

Role of Head Teacher Employing Laissez-Faire Method in Secondary Schools for Teacher Motivation, Pedagogy and Academic Performance

¹Asadullah

²Salma Shahzadi

³Prof. Dr. Hukum Dad

⁴Muhammad Sallah

¹PhD Scholar, Institute of Research and Education, Muslim Youth University, Islamabad, Pakistan

²PhD Scholar, Institute of Research and Education, Muslim Youth University, Islamabad, Pakistan

³Director Institute of Research and Education, Muslim Youth University, Islamabad, Pakistan

⁴MPhil (Education), Graduate

asadlakh0642@gmail.com, hinaf4543@gmail.com, muhammadsallah122@yahoo.com

Abstract

A research on “Role of head teacher employing laissez-faire method in secondary schools on teacher motivation, pedagogy and academic performance” was held at Secondary Schools. Objectives of the study were (i) to scrutinize the role of head teachers’ behavior for teachers’ motivation; (ii) to evaluate the role of head teachers’ behavior on teachers’ pedagogy; (iii) to test the role of head teachers’ behavior on teachers’ academic performance. A quantitative research approach and descriptive in nature of study was designed to achieve objectives. Data collection was done by using survey technique. Population comprised students, teachers and head teachers of the secondary schools. Sampling technique adopted was simple random sampling technique. Research tool was self developed questionnaire. Validity of the questionnaire was checked by educational experts. Questionnaire was reliable by testing the use of Cronbach Alpha. After the data collection, data was entered in software namely SPSS. Results were obtained using descriptive statistics. Data was analyzed, interpreted and results were summarized to reach at the findings and conclusion.

Keywords: Laissez-faire, Secondary School, Motivation, Pedagogy, Academic Performance

Article Details:

Received on 20 Jan 2025

Accepted on 15 Feb, 2025

Published on 26 Feb, 2025

Corresponding Authors*

1. Introduction

Leadership is about team functioning, setting agreed-upon and valuable guidelines for the firm and taking the needed steps to urge employees to go in the correct direction. Success is mostly recognized by that of the leadership method used in schools, these are dictatorial, democratic and others. Democratic leadership method created a good link with performance in the United States, but the other type identified was laissez-faire, which allows free participation of thoughts and ideas without meddling from the leader (Rahman, 2017).

Due to involvement of different elements in job satisfaction, leadership methods have either a good or bad influence on job satisfaction, which leads to an individual's attitude to the job experience. These criteria are important as they all have an effect upon the way an individual feels about the work. Salary, advancement, benefits, colleagues, environment, job security, performance, and the work itself are among these factors. Each component has a different effect on a person's job satisfaction (Rahman, 2017).

1.1. Objectives

- i. To scrutinize the role of head teachers' behavior for teachers' motivation
- ii. To evaluate the role of head teachers' behavior on teachers' pedagogy
- iii. To test the role of head teachers' behavior on teachers' academic performance

1.2. Research Questions

- i. What is the role of head teachers' behavior on teachers' motivation ?
- ii. What is the role of head teachers' behavior on teachers' pedagogy ?
- iii. What is the role of head teachers' behavior on teachers' academic performance?

2. Literature Review

When a head teacher acts like this, it seems like they don't care about anything else. Two Factor Theory of Herzberg backs up the current study, which says that job happiness and dissatisfaction are caused by different things, like personal cleanliness and what motivates people to do their jobs. We found differences between the things that make people happy and unhappy at work. Herzberg made this theory to show these results. He called satisfiers "motivators" and dissatisfies "hygiene factors" to show that hygiene factors are important to ignore unhappiness (Wellman & Lepine, 2017).

Academic performance refers to the level of achievement and success demonstrated by students in their academic pursuits. It is typically assessed through various measures, including grades, test scores, class rankings, and evaluations by teachers. Academic performance is an important aspect of a student's educational journey and can have implications for future opportunities, such as college admissions, scholarships, and career prospects. Here are some key factors that can influence academic performance (Skakni, 2018).

It is important to note that academic performance is not the sole determinant of a student's abilities, potential or worth. Students' overall growth, social-emotional development and well-rounded skills are also vital considerations in their educational journey. Educators, parents and students themselves should strive for a balanced approach that promotes both academic achievement and holistic development (Skakni, 2018).

• Study Skills and Strategies

Developing effective study skills and strategies is crucial for academic success. This includes skills such as time management, note-taking, organization, critical thinking, and problem-solving. Students who possess and utilize strong study skills are better equipped to understand and retain information, leading to improve academic performance.

- **Motivation and Engagement**

Motivation plays a significant role in academic performance. Students who are intrinsically motivated, have a genuine interest in learning, and set meaningful goals tend to be more engaged and dedicated to their studies. Motivated students are more likely to put in the effort required to excel academically.

- **Learning Environment**

The learning environment, both at school and at home, can impact academic performance. Supportive and conducive learning environments that provide resources, encourage active participation, foster collaboration, and offer opportunities for individualized instruction can positively influence student performance.

- **Quality of Instruction**

The quality of instruction delivered by teachers is a critical factor in academic performance. Skilled and knowledgeable teachers who use effective teaching methods, provide clear explanations, offer guidance and facilitate student-centered learning can enhance student understanding and achievement (Lee & Hannafin, 2016).

- **Parental Involvement and Support**

Parental involvement and support are influential factors in academic performance. When parents are engaged in their child's education, provide a supportive home environment, establish routines, monitor progress, communicate with teachers and therefore students are more likely to thrive academically.

- **Individual Differences**

Each student has unique strengths, weaknesses, learning styles and abilities that can impact their academic performance. Recognizing and accommodating these individual differences through differentiated instruction and personalized learning approaches can support student success (Wan & Teaching, 2016).

- **Health and Well-being**

Students' physical and mental health directly impact their academic performance. Maintaining a healthy lifestyle, getting sufficient sleep, managing stress and addressing any physical or mental health challenges contribute to improved focus, attention and cognitive functioning.

- **Peer Influence**

Peer relationships and interactions can have both positive and negative effects on academic performance. Positive peer relationships can foster collaboration, provide support and create a conducive learning environment. Conversely, negative peer influences, such as distractions or disengagement from academics, can hinder performance (Perry, Nicholls & Morley, 2016).

- **Assessment and Feedback**

Regular and constructive assessment and feedback are essential for academic growth. Assessments that align with learning objectives, provide clear expectations and offer opportunities for self-reflection and improvement can guide students' progress and enhance their academic performance.

- **Educational Resources and Opportunities**

Access to educational resources, such as textbooks, technology, libraries and extracurricular activities, can contribute to academic performance. Providing diverse learning opportunities and experiences broadens students' knowledge base, foster skills and stimulate their intellectual curiosity (Chankseliani, Qoraboyev & Gimranova, 2021).

3. Methodology

Keeping in view the topic of the research “Role of head teacher employing laissez-faire method in secondary schools on teacher motivation, pedagogy and academic performance” quantitative research approach was used and survey technique was utilized for data collection. Data was collected with a self developed questionnaire according to the objectives. Same was presented to the experts for validation. After validation its reliability was checked by the use of Cronbach Alpha. Population for this study was head teachers, teachers and students of secondary schools of a city Sui, located in Province of Balochistan. Sampling was carried out by the use of simple random sampling technique. Data was entered in software used for social sciences to obtain its statistical results i.e. Statistical Package for Social Sciences. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics i.e. percentage, frequency, mean and standard deviation.

4. Results and Findings

Table 4.1

Item-1 Head Teacher Makes School Plan For Betterment Of Students And Implement By Head Teacher

Ser. No.	Respondents	Statistics	Results						Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total		
1.	Head teacher	f	1	0	1	1	1	4	3.25	1.708
		%	25	0	25	25	25	100		
2.	SST	f	0	4	2	9	1	16	3.44	.964
		%	0	25	12.5	56.3	6.3	100		
3.	Students	f	26	21	15	43	15	120	3	1.384
		%	22	17	13	35	13	100		
Total		f	27	25	18	53	17	140	3.23	1.352
		%	16	14	17	38	15	100		

Table 4.1 states that 38% of participants were agreed with the statement, 15% were strongly agreed, 14% were disagreed and 16% were strongly disagreed, whereas 17% of participants were undecided with the statement. Collectively 53% (38%+15%) were agreed. Mean score 3.23 and standard deviation 1.352 supported the statement.

Table 4.2

Item-2 Head teacher organizes school events as per his instructions

Ser. No.	Respondents	Statistics	Results						Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total		
1.	Head teacher	f	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.25	.500
		%	0	0	0	75	25	100		
2.	SST	f	2	5	0	5	4	16	3.25	1.483
		%	13	31	0	31	25	100		
3.	Students	f	13	20	26	45	16	120	3.26	1.206
		%	11	17	22	38	13	100		
Total		f	15	25	26	53	21	140	3.58	3.189
		%	8	16	7	48	21	100		

Table 4.2 states that 48% of participants were agreed with the statement, 21% were strongly agreed, 16% were disagreed and 8% were strongly disagreed, whereas 7% of participants were undecided with the statement. Collectively 69% (48%+21%) were agreed. Mean score 3.58 and standard deviation 3.189 supported the statement.

Table 4.3

Item-3 Head Teacher Ensures Admission of Students On Merit Basis

Ser. No.	Respondents	Statistic	Results						Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total		
1.	Head teacher	f	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.50	.577
		%	0	0	0	50	50	100		
2.	SST	f	0	3	3	4	6	16	3.81	1.167
		%	0	19	19	25	38	100		
3.	Students	f	21	12	26	52	9	120	3.13	1.236
		%	18	10	22	42	8	100		
Total		f	21	15	29	58	17	140	3.81	2.98
		%	6	10	14	38	32	100		

Table 4.3 states that 38% of participants were agreed with the statement, 32% were strongly agreed, 10% were disagreed and 6% were strongly disagreed, whereas 14% of participants were undecided with the statement. Collectively 70% (38%+32%) were agreed. Mean score 3.81 and standard deviation 2.98 supported the statement.

Table 4.4

Item-4 Head Teacher Gives Directions To The Teachers About Their Responsibilities

Ser. No.	Respondents	Statistics	Results						Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total		
1.	Head teacher	f	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.75	.500
		%	0	0	0	25	75	100		
2.	SST	f	0	3	1	2	10	16	4.19	1.223
		%	0	19	6	12	62	100		
3.	Students	f	13	20	20	39	28	120	3.41	1.306
		%	11	17	17	32	23	100		
Total		f	13	23	21	42	41	140	4.11	3.029
		%	4	12	8	23	53	100		

Table 4.4 states that 23% of participants were agreed with the statement, 53% were strongly agreed, 12% were disagreed and 4% were strongly disagreed, whereas 8% of participants were undecided with the statement. Collectively 76% (23%+53%) were agreed. Mean score 4.11 and standard deviation 3.029 supported the statement.

Table 4.5
Item-5 *Head Teacher Coordinates Students Workshop And Work With Schools To Tackle*

Ser. No.	Respondents	Statistics	Results						Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total		
1.	Head teacher	<i>f</i>	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.25	.500
		<i>%</i>	0	0	0	75	25	100		
2.	SST	<i>f</i>	0	2	2	10	2	16	3.75	.856
		<i>%</i>	0	13	13	62	12	100		
3.	Students	<i>f</i>	18	19	19	49	15	120	3.20	1.281
		<i>%</i>	15	16	16	41	12	100		
Total		<i>f</i>	18	21	21	62	18	140	3.73	2.637
		<i>%</i>	5	10	10	59	16	100		

Table 4.5 states that 59% of participants were agreed with the statement, 16% were strongly agreed, 10% were disagreed and 5% were strongly disagreed, whereas 10% of participants were undecided with the statement. Collectively 75% (59%+16%) were agreed. Mean score 3.73 and standard deviation 2.637 supported the statement.

Table 4.6
Item-6 *Head Teacher Makes Innovative Decisions For School Development*

Ser. No.	Respondents	Statistics	Results						Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total		
1.	Head teacher	<i>f</i>	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.50	.577
		<i>%</i>	0	0	0	50	50	100		
2.	SST	<i>f</i>	0	2	1	7	6	16	4.06	.998
		<i>%</i>	0	13	6	44	37	100		
3.	Students	<i>f</i>	18	23	14	29	36	120	3.35	1.459
		<i>%</i>	15	19	12	24	30	100		
Total		<i>f</i>	18	25	15	38	44	140	3.97	3.034
		<i>%</i>	5	11	6	39	39	100		

Table 4.6 states that 39% of participants were agreed with the statement, 39% were strongly agreed, 11% were disagreed and 5% were strongly disagreed, whereas 6% of participants were undecided with the statement. Collectively 78% (39%+39%) were agreed. Mean score 3.97 and standard deviation 3.034 supported the statement.

Table 4.7
Item-7 *Head Teacher Keeps Control On Teaching Learning Activities*

Ser. No.	Respondents	Statistics	Results						Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total		
1.	Head teacher	<i>f</i>	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.25	.500

		%	0	0	0	75	25	100		
2.	SST	f	2	2	2	3	7	16		
		%	13	13	12	19	43	100	3.69	1.493
3.	Students	f	12	18	46	30	14	120		
		%	10	15	38	25	12	100	3.13	1.122
Total		f	14	20	48	36	22	140		
		%	8	9	17	40	26	100	3.69	3.115

Table 4.7 states that 40% of participants were agreed with the statement, 26% were strongly agreed, 9% were disagreed and 8% were strongly disagreed, whereas 17% of participants were undecided with the statement. Collectively 66% (40%+26%) were agreed. Mean score 3.69 and standard deviation 3.115 supported the statement.

Table 4.8

Item-8 Head Teacher Prepares School Budget According To Students Priorities

Ser. No.	Respondents	Statistics	Results						Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total		
1.	Head teacher	f	0	0	0	3	1	4		
		%	0	0	0	75	25	100	4.25	.500
2.	SST	f	2	4	1	4	5	16		
		%	13	25	6	25	31	100	3.37	1.500
3.	Students	f	24	16	40	27	13	120		
		%	20	13	33	23	11	100	2.91	1.264
Total		f	26	20	41	34	19	140		
		%	11	13	13	41	22	100	3.51	3.264

Table 4.8 states that 41% of participants were agreed with the statement, 22% were strongly agreed, 13% were disagreed and 11% were strongly disagreed, whereas 13% of participants were undecided with the statement. Collectively 63% (41%+22%) were agreed. Mean score 3.51 and standard deviation 3.264 supported the statement.

Table 4.9

Item-9 Head Teacher Makes Bold Decision For Betterment Of School

Ser. No.	Respondents	Statistics	Results						Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total		
1.	Head teacher	f	0	0	0	0	4	4		
		%	0	0	0	0	100	100	5.00	.000
2.	SST	f	2	1	0	5	8	16		
		%	13	6	0	31	50	100	4	1.414
3.	Students	f	14	20	19	49	18	120		
		%	12	17	16	41	15	100	3.31	1.249
Total		f	16	21	19	54	30	140		
		%	8	8	5	24	55	100	4.10	2.663

Table 4.9 states that 24% of participants were agreed with the statement, 55% were strongly agreed, 8% were disagreed and 8% were strongly disagreed, whereas 5% of participants were undecided with the statement. Collectively 79% (24%+55%) were agreed. Mean score 4.10 and standard deviation 2.663 supported the statement.

undecided with the statement. Collectively 79% (24%+55%) were agreed. Mean score 4.10 and standard deviation 2.663 supported the statement.

Table 4.10

Item 10- Head Teacher Conducts Meeting With Parents Frequently

Ser. No.	Respondents	Statistics	Results						Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total		
1.	Head teacher	f	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.50	.577
		%	0	0	0	50	50	100		
2.	SST	f	3	1	1	5	6	16	3.63	1.544
		%	19	6	6	31	38	100		
3.	Students	f	15	21	20	47	17	120	3.25	1.259
		%	13	18	17	39	14	100		
Total		f	18	22	21	54	25	140	3.76	3.38
		%	12	7	7	40	34	100		

Table 4.10 states that 40% of participants were agreed with the statement, 34% were strongly agreed, 7% were disagreed and 12% were strongly disagreed, whereas 7% of participants were undecided with the statement. Collectively 74% (40%+34%) were agreed. Mean score 3.76 and standard deviation 3.38 supported the statement.

Table 4.11

Item 11 Head Teacher Disseminates School Progress Through Social Media

Ser. No.	Respondents	Statistics	Results						Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total		
1.	Head teacher	f	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	.000
		%	0	0	0	100	0	100		
2.	SST	f	1	3	1	8	3	16	3.56	1.209
		%	6	19	6	50	19	100		
3.	Students	f	19	15	42	27	17	120	3.07	1.248
		%	16	13	35	22	14	100		
Total		f	20	18	43	39	20	140	3.54	2.457
		%	7	11	14	57	11	100		

Table 4.11 states that 57% of participants were agreed with the statement, 11% were strongly agreed, 11% were disagreed and 7% were strongly disagreed, whereas 14% of participants were undecided with the statement. Collectively 68% (57%+11%) were agreed. Mean score 3.54 and standard deviation 2.457 supported the statement.

Table 4.12

Item-12 Head Teacher Communicates Students Issues To The Higher Authorities

Ser. No.	Respondents	Statistics	Results						Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total		
1.	Head teacher	f	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.75	.500
		%	0	0	0	25	75	100		
2.	SST	f	0	1	1	6	8	16	4.31	.873
		%	0	6	6	38	50	100		
3.	Students	f	13	26	15	42	24	120	3.32	1.309
		%	11	22	12	35	20	100		
Total		f	13	27	16	49	35	140	4.12	2.682
		%	4	9	6	33	48	100		

Table 4.12 states that 33% of participants were agreed with the statement, 48% were strongly agreed, 9% were disagreed and 4% were strongly disagreed, whereas 6% of participants were undecided with the statement. Collectively 81% (33%+48%) were agreed. Mean score 4.12 and standard deviation 2.682 supported the statement.

Table 4.13

Item-13 Head Teacher Resolves Students Problems As An Efficient Leader

Ser. No.	Respondents	Statistics	Results						Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total		
1.	Head teacher	f	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.00	2.0
		%	25	0	0	0	75	100		
2.	SST	f	0	2	0	11	3	16	3.94	.854
		%	0	12	0	69	19	100		
3.	Students	f	19	20	17	43	21	120	3.22	1.350
		%	16	17	14	36	17	100		
Total		f	20	22	17	54	27	140	3.7	1.40
		%	13	10	5	35	37	100		

Table 4.13 states that 35% of participants were agreed with the statement, 37% were strongly agreed, 10% were disagreed and 13% were strongly disagreed, whereas 5% of participants were undecided with the statement. Collectively 72% (35%+37%) were agreed. Mean score 3.7 and standard deviation 1.40 supported the statement.

Table 4.14

Item-14 Head Teacher Motivates His Students To Work Hard

Ser. No.	Respondents	Statistics	Results						Mean	SD
			SDA	DA	UD	A	SA	Total		
1.	Head teacher	f	1	0	0	2	1	4	3.50	1.732
		%	25	0	0	50	25	100		

2.	SST	<i>f</i>	2	1	1	1	11	16	4.13	1.500
		%	13	6	6	6	69	100		
3.	Students	<i>f</i>	16	16	13	36	39	120	3.55	1.407
		%	13	13	11	30	33	100		
Total		<i>f</i>	19	17	14	39	51	140	3.72	1.54
		%	17	6	6	29	42	100		

Table 4.14 states that 29% of participants were agreed with the statement, 42% were strongly agreed, 6% were disagreed and 17% were strongly disagreed, whereas 6% of participants were undecided with the statement. Collectively 71% (29%+42%) were agreed. Mean score 3.72 and standard deviation 1.54 supported the statement.

Table 4.15: Overall Results Of Laissez-Fair Method by Head Teacher

Ser. No.	Statistics	Results					Total	Mean	SD
		SDA	DA	UD	A	SA			
1.	<i>f</i>	27	25	18	53	17	140	3.23	4.056
	%	16	14	17	38	15	100		
2.	<i>f</i>	15	25	26	53	21	140	3.58	3.189
	%	8	16	7	48	21	100		
3.	<i>f</i>	21	15	29	58	17	140	3.81	2.98
	%	6	10	14	38	32	100		
4.	<i>f</i>	13	23	21	42	41	140	4.11	3.029
	%	4	12	8	23	53	100		
5.	<i>f</i>	18	21	21	62	18	140	3.73	2.637
	%	5	10	10	59	16	100		
6.	<i>f</i>	18	25	15	38	44	140	3.97	3.034
	%	5	11	6	39	39	100		
7.	<i>f</i>	14	20	48	36	22	140	3.69	3.115
	%	8	9	17	40	26	100		
8.	<i>f</i>	26	20	41	34	19	140	3.51	3.264
	%	11	13	13	41	22	100		
9.	<i>f</i>	16	21	19	54	30	140	4.10	2.663
	%	8	8	5	24	55	100		
10.	<i>f</i>	18	22	21	54	25	140	3.79	3.38
	%	12	7	7	40	34	100		
11.	<i>f</i>	20	18	43	39	20	140	3.54	2.457
	%	7	11	14	57	11	100		
12.	<i>f</i>	13	27	16	49	35	140	4.12	2.682
	%	4	9	6	33	48	100		
13.	<i>f</i>	20	22	17	54	27	140	3.72	4.204
	%	13	10	5	35	37	100		
14.	<i>f</i>	19	17	14	39	51	140	3.72	4.639
	%	17	6	6	29	42	100		
Total	<i>f</i>	258	301	349	665	387	1960	3.75	4.639
	%	9	10	10	39	32	100		

5. Conclusion

It was concluded that most of the head teachers make school plan for betterment of students, ensure admission of students on merit basis, give direction to the teacher about their responsibilities, coordinate students workshop and work with schools to tackle, make

innovative decisions for school development, keep control on teaching learning activities, prepare school budget according to students priorities, conduct meeting with the parents frequently, disseminate schools progress through social media, communicate students issues to the higher authorities, resolve students problems as an efficient leader and motivate students to work hard.

References

- Amna, N., & Syahputra, Y, J, J. (2022). Conditions of work motivation and teacher performance at madrasah tsanawiyah in north sumatra. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran*, 29(2), 56-61.
<https://journals.um.ac.id/index.php/jpp/article/download/226/161>
- Brown, D, A. (2015). Identities and identity work in organizations. *Online Journal*, 17(1), 20-40.
https://researchportal.bath.ac.uk/files/108027238/Identities_and_Identity_Work_in_Organizations_Version_Accepted_for_Publication_IJMR_2014.docx
- Chankseliani, M., Qoraboyev, I., & Gimranova, D. (2021). Higher education contributing to local, national, and global development: New empirical and conceptual insights. *Highr Educaiton*, 81, 109-127. Springer.
<https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s10734-020-00565-8.pdf>
- Chansaengsee, S. (2017). Time management for work-life and study-life balance. *International (Humanities, Social Sciences and Arts)*. 10(5), 20-34.
<https://heo2.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/veridian-e-journal/article/download/99065/77037>
- Ciulla, B, J. (2020). *Leadership and the problem of bogus empowerment*. Chapter 17, p.331-352, Springer.
https://wagner.nyu.edu/files/leadership/img/CIULLA_Leadership_and_the_Problem_of_Bogus_Empowerment.pdf
- Downe, J., Cowell, R., & Morgan, K, J. (2016). What determines ethical behavior in public organizations: Is it rules or leadership? *Public Administration Review*, 76(6), 898-909.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/puar.12562?src=getfr>
- Foulger, S, T., Wetzal, K., & Buss, R, R. (2019). Moving toward a technology infusion approach: Considerations for teacher preparation programs. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, 35(2), 79-91.
Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2019.1568325>
- Green, L, T., (2017). Community-based equity audits: A practical approach for educational leaders to support equitable community-school improvements. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 53(1), 3-39. Sagepub.Com
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0013161X16672513>
- Hirschy, S, A., Wilson, E, M., Liddell, L, D., Boyle, M, K., & Pasquesi, K. (2015). Socialization to student affairs: Early career experiences associated with professional identity development. *Higher Education and Student Affairs Faculty Publications*. 56(8), 777-793. No-24. Bowling Green State University.
https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1022&context=hied_pub
- Johnson, L., Becker, A, S., Cummins, M., Estrada, V., Freeman, A., & Hall, C. (2016). *NMC horizon report: 2016 higher education edition*: The New Media Consortium.
<https://www.learntechlib.org/d/171478/>
- Kim, J. (2020). Learning and teaching online during Covid-19: Experiences of student teachers in an early childhood education practicum. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 52(2), 145-158.

- <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13158-020-00272-6?fbclid=IwAR3x-u9vdpJctNnoVQ>
- Lin, L., & Shek, T, L, D. (2019). Does service leadership education contribute to student well-being? A quasi-experimental study based on Hong Kong university students. *Applied Research Quality Life*, 14, 1147-1163.
<https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s11482-018-9644-x.pdf>
- Lee, E., & Hannafin, J, M. (2016). A design framework for enhancing engagement in student-centered learning: Own it, learn it, and share it. *Educational technology research and development*, 64, 707-734.
https://iled.snu.ac.kr/wp-content/uploads/kboard_attached/14/201701/201701190524461221111.pdf
- Mehta, S., Saxena, T., & Purohit, N. (2020). The new consumer behaviour paradigm amid COVID-19: Permanent or transient? , *Journal of Health Management*, 22(2), 291-301.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0972063420940834>
- Miller, M, L., Dufrene, A, B., Sterling, E, H., Olmi, J, D., & Bachmayer, E. (2015). The effects of check-in/check-out on problem behavior and academic engagement in elementary school students. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 17(1), 28-38.
- Newman, A, S, & Ford, C, R. (2021). Five Steps to Leading Your Team in the Virtual COVID-19 Workplace. *Organizational Dynamic*, 50, 1-11.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9753911/pdf/main.pdf>
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1098300713517141>
- Perry, J., Nicholls, R, A., & Morley, D. (2016). The model of motivational dynamics in sport: resistance to peer influence, behavioral engagement and disaffection, dispositional coping, and resilience. *Behavioral Engagement and Disaffection, Dispositional Coping, and Resilience. Front. Psychol.* 6.
<https://dSPACE.mic.ul.ie/items/78dc8372-9233-47e9-a512-94c280df7aaf>
doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2015.02010
- Melina, P., & Michael, B. (2015). A curriculum for action in the community and intercultural citizenship in higher education - Culture & Curriculum. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 28(3), 226-242.
https://www.memoria.fahce.unlp.edu.ar/art_revistas/pr.12985/pr.12985.pdf
- Rahman, U, K., Akhter, W., Khan, U, S., (2017). Factors affecting employee job satisfaction: A comparative study of conventional and Islamic insurance. *Cogent Business & Management* , 4(1).
DOI:10.1080/23311975.2016.1273082
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/23311975.2016.1273082>
- Shahr, S, A, H., Yazdani, S., Afshar, L. (2019). Professional socialization: An analytical definition. *J Med Ethics Hist Med*, 12(17), 1-14.
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7166248/pdf/JMEHM-12-17.pdf>
- Skakni, I. (2018). Doctoral studies as an initiatory trial: Expected and taken-for-granted practices that impede PhD students' progress. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23(8), 927-944.
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Isabelle-Skakni/publication/341408348_Doctoral_studies_as_an_initiatory_trial_expected_and_taken-for-granted_practices_that_impede_PhD_students'_progress/links/5ebeb698299bfico9abd

- 2020/Doctoral-studies-as-an-initiatory-trial-expected-and-taken-for-granted-practices-that-impede-PhD-students-progress.pdf
- Shamir, B., & Eilam, G. (2005). What's your story? A life-stories approach to authentic leadership development. In *Leadership now. The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 395-417.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1048984305000299>
- Ullah, I., Kiran, A., & Liu, B. (2019). Impacts of leadership styles on motivations of employees. *IGI Global. Chapter 10*, 205-217.
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Saqib-Malik-5/publication/344616975_Measuring_Moderating_Effect_of_Power_Distance/links/682781b6be1b507dce8ba07b/Measuring-Moderating-Effect-of-Power-Distance.pdf#page=223
- Wan, W, S. (2016). Differentiated instruction: Hong Kong prospective teachers' teaching efficacy and beliefs. *Teachers and Teaching*, 22(2), 148-176.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13540602.2015.1055435>
- Wickert, C., Scherer, G, A., & Spence, L. (2016). Walking and talking corporate social responsibility: Implications of firm size and organizational cost. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(7), 1169-1196.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12209>
https://research.vu.nl/files/120398900/JMS_2016_Wickert_Scherer_Spence.pdf
- Wellman, M, E, & LePine, J. (2017). *Laissez-Faire leadership and informal leadership behavior*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Proceedings.
<https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/ambpp.2017.11499abstract>