# Teacher Leadership and Student Outcomes in a US University Intensive English Program

**Rachel DeDeyn**
English Language Center, University of Denver, USA
<rachel.dedeyn@du.edu>

## Abstract

*This study applies the Full Range of Leadership Model (Bass & Avolio, 1994), which includes the popular concepts of transformational, transactional, and non-leadership, in a university intensive English program (IEP) with the goal of better understanding effective teacher leadership practices in a TESL context. Fifty-nine pre-collegiate IEP students completed an adapted form of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5x-Short (Avolio & Bass, 1995). Correlation and regression analyses were used to explore the associations between teacher leadership style, student course satisfaction, and student grades. Across analyses, transformational leadership had the strongest positive relationships with student course satisfaction. More specifically, course satisfaction was most strongly associated with the inspirational motivation factor of transformational leadership and the contingent reward factor of transactional leadership. The inspirational motivation leadership factor was also a significant predictor of student course grades. These findings indicate that teachers should be enthusiastic, establish a vision for their class, challenge students, and use rewards strategically.*

## The Importance of Teacher Leadership

> *What makes a teacher a leader? Simply stated, it is an ethos of care and the skills one needs to be an inspiration. It is the qualities found in teachers who recognize their innate power to make a difference in their students' lives, to be caring and compassionate, and to be the role model who "walks the talk," who believes all students have exceptional gifts, and who takes the time to help students find and give voice to themselves (Papalewis, 2007, p. xi).*

Teacher leadership became a popular topic in the field of education in the 1980's (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). However, this topic has remained largely unexplored in the field of TESOL (Greenier & Whitehead, 2019; Shah, 2017). The TESOL field is beginning to recognize leadership as an important skill for professionals, as evidenced by the TESOL organization's

Leadership Management Certificate Program and the books available on leadership in TESOL. However, these programs and publications tend to focus on leadership theories and their applications in administration (Baecher, 2012; Christison & Murray, 2009; Greenier & Whitehead, 2016; Greenier & Whitehead, 2019; Shah, 2017; TESOL, 2018; White, 2008). Greenier and Whitehead (2019) theorize this is due to the assumption that good leadership is naturally a part of good teaching.

While these concepts do overlap, good teaching does not necessarily ensure good leadership. Teacher leadership moves beyond the skills necessary for good teaching, like organization, preparation, knowledge, teaching strategies, and even interpersonal communication skills, to include the ability to motivate and empower students. Slavich and Zimbardo (2012, p. 576) define transformational teaching, which was developed based on the principles of transformational leadership as, "the expressed or unexpressed goal to increase students' mastery of key course concepts while transforming their learning-related attitudes, values, beliefs, and skills." Thus, in addition to helping students accomplish the goals of a course, as all good teaching does, teacher leadership can fundamentally change students' approach to education, increasing autonomy, self-efficacy, and interest in learning (Slavich & Zimbardo, 2012). The impacts teacher leadership can have on students' educational values, beliefs, and skills can also translate into positive student outcomes, like course satisfaction and grades (Bogler et al., 2013).

It would benefit the field of TESOL to view teachers as leaders to increase the recognition and attention given to the social and relational side of teaching. English language teachers pass knowledge on to students, developing lessons on grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and language learning strategies. However, successful instructors also need to have the ability to motivate students and create a positive learning environment (Bogler et al., 2013; Cheong Cheng, 1994; Greenier & Whitehead, 2019). Most TESOL teacher training programs focus on the knowledge transference portion of teaching, preparing future English language teachers with knowledge of linguistics, second language acquisition theories, research methods, and language learning strategies (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Greenier & Whitehead, 2019). Although teacher training programs do not typically cover the social and relational skills that are a part of good teacher leadership, these skills are also important (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Greenier & Whitehead, 2019). Because research on teacher leadership in the English language classroom is limited, studies applying leadership theories to English classroom practices are necessary to understand which leadership practices are effective in this context.

This study examines teacher leadership in a US university intensive English program (IEP) using the Full Range of Leadership Model (FRLM), which includes the popular constructs of transformational and transactional leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994). This study examines effective leadership in a TESOL setting by exploring the relationships between student perceptions of teacher leadership, student course satisfaction, and student grades through correlation and regression analyses. The findings suggest that teachers should engage with students enthusiastically, in ways that inspire optimism and hope; establish a transformational vision for their class; challenge students through differentiated instruction that provides choice; and use rewards strategically to promote extrinsic motivation.

# Literature Review

## The Full Range of Leadership Model

Bass and Avolio developed the FRLM, which has been one of the most popular and well-documented leadership theories developed in the past 50 years, through their work in organizational psychology (Anderson, 2017; Jackson et al., 2013; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe et al., 1996; Northouse, 2010; Wang et al., 2011). This theory views all leadership as existing on a continuum between effective and ineffective leadership, which includes three distinct leadership styles: transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and non-leadership. Each of these leadership styles is composed of several leadership factors, which define the specific characteristics that comprise each of the leadership styles.

| Effective Leadership ↑↓ Ineffective Leadership | Transformational Leadership | Idealized Influence – Attributed |
| | | Idealized Influence – Behavior |
| | | Inspirational Motivation |
| | | Intellectual Stimulation |
| | | Individual Consideration |
| | Transactional Leadership | Contingent Reward |
| | | Management by Exception – Active |
| | Non-Leadership | Management by Exception – Passive |
| | | Laissez-Faire |

**Figure 1. Full Range of Leadership Model**

The FRLM describes all leaders as displaying each of the nine components of transformational, transactional, and non-leadership to some degree (Bass, 1998). However, knowledge of which types of leadership can be most helpful informs leaders of the behaviors or types of leadership to use with their teams. Effective leaders frequently display the transformational and transactional leadership factors and rarely display the non-leadership factors, while the opposite is true for ineffective leaders (Bass, 1998; Bass & Avolio, 1994) (see Figure 1). A large body of research has validated this leadership model and its factor structure through the study of organizations and has provided evidence that transformational and transactional leadership styles are associated with increased performance of employees, teams, and organizations while non-leadership is not (Jackson et al., 2013; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe et al., 1996; Wang et al., 2011).

Because of the extensive empirical evidence that supports the effectiveness of transformational and transactional leadership for achieving a variety of organizational outcomes (Jackson et al., 2013; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe et al., 1996; Wang et al., 2011), researchers have applied the FRLM in many contexts, including education, to determine if the positive associations between transformational and transactional leadership and organizational effectiveness are evident in other contexts (Bogler et al., 2013; Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009; Greenier & Whitehead, 2016; Greenier & Whitehead, 2019; Harvey et al., 2003). This study focuses on the FRLM in English language teaching, so it is necessary to understand each of the leadership factors included in the model in this context.

Transformational leaders inspire and empower followers to accomplish lofty goals and to develop into leaders themselves (Bass & Riggio, 2006). There are five factors of transformational leadership. Attributed idealized influence is a follower's belief in a leader's abilities and characteristics (Bass, 1990; Bass, 1998; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Behavioral idealized influence is a leader's use of behaviors demonstrating high ethical and moral standards to provide direction to followers (Bass, 1990; Bass, 1998; Bass & Riggio, 2006). The two idealized influence factors are often referred to as charisma. Charismatic teachers have good rapport with their students and treat them respectfully and fairly (Noland & Richards, 2014). Inspirational motivation is the ability of a leader to hold followers to high expectations (Bass, 1990; Bass, 1998; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Inspirational motivation is visible in teachers who are skilled at building buy-in in their students, whose students are excited about projects and class activities. Leaders use intellectual stimulation when encouraging followers to be innovative and creative in problem solving (Bass, 1990; Bass, 1998; Bass & Riggio, 2006). For example, an English teacher using a content-based approach might choose to focus on a controversial topic in society, introducing students to different viewpoints on this issue, and asking students to think about the topic in a new way. Individual consideration occurs when a leader recognizes the individual differences in followers, giving them the support and coaching they need to be successful (Bass, 1990; Bass, 1998; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Teachers who use individual consideration get to know their students' individual strengths, weaknesses, interests, and goals, and serve as mentors and advocates for their students (Noland & Richards, 2014).

Transactional leadership, as its name implies, conceptualizes leadership as a transaction (Bass, 1998). Bass (1998; 2008) referred to it as the carrot-and-stick approach to leading. Transactional leaders reward desired behaviors and correct errors (Bass, 1998; Bass, 2008; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Two distinct factors compose the transactional leadership style. Contingent reward involves a leader assigning a task to a follower and promising rewards to the follower for a job well done (Bass, 1990; Bass & Riggio, 2006). In the English language classroom, this might be giving praise, positive feedback, or prizes, or could be having a class celebration after students perform well on an assessment. Leaders use active management-by-exception when monitoring followers' performance and correcting followers before problems occur (Bass, 1990; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Language teachers use active management-by-exception in their error correction.

Non-leadership is a hands-off approach to leading that occurs when a leader does not take action in a timely manner. There are two factors of non-leadership. Passive management-by-exception occurs when a leader waits for followers to underperform or make errors before taking corrective action (Bass, 1998; Bass & Riggio, 2006). For example, an English teacher who does not provide extra instruction and practice with a particular grammar point that students are struggling with until students underperform on a test demonstrates passive management-by-exception. Laissez-faire is an absence of leadership and is demonstrated when a leader fails to take action by putting off decision-making (Bass, 1998; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Teachers who are laissez-faire leaders fail to correct students or do not engage in classroom management.

**The Full Range of Leadership Model and Educational Outcomes**

Much like the studies in organizational leadership that have demonstrated that employee perceptions of leader use of transformational and transactional leadership increase a number of positive outcomes, like employee commitment to an organization, employee satisfaction with their boss, team effectiveness, and individual employee performance, the application of the FRLM in higher education has provided evidence that transformational leadership is an effective leadership style for teachers (Jackson et al., 2013; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Lowe et al., 1996; Wang et al., 2011). Due to its roots in organizational psychology, much of the research conducted using the FRLM focuses heavily on concrete measures of performance and effectiveness. Studies that have applied the FRLM in educational contexts are no exception, finding relationships between student perceptions of their professor's use of transformational and transaction leadership and student outcomes like course satisfaction, participation, learning, motivation, and positive perceptions of the professor.

Bogler et al. (2013) found that student perceptions of professor use of transformational leadership and non-leadership were predictive of student course satisfaction, with transformational leadership having a positive relationship with satisfaction and non-leadership having a negative relationship with this variable in an online course. The researchers found moderate positive corrections between participant perceptions of professor use of all of the transformational leadership factors and student satisfaction. Additionally, there was a strong moderate positive correction between participant perceptions of professor use of the contingent reward factor of transactional leadership and student satisfaction, which was the strongest correlation between any of the leadership factors and student satisfaction. This study also found weak, but statistically significant negative correlations between students' grades and their perceptions of professor use of non-leadership (Bogler et al., 2013).

In a previous study, Bolkan and Goodboy (2009) found moderate to strong positive correlations between participant perceptions of professor use of the factors of transformational leadership and perceptions of professor credibility, student class participation, student learning, and student motivation in in-person classes. The strongest correlations existed between these student outcomes and student perceptions of professor use of the idealized influence and inspirational motivation factors of transformational leadership (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009).

Likewise, Harvey et al. (2003) found significant positive correlations between student perceptions of teacher use of the idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation factors of transformational leadership and participant ratings of professor performance and participant involvement in a class. Additionally, regression analysis showed that student perceptions of teacher use of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation accounted for 66.3% of the variance in participant ratings of professor performance, and individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation accounted for 51.5% of variance in participant ratings of their class involvement (Harvey et al., 2003).

It is important to note that the studies conducted by Bolkan and Goodboy (2009) and Harvey et al. (2003) examined only the relationships between student outcomes of interest and the

transformational leadership factors. These studies did not survey participants on their perceptions of professor use of the transactional or non-leadership factors, and thus, do not provide insight into the relationships that exist between student outcomes and these types of leadership.

## Teacher Leadership in TESOL

While teacher leadership and the FRLM have received some attention in higher education, leadership theories have gone largely unexplored in classroom teaching in TESOL contexts (Greenier & Whitehead, 2016; Shah, 2017). Although transformational leadership has appeared in several studies conducted in IEPs, these studies have focused on the application of transformational leadership by program administrators (Bi et al., 2012; Christison & Murray, 2009; McGee et al., 2015).

Shah (2017) reviewed research relevant to teacher leadership in TESOL and found that much of the available literature is not specific to the TESOL context, and instead, the article borrows largely from the field of education. Based on his review of literature, Shah (2017, p. 252) concludes, "As the paper signifies the role of teacher leadership in the US and the UK contexts, it indicates a void in the literature on this issue in the field of TESOL that also directs researchers' endeavours towards investigating this concept in the context of English language teaching."

While studies on teacher classroom leadership in the field of TESOL are limited, two qualitative studies conducted by Greenier and Whitehead (2016; 2019) offer interesting insights into teachers' self-perceived leadership and South Korean students' views of teachers as leaders. These researchers found that the teachers they interviewed have a solid knowledge base of what teachers do, but not of who they are as teachers (Greenier & Whitehead, 2016). Greenier and Whitehead (2016, p. 88) state, "While possessing a knowledge-base and teaching strategies are certainly beneficial, they do not direct teachers to the more humanizing aspects of leadership that will help them excite, inspire, and build relationships."

In a later study, Greenier and Whitehead (2019) interviewed university students in South Korea, transcribed and coded their responses, and identified themes in what these students viewed as good teacher leadership. The researchers identified the following qualities to characterize good teacher leadership, according to the students interviewed: passion, or charisma, enthusiasm, confidence, engagement in the teaching profession, and development of themselves and their students; rapport, or the building of positive relationships and an active class community through respect, kindness, and empathy; purpose, or a teacher's commitment to teaching and a desire for professionalism and excellence in their work; and balance and flexibility, or the ability to find a balance between challenge and fun, while also making classes interesting (Greenier & Whitehead, 2019). These characteristics all relate to what Greenier and Whitehead (2016, p. 88) term the "humanizing aspects of leadership" and do not focus on teaching strategies.

Although Greenier and Whitehead's (2019) work did not use the FRLM, there are similarities between many of the characteristics students identified as good teacher leadership and

transformational leadership. Specifically, passion includes the qualities of charisma and enthusiasm found in the FRLM's idealized influence and inspirational motivation factors of transformational leadership (Bass, 1990; Bass, 1998; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Greenier & Whitehead, 2019). Rapport contains qualities like respect, kindness, and empathy, which relate to the high ethical and moral standards that idealized influence leadership requires, and includes positive relationship building, much like the individual consideration factor of transformational leadership (Bass, 1990; Bass, 1998; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Greenier & Whitehead, 2019). Finally, the balance and flexibility described in Greenier and Whitehead's (2019) study as a teacher's ability to provide novelty, challenge, and enjoyment mirrors the inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation leadership factors of transformational leadership, which involve the qualities of presenting new ways of thinking, challenging followers to meet high expectations, and enthusiasm (Bass, 1990; Bass, 1998; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Greenier and Whitehead's research indicates that, like in other educational settings, transformational leadership may improve students' experiences in their English language classes.

More research is necessary to build a strong understanding of what teacher classroom leadership is in the field of TESOL. Because effective leadership differs across cultures (Greenier & Whitehead, 2019; Ma & Tsui, 2015), there may be no one definitive description of effective teacher classroom leadership in the field of TESOL due to the diversity of students in those classrooms. However, as Greenier and Whitehead's (2016; 2019) studies point out, resources that help teachers develop the skills to "excite, inspire, and build relationships" are needed (2019, p. 88).

## Research Questions

This study applies the FRLM to a US university IEP. Student perceptions of teacher use of transformational, transactional, and non-leadership in IEP classes are used to explore effective teacher leadership and to answer the following research questions:

Research Question 1: Which leadership styles and factors have the strongest relationships with student course satisfaction?

Research Question 2: Which leadership styles and factors have the strongest relationships with student course grade?

Research Question 3: Which leadership styles and factors significantly predict student course satisfaction?

Research Question 4: Which leadership styles and factors significantly predict student course grade?

## Methods

This study used a survey to collect data on participants' perceptions of teacher use of transformational, transactional, and non-leadership, the nine factors that compose these leadership styles, and the student outcomes of interest, grades and course satisfaction.

## Sample

This study's sample included English language learners enrolled in an IEP at a private university in the United States. Participants invited to participate in the study were enrolled in one of six sections of Integrated Skills classes offered when the study took place, including two sections at level three (CEFR level B1), two at level four (CEFR level B1+/B2-), and two at level five (CEFR level B2) of a five-level program. Different teachers taught each of these sections. None of these teachers had prior leadership training. Sampling for the study did not include students enrolled in Integrated Skills classes at the lower levels of the program because these students did not have the English language proficiency necessary to comprehend the survey items. The researcher visited the six sections of the level three, four, and five Integrated Skills classes at the end of class time during the final week of a nine-week term to recruit participants for the study. Students who volunteered to participate in the study stayed after class time to complete a paper copy of the survey. Of the 77 students enrolled in these classes when the study took place, 59 voluntarily participated in the study. Prior to participating in the study, all participants were required to read a consent form and agreed to participate in the study by completing the adapted form of the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire 5x-Short (MLQ). Surveys were anonymous and student names were not collected.

All participants in this study were born outside of the United States. Their countries of origin were self-identified and included China ($n=39$), Saudi Arabia ($n=10$), Kuwait ($n=2$), the United Arab Emirates ($n=2$), Colombia ($n=1$), Ecuador ($n=1$), Japan ($n=1$), Peru ($n=1$), South Korea ($n=1$), and Vietnam ($n=1$). At the time of the study, the length of time participants had lived in the United States ranged from less than three months to more than two years. Forty participants identified as male and 19 as female. Participants ranged in age from 18 to over 35 years old.

## Survey

This study used an adapted form of Bass and Avolio's (1995) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5x-Short (MLQ) to examine participant perceptions of teacher leadership style, satisfaction with the Integrated Skills class, and grade in that course. The MLQ is the most widely used instrument to measure perceptions of transformational, transactional, and non-leadership styles (Northouse, 2010). Numerous studies have validated the MLQ (Avolio et al., 1999; Den Hartog et al., 1997; Rowold & Heinitz, 2007; Tepper & Percy, 1994). The MLQ includes 36 statements that describe leadership behaviors related to the nine leadership factors that compose the FRLM. Participants rate the frequency with which a leader exhibits the behavior described by each of the 36 items using a five-point Likert-type scale, where $0 =$ never, $1 =$ rarely, $2 =$ sometimes, $3 =$ often, and $4 =$ frequently or always.

The MLQ was adapted to the context of this study by specifying that the leader participants should rate on the MLQ's 36 statements was their Integrated Skills teacher. The survey asked participants about their perceptions of their Integrated Skills teacher because this was their longest class. Additionally, because English language learners were the participants in this study, the vocabulary and sentence structure of questionnaire items were simplified to aid participants' ease of comprehension.

The student outcomes of interest selected for this study were course satisfaction and grades. This study selected these outcomes in light of the decreasing student enrollment seen at many IEPs in the USA at the time of the study. In 2018, student enrollment in IEPs at universities in the USA was down 20% from 2017 and had declined almost 40% from 2016 (Redden, 2018). Due to declining student numbers, it was increasingly important for programs to find ways to improve the student experience and to provide evidence that courses improve English proficiency in order to retain and attract students. With these goals in mind, course satisfaction and grades were selected as measurable student outcomes through which the effectiveness of teacher leadership could be examined.

The adapted version of the MLQ included two additional items to assess the student outcomes of interest. One of these items asked participants to rate their satisfaction with their Integrated Skills class using a Likert-type scale ranging from zero to four, where 0 = very unsatisfied/I hate this class, 1 = unsatisfied/I don't like this class, 2 = somewhat satisfied/This class is ok, 3 = satisfied/I like this class, 4 = very satisfied/I love this class. The other added item asked participants to self-report their grade percentage in their Integrated Skills class during the final week of the course. If participants were unsure, they had the opportunity to look up their grade on the online learning management system. The self-reporting of grades allowed for participant anonymity. The teacher whose leadership style students rated on the MLQ determined student grades through a combination of formative and summative assessments created to measure student achievement of the student learning outcomes for the course.

## Reliability and Validity

Evaluation of the reliability of the adapted MLQ used Cronbach's alphas. Cronbach's alphas for the three leadership factors were all greater than 0.70, indicating that the items measuring each of the three leadership styles were related to one another and reliably measured a single construct (see Table 1).

**Table 1. Leadership Styles and Reliability Statistics.**

| | |
|---|---|
| Transformational Leadership 20 items | $\alpha=0.926$ |
| Transactional Leadership 8 items | $\alpha=0.717$ |
| Non-Leadership 8 items | $\alpha=0.725$ |

Cronbach's alphas were additionally calculated for each of the nine leadership factors. Cronbach's alpha was greater than 0.70 for the idealized influence (attributed) (a=0.776), inspirational motivation (a=0.767), and intellectual stimulation (a=0.708) factors of transformational leadership (see Table 2). For several factors, eliminating one of the items that measured that factor from the MLQ raised Cronbach's alpha to greater than the 0.70 criterion. Items three (*Only helps when problems become serious.*), six (*Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs.*), and 33 (*Waits for a long time to answer to important questions.*) were eliminated, raising the Cronbach's alpha values of management by exception (passive)

(a=0.715), idealized influence (behavior) (a=0.762), and laissez-faire (a=0.700), respectively (see Table 2). Subsequent analyses excluded these items since they detracted from the reliability of the measure of these leadership factors.

After removing MLQ items that detracted from the reliability of the measurement of the nine factors of leadership, six of the nine leadership factors had Cronbach's alpha values above 0.70. The low Cronbach's alpha values for individualized consideration, contingent reward, and management by exception (active) indicate that the items measuring each of these constructs do not sufficiently relate to one another. The four items designed to measure each of these factors may not measure a single factor for the population sampled for this study, and the reliability of these factors is weak.

**Table 2. Leadership Factors and Reliability Statistics.**

| Leadership Style | Leadership Factor | Original α | | Revised α |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transformational Leadership | Idealized Influence (attributed) 4 items | α=0.776 | | |
| | Idealized Influence (behavior) 4 items | α=0.611 | Idealized Influence (behavior) 3 items | α=0.762 |
| | Inspirational Motivation 4 items | α=0.767 | | |
| | Intellectual Stimulation 4 items | α=0.708 | | |
| | Individualized Consideration 4 items | α=0.597 | | |
| Transactional Leadership | Contingent Reward 4 items | α=0.666 | | |
| | Management by Exception (active) 4 items | α=0.633 | | |
| Non-Leadership | Management by Exception (passive) 4 items | α=0.695 | Management by Exception (passive) 3 items | α=0.715 |
| | Laissez-Faire 4 items | α=0.608 | Laissez-Faire 3 items | α=0.700 |

**Data Analysis**

Calculation of the strength and direction of relationships between participant perceptions of teacher leadership and the student outcomes of interest used Pearson correlation coefficients. Calculation of the predictive relationships between participant perceptions of teacher leadership and the student outcomes of interest used multiple linear regression analyses. Four multiple linear regressions were conducted. These analyses allowed for the identification of the leadership styles and factors most strongly associated with participants' course satisfaction and

grades, providing information on which types of teacher leadership can produce the most significant impacts on student outcomes at a US university IEP.

## Results

Correlations were calculated to determine the magnitude and direction of the relationships between teacher leadership and the student outcomes of interest. There was a significant moderate-to-strong positive correlation between participants' perceptions of teacher use of transformational leadership and satisfaction with the class, $r(56) = 0.647$, $p < 0.05$; a significant moderate correlation between participants' perceptions of teacher use of transactional leadership and satisfaction with the class, $r(56) = 0.548$, $p < 0.05$; and a significant, but weak negative correlation between participants' perceptions of teacher use of non-leadership and satisfaction with the class, $r(56) = -0.364$, $p < 0.05$ (see Table 3).

**Table 3. Correlations between Leadership Styles, Course Satisfaction, and Grade.**

| | | Satisfaction | Grade | Transform. Leadership | Transactional Leadership | Non-Leadership |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Satisfaction** | Pearson r | 1.0 | | | | |
| | Sig. | | | | | |
| | N | 58 | | | | |
| **Grade** | Pearson r | 0.227 | 1.0 | | | |
| | Sig. | 0.102 | | | | |
| | N | 53 | 53 | | | |
| **Transformational Leadership** | Pearson r | 0.647** | 0.084 | 1.0 | | |
| | Sig. | 0.000 | .549 | | | |
| | N | 58 | 53 | 59 | | |
| **Transactional Leadership** | Pearson r | 0.548** | -0.048 | 0.735** | 1.0 | |
| | Sig. | 0.000 | 0.735 | 0.000 | | |
| | N | 58 | 53 | 59 | 59 | |
| **Non-Leadership** | Pearson r | -0.364** | -0.058 | -0.265 | -0.160 | 1.0 |
| | Sig. | .005 | 0.682 | 0.043* | 0.227 | |
| | N | 58 | 53 | 59 | 59 | 59 |

**Sig. at the .01 level, *Sig. at the .05 level

Additionally, participant perceptions of teacher use of all five factors of transformational leadership significantly and positively correlated with participant satisfaction with their Integrated Skills class (see Table 4). There were also significant positive correlations between participant perceptions of teacher use of the transactional leadership factors and participant satisfaction with their Integrated Skills class, and a significant negative correlation between participant perceptions of teacher use of the laissez-faire factor of non-leadership and participant satisfaction with their Integrated Skills class (see Table 4).

While many of the correlations between the leadership factors and participant course satisfaction were statistically significant, only two were strong. Strong correlations existed between participant course satisfaction and participant perceptions of teacher use of the inspirational motivation factor of transformational leadership, $r(56) = 0.764$, $p < .05$ and

between participant course satisfaction and participant perceptions of teacher use of the contingent reward factor of transactional leadership, $r(56) = 0.733$, $p < .05$ (see Table 4).

No significant relationships existed between participant perceptions of teacher use of any of the three leadership styles or nine leadership factors measured by the MLQ and participant grade in Integrated Skills (see Tables 3 and 4).

**Table 4. Correlations between Leadership Factors, Course Satisfaction, and Grade.**

| | | Satisfaction | Grade | IIA | IIB | IM | IS | IC | CR | MEA | MEP | LF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Satisfaction** | Pearson R | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Sig. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | N | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | Pearson R | 0.227 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | | |
| | Sig. | 0.102 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | N | 53 | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Idealized Influence (attributed)** | Pearson R | 0.543** | 0.131 | 1.00 | | | | | | | | |
| | Sig. | 0.000 | 0.349 | | | | | | | | | |
| | N | 58 | 53 | | | | | | | | | |
| **Idealized Influence (behavior)** | Pearson R | 0.615** | 0.028 | 0.651** | 1.00 | | | | | | | |
| | Sig. | 0.000 | 0.845 | 0.000 | | | | | | | | |
| | N | 58 | 53 | 59 | | | | | | | | |
| **Inspirational Motivation** | Pearson R | 0.764** | 0.226 | 0.768** | 0.678** | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| | Sig. | 0.000 | 0.104 | 0.000 | 0.000 | | | | | | | |
| | N | 58 | 53 | 59 | 59 | | | | | | | |
| **Intellectual Stimulation** | Pearson R | 0.573** | 0.027 | 0.498** | 0.546** | 0.710** | 1.00 | | | | | |
| | Sig. | 0.000 | 0.845 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | | | | | | |
| | N | 58 | 53 | 59 | 59 | 59 | | | | | | |
| **Individualized Consideration** | Pearson R | 0.420** | 0.042 | 0.573** | 0.533** | 0.615** | 0.420** | 1.00 | | | | |
| | Sig. | 0.000 | 0.766 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.001 | | | | | |
| | N | 58 | 53 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | | | | | |
| **Contingent Reward** | Pearson R | 0.733** | 0.073 | 0.493** | 0.607** | 0.764** | 0.618** | 0.505** | 1.00 | | | |
| | Sig. | 0.000 | 0.606 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | | | | |
| | N | 58 | 53 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | | | | |
| **Management by Exception (active)** | Pearson R | 0.264* | -0.120 | 0.303* | 0.331* | 0.351** | 0.556** | 0.558** | 0.405** | 1.00 | | |
| | Sig. | 0.045 | 0.391 | 0.020 | 0.010 | 0.006 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.001 | | | |
| | N | 58 | 53 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | | | |
| **Management by Exception (passive)** | Pearson R | -0.239 | -0.072 | -0.131 | -0.088 | -0.166 | -0.332* | 0.109 | -0.145 | -0.200 | 1.00 | |
| | Sig. | 0.071 | 0.606 | 0.322 | 0.507 | 0.209 | 0.010 | 0.421 | 0.273 | 0.129 | | |
| | N | 58 | 53 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | | |
| **Laissez-Faire** | Pearson R | -0.433** | 0.059 | -0.335** | -0.316* | -0.413** | -0.203 | -0.238 | -0.348** | -0.081 | 0.242 | 1.00 |
| | Sig. | 0.001 | 0.675 | 0.10 | 0.015 | 0.001 | 0.122 | 0.70 | 0.007 | 0.540 | 0.065 | |
| | N | 58 | 53 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | |

**Sig. at the .01 level, *Sig. at the .05 level

Multiple linear regressions were calculated to examine the predictive relationships between teacher leadership and the student outcomes of interest in this study. Two regression models were tested for each of the student outcomes of interest to obtain both an overview of which leadership styles predict course satisfaction and grades and a more in-depth view of which specific factors predict each of these variables.

Two models determined which of the leadership styles and factors were predictive of course satisfaction (see Table 5). In Model 1, the independent variables were participant perceptions of teacher use of transformational, transactional, and non-leadership styles. In Model 2, the independent variables were participant perceptions of teacher use the nine leadership factors. Both of the tested models produced significant results (see Table 5).

**Table 5. Regression Models for Course Satisfaction.**

| Model | $R$ | $R$ Square | $F$ Change | DF1 | DF2 | Sig. $F$ Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model 1: 3 Leadership Styles | 0.689 | 0.474 | 16.247 | 3 | 54 | 0.000** |
| Model 2: 9 Leadership Factors | 0.812 | 0.659 | 10.306 | 9 | 48 | 0.000** |

**Sig. at the .01 level

In Model 1, multiple regression analysis tested if participant perceptions of teacher use of the three leadership styles significantly predicted participants' course satisfaction. The results indicated the three predictors explained 47.4% of the variance in course satisfaction, $R^2 = 0.474$, $F(3, 54) = 16.247$, $p < 0.05$. Transformational leadership, $b = 0.455$, $t(54) = 3.0$, $p < 0.05$, and non-leadership, $b = -0.223$, $t(54) = -2.174$, $p < 0.05$, significantly predicted participant course satisfaction (see Table 6).

**Table 6. Model 1 Regression Table for Course Satisfaction.**

| Source | $B$ | $SE\ B$ | $b$ | $t$ | $p$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transformational Leadership | 0.608 | 0.203 | 0.455 | 3.000 | 0.004** |
| Transactional Leadership | 0.253 | 0.207 | 0.181 | 1.223 | 0.227 |
| Non-Leadership | -0.256 | 0.118 | -0.223 | -2.174 | 0.034* |

**Sig. at the .01 level, *Sig. at the .05 level

In Model 2, multiple regression analysis measured if participant perceptions of teacher use of the nine leadership factors significantly predicted participants' course satisfaction. The nine predictors explained 65.9% of the variance in course satisfaction, $R^2 = 0.659$, $F(9, 48) = 10.306$, $p < 0.05$. The inspirational motivation factor of transformational leadership, $b = 0.464$, $t(48) = 2.118$, $p < 0.05$, and the contingent reward factor of transactional leadership, $b = 0.357$, $t(48) = 2.499$, $p < 0.05$, significantly predicted participant course satisfaction (see Table 7).

**Table 7. Model 2 Regression Table for Course Satisfaction.**

| Source | $B$ | $SE\ B$ | $b$ | $t$ | $p$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Idealized Influence attributed | -0.053 | 0.169 | -0.046 | -0.311 | 0.757 |
| Idealized Influence behavior | 0.190 | 0.149 | 0.170 | 1.273 | 0.209 |
| Inspirational Motivation | 0.498 | 0.235 | 0.464 | 2.118 | 0.039* |
| Intellectual Stimulation | -0.108 | 0.187 | -0.088 | -0.579 | 0.565 |
| Individualized Consideration | -0.090 | 0.155 | -0.083 | -0.583 | 0.563 |
| Contingent Reward | 0.500 | 0.200 | 0.357 | 2.499 | 0.016* |
| Management by Exception active | -0.016 | 0.124 | -0.015 | -0.125 | 0.901 |
| Management by Exception passive | -0.078 | 0.076 | -0.097 | -1.029 | 0.309 |
| Laissez-Faire | -0.085 | 0.096 | -0.086 | -0.886 | 0.380 |

*Sig. at the .05 level

Two models also determined which of the leadership styles and factors were predictive of student course grade. Neither model yielded statistically significant results (see Table 8).

**Table 8. Regression Models for Grade.**

| Model | R | R Square | F Change | DF1 | DF2 | Sig. F Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model 1: 3 Leadership Styles | 0.176 | 0.031 | 0.522 | 3 | 49 | 0.669 |
| Model 2: 9 Leadership Factors | 0.429 | 0.184 | 1.081 | 9 | 43 | 0.396 |

In Model 1, multiple regression analysis tested if participant perceptions of teacher use of the three leadership styles significantly predicted participants' course grades. The three predictors explained 3.1% of the variance in course grade, $R^2 = 0.031$, $F(3, 49) = 0.522$, $p > 0.05$, which was not significant. There were no significant predictors of course grade in this model (see Table 9).

**Table 9. Model 1 Regression Table for Grade.**

| Source | B | SE B | b | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transformational Leadership | 4.322 | 3.855 | 0.229 | 1.121 | 0.268 |
| Transactional Leadership | -4.249 | 4.006 | -0.213 | -1.061 | 0.294 |
| Non-Leadership | -0.404 | 2.234 | -0.026 | -0.181 | 0.857 |

In Model 2, multiple regression analysis measured if participant perceptions of teacher use of the nine leadership factors significantly predicted participants' course grades. The nine predictors explained 18.4% of the variance in course grade, $R^2 = 0.184$, $F(9, 43) = 1.081$, $p > 0.05$, which was not significant. However, the inspirational motivation factor of transformational leadership, $b = 0.802$, $t(43) = 2.294$, $p < 0.05$, significantly predicted participant course grade (see Table 10).

**Table 10. Model 2 Regression Table for Grade.**

| Source | B | SE B | b | t | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Idealized Influence attributed | -1.690 | 3.837 | -0.103 | -0.440 | 0.662 |
| Idealized Influence behavior | -0.725 | 3.599 | -0.048 | -0.201 | 0.841 |
| Inspirational Motivation | 12.563 | 5.476 | 0.802 | 2.294 | 0.027* |
| Intellectual Stimulation | -5.937 | 4.455 | -0.344 | -1.333 | 0.190 |
| Individualized Consideration | 0.028 | 3.414 | 0.002 | 0.008 | 0.994 |
| Contingent Reward | -2.491 | 4.380 | -0.127 | -0.569 | 0.572 |
| Management by Exception active | -1.531 | 2.784 | -0.108 | -0.550 | 0.585 |
| Management by Exception passive | -1.573 | 1.751 | -0.136 | -0.878 | 0.385 |
| Laissez-Faire | 3.134 | 2.124 | 0.236 | 1.476 | 0.147 |

*Sig. at the .05 level

## Discussion

Participant perceptions of teacher use of transformational leadership positively related to course satisfaction across all analyses (see Tables 3 and 6). Additionally, participant perceptions of teacher use of the inspirational motivation factor of transformational leadership was a significant predictor of course grade (see Table 10). These findings are consistent with studies conducted by Bogler et al. (2013), Bolkan and Goodboy (2009), and Harvey et al. (2003), which

also found strong positive relationships between perceptions of professor use of transformational leadership and its factors and various student outcomes in higher education. These findings indicate that if teachers in IEPs adopt a transformational leadership style, and particularly if they use inspirational motivation in their classes, students may be more satisfied with their classes and earn higher grades.

The findings of this study also affirm Greenier and Whitehead's (2019) qualitative study on South Korean English language learners' perceptions of good teacher leadership. The qualities the participants in their study identified as being indicative of good teacher leadership included passion, rapport, balance, and flexibility. These qualities all are necessary for transformational leadership, and particularly for inspirational motivation leadership. This study follows the trend observed in leadership studies conducted in higher education contexts, that students' perceptions of teacher use of transformational leadership may have measurable positive relationships with student outcomes.

This study found the inspirational motivation factor of transformational leadership and the contingent reward factor of transactional leadership had the strongest relationships with student course satisfaction (see Tables 4 and 7). These findings were consistent with the findings in the study conducted by Bogler et al. (2013) that found positive correlations between student satisfaction and both the transformational leadership factors and the contingent reward leadership factor. However, these results deviated from Bass's (1990) FRLM theory. While Bass (1990, p. 21) asserts that both transformational and transactional leadership are effective, he tends to favor transformational leadership, referring to it as "superior leadership performance" in one of his articles. However, the contingent reward factor of the FRLM has been the most extensively researched factor because studies frequently have shown it to correlate highly to the factors of transformational leadership and various measures of effectiveness (Goodwin et al., 2001; Heinitz et al., 2006; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008). The current study provides further evidence that contingent reward leadership is effective.

Additionally, the strong associations found between student course satisfaction and the contingent reward factor of transactional leadership in this study may be due to the cultural background of participants. The majority (66%) of participants in this study were from China. The effectiveness of contingent reward leadership found in this study may be due to the popularity of contingent reward leadership in China. Ma and Tsui (2015) examined the relationships between Western leadership theories, including transformational and transactional leadership, and three traditional Chinese philosophies, Daoism, Confucianism, and Legalism. They explain that contingent reward leadership aligns with Legalism, in which leaders "initiat[e] structures that include coordinated requirements along with clear rules, role specifications, and power limits" (Ma & Tsui, 2015, p. 18). Ma and Tsui (2015) used interviews conducted of successful business leaders in China to determine which leadership practices they commonly use. All of the 15 business leaders' interviews demonstrated use of leadership practices consistent with Legalism and contingent reward leadership (Ma & Tsui, 2015). The acceptance of Legalism and contingent reward leadership in China indicate that these practices are likely familiar to Chinese students.

**Teaching Recommendations**

Because the inspirational motivation and contingent reward leadership factors consistently had the strongest relationships with student outcomes in this study, English language teachers working in IEPs may want to consider utilizing these types of leadership in their classes. However, little has been written on the specific classroom practices that correspond to the nine leadership factors of the FRLM. This section explores the applications of inspirational motivation and contingent reward leadership in the English language classroom using Bass's (1990, 1998, 2008) advice to organizational leaders in combination with research from the field of English language teaching.

One of the most important characteristics of the inspirational motivational teacher is enthusiasm. According to Bass (2008, p. 607), leaders who inspire and motivate followers "focus on the bright side of things." Good teachers show up for class with a positive attitude and excitement for the day's lesson. However, inspirational motivational teachers go beyond this and display optimism and hope, instilling these attitudes in their students. Cacciattolo and McKenna (2012, p. 58) discuss this idea in their article on ESL student motivation, stating, "A motivational teacher should always be life changing; he or she must make hope practical when the challenges of daily life as an ESL/EFL learner can appear insurmountable. The skillful, respectful and motivating teacher can re-create and re-invent the world of the learner." Inspirational motivators will be aware of their students' challenges and work with students to empower them with the confidence, skills, and resources to overcome these challenges. When students see that English is a tool they can use to overcome obstacles in their daily lives, their desire to learn English for reasons like self-determination and confidence may increase (Ng & Ng, 2015).

Another important aspect of inspirational motivation leadership is establishing a vision (Bass, 1990, 1998, 2008). Good teaching involves having course goals and student learning outcomes, which indicate where a teacher hopes students will be by the end of the class, the basic definition of a vision (The Commission on English Language Program Accreditation, n.d.). However, teachers who use inspirational motivation leadership will reflect on the classroom experience they hope students will have in order to create a powerful and motivational vision statement. Hammerness (2006) suggests that teachers reflect on their concept of an ideal classroom to develop a vision statement by considering the aesthetics and classroom culture, the teacher and student roles, the instructional content, and the relationships between course content and the kind of society in which they want to live. Answering these questions about their ideal classroom can give teachers a starting place for developing a vision that they can share with students. A transformational vision will create buy-in and a desire to learn in students (Slavich & Zimbardo, 2012).

An aspect essential to inspirational motivation leadership is challenge. Leaders who display inspirational motivation, "have insight into what will be challenging to followers, and why" (Bass, 2008, p. 606). In English language classrooms, there are differences between students' proficiency levels, skill areas of strength, and learning styles. This means that what is challenging for one student is not necessarily challenging for another. If possible, teachers should differentiate instruction, providing students with a choice in the activities and

assessments they do as a part of a class, which allows students to select those that will be challenging for them. This promotes learner autonomy and can empower students to take ownership of their language learning (Said, 2019; Tsai, 2019).

Teachers who use inspirational motivation leadership in their classes embody Slavich and Zimbardo's (2012, p. 576) concept of transformational teaching in that the desired outcome of the enthusiasm, vision, and challenge they provide to students is not only helping students learn English, but also "transforming their learning-related attitudes, values, beliefs, and skills." When students have a teacher whose leadership promotes a positive attitude towards learning English and shows students the value of their education, it is not surprising that students report greater satisfaction with this teacher's class. Additionally, these positive changes in a student's attitude, values, and beliefs about studying English can increase students' enjoyment of learning and studying (Ng & Ng, 2015). Ng and Ng (2015) report that students who enjoy learning language for reasons like those listed in the previous paragraphs, like self-determination or confidence, tend to learn language faster. This would likely result in students earning higher grades.

Next, leaders who display contingent reward leadership reward followers for meeting or surpassing expectations (Bass, 1990; Bass, 2008; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Good teachers establish clear academic and behavioral expectations for the class and communicate clear expectations on individual activities and assessments. Doing so ensures that students know what they need to do to be successful. Teachers who use contingent reward leadership recognize students who meet and exceed expectations with rewards (Bass, 2008). Brown (1997, p. 12) identifies "the anticipation of reward" as one of the twelve principles on which good teaching is built. He explains that intrinsic motivation often drives the long-term success of language learners, but immediate rewards can engage English language learners in the short-term by keeping classes interesting and exciting (Brown, 1997). Likewise, Arnold (2013) cites the work of Ellis and Stevick in her explanation of the importance of teacher confirmation in learning. Teacher confirmation is a transactional process in which a teacher shows students that they are recognized and valuable individuals. Praise and positive feedback, which are aspects of contingent reward leadership, communicate teacher confirmation to students.

Both psychological rewards, like positive feedback and praise, and material rewards, like awards and prizes, can be effective forms of reward (Bass, 2008). Rewards should reinforce high performance and must be meaningful be effective. This means that neither psychological nor material rewards should be given out for the sake of giving out rewards in contingent reward leadership, but should be used strategically to let students know when they have made significant improvement or progress towards goals. Park et al. (2019) demonstrates the importance of meaningful rewards in their study on the rewards system used in a game-based learning program. The researchers found that participants who received performance-based rewards in the game showed significantly higher learning gains, engagement, autonomy, and motivation than participants who received completion-based rewards (Park et al., 2019). Teachers who use meaningful contingent rewards can make classes more engaging for students and motivate them to achieve.

While it might seem that grades, one form of reward, should be associated with contingent reward leadership, the results of this study provided no evidence of this relationship. Instead, contingent reward leadership was strongly correlated with and predictive of student course satisfaction. As the studies cited in the previous two paragraph indicate, giving meaningful rewards has a number of positive consequences, like showing students they are recognized and valued, making class interesting and exciting, and increasing motivation. These are all ways in which teacher use of contingent reward leadership can increase students' satisfaction with their class.

By following the recommendations in this section, IEP instructors can integrate inspirational motivation and contingent reward leadership into their classroom practices. While this study indicates that these leadership styles may be effective in US university IEP settings, more research is necessary to understand effective classroom leadership in TESOL contexts.

### Areas for Further Research

This study has several limitations. First, it used convenience sampling to recruit participants. Due to low student numbers during the time of the study at the IEP where the study took place, the study used convenience sampling to recruit the maximum number of participants. Despite efforts to maximize participation, the sample size for the study is small, with only 59 participants. Translating the survey could have allowed for participation from students in the lower levels of the IEP and should be considered in future studies. The limitations of this study make the results ungeneralizable beyond the sample. Additionally, this research adopted a single measure of leadership for data collection. Future studies may want to consider utilizing qualitative or mixed methodologies to add a deeper layer of understanding of participants' experience of teacher leadership in the TESOL context.

Further research examining teachers' role as the leader of a classroom is necessary. While this study provides preliminary findings on the effectiveness of teachers' use of transformational, transactional, and non-leadership styles and of the nine leadership factors that comprise these styles in an IEP setting, further research is necessary to understand these relationships. This study examined only two measures of effectiveness, student satisfaction and grades. Future research could explore the relationships that exist between teacher leadership style and a multitude of other measures of effectiveness, including student commitment to a program or school, perceptions of teacher performance, student participation, student motivation, student autonomy, and student empowerment. Additionally, future studies should consider between group comparisons of the leadership styles and factors that are most effective for students from different countries or regions of the world. This could help English language teachers identify the types of leadership that would be most effective for a particular group of students.

### About the Author

**Rachel DeDeyn** is the Program Manager for Special Programs at the University of Denver's English Language Center. She holds master's degrees in Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language and Leadership and Organizations. She has presented at national and local

conferences and has published several articles in the field of TESOL. Her research interests include teacher leadership and student identity.

## To cite this article:

## References

Anderson, M. (2017). Transformational leadership in education: A review of existing literature. *International Social Science Review, 93*(1), 1–13. https://digitalcommons.northgeorgia.edu/issr/vol93/iss1/4/

Arnold, J. (2013). Self issues and motivated behaviour in language learning. In J. Arnold & T. Murphey (Eds.), *Meaningful action: Earl Stevick's influence on language teaching* (pp. 29–44). Cambridge University Press.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72*, 441–462. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317999166789

Baecher, L. (2012). Pathways to teacher leadership among English-as-a-second-language teachers: Professional development by and for emerging teacher leaders. *Professional Development in Education, 38*(2), 317–330. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2012.657877

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(3), 19–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S

Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* Sage Publications.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1996). Multifactor leadership questionnaire. APA PsycTests. https://doi.org/10.1037/t03624-000

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bi, L., Ehrich, J., & Ehrich, L. C. (2012). Confucius as transformational leader: Lessons for ESL leadership. *International Journal of Educational Management, 26*(4), 391–402. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541211227791

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

Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A. K. (2009). Transformational leadership in the classroom: Fostering student learning, student participation, and teacher credibility. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 36*(4), 296–307.

Brown, H. D. (2002). English language teaching in the "post-method" era: Towards better diagnosis, treatment, and assessment. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 9–18). Cambridge University Press.

Cacciattolo, M., & McKenna, T. (2012). What drives motivation in ESL/EFL classrooms? *Journal of Asian Critical Education, 1*(1), 57–69.

The Commission on English Language Program Accreditation.
(n.d.). *Standards.* Commission on English Language Program Accreditation. https://cea-accredit.org/about-cea/standards

Cheong Cheng, Y. (1994). Teacher leadership style: A classroom-level study. *Journal of Educational Administration, 32*(3), 54–71. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578239410063111

Christison, M., & Murray, D. E. (2009). *Leadership in English language education.* Routledge.

Den Hartog, D. N., Van Muijen, J. J., & Koopman, P. L. (1997). Transactional vs. transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 70*, 19–34. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00628.x

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(2), 397–417. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588114

Goodwin, V. L., Wofford, J. C., & Whittington, J. L. (2001). A theoretical and empirical extension to the transformational leadership construct. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22,* 759–744. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.111

Greenier, V. T., & Whitehead, G. E. K. (2016). Towards a model of teacher leadership in ELT: Authentic leadership in classroom practice. *RELC Journal, 47*(1), 79–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688216631203

Greenier, V. T., & Whitehead, G. E. K. (2019). Beyond Good Teaching Practices: Language Teacher Leadership From the Learners' Perspective. TESOL Quarterly, 53(4), 960–985. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.526

Hammerness, K. (2006). *Seeing through teachers' eyes: professional ideals and classroom practices*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Harvey, S., Royal, M., & Stout, D. (2003). Instructor's transformational leadership: University student attitudes and ratings. *Psychological Reports, 93*, 395–402. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2003.92.2.395

Heinitz, K., Liepmann, D., & Felfe, J. (2005). Examining the factor structure of the MLQ: Recommendation for a reduced set of factors. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 21*(3), 182–190. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.21.3.182

Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2008). A theoretical and empirical examination of the transactional and non-leadership dimensions of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(5), 501–513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.07.001

Jackson, T. A., Meyer, J. P., & Wang, X. H. (2013). Leadership, commitment, and culture: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 20*(1), 84–106. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051812466919

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(5), 755–768. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*(3), 385–425. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90027-2

Ma, L., & Tsui, A. S. (2015). Traditional Chinese philosophies and contemporary leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 26*(1), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.11.008

McGee, A., Haworth, P., & Macintyre, L. (2015). Leadership practices to support teaching and learning for English language learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 92–114. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.162

Ng, C. F., & Ng, P. K. (2015, June 9-10). *A review of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations of ESL learners*. International Conference on Culture, Languages and Literature, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7ff6/a6796fad4b82c40c082ebdcaaa345decf06c.pdf

Noland, A., & Richards, K. (2014). The relationship among transformational teaching and student motivation and learning. *The Journal of Effective Teaching, 14*(3), 5–20.

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership theory and practice.* Sage.

Papalewis, R. (2007). Foreword. In E. L. Wilmore, *Teacher leadership: Improving teaching and learning from inside the classroom* (xi–xii). Cornwin Press.

Park, J., Kim, S., Kim, A., & Yi, M. Y. (2019). Learning to be better at a game: Performance vs. completion contingent reward for game-based learning. *Computers and Education, 139,* 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.04.016

Redden, E. (2018, May 31). Intensive English enrollments in U.S. drop 20%. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2018/05/31/intensive-english-enrollments-us-drop-20

Rowold, J., & Heinitz, K. (2007). Transformational and charismatic leadership: Assessing the convergent, divergent and criterion validity of the MLQ and the CKS. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(2), 121–133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.01.003

Said, N. E. M. (2019). *The Effects of Differentiated Instruction on Students' Language Attitude and Critical Thinking in an ESL Context* (Publication No. 778793) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield]. White Rose eTheses Online.

Shah, S. R. (2017). The significance of teacher leadership in TESOL: A theoretical perspective. *Arab World English Journal, 8*(4), 240–258. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no4.16

Slavich, G. M., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2012). Transformational teaching: Theoretical underpinnings, basic principles, and core methods. *Educational Psychology Review, 24*, 569–608. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-012-9199-6

Tepper, B. J., & Percy, P. M. (1994). Structural validity of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54*(3), 734–744. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164494054003020

TESOL. (2018). ELT leadership management certificate program. Retrieved from https://www.tesol.org/attend-and-learn/certificate-leadership-programs/elt-leadership-management-certificate-program

Tsai, Y. R. (2019). Promotion of learner autonomy within the framework of a flipped EFL instructional model: perception and perspectives. *Computer Assisted Language Learning,* 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1650779

Wang, G., Oh, I. S., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of

research. *Group and Organization Management, 36,* 223–270. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601111401017

White, R. V. (2008). *From teacher to manager: Managing language teaching organizations*. Cambridge University Press.

York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership: Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(3), 255–316. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074003255