

OPEN ACCESS

Manuscript ID:
EDU-2026-140310459

Volume: 14

Issue: 3

Month: June

Year: 2026

P-ISSN: 2320-2653

E-ISSN: 2582-1334

Received: 30.03.2026

Accepted: 10.05.2026

Published Online: 01.06.2026

Citation:

Nguanjay, S., & Piatanom, P. (2026). The Influence of School Administrators' Situational Leadership on School Effectiveness in the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 14(3), 118–125.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v14i3.10459>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

The Influence of School Administrators' Situational Leadership on School Effectiveness in the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration

Saowalak Nguanjay

Ramkhamhaeng University, Thailand

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1689-7224>

Patumphorn Piatanom

Ramkhamhaeng University, Thailand

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6989-8280>

Abstract

This research aims to study 1) the school administrators' situational leadership in the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration (BMA), 2) the school effectiveness in the BMA, 3) the correlation between school administrators' situational leadership and school effectiveness in the BMA, and 4) the influence of school administrators' situational leadership on school effectiveness in the BMA. The sample group comprised 370 government teachers in the BMA for the 2025 academic year. The sample was selected through multi-stage random sampling. The research instrument was a questionnaire, with a reliability of 0.973. Statistics included mean, standard deviation, Pearson's correlation coefficient, and stepwise multiple regression. The research findings revealed that: 1) school administrators' situational leadership and school effectiveness in the BMA were overall at a high level; 2) there was a significant positive correlation between situational leadership and school effectiveness at the .01 level; and 3) the participating, telling, selling, and delegating leadership styles collectively predicted 69.80% of the variance in school effectiveness. In conclusion, administrators significantly enhance school operations by adapting their leadership styles to specific situational demands, with 'Telling' emerging as a highly influential factor within this context. Future research should employ qualitative methodologies to deeply explore the operational mechanisms of these leadership styles and expand the scope of the study to compare diverse educational jurisdictions beyond the BMA.

Keywords: Educational Leadership, Situational Leadership, School Effectiveness, Correlation, Regression Analysis in Education, BMA School

Introduction

In the current situation, Thailand is facing rapid changes in the economy, society, and technology. These shifts have forced the education system to change significantly, affecting its structure, content, and teaching methods. Because of this, school leaders must adapt their management styles quickly to remain relevant in a changing environment ([Karnjanapun, 2020](#)).

In this period of change, school leaders need strong leadership. This is defined as the behavior of an individual who can influence and motivate staff to work together willingly and with trust. By using different processes and roles, a leader can change the behavior of individuals or groups to work effectively toward school goals ([Borieak, 2021](#)).

The effectiveness of a school is the extent to which it achieves the goals set by the organization. The leader plays a key role by motivating and supporting staff to work at their full potential. They must also be able to adapt to environmental changes and use their knowledge to drive the school forward to meet its objectives ([Thaiprayoon, 2021](#)).

A key factor affecting school effectiveness is “Situational Leadership.” As [Hersey and Blanchard \(1988\)](#) stated, effective leaders must adjust their leadership style to match their followers’ readiness and the changing situation. By aligning their behavior with the team’s ability and willingness, leaders can better encourage participation and improve performance.

For schools in the BMA, which vary in size and social context, flexible leadership is necessary. Without the right leadership, school operations—such as teaching quality, teacher development, and student results—may suffer. Therefore, this research aims to examine how school administrators’ situational leadership affects school effectiveness in BMA schools. By analyzing different leadership styles, this study will provide suggestions for developing leaders who fit the specific contexts of BMA and another school.

Research Objectives

- To study the school administrators’ situational leadership in the BMA.
- To study the school effectiveness in the BMA.
- To study the correlation between school administrators’ situational leadership and school effectiveness in the BMA.
- To study the influence of school administrators’ situational leadership on school effectiveness in the BMA.

Research Hypothesis

- School administrators’ situational leadership in the BMA is at a high level.
- The school’s effectiveness in the BMA is at a high level.
- The correlation between school administrators’ situational leadership and school effectiveness in the BMA was statistically significant at the 0.01 level.
- The influence of school administrators’ situational leadership had a statistically significant influence at the 0.05 level on school effectiveness in the BMA.

Conceptual Framework

This study examines the influence of school

administrators’ situational leadership on school effectiveness in the BMA focuses on two main variables:

School administrators’ situational leadership: This includes four styles: Participating, Telling, Selling, and Delegating ([Boonbai, 2023](#); [Chaiudom & Piatanom, 2023](#); [Chumnoi & Indusuta, 2024](#); [Donrahan & Kaewwongsri, 2024](#); [Duangthe, 2022](#); [Sikhuntagasamit & Pakdeejit, 2023](#); [Sookkaew, 2021](#); [Suwannakam & Lertamornsak, 2024](#); [Tangkaew, 2020](#); [Vatchanarat & Sauphayana, 2023](#)).

School Effectiveness: This includes Academic Achievement, Internal Problem Solving, and Teacher Job Satisfaction ([Buranachart, 2022](#); [Changkwian & Wangthanomsak, 2022](#); [Deepan, 2020](#); [Jetjumnong, 2021](#); [Khamphaeng et al., 2022](#); [Lumlertwattana & Chatrupachewin, 2023](#); [Maneeewan et al., 2023](#); [Thaiprayoon, 2021](#); [Thiangtham et al., 2024](#); [Thongdee & Wannasri, 2024](#)). The conceptual framework is detailed in Figure 1.

School Administrators’ Situational Leadership	School Effectiveness
Participating	Academic Achievement
Telling	Internal Problem Solving
Selling	Teacher Job Satisfaction
Delegating	

Figure1 Conceptual Framework

Methodology

Population and Sample

The population of this study comprises 13,612 government teachers in BMA schools for the year 2025, across 437 schools. The sample size was calculated using the formula from [Cohen et al. \(2018\)](#). At a significance level of 0.05, the required sample size is 370 teachers. To ensure the sample accurately represents the large and diverse population of 13,612 teachers across 437 schools in the BMA, multi-stage random sampling was utilized. This method was chosen to systematically reduce sampling bias and account for variations across different administrative districts. 1) Cluster random sampling: select one group in Central Bangkok, 2) cluster random sampling, three offices, which are Phra Nakhon, Dusit, and Huai Khwang, and 3) simple random sampling: teachers from the school by using the proportion of the sample size.

Research Instrument

The research instrument used a questionnaire consisting of three parts as follows:

Part 1: General information, gender, age, education, and years of work.

Part 2: Opinion on school administrators' situational leadership. This section measures the four leadership dimensions (Participating, Telling, Selling, and Delegating) through 28 specific items. Responses were anchored on a 5-point Likert Scale (Likert, 1967), ranging from 5 (highest level of practice) to 1 (lowest level of practice).

Part 3: Opinion on school effectiveness. This section evaluates three dimensions (Academic Achievement, Internal Problem Solving, and Teacher Job Satisfaction) using 21 items. This part also utilized a 5-point Likert Scale to quantify the teachers' perspectives.

Part 3: Opinion on school effectiveness. This part has 21 items across 3 areas and also uses a 5-point Likert Scale.

Quality Assessment of the Instruments

Content Validity: The questionnaire was reviewed by five experts in educational administration. The Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC) scores ranged from 0.6 to 1.0, indicating acceptable validity.

Reliability: A "Try Out" was conducted with 30 teachers at Samsen Nok School. The Item-total Correlation scores ranged from 0.2 to 0.8. The Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for the entire questionnaire was 0.97, showing high reliability.

Data Analysis

School administrators' situational leadership: Analyzed using Mean and Standard Deviation (S.D.). Results were interpreted according to the criteria of Srisa-ard (2017).

Correlation analysis: The correlation between school administrators' situational leadership and school effectiveness was analyzed using Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient.

Influence analysis: To study how the influence of school administrators' situational leadership on school effectiveness was used, Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis was used.

Research Results

The analysis revealed that the school administrators' situational leadership within the BMA is generally high across all areas. The highest average score was in Participating leadership, followed by Delegating leadership. The area with the lowest average score was Selling leadership (Table 1).

Table 1 Means and Standard Deviations of School Administrators' Situational Leadership in the BMA

School Administrators' Situational Leadership	Teacher's Perspectives			
	X $\bar{}$	S.D.	Level	Rank
1. Participating	4.14	0.41	High	1
2. Telling	4.08	0.44	High	3
3. Selling	4.05	0.50	High	4
4. Delegating	4.12	0.43	High	2
Overall	4.10	0.33	High	

The analysis of school effectiveness in the BMA showed a high overall score as well as strong scores across individual dimensions. The highest average score was in Academic Achievement, followed by Internal Problem Solving. The lowest average score was in Teacher Job Satisfaction (Table 2).

Table 2 Means and Standard Deviations of School Effectiveness in the BMA

School Effectiveness	Teacher's Perspectives			
	X $\bar{}$	S.D.	Level	Rank
1. Academic Achievement	4.49	0.13	High	1
2. Internal Problem Solving	4.09	0.31	High	2
3. Teacher Job Satisfaction	4.00	0.21	High	3
Overall	4.19	0.16	High	

The study of the correlation between school administrators' situational leadership and school effectiveness in the BMA revealed that school administrators' situational leadership (X_{tot}) has a high level of correlation with school effectiveness (Y_{tot}) ($r_{xy}=0.637^{**}$), which is statistically significant at the .01 level. When considering each dimension, the findings showed that Participating Leadership (X_1) had a low positive correlation ($r_{xy}=0.362^{**}$), Telling Leadership (X_2) had a high positive

correlation ($r_{xy}=0.742^{**}$), Selling Leadership (X_3) and Delegating Leadership (X_4) had a low positive correlation ($r_{xy}=0.463^{**}$), correlation ($r_{xy}=0.334^{**}$) (Table 3).

Table 3 Correlation Coefficients between the School Administrators' Situational Leadership and School Effectiveness in the BMA

Situational Leadership of School Administrators	School Effectiveness					
	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4	X_{tot}	Y_{tot}
X_1	1					
X_2	0.411**	1				
X_3	0.344**	0.329**	1			
X_4	0.449**	0.724**	0.255**	1		
X_{tot}	0.717**	0.816**	0.671**	0.798**	1	
Y_{tot}	0.362**	0.742**	0.463**	0.334**	0.637**	1

** Statistically significant at the .01 level

The influence of school administrators' situational leadership on school effectiveness in the BMA found that all four leadership dimensions were significant predictors at the .01 level. These include: Participating (X_1), Telling (X_2), Selling (X_3), and Delegating (X_4). The statistical results showed a multiple correlation coefficient (R) of 0.837 and a coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.701. The Adjusted R2 was 0.698, with a Standard Error of

Estimate (SEE) of 0.090. This indicates that these four leadership styles together can predict 69.80% of school effectiveness (Table 4).

The predictive equations are as follows:

The regression equation in unstandardized form (Raw Scores): $\hat{Y}_1 = 2.995 + 0.357X_2 - 0.176X_4 + 0.076X_3 + 0.039X_1$

The regression equation in standardized form (Z-Scores): $Z_y = 0.964X_2 - 0.467X_4 + 0.231X_3 + 0.097X_1$

Table 4 The Influence of School Administrators' Situational Leadership on School Effectiveness in the BMA

Situational Leadership	B	S.E.	β	t	Sig.
X_1	0.039	0.014	0.097	2.834**	0.005
X_2	0.357	0.016	0.964	22.094**	0.000
X_3	0.076	0.011	0.231	7.240**	0.000
X_4	-0.176	0.017	-0.467	-10.666**	0.000
constant	2.995	0.060		50.043**	0.000

$R=0.837$; $R^2 = 0.701$; Adjusted $R^2 = 0.698$; SEE = 0.090; ** Statistically significant at the .01 level

Findings & Discussion

Based on the research findings regarding the influence of school administrators' situational leadership on school effectiveness in the BMA, the results can be discussed as follows:

School administrators' situational leadership was found to be at a high level. A main reason for this is that the Education Department, as the governing body, consistently supports the ongoing development of school leaders. Specifically, there is a strong emphasis on leadership qualities such as knowledge, professional skills, and experience in managing and

solving problems based on specific situations. This is reflected in the recruitment and selection process for school administrators, which requires extensive training and development before they officially start their roles. As a result, administrators can design and modify their leadership behaviors to fit the specific context of each period. Additionally, they can respond appropriately to different situations based on their followers' readiness levels. This finding aligns with the Situational Leadership Theory by [Hersey & Blanchard \(1988\)](#), which suggests that the core of situational leadership lies in the leader's behavior

in relation to the followers. These results are also consistent with research by [Chumnoi & Indusuta \(2024\)](#), who found their situational leadership to be high. Similarly, [Sookkaew \(2021\)](#), [Saengsit & Usaho \(2023\)](#), and [Zohair et al. \(2021\)](#) all reported high levels of situational leadership in their respective studies of educational administrators.

School Effectiveness found that the overall effectiveness of schools in the BMA is high. This may be because school administrators demonstrate leadership styles suited to the current situation, enabling them to manage and delegate tasks efficiently. This success encompasses student academic achievement, internal problem-solving, and teacher job satisfaction. Furthermore, administrators consistently promote and develop the potential of teachers and staff, ensuring that school operations meet their goals. The Education Department's systematic educational policies also play a key role in guiding schools toward sustainable development. These findings are consistent with the research by [Thaiprayoon \(2021\)](#) and [Khamphaeng et al. \(2022\)](#), who found high school effectiveness. These results also align with those of [Ismail et al. \(2022\)](#) and support the work of [Dilekçi et al. \(2023\)](#) and [Demirhan \(2023\)](#) on perceived school effectiveness and innovative characteristics.

The correlation between school administrators' situational leadership and school effectiveness in the BMA. The study found a strong positive correlation between school administrators' situational leadership and school effectiveness, which was statistically significant at the .01 level. This result supports the research hypothesis. The reason for this strong relationship is that administrators can adjust their leadership styles—whether Telling, Participating, Selling, or Delegating—to fit the specific needs of each situation. This flexibility allows staff to clearly understand their goals and roles, leading to effective teamwork and high-quality performance. As a result, schools are better able to achieve their objectives with high standards. These findings align with the study by [Donrahman & Kaewwongsri \(2024\)](#), which found a highly significant positive correlation between these variables in private Islamic schools. Similarly, [Suwannakam & Lertamornsak \(2024\)](#) reported a very high positive correlation in secondary schools in

Samut Prakan. The findings are also consistent with [Komariah et al. \(2017\)](#), which showed a significant positive correlation between situational leadership and school effectiveness. Furthermore, [Boonbai \(2023\)](#) confirmed that situational leadership has a strong positive correlation with school administrative effectiveness.

The influence of school administrators' situational leadership on school effectiveness in the BMA revealed that four dimensions of situational leadership—Participating, Telling, Selling, and Delegating—were significant predictors of school effectiveness at the .01 level. Collectively, these factors could predict for 69.80% of the variance in school effectiveness, with a Standard Error of Estimate (SEE) of 0.090. This strong predictive power likely results from administrators' ability to match the appropriate leadership style to each situation. Specifically, participating fosters a sense of ownership and willingness among staff. Telling offers clear direction and structure for operations. Selling encourages staff to accept new ideas through inspiration and persuasion. Delegating demonstrates trust and promotes staff development. Together, these styles enable schools to operate efficiently and achieve their goals. The significant predictive power of these combined styles highlights the absolute necessity of administrative flexibility. Notably, the strong influence of Telling leadership reflects the highly structured bureaucratic environment of the BMA, where providing clear directives, reducing operational ambiguity, and defining explicit roles are critical to efficiently mobilizing personnel. These findings are consistent with research by [Boonbai \(2023\)](#), which found that situational leadership styles could predict school administrative effectiveness with 71.90% accuracy. Similarly, [Saokaew et al. \(2024\)](#) and [Suwannakam & Lertamornsak \(2024\)](#) reported predictive values of 57.00% and 67.90%, respectively. These results are further supported by the work of [Hempijit & Lertamornsak \(2024\)](#) and [Tangkaew \(2020\)](#), both of whom confirmed that situational leadership is a strong predictor of institutional effectiveness, with predictive values ranging from 43% up to 96.7%.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Practice

Short-term Strategies

The research findings show that Selling leadership received a lower average score compared to other leadership styles. Given its positive correlation with school effectiveness ($r_{xy} = 0.463$), school administrators should emphasize the “Selling” approach by clearly explaining their decisions and giving teachers opportunities to understand the details of their tasks. Consistent support and guidance are essential to ensure work objectives are achieved.

According to the results, Teacher Job Satisfaction scored lower than other aspects of school effectiveness. To improve this, school administrators should adopt a comprehensive approach that focuses on both psychological support and systemic improvements. Additionally, since Telling leadership demonstrated the highest predictive power for school effectiveness, administrators should leverage clear communication and structured directions to reduce operational ambiguity, thereby fostering a more secure and positive workplace atmosphere.

Long-term Strategies

The Education Department and relevant agencies should utilize these findings to plan strategic developments. Specifically, because the research provides strong evidence that the four situational leadership dimensions collectively account for 69.80% of the variance in school effectiveness, they should focus on situational leadership programs for administrators to further enhance institutional effectiveness.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should examine different leadership styles of school administrators that could influence school effectiveness within the BMA. This would offer a wider variety of strategies to enhance educational management.

Conduct comparative research on situational leadership and school effectiveness across different educational organizations. This enables a valuable comparison of results among various management systems.

Conclusion

The research findings show that both school administrators’ situational leadership and school effectiveness are high, both overall and in each specific area. These results support research objectives 1 and 2, respectively. Regarding school administrators’ situational leadership, the highest average score was for Participating, while Selling had the lowest. For school effectiveness, Academic Achievement scored the highest, and Teacher Job Satisfaction the lowest. Correlation: There is a significant positive correlation between school administrators’ situational leadership and school effectiveness at the .01 level. This supports Research Objective 3. Predictive Power: The four dimensions of situational leadership—Participating (X_1), Telling (X_2), Selling (X_3), and Delegating (X_4)—together can predict school effectiveness with statistical significance. These variables explain 69.80% of the variance in school effectiveness, aligning with Research Objective 4. The most influential predictor is Telling leadership (X_2), indicating that administrators are crucial for providing direction, controlling operations, and guiding the school toward its goals. Clear decision-making and direct instructions ensure that teachers and staff work toward shared objectives, resulting in greater efficiency and effectiveness. This study improves understanding of situational leadership in education. However, there are some limitations, such as the BMA’s focus on schools. Future studies should include other educational organizations or explore different provinces. Broader research would gather diverse perspectives from school administrators and teachers across social and geographical areas, leading to more comprehensive results.

References

- Borieak, S. (2021). *Leadership of School Administrators Affecting Teachers Performance in Schools under the Secondary Educational Service Area Office 22*. Sakon Nakhon Rajabhat University.
- Boonbai, W. (2023). *Situational Leadership of Administrators Affecting the Effectiveness of School Administration under Sakon Nakhon Primary Educational Service Area Office 1*. Sakon Nakhon Rajabhat University.

- Buranachart, S. (2022). Correlation between the mental traits of school administrations with school effectiveness under the Office Secondary Education Service Area. *Journal of Education Research, Faculty of Education, Srinakharinwirot University*, 17(1), 95-109.
- Chaiudom, P., & Piatanom, P. (2023). Situational leadership of school administrators as perceived by teachers in schools under the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration, South Bangkok Group. *Journal of Education and Innovation*, 26(2), 238-247.
- Changkwian, A., & Wangthanomsak, M. (2022). Administrator's roles and the effectiveness of school under the Secondary Educational Service Area Office Nakhon Pathom. *Journal of Multidisciplinary in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(1), 93-108.
- Chumnoi, C., & Indusuta, K. (2024). Situational leadership of school administrators under the Bangkok Metropolitan Administration. *SSRU Graduate Studies Journal*, 17(1), 97-122.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education*. Routledge.
- Deepan, J. (2020). *Decision-making of Administrator and School Effectiveness under Nonthaburi Primary Educational Service Area Office*. Silpakorn University.
- Demirhan, G. (2023). The mediating role of innovative school characteristics in the relationship between school culture and school effectiveness. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 10(4), 942-953.
- Dilekçi, Ü., Limon, İ., & Kaya, A. (2023). The relationship between teacher demoralization in educational policy context and school effectiveness. *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 23(1), 191-208.
- Donrahman, Y., & Kheowongsri, S. (2024). Situation leadership among Institution educational and the effectiveness of private Islamic schools in Phatthalung Province. *Journal of Setthawit Review*, 4(2), 381-395.
- Duangthe, W. (2022). *A Study of Situational Leadership of School Administrators, Rimkok Consortium under the Secondary Educational Service Area Chiangrai*. Phayao University.
- Hempijit, T., & Lertamornsak, G. (2024). The situational leadership affecting the effectiveness in personnel administration of primary school under Nonthaburi Primary Educational Service Area Office 1. *The Journal of Sirindhornparidhat*, 25(2), 1845-1855.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*. Prentice Hall.
- Ismail, M., Khatibi, A. & Azam, S. M. F. (2022). Impact of school culture on school effectiveness in government schools in Maldives. *Participatory Educational Research*, 9(2), 261-279.
- Jetjumnong, N. (2021). *Transformational leadership of administrators affecting the effectiveness of schools under the auspices of Bangkok Metropolitan Administration*. Siam University.
- Khamphaeng, K., Donhongsa, L., Pangthai, S., & Tongmokaew, K. (2022). School administration affecting to effectiveness of school under Sakon Nakhon Primary Educational Service Area Office 3. *Journal of Social Science Panyapat*, 4(4), 137-148.
- Karnjanapun, R. (2020). School administration in the crisis situation of the coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19). *Ph.D. in Social Sciences Journal*, 10(3), 545-556.
- Komariah, A., Mawardi, & Abubakar. (2017). School effectiveness: Situational leadership and school cultures. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Educational Sciences*.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value*. McGraw-Hill.
- Lumlertwattana, N., & Chatrupachewin, C. (2023). A study of the relationship between the innovative leadership of school administrators and the effectiveness of schools under the Secondary Educational Service Area Office Phrae. *Sikkha Journal of Education*, 10(1), 53-61.

- Maneewan, P., Jarueksil, T. Y., & Chongcharoen, K. (2023). The relationship between strategic leadership of school administrators and effectiveness of schools under Mahasarakham Primary Educational Service Area Office 2. *Integrated Social Science Journal*, 10(1), 18-38.
- Saengsit, S., & Usaho, K. (2023). Situational leadership of school administrators under Udon Thani Secondary Educational Service Area Office. *Journal of Management Science, Sakonnakon Rajabhat University*, 4(1), 137-148.
- Saokaew, T., Yamchuti, U., & Intarasompun, W. (2024). Situational leadership affecting the effectiveness of educational institutions under the Secondary Educational Service Area Office, Samut Sakhon, Samut Songkhram. *Journal of Modern Learning Development*, 9(12), 90-104.
- Sikhuntagasamit, H., & Pakdeejit, Y. (2023). Situational leadership roles of school administrators in small schools under Nakhon Sawan Primary Educational Service Area Office 1. *Education Journal, Faculty of Education, Nakhon Sawan Rajabhat University*, 6(1), 178-190.
- Srisa-ard, B. (2017). *Basic Research*. Suwiriyasarn Publishing.
- Sookkaew, R. (2021). *Situational Leadership of School Administrators, Sut Tin Thai Consortium, Secondary Educational Service Area Office 36*. Phayao University.
- Suwannakam, W., & Lertamornsak, G. (2024). Administrators affecting school effectiveness under the office of Secondary Educational Service Area, Samut Prakan. *Journal of Education Burapha University*, 35(3), 32-48.
- Tangkaew, W. (2020). *The Contingency Leadership Affecting the Effectiveness of Personnel Administration of Primary Schools under Suratthani Primary Educational Service Area Office 3*. Suratthani Rajabhat University.
- Thaiprayoon, W. (2021). *Administrators' Leadership Affecting the Effectiveness of Schools under the Saraburi Primary Educational Service Area Office*. Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi.
- Thiangtham, B., Suwanmanee, S., & Wannapiro, S. (2024). The super leadership influence school effectiveness under Songkhla Primary Education Service Area Office 1. *Journal of Association of Professional Development of Educational Administration of Thailand*, 6(3), 222-236.
- Thongdee, R., & Wannasri, J. (2024). The relationship between creative leadership of school administrators and the effectiveness of schools under Phichit Educational Service Area Office 2. *Educational Administration and Innovation Journal*, 4(1), 43-58.
- Vachanarat, P., & Sauphayana, S. (2023). Situational leadership of school administrators according to the perception of the teachers in demonstration schools affiliated with the autonomous university in Bangkok. *Interdisciplinary Academic and Research Journal*, 3(4), 97-110.
- Zohair, A., Shoorooq, M., Najwa, D., & Issahythem, B. M. (2021). High school principals' situational leadership and its relationship with teachers' achievement motivation. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 10(4), 1027-1041.

Author Details

Saowalak Nguanjay, Ramkhamhaeng University, Thailand, **Email ID:** 671447021@rmail.ru.ac.th

Patumphorn Piatanom, Ramkhamhaeng University, Thailand, **Email ID:** p.piatanom@gmail.com