Tampere University

Kaosy Azuka

EXAMINING TEACHER LEADERSHIP USING THE FULL RANGE OF LEADERSHIP MODEL:
Perspectives of Senior Year Students in Apo Secondary Schools, Abuja, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The concept of teacher leadership has been widely discussed in the literature, with research conducted in various parts of the world including the United States of America, Canada, UK, China, and Australia. However, there has been limited exploration of this form of leadership in the Nigerian context. The present research utilized the full range of leadership model to investigate teacher leadership in Nigerian secondary schools. Specifically, the present study was focused on determining the prevalent teacher leadership style in Apo secondary schools according to students' perception. Secondly, the research sought to establish which leadership style that consistently predicted students' extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction with the teacher. Lastly, the researcher was interested determining whether any significant differences exist in teachers' leadership styles by gender and school type. To achieve these objectives, a quantitative cross-sectional survey was conducted across 20 secondary schools in Apo district, using a revised version of the multi-factor leadership questionnaire (5X Short) in pen-and-paper format. The survey was self-administered by 574 senior secondary students (SSS3) from both public and private secondary schools in Apo district, Abuja Municipal Area Council, Nigeria, with a mean age of 15.9 years. The data collected were analysed using descriptive statistics, multiple regression, and independent samples t-test statistics on SPSS.

The findings of the study showed that transformational teacher leadership style was more prevalent in secondary schools in Apo district. More so, transformational teacher leadership style was found to significantly predict extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction. Additionally, transactional teacher leadership style significantly predicted effectiveness. Female teachers displayed more transformational leadership style than male teachers, and public secondary schools had more occurrences of transformational teacher leadership style than private secondary schools. These results suggest that active leadership behaviours as described in the full range of leadership model are present in the classroom according to students' perception, and teachers are displaying a more transformational leadership style, which is considered the most effective form of leadership.

The study has important implications for the development of teacher leadership in Nigeria. It highlights the existence of teacher leadership in the secondary school classroom context, particularly in AMAC secondary schools, and the benefits associated with the display of transformational teacher leadership style. Educational stakeholders in Nigeria, including government, teacher training institutions, principals, and teachers, should embrace teacher leadership as a pedagogical practice and develop it. Further research is needed to explore the extent and impact of teacher leadership in Nigeria.

Keywords: *classroom teaching, teacher leadership, Nigerian secondary education, full range of leadership model.*

CONTENTS

TABLES

1 INTRODUCTION

Research on educational leadership is unanimous in recognizing the significance of school leadership for school development. Reportedly, the decisions of school principals have indirect effects on student results (Witziers et al., 2003; Marzano et al., 2005; Leithwood et al., 2017; in Liu, 2021; Griffith, 2004; in Robinson et al, 2008). Notwithstanding, due to economic, cultural, political, technological, and ideological developments, schools are becoming increasingly complex and dynamic (Araşkal & Kilinc, 2019). Thus, traditional leadership methods such as principal leadership are becoming increasingly insufficient. In addition, principal leadership in Nigeria has been seen to be unsuccessful in promoting educational output and academic performance among students (Bada et al., 2020). This has prompted educational leadership scholars to argue for a reimagining of school leadership to include different actors within and beyond the school, especially teachers, and to assess their impact on teaching and learning (Nguyen et al., 2019; York-Barr & Duke, 2004).

The concept of teacher leadership has existed for decades, and although its origin is unknown, a few significant scholarly contributions marked a turning point in its evolution. For example, Howey (1988; as cited in Webber & Okoko, 2021) suggested that a teacher's job description should include collaborative action research, school monitoring, curriculum development, and pedagogical development. In a similar spirit, Little (1995) observed that school leadership was transitioning from a hierarchical structure to one that respects alternative sources of expertise and is founded on multidisciplinary collaboration. In their 1996 article titled "Awakening the sleeping Giant: Leadership Development for Teachers" Katzenmeyer and Moller made a clear distinction between teacher leadership and other types of leadership. In their paper, the leadership potentials of schoolteachers in the achievement of school transformation and development were acknowledged. Consequently, attempts have been made to define teacher leadership.

There are numerous definitions of teacher leadership in the academic literature. The prevalent viewpoint accepts teacher leadership as a school level practice, albeit a non-formal position held by a few teachers with a set of traits, skills, and dispositions to influence other members of the school community toward instructional improvement and educational goal accomplishment (Wenner & Campbell, 2017; Smith et al., 2017; Wasley, 1991; Webber and Nickel, 2021). In contrast, teacher leadership is considered as the behaviours and actions of teachers that affect students both inside and beyond the classroom (Ertesvag, 2009; Öqvist & Malmstrom, 2016). This suggests that all teachers demonstrate leadership in their interactions with students. There is unanimity, however, that teacher leadership happens both in the classroom and at the school level, as teachers exert varied degrees of influence on other members of the school community to improve teaching and learning (Crowther, 1997; Harris, 2003; Harris & Lambert, 2003; Muijs & Harris, 2006; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). Evidently, the concept of teacher leadership is well-developed. Moreover, its benefits have been extensively reported. This study understands teacher leadership as those teachers' behaviours that influence students in the classroom (Oqvist & Malmstrom, 2016), with an aim to find out the leadership behavioural patterns of Nigerian secondary school teachers.

1.1 Exploring teacher leadership

The multiple advantages of teacher leadership have been extensively covered in the academic literature. Changes within the school are prompted by teacher leadership in areas such as curriculum enhancement and the promotion of a positive organizational culture (Snoek et al., 2014). Moreover, instructors who exhibit leadership have greater job satisfaction, are more confident, and solve classroom problems more effectively (Allen, 2017; Berg & Zoellick, 2019; Criswell et al., 2018; Jacobs et al., 2016; Lee Bae et al., 2016). Additionally, there is substantial evidence that teacher leadership indirectly benefits students. It has been found to have a positive relationship with student engagement and motivation to learn (Avsec, 2016; Lu et al., 2016; Oqvist & Malmstrom, 2018). Finally, teacher leadership enhances family engagement and school confidence (Conan Simpson, 2021). Undoubtedly, the leadership practices of teachers

provide multiple benefits for the school, the students, the teachers, and the larger community, making it a crucial practice that should be investigated and promoted across all cultures.

Despite significant progress in teacher leadership research, a few lacunae have been identified in the literature. Firstly, most studies on teacher leadership are unduly focused on the leadership practices of teachers at the school level (Beycioglu & Aslan, 2010; Can, 2007; Demir, 2014, Köse, 2019). While this is admirable, it reinforces the assumption that only a select few teachers are capable of leadership, ignoring the fact that school-level teacher leaders are first and foremost classroom teachers whose leadership behaviors are reflected in their classroom practices. Secondly, the methodology of teacher leadership research over the years has been predominantly qualitative (York-Barr & Duke, 2004), and these studies are typically undertaken on a small scale, providing a limited knowledge of the phenomena. In addition, the bulk of studies on teacher leadership have been undertaken in contexts that include the United States, Canada, England, China, Taiwan, and Malaysia (Harris, 2003; Schott et al., 2020). Evidently, there is a paucity of study on teacher leadership in Nigerian context.

In addition, the framework for classroom teacher leadership lacks standardization. It has been suggested that teacher leadership consists of establishing positive relationships with students, employing a variety of instructional techniques, having high expectations for students, and establishing clear lesson objectives, displaying classroom authority, implementing a reward and punishment system in the classroom, and fostering student autonomy through participation (Bear 1998; Darrin Thomas, 2014; as cited in Khany & Ghasemi, 2021).

Köse (2019) proposed a statistically validated theoretical framework of classroom teacher leadership consisting of four sub-dimensions: strong student-teacher interactions, student motivation, teacher's presentation of strong teaching leadership, and engagement with students outside of school. In contrast to past ideas, Köse's (2019) framework provides a realistic framework for classroom teacher leadership research and specifies the ideal classroom teacher leadership behaviors. Unfortunately, it lacks a clear definition of optimal teacher leadership practices in the classroom. Evidently, a consistent paradigm for the

quantitative analysis of teacher leadership is lacking. Intriguingly, alternative frameworks have been employed to analyze teacher leadership in the classroom. In her study of classroom teacher leadership styles, Cheong Cheng (1994) employed the leadership framework produced by Ohio State University (Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire - LBDQ). Similarly, the full range of leadership model has been used to investigate instructor leadership (Pounder, 2008).

The full range of leadership model (FRLM) created by Avolio and Bass (1991) views leadership as occurring along a continuum of three leadership dimensions: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles. These leadership styles reflect the behavior of leaders in their relationships with their followers, with transformational leadership being the most effective and Laissez-faire leadership being the least effective (Northouse, 2010). Transformational leadership employs many tactics to help followers realize their full potential, whereas transactional leadership style employs reward and punishment to advance the group's purpose (Bass & Avolio, 1991). In contrast, the laissez-faire leadership style is characterized as a lack of leadership. A leader exhibits more of one leadership style and less of the others, in accordance with the theory (Bass, 1999). The FRLM is assessed using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), which is utilized for leadership behavior assessment. In addition, the MLQ is used to assess leadership outcomes including extra effort, followers' satisfaction with the leadership, and the effectiveness of such leadership (Bass, 1999).

In this study, the FRLM was chosen for numerous reasons. First, it provides a concise overview of a variety of leadership behaviors exhibited by teachers, highlighting transformational leadership style as the most effective and laissez-faire leadership style as the least effective. The FRLM is reportedly sensitive to contingencies, particularly cultural and organizational ones. For instance, the FRLM has been utilized in both individualistic and collectivist societies, as well as in various organizational settings (Bass, 1999). Hence, Pounder (2008) confirms its usefulness within the classroom setting. The FRLM framework and instrument are suited for quantitative studies of teacher leadership because they permit large-scale data collection. In addition, the instrument has undergone multiple phases of development and is considered to have good reliability and validity.

The pivotal role played by Nigerian teachers in the secondary education system is widely recognized. Teachers occupy a prominent position in the National Policy on Education, which recognizes that the educational system cannot surpass the quality of its teachers (NPE, 2004). Exemplary and devoted teachers are the remedy for the nation's socioeconomic and political progress (Ogunyinka et al.,2015). Similarly, effective teachers cultivate good pupils who ultimately become good citizens, and as such, teachers are essential nation-building stakeholders (Chukwu, 2019; Enaibe & Imonivwerha, 2010). Moreover, the impact of the Nigerian secondary school teacher is pervasive and permeates every aspect of society (Ogunyinka et al., 2015). This is particularly evident as all adult Nigerian citizens have received instruction from teachers at some point. As a result, the leaders in all domains of society can be traced back to the tutelage of their teachers. Although, the professional practices of the Nigerian teacher have been examined in terms of classroom learning facilitation, curriculum implementation, student mentoring and motivation, and classroom management (Adebile,2009; Agi, 2019; Chukwu, 2019), little is known about the secondary school teachers' classroom leadership behaviors.

1.2 The aim of the thesis

This thesis' fundamental argument is that teacher leadership is a pedagogical activity of all Nigerian teachers, therefore it studies teacher leadership in the Nigerian secondary school context and according to the perspectives of senior secondary students (SSS3) using the FRLM. The present study has three key objectives:

1.   To investigate the predominant teacher leadership style in Apo secondary schools;

2.   To determine differences in teacher leadership perceptions based on school type and teacher gender; and

3.   To determine the leadership style of teachers most likely to predict extra effort, effectiveness, and students' satisfaction. Thus, the following research questions guides the study:

1.   What is the prevalent teacher leadership style in senior secondary schools according to students' perception?

2.   Do the three teacher leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) predict the leadership outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction?

3.   Does students' perception of classroom teacher leadership differ by teachers' gender and school type?

It is hypothesized that a more transactional teacher leadership style will be prevalent as measured by the revised MLQ (5X short) questionnaire. Secondly, transformational teacher leadership style will predict all three outcomes of leadership including extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction. Furthermore, Students perception of teacher leadership will differ by   teachers' gender, as female teachers will display more transformational leadership style than their male colleagues. Lastly, students' perception of teacher leadership will differ by school type, as teachers in private secondary schools will display more transformational leadership style than teachers in public secondary schools.

Using quantitative research methods, a modified version of the MLQ (5x short), an instrument developed alongside the FRLM was used to collect data for this study. To make the MLQ (5X short) questionnaire more appropriate for administration to secondary school students, modifications were made. These changes were implemented to ensure that the questionnaire was clear and easy to understand for this population. Specifically, alterations were made to the language used in the questionnaire items to make them more age-appropriate and understandable for secondary school students. These modifications were made with the goal of improving the reliability and validity of the MLQ (5X short) as a measure of leadership behaviors among secondary school students. SPSS was then utilized to perform statistical analysis on the acquired data namely, mean, multiple regression analysis and independent samples t-test.

This is the first research to examine teacher leadership in the secondary education system of Nigeria. Its aim is to provide new information regarding the leadership behaviors of secondary school teachers. It is considered that the full range of leadership theory is constant across cultures and circumstances (Antonakis et al.,2003; Nawaz & Bodla, 2010). The present investigation will therefore serve as a test for the theory's application in this setting. Principal

support is one of the most influential factors in determining teacher leadership (Araskal & Klinic, 2019). Since principal support is necessary for teacher leadership, this study intends to raise school leaders' awareness of the need to cultivate and support teacher leadership in the classroom. The findings will also increase awareness of the necessity to incorporate teacher leadership into the Nigerian curriculum for teacher education. However, it is outside the scope of this study to analyze teacher leadership at the school level.

The thesis consists of six chapters. In the first chapter the background and context of the study are presented, alongside, the research aims, research questions and hypotheses that guide the study. Chapter two will discuss the conceptual and theoretical frameworks for the study, as well as an exploration of relevant literature supporting the study. In the third chapter the methodology for data collection, management and analysis, as well ethical practices will be described. The results from mean, multiple regression and independent samples t-test statistical analyses will be presented in the fourth chapter. In chapter five the results will be discussed in tandem with the research questions and reviewed literature. Lastly, the conclusion of the study, limitations, and recommendation for future practice and research are explored in the sixth chapter.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents an examination of the concepts of leadership and teacher leadership, including an exploration of teacher leadership from the perspectives of trait, behavioural, contingency, and distributive leadership theories. The teacher leadership paradigm will also be discussed, including its origin, dimensions, benefits, and determinants. Several frameworks for investigating teacher leadership will be briefly reviewed. The full range of leadership model will be discussed in detail, along with an examination of its strengths and weaknesses. Additionally, the full range of teacher leadership will be explored. Lastly, this Chapter will discuss teacher leadership within the context of the Nigerian secondary school system to identify factors that may affect its practice, including school type, principal leadership, and intrinsic teacher factors.

2.1 Conceptual Framework

2.1.1 The concept of leadership

Leadership is a subject that has been extensively studied in management literature (Itzkovich et al., 2020). It is a ubiquitous phenomenon that transcends cultures, fields, organizations, and groups, and it plays a crucial role in determining the extent to which these groups achieve their objectives (Arikewuyo, 2009).

Current definitions of leadership place significant emphasis on the leader as an individual. Robbins and Coulter (2005) describe leadership as "the process of influencing a group to attain its goals." Similarly, Ibukun (2004) defines leadership as a position of superiority coupled with the ability to achieve a goal through guiding, assisting, and motivating others. In a similar vein, Yukl (2007) describes leadership as an influence process in which an individual seeks the understanding and support of others to accomplish a task effectively. These

definitions imply that followers play a passive role in their relationship with the leader and that leadership is a one-way street. Additionally, these connotations stem from the traditional leadership paradigm, which supports hierarchy, centralized control, and bureaucracy. These notions limit the practice of leadership to a small number of individuals, such as school principals and assistant principals (Agi et al., 2016). However, recent views of leadership suggest that it can emerge from a range of organizational sources.

In contrast, leadership is viewed as a group activity, a viewpoint reinforced by Morgan (1986), who argues that leadership can only be examined in connection with common organizational meanings. In other words, leadership is the collaborative creation of organizational knowledge and purpose. According to Rost (1991), leadership is a powerful relationship between followers who are motivated by a sense of purpose and leaders who seek meaningful change. Furthermore, Northouse (2007) believes that leadership should be regarded as a collective social process emerging from the interaction of many individuals. This suggests that every member of a group is capable of exerting influence; in other words, everyone is capable of leadership and followership. In this context, followers play an active role, and it is possible for them to evolve into leaders themselves. In contrast to a top-down approach to leadership, these perspectives advocate for a multidirectional, vertical, horizontal, circular, or diagonal leadership relationship (Badshah, 2012). Therefore, a participatory leadership approach in a school context may involve the principal, vice-principals, teachers, students, parents, education boards, and authorities (Agi et al., 2016). This is where teacher leadership is situated. Despite the belief that this perspective renders the role of a school leader irrelevant, these interactions remain unequal, as organizational leaders exert more influence than followers (Prentice, 1961). However, it promotes the democratization of organizational leadership to as many organizational actors as possible to enable meaningful change.

2.1.2 The concept of teacher leadership

Several definitions of teacher leadership exist in the literature. Often debated is whether teacher leadership is a practice in the classroom or at the school level. Smith et al. (2017) defined teacher leadership as "an influential, non-supervisory approach aimed at enhancing instructional practice with student learning as its primary objective." Similarly, Wasley (1991) defines teacher leadership as the ability to persuade colleagues to engage in activities they would not typically consider. According to Wenner and Campbell (2017), teacher leaders are educators who maintain classroom teaching responsibilities while engaging in extracurricular leadership activities. Webber and Nickel (2021) claim that teacher leadership is reserved for a select group of educators who exhibit sets of abilities and knowledge that other educators find inspiring and who are motivated to engage in unusually productive behaviour. In a similar vein, Lin et al. (2018) defined teacher leadership as a collection of leadership abilities that allow classroom teachers to exert influence beyond the classroom, particularly on matters related to enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. According to these perspectives, the focus of teacher leadership is on the teacher's leadership skills and behaviours in their relationships with other colleagues, educational stakeholders, and teachers' participation in school administrative processes (Köse, 2019). Here classroom teaching and guidance are separated from teacher leadership, and teacher leadership is limited to school-level practice, and teacher leaders hold formal leadership positions such as subject coordinator, department head, year head, and committee chair. Teacher leaders may also assume informal leadership responsibilities, such as directing professional development efforts, coaching, and mentoring colleagues, and designing curricular content (Conan Simpson, 2021). Hence, Teacher leadership emergence may be contingent on the teacher's capacity to demonstrate specific skills and attributes over time to be considered for leadership responsibilities. Nevertheless, teachers who eventually engage in school-level forms of teacher leadership are invariably also classroom leaders.

The concept of teacher leadership also includes classroom leadership activities. According to Darrin Thomas (2014, as cited in Khany & Ghasemi, 2021), teachers are classroom leaders who provide advice and help to pupils so

that they may comprehend and apply newly learned knowledge. In this context, the classroom is a tiny social organization, with the teacher as the leader and the students as the followers (Cheong Cheng, 1994). Ertesvag (2009) provided a suitable definition of teacher leadership as "actions teachers take to create an environment that promotes and encourages both academic and social-emotional learning" (p.515). In addition, Öqvist and Malmstrom (2016) define teacher leadership as a collection of teacher characteristics and behaviours that affect students inside and outside of the classroom. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, teacher leadership refers to classroom-based teachers' actions, techniques, and attitudes that may impact student learning and the teaching-learning process. In other words, teacher leadership is the use of influence to improve student learning. It is premised on the notion that all educators are leaders (Pounder, 2008; Roland, 1999; Strodl, 1992; Wilmore, 2007). Teachers function as leaders in the classroom who direct and facilitate student learning. They develop unambiguous lesson objectives, employ a variety of pedagogical strategies, engage students in their learning, and evaluate their progress (Thomas, 2014)

Unanimity exists around the fact that teacher leadership occurs both inside and outside the classroom (Crowther, 1997; Harris, 2003; Muijs & Harris, 2006). Members of the school community exercise individual and collective responsibility to improve the quality of education (Harris & Lambert, 2003; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009). Teacher leadership is holistically viewed as the influence of teachers on other school community members to improve teaching and learning (Webber & Nickel, 2021). Thus, it exists both inside and outside of the classroom. Accordingly, Katzenmeyer and Moller (2009) state that teacher leaders "lead within and beyond the classroom; identify with and contribute to a community of teacher learners and leaders; influence others toward improved educational practice; and accept responsibility for achieving the results of this leadership." Schott et al. (2020) assert that teacher leadership is best defined as a "process of influencing others" to achieve educational goals, independent of the teacher's function.

Notably, teacher leadership is mostly autonomous of formal positions, is ineffective without principal assistance, and geared toward student growth (York-Barr and Duke, 2004).

Perhaps the argument inherent in the notion of teacher leadership is a continuation of earlier disagreements in leadership studies regarding what makes effective leadership. Years-long debates have cantered on whether effective leaders (i.e., those who achieve organizational goals) are born or made. The ongoing discussion in favour of and against teacher leadership is reflected in an overview of leadership theories.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

2.2.1 Teacher leadership: A fantasy or possibility

The study of leadership has progressed through distinct phases. Leadership effectiveness has been examined as a function of internal disposition, traits, situations, styles, and behaviors for more than a century (Badshah, 2012). These studies on leadership have been broadly classified into three key theories: trait theory, behavior theory, and contingency theory. Intrinsic to these discussions is the question of whether anyone can be a leader. A synopsis of these leadership theories will throw light on the present debate in the literature on teacher leadership.

Trait leadership theory is a widely recognized approach that aims to differentiate leaders from non-leaders based on their observable personal attributes and qualities (Robbins & Judge, 2006). This theory traces its origins to the pioneering work of Galton and Eysenck (1869), who investigated the genetic characteristics that distinguish effective leaders from followers. However, subsequent research shifted the focus to identifying the personal traits that could potentially predict leadership effectiveness. For instance, Goldberg's (1990) "Big Five traits," namely, openness (extraversion), agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience, have been associated with effective leadership (Judge et al., 2002). Similarly, Yukl (2006) and Sidle (2007) identified four characteristics that are commonly found in effective leaders, namely, intellect, maturity and breadth, accomplishment drive,

and integrity. Trait theory has gained considerable credibility due to its comprehensive approach to the study of leadership (Northouse, 2007). However, this theory has been criticized for its failure to consider other important factors that influence leadership success, such as the nature of followers and the environment (Verawati & Hartono, 2020).

Skepticism regarding the trait model prompted researchers to examine leadership as a behavior (Derue et al., 2011). Behavioral leadership theory emphasizes the relevance of the leader-follower relationship in the leadership process by observing how the behaviors of leaders influence the followers and, ultimately, their effectiveness (Chow et al., 2017). In other words, a leader's efficacy depends on his or her actions rather than his or her traits. Furthermore, the behavioral theory is founded on the notion that leaders are made, not born, therefore contradicting the trait theory. It is argued that Leader actions and behaviors are more easily detected than traits, and that anyone who want to be a leader can imitate those patterns that have been shown to be effective, through training and observation (Verawati & Hartono, 2020). Prior works recognizes these leadership behaviors to include autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership styles (Lewin et al.,1939), consideration and initiating structure (Robbins, 2001). Consequently, leadership behaviours such democratic leadership style, high consideration and high initiating structure behaviors are considered effective (Uslu, 2019).

The contingency leadership theory argues that there is no single optimal leadership style for all situations and contexts (Uslu, 2019). Hence, leadership effectiveness under one circumstance does not ensure leadership effectiveness under another circumstance. Therefore, leadership success is heavily reliant on contextual elements (Vidal et al., 2017), and it is important to identify and understand the various aspects that enable leadership effectiveness (Kraft, 2018). Among these contextual variables are the characteristics of the leader, the characteristics of the followers, the organizational characteristics, the nature of the goals, and the prior experiences of the leader and followers (Yukl, 1989). By implication, individuals who appear to be leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in other situations, while those who do not appear to be leaders in one scenario may very well demonstrate leadership in another if the environment is modified to their leadership style (Fiedler, 2006; Stogdill, 1974).

For instance, Fiedler (1964) theorized that leadership effectiveness is dependent on the compatibility between the leader's style and the situation (Northouse, 2010). A leader may adopt a task-motivated or relationship-motivated leadership style depending on following organizational variables such as, leader-member relationships, task structure, and positional power (Fiedler,1964; as cited in Northouse, 2010).

The concept of distributive leadership has been a subject of ongoing research and discussion. It involves a decision-making process that entails the active participation and collaboration of all stakeholders within the educational system, including school administrators, teachers, parents, and students (Heck & Hallinger, 2009). Distributive leadership is founded on the premise that leadership can be exercised at every level of the school organization, and not solely by the school management team (Fletcher & Kaufer, 2003). Gronn (2000) expanded the theory of distributive leadership, based on Engeström's (1999) activity theory, by identifying two types of distributive leadership that exist in organizations: additive and holistic leadership patterns (Gronn, 2000). Additive patterns of leadership arise spontaneously from all organizational personnel who perform leadership responsibilities without the organization being aware of them. On the other hand, the holistic pattern of leadership occurs when the leadership sources in an organization are consciously coordinated (Leithwood et al., 2007).

Notably, leadership theories provide varying perspectives on the feasibility of teacher leadership. According to the trait perspective, teacher leaders can be distinguished from others based on identifiable traits such as openness (extraversion), agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience (Judge et al., 2002). This implies that not all teachers possess the qualities that are likely to result in effective classroom leadership, and only those who do should be recognized as leaders. This belief system is inherent in the teacher leadership literature. For instance, Webber and Nickel (2021) posit that teacher leadership is a practice for the most experienced and knowledgeable teachers, who are frequently acknowledged for their ability to motivate others to action. In this sense, leadership is restricted to a select group of teachers who demonstrate specific talents and knowledge that inspire their colleagues to be creatively productive. In the same vein, Crowther et al. (2008) assert that teacher leaders possess distinctive dispositions, styles, and values.

Additionally, they acknowledge the impracticality of assuming that all teachers have the confidence and motivation to demonstrate leadership at every stage of their teaching careers (Crowther et al., 2008). As such, teacher leadership is only possible for teachers who possess key leadership characteristics, as those who lack such traits may not be considered leaders.

Behavioral leadership theory presents an alternative perspective, contending that leadership can be cultivated in individuals (Verawati & Hartono, 2020), offering a promising avenue for teacher leadership. This theory asserts that leaders are not inherently born but made, necessitating the recognition that all teachers possess the potential for leadership. This perspective is shared by many researchers (Katzenmeyer and Moller, 1996; Pounder 2006; Roland 1999); Strodl, 1992; Wilmore, 2007). Consequently, attention is directed towards identifying evidence-based effective leadership behaviors such as democratic leadership, high consideration, and high initiating structural dimensions of leadership, and promoting their adoption in the classroom. Therefore, the behavioral leadership theory establishes the possibility for teacher leadership.

The contingency leadership theory proposes various contextual factors that can impacts leadership. Notably, the theory allows for inferences about the probable causes of success or failure of teacher leadership within specific contexts and cultures. It is uncertain whether teacher leaders will demonstrate effectiveness or ineffectiveness in all school and classroom settings. Structural and cultural components within the school and broader society, as well as a teacher's lack of awareness of their leadership potential, may impact teacher leadership. Interestingly, one's perception of leadership is a significant predictor of their leadership capacity (Meng & Heyman, 2009). Therefore, teacher leadership is feasible for all educators when the contexts in which they operate are considered and adapted accordingly.

The theory of distributive leadership plays a crucial role in the comprehension of teacher leadership. Gronn (2002) has proposed organizational leadership patterns that accurately capture the leadership behaviors of teachers at all levels of the school. Specifically, both school-wide and classroom teacher leadership can be effectively positioned within the additive and holistic dimensions, thus recognizing the leadership contributions and abilities of all teachers. As school organizations become more intricate, diverse, and

interconnected, it becomes imperative to synchronize various sources of influence to promptly respond to school innovation and change (Harris, 2012). Furthermore, Elmore (2000) has acknowledged that education is a knowledge-intensive enterprise, and that the successful accomplishment of complex school tasks requires the distribution of leadership duties.

In summary, the examination of various leadership perspectives has provided substantial backing to the research and advancement of teacher leadership. While the trait perspective implies that teacher leadership only applies to individuals who possess specific qualities that lead others to perceive them as leaders, other leadership theories provide compelling evidence for the potential of teacher leadership. Specifically, the behavioral paradigm enhances teacher leadership by recognizing the leadership potential of all individuals. Thus, every teacher has the capacity for leadership, and with appropriate leadership training and competence, they can exhibit leadership both within and beyond the classroom. Similarly, the contingency paradigm views all teachers as leaders if the conditions that expand their leadership skills are met. Finally, the theory of distributed school leadership appropriately acknowledges teacher leadership. Thus, a thorough exploration of the teacher leadership paradigm is imperative to gain a comprehensive understanding of its origin, determinants, benefits, and dimensions.

2.2.2 Teacher leadership: An emerging paradigm

The phenomenon of teacher leadership within the context of school leadership has been the subject of extensive research for over three decades (Webber & Okoko, 2021). Despite the lack of clarity regarding its origin, several authors have been credited with initiating the discourse in support of this practice. For instance, Howey (1988) proposed that a select group of teachers could be recruited on a part-time basis to provide assistance to their peers to enhance teaching and learning outcomes. Howey (1988) further recommended expanding teachers' job descriptions to include joint action research, school monitoring, curriculum development, and pedagogical advancement (Webber & Okoko, 2021). Similarly, Little (1995) argued that school leadership is undergoing a transition from a hierarchical structure to one that emphasizes subject matter expertise and

interdisciplinary collaboration. In their seminal book, Awakening the Sleeping Giant: Leadership Development for Teachers, Katzenmeyer and Moller (1996) acknowledged the potential of teacher leadership to drive educational transformation and development. They employed the metaphor of a dormant giant to describe the potential impact of teacher leadership when harnessed effectively (Crowther et al., 2008).

Other noteworthy contributions to the development of teacher leadership include Lambert's (2003) assertion that all teachers possess leadership skills and should exercise leadership. Furthermore, Lambert argued that power and authority within the school could be manifested outside formal authority arrangements, thereby creating opportunities for teachers to participate in shaping the school's vision and mission. However, Harris (2003) suggested that not all teachers need to assume leadership positions, diverging slightly from the earlier position. Harris (2003) utilized the distributed leadership theory to demonstrate how formal school leaders could delegate authority and responsibilities to teachers. Durrant (2004) argued that neglecting the role of teacher leadership in school reform is unlikely to result in increased capacity, while Katyal and Evers (2004) asserted that teacher leaders possess highly developed pedagogical and social skills that, when appropriately harnessed, can positively impact student engagement.

Teacher leadership is widely recognized and studied in many parts of the world, including the United States, Canada, England, China, Taiwan, and Malaysia (Harris, 2003; Schott et al., 2020). Academic consensus suggests that the growth of teacher leadership depends on several factors that need to be appropriately integrated.

2.2.2.1 Determinants of teacher leadership

Teacher leadership is considered an important element of school leadership, but its growth is contingent upon certain conditions (Harris, 2003). The literature has identified antecedents of teacher leadership, which can be categorized into three groups: teacher determinants, school-level determinants, and supra-school level determinants (Schott et al., 2020).

Teacher determinants refer to factors intrinsic to the teacher that contribute to their identity. These include both learnable traits such as skills and expertise, and immutable features such as personality and gender (Schott et al., 2020). Teachers must possess professional skills, self-awareness, teaching experience, and leadership aptitude to assume leadership roles in the classroom and beyond (Conan Simpson, 2021). Additionally, teacher self-awareness, willingness, and initiative are crucial for the growth of teacher leadership (Cheng & Szeto, 2015). Capacity building can enhance teachers' confidence to assume leadership roles (Harris, 2003).

School-level determinants refer to factors inherent in the school that may promote or inhibit the growth of teacher leadership. School principals play a crucial role in promoting teacher leadership by fostering a culture of collaboration, trust, collegiality, shared decision-making, and effective communication (Conan Simpson, 2021; Helterbran, 2010; Muijs & Harry, 2007;). They can also improve their leadership styles, invest in professional development, and modify school procedures to enhance teacher leadership. Professional development should emphasize the growth of teachers' leadership abilities and knowledge in areas such as group management, mentorship, collaboration, and action research (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). The organizational context, culture, and structure can either support or restrict teacher leadership, and inadequate funding and poor teacher qualifications can significantly affect teacher leadership (Cooper et al., 2016). Teachers can also learn from one another through mentorship, peer coaching, reflection, and observation (Gilles et al., 2018; Little 1995; Stanulis & Bell, 2017).

Supra-school level determinants examine variables outside the school. For example, the government can provide pre-service and in-service teacher leadership training and certifications and incorporate teacher leadership into the national curriculum for teacher education and inspection standards (Supovitz, 2015). Similarly, networks and groups such as teacher unions can offer opportunities for the development of teacher leadership by advocating for policies that support it (Osmond-Johnson, 2015).

In summary, the growth of teacher leadership requires careful consideration of teacher factors and contextual variables. When fully developed, teacher leadership provides numerous benefits for students, schools, and communities.

2.2.2.2 Benefits of teacher leadership

Teacher leadership holds immense potential for fostering positive outcomes across various domains, including the teacher, students, school, and greater community. Teacher leadership plays a crucial role in shaping the culture of schools, promoting collaboration, and supporting a positive school atmosphere (Allen, 2017; Schott et al., 2020; Visone, 2020). As teachers possess extensive experience in the classroom, they are well-positioned to exert individual and collective influence over curriculum development and other reform initiatives. Snoek et al. (2014) found that teacher leaders not only encourage curriculum reform but also foster a healthy organizational culture.

Furthermore, teacher leadership holds inherent benefits for teachers themselves, with research demonstrating that teachers who engage in leadership activities experience greater job satisfaction (Allen, 2017; Jacobs et al., 2016; Lee Bae et al., 2016). The collaborative and supportive nature of teacher leadership also enhances teachers' confidence and problem-solving abilities in the classroom (Allen, 2017; Berg & Zoellick, 2019; Criswell et al., 2018). In addition, embracing teacher leadership can result in personal benefits, such as financial compensation or higher standing within the school, district, and greater community (Allen, 2017; Berg & Zoellick, 2019; York-Barr & Duke, 2004).

Teacher leadership also has a significant impact on students, as it contributes to the development of better teachers who possess greater self-awareness and job satisfaction (Conan Simpson, 2021). This, in turn, positively influences students indirectly, resulting in instructional enhancements, peer support, mentoring, coaching, and improved student achievement (Avsec, 2016; Liu, Liu, & Xie, 2018). Properly developed teacher leadership in schools also enhances student engagement, particularly in inquiry-based education and technology literacy development (Avsec, 2016), and influences students' educational motivation significantly (Lu et al., 2016; Öqvist & Malmstrom, 2018).

Beyond the classroom, teacher leadership also contributes to improved parental engagement and trust in the school, as parents observe teachers exercising autonomy in establishing school culture and curriculum (Conan

Simpson, 2021). Additionally, teacher leaders often participate in district- or state-level initiatives and policy formulation, expanding their sphere of influence over time and assuming positions of leadership in professional groups (Liljenberg, 2016), influencing policy (Poekart et al., 2016), and participating in local, state, or national professional learning communities (Conan Simpson, 2021).

Overall, the benefits of teacher leadership are numerous and essential for the teacher, students, school, and community at large. Sebastian, Huang, and Allensworth (2017) conducted a significant study to evaluate the outcomes of teacher leadership at different levels and found that teacher leadership moderated the relationship between principal leadership and professional development, learning climate, and teacher-parent trust, highlighting the importance of developing and promoting teacher leadership across all contexts. Nevertheless, It is essential to have a comprehensive understanding the various dimensions of teacher leadership proper research and development.

2.2.2.3 Dimensions of teacher leadership

There have been numerous attempts to establish a framework for the discussion and analysis of teacher leadership. Nonetheless, as with its conceptualization, no general framework has been adopted. Thus, various authors construct their own paradigm of teacher leadership.

Webber and Nickel (2021) established six characteristics of teacher leadership after conducting a document analysis: professional, legal, values, student diversity, 21st century competencies, innovative curriculum and student involvement, and community participation. The professional dimension emphasizes the necessity for teacher leadership to acknowledge and respect the formal institutions within the school community, as it is counterproductive to dismiss, oppose, or resist these structures, since they are essential for effective teacher leadership. Second, the legal dimension necessitates that teacher leaders are cognizant of their legal responsibilities, such as avoiding releasing students' confidential information. The values component emphasizes the necessity for teacher leaders to convey high student expectations while believing in the learning potential of all students. Teacher leaders are expected to exhibit

expertise in addressing student diversity, such as respecting the individual rights, privacy, and confidentiality of students and minimizing segregation. The 21st century competencies pertain to the teacher leader's capacity to foster active citizenship among students while fostering their learning-to-learn skills. Webber and Nickel (2021) highlighted the curriculum and student involvement dimensions of teacher leadership. To ensure student involvement, teacher leaders collaborate to develop novel curricula and use non-traditional ways of education. It also involves measuring student progress regularly and correctly so that students can reflect on their learning. Finally, teacher leadership requires teachers to engage organizations and community members outside the classroom.

Katzenmeyer and Moller (2013) have a somewhat divergent viewpoint. In an earlier study, the authors determined that teacher leadership consisted of three primary components: leadership of students or other teachers, leadership of operational tasks, and leadership through decision making or partnership (Katzenmoyer and Moller, 2001). Subsequently, they hypothesized that teacher leadership is founded on four dimensions: (1) enhancing the organization's capacity by maximizing teachers' and students' ability to adapt to change and by encouraging students to reach their highest cognitive potential; (2) establishing a system of democracy in schools through shared leadership and cooperation; (3) empowering teachers through participation in decision-making and recognizing their voice; and (4) enhancing teacher professionalism so that they exercise greater autonomy in their work.

Lambert (1998) noted that teacher leadership consists of two essential components: broad-based participation and skilful participation. In broad-based involvement, many people, including teachers, students, parents, and community members, participate in leadership. However, in Skilful participation, sensitive leadership positions are reserved for teachers who have exhibited a particular leadership temperament, knowledge, and skills.

Day and Harris (2003) investigated four facets of teacher leadership. First, teacher leaders implement school policy in their classrooms. Second, the position of the teacher leader flourishes under participative leadership when teachers have a feeling of ownership and participation in school development. Thirdly, teacher leadership is a position of mediation in which teachers are viewed as

credible providers of knowledge and information. Lastly, teacher leadership promotes mutual learning through teacher collaboration.

Crowther et al. (2008) introduced a novel framework for comprehending teacher leadership. They argue that teachers exert influence in the school community by communicating beliefs about a better world, facilitating learning communities, pursuing pedagogical excellence, confronting barriers in the school's culture and structure, translating ideas into sustainable systems of action, and fostering a culture of success.

Conan Simpson (2021) developed a more complete teacher leadership theory based on the work of prior scholars. She identifies five stages of teacher leadership: the student level, the teacher level, the school level, the parent or family level, and the community or state level. At the student level, the focus of teacher leadership is on improving classroom practices, creating student leadership, fostering equity, and encouraging student activism beyond the classroom. Teacher-level, teacher leadership stresses teacher ownership of school transformation and innovation, teacher cooperation, coaching, mentoring, and conducting professional development activities. School-level teacher leadership involves curricular leadership, engagement in school improvement planning, leading initiatives and professional development, and action research. Parent or family level teacher leadership involves collaborative efforts with parents in event planning and school development, as well as advocacy for parents and families at the school level. At the state or municipal level, teacher leadership presents itself through student advocacy, participation in professional learning communities, and advisory responsibilities to state and local agencies.

Obviously, the majority of teacher leadership dimensions frequently described in the literarture occur at the school-level. Often mentioned sub-components of school-level teacher leadership include professional development, action research, cooperation, participation in decision-making, initiatives and projects, and co-creation of a strong school culture (Köse, 2019). These frequently mentioned characteristics are holistic, and have an administrative undertone.

Notwithstanding, few studies offer insight on aspects of classroom teacher leadership. It entails fostering pleasant and supportive relationships with students, meticulous planning and organizing of instruction, and monitoring

student activities (Khany & Ghasemi, 2021). Building a favourable relationship with students is crucial because it increases students' drive for goal attainment and aids in regulating their classroom conduct (Chen, 2005; Hughes et al., 2001). Darrin Thomas (2014) outlined five characteristics of teacher leaders, including the use of a range of teaching strategies, student engagement, high student expectations, and the establishment of clear lesson objectives. In addition, the classroom teacher leadership dimension includes the demonstration of classroom authority by setting high standards, implementing a reward and punishment system in the classroom, consistently enforcing rules and standards, and encouraging student autonomy through involvement (Bear, 1998). According to Köse (2019), the classroom teacher leadership domain comprises of in-class processes, interaction, motivation, and out-of-school processes, demonstrating that classroom teacher leadership is a form of teacher-student interaction that occurs both within and outside the classroom (for instance, during excursions, sports events and field work).

Although attempts have been made to construct a clear framework for the study of the phenomena, there does not appear to be a consensus over what teacher leadership dimensions constitute. A few commonalities can be taken from past contributions, however, as with the majority of leadership studies, a universally accepted framework for teacher leadership has yet to be embraced. The offered frameworks are, at best, statistically established models from inductive and deductive teacher leadership research (Köse, 2019). Nonetheless, they are predominantly hypothetical depictions or explanations of teacher leadership principles in western cultures (Crowther et al., 2008). Moreover, the analysis of teacher leadership over the years has been predominantly qualitative (Wenner & Campbell, 2017), likely because the operationalization of the concept for a more extensive quantitative study is still in its infancy.

Numerous leadership frameworks have been applied to explore teacher leadership. Yildrim et al. (2008) employed the task-oriented and people-oriented leadership styles paradigm to evaluate whether students passed or failed a specific course. In another investigation, Cheong Cheng (1994) utilized two leadership models: initiating structure (IS) and consideration (CN). Furthermore, the concept of "authentic instructor leadership" has been emphasized in the literature, defining instructors who are self-aware, serve as role models for their

27

students, and cultivate a classroom climate that prioritizes honesty, openness, and positive emotions (Gardner et al., 2005). As a result, there is a need for a quantitative analysis of teacher leadership that employs a distinctive leadership framework, such as the full range of leadership model.

2.2.3 Full Range of Leadership Model

The Full Range of Leadership Model (FRLM), also known as the transformational-transactional leadership theory, is a range of leadership characteristics consisting of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles, which exist as a continuous continuum rather than as independent of each other (Northouse, 2010). According to this theory, every leader demonstrates both transformational and transactional leadership, but each leader demonstrates one style to a greater extent than the other (Bass, 1999). Furthermore, followers find transformational leaders more effective and satisfying than transactional leaders (Avolio & Bass, 1991). The theory is an extension of Burns's (1978) prior works, and it stipulates four components of transformational leadership behaviour (idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration), and three components of transactional leadership behaviour (contingent reward, active and passive management-by-exceptions), as well as the non-leadership dimension, also referred to as the Laissez-faire leadership style. These elements make up the nine leadership factors of the FRLM (Bass & Avolio, 2004b), and describes the three broader leadership dimensions.

Although the FRLM was developed in the field of Management and organizational behaviour (Burns, 1978; Bass & Avolio, 1994), a confirmation factor analysis conducted in a Hong Kong study demonstrated that this model preserved its qualities when applied to the classroom setting (Pounder 2008; as cited in Pounder, 2014). Therefore, teachers' leadership styles encompass both transformational and transactional behaviours (Erdel & Takkac, 2020). The FRLM paradigm permits a more in-depth examination of teachers' leadership behaviours.

2.2.3.1 Transformational leadership style

The most dynamic kind of leadership is transformational leadership (Itzkovich et al., 2020). It was developed by Burns (1978) as part of his research on political leadership (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Transformational leaders, according to Burns (1978), emanate higher-order principles and moral standards with which they empower followers and acquire their commitment to these values and ideals. In other words, transformational leaders assist followers ascend Maslow's hierarchy by transcending their own self-interests (Bass, 1999). It is 'transforming' because it seeks to attain organizational objectives while transforming its followers (Covey, 2007). Transformational leaders, according to the model, display four primary behaviours, including charisma (idealized influence), inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation.

Idealized influence comprises extraordinarily expressive, articulate, and persuasive behaviours (Jacquart & Antonakis, 2015). Since the leader has high moral and ethical standards and leads by example, his followers readily identify with him (Northhouse, 2007). Charismatic leaders can articulate a clear vision for their followers and are prepared to share in their accomplishments and liabilities (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). They prioritize the needs of others before their own.

Second, it is believed that inspirational motivation involves a leader's capacity to express vision in an enticing manner while challenging followers to perform better. Leaders that possess this trait motivate their followers to work diligently and accomplish more than they ever imagined possible. He or she speaks with vigour and optimism (Peng et al., 2021).

Individualized consideration is a characteristic of transformational leaders that regard their followers as unique individuals, paying close attention to each of them and offering support and encouragement to those in need. The leader is attentive to the needs of the followers and acts as a mentor or coach. He recognizes and values the contributions of team members (Peng et al., 2021).

Intellectual stimulation is a prevalent characteristic of leaders who push their followers' thought patterns so they can approach challenges and circumstances differently (Balwant et al., 2019). Here, leadership encourages followers to be

inventive and creative, as well as to question their own thought patterns, assumptions, and beliefs, and those of the leader (Northouse, 2010).

2.2.3.2 Transactional leadership style

Transactional leadership is defined by exchanges and transactions between leaders and followers, based on an agreed-upon discussion of the incentives that result from the fulfilment of specific requirements (Bass and Avolio, 1994). It is a task-oriented leadership style in which followers are rewarded for performing and behaving as expected, while negative performance or behaviour is punished (Peng et al., 2021). The ability of transactional leaders to influence people through rewards and punishments is the source of their power. Transactional leaders are realists who are opposed to change; they like to maintain the status quo (Peng et al., 2021). They disregard the specific requirements and personal growth of their followers (Northouse, 2010). This leadership quality can be useful for guaranteeing organizational effectiveness, task completion, and high performance; but it is unlikely to inspire followers' long-term dedication and passion (Northouse, 2010). Three characteristics define Transactional Leadership: contingent rewards, active management-by-exception, and passive management-by-exception.

A leader demonstrates contingent reward when he pays his subordinates for achieving organizational objectives. Leaders are engaged in establishing expectations and agreements with followers and exchanging them for promises when the conditions are satisfied (Northouse, 2010). The second component of Active management-by-exception consists of active feedback and negative reinforcement (Northouse, 2010). It is adopted by leaders who consistently monitor the behaviour and actions of followers to prevent deviance from predetermined guidelines and take remedial action when rules are broken (Northouse, 2010). Leaders who rarely act unless there is a break from the established standard are characterized by passive management-by-exception. Followers are granted latitude if they adhere to directions. The transactional leader adores the status quo and strives to preserve it using reward and punishment on followers (Bass, 1985).

2.2.3.3 Laissez-faire leadership style

Laissez-faire leadership moves further away from transactional leadership on the leadership spectrum and is defined by the absence of leadership and the wilful avoidance of any leadership obligations (Northouse, 2010). Laissez-faire leadership is unconcerned with task accomplishment and cares nothing for followers. In addition, laissez-faire leaders rarely establish criteria, provide performance evaluation, or are involved (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016).

The leadership dimensions addressed above are distinct from one another. Transformational leadership looks to be more relationship-oriented due to its emphasis on follower involvement, enhancing followers' awareness of the significance of collective goals, and winning their commitment to achieving those goals (Peng et al., 2021). Transactional leadership, on the other hand, is more task-oriented, exchanging rewards for task accomplishment. Moreover, transformational leadership style is the most effective form of leadership, followed by transactional leadership style. Laissez-faire leadership style is the least effective according to the model.

Despite their conceptual differences, transformational leadership greatly enhances transactional leadership, resulting in improved outcomes at the individual, group, and organizational levels (Bass & Avolio, 1994). In other words, transformational and transactional leadership are not incompatible nor mutually exclusive (Anderson 2017; White, 2018; as cited in Ronksley-Pavia & Neumann, 2022). Consequently, a combination of the two leadership styles is required for effectiveness (Balwant, 2022; Pietsch & Tulowitzki, 2017).

2.2.3.4 Multi-factor leadership questionnaire

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), which Bass and Avolio later modified to the MLQ (5X Short), was developed concurrently with the FRLM (Bass & Avolio, 2004) to measure followers' perceptions of the leader's behaviour based on the three dimensions of the FRLM. In addition, it assesses three

leadership behaviour outcome variables, namely extra effort, leader effectiveness, and follower satisfaction (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Extra effort indicates how followers see a leader's ability to motivate them to persevere in a task. The second outcome, leader effectiveness, relates to how well a leader executes their responsibilities. Lastly, satisfaction measures how pleased the followers are with the leadership style (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Pietsch & Tulowitzki, 2017). Prior research demonstrates that the MLQ-5X short is reliable for measuring the same constructs across different groups (Antonakis, 2001).

2.2.3.5 Criticisms and strengths of the Full Range of Leadership Model

The Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM) has been widely recognized as a prominent leadership paradigm with cross-border applications. However, despite its popularity, the FRLM has faced criticisms over the years. One criticism is that the MLQ scale used to operationalize the FRLM components fails to capture the positive dimension of passive leadership, such as delegation and empowerment. Secondly, the FRLM fails to identify a substantial number of destructive leadership behaviors that are essentially active but ineffective (Itszkovich et al., 2020).

While the FRLM considers passive leadership styles as unsuccessful, literature has found a few active, yet negative leadership constructs. Furthermore, traditional classifications between transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership have revealed considerable inconsistencies. For instance, it is suggested that contingent reward, a component of transactional leadership, is favourably correlated with transformational leadership, while passive management-by-exception and laissez-faire leadership are positively correlated and may be readily grouped together.

To address the shortcomings of the FRLM, Itszkovich et al. (2020) proposed a new model called the Complete Full Range Leadership Model (CFRLM). The CFRLM combines transformational leadership components and contingent reward into an active constructive leadership (ACL) and combines the active and passive management-by-exception elements of transactional leadership with

laissez-faire leadership to create passive destructive leadership (PDL). Delegation, which was absent from the FRLM, is established as a new dimension known as the passive constructive leadership (PCL) component, followed by the active destructive leadership (ADL) component. These four characteristics of leadership (ACL, ADL, PDL, and PCL) are combined to create the CFRLM.

However, the CFRLM is still in its infancy, as there is no evidence of its validity and usefulness in the research field. Moreover, the author did not provide a valid operationalization tool for the CFRLM. Therefore, due to its inherent flaws and lack of development, the CFRLM cannot be utilized in this investigation. Although the FRLM takes a positivist approach to leadership, it remains the ideal framework due to its broad applicability and validity.

2.2.4 The full range of teacher leadership

Teachers who demonstrate genuine concern for the academic progress of their students are exemplifying transformational leadership. Such leaders enthusiastically address the requirements for academic success, emphasizing the importance of dedication to studying. Additionally, they foster critical thinking skills by posing thought-provoking questions and challenging commonly held beliefs in the classroom. Transformational teacher leaders often provide individualized instruction and may even offer extra assistance outside of regular class time. They set high standards for both themselves and their students and strive to meet them.

In contrast, teachers who exhibit transactional leadership tend to focus solely on completing the given task and may use incentives such as bonuses, points, and stars to motivate students to remain on task. Some may rely on negative reinforcement to remove obstacles to learning, while others only respond when classroom instruction or procedures are not being followed.

Lastly, laissez-faire teacher leaders tend to take a "hands-off" approach to classroom leadership, showing little concern for the individual and collective needs of their students. They rarely set performance standards for students and provide little to no feedback on completed assignments. This approach is an ineffective method of leading in a school setting and demonstrates little regard for students and their work (Poels et al., 2020).

Empirical findings suggests that transformational teacher leadership is advantageous. Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) found that transformational teacher leadership had a modest indirect effect on student outcomes, based on analysis of around fifty earlier research. More so, Bolkan and Goodboy (2009) discovered a moderate to strong correlation between transformational teacher leadership characteristics and student achievement. A Mexican study (Almazan Anaya et al., 2014) investigated the role of teachers as leaders in educating gifted children and found a relationship between teacher leadership and students motivation and engagement, using technology, individualised consideration, and inspirational motivation. Two components of transformational leadership, inspirational motivation and individualized consideration, were pronounced in this investigation, and the display of these characteristics by teachers led to increased student satisfaction and investment in learning. Furthermore, Silins and Mulford (2004) found that the work of teachers had a significant direct effect on student engagement. Interestingly, Berghdal and Bond (2022) reported that classroom leadership affected (dis)engagement in a mixed learning setting.

Research has predominantly focused on the transformational aspect of the Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM) in the study of teacher leadership. Balwant et al. (2019) investigated the mediating effects of student engagement on the relationship between transformational teacher leadership and student outcomes and identified student engagement as a crucial factor in this relationship. Moreno-Casado et al. (2022) analysed the relationship between transformational leadership among teachers and student needs satisfaction, discovering that transformational leadership positively predicted needs satisfaction and negatively predicted needs frustration in various disciplines, whereas transactional leadership predicted needs frustration. Passive leadership predicted needs satisfaction negatively and frustration positively.

University-based research has demonstrated intriguing results regarding the influence of the transformational-transactional leadership paradigm on components of the FRLM outcomes. Pounder's (2008) research on the influence of classroom leadership styles of Hong Kong university teachers on FRLM outcomes revealed a significant association between all transformational leadership components and the three leadership outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction. Pounder (2008) also observed that certain

aspects of transactional leadership, such as contingent reward and active management-by-exception, were significantly and positively correlated with those leadership outcomes. Similarly, Kim's (2012) research reported higher levels of satisfaction, extra effort, and perceived effectiveness among professors who exhibited both transformational and transactional leadership characteristics. Bogler et al. (2013) found an association between transformational leadership in the classroom and student satisfaction. Transformational leadership behaviours was connected with traditional learning outcomes in a college learning environment, including affective learning, motivation, student participation, and motivation (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009). Bolkan and Goodboy (2011) indicated in a subsequent study that the intellectual stimulation dimension of a teacher's transformational leadership can increase intrinsic motivation in the classroom by fostering an engaging classroom environment. Balwant (2016) observed a strong correlation between transformational leadership characteristics of university instructors and motivation, contentment with instructors, favourable attitudes toward the module, and academic success. However, these results may differ in the secondary school teacher leadership context, highlighting the need for further research.

Several relationships may exist between the FRLM and moderating variables such as gender, grade level, and socioeconomic status. Walumba and Ojode (2000) observed that female students evaluated their classroom teachers higher than their male peers on transformational leadership aspects. Li and Liu (2020) hinted that leadership techniques may vary throughout schools since schools that serve low-income students confront greater obstacles. Consequently, Liu (2021) found that schools serving students from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds have much less teacher leadership. Moreso, Silins, and Mulford (2004) acknowledged the direct effect of teachers' work on students' participation, which was minimal among socioeconomically disadvantaged students.

There is little evidence that task-oriented leadership style correlates more strongly with student outcomes than relationship-oriented leadership orientations (Robinson et al., 2008). For instance, Wallace, Ye, and Chuon (2012) observed that mechanical teaching led to reduced student participation in classroom activities. In contrast, students reported greater success in courses when

teachers exhibited people-oriented leadership as opposed to task-oriented leadership (Yildrim et al., 2008).

2.2.5 Teacher leadership in the Nigerian context

According to the existing literature, leadership exhibits varying forms depending on cultural and situational contexts. Several significant contextual factors may have either favourable or unfavourable, direct or indirect consequences on teacher leadership, particularly in the secondary school context of Nigeria. This section provides a brief overview of senior secondary education in Nigeria, followed by an examination of various factors that may impact teacher leadership, including school type, the leadership practices, and ideologies of principals, as well as intrinsic teacher-related factors.

2.2.5.1 Overview of the Nigerian secondary education system

The educational system in Nigeria follows a 9-3-4 structure, encompassing nine years of basic education, three years of upper secondary education, and a minimum of four years of higher education (Oladipo et al., 2016). The National Policy on Education (NPE, 2004) outlines the primary objectives of secondary education as preparing students for active participation in society and facilitating their success in higher education. The secondary curriculum is typically academic and vocational, aimed at developing students' knowledge and skills (Ige, 2013). Upper secondary education, comprising Senior Secondary Schools (SSS) 1 to 3, employs English as the medium of instruction for most subjects and requires students to study a minimum of seven subjects, including English language, Mathematics, Civic education, a major Nigerian language, a science, art, or vocational subject (Ige, 2013; Ogunode, 2020). The administration and management of education in Nigeria are shared between the federal and state governments, with the former having greater control (Ogunode, 2020).

The history of secondary education in Nigeria began with private missionary organizations, such as the Church Missionary Society (CMS) and the Wesleyan Methodist Society, establishing both primary and secondary education (Abolade

& Ayotunde, 2018). These organizations aimed to propagate Christianity and impart skills necessary for the colonial workforce. The colonial government passed its first education ordinance in 1882, establishing education boards, aid grants for privately managed schools, and government-owned schools (Ehigiamusoe, 2012). Despite criticism of western education by Nigerians due to its lack of relevance to their needs, it laid the foundation for the growth of secondary education in Nigeria. After gaining independence, the Nigerian government took over all private schools, but the introduction of universal primary education in 1976 led to a surge in enrolment and the government allowing private sector participation at all levels of education (Ogbiji & Ogbiji, 2014). Currently, there are two types of secondary schools in Nigeria: government-owned, also referred to as public secondary schools, and private secondary schools.

2.2.5.2 Secondary school types in Nigeria

The distinction between state-owned, public secondary schools and privately run secondary schools in Nigeria are noticeable. Private schools are owned and funded independently from the state (Day et al., 2014), whereas public schools are administered by the federal and state government (Olasehinde & Olatayo, 2014). In addition, private secondary schools offer superior infrastructure compared to public schools (Ehigiamusoe, 2012), a smaller student-teacher ratio, and a safe and friendly school environment (Olasehinde & Olatayo, 2014). In terms of the quality and conditions of service for teachers, private schools have greater levels of teacher qualification and accountability (Donald et al., 2018), high quality teaching and higher levels of teacher presence (Day et al., 2014), and some private schools pay higher salaries than public schools (Alimi, 2012). According to research by Duflo et al. (2011), teachers at public schools are less motivated than contract teachers in private schools. These key factors significantly influence parents' preference for private secondary schools over public secondary schools (Day et al., 2014). However, private secondary schools are not so affordable.

While being available to the majority of the population, public secondary education is not without challenges. Many setbacks have been reported in Nigerian public secondary schools, including subpar and inadequate learning infrastructure, mismanagement, deteriorating standards, and classroom overcrowding (Ehigiamusoe, 2012). More worrisome is the low quality and number of teachers in most public schools, who have inadequate teaching credentials, exhibit bad professional conducts, and have low morale due to poor salary and working circumstances (Ige, 2013; Ehigiamusoe, 2012). These obstacles have an impact on the quality of pedagogical practices (Akindele, 2013; as cited in Agi, 2019) The terrible condition of the majority of public secondary schools in Nigeria created a void, necessitating private sector's participation in educational services provision.

Secondary schools in Nigeria are also differentiated by cost. According to the evidence, private schools are more expensive than public schools in terms of school fees and other attendance-related expenses (Day et al., 2014). Thus, socioeconomic status determines access to these schools (Donald et al., 2018), leaving less financially capable parents with fewer school options. Parents who eventually enrol their children in private secondary schools make significant sacrifices. Thus, parents demand greater accountability and are more engaged in decision-making (Olatoye & Agbatogun, 2009). There is substantial evidence that teachers in private schools are more likely to respond to parental demands (Day et al., 2014), and in some instances, this constitutes a threat to teachers' professional autonomy and is likely to affect their leadership practices and effectiveness. Furthermore, to be financially viable, private schools are market-sensitive in their efforts to attract and retain students (Day et al., 2014), and this has negative implications for teachers' autonomy and leadership. It is important to note that private schools are not entirely autonomous of the government because they depend on the government for school approval, educational policy, and instructional materials. Moreover, they adhere to the national curriculum and assessment system (Day et al., 2014). In essence, private secondary schools have better inputs than public secondary schools, and this can have a significant impact on teacher leadership practices and outcomes.

It is essential to recognize that private education in many low- and middle-income nations is not a homogeneous sector. In other words, private schools are

divided into distinct groups based on their quality, location, and tuition rates. Donald et al. (2018) refer to a group of private schools as low-cost (or low-fee) private schools, which are essentially non-state schools that provide inexpensive educational services for the impoverished majority. These schools charge less than 10% of the family income of low-income families (Donald et al., 2018). Several studies address the crucial role that low-cost private schools play in expanding access to education in a number of global south cities. 59% of children from low-income families in Lagos state have access to basic education given by low-cost private schools (Donald et al., 2018). However, the majority of the poorest students are unable to attend these private schools due to the cost (Akaguri, 2014), and households that are able to send their children to these low-cost private schools spend 44% of their annual income to send a child to private schools in Lagos state (Härmä, 2011). Hence, socioeconomically disadvantaged kids continue to rely mostly on public schooling systems. In addition, there are worries that the quality of education provided by low-cost private schools is insufficient, as these schools struggle to obtain government approval and use incompetent teachers to save money (Donald et al., 2018). In addition, low-cost private schools confront the same issues as public schools, including inadequate teaching and learning facilities, inadequate teaching staff, and substandard execution of the curriculum (Ogbiji & Ogbiji, 2014). Hence, there are similarities between public secondary school and low-cost private secondary schools.

Higher-priced (or high-fee) private schools represent the opposite extreme of the private school continuum. They have commendable inputs such as smaller class sizes, more qualified teachers, and faster school progression (Donald et al., 2018). Intriguingly, there are variations in outcome and performance between low-cost and high-cost private schools in comparison to public schools, with high-fee private schools in India having a significant edge over low-fee private schools and public schools (Chudgar & Quin, 2011). Children from the poorest households attend public secondary schools and low-cost private schools, whilst students from the wealthiest families attend High-fee private schools. Inductively, the leadership repertoires of classroom teachers in these settings may vary.

2.2.5.3 Principal leadership in Nigeria

Early African leadership theories shed light on the nature of school administration in Nigeria. This leadership era was marked by traditional, hierarchical, customary leadership (Kisangani & Pickering, 2011). Although there were several forms of leadership during that time period, communalism was a major characteristic of leadership; that is, it was a type of leadership that compelled everyone, including the leaders, to live for and by the society (Asadu & Aguinam, 2019). Additionally, the phrase 'Ubuntu leadership' is used to define an African leadership philosophy that acknowledges the interdependence of a community's members (Brubaker, 2013), as well as the significance of participation and divinity of leadership (Ugwu et al., 2022). During the pre-colonial era in Nigeria, leadership was a collective role involving the traditional ruler and his team (Ugwu et al., 2022), and any choice made was widely accepted by community members because such decisions were typically people centred. Although the African leadership of the century was marked by a high power distance, leaders enjoyed the loyalty of their followers because they were concerned with the development of the society (Hofstede, 2011).

While colonialism brought about significant prosperity in many parts of Africa, it assured the subordination of African culture, particularly African leadership culture (Vickers 2020). It has been observed that school administrators are significantly affected by Western management practices. The government's demands, expectations, and pressure have an imposing effect on the leadership of public schools, which must follow directives from the education ministries and departments. Nonetheless, there are certain advantages to western principal leadership, since it was shown to promote delegation and the equal participation of both genders in leadership (Ugwu et al., 2022).

Clearly, a variety of western leadership paradigms are adaptable to principal leadership in Nigeria. The literature identifies a variety of leadership paradigms, including democratic, instructional, transformational, and distributed leadership approaches (Bush & Glover, 2013b). In a study on the perceived knowledge and practice of transformational leadership among secondary school principals in Nigeria, Money (2017) found that despite the principals' general knowledge of

transformational leadership, they expressed doubts about their ability to transform the school and teachers. Principals in that study viewed themselves as the most important individuals in the organization and preferred to make decisions without including their subordinates. In a thorough analysis of the literature, Bush and Glover (2016) found that the prevalent leadership style employed by West African principals was managerial, which emphasized accountability to hierarchy. Money (2017) defines managerial leadership as a traditional type of leadership in which a rigid line of command is formed and must be followed by subordinates, as the school's chief executive, in this case the school principal, makes most of the decisions. According to a study conducted by Adegbesan (2013), the management style of principals in Ogun state, Nigeria, was aggressive and improper towards teachers. The predominant leadership methods of private secondary school principals were supervision of teachers, enforcement of specified norms, and productivity enhancement (Besong, 2013). In Edo state, Ofeoegbu et al. (2013) identified a variety of leadership techniques among secondary school principals, including transformational, transactional, servant, and strategic leadership styles, with transformational leadership being the most prevalent at 32%. A few studies also indicated that Nigerian school principals lacked leadership in administrative areas such as school monitoring and teacher supervision (Ifedili, 2015; Ayandoja et al., 2017).

Positive models of principal leadership have been highlighted in the literature. Obineme et al. (2020) discovered an abundance of democratic leadership practices in schools, including the delegation of responsibilities, the active participation of teachers in decision-making, and the freedom for teachers to express their opinions on school activities. Based on teachers' self-reports, Bada et al. (2020) found considerable evidence in support of Principal's instructional leadership. Thus, the leadership of secondary school principals varies across schools, with managerial leadership being the most prevalent style. Money (2017) criticized the traditional form of leadership prevalent in most secondary schools today for disregarding the needs, contributions, autonomy, and roles of schoolteachers.

Hence, the leadership styles of school principals have a significant impact on teachers, who may imitate these patterns in the classroom. This is confirmed by Bush and Glover (2016), who predict that teachers who frequently encounter

41

traditional, administrative leadership models will likely adopt these ideologies. In addition, Bada et al. (2020) noted that the instructional leadership of a teacher might be influenced by the leadership of the principal, which in turn could affect the efficacy of teachers in the classroom and the learning of students. This view is relevant in the Nigerian public secondary education system, where an apprenticeship model to leadership training is observed (Bush & Glover, 2016).

2.2.5.4 The Nigerian teacher

The major role played by Nigerian teachers in the education sector and broader society has been extensively studied in the literature. The teacher is essential to the teaching-learning relationship and is trained to facilitate classroom learning for the attainment of predetermined objectives (Chukwu, 2019). Furthermore, the teacher is considered as a reservoir of knowledge with the task of transferring knowledge, skills, and attitudes to students to promote their behavioural change and development. Agi (2019) stated that the classroom teacher is accountable for implementing the curriculum, which is crucial to the learning process. The primary responsibility of a Nigerian teacher is to urge each student to learn, reduce barriers to learning, and deal with any frustrations faced during the learning process (Adebile, 2009).

Furthermore, there is widespread awareness of the significance of Nigerian teachers. According to the National Policy on Education (NPE, 2004), "No Education system can surpass the quality of its teachers." This is confirmed by Ogunyinka et al. (2015), who state that there can be no significant socio-economic or political development without teachers, particularly qualified, devoted teachers. Similarly, Ukeje (1996) famously stated that education is the gate to development, and that teachers hold the key to this gate. Good teachers produce good students who eventually become good citizens, whilst bad teachers have the reverse effect (Enaibe & Imonivwerha, 2010). Similarly, Chukwu (2019) considers Nigerian teachers as significant nation-building partners. In other words, the Nigerian teacher is both an agent of societal change and a role model for students. Their effect is enduring and permeates every aspect of society (Ogunyinka et al., 2015). In fact, the influence of teachers in the

classroom, educational system, and Nigerian society as a whole is widely acknowledged in the academic literature. Yet, the level of influence held by Nigerian teachers differs from that demonstrated from a position of authority in that it is derived from their professional and pedagogical practices in the classroom. Although this form of leadership receives little attention, it is equally as vital as positional leadership and should be explored and promoted.

Even though there are limited empirical findings on the leadership practices of Nigerian teachers in secondary schools, a number of research demonstrate that these teachers have diverse pedagogical practices. A study of the pedagogical practices of secondary school civic education teachers reveals that they employ traditional, teacher-centred approaches (Magasu et al., 2020). Traditional teaching methods are typically characterized by rote memorization, lecture-based teaching, and student passivity (Gulfoile & Delander, 2014; Umar et al., 2021). In this scenario, the teacher's position is elevated, he is perceived as the subject's authority, and he has a strong need to manage classroom interaction (Hand & Levinson, 2012; Molinari et al., 2013).

Effective classroom management is a commonly advocated teaching technique among Nigerian educators. Onwunyili and Onwunyili (2020) define classroom management as the organization and coordination of classroom activities to facilitate teaching and learning. Student behaviours and activities, classroom furnishings, and facilities are among the elements to be managed. One component of classroom management examined in the literature is the strategies teachers employ to set the tone and acquire students' cooperation, which could impact a teacher's effectiveness in the classroom (Onwunyili & Onwunyili, 2020). Relationship-based classroom discipline strategies and coercive classroom discipline strategies are both referenced in the literature. While relationship-based strategies involve teachers negotiating classroom rules and discussing instances of disobedience with pupils, coercive strategies involve teachers taking punitive measures such as corporal punishment and vocal rebuttal to reduce classroom misbehaviour (Shook 2012; Rydell & Henricsson 2014). According to Rahimi and Karkami (2015), caring educators choose relationship-based over forceful disciplinary tactics. While students believe such professors to be effective (Noddings, 2007), they are consequently more engaged in the classroom. Conversely, the use of forceful strategies has a detrimental effect on learning

(Rahimi & Karkami, 2015). Nonetheless, Onwunyili and Onwunyili (2020) discovered that teachers in the state of Anambra continue to employ coercive classroom management techniques. Biamba et al. (2021) discovered that the democratic leadership practices of Civic education teachers in Southeast Nigeria were negligible.

Evidently, classroom teachers' leadership styles are reflected in their teaching methods. A review of the various teaching strategies in Nigeria reveals that classroom teachers may prefer task-oriented, administrative, teacher-focused, transactional leadership strategies over more empowering leadership strategies. Different environments may be influencing the leadership performance of teachers in the classroom, which is a plausible explanation for this phenomenon.

Summarily, situations have a profound effect on the teacher and his or her leadership inclination. This viewpoint is supported by Biamba et al. (2021), who acknowledge the impact of factors such as teachers' self-perception, content, setting, teaching style, societal norms, and students on their instruction. In a similar vein, Bush and Glover (2016) acknowledge the inherent contextual variables in the study of school leadership and caution against generalizations. For example, classroom teachers who are predisposed to retain authority and control are less likely to permit active student participation (Biamba et al., 2021). The reasons for this orientation may include inadequate teacher training, lack of confidence, knowledge, and skills on the part of the teacher (Lawthong, 2010), students' misperception of certain leadership styles as weak (Morrison, 2008; as cited in Biamba et al., 2021), or constraints and pressure from the curriculum (Howe & Abedin, 2013). Additionally, socioeconomic position can influence the leadership of classroom teachers, as correctly highlighted by (Bush & Glover, 2015). Given that socioeconomic status of households determines school access, it is reasonable to predict that teacher leadership behaviours may vary between public secondary schools with fewer facilities and resources, and private secondary schools, particularly high-fee private schools.

Likewise, the type of principal leadership to which a teacher is exposed influences, to some extent, the leadership disposition of the classroom teacher (Bush & oduro, 2006). Indeed, the beliefs and actions of school administrators have a significant impact on teachers (Stein et al., 2016). Moreover, teachers'

perceptions of their working conditions, including compensation, autonomy, and the availability of learning resources, have a significant impact on their work performance (Agi, 2018), particularly their leadership disposition. Hence, researching teacher leadership in the Nigerian context may reflect a unique cultural nuance.

.

3 DATA AND METHODS

This section describes the research procedures, particularly the research design, data collection, analysis, and management techniques, as well as ethical practices.

The present study employed a survey research design to collect data on students' perspectives regarding the leadership behaviours of their classroom teachers, utilizing the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (5X short). The survey research design is considered appropriate for this study due to its ability to collect data at a single point in time to describe a particular phenomenon or determine the relationship between two variables (Cohen et al., 2018).

Survey research offers several advantages, including its cost-effectiveness, efficiency, and ability to generate numerical data that can be standardized across all participants. Additionally, surveys provide descriptive, explanatory, or inferential information, enabling the support or rejection of hypotheses about the target population. Surveys also allow for the collection of data on a large scale, generalizing about variables in the population possible (Cohen et al., 2018).

Specifically, this study is a cross-sectional survey, which enables the collection of data from different participants at a single point in time, allowing for comparisons to be made between groups. This design is relatively inexpensive and timesaving, and it enables the collection of data from many participants (Thomas, 2022).

However, cross-sectional studies have some limitations. They do not allow for the establishment of causal relationships as they only conduct a one-time evaluation of the supposed cause and effect. Cross-sectional studies are also criticized for their failure to account for individual variations between variables, making them unsuitable for long-term behavioural analysis. Additionally, errors in measurement may occur from the use of faulty instruments. Lastly, the timing of a cross-sectional study may not accurately represent group behaviours (Cohen

et al., 2018; Thomas, 2022). Therefore, it is important to acknowledge these inherent weaknesses of the cross-sectional survey as a limitation of this study.

3.1 Research questions and hypotheses

For improved student outcomes, it is essential to examine the teacher's pedagogical techniques, particularly their classroom leadership behaviours. Thus, the purpose of this study is to investigate teacher leadership in the Nigerian setting, specifically in senior secondary schools of Apo district, Abuja, using the full range of leadership model.

1. What is the prevalent teacher leadership style in senior secondary schools according to students' perception?

    Hypothesis 1: *Based on students' perception, transactional teacher leadership style will be prevalent*.

    Scholarly literature suggests that Nigerian teachers often employ traditional, teacher-centered, and task-oriented teaching methods (Magasu et al., 2020). These approaches are characterized by passive learning, lecture-based instruction, and rote learning among students (Gulfoile & Delander, 2014; Umar et al., 2021). The transactional leadership style shares several similarities with these pedagogical strategies, emphasizing task completion through the use of rewards and punishments for followers. Notably, the leadership style of school principals has been observed to influence the leadership behaviors of teachers (Bush & Glover, 2016). In Nigeria, school principals predominantly adopt a managerial leadership style (Adegbesan, 2013; Besong, 2013; Bush & Glover, 2016; Money, 2017), which may contribute to the adoption of transactional leadership styles by teachers.

2. Do the three teacher leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) predict the leadership outcomes of
a. extra effort;
b. effectiveness;
c. satisfaction?

Hypothesis 2: *Transformational teacher leadership style will predict all three outcomes leadership of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction.*

Prior research has demonstrated a noteworthy correlation between the exhibition of a transformational leadership style by leaders and the three leadership outcomes encapsulated within the full range of leadership model (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bolger et al., 2013; Kim, 2012; Northouse, 2010; Pounder, 2008). Specifically, a more transformational leadership approach is positively associated with self-reported extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction among followers.

3. Does students' perception of classroom teacher leadership differ by teachers' gender and school type?

Hypothesis 3a: *Students perception of classroom teacher leadership will differ by teachers' gender, as female teachers will display more transformational teacher leadership.*

Previous research indicates that, as per the perceptions of followers, female leaders tend to exhibit a more transformational leadership style compared to male leaders (Bass, 1999; Eagly et al., 2003). Accordingly, it is anticipated that comparable results will be obtained in this study.

Hypothesis 3b: *Students perception of classroom teacher leadership will differ by school type, as teachers in private secondary schools will display more transformational teacher leadership than teachers in public secondary schools.*

Differences in context between public and private secondary schools may lead to variations in students' perceptions of transformational teacher leadership. Specifically, teachers in private secondary schools often possess higher qualifications, exhibit higher morale, and receive better remuneration compared to their public-school counterparts (Alimi, 2012; Day et al., 2014; Duflo et al., 2011; Ehigiamusoe, 2012; Ige, 2013). Additionally, private schools generally offer better working conditions, including smaller class sizes and superior teaching and

learning facilities, relative to public secondary schools (Donald et al., 2018; Ehigiamusoe, 2012). Such conditions are known to impact teaching activities in schools (Akindele, 2013; as cited in Agi, 2019) and are expected to influence teacher leadership as well. Moreover, attendance in these two types of schools is socio-economically determined (Donald et al., 2018), such that students from low-income households attend public secondary schools due to their lower costs, whereas those from affluent households attend high-fee private secondary schools. Interestingly, research has indicated that teacher leadership occurs less frequently in schools that serve socio-economically disadvantaged students (Liu 2021; Silins & Mulford, 2004). Therefore, it is expected that reports of transformational teacher leadership will be more prevalent in private secondary schools than in public secondary schools when all of these factors are taken into account.

3.2 Methodology

This study adopts a post-positivist worldview, which embraces the scientific method and an objective universe, yet acknowledges that there are no absolute truths, just stochastic information (Cohen et al., 2018). According to Cohen et al. (2018), post-positivism views the world as multi-layered, and as a result, there is context-dependent, tentative, and imperfect knowledge of various truths of a phenomenon, whose validity must be affirmed, and possibly overturned, in light of fresh evidence. Indeed, there is an objective reality, but numerous realities can coexist in contrast to positivism's singular reality (Cohen et al., 2018). Recognizing the importance of the scientific process and an objective reality is a defining characteristic of this worldview. In this study, the objective reality is the phenomenon of teacher leadership, which has been objectively (and subjectively) studied across cultures and in a variety of contexts for years; as such, it can be said to exist independently of the researcher, consisting of various interacting elements, and can be observed scientifically. Adopting a quantitative research approach, the dimensions of teacher leadership behaviours are operationalized in accordance with the Full Range of Leadership Model to collect numerical data, adhere to an objective data analysis procedure without manipulating variables to identify patterns, and then generalize the findings (Cohen et al., 2018)

Specifically, quantitative research approach is advantageous for this study since it permits the collection and analysis of numerical data to identify trends, make predictions, and generalize conclusions to a larger population (Bahrandi, 2022).

As a cross-sectional survey research, this study collected primary data through a questionnaire to answer the research questions. According to Creswell (2023) cross-sectional surveys are important when there is need to investigate current opinions, beliefs, practices, and attitudes. It is also useful when making comparison between two or more educational groups in terms of opinions, attitudes, and beliefs (Creswell, 2023). Accordingly, the present study sought students' perspectives on teacher leadership, and comparison of their perception will be conducted between two school categories: public secondary schools and private secondary schools. Particularly, data is analysed with respect to the predominant teacher leadership style in Apo secondary schools, and to determine the most likely teacher leadership style to predict extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction.

Cross-sectional surveys are advantageous because they are economical and allow for on-site data collection; they are representative of the entire population and provide descriptive, inferential, and explanatory information; and they provide statistically analysed data (OECD, 2012). In addition, they provide a description of the factors of interest (Cohen et al., 2018), in this case, teacher leadership across schools and from the perspective of senior secondary school students (SSS3). To enable statistical analysis, the multi-factor leadership questionnaire (MLQ 5X short) will be administered to a sample that is representative of the population, and efforts would be made to ensure high response rates (Creswell, 2023).

3.3 Population of the study

The term "population" refers to all individuals or entities from which inferences are to be made (Creswell, 2023). In the context of this study, the population comprises Senior Secondary School 3 (SSS3) students who attend either public secondary schools or private secondary schools with high tuition fees in the Abuja Municipal Area Council (AMAC), Nigeria. Low-cost private schools were excluded from the study as they share similar characteristics with public schools such as

inadequate facilities and teaching staff and are attended mainly by students from low-income households (Donald et al., 2018). Moreover, these schools are sparse in the Apo district as shown by data from the FCT-EMIS.

In addition, the study's population includes all secondary school teachers in AMAC. Due to logistical constraints such as time, financial resources, and accessibility, it was impractical to collect data from the entire population. Therefore, the study used a sample that is representative of the entire population to ensure that the findings are generalizable (Cohen et al., 2012).

The education board was contacted for data on the total number of senior-year students in the Apo district. However, the board was unable to provide such data. According to the FCT-EMIS, there are 1269 senior secondary schools in AMAC, comprising 18 government schools and 1251 private schools. On the other hand, the Apo district has a total of 26 senior secondary schools. Therefore, the study's population consists of the 26 senior secondary schools in the Apo district of Nigeria's federal capital territory.

Since it would prove challenging for students to undertake a comprehensive appraisal of the leadership behaviours of their teachers in a collective manner, the population of the study consisted of teachers of civic education. Civic education is a mandatory subject at the senior secondary education level, as stipulated in the National Policy on Education (NPE, 2004). Consequently, every student is provided with an opportunity to participate in the study.

3.4 Sampling method

Sampling is a crucial aspect of research and involves selecting a subset of the population for analysis to draw generalizations about the target population (Creswell, 2008). The choice of sampling method is influenced by factors such as population diversity, cost, and time constraints. Probability sampling, a rigorous sampling method that involves selecting study participants who represent the entire population, was employed in this study (Creswell, 2008). The use of probability sampling ensures that the characteristics of the entire population are present in the sample, allowing for population-wide generalizations (Creswell, 2008). The larger the fraction of the population

represented in the sample, the smaller the population size, as noted by Krejcie and Morgan in Cohen et al. (2018).

To select all Senior Secondary School (SSS3) students from both public and private schools in Apo, a district in AMAC with characteristics similar to the senior student population, a multistage cluster sampling method was used. Apo district is situated in the southern part of Abuja's city centre and is a rapidly growing area with sufficient infrastructure and basic social amenities. There is a mix of social classes in the area, including the wealthy and less affluent.

Multistage cluster sampling is an iterative cluster sampling method involving two or more stages of sampling since the population of the study is not easily identifiable (Creswell, 2008). The first step is to gather any information about the population that can be easily obtained, followed by a sampling process in stages until a sample that is representative of the population is reached. The population of the study consists of 26 senior secondary schools in the Apo district of AMAC, Nigeria, comprising three public secondary schools and 23 private secondary schools, according to the FCT-EMIS. Access and information requests were sent to all 26 secondary schools in Apo district, with six schools declining and 20 schools granting access. Of the 20 schools that granted access, 13 responded to the request for information about the population of senior-year students, which totaled 1,427.

The next step involved determining the sample size. One approach to estimating sample size is to select enough individuals to conduct statistical analysis (Creswell, 2008). Additionally, Creswell (2008) suggested a minimum sample size of 350 for a survey study. Hence, a sample size of 600 was chosen in this study. A Microsoft Excel spreadsheet was used to list the 20 schools that agreed to participate, and the RAND function was used to determine the number of participants to be selected from each school based on the sample size of 600. Participants were then randomly selected from each school.

3.5 Instrument

Questionnaires are commonly used for data collection in cross-sectional survey research (Cohen et al., 2018). This study employed the multi-factor leadership questionnaire (MLQ 5X short) created by Bass and Avolio (2004) to examine

transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles. In other words, it was created in accordance with the full range of leadership model.

The MLQ (5x short) evaluates the following five behavioural components of transformational leadership: idealized influence behaviour, idealized influence attribution, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. In addition, it assesses three behavioural aspects of transactional leadership: contingent reward, active management-by-exception, and passive management-by-exception. Furthermore, there is a laissez-faire leadership component of the questionnaire. Together, these constructs make up the nine components of the FRLM as assessed by the MLQ. Furthermore, the MLQ examines three leadership outcomes of extra effort, leader effectiveness and follower satisfaction with the leadership. There are 45 items in the MLQ (5X short). Moreover, each of the nine leadership components of the FRLM is measured by four inter-correlated questions that are as uncorrelated as feasible with those of the other eight leadership components (Bass & Avolio, 2004). That is, each leadership construct had four items. In addition, extra effort had three items, effectiveness had four items, and satisfaction had two items.

On a five-point Likert scale, the frequency with which teachers exhibit transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles was determined (i.e., not at all, once in a while, sometimes, fairly often, frequently if not always). The leadership outcomes of extra effort, leader effectiveness, and leader satisfaction were measured using the same scale. According to Bass and Avolio (2004), the MLQ (5X Short) is appropriate for respondents with reading skills equivalent to those of ninth graders in the United States. Consequently, the questionnaire is appropriate for seniors students in this study, who are in their final year of secondary school (SSS3).

Based on the research purpose, the MLQ was adjusted so that it could be administered to senior year students in secondary schools. The modification was based on a previous modification by Pounder (2008), as well as a few revisions from a senior university academic and a colleague at Tampere university. Hence, the questionnaire consisted of two sections: (1) a background segment consisting of the teacher's gender, the student's gender, and the student's age; (2) 20 items to measure the five components of transformational leadership style, 12 items to measure the three components of transactional leadership style, and 4 items to

measure laissez-faire leadership style. Specifically, there are four items each for the five constructs describing transformational leadership style: Four items each for the three constructs describing transactional leadership style. (3) extra effort, leader effectiveness, and leader satisfaction each had three, four and two items respectively.

Pilot testing was performed to determine whether the instrument was suitable for the research sample (Creswell, 2023). According to Creswell (2023), this technique is required to improve or amend the questions, instructions, and format, as well as to assess the items' internal consistency. Consequently, 15 questionnaires were distributed to seniors in both public and private secondary schools. At the end of the process, the students were interviewed to hear their experience about the questionnaires, particularly to determine if there were areas of difficulty, ambiguity or confusion in the questionnaire. The questionnaires were modified somewhat based on the results of the pilot study.

In addition, it was important to evaluate the reliability of the instrument. Calculating an instrument's internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha is one method for determining its reliability (Cohen et al., 2018). Cronbach's alpha is used to calculate the average of all possible split-half reliability coefficients to obtain the inter-item correlation coefficient (Cohen et al., 2018). In social science research, a dependability level of 0.60 or above is regarded acceptable (Anastasi,1990). Table 1 displays the reliability of scales of teacher leadership styles. All leadership dimensions' alpha values exceed 0.60. The Cronbach alpha for the entire instrument was determined to be 0.91.

TABLE 1.   Cronbach's alpha scores for the teacher leadership scales

Leadership dimension	No. of items in scale	Cronbach's alpha
Transformational	20	0.89
Transactional	12	0.62
Laissez-faire	4	0.61
Extra effort	3	0.78
Effectiveness	4	0.69
Satisfaction	2	0.61

A sample of the instrument is included in the appendix (Appendix 2).

Previous studies have evaluated the validity of the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (5X short). Antonakis et al. (2003) investigated the psychometric properties of the MLQ in a sample of more than 3000 respondents and found strong support for its validity. They observed that the MLQ (Form 5x) effectively distinguished the nine components of the Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM). Similarly, Pounder (2008) employed LISREL 8.54 to perform a confirmatory factor analysis of the classroom leadership model of the MLQ (5x short) using the original data from the FRLM as a reference. The results demonstrated a strong goodness-of-fit, indicating that the factor structure of the original FRLM was mirrored in the classroom leadership model. Since its introduction, the MLQ has undergone various modifications and ongoing enhancements aimed at improving its validity and reliability.

3.6 Participants

The study's population comprised civic education teachers, and the total number of student participants was 574. Complete questionnaires were returned by these participants to the researcher's representative, while a few withdrew their participation during administration. Nonetheless, a high response rate of 96 percent was attained, which is deemed commendable (Creswell, 2008). The participants consisted of students from both public ($N = 148$) and private ($N =$

426) secondary schools in Apo district. The assessment was made for both male (*N = 122*) and female (*N = 452*) civic education teachers in secondary schools within the Apo district. Both male (N = 248) and female (N = 326) student participants were involved in the study, and the majority (N = 500) were aged between 15 and 17 years. The background information of the participants is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2.   Descriptive statistics of background variables

Background variables	Frequency (n=574)	Percent
School Type		
Public	148	25.8
Private	426	74.2
Teacher's Sex		
Male	122	21.3
Female	452	78.7
Student's Sex		
Male	248	43.2
Female	326	56.8
Students' Age		
13 – 14yrs	36	6.3
15 – 17yrs	500	87.1
18 – 19yrs	20	6.6

3.7 Data collection

The data collection process involved the self-administration of a pen-and-paper questionnaire in the presence of a competent representative of the researcher. The questionnaire took about 15 minutes to complete, and the representative was properly trained by the researcher to ensure that the questions were well understood. Self-administered questionnaires are known to be effective because they enable the researcher to ensure that the intended meaning of the questions is well communicated (Cohen et al., 2018).

Prior to the data collection phase, two letters were sent to all 26 secondary schools in Apo. The first letter addressed the school principals and requested access to the schools for data collection, and it included details on the purpose of the study, research objectives, and the significance of the study. The second letter also addressed the school principals and requested data on the population of SSS3 students in each school. Of the 26 schools, six declined the requests, while 20 schools granted the requests.

The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter that provided information on the aim of the research, the rights of the participants, the significance of the research, and a guarantee of confidentiality. Verbal consent was obtained from the students since the principal's consent had already been secured. In six of the schools, the questionnaires were dropped off and picked up later, and a teacher was assigned to supervise the administration of the questionnaire in each of these schools. Contact information of the representative was provided in case of questions or difficulty.

The data collection process took place between the 30th of January and the 3rd of March 2023, and the questionnaire was administered to all participants in the 20 Apo secondary schools.

3.8 Data management

Data management is a critical component of good scientific practice. The Finnish Social Science Data Archive (FSD) defines research data management as the process of creating, preserving, and organizing data to ensure its accessibility, reliability, security, and protection throughout the data lifecycle. In order to adhere to scientific standards, it is essential to implement appropriate data creation and storage practices. Specifically, the research data lifecycle includes data processing and documentation during the research phase, and data sharing or archiving after the research is completed (FSD).

For the present study, data was collected via a survey using a revised version of the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (5X Short) from a sample of 600 senior year students in secondary schools located in the Apo district of Abuja, Nigeria. Pen-and-paper questionnaires were self-administered by participants, primarily in the presence of a competent representative of the

researcher. The questionnaire consisted of 45 items designed to gather students' perspectives on teacher leadership behaviours and outcomes. Data was also obtained from school principals regarding the population of senior year students in their schools, mostly through WhatsApp text messages and phone calls.

To protect participants' privacy, data was anonymized, and personal information such as names of participants, schools attended, and names of their teachers were not collected. Only background information about participants' age and school type, and teachers' gender were gathered.

To ensure data reliability, a competent data entry personnel manually entered the data into a password-protected Excel file. Editing was restricted in the Excel worksheet to prevent the data entry personnel from making any changes to the cells, rows, and columns of the original sheet created by the researcher. Data validation functions were also employed in Excel to prevent invalid data from being entered into the cells. The collated data was sent to the researcher via a secured email service, such as Gmail. Duplicate versions of the data were stored on a USB stick and Google drive.

Subsequently, the data in the Excel file was exported to SPSS (IBM SPSS statistics) software, where a visual inspection of the data was conducted. Variable names and labels were entered into the software, based on each item in the questionnaire, and values were assigned to each variable. Additionally, the mean substitution method was used to replace missing data, following recommendations by Creswell (2008) and Bass and Avolio (2004). Data analysis was performed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The mean and standard deviation were used to summarize the students' responses regarding the prevalent teacher leadership styles. Multiple regression analysis and independent samples t-test were also conducted to test hypotheses, observe differences, and determine the relationship between variables.

It is of important to note that the prospective use of the collected data is constrained, as participants were duly informed that the data would be destroyed after its application. Consequently, the data file will be stored by the researcher on Google drive for a period of six months and destroyed afterwards.

3.9 Data analysis

In order to conduct a thorough data analysis, it is imperative to clearly identify the scales of data used in the study. In this study, nominal scales are present in the provided background information, such as teacher gender, student gender, student age, and school type. Nominal scales, also known as categorical data, are not ordered and are classified as discrete variables. On the other hand, the Likert scale items are ordinal scales, which possess both classification and order. However, it is important to note that the distance between each ordinal scale should not be assumed to be the same (Cohen et al., 2018). Furthermore, both nominal and ordinal scales are considered to be nonparametric data, which will inform the selection of statistical tests for this study, including descriptive and inferential statistics.

To ensure accurate data entry, a trained personnel was employed to transfer the responses from the questionnaire to an Excel spreadsheet. Subsequently, it was crucial to assess for data errors and missing data. A visual inspection of the data was conducted to identify isolated values, which are values that could potentially be erroneous. The data was also examined for missing values, which occur when participants do not provide data. The missing data was found to be less than the 15% benchmark recommended by Creswell (2008). Therefore, a mean substitution method was utilized in SPSS to replace missing scores with the average value of the item for all participants.

Further, it is imperative to delimit independent variables from the dependent variables in this study. According to Cohen et al., (2018), an independent variable is not impacted by other variables, in other words, they are independent of other variables. Independent variables can be manipulated and are known to stimulate a response. On the other hand, a dependent variable, when expressed in values is largely dependent on the independent variable. The Independent variable in this study is teacher leadership dimensions of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire styles, while the dependent variable is the teacher leadership outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction. Furthermore, school type (either private or public secondary school), and teachers' gender may act as dependent variables to determine any perceived differences of teacher leadership. IBM SPSS Statistics version 29 was used to analyse the data.

Hypothesis 1: *Based on students' perception, transactional teacher leadership style will be prevalent.*

Descriptive statistical analysis of the data was conducted to answer the first research question. Descriptive statistics gives a summary of the trends and tendencies in the collected data, provides understanding on the variations in scores and the standing of one score in relation to others (Creswell, 2023). For this purpose, the mean and standard deviation was used. As a measure of central tendency, the mean describes the responses of all the participants to the instrument (Creswell, 2008). To get the mean, the sum of all the scores for each teacher leadership dimension (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) will be divided by the number of scores. The mean provides an average for all the scores acquired in each dimension. The most prevalent teacher leadership dimension in Apo secondary comes from the dimension with the highest average score. From the mean score, the level of occurrence of each leadership style can be known when compared to the rating scales. Additionally, a mean score of 0 to 0.8 will be rated as "not at all", 0.9 to 1.6 will be rated as occurring "once in a while", mean score of 1.7 to 2.4 as "sometimes", 2.5 to 3.2 will be rated as "fairly often", while a mean score of 3.3 to 4.0 will be regarded as occurring "frequently, if not always". The mean scores of the teacher leadership dimensions will also be useful in calculating other statistics. Furthermore, the standard deviation, which is a measure of variability is used to understand the spread of the scores, in other words, to know how dispersed the responses are to items on the instrument.

Hypothesis 2: *Transformational teacher leadership style will predict all three leadership outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction.*

To test the hypothesis, a multiple regression was performed. Regression analysis is a powerful inferential statistic that enables one to predict the value of one variable when the values of the other variables are known or assumed (Cohen et al.,2018). Particularly, multiple regression allows for the calculation of the effect of two or more independent variables on a dependent variable. The independent variables in this analysis are transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles, while the dependent variables are leadership outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction. The analysis was used

to explore the relationship between the three classroom teacher leadership dimensions and leadership outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction, to determine which classroom teacher leadership style is most likely to predict the leadership outcomes. There are several requirements to be met for multiple regression to be used safely such as having a large sample size, avoidance of multicollinearity, avoiding singularity, all variables being real numbers, ensuring an approximate linear relationship between the dependent and independent variables, ensuring normal distribution of variables, looking out for homoscedasticity, among others (Cohen et al.,2018). These safety checks were run prudently on SPSS, as perfection is impossible (Cohen et al.,2018).

Subsequently, the first regression analysis was run to predict extra effort from the three teacher leadership dimensions of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles. There was linearity as assessed by partial regression plots and a plot of studentized residuals against the predicted values. There was independence of residuals, as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.76. There was homoscedasticity, as assessed by visual inspection of a plot of studentized residuals versus unstandardized predicted values. There was no evidence of multicollinearity, as assessed by tolerance values greater than 0.1. The assumption of normality was met, as assessed by a Q-Q Plot.

A second regression analysis was run to predict effectiveness from the three teacher leadership dimensions of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership. There was linearity as assessed by partial regression plots and a plot of studentized residuals against the predicted values. There was independence of residuals, as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.77. There was homoscedasticity, as assessed by visual inspection of a plot of studentized residuals versus unstandardized predicted values. There was no evidence of multicollinearity, as assessed by tolerance values greater than 0.1. The assumption of normality was met, as assessed by a Q-Q Plot.

Lastly, a multiple regression analysis was run to predict satisfaction from the three teacher leadership dimensions of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership. There was linearity as assessed by partial regression plots and a plot of studentized residuals against the predicted values. There was independence of residuals, as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.99.

There was homoscedasticity, as assessed by visual inspection of a plot of studentized residuals versus unstandardized predicted values.

There was no evidence of multicollinearity, as assessed by tolerance values greater than 0.1. The assumption of normality was met, as assessed by a Q-Q Plot.

Hypothesis 3a, 3b: *Female teachers will display more transformational teacher leadership than their male counterparts. Students' perception of teacher leadership style will differ by school type, as teachers in private schools will display more transformational teacher leadership than teachers in public schools.*

To test the hypothesis, an independent samples t-test was applied. As a measure of variance, the t-test is used to determine if there are statistically significant differences between the means of two (or more) groups, or for the same group under differing situations (Cohen et al.,2018). In this study, the independent samples t-test will be deployed determine if there is a statistically significant difference between the means of the three teacher leadership dimensions between male and female teachers, and in two secondary school contexts in Apo: public secondary schools and private secondary schools. The categorical variables for this analysis are school type (private or public), and teacher's sex (male or female). The means of transformational, transactional, and Laisses-faire teacher leadership styles are continuous variables. The categorical groups are the independent variables, whereas the leadership dimensions are the dependent variables. Cohen et al. (2018) identifies a few safety checks to be conducted before performing an independent samples t-test such as normal distribution of the data, and the equality of variance. Nevertheless, in a situation where there is no equality of variance, the Levene test can be used instead to overcome the problem. This is automatically calculated by SPSS.

Thus, there were 122 male and 452 female participants. Independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in teacher leadership styles between male and female teachers. There were no outliers in the data, as assessed by inspection of a boxplot. Teacher gender were normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p > .05$), and there was homogeneity of variances for transformational ($p = .174$), however the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated for transactional leadership

(p = .002), and Laissez-faire leadership (p = .018), as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances. Female teachers were more transformational (M = 2.53, SD = 0.74) than male teachers (M = 2.29, SD = 0.68), a statistically significant difference, M = 0.24, SE = 0.07, t(572) = 3.197, p = .001, d= -.33. A Welch t-test was run to determine if there were differences in transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles between male and female teachers due to the assumption of homogeneity of variances being violated.

More so, there were 422 private school participants and 148 public school participants. An independent-samples t-test was run to determine if there were differences in teacher leadership styles in public and private secondary schools. School types were normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test (p > .05), and there was homogeneity of variances for transactional (.531) and laissez-faire (.066) leadership styles, however the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated for transformational leadership (.008), as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances.

3.10 Ethical practices

Ethics in research according to Hammersley and Traianou (2012) must follow the principles of minimization of harm; respect for autonomy (and informed consent); and the protection of privacy (addressing confidentiality and anonymity). They are those standards that guide the behaviours of educational researchers. Since the study involved getting responses from participants, the researcher informed them of the purpose of the research and made sure they knew what was required (through a representative). A request for consent was included in the cover letter which was attached to the questionnaire. The researcher made sure that the exercise did not bring any harm to anyone by ensuring the exercise does not cause psychological stress or relational tension between the students and teachers. As such, the participants, as well as the teachers were assured that the research was for educational purposes only, and not a performance evaluation. Furthermore, the principals, as well as the participants were informed of the benefits of this research, which summarily includes the examination and identification of the leadership behaviours of secondary school teachers for the

possibility of more research and development. There was a high response rate as a result. A high response meant an agreement to being a participant.

The privacy of participants was respected. Particularly, they were duly informed of their rights as participants. The anonymity and confidentiality of the participants was respected, as their names was not requested for in the questionnaire. More so, due process was followed when accessing the schools where the research was to be conducted. Request for permission from the school principals to conduct the survey was sent. In the letter, the explained the research aims and objectives, then making sure to gain the trust and cooperation of the participants. The researcher encouraged his representative to establish rapport and trust with the participants, and recognize the participants for their time and cooperation, by giving verbal praise.

Data was carefully compiled and analysed on SPSS. Conscious effort was made not to misrepresent, overstate, or understate the findings of the research.

In addition, the data was reported in a true and fair manner and in a format that is readable. Recognizing those who assisted in the research was done, including my supervisor, participants, and faculty members. A copy of the thesis will be sent across to all twenty secondary school principals who gave permission for the current research to be carried. Copies of the thesis will also be sent to researchers who aided in the identification and selection of the instrument. Additionally, a copy of the thesis will be sent the quantitative research expert who provided guidance in the analysis of the collected data.

As the copyright of the MLQ (5x short) belongs to Bass and Avolio (2004), permission to use and adapt it was obtained from mindgarden.com for the purposes of this study.

4 EXPLORING TEACHER LEADERSHIP IN APO DISTRICT

This Chapter presents the results of the descriptive cross-sectional research described earlier. Adopting the Full Range of Leadership model (Bass & Avolio, 1994), the current research explored teacher leadership in the senior secondary school context in Apo district, AMAC, Nigeria.

4.1 The prevalent teacher leadership style in Apo senior secondary schools.

I hypothesized that transactional teacher leadership will be more prevalent than transformational and laissez-faire leadership dimensions. Interestingly, transformational teacher leadership style was observed to be more prevalent (M = 2.48, SD = 0.73), followed by transactional leadership style (M = 1.99, SD = 0.58). Laissez-faire leadership was the least prevalent (M = 1.30, SD = 0.92). Although transformational teacher leadership is perceived to be more prevalent, the mean score of 2.48 suggests that on average, respondent answers were closer to "fairly often" on the Likert scale, whereas students' average perception of transactional teacher leadership was closer to "sometimes" in the Likert scale. On average, laissez-faire teacher leadership was perceived by students to occur "once in a while". Therefore, secondary school teachers in this school district display a more transformational teacher leadership style fairly often in the classroom. This result is inconsistent with the hypothesis. Table 3 shows a summary of the teacher leadership styles reported by the students.

TABLE 3.   Descriptive statistics of teacher leadership styles

Variable	N	M	SD	Min	Max
Transformational Leadership style	574	2.48	0.73	0.30	4.00
Transactional Leadership Style	574	1.99	0.58	0.17	3.92
Laissez-faire Leadership Style	574	1.30	0.92	0.00	4.00

Note. N = number of responses, M = mean, SD = standard deviation, Min = minimum value, Max = maximum value.

Within the transformational leadership dimension, idealized influence (attributed) had the highest average occurrence ($M = 2.57$, $SD = 0.91$). It means that teachers display of idealized influence (attributed) component of transformational leadership style, was most noticeable based on students' perspectives. In the transactional teacher leadership dimension, contingent reward was perceived to be higher ($M = 2.38$, $SD = 0.87$), indicating that the display of contingent reward was more obvious, based on students' perception. A component-by-component analysis is presented in table 4.

TABLE 4.   Descriptive statistics of teacher leadership dimensions

Variable	N	M	SD	Min	Max
Idealized Influence (Attributed)	574	2.57	0.91	0.00	4.00
Idealized Influence (Behaviour)	574	2.54	0.87	0.00	4.00
Inspirational Motivation	574	2.58	0.91	0.00	4.00
Intellectual Stimulation	574	2.31	0.86	0.00	4.00
Individualized Consideration	574	2.37	0.86	0.00	4.00
Contingent Reward	574	2.38	0.87	0.00	4.00
Mgt. by Exception (Active) MBEA	574	2.17	0.90	0.00	4.00
Mgt. by Exception (Passive)	574	1.39	0.84	0.00	4.00
Laissez-Faire	574	1.30	0.92	0.00	4.00

Note. N = number of responses, M = mean, SD = standard deviation, Min = minimum value, Max = maximum value.

4.2 Relationship between the teacher leadership styles and the leadership outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, satisfaction

I hypothesized that transformational teacher leadership will predict the three outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction.

A multiple regression was run to predict extra effort from the three teacher leadership dimensions of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership.

The multiple regression model statistically significantly predicted Extra Effort, $F_{(3, 570)}$ = 199.35, $p < .001$, adjusted R^2= .51. It also statistically

significantly predicted Effectiveness, F (3, 570) = 181.98, $p < .001$, adjusted R^2 = .49, and it predicted satisfaction, F (3, 570) = 117.497, $p < .001$, adjusted R^2 = .38.

Only transformational leadership style out of the three leadership dimensions added statistically significantly to the prediction of extra effort, $p < .05$. A positive slope coefficient for transformational leadership style (B = 1.02), is indicative that exhibiting a more transformational teacher leadership style is associated with an increase in extra effort, when other independent variables are held constant. Therefore, there is a linear relationship, thereby lending support to the hypothesis. In other words, students will make extra effort in the classroom under a transformational teacher leader. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 5 (below).

TABLE 5.   Multiple regression table for Extra Effort

Extra Effort	B	95% OF CI for B		$SE\ B$	β	R^2	∇R^2
		LL	UL				
Model						.51	.51***
Constant	-.11	-.37	.16	.13			
Transformational	1.02***	.90	1.13	.06	.68***		
Transactional	.10	.05	.24	.08	.05		
Laissez-faire	.00	.08	.07	.04	.00		

Note. Model = "Enter" method in SPSS statistics; B = unstandardized regression coefficient; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = Upper limit; $SE\ B$ = standard error of the coefficient; β = standardized coefficient; R^2 = coefficient of determination; ∇R^2 = adjusted R^2. ***$p < .001$.

Furthermore, transformational, and transactional teacher leadership styles added statistically significantly to the prediction of effectiveness, $p < .05$. A positive slope coefficient for transformational leadership style (B = .77), and transactional leadership (B = .22), shows that exhibiting more of the two leadership styles is associated with an increase in students' self-reported effectiveness, when the other independent variable is held constant. However transformational teacher

leadership appeared to be a stronger predictor of effectiveness due to its higher slope coefficient. As such, a linear relationship was observed between transformational and transactional teacher leadership scores and effectiveness. Therefore, the hypothesis is supported by this finding. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 6 below.

TABLE 6.   Multiple regression table for Effectiveness

Effectiveness	B	95% OF CI for B		$SE\ B$	β	R^2	∇R^2
		LL	UL				
Model						.49	.49*
Constant	.16	-.07	.39	.12			
Transformational	.77***	.67	.87	.05	.61***		
Transactional	.22***	.09	.35	.07	.14***		
Laissez-faire	-.03	-.10	.04	.04	-.03		

Note. Model = "Enter" method in SPSS statistics; B = unstandardized regression coefficient; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = Upper limit; $SE\ B$ = standard error of the coefficient; β = standardized coefficient; R^2 = coefficient of determination; ∇R^2 = adjusted R^2. ***p < .001.

Additionally, transformational leadership added statistically significantly to the prediction of satisfaction, *p* < .05. A positive slope coefficient for transformational leadership style (*B* = .97), is indicative that exhibiting a more transformational teacher leadership style is associated with an increase in students' perceived satisfaction with such leadership, when other independent variables are held constant. Therefore, there is a linear relationship, and the hypothesis is supported. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 7 below.

TABLE 7.   Multiple regression table for Satisfaction

Satisfaction	B	95% OF CI for B		$SE\ B$	β	R^2	∇R^2
		LL	UL				
Model						.38	.38***
Constant	-.06	-.38	.26	.16			
Transformational	.97***	.83	1.11	.07	.60***		
Transactional	.05	-.13	.23	.09	.03		
Laissez-faire	-.01	-.11	.09	.05	-.01		

Note. Model = "Enter" method in SPSS statistics; B = unstandardized regression coefficient; CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = Upper limit; $SE\ B$ = standard error of the coefficient; β = standardized coefficient; R^2 = coefficient of determination; ∇R^2 = adjusted R^2.   ***p $<$ .001.

4.3 Differences in students' perception of teacher leadership according to teachers' gender and school type.

I hypothesized that classroom teacher leadership style will differ by teachers' gender and school type. Accordingly, female teachers displayed more transformational leadership style (M = 2.53, SD = 0.74) than male teachers (M = 2.29, SD = 0.68), a statistically significant difference, M = 0.24, SE = 0.07, t (572) = 3.21, p = .002, d = -.33. However, there was no statistically significant difference between male and female teachers in either transactional scores or laissez-faire scores. The hypothesis is therefore supported. In other words, students in Apo secondary schools perceive their female teachers as displaying a more transformational leadership style than their male counterparts. The results of the analysis of variance are presented in Table 8 below.

TABLE 8.   Results of differences in perception of teacher leadership by
            teachers' gender

	Male		Female					
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*	Cohen's *d*
Transformational	2.29	.68	2.53	.74	572	3.21	.002	-0.33
Transactional[a]	1.92	.46	2.00	.61	251.72	1.72	.087	-0.14
Laissez-faire[a]	1.43	.80	1.26	.95	222.83	1.94	.054	0.18

[a] Welch test is reported because Levene's test indicated that the homogeneity of variances assumption was not met for this variable.

Regarding differences in perception of teacher leadership by school type, there was no statistically significant difference in transactional scores between private secondary schools and public secondary schools. Furthermore, there was no statistically significant difference in Laissez-faire scores between private schools and public schools. Nevertheless, there were more occurrences of transformational teacher leadership behaviours in public secondary schools (*M* = 2.69, *SD* = 0.63) than in private secondary schools. (*M* = 2.40, *SD* = 0.75), a statistically significant difference, *M* = 0.29, *SE* = 0.06, *t* (304.72) = 4.53, *p* < .001, d= -.40. Particularly, in Apo district, students in public secondary schools reported a more transformational leadership style by teachers than students in private secondary schools. Results are presented in table 9 below.

TABLE 9.   Results of differences in perception of teacher leadership by
            school type

School type	Private		Public					
	M	SD	M	SD	df	t	p	Cohen's d
Transformational[a]	2.40	0.75	2.69	0.63	304.72	4.53	.00	-0.40
Transactional	1.97	0.59	2.03	0.56	572	1.11	.29	-0.10
Laissez-faire	1.32	0.94	1.22	0.87	572	1.18	.24	0.11

[a] Welch test is reported because Levene's test indicated that the homogeneity of variances assumption was not met for this variable.

The results in this chapter indicate that secondary school teachers in Apo district were perceived by the students to display a more transformational leadership style than transactional or laissez-faire leadership styles. More so, female teachers displayed a more transformational leadership style than male teachers, and there were more reports of transformational teacher leadership styles in public secondary schools than in private secondary schools. Lastly, transformational teacher leadership style was more likely to predict all three outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction based on students' self-report. Teachers display of a transactional leadership style will only predict effectiveness, while Laissez-faire leadership style showed no predictions. The next chapter, therefore, moves on to discuss the findings.

5 DISCUSSION

This chapter presents a discussion based on the findings of the study that explored teacher leadership in senior secondary schools in Apo district, Abuja, Nigeria. The study adopted the Full Range of Leadership Model (Bass & Avolio, 1994) and collected data from students using a revised version of the multifactor leadership questionnaire as a tool. The primary objectives of the study were to determine the prevalent teacher leadership style, to identify the teacher leadership style that predicts the leadership outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction, and to examine differences in classroom teacher leadership based on teachers' gender and school type, and

The findings of the study revealed that a transformational teacher leadership style is the most prevalent in Apo secondary schools. Furthermore, transformational teacher leadership consistently predicted students' self-reported extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction, whereas transactional teacher leadership only predicted effectiveness. The study also found a significant difference in transformational teacher leadership style by gender and school type. Female teachers were perceived to display a more transformational leadership style than their male colleagues, and more occurrences of transformational teacher leadership behaviours were reported in public secondary schools than in private secondary schools.

5.1 The prevalent teacher leadership style in Apo senior secondary schools

The first hypothesis concerned the predominant teacher leadership style, as perceived by students. Transformational teacher leadership was more widespread in Apo secondary schools, according to the findings of the current study. This study contradicts past research on the pedagogical techniques of secondary school teachers in Nigeria. For example, research on the teaching

techniques of civic education teachers in secondary schools revealed that teachers embraced conventional teaching approaches that were teacher-centred, and task oriented (Magasu et al., 2020), which is characterised by rote learning, lecture-based instruction, and the passivity of learners (Gulfoile & Delander, 2014; Umar et al., 2021). Similarly, Onwunyili and Onwunyili (2020) reported that teachers in the Nigerian state of Anambra used coercive classroom management techniques. In addition, the democratic leadership practises of teachers of Civic Education in Southeast Nigeria were determined to be marginal (Biamba et al., 2021). The focus on tasks shown by these techniques is a defining feature of transactional teacher leadership. Traditional teaching approaches are often used by teachers to guarantee curriculum covering and increase students' performance within a certain time limit. According to the findings of this research, however, secondary school teachers in Apo exhibited a leadership style that was more focused on the students, thereby refuting the hypothesis. Transformational teacher leadership is student-centred because it focuses on satisfying the needs of followers and inspiring them to attain greater ideals, morals, and responsibilities (as in Northouse, 2010).

According to the Full Range of Leadership model (FRLM), transformational leadership style is an active kind of leadership in which the leader lives by a set of high standards and morals and inspires followers to do more than they would ordinarily wish to (Burns, 1978; Itzkovich et al., 2020). In addition, it is the most successful style of leader behaviours due to its potential to accomplish organisational objectives while simultaneously reforming followers (Covey, 2007). Furthermore, transformational teacher leadership is characterised by the following characteristics: idealised influence attribute, idealise influence behaviour, inspiring motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual concern (Northouse, 2010). Based on the results, instructors exhibited idealised influence (behaviour) by really caring about their students' academic development, exuding confidence in the classroom, and demonstrating respect-building behaviour (M = 2.54). They inspired their pupils to learn in the classroom (M = 2.58). Finally, the majority of teachers practised idealised influence (attributed) by periodically communicating their values and ideals with students and by being attentive to the moral and ethical consequences of their classroom actions (M = 2.57). Moreover, they demonstrated individualized consideration by devoting a substantial amount

of time to teaching and leading the students while recognising and responding to their unique needs, talents, and objectives (M = 2.37). The teachers employed intellectual stimulation by fostering 'out-of-the-box' thinking towards classroom objectives or challenges and entertaining multiple viewpoints to problem solving in the classroom, while also encouraging students to do the same (M = 2.31).

Students also acknowledged that teachers sometimes exhibit transactional leader behaviours, but to a smaller extent than transformational leadership behaviour. Transactional leadership is primarily characterised by an interchange between leaders and followers geared at the completion of organisational goals (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Transactional leadership is successful in achieving corporate objectives (Northouse, 2010) due to its focus on task completion via rewards and punishments; nevertheless, it is not as effective as transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Categorically, contingent compensation was prevalent among Apo secondary school teachers, as they were judged to provide detailed explanations about classroom performance expectations, the incentive for high performance, and their pleasure when performance objectives are attained (M = 2.38). The teachers demonstrated active management-by-exception by actively addressing student mistakes and failures, keeping track of them, and bringing them to the students' attention (M = 2.17). Occasionally, the teachers intervened only when issues grew severe and showed hesitation towards difficulties unless they were really severe (M = 1.39). Fewer students (M = 1.3) reported laissez-faire teacher leadership, which is similar to a lack of leadership (Northouse, 2010).

The present research revealing the predominance of transformational teacher leadership in Apo secondary schools has addressed the continuing dispute in the literature on teacher leadership about the teacher's leadership potential. Although some theorists contend that teacher leadership is a school-level exercise reserved for a select few excellent, experienced, and skilled teachers with admirable leadership dispositions and qualities (Crowther et al., 2008; Webber & Nickel, 2021), this study demonstrates that active and effective forms of teacher leadership behaviours are relatively common in the classroom, especially in the Apo secondary school context. This research supports the argument that classroom teachers are capable of leadership and do in fact demonstrate leadership (Lambert, 2003; Pounder, 2006; Roland, 1999; Strodl,

1992; Wilmore, 2007). In contrast, a preponderance of laissez-faire leadership would have supported past assertions, which is not the case in this research. Besides, both transformational and transactional leadership styles are effective leadership behaviours (Bass & Avolio, 1994), with transformational leadership being the most effective. Therefore, the predominance of a more transformational teacher leadership style followed by a transactional leadership style implies that teacher leadership is more frequently displayed in the classroom, than its absence.

Many connections may be seen between this result and the literature on teacher leadership. Webber and Nickel (2021) observed that teacher leaders utilise non-traditional ways of teaching to ensure student involvement, respect students' rights, express high expectations to students, and have faith in each student's learning potential. According to Crowther et al. (2008), teacher leadership encompasses the transmission of a belief in a better world, the facilitation of learning, the confrontation of barriers within the school, the embodiment of pedagogical excellence, the cultivation of a culture of success, and the implementation of ideas. The descriptions of teacher leadership resemble aspects of transformational leadership, including idealised influence, personalised concern, and inspiring motivation. Furthermore, some conceptions of teacher leadership stress its transactional aspect. Darrin Thomas (2014), for instance, listed many teacher leadership behaviours, such as displaying classroom authority by establishing high standards, implementing a reward and punishment system in the classroom, and enforcing rules and standards consistently. These actions are comparable to contingent reward and active management-by-exception, the two defining characteristics of transactional leadership. Undoubtedly, teacher leadership exists in Apo secondary schools. These parallels gives credence to the deployment of the full range of leadership framework, thereby allowing for a deeper understanding of teacher leadership, and the recognition of transformational teacher leadership.

5.2 Teacher leadership styles and the leadership outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, satisfaction.

The second hypothesis concerned the teacher leadership style that would best predict the leadership outcome variables in the MLQ, including extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction. The instrument of the Full Range of Leadership model (i.e., the MLQ 5X short) permits the evaluation of three leadership behaviour outcomes: extra effort, leader effectiveness, and follower satisfaction (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). These factors in the classroom environment pertain to the students' desire to exert additional effort, their perceptions of the effectiveness of the teacher's leadership style, and their satisfaction with classroom teacher leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Pietsch & Tulowitzki, 2017). The results indicate that at secondary schools in Apo, when teachers display a more transformational leadership style in the classroom, students will exert more effort in classroom activities. In addition, classroom teachers who exhibit both transformational and transactional leadership behaviours are likely to be considered effective leaders by their students. Nonetheless, a more transformational leadership style will result in more instances of these sentiments among students than a transactional leadership style. Mores so, transformational leadership behaviours of classroom teachers will likely result in a sense of satisfaction with the leadership style. Apparently, only transformational teacher leadership reliably predicted all three leadership outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction, while transactional teacher leadership predicted just effectiveness. The laissez-faire leadership style shown no prediction.

The results are congruent with the scientific literature. Transformational leadership activities are more likely to predict the three leadership outcomes than transactional leadership behaviours (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Northouse, 2010). Pounder (2008), in a study on the impact of classroom leadership styles of Hong Kong university instructors on the full range of leadership outcomes, found a significant relationship between all components of transformational leadership and the three leadership outcomes, as well as some components of transactional leadership, such as contingent reward and active management-by-exception, in the context of the university. In a similar vein, Kim (2012) noticed more student satisfaction, extra effort, and perceived effectiveness when professors displayed

both transformational leadership and transactional leadership's contingent incentive aspect. In addition, Bolger et al. (2013) found an association between transformational leadership and student satisfaction. There is a correlation between transformational and transactional teacher leadership and student-reported extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction, according to a survey of 107 online university students (Livingston, 2010). While these studies demonstrate a correlation between transformational leadership (and some components of transactional leadership) and the three leadership outcomes, the present study allows for predictions to be made about teacher leadership in the general population, such that a more transformational classroom leadership in Apo secondary schools will most likely result to an increase in students' perceptions of extra effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness.

Interestingly, much research has been undertaken on the numerous outcomes of teacher leadership. In certain circumstances, transformational teacher leadership is shown to have a minimal and indirect effect on student outcomes, but in other studies, its effect is moderate to significant (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). Hence, demonstrating transformational teacher leadership is believed to influence students' engagement, self-efficacy, motivation, emotional learning, and involvement (Almazan Anaya et al., 2014; Bolkan & Goodboy; 2009; Bolkan &Goodboy, 2011; Wilson et al., 2012, 31). Particularly noted in the association between transformational teacher leadership and student outcomes is engagement, demonstrating that a more transformational leadership style has a direct impact on engagement, resulting in higher student outcomes (Balwant et al., 2019; Berghdal & Bond, 2022; Sins & Mulford, 2004). The influence of transactional leadership, on the other hand, is mixed. In one research, transactional leadership behaviour was shown to result in classroom disengagement (Wallace et al., 2012), whilst in another, it was found to be useful in guaranteeing positive students' achievement (Robinson et al., 2008). In contrast, Moreno-Casado et al. (2022) found that Laissez-faire leadership adversely predicts needs satisfaction and positively predicts needs frustration. The results of transformational teacher leadership are more positive than those of other leadership approaches. Undoubtedly, a display of a more transformational teacher leadership style might result in improved student and school success.

Further, the results corroborate prior statements about the application of the full range of leadership model and, by extension, the multifactor leadership questionnaire in a school setting (Pounder 2008; as cited in Pounder 2014). Moreover, it expands on previous findings about the effectiveness of transformational leadership in various circumstances (Northouse, 2010). A comparison of empirical data from other settings with the current research reveals commonalities, confirming the universality and adaptability of the model to many contexts, in this instance the secondary school setting in Apo, Nigeria. Transformational teacher leadership is undoubtedly successful and has the potential to provide additional desired educational outcomes not addressed by the present study.

5.3 Differences in students' perception of classroom teacher leadership according to teachers' Gender and school type

The third research objective is to examine if there are differences in teacher leadership based on the teacher's gender and the type of school. The results indicate that female teachers were perceived to have a more transformational leadership style than their male counterparts. In addition, it was revealed that transformational teacher leadership behaviours were more prevalent in public secondary schools in Apo than in private secondary schools.

As reported in prior studies, the gender disparity in transformational teacher leadership was anticipated. For example, Bass (1999) suggests that female leaders are often more transformational than their male colleagues. In addition, a meta-analysis done by Eagly et al. (2003) indicated that followers rated female leaders as more transformational than male leaders. While Bass (1999) proposed as an explanation for this result that women leaders tend to be more successful because they work more to demonstrate their leadership skills, this argument is not universally accepted. Yet, the notion that women (in this instance, female teachers) are more caring than males is a plausible explanation for this result. Consequently, it should not come as a surprise that female teachers were judged to have a more transformational leadership style. Moreover, the background data showed that there were more female teachers in Apo district than male teachers.

It can be deduced that having more female teachers in schools could increase the occurrences of transformational leadership.

Literature provides many reasons for the observed differences in transformational teacher leadership between public and private secondary schools in Apo. According to the contingency theory, leadership is highly dependent on environmental factors (Vidal et al., 2017). Yukl (1989) outlines many circumstances that might impact leadership effectiveness, including leader traits, the nature of group objectives, and the past experiences of the leader and followers. In the research on teacher leadership, these circumstances are referred to as teacher leadership determinants and may be categorised into two major groups: intrinsic teacher variables and school variables. An investigation of these factors in the Nigerian context offers explanations for the observed disparities in transformational teacher leadership across various school types.

The teacher's abilities, level of experience, competence, and personal qualities, including personality and gender, are examples of teacher variables (Liljenberg, 2016; Struyve et al., 2018; Schott et al., 2020). In addition, self-awareness, willingness, and leadership ability of teachers have been highlighted as crucial for the development of teacher leadership (Conan Simpson, 2021; Cheng and Szeto, 2015). In the context of secondary education in Nigeria, public school teachers are reportedly of low quality, with inadequate teaching credentials and low morale, and are poorly compensated (Ehigiamusoe, 2012; Ige, 2013). On the contrary, it is believed that teachers at private secondary schools have better teacher qualifications, and in certain circumstances, higher levels of motivation and income (Alimi, 2012; Day et al., 2014; Duflo et al., 2011). Hence, it was hypothesised that teachers at private schools would demonstrate more effective leadership styles than their colleagues in public schools owing to their superior credentials, motivation, and compensation. In contrast, the results indicate the reverse, hence invalidating the hypothesis. It is probable that public secondary school teachers in Apo exhibit more transformational leadership as a result of their long years of teaching experience or due to a more positive professional identity and self-awareness, which has influenced their leadership behaviour. Thus, they are more likely to demonstrate transformational leadership because they have a more positive self-image and are capable of inspiring pupils to greater moral and academic accomplishment.

In addition, elements intrinsic to these schools may provide light on the observed variations in transformational teacher leadership. Literature identifies as school level factors of teacher leadership the actions of the school principal, as well as the setting, structure, and culture of the school organisation.

The actions, attitudes, and leadership styles of school administrators are of utmost importance to teachers' leadership identities, given that principals generally determine the school's culture and are primarily accountable for its success. By creating a culture of cooperation, shared decision-making, and trust, in addition to modifying their their leadership behaviours and investing in professional development, school principals may foster teacher leadership (Conan Simpson, 2021; Helterbran, 2010; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Muijs & Harry, 2007). It is likely that these practices are more common among public secondary principals, which has positively impacted their teachers leadership behaviours.

Regarding principal leadership in Nigeria, several leadership styles, such as dispersed, democratic, instructional, and transformational, have been observed (Bush & Glover, 2013b). In most instances, school principals in Nigeria demonstrate managerial leadership, which is frequently characterised by hierarchy, centralised decision-making and authority, adherence to a strict chain of command, emphasis on productivity, enforcement of guidelines, regular supervision of teachers, and a propensity for inappropriacy, harshness, and disregard for teachers (Adegbesan, 2013; Besong, 2013; Bush and Glover 2016; Money 2017). A high level of positive leadership practises by school principals, such as democratic leadership exemplified by the delegation of responsibilities and active participation of teachers in decision-making, and the freedom for teachers to express their opinions on school activities, have also been identified (Obineme et al, 2020). In the state of Edo, for example, Ofeoegbu et al. (2013) noticed a variety of major leadership styles, including transformational, transactional, servant, and strategic leadership, with transformational leadership occurring the most often (32%). Several studies have also revealed a lack of principal leadership in administrative areas such as school monitoring and teacher supervision (Ayandoja et al., 2017; Ifedili, 2015). Clearly, secondary school principals in the Abuja suburb of Apo exhibit a range of leadership styles,

and this may have had an outsized impact on the leadership behaviours of teachers.

Indeed, the leadership style of the school principal might emerge in the way a teacher leads students in the classroom. This is confirmed by Bush and Glover (2016), who anticipate that teachers who often encounter conventional, administrative leadership models would likely adopt similar ideologies. In addition, Bada et al. (2020) noted that the instructional leadership of a teacher might be impacted by the leadership of the principal, which in turn could affect the efficacy of teachers in the classroom and the learning of students. Hence, the disparities in transformational teacher leadership between public and private schools may be indicative of the sorts of principal leadership experienced by teachers in these schools. Teachers in public schools may have displayed greater transformational leadership because their principals use more transformational leadership styles, allowing teachers to exercise professional autonomy and participate in decision-making. These techniques may go a long way towards enhancing a teacher's confidence, work satisfaction, and eventually their desire to reproduce such leadership in the classroom. Perhaps the reverse is true for private schools. Principals' leadership styles may be more managerial, performance- and task-oriented, with the primary objective being to optimise staff productivity and teachers being routinely watched and overseen. To satisfy curricular needs and school goals, teachers may adopt leadership styles other than transformational ones. Hence, the principal's involvement in the practise of teacher leadership remains crucial.

An examination of the intrinsic characteristics of public and private secondary schools in Apo revealed that they had little impact on the identification of transformational teacher leadership behaviours. Public secondary schools that are typically open to the public face several obstacles that were once believed to hinder teachers' transformational leadership. They are found to have subpar and insufficient educational facilities, as well as large class sizes (Ehigiamusoe, 2012). Additionally, it is considered that these challenges impact the quality of teaching activities in these institutions (Akindele, 2013; as cited in Agi, 2019). In contrast, the private schools in this research are distinguished by positive attributes such as smaller class sizes and superior facilities (Ehigiamusoe, 2012; Donald et al., 2018). Evidence suggests that private schools are more expensive

than public schools in terms of school fees and other related costs of attendance (Day et al., 2014); consequently, access to these schools is socioeconomically determined (Donald et al., 2018), such that students from low-income households attend public secondary schools and children from affluent homes attend expensive private schools. All these variables were assumed to influence a teacher's leadership practise, such that transformational teacher leadership would be more prevalent in private secondary schools than in public schools. The hypothesis is backed by Liu's empirical observation that schools serving socioeconomically disadvantaged pupils have much less teacher leadership. Even so, Silins and Mulford (2004) recognized that the effect of teachers' work on students' engagement was minimal among socioeconomically disadvantaged students. This research demonstrated, contrary to previous results, that transformational teacher leadership was much greater in public secondary schools than in private schools, hence refuting the hypothesis.

To elaborate on the observed difference, an examination of teacher leadership in the setting of high-cost private schools is necessary. These schools are privately owned and financed (Day et al., 2014), and to remain financially viable, private schools are responsive to 'market' pressures to recruit and retain students (Day et al., 2014). Consequently, the staff members of these institutions are highly obligated to meet the needs of the parents and pupils. Interestingly, it has been observed that parents of students in private schools are more likely to make demands and exert reasonable control over the school (Day et al., 2014), and usually, the school administration acquiesces to the parents at the expense of the teachers' voices and professional autonomy. Hence, teachers who feel helpless in their classrooms are less likely to demonstrate transformational teacher leadership.

In his contingency theory of leadership, Fiedler (1964) provides an explanation for this predicament. According to Fiedler (1964), a leader may be affected by three contextual elements, sometimes known as conditions: leader-member relations, task structure, and position power. These conditions affect whether a leader chooses a task-driven or relationship-driven leadership style. Leader-member connections (which may be strong, moderate, or poor) consist of the amount of followers' trust and regard for their leaders. The second aspect of task structure (which may be structured, somewhat structured, or unstructured)

relates to working processes and techniques. Position power (which might be strong, moderate, or weak) refers to the degree of authority of a leader to reward or punish followers (Uslu, 2019). Good leader-follower relationship, well-defined tasks, and strong positional power for the leader are examples of favourable situations that contribute to leadership effectiveness (Northouse, 2010). In contrast, negative conditions may be stressful for leaders and may have a lasting influence on their leadership effectiveness (Fiedler, 1964).

Accordingly, transformational teacher leadership was significantly more evident in public secondary schools not necessarily because of teachers' qualification, the availability of learning facilities and resources, or smaller class sizes (as evidence suggests that these elements are lacking), but because of other favourable conditions such as good leader-follower relationships (in this case, a good teacher-student relationship), well-defined tasks, and strong positional authority. In contrast, the private school setting may be characterised by poor Leader-member relationships, standardised or somewhat structured working processes, and limited position authority, all of which may hinder teachers' desire to display transformational leadership. According to this perspective, the prevalence of transformational teacher leadership in public secondary schools might be attributed to the favourable public-school environment.

6 CONCLUSION

This study aimed to analyse teacher leadership in the Nigerian secondary school context utilizing the full range of leadership model in the AMAC zone of Abuja, Nigeria. First, the researcher attempted to determine the predominant teacher leadership style as perceived by senior students in Apo district, AMAC secondary schools. The second objective of the study was to determine whether there are differences in classroom teacher leadership based on teachers' gender and school type. Furthermore, the objective of the present study was to discover which teacher leadership style predicts the leadership outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction.

According to students' self-report, transformational teacher leadership is prevalent in Apo secondary schools. In addition, female secondary school teachers in the Apo district demonstrated more transformational teacher leadership than their male colleagues, and transformational teacher leadership behaviours were reported to occur more frequently in public secondary schools than in private secondary schools. The transformational leadership style reliably predicted the outcomes of extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction, whereas the transactional leadership style predicted only effectiveness. Indeed, the aims of this investigation were accomplished to a significant degree.

The very concept of teacher leadership has been the subject of debate. On the one hand, teacher leadership is regarded as distinct from classroom practice and exerted by a small number of teachers with a specific skill set, temperament, and the ability to influence others towards the achievement of school goals (Wenner & Campbell, 2017; Webber & Nickel, 2021; Smith et al., 2017). This perspective is rooted in trait leadership theory, which argue for distinguishing leaders from non-leaders based on observable natural characteristics and demonstrations of competence. Alternatively, teacher leadership is conceptualized as a classroom teaching practise. In other words, teacher leadership consists of the influential acts and behaviours exhibited by teachers in

the facilitation of academic, social, and emotional learning (Darrin Thomas, 2014; as cited in Khany & Ghasemi, 2021; Ertesvag; 2009; Öqvist and Malmstrom, 2016). This idea is grounded in the behavioural leadership paradigm, which holds that every human possesses leadership potential, and can learn to lead effectively. By adopting the later viewpoint on teacher leadership, the present study aimed to assess the viability of teacher leadership in the Nigerian context using the full range of leadership model. Hence, teacher leadership has been established in the secondary school context, based on the perspectives of students. Similarly, transformational, and transactional leadership approaches were reported in Apo secondary schools. Presumably, teacher leadership emanates from the classroom and extends to other 'spheres of practice' both within and beyond the school. Hence, the duality evident in the conception of teacher leadership is softened.

Many proposals were made regarding the scope of teacher leadership in the classroom. Teacher leadership involves meticulous planning and organizing of instruction, monitoring student activities, and establishing a positive, supporting rapport with pupils (Khany & Ghasemi, 2021). Other perspectives consider teacher leadership as a collection of characteristics exhibited by teachers, such as using a variety of teaching strategies, having high expectations of students, and establishing clear lesson objectives (Darrin Thomas, 2014). In contrast, the realm of classroom teacher leadership includes in-class processes, interaction, motivation, and out-of-school procedures (Köse, 2019). Many assertions exist regarding what classroom teacher leadership comprises, resulting in the absence of a common framework for studying the phenomena. Crowther et al. (2008) acknowledge this inherent flaw in the literature by describing the depictions of classroom teacher leadership as merely hypothetical portraits and explanations of the ideals of teacher leadership in western contexts, implying that teacher leadership research is predominantly qualitative.

So far, the full range of leadership model provides an established and dependable theoretical basis for teacher leadership research. Through the lenses of the model, teacher leadership behaviours is denoted as occurring in a spectrum of transformational-transactional-laissez-faire leadership styles (Avolio & Bass, 1999), thereby making it possible for the quantitative research of the phenomenon through the deployment of the MLQ (5x short). In addition, it was

possible to rank the leadership behaviours of teachers from the most effective leadership behaviour, that is, transformational leadership, to the least effective leadership behaviour, that is, laissez-faire leadership (Bass & Avolio,1999). Obviously, the study demonstrated that teacher leadership could be examined and enhanced in the Nigerian environment, as transformational teacher leadership was reported as the predominant leadership style in the Apo district, based on students' perspectives. The research lends credence to the applicability of the full range of leadership model, particularly on the importance of transformational teacher leadership in secondary schools.

The conclusions are consistent with past studies about the effectiveness of transformational teacher leadership. The researched literature and current data indicate that a transformational leadership style will result in increased students' self-reported effort, effectiveness, and student satisfaction. Furthermore, other benefits of a more transformational teacher leadership style have been extensively proven, necessitating the propagation of transformational teacher leadership.

The present study's sub-contextual comparison also revealed differences in the manifestation of transformational teacher leadership across schools and according to teachers' gender. The contingency leadership theory provided reasons for these disparities. In addition, the literature identifies many teacher leadership antecedents known to support or inhibit teacher leadership, including intrinsic teacher antecedents, school level antecedents, and supra-school level antecedents. Attention should be given to these factors for teacher leadership development. Likewise, an investigation of teacher leadership in various organizational contexts has added subtlety to the research and development of teacher leadership in Nigeria, particularly in Apo district.

6.1 Limitations

Many limitations of the current research should be considered. First, it is crucial to emphasize that only the leadership behaviours of civic education teachers in Apo secondary schools were examined in this study, therefore the results cannot be generalized to all teachers in Apo secondary schools. Second, the present study relied on cross-sectional data to reach these conclusions. Consequently,

only inferences and not causality may be drawn. Lastly, student self-report assessments of teacher leadership could pose difficulties for the accuracy of evaluations for teacher leadership, as student ratings of teacher leadership are susceptible to numerous individual biases, such as personality bias, attribution styles, needs and motives, psychological biases (such as liking and mood, and stereotyping), and contextual biases (such as school culture, research methods, leader individual differences) (Hansbrough et al., 2015 29). As a result of the limited scope of the study, generalizations cannot be made for the larger AMAC zone of Abuja or for Nigeria as a whole.

6.2 Further studies

For a deeper comprehension of teacher leadership in the Nigerian setting, additional research is required. For instance, a similar study can be undertaken on a bigger scale, including the AMAC zone or all of Nigeria's geopolitical zones, to gain a better understanding of teacher leadership in Nigeria. More so, the viewpoints of school principals, supervisors, and classroom teachers on the phenomenon should be elicited. Qualitative research could provide a clearer picture of how teachers, principals, students, and even parents perceive teacher leadership and reveal the motivations behind teachers' leadership behaviours, particularly when interviews and observations are employed. In addition, a cohort study of teacher leadership using the full range of leadership model can be conducted in public and private secondary school contexts to properly capture the likely differences in the relationship between teacher leadership styles and students' self-reported extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction, engagement, motivation, and possibly, academic performance. A cohort study may provide context-specific explanations for the observed disparities in transformational teacher leadership.

6.3 Teacher leadership development

The findings of this study indicate that teacher leadership exists in Apo secondary schools. Thus, there is a need to cultivate teacher leadership in the district, particularly transformational teacher leadership, which has been shown to result

in a variety of positive results. Furthermore, the importance of school principals in the leadership development of classroom teachers cannot be overstated. Principals should be willing to promote teacher leadership by fostering a climate of collegiality, collaboration, effective communication, shared decision-making, and trust (Helterbran, 2010; Muijs & Harry, 2007). Principals may need to adopt a distributive leadership approach by recognizing teachers' knowledge and autonomy and valuing their contributions. Interestingly, transformational leadership behaviours can be acquired through training and education. Bass (1999) suggested the techniques for such training, which he termed the "full range of leadership development". It entails identifying the most ideal forms of teacher leadership (transformational teacher leadership in this case); assessing the leadership behaviours of all classroom teachers; preparing an improvement plan for areas where classroom leadership behaviours must be altered; implementing those improvement plans, and periodically evaluating the success of their plans to become more transformational teacher leaders (Bass, 1999). This technique for teacher leadership development should be coordinated and supervised by school principals for optimal effectiveness.

The willingness, self-awareness, and initiative of teachers are vital to the development of teacher leadership (Cheng & Szeto, 2015). Thus, teachers are urged to embrace leadership and commit to developing their leadership abilities and competencies through both conventional (in-service trainings) and non-traditional (by reading books and enrolling in online courses) sources. Teachers can initiate professional development initiatives in areas such as group leadership, collaboration, mentorship, and action research (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001).

There is a great deal that can be done at the supra-school level to improve teacher leadership. The government may provide pre-service and in-service teacher leadership trainings and certifications, as well as incorporate teacher leadership into the national teacher education curriculum and inspection standards (Supovitz, 2015). Likewise, networks and groups, such as teacher unions, may give possibilities for the development of teacher leadership by, for instance, advocating for effective policies (Osmond-Johnson, 2015).

REFERENCES

Abari, A., Mohammed, M., Babatunde, O., & Idowu, O. (2012). Organizational identity and effectiveness of public and private senior secondary schools in Southwest Nigeria. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century, 40*, 7–16.

Abolade, S. B., & Ayotunde, F. O. (2018). Historical development of private secondary school education in Nigeria: 1859-present. JEP: *ejournal of Education Policy*. Print.

Adebile, R. (2009). The role of Nigerian teachers and parents: A pre- requisite for efficient and dynamic curriculum development. *African Research Review, 3*(1).   https://doi.org/10.4314/afrrev.v3i1.43583

Adegbesan, S. O. (2013). Effect of principals' leadership style on teachers' attitude to work in Ogun state secondary schools, Nigeria. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 14* (1), 14-28. Retrieved from
https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/tojde/issue/16895/176009

Agi, U. K. (2018). Administration issues in teaching and learning for the future of secondary education in Rivers state, Nigeria. *Journal of the International Society for Teacher   Education, 22*(1), 74–87.

Agi, U. K. (2019). Teacher education and its relevance to 21st century secondary school education in Nigeria: The perspective of an educational administrator. *European   Scientific Journal (Kocani) 15* (1).

Agi, U. K., Kalagbor, L., & Anthony, H. (2016). Politics of educational leadership: Its   implications for secondary school improvement in rivers state. Journal of Education   and Practice, 7(21), 72–85.

Akaguri, L. (2014). Fee-free public or low-fee private basic education in rural Ghana: How does the cost influence the choice of the poor? *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education,44*, 140–161.

Allen, L. (2017). Teacher leadership and the advancement of teacher agency. *ForeignLanguage Annals, 51*, 240–250. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12311

Alimi, O. S., Ehinola, G. B., & Alabi, F. O. (2012). School types, facilities, and academic performance of students in senior secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. *International Education Studies, 5*(3), 44–48. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n3p44

Almazan Anaya, A. A., Illoldi Rangel, P., & Valdes Ramirez, M. del P. (2014). Educational Leadership in the teaching of gifted children. *REVISTA DE INVESTIGACION EDUCATIVA DE LA ESCUELA DE GRADUADOS EN EDUCACION, 4*(8), 25–34.

Anderson, M. (2017). Transformational leadership in education: A review of existing literature. *International Social Science Review, 93*(1), 1–13.

Anastasi, A. (1990). *Psychological Testing*. New York: Macmillan

Antonakis, J. (2001). *The validity of the transformational, transactional, and laissez -faire leadership model as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X)*. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Antonakis, j., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 261-295

Araşkal, S., & Kılınç, A. Ç. (2019). Investigating the factors affecting teacher leadership: A qualitative study. Educational Administration: *Theory and Practice, 25*(3), 419–468. https://doi.org/10.14527/kuey.2019.011

Arikewuyo, M. (2009). Teachers' perception of principals' leadership capacities in Nigeria. *The Nigerian Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 13*(1). https://doi.org/10.4314/njgc.v13i1.36976

Arvey, R. D., Rotundo, M., Johnson, W., Zhang, Z., & McGue, M. (2006). The determinants of leadership role occupancy: Genetic and personality factors. *Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 1–20

Asadu, G. C., and Aguinam, C. C. (2019). Philosophy: A veritable tool for rescuing African leadership from the legacies of colonial administration. OGIRISI: *A New Journal of African Studies, 15*(1): 158-168.

Ashforth, B. (2016). Petty tyranny in organizations. In Porter, L.W., Angle, H.L.
       & Allen,   R.W. (Eds.), *Organizational Influence Processes* (pp. 151-171).
       ME Sharpe, Armonk, NY.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *MLQ Manual*. Mind Garden, Inc.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1991). *The full range leadership development
       programs: Basic and advanced manuals*. Bass, Avolio & Associates.

Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory-
       building. *The American Psychologist, 62*(1), 25–33.
       https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.25

Avsec, S. (2016). Profiling an inquiry-based teacher in a technology-intensive
       open learning environment. *World Transactions On Engineering And
       Technology, Education, 14*(1), 25–30.

Ayandoja A. C, Aina B. C. & Idowu A. F. (2017). Academic supervision as a
       correlate of students' academic performance in secondary schools in Ekiti
       State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and
       Review, 4*(1), 8–13.

Bada, H. A., Ariffin, T. F. T., & Nordin, H. (2020). Teachers' perception of
       principals' instructional leadership practices in Nigeria. *Universal Journal
       of Educational   Research, 8*(10), 4459–4469.
       https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.081013

Badshah, S. (2012). Historical study of leadership theories. *Journal of Strategic
       Human Resource Management, 1*(1), 49–61.

Balwant, P. T., Birdi, K., Stephan, U., & Topakas, A. (2019). Transformational
       instructor- leadership and academic performance: a moderated mediation
       model of student engagement and structural distance. *Journal of Further
       and Higher Education, 43*(7), 884–900.
       https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2017.1420149

Balwant, P. T. (2022). "Keeping it real" authentic instructor-leadership, student
       engagement   and performance, and leader distance. *International
       Journal of Leadership in   Education, 25*(1), 39–65.
       https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1657593

Balwant, P. T. (2016). Transformational Instructor-Leadership in Higher
       Education Teaching: A Meta-Analytic Review and Research Agenda.
       Journal of Leadership Studies 9 (4),   20–42. doi:10.1002/jls.21423.

Barling, J., Christie, A., & Hoption, C. (2011). Leadership. In Zedeck, S. (Ed.),
APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol 1: Building
and developing the organization. *APA Handbooks in Psychology* (pp.
183– 240). American Psychological Association.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Manual for the Multifactor Leadership
Questionnaire*. Consulting Psychologists Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *MLQ Multifactor Leadership
Questionnaire: Technical report*. Redwood City, CA: Mind
Garden.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership
paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American
Psychologist, 52*(2), 130–139.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire:
Manual and sample set (3rd ed.)*. Mind Garden, Redwood City, CA.

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in
transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational
Psychology, 8*(1), 9–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398410

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2004b). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire:
Manual and sample set*. Palo Alto: Mind Garden Inc.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New
York, NY: Free Press.

Bear, G. (1998). School discipline in the United States: Prevention, correction,
and long-term social development. *Educational and Child Psychology,
15*, 15–39.

Becker, B. E., & Luthar, S. S. (2002). Social-emotional factors affecting
achievement outcomes among disadvantaged students: Closing the
achievement gap. *Educational Psychologist, 37*(4), 197-214.

Bellibaş, M.S., Kılınç, A.Ç. & Polatcan, M. (2021). The moderation role of
transformational leadership in the effect of instructional leadership on
teacher professional learning and instructional practice: an integrated
leadership perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. doi:
10.1177/0013161X211035079.

Berg, J., & Zoellick, B. (2019). Teacher leadership: Toward a new conceptual framework. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community, 4*(1), 2–14.   https://doi.org/10.1108/JPCC-06-2018-0017

Bergdahl, N., & Bond, M. (2022). Negotiating (dis-)engagement in K-12 blended learning.   *Education and Information Technologies, 27*(2), 2635–2660. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10714-w

Besong. J.B. (2013). A comparative study of the administrative efficiency of principals in public and private secondary schools in Maroua, Far North Region, Cameroon. *International Journal of Business and Management 8*(7): 90–99

Beycioglu, K. & Aslan, B. (2010). Teacher leadership scale: A validity and reliability study. *Elementary Education Online, 9*(2), 764-775.

Bhandari, P. (2022, November 24). *What Is Quantitative Research? | Definition, Uses & Methods*. Scribbr. Retrieved January 13, 2023, from https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/quantitative-research/

Biamba, C. N., Chidimma, O. N., Chinwe, O. V., Kelechi, M. C., & Chinyere, N. A. (2021). Assessing democratic classroom practices among secondary school civic education teachers in the global south: Case study of South East Nigeria. *Cogent Education, 8*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1896425

Boamah, S. A. & Tremblay, P. (2019). Examining the factor structure of the MLQ transactional and transformational leadership dimensions in nursing context. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 41* (5), 743-761.

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 & Leadership, 41*(3), 372-392.

Bolkan, S., Goodboy, A. K., & Griffin, D. J. (2011). Teacher leadership and intellectual stimulation: Improving students' approaches to studying through intrinsic motivation. *Communication Research Reports, 28*(4), 337–346. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2011.615958

Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A. K. (2009). Transformational leadership in the classroom: Fostering student learning, student participation, and teacher credibility. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 36*, 296–306.

Botha, J. R., & Afework, H. T. (2020). A distributive approach to instructional leadership: Challenges for female principals in Ethiopian secondary schools. *Gender & Behaviour, 18*(2), 15862–15873.

Brubaker, R. (2013). *The limits of rationality*. New York: Routledge.

Bru, E., Stephens, P., & Torsheim, T. (2002). Students' perception of class management and reports of their own misbehaviour. *Journal of School Psychology, 40*, 287–307

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row, New York.

Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2016). School Leadership in West Africa: Findings from a Systematic Literature Review. *Africa Education Review, 13*(3-4), 80–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/18146627.2016.1229572

Bush, T. and G.K.T. Oduro. (2006). New principals in Africa: Preparation, induction, and practice. *Journal of Educational Administration 44*(4): 359–375

Bush, T., & D. Glover. (2013b). *School leadership: Concepts and evidence 'refreshed'*. Nottingham: NCSL.

Camburn, E., Rowan, B., & Taylor, J. E. (2003). Distributed leadership in schools: The case of elementary schools adopting comprehensive school reform models. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 25*(1), 347-373.

Can, N. (2007). Öğretmen liderliği becerileri ve bu becerilerin gerçekleştirilme düzeyi. Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler. Enstitüsü Dergisi 22(1), 263-288.

Chen, J. J. L. (2005). Relation of academic support from parents, teachers, and peers to Hong Kong adolescents' academic achievement: The mediating role of academic engagement. Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs, 131, 77–127. satisfaction. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 37*(5), 600–623

Cheng, A. Y., & Szeto, E. (2016). Teacher leadership development and principal facilitation: Novice teachers' perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 58*, 140–148.

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

Chudgar, A., & Quin, E. (2011). Relationship between private schooling and achievement: Results from rural and urban India. *Economics of Education Review, 31*, 376–390.

Chow, T. W., Mohd. Salleh, L., & Arif Ismail, I. (2017). Lessons from the major leadership theories in comparison to the competency theory for leadership practice. *Journal of Business and Social Review in Emerging Economies, 3*(2), 147–156. https://doi.org/10.26710/jbsee.v3i2.86

Chukwu, L. C. (2019). Managing teacher education in Nigeria. *International Journal of Integrated Research in Education*, 42–49. https://doi.org/10.36265/ijired.2019.010106

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Conan Simpson, J. (2021). Fostering teacher leadership in k-12 schools: A review of the literature. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 34*(3), 229–246. https://doi.org/10.1002/piq.21374

Cooper, K. S., Stanulis, R. N., Brondyk, S. K., Hamilton, E. R., Macaluso, M., & Meier, J. A. (2016). The teacher leadership process: Attempting change within embedded systems. *Journal of Educational Change, 17*(1), 85–113.

Covey, S. (2007). *The transformational leadership reports*. Retrieved February 1st, 2017 from www.transformationalleadership.net/products/TransformationalLeadr shipReport.p   df

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Pearson.

Creswell, J. W. (2023). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods   approach*. SAGE.

Criswell, B. A., Rushton, G. T., Nachtigall, D., Staggs, S., Alemdar, M., & Cappelli, C. J. (2018). Strengthening the vision: Examining the understanding of a framework for teacher leadership development by experienced science teachers. *Science Teacher Education, 102*(6), 1265–1287. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21472

Crowther, F. (1997). Teachers as leaders – An exploratory framework. *International Journal of Educational Management, 11*(1), 6–13.

Crowther, F. A., Ferguson, M., & Hann, L. (2008). *Developing teacher leaders: How teacher leadership enhances school success*. Corwin Press.

Daft, R. L., Kendrick, M. & Vershinina, N. (2010). *Management*. Cengage Learning Emea, UK.

Data Management Guidelines [Online]. Tampere: Finnish Social Science Data Archive [distributor and producer]. <https://www.fsd.tuni.fi/en/services/data-management-guidelines/>. urn:nbn:fi:fsd:V-201504200002 (cited 26.04.2023.)

Day, A. L., Mcloughlin C., Aslam M., Engel J., Wales J., Rawal S., Batley R., Kingdon G., Nicolai S., & Rose P. (2014). *The role and impact of private schools in developing countries: a rigorous review of the evidence. Final report. Education Rigorous Literature Review*. Department for International Development.

Day, C. & Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership, reflective practice, and school improvement. In Leithwood, K. & Hallinger, P. (eds.). *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Demir, K. (2014). Öğretmen liderliği kültürü ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. İlköğretim Online, 13(2), 334-344.

Derue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. Personnel Psychology, 64(1), 7–52. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01201.x

Donald, R. B., Husein, A. & Hugo, T. W. (2018). Inequality of educational opportunity: The relationship between access, affordability, and quality of private schools in Lagos, Nigeria. *Oxford Review of Education, 44* (4), 459-475. DOI:10.1080/03054985.2017.1421153

Duflo, E., Dupas, P., & Kremer, M. (2011). Peer effects, teacher incentives, and the impact of tracking: Evidence from a randomized evaluation in Kenya. *American Economic Review, 101*, 1739–1774

Durrant, J. (2004). Teachers leading change: Frameworks and key ingredients for school improvement. *Leading & Managing, 10* (2), 10– 29.

Eagly A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt M. C., Van Engen M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A

meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 569–591

Easley, J. I., & Tulowitzki, P. (Eds.). (2016). *Educational accountability – International perspectives on challenges and possibilities for school leadership*. London, UK: Routledge

Ehigiamusoe, U.K. (2012). Private sector participation in secondary education in Nigeria: Implications for national development. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability, 1*(3), 1062-1074.

Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute.

Erdel, D., & Takkaç, M. (2020). Instructor leadership in EFL classrooms and the outcomes: The effects of transformational and transactional leadership styles. *TEFLIN Journal, 31*(1), 70–87. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v31i1/70-87

Engeström. Y. (1999). Activity theory and individual and social transformation. In Engeström. Y., Mietten, R. & Punama ̇ki, R-L.(eds.) *Perspectives on Activity Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Einarsen, S., Aasland, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behavior: A definition and conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 207–216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.002

Enaibe, P. U. & Imonivwerba, P. A. (2010). The place of teaching practice in teacher education programme in Nigeria: State of affairs in the 21st Century. In Iloputaife, E. C., Maduewesi, B. U. & Igbo, R. O. (Eds.), *Issues and challenges in Nigerian education in the 21st century*. Onitsha: West and Solomon publishing coy   ltd.

Ertesvag, S. K. (2009). Classroom leadership: The effect of a school development   programme. *Educational Psychology (Dorchester-on-Thames), 29*(5), 515–539. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410903122194

FCT Education Management Information System. (2022). FCT Education Secretariat – Public senior secondary schools list. https://fctemis.org/list_public_ss_school

FCT Education Management Information System. (2022). FCT Education Secretariat – private schools list. https://fctemis.org/list_private_school

Fletcher, J. K., & Kaufer, K. (2003). Shared leadership: Paradox and possibility. In C. J. Pearce & C. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the how and whys of leadership* (pp. 21–47). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fiedler, F. E. (2006). The contingency model: a theory of leadership effectiveness. In Levine, J. M. & Moreland, R. L. (Eds.), *Small Groups Key Readings*. Psychology Press, New York.

Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 149-190). New York: Academic Press.

Furtner, M. R., Baldegger, U., & Rauthmann, J. F. (2013). Leading yourself and leading others: Linking self-leadership to transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 22*(4), 436 – 449. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2012.665605

Gardner, W. L., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., May, D. R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). "Can you see the real me?" A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*(3), 343–372.

Germain, M.-L. (2012). Traits and skills theories as the nexus between leadership and expertise: Reality or fallacy? Performance Improvement. *International Society for Performance Improvement, 51*(5), 32–39. https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.21265

Ghasemi, F., & Khany, R. (2019). EFL teachers' emotional intelligence, emotional support, and their classroom leadership: A structural equation modeling approach. *International Journal of Research in English Education, 4*(3), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.29252/ijree.4.3.1

Gilles, C., Wang, Y., Fish, J., & Stegall, J. (2018). "I learned by watching my mentor." Nurturing teacher leadership with an induction program. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 26*(4), 455–475.

Goddard, Y. L., Goddard, R. D., Bailes, L. P. & Nichols, R. (2019). From school leadership to differentiated instruction: A pathway to student learning in schools. *The Elementary School Journal, 120* (2), 197-219. Doi: 10.1086/705827.

Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "description of personality": The big-five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 1216–1229.

Goodboy, A. K. and Myers, S. A. (2008). The effect of teacher confirmation on student communication and learning outcomes. *Communication Education,57* (2), 153-179.

Griffith, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration,42*(3), 333-356

Grint, K. (2011). A history of leadership. In Bryman A., Colinson D., Grint K., (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Leadership*. Los Angeles: Sage, 3–14.

Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management and Administration, 28*(3), 317–338.

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership. In K. Leithwood & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership And Administration* (pp. 653–696). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Guilfoile, L., & Delander, B. (2014). *Guidebook: Six proven practices for effective civic learning*. National centre for learning and civic engagement

Gunter, H. M. (2003). Teacher leadership: Prospects and possibilities. In M. Brundrett, N.   Burton and R. Smith (Eds.), *Leadership in Education*, (pp. 118-131). London: Sage.

Hammersley, M. (2013). *What is qualitative research*? London. Bloomsbury Academic.

Hammersley, M. & Traianou, A. (2012). *Ethics in qualitative research: Controversies and contexts*. London: Sage.

Hand, M., & Levinson, R. (2012). Discussing controversial issues in the classroom. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 9*(6), 614–629. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469- 5812.2010.00732.x

Hargreaves, A. (2003). *Teaching in the knowledge society: Education in the age of insecurity*. New York. Teachers College Press

Härmä, J. (2011). *Education Sector Support Programme in Nigeria (ESSPIN) assignment report: Study of private schools in Lagos*. Report No. LG 303.

Harris, A. & Lambert, L. (2003). *Building leadership capacity for school improvement*. Open University, Maidenhead.

Harris, A. (2008). *Distributed leadership: Developing tomorrow's leaders*. London: Routledge Publishers.

Harris, A. (2012). Leadership system transformation. *School Leadership and Management, 3*,179-209.

Harris, A., Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammon, P., and Hopkins, D. (2007). Distributed leadership and organizational change: Reviewing the evidence. *Journal of Educational Change, 8*: 337-347.

Harris, A. (2002b). *School improvement: What's in it for schools?* London, New York: Routledge.

Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership as distributed leadership: Heresy, fantasy, or possibility*? School Leadership & Management, 23*(3), 313–324.

Harrison, C. (2018). Leadership research and theory. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (2009). Assessing the contribution of distributed leadership to school improvement and growth in maths achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 46*(3): 659-689.

Helterbran, V. R. (2010). Teacher leadership: Overcoming 'I am just a teacher' syndrome. *Education, 131*(2), 363–371.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online readings in psychology and culture, 2*(1).

Howe, C., & Abedin, M. (2013). Classroom dialogue: A systematic review across four decades of research. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 43*(3), 325–356. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2013.786024

Howey, K. R. (1988). Why teacher leadership? *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(1), 28-31. https://doiorg.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/10.1177%2F002248718803900107

Hughes, J. N., Cavell, T. A., & Willson, V. (2001). Further support for the developmental significance of the quality of the teacher-student relationship. *Journal of School Psychology, 39*, 289–301.

Ibrahim, A., & El Zaatari, W. (2020). The teacher-student relationship and adolescents' sense of school belonging. *International Journal of*

Adolescence and Youth, 25(1), 382–395.
https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2019.1660998

Ibukon, W., Oyewole, B. & Abe, T. (2011). Personality characteristics and principal   leadership effectiveness in Ekiti state, Nigeria. *International Journal of Leadership Studies 6*(2),247–259.

Ifedili C. J. (2015). Instructional supervision and quality assurance in schools in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Social Science, 4*(9), 106–115.

Ige, A. M. (2013). Provision of secondary education in Nigeria: Challenges and way forward. *Journal of African Studies and Development,5*(1), 1-9. DOI: 10.5897/JASD11.058

Ingersoll, R. M., Sirinides, P. & Dougherty, P. (2018). Leadership matters: Teachers' roles in school decision making and school performance. *American Educator,42*(1), 13-17.

Itzkovich, Y., Heilbrunn, S., & Aleksic, A. (2020). Full range indeed? The forgotten dark side   of leadership. *The Journal of Management Development, 39*(7/8), 851–868. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-09-2019-0401

Jacobs, J., Gordon, S. P., & Solis, R. (2016). Critical issues in teacher leadership: A national look at teachers' perception. *Journal of School Leadership, 26*, 374–406.

Jacquart, P., and J. Antonakis. (2015). When does charisma matter for top-level leaders? Effect of attributional ambiguity. *Academy of Management Journal 58* (4), 1051–1074. doi:10.5465/amj.2012.0831.

Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Management Science, 28*(3), 315–336.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 765–780

Judge, T. A. & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership:
A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(1), 755-768.

Katyal, K., & Evers, R. (2004). Student learning, engagement with schools, and teacher leadership: Case studies in Hong Kong. *Leading & managing, 10*(2), 41– 53.

Katzenmeyer, M., & Moller, G. (2013). Uyuyan devi uyandırmak, öğretmen liderler yetiştir- mek (Çev. Ed. S. Özdemir). Ankara: Nobel.

Katzenmeyer, M. & Moller, G. (2001). *Awakening the Sleeping Giant: Helping teachers develop as leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Katzenmeyer, M. and Moller, G. (2009). *Awakening the sleeping giant: Helping teachers develop as leaders* (3rd ed.). Corwin, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Katzenmeyer, M., & Moller, G. (1996). *Awakening the sleeping giant: Leadership development for teachers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Khany, R., & Ghasemi, F. (2021). Development and validation of teacher classroom leadership scale in EFL context. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 24*(4), 513–532. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1591516

Kraft, M. H. G. (2018). Antecedents & perspectives of ambidextrous leadership. *Marketing and Management of Innovations, 4*, 5-13.

Kilinc, A. C., Bellibas, M. S., & Bektas, F. (2021). Antecedents and outcomes of teacher leadership: The role of teacher trust, teacher self-efficacy and instructional practice. *International Journal of Educational Management, 35*(7), 1556–1571. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-04-2021-0148

Kim, W. J. (2012). *Transformational teaching: Connecting the full range leadership theory and graduate teaching practice*. (Doctoral dissertation, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, Chicago, Illinois, USA). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (UMI No. 3536309)

King, F. (2017). Evolving perspective(s) of teacher leadership: An exploration of teacher leadership for inclusion at preservice level in the Republic of Ireland. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 45*(1), 5-21.

Kirkbride, P. (2006). Developing transformational leaders: the full range leadership model in action. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 38*(1), 23-32

Kirkpatrick, S. A. & Locke, E. A. (1991). *Leadership: do traits matter?* Academy of Management Executive, 5(2), 48–60

Kisangani, E. F., and Pickering, J. (2011). Democratic accountability and diversionary force: Regime types and the use of benevolent and hostile military force. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 55*(6): 1021-1046.

Köse, E. K. (2019). Development and psychometric properties of teacher classroom leadership scale (TCLS). *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 25*(1), 139– 168. https://doi.org/10.14527/kuey.2019.004

Lambert, L. (2003). *Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lambert, L. (2003). Leadership redefined: An evocative context for teacher leadership. *School Leadership and Management, 23*(4), 421-430. https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/10.1080/1363243032000150953

Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, VA, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lawthong, N. (2010). Pedagogies for citizenship education in Thailand: The gap between   government policy and implementation. In K. J. Kennedy, W. O. Lee, & D. L. Grossman (Eds.), *Citizenship pedagogies in Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 203–220). Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong. Springer.

Lee Bae, C., Hayes, K. N., O'Connor, D. M., Seitz, J. C., & Distefano, R. (2016). The diverse faces of teacher leadership: A typology and survey tool. *Journal of School Leadership,   26*, 905–937. https://doi.org/10.1177/105268461602600602

Poekert, P., Alexandrou, A., & Shannon, D. (2016). How teachers become leaders: An internationally validated theoretical model of teacher leadership development. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education, 21*(4), 307–329.

Lee, J. S., Sachs, D., & Wheeler, L. (2014). The crossroads of teacher leadership and action research. *The Clearing House, 87*, 218–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2014.924896

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership research 1996–2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4*(3), 177-199

Leithwood, K. A., Sun, J. & Pollock, K. (2017). *How school leaders contribute to student success: The four paths framework. (Vol. 23).* Springer, Gewerbestrasse.

Leithwood, K., Mascal, B., & Strauss, T. (2009). *Distributed leadership according to the evidence.* London: Routledge Publishers.

Leithwood, K., Mascall, B., Strauss, T., Sacks, R., Memon, N., & Yashkina, A. (2007). Distributing leadership to make schools smarter: Taking the ego out of the system. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 6*(1), 37–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760601091267

Lewin, K., Lippert, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behaviour in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology, 10*(2), 271–301

Li, L. & Liu, Y. (2020). An integrated model of principal transformational leadership and teacher leadership that is related to teacher self-efficacy and student academic performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, Advanced online publication. doi: 10.1080/02188791.2020.1806036

Liljenberg, M. (2016). Teacher leadership modes and practices in a Swedish context: A case study. *School Leadership & Management, 36*(1), 21–40.

Lin, W., Lee, M., & Riordan, G. (2018). The role of teacher leadership in professional learning community (PLC) in international baccalaureate (IB) schools: A social network approach. *Peabody Journal of Education, 93*(5), 534–550.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (2011). Toxic leadership: a rejoinder. *Representation, 47*(3), 331-342.

Little, J.W. (1995). Contested ground: The basis of teacher leadership in two restructuring high schools. *Elementary School Journal, 96*(1), 47-63.

Liu, Y. (2021). Distributed leadership practices and student science performance through the four-path model: examining failure in underprivileged schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 59*(4), 472–492. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-07-2020-0159

Liu, P., Liu, L., & Xie, Y. (2018). Leadership of class teachers (banzhuren) in improving student learning: Case studies of Chinese primary schools. *Frontiers of Education in China, 13*(1), 28–55.

Livingston, R. K. (2010). *An investigation of transformational leadership in a virtual learning environment*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Capella University, Minneapolis, MN.

Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., Harvey, J. L. & Hall, R. J. (2001). Contextual constraints on prototype generation and their multilevel consequences for leadership perceptions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12*(3), 311-338.

Lu, Y. Y., Chen, H. T., Hong, Z. R., & Yore, L. D. (2016). Students' awareness of science teachers' leadership, attitudes toward science, and positive thinking. *International Journal of Science Education, 38*(13), 2174–2196.

Lubienski, S., Lubienski, C. & Crane, C. (2009). *Public schools outperformed private schools in mathematics*. Publication of College of Education, Illinois University, USA. Retrieved online 13 April 2013

Magasu, O., Muleya, G., & Mweemba, L. (2020). Teaching strategies used in civic education lessons in secondary schools in Zambia. *International Journal of Research -GRANTHAALAYAH, 8*(2), 39–46. https://doi. org/10.5281/zenodo.3692546.

Marks, H. M. & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: an integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(3), 370-397.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). School leadership that works: From research to results. Aurora, CO: ASCD and McREL.

Meng, J. & Heyman, W.C. (2009). *Measuring excellent leadership in public relations: A second-order factor model in the dimension of self-dynamics*. Institute of Public Relations, Gainesville, FL.

Michel, J. W., Lyons, B. D. & Cho, J. (2011). Is the full-range model of leadership really a full-range model of effective leader behaviour? *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 8*(4), 493-507.

Molinari, L., Mameli, C., & Gnisci, A. (2013). A sequential analysis of classroom discourse in Italian primary schools: The many faces of the IRF pattern. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*(3), 414–430. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.2012.02071.x

Money, V. O. (2017). Effectiveness of transformational leadership style in secondary schools in Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice, 8*(9), 135–140.

Moreno-Casado, H., Leo, F. M., López-Gajardo, M. Á., García-Calvo, T., Cuevas, R., & Pulido, J. J. (2022). Teacher leadership and students' psychological needs: A multilevel approach. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 116*, 103763–. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103763

Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organisations*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Muijs, D., & Harris, A. (2007). Teacher leadership in action: Three case studies of contrasting schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 35*(1),111–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143207071387

Muijs, D., & Harris, A. (2006). Teacher led school improvement: Teacher leadership in the UK. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*, 961–972.

Nakpodia, E. D., & Urien, J. (2011). Teacher education in Nigeria: Challenges to educational administrators in the 21st century. *Social Sciences (Faisalābād, Pakistan), 6*(5), 350–356. https://doi.org/10.3923/sscience.2011.350.356

National Policy on Education 2004 (Nigeria), Revised Edition.

Nawaz, M. M., & Bodla, M. A. (2010). Comparative study of full range leadership model among faculty members in public and private sector higher education institutes and universities. *International Journal of Business and Management, 5*(4). https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v5n4p208

Nguyen, D., Harris, A. & Ng, D. (2019). A review of the empirical research on teacher leadership (2003-2017). *Journal of Educational Administration, 58*(1), 60-80. doi:10.1108/jea-02-2018-0023.

Noddings, N. (2007). *Philosophy of education*. Cambridge: West View.

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: theory and practice* (5th ed.). SAGE

Northouse, P.G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

OECD (2012). *Good practices in survey design step-by-step. In Measuring Regulatory Performance: A Practitioner's Guide to Perception Surveys*. Paris: OECD. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789262167179-6-en [Accessed 20 March 2016]

Obineme, P. O., Nweke, V. J., Chime, G. O., & Ekweogu, L. B. (2020). Educational leadership for institutional best practices and goal

achievement among secondary schools in Enugu state, Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development, 9*(8). https://doi.org/10.24940/ijird/2020/v9/i8/AUG20012

Ofoegbu, F., Clark, A. O. & Osagie, R. O. (2013). Leadership theories and practice: Charting a path for improved Nigerian schools. *International Studies in Educational Administration 41*(2), 67–76.

Ogbiji, J. E., & Ogbiji, S. A. (2014). A boom in private secondary education in Cross River state, Nigeria: Causes and consequences on the education system. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*. https://doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2014.v4n6p485

Ogunode, N. J. (2020). Challenges of planning secondary school education in federal capital   territory of Abuja, Nigeria. RUNAS. *Journal of Education and Culture, 1*(1), 9-19. https://doi.org/10.46652/runas.

Ogunyinka, E. K., Okeke T. I., Adedoyin, R. C. (2015). Teacher education and development in Nigeria: An analysis of reforms, challenges, and prospects. *Education Journal, 4* (3),   111-122. Doi: 10.11648/j.edu.20150403.14

Oladipo, S. A., Adebakin, A. B., & Iranloye, O. F. (2016). Mentoring and succession of administrators: Critical issues in public and private secondary schools in Lagos state, Nigeria. *Bulgarian Journal of Science and Education Policy, 10*(1), 19–38.

Olasehinde, K. J., & Olatoye R. A. (2014). A comparative study of public and private senior   secondary school students' science achievement in Katsina state, Nigeria. *Journal of educational and social research, 4* (3), 203-207. Doi:10.5901/jesr.2014.v4n3p203.

Olatoye, R. A. & Agbatogun A. A. (2009). Parental involvement as correlates of pupils' achievement in mathematics and science in Ogun state, Nigeria. *Educational Research and Review, 14* (10), 457-464.

Onwunyili, C. F. & Onwunyili C. M. (2020). Relationship between effective classroom management and students' academic performance in biology in Anambra west L.G.A. of Anambra state, Nigeria. *Bulgarian Journal of Science and Education Policy, 14*(2), 339–355.

Osmond-Johnson, P. (2015). Supporting democratic discourses OF teacher professionalism: The case OF the Alberta teacher's association. Canadian *Journal of Educational Administration and Policy* (171).

Öqvist, A., & Malmström, M. (2018). What motivates students? A study on the effects of teacher leadership and students' self-efficacy. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 21*(2), 155–175.

Öqvist, A., & Malmström, M. (2016). Teachers' leadership: A maker or a breaker of students' educational motivation. *School Leadership & Management, 36*(4), 365–380.

Özdemir, N. (2019). Principal leadership and students' achievement: Mediated pathways of professional community and teachers' instructional practices. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy, 16*(1), 81-104.

Peng, J., Li, M., Wang, Z., & Lin, Y. (2021). Transformational leadership and employees' reactions to organizational change: Evidence from a meta-analysis. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 57*(3), 369–397. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886320920366

Pietsch, M., & Tulowitzki, P. (2017). Disentangling school leadership and its ties to   instructional practices - an empirical comparison of various leadership styles. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 28*(4), 629–649. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2017.1363787

Poels, J., Verschueren, M., Milisen, K., & Vlaeyen, E. (2020). Leadership styles and leadership outcomes in nursing homes: a cross-sectional analysis. *BMC Health Services Research, 20*(1), 1009–1009. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-020-05854-7

Pont, B., Nusche, D., & Moorman, H. (2008). Improving school leadership (Vol. 1): Policy &   practice. Paris, France: OECD

Pounder, J. S. (2008). Full range classroom leadership: Implications for the cross organizational and cross-cultural applicability of the transformational-transactional   paradigm. *Leadership, 4*(2), 115-135.

Pounder, J. (2014). Quality teaching through transformational classroom leadership. *Quality Assurance in Education, 22*(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-12-2013-0048

Pounder, J. (2006). Transformational classroom leadership: The fourth wave of teacher leadership? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 34*(4), 533- 545.

Prentice, W. (1961). *Understanding leadership*. Harvard Business Review, 102-109.

Rahimi, M. & Karkami, F.H. (2015). The role of teachers' classroom discipline in the teaching effectiveness and students' language learning motivation and achievement: A path method. *Iranian Language Teachers, 3*(1), 57-82.

Ramrathan, L., & Ngubane, T. I. (2013). Instructional leadership in multi-grade classrooms: What can mono-grade teachers learn from their resilience? *Education as Change, 17*(1), S93–S105. https://doi.org/10.1080/16823206.2014.865995

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational   Administration Quarterly, 44*(5), 635–674. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509

Robbins, S. P., & Coultar, M. (2005). *Management* (8th Ed.). Pearson Education, Inc

Robbins, S. P. (2001). *Organizational behaviour* (9th Ed.). Prentice Hall International, New Jersey.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2006). *Organizational behaviour* (12th Ed.). Prentice Hall.

Rost, J. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger.

Roland, E. (1999). *School influences on bullying*. Stavanger, Norway: Rebell Forlag.

Ronksley-pavia, M., & Neumann, M. M. (2022). Exploring educator leadership practices in gifted education to facilitate online learning experiences for (re)engaging gifted   students. *Education Sciences, 12*(2), 99–111. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12020099

Ryan, J. C., & Tipu, S. A. A. (2013). Leadership effects on innovation propensity: A two-factor full range leadership model. *Journal of Business Research, 66*(10), 2116–2129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.02.038

Rydell, A.M. & Henricsson, L. (2014). Elementary school teachers' strategies

to handle externalizing classroom behaviour: A study of relations be-tween perceived control, teacher orientation and strategy preferences. *Scand. J. Psych., 45*, 93-102

Schott, C., Van Roekel, H., & Tummers, L. G. (2020). Teacher leadership: A systematic review, methodological quality assessment and conceptual framework. *Educational Research Review, 31*, 100352–. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100352

Sebastian, J., Allensworth, E. & Huang, H. (2016). The role of teacher leadership in how principals influence classroom instruction and student learning. *American Journal of Education, 123*(1), 69-108. Doi: 10.1086/688169.

Sebastian, J., Huang, H., & Allensworth, E. (2017). Examining integrated leadership systems   in high schools: connecting principal and teacher leadership to organizational processes and student outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 28*(3), 463–488. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2017.1319392

Shava, G. N. (2018). Distributed leadership in education: Contemporary issues in educational leadership. *African Educational Research Journal, 6*(4), 279–287. https://doi.org/10.30918/AERJ.64.18.097

Shokanie, M. S., Stanz, K. J., & Slabbert, J. A. (2004). Description of leadership in South   Africa: Organizational context perspective SA. *Journal of Human Resource Management, 2*(3),1–6.

Shook, A. C. (2012). A study of preservice educators' dispositions to change behaviour management strategies. *Preventing School Failure, 56*, 129-136.

Sidle, C. (2007). The five intelligences of leadership. Leader to Leader Institute.

Silns, H. & Mulford, B. (2002). Leadership and school results. In Leithwood, K. & Hallinger, P. (eds.). *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Silins, H., & Mulford, B. (2004). Schools as learning organisations - effects on teacher leadership and student outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 15*(3/4), 443–466. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450512331383272

Smith, P. S., Hayes, M. L., & Lyons, K. M. (2017). The ecology of instructional teacher leadership. *The Journal of Mathematical Behaviour, 46*, 267–288.

Smulyan, L. (2016). Stepping into their power: The development of a teacher leadership stance. *Schools: Studies in Education, 13*(1), 8–28.

Snoek, M., & Volman, M. (2014). The impact of the organizational transfer climate on the   use of teacher leadership competences developed in a post-initial Master's program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 37*, 91–100.

Sosik, J. J., & Jung, D. I. (2010). *Full range leadership development: Pathways for people, profit, and planet*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Spillane, J. P., & Coldren, A. P. (2011). *Diagnosis and design for school improvement*. New   York: Teachers' College Press.

Stanulis, R. N., & Bell, J. (2017). Beginning teachers improve with attentive and targeted mentoring. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 53*(2), 59–65.

Stein, K. C., Macaluso, M., & Stanulis, R. N. (2016). The interplay between principal   leadership and teacher leader efficacy. *Journal of School Leadership, 26*(6), 1002-   1032.

Spector, B. A. (2016). Carlyle, Freud, and the Great Man Theory more fully considered. *Leadership (London, England), 12*(2), 250–260. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715015571392

Stogdill, R. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology, 25*, 35-71.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature*. New York: Free Press.

Strodl, P. (1992, March). *A model of teacher leadership*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Hilton Head, SC.

Stronge, J. H. (2007). *Qualities of effective teachers* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association of   Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L. W. (2011). What makes good teachers good? A cross- case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(4), 339–355.   https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487111404241

Struyve, C., Hannes, K., Meredith, C., Vandecandelaere, M., Gielen, S., & De Fraine, B. (2018). Teacher leadership in practice: Mapping the negotiation of the position of the special educational needs coordinator in schools. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 62*(5), 701–718.

Supovitz, J. (2015). School leadership lessons from England. Phi Delta Kappan, 97(3), 38–41. Osmond-Johnson, P. (2015). Supporting democratic discourses of teacher professionalism: The case of the Alberta teachers' association. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy* (171).

Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium. (2012). Teacher leader model standards.https://www.ets.org/s/education_topics/teaching_quality/pdf/teacher_le   ader_model_standards.pdf

Thomas, D. (2014, June 2). Leadership in the classroom. Retrieved from https://www.linkedin/pulse/20140602084944-324997647-leadership-in-the-classroom

Thomas, L. (2022, July 21). Cross-Sectional Study | Definition, Uses & Examples. Scribbr. Retrieved April 24, 2023, from https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/cross-sectional-study/

Thoonen, E. E., Sleegers, P. J., Oort, F. J., Peetsma, T. T. & Geijsel, F. P. (2011). How to improve teaching practices: the role of teacher motivation, organizational factors, and leadership practices. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 47*(3), 496-536. Doi: 10.1177/0013161X11400185.

Timperley, H. S. (2005). Distributed leadership: Developing theory from practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 37*, 395-420.

Tsai, K.C. & Lin, K. (2012). Rethink student evaluation of teaching. *World Journal of Education, 2*(2), 17-22.

Ugwu, C., Makore, S., Raditshego, E., Maboka, K., & Pansiri, N. O. (2022). The role of current   school leadership models in promoting African values: The impact on Botswana, Nigeria, and Zimbabwe school leadership systems. *African Educational Research Journal, 10*(3), 302–311. https://doi.org/10.30918/AERJ.103.22.049

Ukeje B. O. (1996). Teacher education for national Development. In P. N. Maiyanga (Ed.), *Teacher education: An imperative for national development*. National Commission for colleges of Education.

Umar, O. S., Kenayathulla, H. B., & Hoque, K. E. (2021). Principal leadership practices and   school effectiveness in Niger state, Nigeria. *South African Journal of Education, 41*(3),1–12. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v41n3a1859

Uslu, O. (2019). General overview to leadership theories from a critical perspective. *Marketynh i Menedzhment Innovat͡siĭ*, 161–172. https://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2019.1-13

Verawati, D. M., & Hartono, B. (2020). Effective leadership: from the perspective of trait   theory and behaviours theory. *Jurnal Riset Ekonomi Manajemen (REKOMEN), 4*(1), 13-   23. https://doi.org/10.31002/rn.v4i1.2147

Vickers, E. (2020). Critiquing coloniality, 'epistemic violence' and western hegemony in comparative education–the dangers of ahistoricism and positionality. *Comparative Education, 56*(2): 165-189.

Vidal, G. G., Campdesuñer, R. P., Rodríguez, A. S., & Vivar, R. M. (2017). Contingency theory to study leadership styles of small businesses owner-managers at Santo Domingo,   Ecuador. *International Journal of Engineering Business Management, 9*,184797901774317–. https://doi.org/10.1177/1847979017743172

Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2007). Leadership style, organizational politics, and employees' performance: an empirical examination of two competing models. *Personnel Review, 36*(5), 661-683.

Visone, J. D. (2020). Teacher leadership for excellence in US national blue-ribbon schools. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 1*–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1811897

Wallace, T. L., Ye, F., & Chhuon, V. (2012). Subdimensions of adolescent belonging in high school. *Applied Developmental Science, 16*(3), 122–139.

Wallace, M. (2001). Sharing leadership of schools through teamwork: A justifiable risk? *Educational Management & Administration, 29*(2), 153-167.

Walumbwa, F. O., & Lawler, J. J. (2003). Building effective organizations: Transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related attitudes, and withdrawal behaviours in three emerging economies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 14*(7), 1083–1101.

Walumbwa, F. O., & Ojode, L. A (2000). *Gender stereotype and instructors' leadership behaviour: Transformational and transactional leadership.* Midwest Academy of Management Annual Conference at Chicago, March 30th-April 1st

Waters, R. D. (2013). The role of stewardship in leadership: Applying the contingency theory of leadership to relationship cultivation practices of public relations practitioners. *Journal of Communication Management (London, England), 17*(4), 324–340. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-05-2012-0041

Weaver, R. R. & Qi, J. (2005). Classroom organization and participation: College students' perception. *The Journal of Higher Education,76*(5), 570-601.

Webber, C. F., & Nickel, J. (2021). Sustainable teacher leadership. *Research In Educational Administration & Leadership, 6*(1), 277–311. https://doi.org/10.30828/real/2021.1.9

Webber, C. F., & Okoko, J. M. (2021). Exploring teacher leadership across cultures: Introduction to teacher leadership. *Research in Educational Administration and Leadership, 6*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.30828/real/2021.1.1

Webber, C. F. (2021). The need for cross-cultural exploration of teacher leadership. *Research In Educational Administration & Leadership, 6*(1), 17–49. https://doi.org/10.30828/real/2021.1.2

Wenner, J. A., & Campbell, T. (2017). The theoretical and empirical basis of teacher leadership: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 87*(1), 134–171.

Wasley, P. A. (1991). *Teachers Who Lead: The rhetoric of reform and the realities of practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

White, S. K. (2022). *What is transformational leadership? A model for motivating innovation*. CIO.

Wilmore, E.L. (2007). *Teacher leadership: Improving teaching and learning from inside the classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Wilson, A. J., Liu, Y., Keith, S. E., Wilson, A. H., Kermer, L. E., Zumbo, B. D. & Beauchamp, M. R. (2012). Transformational teaching and child psychological needs satisfaction, motivation, and engagement in elementary school physical education. *Sport, Exercise and Performance Psychology, 1*(4), 215-230.

Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J., & Krüger, M. L. (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly,39*(3), 398-425.

Yahaya, R., & Ebrahim, F. (2016). Leadership styles and organizational commitment: literature review. *The Journal of Management Development, 35*(2), 190–216. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-01-2015-0004

Yildirim, O., Acar, A. C., Bull, S., & Sevinc, L. (2008). Relationships between teachers' perceived leadership style, students' learning style, and academic achievement: a study on high school students. *Educational Psychology (Dorchester-on-Thames), 28*(1), 73–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410701417945

Yukl, G. A. (2007). Leadership in organizations. New York City: Pearson Education

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education.

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: a review of theory and research. *Journal of Management, 15*(2), 251–289.

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

Zaccaro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *The American Psychologist, 62*(1), 6–16. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.6

Zahorik, J., Halbach, A., Ehrle, K., & Molnar, A. (2003). Teaching practices for smaller classes. *Educational Leadership, 61*(1), 75-77.

Zhang, Y., & Henderson, D. (2018). Interactions between principals and teacher leaders in the context of Chinese curriculum reform: A micropolitical perspective. *Australian Educational Researcher, 45*(5), 603–624.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: The Invitation letter of the present research.

Principal Investigator: Kaosy Azuka (kaosy.azuka@tuni.fi)

Supervisor: Zsuzsanna Millei (Zsuzsa.millei@tuni.fi)

Faculty of Education and Culture, Tampere University

Åkerlundinkatu 5, 33014Tampere University

Dear Participant,

Re: Invitation to Participate in a Research

This letter invites you to participate in a research study entitled "Examining Teacher Leadership Using the Full Range of Leadership Model: Perspectives of Senior Year Students in Apo Secondary Schools, Abuja, Nigeria." The primary purpose of this study is to investigate, from your perspective, the leadership of senior secondary school teachers in Apo district. This study will lay the groundwork for the development of teacher leadership in the Nigerian classrooms.

You are not required to participate in this survey. Nevertheless, if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw from the research at any time without being required to provide a reason. It will take approximately 15 minutes to complete the pen-and-paper questionnaire in the presence of a qualified representative of the researcher. In addition, you will be required to provide verbal consent and some basic information about yourself. The information collected from you will be kept safe and will not be revealed to anyone. After the research has been completed, the data collected will be destroyed. There are no risks associated with participating in this study, and all personal information provided in the questionnaire will be kept confidential and not included in the final report.

Before providing your consent to participate in the study, please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss the provided information or have any questions.

We appreciate you taking the time to read this.

Yours sincerely,

Kaosy Azuka
Kaosy.azuka@tuni.fi
+2348137286996

Appendix 2: Revised version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (5x short)

MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

RATER FORM

TEACHER'S GENDER (Male or Female)	

This questionnaire is used to describe the leadership style of your Civic education teacher, as you perceive it. Answer all items on this answer sheet. **If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank**. Please answer this questionnaire anonymously.

Background Information
Kindly fill the necessary information about you

Your age:

I am Male ☐   I am Female ☐

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits the teacher(s) you are describing. Indicate an '**X**' where appropriate, using the following rating scale:

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

My teacher…	Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
1. assists me when I put effort into my class work.					
2. critically thinks and comments on the fundamental assumptions of a school of thought or theory.					
3. fails to interfere until problems become serious					
4. focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from classroom rules and standards.					
5. avoids getting involved when important issues arise					
6. talks about his/her most important values and beliefs					
7. is absent when needed					
8. seeks differing perspectives when solving problems					
9. talks optimistically about the future					
10. makes me feel proud to be associated with him or her					

Due to copyright constraints, it is not possible to include a complete replica of the instrument.