan, P. (2019). Is transformational leadership theory passé? Revisiting the integrative effect of instructional leadership and transformational leadership on student outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(2).  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19861137>
- Lalzary, G. (2022) *15 effective ways to boost employee morale*. Connecteam.  
<https://connecteam.com/boost-employee-morale/>
- Lashway, L. (2002). *Developing instructional leaders*. (ED466023). ERIC.  
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED466023.pdf>
- Leadership. (2021). *Coercive leader – what it is, the pros, cons and signs you may be one*. 10-minute leader. <https://www.the10minuteleader.com/coercive-leader-what-it-is/>
- Leading Effectively Staff. (2022). What are the characteristics of a good leader? *Center for Creative Leadership*. <https://www.ccl.org/articles/leading-effectively-articles/characteristics-good-leader/>
- Lee, L. (2015). School performance trajectories and the challenges for principal succession. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(2), 262–286.
- Lee, S. (2020, July 28). *What is coaching leadership?* Torch.  
<https://torch.io/blog/what-is-coaching-leadership/>

- Lee, M. C. C., Idris, M. A., & Tuckey, M. (2019). Supervisory coaching and performance feedback as mediators of the relationships between leadership styles, work engagement, and turnover intention. *Human Resource Development International*, 22, 257–282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2018.1530170>
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Wahlstrom, K., Anderson, S., Mascall, B., & Gordon, M. (2009). *How successful leadership influences student learning: The second installment of a longer story*. Springer Netherlands. 611-629. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2660-6\\_35](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2660-6_35)
- Liebenberg, K. (2017). An evaluation of educators' morale in schools of Wellington. *Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 3(12), 130-138.
- Lim, J. (2021). Strengthening teachers' morale through awards and recognition approach. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 10(9), 15-22. [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jensen\\_Ryan\\_Lim/publication/353194810\\_Strengthening\\_teachers'\\_morale\\_through\\_awards\\_and\\_recognition\\_approach/links/610d18e01e95fe241ab3c83e/Strengthening-teachers-morale-through-awards-and-recognition-approach.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jensen_Ryan_Lim/publication/353194810_Strengthening_teachers'_morale_through_awards_and_recognition_approach/links/610d18e01e95fe241ab3c83e/Strengthening-teachers-morale-through-awards-and-recognition-approach.pdf)
- Lindberg, C. (2022). *Affiliative leadership: What is it? pros/cons? examples?* Leadershipahoy. <https://www.leadershipahoy.com/affiliative-leadership-what-is-it-pros-cons-examples/>
- Littleford, A. (2007). *Principal leadership and its perceived influence on teacher morale*

*in elementary schools*. [Doctoral Dissertation, East Tennessee State University].

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/2138>

Lopaze, K. (2022). *Educational leadership styles: Which one fits you?* Job Network.

<https://www.thejobnetwork.com/educational-leadership-styles-which-one-fits-you/>

Lüleçii, C., & Çorukii, C. (2018). The relationship between morale and job satisfaction of teachers in elementary and secondary schools. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 13(1), 1-17.

Lyons, J. (2017). *The impact of title 1 designation on teacher morale in middle schools*.

[Doctoral Dissertation, Liberty University]. Liberty University Library. Digital Commons.

<https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2505&context=doctoral>

Mangin, R. (2021). Increasing teacher morale. *BU Journal of Graduate Studies in*

*Education*, 13(1). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1303990.pdf>

Maslow, A. (1968). *Toward a Psychology of Being, 3 Edition*. John Wiley & Sons.

Mboweni, L., & Taole, M. J. (2022). Understanding teacher morale among primary

school teachers. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 8(1), 29-38.

<https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.8.1.29>

McCallum, F. (2021). Teacher and staff wellbeing: Understanding the experiences of school staff. *The Palgrave Handbook of Positive Education*.

[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64537-3\\_28](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64537-3_28)

McGrath, K. (2022). *I've worked at 2 schools with high teacher morale. Here's what they*

*do differently*. Truth for Teachers. <https://truthforteachers.com/how-schools-can-maintain-high-teacher-morale/>

Meeks, T. (2020). *The relationship between principal leadership style and teacher morale in a rural southern school district*. [Doctoral dissertation, Liberty University]. Digital Commons.

<https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3457&context=doctoral>

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). High school. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Retrieved June 19, 2022, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/high%20school>

Miller, K. (2022). *Coercive leadership style advantages, disadvantages and characteristics*. FutureofWorking.com <https://futureofworking.com/coercive-leadership-style-advantages-diadvantages-and-characteristics/FutureofWorking.com>

Mohler, T. (2021). *Teachers speak out at school board meeting*. The Tidewater News. <https://www.thetidewaternews.com/2021/07/07/teachers-speak-out-at-school-board-meeting/>

Morris, J. E., Lummis, G. W., Lock, G., Ferguson, C., Hill, S., & Nykiel, A. (2020). The role of leadership in establishing a positive staff culture in a secondary school. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(5), 802-820. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219864937>

Msuya, W. (2016). Exploring levels of job satisfaction among teachers in public



secondary schools in Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 8(2), 9-16.

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1102240.pdf>

Mwai, E. (2011). *Creating effective leader's through situational leadership approach*.

[Unpublished bachelor thesis] Bitstream

[https://www.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/33027/mwai\\_esther.pdf?sequence=2](https://www.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/33027/mwai_esther.pdf?sequence=2)

Nanjundeswaraswamy T. S. & Swamy D. R. (2014). Leadership styles. *Advances In Management*, 7(2). 57-62.

Nigama, K., Selvabaskar, S., Surulivel, S., Alamelu, R., & Uthaaya Joice, D. (2018). Job satisfaction among school teachers. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 119(7). 2645-2655. <https://acadpubl.eu/jsi/2018-119-7/articles/7c/80.pdf>

Noddings, N. (2014). High morale in a good cause. *Educational Leadership*, 71(5), 14-18. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/high-morale-in-a-good-cause>

Nolan, C., & Stitzlein, S. (2011). Meaningful hope for teachers in times of high anxiety and low morale. *Democracy & Education*, 19(1).

[http://democracyeducaionjournal.org/home/vol\\_19/iss1/2](http://democracyeducaionjournal.org/home/vol_19/iss1/2)

Ofrita, L. (2022). The effect of principal leadership and teacher work spirit on teacher discipline in elementary schools. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 6(1), 116-127.

<https://jes.ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JES>

O'Reilly, P. (2020). *How to boost teacher morale* [PowerPoint slides]. Odyssey

Community School. [https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/Turnaround/Professional-Learning/BoostTeacherMorale11\\_16.pdf](https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/Turnaround/Professional-Learning/BoostTeacherMorale11_16.pdf)

Phillips, A. W. (2017). Proper applications for surveys as a study methodology. *The Western Journal of Emerging Medicine*, 18(1), 8-11.

Picincu, A. (2021, June 22). *Effects of low employee morale*. Chron.

<https://smallbusiness.chron.com/effects-low-employee-morale-1768.html>

Point, B., Nusche, D., & Moorman, H. (2008). *Improving school leadership volume 1: Policy and practice organization for economic co-operation and development*. Google books.

Pratt, M. (2017, November). Definition leadership. SearchCIO.

<https://www.techtarget.com/searchcio/definition/leadership>

Rios, O. (2021). *The overlooked threat to K-12's pandemic recovery? Low teacher morale*. EAB.

<https://eab.com/insights/blogs/district-leadership/pandemic-recovery-low-teacher-morale/#:~:text=In%20fact%2C%20teacher%20morale%20hit,of%20nearly%2010%25%20from%202018.>

Robbin, A. (2019). *The school principal as leader*. Graduate Programs for Educators.

<https://www.graduateprogram.org/2019/09/the-principal-as-leader/>

Robinson, J. (2010). *The leadership effect: Teacher morale within selected schools in one Tennessee system*. [Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga]. The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga Library.

<https://scholar.utc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1517&context=theses>

Rowland, K. A. (2008). *The relationship of principal leadership and teacher morale*.

[Doctoral dissertation, Liberty University]. Digital Commons.

<https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1088&context=doctoral>

Safari, P., & Rashidi, N. (2015). A critical look at the EFL education and the challenges faced by Iranian teachers in the educational system. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 11(3), 153-161.

Sainato, M. (2022, January 08). Morale is low': United States teachers push back on school reopening amid Omicron wave. *The Guardian News*.

<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2022/jan/08/us-teachers-schools-omicron-staff-shortages-working-conditions-testing>

Saleem, A., Aslam, S., Yin, H., & Congman, R. (2020). *Principal leadership styles and teacher job performance: Viewpoint of middle management*. Sustainability.

<file:///Users/mercedeswudyka/Downloads/sustainability-12-03390-v2.pdf>

Schnackenberg, A. K., & Tomlinson, E. C. (2016). Organizational transparency: A new perspective on managing trust in organization-stakeholder relationships. *Journal of Management*, 42(7), 1784–1810. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314525202>

Senechal, J., Sober, T., Hope, S., Johnson, T., Burkhalter, F., Castelow, T., Gilfillan, D., Jackson, K., Nabors, A., Neuman, P., Robinson, R., Sargeant, R., Stanford, S., & Varljen, D. (2016). *Understanding teacher morale*. Virginia Commonwealth University VCU Scholars Compass.

[https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1055&context=merc\\_pubs](https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1055&context=merc_pubs)

Seppälä, E., & Cameron, K. (2022). The best leaders have a contagious positive energy.

- Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2022/04/the-best-leaders-have-a-contagious-positive-energy>
- Sharma, A. D. (2016). Study of teacher morale in relation to organizational climate of urban and rural secondary schools. *Abhinav National Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Arts & Education*, 5(3), 1-8.
- Shavuka, T. (2020). *Factors contributing to low teacher morale in secondary schools in the Oshana educational region, Namibia*. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Namibia].  
[https://repository.unam.edu.na/bitstream/handle/11070/2942/shavuka\\_2020.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://repository.unam.edu.na/bitstream/handle/11070/2942/shavuka_2020.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
- Shepard, L. (2021). *A vision for prioritizing learning, not testing*. American Educator, Fall 2021 American Federation of Teacher.  
<https://www.aft.org/ae/fall2021/shepard>
- Sivakumar, I., & Arun, A. (2019). Morale among school teachers in Coimbatore District. *International Journal of Applied Social Science*, 6(4), 803-807.  
<https://bit.ly/3IIKbaT>
- Smith, G., Minor, M., Brashen, H., & Remaly, K. (2017). Successful instructional leadership styles in education. *Journal of Instructional Research*, 6, 46-52.
- Snyder, T. D., de Brey, C., & Dillow, S. A. (2016). *Digest of education statistics 2014* (ED565675). ERIC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED565675.pdf>
- Solomon, A., & Steyn, R. (2017). Leadership styles: The role of cultural intelligence. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*. 43(1) 1–12.
- Spears, L. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective,

- caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, 1(1). 25-30.
- Steyn, G. M. (2014). A theoretical analysis of educator motivation and morale. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82-90.
- Stone, G. A., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(4). 349–361.
- Strasser, D. (2014). An open letter on teacher morale. *Educational Leadership*, 71(5), 10-13.
- STU online. (2014, November 25). *What is laissez-faire leadership? How autonomy can drive success*. St. Thomas University Online.  
<https://online.stu.edu/degrees/education/what-is-laissezfaire-leadership/>
- Supriyatno, T. (2021). Visionary leadership of the head of Diniyah Madrasah in improving the quality Santri. *Journal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 6(3), 513-525.
- Sutton, J. (2021, April 11). *What is the coaching leadership style?* Positive Psychology.  
<https://positivepsychology.com/coaching-leadership-style/>
- Swisher, A. (2022). *Building a school climate that makes teachers want to stay*. NCTQ.  
<https://www.nctq.org/blog/Building-a-school-climate-that-makes-teachers-want-to-stay>
- Tabrizi, S., & Rideout, G. (2019). Exploring situational leadership in the education system: Practices for multicultural societies. *International Journal of Innovative Business Strategies*, 5, 234-244.
- Talalienė, Ž., & Šečkuvienė, H. (2015). Muzikos mokytojo lyderystės gebėjimų raiška.

*Pedagogika*, 119(3), 134-146.

Team Asana. (2021). *Situational leadership: 4 styles and qualities*. Asana.

<https://asana.com/resources/situational-leadership>

Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 357-385.

Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., & Johansson, S. (2020). Teacher job satisfaction: The importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. *Educational Review*, 73(1), 71-97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2019.1705247>

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Tschannen-Moran, B. (2014). What to do when your schools in a bad mood. *Educational Leadership*, 71(5), 36-41.

University of Bridgeport. (2022, May 19). What does an education administrator do?

*University of Bridgeport News*. <https://www.bridgeport.edu/news/what-does-an-education-administrator-do/#:~:text=At%20a%20high%20level%2C%20school,design%20curriculum%2C%20and%20oversee%20recordkeeping>.

University of Massachusetts Global. (2020, July 08). Teacher turnover: What you need to know and how you can curb the trend. *University of Massachusetts Global*

<https://www.umassglobal.edu/news-and-events/blog/teacher-turnover>

Uno, H. B. (2017). Teori Motivasi dan Pengukurannya. *Bumi Aksara*

Wang, Z., Liu, Y. & Liu, S. (2019). Authoritarian leadership and task performance: the effects of leader-member exchange and dependence on leader. *Frontier Business Research China* 13(19). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s11782-019-0066-x>

Watson, T. (2019). *Parent, teacher, and administrator perceptions of school community*

*relationships*. [Doctoral Dissertation, East Tennessee State University]. East Tennessee State University.

<https://dc.etsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5082&context=etd>

Webb, D. (2014). *The relationship between principal leadership and teacher morale in the elementary schools in a northwest Georgia school district*. [Doctoral Dissertation, Liberty University]. Liberty University Library. Digital Commons.

<https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1852&context=doctoral>

Weiss, L. (2020). Burnout from an organizational perspective. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. <https://doi.org/10.48558/9CV0-C436>

Welch, M. S. (2014). *Teacher perceptions of principal leadership behaviors and morale: A descriptive case study*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Kansas City]. Mospace. <https://mospace.umsystem.edu>

Werang, B. R., & Lena, L. (2014). Relationship between principal's leadership, school organizational climate, and teachers' job performance at state senior high schools in Merauke Regency–Papua–Indonesia. *International Journal of Education Research*, 2, 635–640.

Will, M. (2019). *Teaching in 2020 vs. 2010: A look back at the decade*. Education Week. <https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/teaching-in-2020-vs-2010-a-look-back-at-the-decade/2019/12>

Will, M. (2021). *As teacher morale hits a new low, schools look for ways to give breaks, restoration*. Education Week. <https://www.edweek.org/leadership/as-teacher-morale-hits-a-new-low-schools-look-for-ways-to-give-breaks-restoration/2021/01>

Will, M. (2022). *Will there really be a mass exodus of teachers?* Education Week.

<https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/will-there-really-be-a-mass-exodus-of-teachers/2022/02>

Witt, D. (2018). *The top 5 characteristics of servant leaders*. Blanchard LeaderChat.

<https://resources.kenblanchard.com/blanchard-leaderchat/the-top-5-characteristics-of-servant-leaders>

Wong, S., & Giessner, S. (2016). The thin line between empowering and laissez-faire leadership: An expectancy-match perspective. *Journal of Management*, 44(2).

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315574597>

Workplace Testing. (2020, May 30). *Job Performance*. Workplace testing.

<https://www.workplacetesting.com/definition/4060/job-performance>

Wuench, J. (2022, March 3). *How to lead through periods of low morale*. ForbesWomen.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/juliawuench/2022/03/03/how-to-lead-through-periods-of-low-morale/?sh=1ba9930c5548>

Wyld, D. (June 29, 2010). *Top ten management on situational leadership theory: An overview of how to match the right leader to the right group of followers*.

Southeastern Louisiana University in Management.

<http://bizcovering.com/management/top-ten-management-on-situationalleadership-theory-an-overview-of-how-to-match-the-right-leader-to-the-right-groupof-followers/>

Yang, Y. (2013). Principals' transformational leadership in school improvement. *Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education*, 9(2), 77-84.

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1140974.pdf>



Zamarro, G., Camp, A., Fuchsman, D. & McGee, J. (2021). *How the pandemic has changed teachers' commitment to remaining in the classroom*. Brookings.

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2021/09/08/how-the-pandemic-has-changed-teachers-commitment-to-remaining-in-the-classroom/>

Zylfijaj, K., Mahmutaj, R., & Grubi, A. (2014). *Authoritarian leadership vs. participative leadership in organizations*. Research Gate.

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/278964936\\_Authoritarian\\_leadership\\_vs\\_participative\\_leadership\\_in\\_organizations](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/278964936_Authoritarian_leadership_vs_participative_leadership_in_organizations)

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A: Educators' Questionnaire – (12-minute survey)

#### Section I - Demographic Questions

1.	Gender:	Male	Female				
2.	Your current age:	22 – 30	31 – 40	41 – 50	51 – 60	61 +	
3.	Years as an educator?	0 – 5 years	6 – 10 years	11 – 15 years	15+ years		
4.	Highest educational level?	Bachelor's Degree	Master's Degree	Degree with Principal Certificate	Doctoral Degree		
5.	Years in your current school as an educator?	0 – 5 years	6 – 10 years	11 – 15 years	15 + years		
6.	Years working with your current administrative leadership?	0 – 5 years	6 – 10 years	11 – 15 years	15 + years		
7.	Location of your current employment? (Fill-in)	City/State:					
8.	School Classification:	Public	Private	Charter	Cyber	Parochial	Other:
9.	What would you consider your school to be:	Inner city school (above 5000 students)	Suburban school (outer edges of metropolitan city)	Rural school (fewer than 600 students)			
10.	Current position? (Fill-in – Grade Level(s) and Subject(s))						
11.	Current School Configuration (i.e. Middle School: 5 – 8)	Elementary School: _____ Intermediate School: _____ Middle School: _____ Jr. High School: _____ Grade Level Center: _____					

	High School: _____
--	--------------------

## Section II – Survey – Part 1

**Directions: The survey questions are inquiring about which qualities you find effective or ineffective in administrators and how do they influence your performance. Please review the following statements and select the appropriate response:**

**Strongly Effective (SE), Effective (E), Ineffective (I), or Strongly Ineffective (SI)**

#	Qualities	Strongly Effective (SE)	Effective (E)	Ineffective (I)	Strongly Ineffective (SI)
1.	Communication (Exceptional listener and lines and methods of communication are well developed and maintained.)	SE	E	I	SI
2.	Acts quickly on daily issues and follows up that day to make sure the issues are resolved.	SE	E	I	SI
3.	Leads by example.	SE	E	I	SI
4.	No micromanaging.	SE	E	I	SI
5.	Open to change.	SE	E	I	SI
6.	Educators need to be watched or they won't do their job.	SE	E	I	SI
7.	Makes the educators feel insecure about their work.	SE	E	I	SI
8.	Command, control, and demanding	SE	E	I	SI
9.	Setting straightforward tasks and expectations.	SE	E	I	SI
10.	One clear voice giving directions	SE	E	I	SI
11.	No feedback	SE	E	I	SI
12.	Absence of leadership	SE	E	I	SI
13.	Set high expectations and demand quick results.	SE	E	I	SI
14.	Encourages collaboration along with resolving team conflicts	SE	E	I	SI
15.	Utilize Data and Resources	SE	E	I	SI
16.	Visual in the school building	SE	E	I	SI
17.	Avoiding Conflict	SE	E	I	SI
18.	Seeing Only What's Wrong	SE	E	I	SI

19.	Taking All the Credit and controlling everything	<b>SE</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>SI</b>
20.	Focusing Exclusively on the Goal	<b>SE</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>SI</b>
21.	Strong personality	<b>SE</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>SI</b>
22.	Holds educators accountable	<b>SE</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>SI</b>
23.	Cares about all educators. (Knows more than the basic information about the educator.)	<b>SE</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>SI</b>
24.	Ensuring an orderly and supportive environment	<b>SE</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>SI</b>
25.	Considered the readiness level of the team members they serve	<b>SE</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>SI</b>

**Section III - Open-Ended Questions** – Please answer the following questions.

What are educators' perceptions regarding the qualities of an effective administrator

1. Select a Strongly Effective or Effective quality statement that you answered above and describe the influence it had on your performance.
2. Select a Strongly Ineffective or Ineffective quality statement that you answered above and describe the influence it had on your performance.

## Appendix B: Educator Interview Questions

1. What leadership qualities does your current administrator use with your faculty?  
Do you find them to be effective or ineffective?
2. Describe how your administrator's leadership qualities influence your performance?
3. What leadership qualities would you like to witness your current administrator to use?

Appendix C: Educators' Questionnaire Panel Score Sheet (Survey, Open-ended, and Interview Questions)

**Section I:** Use the key below as a reference for your score.

**Research questions:**

**RQ1-** What are the qualities of an effective administrator?

**RQ2-** What are the qualities of an ineffective administrator?

**RQ3-** How do the effective and ineffective qualities of an administrator influence the educator's performance?

**ADD** indicates the question/statement will be used to gather additional educator perceptions for this qualitative study.

**DEMO** indicates the question/statement will be used for demographic information.

**Panel Score:**

A score of 3 indicates high relation to the research question/statement.

A score of 2 indicates a good relation to the research question/statement.

A score of 1 indicates little relation to the research question/statement.

	<b>Research Question</b>	<b>Panel Score</b>		
Gender	<b>DEMO</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Current age	<b>DEMO</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

Years as an educator?	<b>DEMO</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Highest educational level?	<b>DEMO</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Years in your current school as an educator?	<b>DEMO</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Years working with your current administrative leadership?	<b>ADD</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Location of your current employment? (Fill-in)	<b>ADD</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
School Classification:	<b>ADD</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
What would you consider your school to be:	<b>DEMO</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Current position? (Fill-in – Grade Level(s) and Subject(s))	<b>DEMO</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Current School Configuration (i.e. Middle School: 5 – 8)	<b>ADD</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>STRONGLY EFFECTIVE- EFFECTIVE- INEFFECTIVE- STRONGLY INEFFECTIVE</b>	<b>RQ#</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Communication (Exceptional listener and lines and methods of communication are well developed and maintained.)	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Acts quickly on daily issues and follows up that day to make sure the issues are resolved.	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

Leads by example.	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
No micromanaging.	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Open to change.	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Educators need to be watched or they won't do their job.	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Makes the educators feel insecure about their work.	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Command, control, and demanding	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Setting straightforward tasks and expectations.	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
One clear voice giving directions	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
No feedback	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>



	(Depends on Educator Answer)			
Absence of leadership	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2</b> (Depends on Educator Answer)	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Set high expectations and demand quick results.	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2</b> (Depends on Educator Answer)	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Encourages collaboration along with resolving team conflicts	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2</b> (Depends on Educator Answer)	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Utilize Data and Resources	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2</b> (Depends on Educator Answer)	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Visual in the school building	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2</b> (Depends on Educator Answer)	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Avoiding Conflict	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2</b> (Depends on Educator Answer)	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Seeing Only What's Wrong	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2</b> (Depends on Educator Answer)	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Taking All the Credit and controlling everything	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2</b> (Depends on Educator Answer)	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

Focusing Exclusively on the Goal	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Strong personality	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Holds educators accountable	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Cares about all educators. (Knows more than the basic information about the educator.)	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Ensuring an orderly and supportive environment	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Considered the readiness level of the team members they serve	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2 (Depends on Educator Answer)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Open Ended Questions</b>	<b>RQ1, RQ2, RQ3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Select a Strongly Effective or Effective quality statement that you answered above and describe the influence it had on your performance.	<b>RQ3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
Select a Strongly Ineffective or Ineffective quality statement that you answered above and describe the influence it had on your performance.	<b>RQ3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

**Section II: Interview Questions**

<b>Interview Question</b>	<b>RQ1, RQ2, RQ3, PER</b>	<b>Score/Comments</b>		
1. What leadership qualities does your current administrator use with your faculty? Do you find them to be effective or ineffective?	<b>RQ1 OR RQ2</b> (Depends on Educator Answer)	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
2. Describe how your administrator's leadership qualities influence your performance?	<b>RQ1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
3. What leadership qualities would you like to witness your current administrator to use?	<b>ADD</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

## Appendix D: RERB Approval

**IMMACULATA UNIVERSITY RESEARCH ETHICS REVIEW BOARD  
REQUEST FOR PROTOCOL REVIEW--REVIEWER'S COMMENTS FORM  
(R1297)**

**Name of Researcher:** Ann Mercedes Wudyka

**Project Title:** Effective and Ineffective Qualities of An Administrator

**Reviewer's Comments:**

Your proposal is **Approved**. You may begin your research or collect your data.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS APPROVAL IS VALID FOR ONE YEAR (365 days) FROM DATE OF SIGNING.

**Reviewer's Recommendations:**

Exempt  
 Expedited  
 Full Review

**Approve**  
 Conditionally Approved  
 Do Not Approve

*Marcia Parris*

December 21, 2022

Marcia Parris, Ed.D.,  
 Chair, Research Ethics Review Board

Date