Teacher leadership inside the classroom: Implications for effective language teaching*

Didem ERDEL [a] †, Mehmet TAKKAÇ [b]

[a] *Igdir University, Igdir,76000, Turkey*
[b] *Ataturk University, Erzurum,25240, Turkey*

Abstract

On definitional and conceptual basis, strong correspondences exist between leadership and the teaching profession yet leadership is nonetheless occasionally studied in the classroom context. This study investigated in-class teacher leadership based on the Full Range Leadership (FRL) model in tertiary-level English language teaching context in Turkey, with the aim of eventually identifying the effective/ineffective classroom leader characteristics. This paper reports the results of a study designed with a mixed methods approach, using a questionnaire survey, which included Classroom Leadership Instrument, a modified version of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire administered to the students and face-to-face interviews with both instructors and students. One particular subject course was determined in two English language-related departments in a Turkish state university and the instructors teaching and the students taking this course were selected as the subject group of the study. 305 students took part in the survey while among these students, 18 were further interviewed besides the four instructors teaching the course. Quantitative data were analyzed through descriptive tests while interviews and observations were content-analyzed. Both quantitative and qualitative results, in broad terms, showed that language instructors displayed all three leadership styles of FRL, namely, transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership, with changing extents for each style. The results indicated that instructors with higher tendencies for transformational and active components of transactional styles were rather more organized, enthusiastic and committed and they were attributed with more positive and effective characteristics by their students while those with higher passive transactional and laissez-faire leadership scores were accordingly less effective in both teaching activities and their relationships with the students. Lastly, it is concluded that transformational and active transactional leadership characteristics contribute to effective leadership inside the classroom and an integration of these characteristics into teaching practices and teacher-student interaction promises potential positive outcomes.

Keywords: Classroom leadership, language classrooms, effective language teaching, transformational leadership, transactional leadership.

---

1. Introduction

The overlapping aspects of classroom instruction and leadership have been emphasized in many studies which advocate that in classroom context, the teacher possesses the role of the group leader and the students may be considered as his/her followers (Baba & Ace, 1989; Bolkan & Goodboy, 2010; Cheng, 1994; Garger & Jacques, 2008; Harrison, 2013; Harvey, Royal, & Stout, 2003; Noland, 2005; Pounder, 2008b; Salinas, 2012). House and Podsakoff (1994) point out the similarities between instructors and organizational leaders and explain that the way instructors have an effect on students, contribute to their future advancement, direct their attention into specified tasks, and introduce them to the field of study or profession is similar to how organizational leaders influence subordinates by setting tasks, giving directions, and organizing and leading operations to achieve a goal. Similarly, Garger and Jacques (2008, p. 251) write that "instructors motivate, inspire, intellectually stimulate, act as coaches and mentors, track mistakes, and give rewards for effort; all behaviors studied and discussed in the organizational leadership literature".

Although the rationale of classroom leadership research, the majority of leadership studies in educational settings comprise educational or instructional leadership, which focuses on a set of principal and teacher activities including identification of educational goals, formation of the curriculum, and assessment of teachers and teaching (Day, Gu, & Sammons, 2016). Teacher leadership, as a constituent of instructional leadership with particular emphasis on teacher characteristics that influence other parties in an educational system including colleagues, principals and students, has gained importance in the last two decades. Similar to instructional leadership, it mostly addresses formal out-of-class leadership practices such as program administration, curriculum development or professional development of colleagues (Can, 2009; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Eventually, classroom leadership research, in a broad sense, is concerned with teacher-student relationships largely taking place in classroom setting and more specifically with interactional and interpersonal teacher actions that have effects on the students in cognitive, affective and social aspects.

1.1. Literature review

1.1.1. The Full-Range Leadership Model and Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles

Leadership studies have gained pace particularly since eighties after the concept of transformational leadership, initially referred to as transforming leadership, was introduced by political historian James MacGregor Burns. Burns (1978) identified a dichotomy of transactional versus transformational leadership styles where he described transactional leadership as an exchange relationship between a leader and his/her followers, such as asking for votes in exchange for job in politics or giving bonus marks in return for better student performances. Transforming leadership, on the other hand, referred to a relationship through which the leader and followers mutually "raise each other to higher levels of morality, motivation and performance" (Burns, 1978, p. 20). Later, Bass (1985) elaborated on this dichotomy and developed transformational-

transactional leadership model. Finally, Full-Range Leadership Model (FRL) introduced by Avolio and Bass (1991) as an expansion of Bass' (1985) work has become the most updated version involving transformational and transactional leadership styles besides laissez-faire leadership, as the third style. Full Range Leadership (FRL) Model has been the theoretical framework on which this study has been grounded.

Current leadership research in educational contexts has largely focused on transformational leadership; nevertheless, transactional leadership has also been accepted equally important and the interconnectedness and complementary constructs of transformational and transactional leadership have been underlined in many studies (Avolio & Bass, 2002; Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1990; Pounder, 2005). Within the framework of FRL model, three leadership outcomes are determined: the effectiveness of leader, the satisfaction of followers with the leader, and the extra effort exerted by the followers (Avolio & Bass, 1991). A positive relationship between especially transformational leadership and these outcomes has been confirmed in previous research in organizational leadership (Bass, 1999) as well as in leadership studies fulfilled in instructional contexts (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009; Harrison, 2013, Hoehl, 2008; Noland & Richards, 2014; Pounder, 2004, 2005, 2008a, 2008b; Walumbwa, Wu, & Ojode, 2004).

When the essentials of FRL notion are considered, it is seen that especially transformational leadership is associated with such terms as inspiration, empowerment, motivation, commitment or enthusiasm which are among the most frequently articulated qualifications of an effective teacher (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011; Kim, 2012; Noland, 2005). Besides, contemporary approaches to language teaching disfavor traditional and authoritarian roles of teachers and rather favor roles such as facilitators of effective learning, who establish right conditions for and deal with learning needs of individual students (Webrinska, 2009), which are indeed among the characteristic features of a transformational leader. It is surprising that leadership has hardly ever been mentioned in language teaching and learning literature so far (Greenier & Whiteland, 2016). It is, therefore, aimed in this study to investigate in-class teacher leadership based on the Full Range Leadership (FRL) model in tertiary-level English language teaching context in Turkey in order to eventually identify the effective/ineffective classroom leader characteristics.

2. Method

The current paper is based on a broader-scope dissertation study conducted in mixed methods research design. Mixed methods design is defined by Creswell (2014, p. 4) as "an approach to inquiry involving collecting both qualitative and quantitative data, integrating the two forms of data, and using distinct designs that may involve philosophical assumptions and theoretical frameworks". This design brings along many advantageous aspects including increasing the strengths while eliminating the weaknesses of different methods and techniques; enabling a multi-level analysis of complex issues; improving validity; and reaching multiple audiences, that is to say, to people from different paradigmatic orientations (Dörnyei, 2007).

2.1. Setting and participants

The setting of the present study was the English Language Teaching (ELT) and English Language and Literature (ELL) departments of a state university located in the Eastern Anatolian region of Turkey. In the determination of research setting and participants, non-probability sampling methods were followed. The particular university and departments that the research data were collected were chosen due to their accessibility for the researcher, which refers to the utilization of convenience sampling method. In the selection of the specific course and participating instructors and students, a purposive sampling was followed. Four instructors teaching the Writing I and Advanced Writing I courses in the fall semester of 2015-2016 academic year and the preparatory and first year undergraduate students taking these courses were selected as the sample participants of the present study. The main study was conducted in totally five preparatory classes (one in the ELT department and four in the ELL department) and six first year classes (two in the ELT and four in the ELL department) whereas one of the first year classes in ELL department was chosen as the pilot group to test the questionnaire survey. The instructors were labeled as instructor A (IA), instructor B (IB), instructor C (IC) and instructor D (ID). The title, department, number of classes and participating students of each instructor are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Information about the Participating Instructors

Instructor	Title	Department	Number of Classes	Number of Students in survey (%)	Number of Students interviewed
IA	Lecturer	ELL	4(preparatory)	112 (37,3 %)	6
IB	Assistant Professor	ELL	3(first year)	85 (28,3 %)	6
IC	Lecturer	ELT	1(preparatory)	36 (12,0 %)	2
ID	Research Assistant	ELT	2(first year)	67 (22,3 %)	4
Total			10	300	18

As regards the positions of the four instructors at the university, one of the instructors was an assistant professor and one was a research assistant while the other two were English language lecturers. The instructors only took part at the qualitative data collection phase where face-to-face interviews were conducted. Total number of students who participated in the quantitative survey was 305; however, after the papers of those students who had left an intolerable number of unanswered items were eliminated, the number was reduced to 300. The demographic information of these participant students is given in Table 2 below. As provided previously in Table 1, the number of students with whom the interviews were fulfilled was eighteen in total.

Table 2. Demographic Information about the Students Participating in the Survey

Variables	Categories	Ϝ	%
Gender	Male	77	25,7
	Female	223	74,3
Department	ELT	104	34,7
	ELL	196	65,3
Instructor	IA	111	37,0
	IB	85	28,3
	IC	36	12,0
	ID	68	22,7

TOTAL	300	100

As presented in Table 2, three fourths of participants were female with the percentage of 74,3 while male participants had the percentage of 25,7. With respect to the participants' departments, ELL students constituted two thirds of participants with a percentage of 65,3 while ELT students were included with a percentage of 34,7. Among the instructors, IA had the highest number of participant students (37,0 %) in the survey followed by IB (28,3 %), ID (22,7 %) and IC (12,0 %), respectively.

2.2. Data collection instruments

The data were collected via the Classroom Leadership Instrument (CLI) of Pounder (2004), a modified form of Bass and Avolio's (2000) Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X short version, 45 items in total). The researcher developed a semi-structured interview consisting of questions each of which scrutinized one dimension of the FRL model. Two interview protocols were developed for the instructors and the students. The instructor interview protocol included ten questions while student interview protocol included eight. The only difference between the protocols was the question inquiring the instructors' experience in the course and their title.

2.3. Validity and Reliability

In the present study, triangulation has been a major strategy followed to ensure the quality. Also, in order to test the qualitative reliability, an intercoder reliability measurement was followed. Three student interviews were selected randomly and coded by two independent coders, the researcher and an expert in the field of ELT. The codes were analyzed through Miles and Huberman's (1994) intercoder reliability formula which is calculated as follows:

$$Reliability = \frac{Na\ (agreements)}{Na\ (Agreements) + Nd\ (Disagreements)}$$

In accordance with the formula, the codes extracted from each interview by the two coders were compared and the numbers of agreed and disagreed codes were determined. Then, the number of agreed codes was divided into the total number of agreements and disagreements. Miles and Huberman (1994) acknowledge a value of 70 % and above reliable, and the percent for this study was 82, indicating that coding of the researcher was 82 % reliable.

The quantitative reliability was tested by measuring the internal consistency of CLI in both the pilot study and the main study. Cronbach's Alpha result of the pilot survey was .79 and as for the main survey, Cronbach's Alpha and split-half coefficient values of the CLI were found to be .90 and .82, respectively.

2.4. Data analysis

The survey data were coded and entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and the descriptive and inferential statistics were used in analyses. In the current paper, only the descriptive findings are provided. The qualitative data gathered in the study were analyzed through content analysis. Weber (1990, p. 9) defines

content analysis as "a research method that uses a set of procedures to make valid inferences from text." Content analysis is used to determine the existence of words, concepts, themes, phrases, characters or sentences in a text or texts and to quantify them (Kızıltepe, 2015). Since the FRL model and its components were taken into consideration in the design of the interview questions of the present study, the analysis of data from this data collection type had a deductive nature.

3. Results

3.1. Quantitative findings

Since the students rated their instructors' behaviors in CLI, it was necessary to investigate whether students of each instructor responded differently from each other. The normality tests indicated the necessity of using non-parametric tests, so Kruskal-Wallis H was carried out to determine instructor-based differences in students' responses. Analyses results, as given in Table 3, revealed significant differences in responses for transformational and transactional leadership styles (p<.001) while results for laissez-faire leadership were found statistically insignificant (p>.05). In other words, according to the students' point of view, the four instructors demonstrated transformational and transactional leadership behaviors at significantly different frequencies.

Table 3. Kruskal-Wallis H Test Results for Perceived Leadership Styles of Instructors

Leadership styles	Instructor	N	Mean rank	χ^2	p
Transformational	D	68	186.83		
	A	111	155.47		
	C	36	133.76	22.80	.000***
	B	85	122.04		
Transactional	D	68	182.82		
	A	111	167.22	34.06	.000***
	C	36	135.69		
	B	85	109.09		
Laissez-faire	A	111	157.42		
	B	85	152.02		
	C	36	146.71	1.95	.582
	D	68	139.31		

*** p<.001

When the mean values of each instructor are examined, it is observed that ID had the highest scores for both transformational (M=186.83) and transactional leadership (M=182.82) styles and the lowest for the laissez-faire (M=139.31). IB had the lowest mean rank for the transformational (M=122.04) and transactional leadership (M=109.09) styles while she also was the second highest rated for the laissez-faire leadership (M=152.02).

3.2. Qualitative findings

The codes and categories extracted from instructor interview records are provided in this section under the predetermined themes each one representing a particular

leadership component. The components of transformational leadership were addressed in the interview with six questions while transactional leadership components were questioned via two questions. Laissez-faire leadership was not interrogated separately; instead, it was included as a sub-component within a question addressing management-by-exception.

3.2.1. Instructors' responses

3.2.1.1. Theme 1: Idealized influence.

Three questions were asked to the instructors in order to detect what they thought about their influence on their students. The instructors were initially asked to describe themselves as the instructor of this course with four or five adjectives that would best define them. As given in Table 4, the responses were grouped in the category of *self-perception*. The most commonly given response was "patient" (N=3); and the adjectives of "tolerant", understanding" and "optimist/positive", which can be accepted as close in meaning, were also commonly uttered by the instructors. The most divergent response came from ID, who defined herself with adjectives such as innovative, productive, motivating and efficient which are typically amongst the effective characteristics of a transformational leader.

Table 4. Categories and Codes for Instructor Responses Regarding Idealized Influence

Category	Codes
Self-perception	Directive, patient, positive, optimist, angry (IA)
	Patient, tolerant, self-improving, caring (IB)
	Patient, optimist, experienced, understanding (IC)
	Efficient, productive, innovative, motivating, interested in the course (ID)
Sharing with students	Personal learning experiences (IC)
	Personal opinions about the importance of writing (IA, ID)
	Advice for self-improvement (IB)
	Not sharing personal beliefs (IC, IB)
Raising students' positive feelings (e.g. respect, trust)	Building immediacy (IA)
	Providing tolerance (IA)
	Being equipped of knowledge (IB, IC)
	Following principles and being inflexible (ID)
	Not expect students' liking/respect (IC, IB)

The *idealized influence* component of transformational leadership is theoretically regarded to be determined by two factors: how the leaders treat their followers, i.e. ideal leader behaviors, and what their followers attribute to them. In the interview, the first factor, ideal behaviors, was referred with the question asking to what extent and how the instructors shared their personal thoughts, beliefs or values with their students. As shown in Table 4, codes from instructor responses to this question were grouped in the category of *sharing with students*. The instructors all stated that they talked about personal ideas if related to the course, particularly sharing their personal learning experiences and opinions about the development of writing skill and giving advice on self-improvement techniques. IC, for instance, said:

Certainly, I do (share personal thoughts and beliefs with students). *We have already experienced what they are experiencing now. … Therefore, when I see them, I talk about*

my experiences saying 'I did it this way or I did this when I faced the same difficulty' and I try to be helpful based on my own experiences.

Similarly, IB was inclined to give advice on personal improvement in the course and explained this as follows:

Most of the students, if not all, are already willing and they come and ask me 'how can we improve our writing ability?'. What I advise them was that they should read more in both Turkish and English, if they wanted to write better … I give such advice.

IA and ID stated that they shared their opinions more on the significance of the course and the development of writing skills. ID explained how and why she did so:

… In especially writing courses … I tell the students 'You have to give importance to writing, especially in the first years because you will need it during your education life…. So, for both your improvement and your success, and at least with pragmatic reasons, to finish school, you should improve your writing.' …

The second dimension of idealized influence, i.e. the attributions of students, was addressed with the questions of how important their students' feelings for them were and what they did to raise those feelings. As presented in Table 4, the codes of "build immediacy, "provide tolerance", "be equipped of knowledge", "follow principles and be inflexible", and "not expect students' liking/respect" were included in the category of *Raising students' positive feelings (e.g. respect, trust).* All four instructors acknowledged the importance of positive feelings such as trust and respect while their responses differed in their acts and behaviors to manage and maintain the positive feelings of students towards them. Following is the response of IC to this question:

Trust is very important for me because one can get something from the person he/she trusts. So, in order to get this trust, I try not to have failings. … Respect comes if you do your job properly, it is not something expected. … So I do not expect it, they do not have to respect me.

IA gave a similar response. Additionally, when asked how he maintained students' positive attitudes towards his classes, he responded:

I primarily make them enjoy the course. If they enjoy the course, they, accordingly, like the teacher. I try to tolerate things so that they may like the teacher... I do as much as I can so that students might not get distanced from the course.

ID had a different perspective towards building trust and respect. Setting principles and following them inflexibly, according to her point of view, was the reason her students trusted and respected her. Here are her words:

In order to establish trust and respect, I tried not to break the promises I made and go outside the lines I drew. For example, homework assignments should be submitted in time, I have never accepted assignments after deadline …. I stated in the syllabus at the beginning of the term that there would be in-class works and unknown quizzes, and that the unknown quizzes will be included in the end-of-term evaluation so as to promote attendance. ….

As a conclusion, all four instructors reported positively about their idealized influence on their students. They all used favorable adjectives while defining themselves and

stated to share personal experiences, opinions or advice about the course content and to care about raising students' positive feelings for them.

3.2.1.2. Theme 2: Individualized consideration.

Instructor responses to the fourth question of the interview, "*To what extent and how do you respond to your students' individual needs, weaknesses and strengths*?" formed the categories and codes of the theme of individualized consideration. As shown in Table 5, the two categories determined for this theme were *assignments* and *consultation*, and the first category consisted of the codes of "in-class writing tasks", "homework assignments", "individual portfolios", "individual online feedback", and "peer feedback/cooperative work" while the latter included the codes of "recommending resources" and "inviting to office to show mistakes". According to their statements, assignments were given by all four instructors in and out of the classroom, and individual evaluations and feedback were provided for each student.

Table 5. Categories and Codes for Instructor Responses Regarding Individualized Consideration

Category	Codes
Assignments	In-class writing tasks (IA, IB, IC, ID)
	Homework assignments (IA, IB, IC, ID)
	Individual portfolios (ID)
	Individual online feedback (IA)
	Peer feedback/cooperative work (IB, ID)
Consultation	Recommending resources (IC)
	Inviting to office to show mistakes (IB)

The instructors had various ways of approaching student performances; however, as clear in Table 5, they all assigned in-class writings and homework which they evaluated individually. When asked how she approached students' individual needs, strengths and weaknesses, IB explained how she evaluated students' individual homework assignments and in-class writings as follows:

I personally go through their papers, read them one by one, like exam papers. Sometimes I hand them out and sometimes, without giving names so as to keep their pride intact and for everyone to see the mistake, I write general mistakes on the board. Sometimes, if we have time during the course, I ask them to write their assignments on the board and we find their mistakes together. …

ID shared the same vision and she also promoted cooperative work in the assessment of individual improvement. Following are her words:

… I give more importance to cooperative works for writing skill because studying individually is not sufficient for writing. … Therefore, I give prominence to cooperative work over individual study so that the students could receive feedback both from their friends in group works and from the teacher during in-class tasks.

IA followed his students' individual improvement through their homework assignments submitted weekly online through their Google Drive accounts. He answered the question as follows:

*I check all the papers one by one. When I cannot complete this process during the lesson, I read them online and send them (*the feedback*) back to the students."*

ID distinguishably used learner portfolios in order to monitor her students' individual development. She explained this process as follows:

We have homework assignments and in-class tasks every week. The students initially went through a sample text and reviewed it. I provided feedback for each work on weekly basis. The students learnt what is wrong through feedback … They had their own portfolios. …

As given in Table 5, as a consultation resort, the instructors stated that they recommended resources or invited students to their offices to show their mistakes. With following words, IC explained how he dealt with students' individual strengths and weaknesses:

I personally expect some demand from the students but when I observe their particular characteristics, I see them outside the class or during break times, or I advise them resources necessary for them to compensate for their weaknesses. As for their strengths, I try to canalize their interest according to their abilities or the areas they are good at.

As shown in Table 5, the other instructor who offered out-of-class individual assistance to students with problems in the course was IB. She said:

The classes are very crowded. Unfortunately they cannot have individual care but I invite those students having difficulty in the course or in grammar to my office and show them their mistakes, as much as I can. I show their mistakes not only on exam papers but also during in-class tasks.

In sum, the implementation of individual consideration common for all four instructors was the evaluation of in-class writing tasks and homework assignments of the students' individual performances. ID and IA differently used student portfolios and online files, respectively. They also reportedly provided out of class assistance to meet individual needs of their students such as advising resources or giving further explanations on student errors in office hours.

3.2.1.3. Theme 3: Intellectual stimulation.

The interview question addressing the theme of intellectual stimulation was "*To what extent and how do you respond to your students' attempts to try new ways and methods in language learning within the context of the subject course?*" The categories determined for this theme were *student-related problems* and *supporting creativity*. As Table 6 presents, students' insufficient L2 knowledge, worries about failure in writing and negative feelings towards writing skill were the student-related problems the instructors reported to face when they intended to stimulate the students' intellectual development. Putting these problems aside, almost all of the instructors stated that they showed positive attitudes towards students' trying new ways and methods in learning; however, regarding their practical approaches towards supporting students' creativity, all had different approaches. As Table 6 shows, providing outside resources, asking students to read more, eliminating prejudices against writing, fostering development of daily L2 writing skills and introducing existing or new strategies such as free-writing, listing or brainstorming were the ways the instructors stated to support creativity.

Table 6. Categories and Codes for Instructor Responses Regarding Intellectual Stimulation

Categories	Codes
Student-related problems	Insufficient L2 knowledge (IA, IB)
	Worries about writing (IB)
	Negative feelings towards writing (IC)
Supporting creativity	Positive approach (IA, IC, ID)
	Making students read more (IA)
	Providing outside resources (IA)
	Eliminating prejudices against writing (IB)
	Fostering development of daily L2 (IC)
	Practicing existing pre-writing strategies, e.g. free writing, listing, brainstorming (ID)
	Introducing own pre-writing strategies (ID)

As given in Table 6, IA was one of the instructors stating student-related problems as the obstacles to intellectual stimulation. His words are as follows: *"The students do not generally try new ways, there is no such thing because of their language level, but I usually respond positively. I try to direct them to find what is better."*

When the researcher asked how he did it and what he particularly did to support the students' creativity, IA responded:

For instance, I make them read more so as to improve their writing and I try to have them learn some cultural information since culture is always within writing. And I also make them use what they have learnt in other courses like grammar.

The researcher once again asked if he provided particular tactics or methods for creative writing, he said: *"Generally we stick to the course book so they do not and cannot get independent of it. What I can do is to provide outside resources or at least give advice to them."*

When asked to what extent and how she promoted students' creativity, IB told about how her students' language level and their worries about not writing well limited their creativity. The way she promoted creativity, according to her following statement, was challenging the students' worries about writing by imposing the belief that they could succeed. The response of IC had similar points with IA and IB regarding how students' feelings influenced their creativity and how he personally approved creativity. However, apparently, he had some concerns regarding the accuracy of the structures students used while attempting to write creatively.

When the researcher asked what he did in order to promote creative writing, IC said:

For example we have a WhatsApp group where we always talk about the course or the topics they have problems in understanding. They make sentences in English there while trying to express themselves. By this way, they both use technology for the course and use current daily life abbreviations, etc. That is how I try to introduce new things and trends to the students.

ID distinguishably stated that she used many pre-writing strategies to foster students' finding new ideas for their writings. She said:

I showed them some pre-writing strategies. I told them 'you can do listing, clustering or free-writing, and these are general things. You can make your draft the way you like.' For example, while writing a narrative essay, I asked them to draw a picture first, which is not a pre-writing strategy written in books."

Although all instructors stated that they responded positively to students' pursuit of new ways and methods in learning their course content in various ways, the practices of ID appeared to be of highest relevance to intellectual stimulation, particularly to stimulating students' creative writing skills. With the help of pre-activity tasks she reportedly used such as brainstorming, free-writing or outlining, the students had the opportunity to improve their creative and innovative thinking skills, which is the core element of intellectual stimulation dimension of transformational leadership.

3.2.1.4. Theme 4: Inspirational motivation.

Inspirational motivation is the final theme that is a component of transformational leadership. The four instructors were asked about how they motivated their students for language learning within the framework of the writing course they had been teaching. As shown in Table 7, instructors' responses were divided into two categories of *acts* and *words* since, according to their statements; they either tried to motive their students by giving verbal advice and/or by making purposeful acts in order to enhance their students' motivation. The codes in the *acts* category were "providing feedback", "promoting engagement", and "keeping the course entertaining" while *words* category included the codes of "specifying course objectives from the beginning", "talking about importance of language learning/writing", and "encouraging".

Table 7. Categories and Codes for Instructor Responses Regarding Inspirational Motivation

Categories	Codes
Acts	Providing feedback (IA, ID)
	Promoting engagement (IA, IC)
	Keeping the course entertaining (IA, IC)
Words	Specifying course objectives from the beginning (IA)
	Talking about importance of language learning/writing (IB, IC)
	Encouraging (IB)

As also clear in Table 7, IA stated that he motivated his students both verbally and practically by giving feedback, encouraging classroom engagement, teaching the course in an entertaining way, and also by specifying course objectives from the beginning of the year. His response to the related question is as follows:

I inform the students about the department and what they are expected to do from the beginning of the year; … I try to make them enjoy the course. ... For example, if their motivation is low, I stop the lesson and make jokes or talk about something funny or about daily life. If a student is not concentrated on the lesson, I make jokes to him/her to draw his/her attention to the course or direct a question to that student.

IB, according to her response to the related question, only provided verbal support for her students' motivation by talking about the importance of the writing course and by encouraging her students saying 'they can do it':

I tell them 'you can do this. ... You do not have to be shy; I am your teacher and I am here to help you'. Apart from these, I tell them that writing is a course that affects all other courses. ... That is how I motivate them.

IC motivated his students, as he stated, through both his acts and his words. He promoted classroom engagement, made the course entertaining and also talked about the importance of the writing skill:

I talk about the future advantages of learning a language and also about the entertaining aspects of language. Through activities such as contests or games, I try to show them the lesson as a part of their daily life. I try to motivate my students by telling them that learning a language will open the doors of the outer world to them.

ID considered her weekly and regular feedback as the major resource of student motivation in this course. She said:

Maintaining student motivation during the class is one of the hardest things. In my course they became more motivated when they saw that they could write. When I gave the feedback, they said 'yes, I can write' or 'I should pay more attention to this'. … If I had not controlled them, they would not keep writing. …. Their mistakes motivated them. ... In the beginning, they wanted to complete the homework for course assessment... but later, as they became successful, the feeling of success made them more motivated.

Among the actions and remarks through which the instructors reportedly motivated their students, specifying the objectives of the course in the beginning, and mentioning the importance and advantages of the writing skill and/or language learning were of highest relevance to the defining characteristics of inspirational motivation. Creating a feeling of success through ongoing feedback, challenging learning inhibitions by heartening students and engaging students in lesson with entertaining activities were other motivating behaviors of the instructors according to their own statements.

3.2.1.5. Theme 5: Contingent reward.

The contingent reward (a transactional leadership component) theme, was addressed in the interview with the question of "*How do you respond to success/successful performances in this course, (e.g., any rewards, praise, etc.)?*" Table 8 displays categories of *verbal* and *instrumental* and the codes within each category extracted from interviewee responses. "Praising and appraising" and "showing successful students exemplary among peers" were the codes in the *verbal* category while "giving bonus marks" and "giving small prizes, e.g., chocolate, candy" were the codes determined to be included in *instrumental* category.

Table 8. Categories and Codes for Instructor Responses Regarding Contingent Reward

Categories	Codes
Verbal	Praise, appraisal (in-class and on assignments) (IA, IB, IC, ID)
	Showing successful students exemplary among peers (IA, IB, IC, ID)
Instrumental	Giving bonus marks (IA, IC, ID)
	Giving small prizes, e.g., chocolate, candy (IA)

In the following quote, IB narrated how she reacted to good performances and how she praised a successful writing performance of one student in the other classes of hers:

… When I go around the class, I make comments and say 'you should write it this way' or to those who write well, I say 'you have written well, well done, bravo' or 'this is quite good'. I turn to the class and tell them 'your friend's paragraph is very nice, isn't it?' …

IC and ID, according to their statements, responded to good performances both verbally through praises and by showing them examples to others, and also instrumentally by giving extra marks. He stated: *"I give feedback more with praise such as 'very good' or 'good idea', or I turn to peers and say 'look how well he/she has written!'. Generally, I use praise."*

Similarly, ID explained how she reacted to successful performances by appraising good work in front of the class and using bonus marks as follows:

The best feedback I can give to a successful performance is giving marks. Sometimes I show the works I like as examples to other students so that both others could see it and the student could feel more motivated... I rather use additional marks more generally.

IA also used praises and appraisals in his feedback to student performances. He said:

I generally write them on the homework papers. ... However, when I try to engage the students in the course I at least thank to those who actively participate or tell them 'you have done well', 'this is good', 'this is better' or guide them saying 'this would be better'.

He later continued: *"I give feedback verbally in general. Apart from that, making the student feel proud among the peers is the best way."*

In sum, all four instructors stated that they showed successful students as examples among their classmates to strengthen their feeling of success and confidence. Another way of rewarding success all instructors mentioned was providing praise or appraisals for students' performances. In addition to these appraising words, all instructors except for instructor B gave additional marks to those students with better performances according to their statements.

3.2.1.6. Theme 6: Management-by-exception.

This component of transactional leadership is theoretically divided into active and passive management; however, these two dimensions of transaction leadership and also laissez-faire leadership were integrated in one question in the interviews of this study. The instructors were asked what they did in case of any failure or inadequacy in their students' learning so that the question could have an open ending. In order to elicit data about passive management and laissez-faire leadership, the researcher added three choices to the question: a) I follow students' progress from the beginning and take action as soon as I detect any problems; b) I take action only when I detect the failure or inadequacy; c) I do not take action. All four instructors favored A, and explained how they managed their students' progress and how they provided corrective feedback during this process. Table 9 presents codes and categories determined for the theme of management-by-exception. The codes are given in two categories: *individual* and *general*. Three instructors stated that they gave both individual and group-level corrective feedback and support in case of inadequate or unsuccessful performances.

Table 9. Categories and Codes for Instructor Responses Regarding Management-by-exception

Categories	Codes
Individual	Ongoing in and out of class feedback (IA, IB, IC, ID)
	Telling individual mistakes anonymously to avoid giving offence (IB, ID)
	Ignoring uninterested students (IA)

	Peer correction (IB, ID)
General	Verbal warnings about common grammar and spelling errors (IB, IC, ID)
	Giving advice to students about their responsibilities (IC)

As shown in Table 9, all four instructors stated that they provided perpetual corrective feedback throughout the course. In the following quotes, the instructors explained how they managed students' errors, mistakes or general failures:

IC: *Since this is the writing course and therefore, they always write, there is already a continuous evaluation. For instance, I give a format, they write in it and I evaluate. Since the grammar topics are given simultaneously, as I give the grammar course, too; I provide permanent feedback from the very beginning.*

IB: *If we are going through a paragraph, I ask the peers to comment. If there is a mistake in their evaluations, I intervene right away. I evaluate paper works right away, too; however, sometimes class hours are limited, so I take the papers, evaluate them later, and give them back during the class, going next to the students and warning them individually about the mistakes....I write the mistake on the board. ... I never directly say 'you did this mistake'.*

When asked whether she provided feedback from the beginning of the semester, IB responded positively; however, she added that she could not do it all the time due to crowded classes and limited course hours.

Similar to IB's statement above, ID also said that she avoided a strict approach to student errors and the in-public announcement of individual errors:

I tried not to give strict negative feedback so as not to discourage them, I mean, I avoided saying 'this is not right' or 'you can't do this'. I rather said 'you can be more successful if you pay attention to these mistakes'...

When her feedback to homework papers was asked, ID responded:

I give feedback on papers, especially by underlining errors, writing the true version or putting a question mark if there is a point not understood… I follow students' progress phase by phase and intervene and give feedback if I detect a problem.

IA also controlled student performances on a regular basis. He, however, added that he ignored uninterested students after a while if he did not receive any return for his attempts:

I try to engage the students into the lesson for a while. When they fail, I show the right way. If they cannot improve, I show again and again; but after a while, if the student is too indifferent to the course, I do not push too much.

All four instructors, according to their statements, monitored their students' progress by providing continuous feedback. In addition to these, IB and ID used peer correction and IC gave students advice about their responsibilities as learners. IA's ignorance towards uninterested students, on the other hand, inferred a partial presence of laissez-faire leadership.

3.2.2. Students' responses

The student participants were addressed with the same questions as their instructors excluding the first two (those asking the instructor's title and year of service in the subject course) and the same procedures of content analysis were followed in the analysis of their responses. Different from the reports of instructor responses in the preceding section, the frequencies of the codes are provided in parentheses in tables in this part.

3.2.2.1. Theme 1: Idealized influence.

Three questions in the student interviews, as in the instructor interviews, addressed the idealized influence theme. In the first question, the students were asked to describe their instructors with four or five adjectives. The second question was to what extent and how the instructors shared their personal thoughts, beliefs or values with their students. The final question addressing this theme was how the students felt about their instructors. As displayed in Table 10, *students' positive opinions; negative opinions; sharing with students; positive feelings and negative feelings* were the categories of this theme.

Table 10. Categories and Codes for Student Responses Regarding Idealized Influence

Categories	Codes
Positive opinions	Sympathetic/ friendly (7)
	A good teacher (5)
	Understanding / optimist (5)
	Competent / successful / well-educated (5)
	Hardworking/devoted (4)
	Disciplined / organized /decisive (4)
	Entertaining (2)
	Loving the job (1)
	Good person (1)
	Thoughtful/respectful (1)
	Good communication (1)
Negative opinions	Authoritarian /strict /short tempered (7)
	Boring/low energy(6)
	Distant / serious (5)
	Not authoritarian (2)
	Intolerant to irresponsibility (1)
	Prejudiced (1)
	Indifferent (1)
	dominant(1)
	Inefficient (1)
	A little shy (1)
Sharing with students	Advice & examples on skill development (12)
	Not sharing personal values/private life (9)
	Talk about personal writing/studying experiences (5)
	Talk about importance of writing skill (2)
	Talk about international experiences (1)
	Share personal opinions on out-of-class subjects (1)
	Distant (1)
	Reflects anger or joy (1)
Positive feelings	trust his/her field knowledge (13)
	Like his attitudes (6)
	Respect him/her (6)
	Take her/him as a role model (4)
	Like her/him for being disciplined / organized (3)

	Favorite teacher (1)
	His love for teaching evokes interest to course (1)
Negative feelings	Not like his/her way of teaching (3)
	Not like his/her distant/ too serious attitudes (3)
	Not take as a role model (1)

An instructor-based evaluation of student responses revealed that the majority of positive comments were made for IA and ID while most of inappreciative opinions were shared by the students of IB. For instance, S1 who was a student of IA responded: *"A good teacher, short-tempered, sympathetic, loving his job, and not hasty."* Excluding "short-tempered", all these adjectives appeared positive. Another student of the same instructor, S3 said: *"entertaining, hardworking and successful."* Another participant who was a student of ID responded: *"I think she is well-educated, secondly, she is organized, rule-based, and sympathetic. I like her, she is cute."* On the other hand, less affirmative comments were frequently shared by the students of IB. For example, S5 used following adjectives: *"very distant, prejudiced, aggressive and very resentful."* When the researcher asked how the student found her as a teacher, she responded: *"I think she is bored, I mean overwhelmed. Maybe it is because of students' attitudes but she seems like 'this is enough, I do not want to be a teacher any more'."* A few of other students also commented on the same instructor with less favorable words stating that she was not very energetic during classes, which affected their willingness to attend the course as they reported. Yet, another student, S10, who also commented on IB, used some positive words, although he also added some criticism: *"First of all, she is devoted. She is interested with our weaknesses. But we all have a right to criticize. She dictates the paragraphs these days, and I do not find the course beneficial."*

In the *sharing with students* category, advice and examples on skill development were the most common items. S2, a student of IA, stated how his instructor gave advice and examples from his own life besides talking about the importance of writing skill and also about his own writing experiences:

Of course he does. For example, he talks about how writing will be useful in the department and about the benefits of good writing skills. ... And since he loves his job, I love writing course more.

One of the students of IB, S8 explained how his instructor shared her own studying habits with the students:

Of course she shares. For example, she once taught some vocabulary memorizing techniques saying 'I used to study this way'...

One of the students of IB also mentioned how the instructor once talked about her international academic experiences. S12 said: *"I attended her course last week. She said she had gone to Italy or Spain, … and talked about what she experienced there in that course."*

In order to examine the *attributed* dimension of the "idealized influence" theme, the students were asked about their feelings for the instructors. Majority of the students stated that they trusted the field knowledge of their instructors and many respected them. S1 expressed her feelings for IA as follows: *"The word that best describes him is*

'kind but firm'. I like him very much. He is very strict but at the same time very sympathetic. I believe he does his job very well. I mean, he is a very good teacher."

When he researcher asked "so, you trust his field knowledge?", she responded:

Definitely, I am so glad he teaches the writing course. I believe he is good at this and that he educates well. He is competent, too. For example, when I say or write something, he examines it in detail even if it is correct. He tries to add something or to change it to make it better.

Another student of IA stated his positive feelings which were evoked by the instructor's enthusiasm for teaching with following words:

S4: *He is a teacher that really loves his course. I can see how much he enjoys giving the writing course from his eyes. ... This teacher wants us to learn with patience. So, I am very positive towards his course. I have interest in his course because he is very warm. I mean, this is a bit about the instructor. He teaches fondly and I like it. As I see his willingness to teach, I enjoy the course, too.*

All four students of ID appreciated her style which they described as disciplined, organized and decisive. These characteristics of her obviously resulted with respect and trust, and even a will to be like her in the future. Following words of S15 clearly supported this deduction:

As a teacher, she is disciplined, hardworking and rule-based, and for me, these are very good characteristics. She gives and takes everything on time. She is very punctual. It is obvious that she has very organized study habits.

When the researcher continued "What kind of feelings does this evoke in you?", the student replied: "*I would like to be like her in the future.*"

Some students, on the other hand, expressed negative feelings towards some instructors. For instance, S5, who is a student of IB, stated her respect and trust for the instructor because of her successful academic career, yet added that she would not take her as a model and implied how her classmates also did not appreciate the instructor, either:

I respect her as a teacher, but you know, there are teachers you might want to be like. She is not a teacher I look up to. ...

The researcher asked how much she trusted IB's field knowledge, S5 said: "*I have complete trust in her knowledge, ... but there is a problem in conveying us that knowledge.*"

S10, who took writing course from IB as well, explained how he expected a warmer attitude from the instructor:

The students expect warmth or immediacy from the instructor. ... I think our teacher is a bit passive at this. ... I expect a warmer talk with the students.

Consequently, considering the *behavior* dimension of idealized influence, it can be inferred from student interviews that all four instructors shared personal opinions and recommendations related to course content with their students yet, avoided talking about their private life or other subjects irrelevant to their course.

The students' feelings and opinions about the instructors, on the other hand, addressed the 'attributed' dimension of idealized influence and as apparent from students' responses, all four instructors were respected and trusted. However, the students of IA and ID uttered affirmative adjectives more frequently than those of other instructors. These two instructors were favored both for being successful in their teaching profession and also for some personal characteristics.

3.2.2.2. Theme 2: Individualized consideration.

As illustrated in Table 11, the categories determined for this theme were *assignments*, *consultation* and *student satisfaction*. The codes which were grouped under the category of *assignments* were "in-class feedback", "online submission & feedback", "on-paper feedback", "peer feedback" and "individual portfolios".

Table 11. Categories and Codes for Student Responses Regarding Individualized Consideration

Category	Codes
Assignments	On-paper feedback (15)
	In-class feedback (7)
	Online submission & feedback (2)
	Peer feedback (1)
	Individual portfolios (1)
Consultation	Respond to individual questions (5)
	Ask students to self-evaluate (2)
	Invite to office on visit hours (1)
Student satisfaction	Satisfactory (6)
	Not satisfactory (4)
	Too crowded classes (3)
	Know student names (3)
	Not know student names (2)

As clear on Table 11, the students stated that they received individual attention from their instructors mostly through different ways of feedback, namely on-paper, in-class or online. S11, who was a student of IA, said:

He gives us some homework and says 'you must write these and these'. ... He writes down all our mistakes, saying you should do it this way. So my answer to this question is yes, he provides individual attention.

The researcher also asked whether the instructor knew student names and the students said: "*Of course he does, and he approaches in a funny way if we have a mistake. He immediately corrects it. If we ask a question, he never leaves unanswered.*"

S10, a student of IB, explained how the instructor used peer feedback while dealing with individual assignments: "*She sometimes does it this way: one student writes a passage on the board and we evaluate them as whole class. Everyone tries to find the mistakes of that student.*" This student also added:

Our teacher considers us as a class rather than individuals. Also she has got hundreds of students and it is hard to deal with us individually. So, I personally find it ineffective for this reason. She is right, though. How can she deal with hundreds of students one by one? ... I mean, it is not about her when she cannot give individual attention, it is about crowdedness.

S14, a student of IC, briefly explained how the instructor set a task and checked individual writings providing feedback: "*The teacher starts an activity. He first gives a topic, says 'write about this and bring your paragraph to me so that I can control*". To the question whether he knew student names, she responded positively.

S17, who takes the course from ID, provided information on how the instructor approached to individual weaknesses and strengths of the students:

She firstly inquires our individual weaknesses and strengths through small papers. Apart from that, we can also see our weaknesses and strengths through her feedback and grading and we can see how much she considers us. When I see my portfolio, I can quite clearly see that she considers me individually.

Another student of ID also mentioned the self-evaluation practices of the instructor as well as her face-to-face feedback after classes. S15 said:

For example, I made a lot of mistakes in previous weeks. She called me after class and showed my errors ... Or during classes, she gives small papers and asks us to write our individual problems in writing. ... She gave cards and asked us to write our comments about the course and herself, too.

In general, individual feedback the instructors provided through in- and out-of-class activities was considered as an indicator of individualized consideration by the students. In addition to assignments, the instructors reportedly dealt with individual needs of their students by responding to individual questions, sometimes inviting them to office, and also by asking students to self-evaluate their weaknesses. Considering students' satisfaction with their instructors' individualized consideration, those who stated to be satisfied are among the students of IA and ID while less satisfied students were those of IB. Three of the unsatisfied students attributed this case with the fact that the classes were too crowded. Student comments also indicated a relationship between student satisfaction and instructors' knowing and calling students by their names.

3.2.2.3. Theme 3: Intellectual stimulation.

Within the theme of intellectual stimulation, the codes were grouped under two categories of *supporting creativity* and *not supporting*. As presented in Table 12, codes in the category of *supporting creativity* were "give tactics / advice on better writing", "practice pre-writing strategies," "provide resource", "introduce writing methods", "provide freedom in topic selection", "use games, puzzles" and "express expectations of better writing".

Table 12. Categories and Codes for Student Responses Regarding Intellectual Stimulation

Categories	Codes
Supporting creativity	Give tactics / advice on better writing (4)
	Practice pre-writing strategies (3)
	Provide resource (1)
	Introduce writing strategies (1)
	Provide freedom in topic selection (1)
	Express expectations of better writing (1)
Not supporting creativity	Stick to course book (6)
	Expect student effort (2)
	Not tolerate language mistakes (1)

Student responses indicated poor practice of intellectual stimulation. An exception was found particularly in the classes of ID, whose students mentioned how she had them practice some prewriting strategies. For instance, S15 replied: "*For example, she gave us pictures after she asked us to write about a topic. She asked us to write narrative essays about what we see on those pictures. She did this a few times to foster our creativity.*"

Giving tactics or advice was also stated by the students as creativity-stimulating actions of the instructors. S1, a student of IA, answered:

For example, he gives some tactics especially on the texts we go through. After he reads and explains the texts, he says 'you can write in this or that way' or 'you can use this/that way in your writings'. He shows such ways or methods to improve our writing. ...

S6, a student of IB, also mentioned her instructor's advice on improving their writing skills through reading books or listening to English music with song lyrics: "*She says read books or listen to songs going over their lyrics. ....*" When the researcher asked whether the instructor used creativity-evoking methods such as brainstorming, the student replied negatively.

However, another student of IB, S8, explained how the instructor introduced different writing strategies such as brainstorming or clustering: "*You know there are methods of writing, ... She generally teaches those methods but usually expects the ideas from us. She only shows the methods.*" As the researcher asked which methods he was talking about, he continued: "*For example brainstorming or clustering. She introduces them and does some exercises about them.*"

S2, a student of IA, stated how their opportunities for creative writing were limited because of following the course book:

Well, he does not do much about that, indeed. That is because he sticks to course book. For example, a topic is given in the book, so we are obliged to write about it. ... He also gives some different topics or he is open to the idea of writing on a different topic yet, he sticks to the book. ...

Among the practices of the instructors that the students believed to address the intellectual stimulation phenomenon, the pre-writing activities introduced and used by IB and ID, and tactics and advice of IA, and partly IB, about better writing seemed to have the highest relevance. Confining classroom activities to those in the course book, expecting student effort rather than pushing them and not tolerating students' errors were related by the students with the absence of creativity support.

3.2.2.4. Theme 4: Inspirational motivation.

The codes and categories for the theme of inspirational motivation, which was determined after the analyses of student responses to the question of "*How does your instructor motivate you for language learning in general and for this lesson in particular?*" are presented in Table 13. The categories into which the codes were divided were *acts*, *words* and *demotivating attitudes and practices*. In the category of *acts*, the codes of "love the job", "care about students", "establish immediacy with students", "a good example for students", "organized and decisive", "set challenging assignments",

"challenge student creativity" and "provide feedback" were included. The category of *words*, on the other hand, consisted of the codes of "talk about importance of writing", "appreciate success" and "encourage for better writing".

Table 13. Categories and Codes for Student Responses Regarding Inspirational Motivation

Categories	Codes
Acts	Care about students (5)
	Establish immediacy with students (3)
	Provide feedback (3)
	A good example for students (2)
	Set challenging assignments (2)
	Organized and decisive (1)
	Challenge student creativity (1)
	Love the job (1)
Words	Talk about importance of writing (4)
	Appreciate success (1)
	Encourage for better writing (1)
Demotivating attitudes and practices	Not energetic (3)
	Use classical methods of teaching (2)
	Distant to students (1)
	Resentful (1)
	Motivation for good marks only (1)

As obvious from Table 13, the most frequently encountered code in the category of *acts* was "care about students" (5). As an example, S1, who was a student of IA, stated that her motivation in this course was due to the instructor's love for his job and also the interest he showed to student questions:

"*Doing his job with love and also showing interest to us. For instance, you can ask any question without hesitation. .... That is why I can say that his care and interest are the reasons I am motivated in his course.*"

S17, who was a student of ID, said that the feedback from her instructor created a feeling of value in students: "*Giving us feedback and making us feel valued as individuals... Other teachers sometimes ask students to do things but they do not give any feedback. Then, the students might feel incompetent and not valued.*"

One of the students of IB, S12, also stated that she was motivated by the feedback her instructor provided: "*Most importantly, she shows us our mistakes. She gives advice such as 'write it this way or that way' or 'this is another alternative'.*"

Establishing immediacy with the students was also a motivating behavior for some students, too. For instance, S3, a student IA stated: "*We are like friends with the instructor in this course. He is very sincere and we are always on good terms with him. We attend classes with joy, make more effort and become more successful in his course.*"

Setting challenging tasks and assignments for the student was another motivating act of IA as stated by his students. S9 said: "*The challenging homework he assigns has been very motivating lately ...*"

S16 had more than one reason to be motivated by her instructor's, ID's, behaviors such as being a good example for them with her field knowledge, giving feedback on the students' assignments and also valuing and appreciating their efforts:

Yes, I see her as a good example and so I become motivated. I also find her assignments motivating. ... I enjoy it when I get very good instead of good. ...

Contrarily, some students of IB mentioned that they were discouraged by some attitudes or classroom practices of their instructor. S5 explained:

She does not motivate, she demotivates on the contrary. For example, when you do not bring your course book, she sulks. …. She sulks so much that she alienates us from herself. Then, I do not want to do anything. ... Her energy drops immediately and she gives an attitude.

S6 also responded negatively to the motivation-related question and expressed her expectations:

My viewpoint here is that a teacher has to be energetic in class because this would motivate the students as well. They would be willing to participate into the lesson. He / she (the teacher) *should somehow engage the students to the course making jokes or something like that. This is not in her method, she only presents the information.*

In summary, the students appeared to be motivated or demotivated by both the acts or behaviors and words of their instructors. IA seemed to be motivating his students by building close relationships with them, giving advice about the significance of his course in their academic life, and also setting challenging tasks to make students study harder. IC's appreciating students' success and encouraging them for better writing motivated his students for his course while ID managed to build a feeling of motivation in her students by being disciplined and setting a good example. The majority of the students of IB, on the other hand, gave less favorable statements about the motivation-supportive behaviors of the instructor.

3.2.2.5. Theme 5: Contingent reward.

Instructors' responses to successful student performances were the focus of the theme of contingent reward and two categories of *words* and *acts* were determined in grouping the codes. As shown in Table 14, the codes in the category of *words* were "praise, appraisal (in-class or on assignments)" and "show successful students exemplary among peers" while the category of *acts* included the codes of "give bonus marks", "more attention to successful students", "higher exam results for more interested students", "use grading scales", "more freedom in course requirements" and "no response to student effort/success".

Table 14. *Categories and Codes for Student Responses Regarding Contingent Reward*

Categories	Codes
Words	Praise, appraisal (in-class or on assignments)(10)
	Show successful students exemplary among peers (2)
Acts	Give bonus marks (3)
	No response to student effort/success (3)
	Use grading scales (3)
	More freedom in course requirements (2)
	More attention to successful students (1)
	Higher exam results for more interested students (1)

More than half of the participating students (N=10) stated that their instructors praised their successful performances in class or on their assignment papers. For instance, S14 stated that IC expressed his appreciation during classes and this motivated the students to study harder: "*He speaks about it* (good performance) *in the classroom, and the students may study more actively when they see this.*" S13 also stated that IC always praised their good writings. The student added that the instructor rewarded grammatically correct writing performances by providing convenience in course requirements: "*For example, he gives us a topic to write about. Then, he says those who write with no grammatical errors can leave earlier. He gives such rewards.*"

ID, according to S15, also praised well-written paragraphs in class along with writing comments on assignment papers and also used a scale to evaluate the students' paragraphs or essays. The student explained:

... when we write well, there is always a positive return on papers since this is a writing course. ... She usually writes good comments on our papers and marks them, too. ...She has a scale, for example, and she gives points on it in terms of grammar or vocabulary.

Giving bonus marks was one way of rewarding success for IA according to his students. S1 and S2 reported as follows:

S1: "*He has these characteristics: he does not talk about your success a lot, I do not know, maybe not to spoil the students. But he gives pluses or extra marks on exam results. ...*

S2: "*The teacher grades us according to active participation to lessons, assignments and essays in exams. ... He really takes notice of our exam performances, course participation and homework.* "

S6 reported that more interested and active students received more attention from IB during lessons and higher grades in her exams. S6 said: "*She definitely returns positively because she says 'this student is eager.'*" When the researcher asked how she would return, the student continued: "*she shows interest, checks their* (more enthusiastic students') *papers during in-class writing or watches their writing when she walks between desks.*"

S7 complained about not receiving any positive or motivating responses from IB in return for successful performance. She said:

Well, she never thought congratulating us or when we wrote well, she never said 'well-done' or anything of that sort. ... And she never says there is a mistake here. She only writes it there and if you ask her what you have done wrong, she answers. But I have not heard any motivating word from her so far.

S10, however, replied the related question with words conflicting with both S8 and S7 stating how fairly IB graded the students in exams and also provided feedback in case of good performances. Below are the student's words:

We all see our grades from the exams, everyone receives what they deserve. I do not believe that she is unfair in grading. At the same time, she says 'this is good' or 'this is a successful work' if we have written a good paragraph during classes.

Consequently, all instructors seemed to use verbal means such as praising students on their writing performances more often than any other ways of rewarding success. More

distinctly observed, IA gave bonus marks while ID used grading scales. IC provided more freedom in course requirements and IB gave more attention to and higher exam grades for more interested and eager students.

3.2.2.6. Theme 6: Management-by-exception.

The codes determined for the theme of management-by-exception were grouped in the categories of *corrective feedback*, *other acts* and *not satisfactory*. As Table 15 depicts, the *corrective feedback* category codes were "underline / correct mistakes", "provide alternatives", "discuss common errors" and "peer correction" while *other acts* category involved the codes of "express expectation for better writing", "acknowledge student improvement", "avoid giving offence", and "not tolerate minor mistakes"; and the category of *not satisfactory* included the codes "too crowded classes" and "explain only when asked".

In the question addressing this theme, the students were also asked to choose among three options: a) he/she follows students' progress from the beginning and takes action as soon as detecting any problems; b) he/she takes action when he/she detects the failure or inadequacy; and c) he/she does not take action. These options were read to the students after they responded the question, and nine students chose A and nine chose B while none opted for C. Despite these results, it is noteworthy that there must have been more of As and less of Bs since, for instance, one of the students who chose option B later reported that her instructor asked them to submit assignments online on a weekly basis and provided regular feedback, which corresponded to option A, not B. Furthermore, the questionnaire results also showed much higher frequencies for active MbE than passive MbE, to which the options of A and B referred to, respectively.

Table 15. Categories and Codes for Student Responses Regarding Management-by-exception

Categories	Codes
Corrective feedback	Underline / correct mistakes (15)
	Discuss common errors (4)
	Provide alternatives (3)
	Peer correction (1)
Other acts	Express expectation for better writing (3)
	Avoid giving offence (3)
	Acknowledge student improvement (2)
	Not tolerate minor mistakes (2)
Not satisfactory	Too crowded classes (2)
	Explain only when asked (2)

As obvious in Table 15, underlining and/or correcting student mistakes (N=15) was the most common act of the instructors as reported by the students. Below are the words of some students of IA:

S9: "*We control the homework our instructor assigns on Google drive. In lessons, he checks the papers of more eager students who want their work to be controlled. ...*

S11 "*He directly corrects our mistakes. Since we upload our papers on Google drive, he corrects each of them individually.*"

The students of IB gave contradictory responses about how she managed student progress. Following are some examples:

S10: *"Our teacher is quite self-sacrificing in correcting our errors. She really helps us saying 'you have written this way but this is how it should be' and explaining how things should be written in a certain way. ...*

S8: *"She talks about our errors in the classroom. … Then, she explains that part we do mistake most with more emphasis."*

S7 also found IB's approach to their development, their errors or failures in particular, unsatisfactory despite admitting that this was due to classes being too crowded. The student said:

She does not say anything individually, but this is impossible anyway because the class is too crowded. ... I do not want to talk to her or attend to her course since she does not show interest to us.

The students of IC briefly replied the related question and stated that the instructor had a positive and constructive approach. S14 reported: *"He does not speak out our failures during the class so as to avoid giving offence but if he sees any errors, he goes next to that student and explains."*

The students of ID seemed to be satisfied with the instructor's monitoring their development and dealing with their errors and underperformances. The statements of S15 are as follows:

"… She, in a proper manner, said 'you should improve yourself'. While giving my paper back, she whisperingly said 'it would be much better if you write it this way' or 'read more if you want to improve your writing."

To sum up, all four instructors, according to their students, appeared to react to their students' errors or underperformances. However, seemingly, IA and ID monitored their students' progress more closely and keenly. They followed student assignments in a more disciplined and controlling manner providing satisfactory corrective feedback leading to a feeling of being valued and appreciated in students.

4. Discussion

The quantitative survey results showed significant differences in the students' responses for instructors' leadership styles, and the responses to interview questions enabled us to elaborate on these results by determining the characteristics of those instructors with more and less effective classroom leadership styles. Starting with *idealized influence* component of transformational leadership, ID who received the highest scores in the survey, and her students had responses distinct from other interviewees. The instructor described herself as efficient, innovative, productive, motivating and interested in the course while her students used adjectives such as hardworking, successful, organized, punctual and well-educated. Apparently, ID had a good impression on her students particularly for her commitment, which is obvious from her own statements as well. These findings support Dörnyei and Murphey's (2009) suggestion that enthusiasm, being among the most essential components of effective teaching, raised students' willingness to become successful both individually and as a group. They also assert that teachers ought to be fully committed to teaching in order to facilitate the learning process of students. The present findings also added evidence to

the results of previous research on effective classroom leadership and simply effective teaching. Baba and Ace (1989), who investigated teachers' classroom leadership behaviors in the perspectives of their students, concluded that the students found well-directing and organized instructors more effective in teaching. In their large-scale research on characteristics of teacher effectiveness attributed by students, Young and Shaw (1999) also concluded that effective teachers organized their courses more efficiently. In a similar vein, Chireshe (2011) investigated effective and ineffective instructor characteristics from student perspectives in a Zimbabwean university context and the findings of the study showed that effective instructors were those who were organized, well-prepared and punctual.

Other positive characteristics of instructors articulated by many students with reference to instructors' idealized influence were sympathetic and friendly attitudes. In classroom communication discourse, such instructor behaviors are related with teacher immediacy, i. e. teacher actions or utterances to reduce the distance with students (Andersen & Andersen, 2011) and several studies on classroom leadership addressed the significant relationship between teacher immediacy and transformational teaching (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011; Harrison, 2013; Hoehl, 2008). Cheng (1994), who studied the affective and social outcomes of transformational leadership concluded that when a teacher developed friendly, trustful, and respectful relationships with students, and used his/her professional knowledge, abilities, personal characteristics, and charisma; then, students would develop positive attitudes towards not only their teachers, but also the school and learning. In a similar vein, Young and Shaw (1999) found that effective teachers communicated well with students and provided a pleasant learning atmosphere. Arıkan et al. (2008) also reported that establishing positive relationships with students in a friendly and humorous attitude was positively associated with effective EFL teaching. Lastly, Sanchez, Gonzalez and Martinez (2013), who studied the emotional dimension of teacher-student relationship in a Mexican EFL context, also suggested that teachers who exhibited interest in students' development and cared and showed respect for them would raise students' positive feelings including confidence and willingness to learn besides would influence their well-being in general.

Individualized consideration, another transformational leadership trait, has a very close association with teaching writing in its nature. A noteworthy detail in the findings was that the instructors displaying transformational teaching more frequently followed students' performances through certain ways such as asking each student to keep individual portfolios and to upload weekly assignments on a shared online platform. These processes must have enabled these instructors to monitor students' performances in a more organized manner and to evaluate them in a more sophisticated and structured way, finally contributing to higher individualized consideration. As discussed earlier, being professionally organized and disciplined also contributed to idealized influence, and several other studies also highlighted how it boosted teacher effectiveness (Baba & Ace, 1989; Chireshe, 2011; Young & Shaw, 1999).

Another effective characteristic of more transformational instructors with higher individualized consideration was that they knew and called students by their names. In support to the present findings, Frymier and Houser (2000) referred such teacher behaviors as calling students by their names or having friendly dialogues with them as

verbal immediacy and suggested that feeling of immediacy increased students' affective and cognitive learning. Dörnyei and Murphey (2009) also argued that it is very crucial for students' in-class identity that a teacher knows student names, and that the students know that the teacher knows them. It helps create a communicative classroom and serves for a powerful rapport between teacher and students, which is very important in teacher-student relationship (Dörnyei & Murphey, 2009). Similar to present findings, in Bolkan and Goodboy's (2011) study, the instructors' individualized consideration was also found to be reflected through remembering student history.

The study also showed that *intellectual stimulation* is also reflected in the EFL teaching in that the instructors with higher rates of perceived transformational leadership and intellectual stimulation from the questionnaire introduced and practiced writing and pre-writing strategies such as brainstorming, outlining or free-writing and gave students advice on writing more effectively.

Regarding *inspirational motivation* as the fourth transformational leadership trait, it was found that promoting student engagement during lessons reportedly motivated students to study harder. Although many students were generally reluctant to actively participate in lessons, particularly when it is an L2 classroom and more specifically when it is a productive skill course such as writing, the participants of this study actually seemed to acknowledge the benefits of active involvement and appreciated the instructors' attempts to challenge them. Previous research provides support for the effectiveness of promoting active involvement. Weaver and Qi (2005) reported that active involvement promoted students' critical thinking and the retention of information. Braskamp (2009) and Bolkan et al. (2011) also argued that instructors should create a challenging atmosphere in classrooms so as to increase student motivation. Lastly, Chireshe (2011), who studied effective and ineffective instructor behaviors, highlighted that facilitating active student involvement was among the instructor characteristics associated with teaching effectiveness.

Instructors' enthusiasm was another finding related to inspirational motivation. Like instructor commitment, enthusiasm was found as a factor associated with idealized influence as well, reinforcing the complementary aspects of these two transformational components. Previous research provided similar results about the importance of teacher enthusiasm in effective EFL teaching. Study results of Arıkan et al. (2008), who focused on effective ELT, indicated that teaching enthusiastically and creatively was a fundamental feature of a successful ELT teacher. The participants of the same study found teachers' depending heavily on lesson plans, using limited methods and ignoring student needs as ineffective features. These results are also similar to those of the present study indicating the de-motivating effects of using traditional teaching methodologies. In a similar vein, Çelik-Korkmaz and Yavuz (2011), who examined the requirements of being an effective EFL teacher, also stated that teacher effectiveness depended on the ability to transfer one's knowledge to students with a comprehensive approach through the utilization of varied methodologies. Lastly, Richter and Lara-Herrera (2017), focusing on positive personality traits and behaviors of effective EFL instructors, also found that all research participants rejected traditional teaching methods. All in all, inspirational motivation appears to have a multifaceted nature

affected by various factors ranging from teacher characteristics such as commitment, teacher immediacy and enthusiasm to effective and contemporary teaching methods.

In the current study, two transactional leadership components, i.e. contingent reward and active management-by-exception, contrary to much of the previous research, brought about positive outcomes. In relation to *contingent reward* behaviors of the instructors, it might be interpreted that the instructors indeed provided positive feedback by using affirming and praising words such as "good", "excellent" or "well-done" for good performances in both assignments and in-class tasks and also showing successful students exemplary among others through which they aimed to instill pride in the students and eventually motivate them. As Bowman (2007) asserted, one of the roles of teachers as leaders is to adopt and fulfill the mission of building pride in their students. Likewise, Nugent (2009) also argued that students' emotional needs should be met besides academic ones and this could be managed through motivating them with praises and rewards. Giving bonus marks and higher exam grades to those students with better writing performances were other ways of rewarding students in the present study. However, whether such teacher actions really motivate students is arguable in SLA discourse since they actually refer to extrinsic motivation, which is associated with one's incentives to achieve an instrumental outcome and is, therefore, a weaker form of motivation when compared with intrinsic motivation, which refers to the incentives to satisfy inherent feelings (Ryan & Deci, 2000). On the other hand, it appears that rewarding students has positive implications from effective classroom leadership perspective although it may not be so from the SLA perspective.

Concerning the results regarding *active management-by-exception*, giving continuous feedback was the most salient practice through which instructors displayed this transactional leadership component. The effectiveness of teacher feedback, particularly corrective feedback focusing on forms, i.e. grammatical errors, has long been under debate and it is possible to find research in literature both supporting (Ashwell, 2000; Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Ellis, 2009; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Ferris, 1999; Ferris & Roberts, 2001) and criticizing (Truscott, 1996, 1999, 2007) the argument that feedback is an effective tool for developing writing skills. Cullen (2002), for instance, argued that feedback should be an essential and inevitable feature of classroom exchanges initiated by the teacher. Bitchener and Ferris (2012) also reported about the long-term studies on the effects of corrective feedback on students' writing, revealing that corrective feedback improved accuracy despite variations across students and types of errors. Ellis (2009) similarly emphasized the increasing evidence that corrective feedback played a crucial role in promoting spoken and written language accuracy. Consequently, even though active management-by-exception is seen as a characteristic of less effective leaders in FRL and more generally in organizational leadership context, it might be an effective factor having positive learning outcomes in the classroom context, just in the same way as contingent reward.

5. Conclusions

Although instructor and student perceptions differed at some points, there was a general consensus across qualitative and quantitative results in that transformational

instructors displayed more effective classroom leadership and they mostly distinguished from less effective instructors with respect to particular leadership components. These instructors were attributed with more positive and effective characteristics by their students and displayed more influential behaviors impelling students to take them as role models. They displayed more committed concerns for individuality of students by monitoring their academic improvements with a more disciplined and rigorous approach and also building closer relationships with students which made students feel special and valued, which eventually raised a higher interest for the course content. The transformational leadership characteristics of the instructors were also evident in their approach towards students' intellectual development in that they were more inclined to use creativity-supporting activities. They also motivated their students not only through articulation but also by their actions such as exhibiting higher commitment to teaching and setting more challenging tasks for students. A significant result of the study was that despite being transactional leadership components, contingent reward and active management-by-exception were also associated with effective classroom leadership.

Classroom leadership remains unexplored in many aspects and it promises significant undiscovered data for various research areas within the fields of leadership and education. The present study has been among the very few works addressing language classroom leadership and currently appears to be a rare study to investigate full range leadership styles of English language instructors and the outcomes of classroom leadership in a Turkish university setting. Further research with the same scope under different contexts with different population and sample groups may be conducted in order to reach higher comprehensiveness. The higher amount of data that future research brings will accordingly contribute to the rationale of this study.

Acknowledgements

References

Andersen, P. & Andersen, J. (2011). Teacher immediacy. In W. Donsbach (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of communication.* doi: 10.1002/9781405186407.wbiect013.pub2

Arıkan, A., Taşer, D., & Saraç-Süzer, H. S. (2008). The effective English language teacher from the perspectives of Turkish preparatory school students. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 33* (150), 42-51. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED506217

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multi-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(3), 227-257. Retrieved from https://www.deepdyve.com/lp/elsevier/patterns-of-teacher-response-to-student-writing-in-a-multiple-draft-V8U3c4AhNo

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

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2002). *Developing potentials across a full-range of leadership.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72,* 441-462. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1348/096317999166789

Baba, V., & Ace, M. E. (1989). Serendipity in leadership: initiating structure and consideration in the classroom. Human Relations, 42 (6), 509-525. doi: 10.1177/001872678904200603

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

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8* (1), 9-32. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/5cae/a17127da453f21562b01d0710898ba01cf19.pdf

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

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). *MLQ Multifactor leadedrrship questionnaire.* Redwood City: Mind Garden.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*, 102-118. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. (2012). *Written corrective feecback in second language acquisition and writing.* London: Routledge.

Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A. (2009). Transformational leadership in the classroom: fostering student learning, student participation, and teacher credibility. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 36* (4), 296-306. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ952280

Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A. (2010). Transformational leadership in the classroom: The development and validation of the student intellectual stimulation scale. Communication Reports, 23 (2), 91-105. doi: 10.1080/08934215.2010.511399

Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A. (2011). Behavioral indicators of transformational leadership in the college classroom. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication, 12* (1), 10-18. doi: 10.1080/17459435.2011.601520

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

Bowman, R. F. (2007). How can students be motivated: a misplaced question? *The Clearing House, 81* (2), 81-86. doi: 10.3200/TCHS.81.2.81-86

Braskamp, L. A. (2009). Professors as leaders: Being open and teachable. *Journal of College and Character, 10* (6), 1-6. doi: 10.2202/1940-1639.1443

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

Can, N. (2009). The leadership behaviors of teachers in primary schools in Turkey. *Education. 129* (3), 436-447.

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

Chireshe, R. (2011). Effective and ineffective lecturers: University students' perspective in Zimbabwe. *Anthropologist, 13* (4), 265-269. Retrieved from https://www.tib.eu/en/search/id/BLSE%3ARN303247499/Effective-and-Ineffective-Lecturers-University/

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (4th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cullen, R. (2002). Supportive teacher talk: The importance of the F-move. ELT Journal, 56(2), 117-127. doi: 10.1093/elt/56.2.117

Çelik-Korkmaz, Ş., & Yavuz, A. (2011). ELT student teachers' perspectives of an effective English teacher. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama, 7* (2), 207-229. Retrieved from http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/63245

Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: how successful leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 52* (2), 221-258. doi: 10.1177/0013161X15616863

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Murphey, T. (2009). *Group dynamics in the language classroom* (4th Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal, 1*(1), 3-18. Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2504d6w3

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28,* 339-368. doi: 10.1017/s0272263106060141

Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes. A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8,* 1-11. doi: 10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80110-6

Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing clases: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10,* 161-184. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ632782

Frymier, A. B., & Houser, M. L. (2000). The teacher-student relationship as an interpersonal relationship. *Communication Education, 49* (3), 207-219. doi:10.1080/03634520009379209

Garger, J. & Jacques, P.H. (2008). A levels approach to student perceptions of leadership. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *22* (3), 251-258. doi: 10.1108/09513540810861883

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

Harrison, J. L. (2013). The effects of instructor transformational leadership and verbal immediacy on learner autonomy and creativity in online contexts (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (UMI No. 3570899)

Harvey, S., Royal, M., & Stout, D. (2003). Instructor's transformational leadership, university student attitudes and ratings. *Psychological Reports, 92*, 395-402. doi: 10.2466/pr0.2003.92.2.395

Hoehl, S. E. (2008). *The relationship between transformational leadership and student educational outcomes as moderated by verbal and nonverbal immediacy.* (Doctoral dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (UMI No. 3309288)

House, R. J., & Podsakoff, P. M. (1994). Leadership effectiveness: Past perspectives and future directions for research. In Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of science* (pp. 45-82). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kızıltepe, Z. (2015). İçerik Analizi. In F. N. Seggie & Y. Bayyurt (Eds.), *Nitel araştırma yöntem, teknik, analiz ve yaklaşımları* (pp.253-266). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Kim, W. J. (2012). *Transformational teaching: connecting full range leadership theory and graduate teaching practice.* (Doctoral dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (UMI No. 3536309)

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook.* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Noland, A. (2005). *The relationship between teacher transformational leadership and student outcomes* (MSc thesis). Retrieved from https://etd.ohiolink.edu (osu1123168677)

Noland, A., & Richards, K. (2014). The relationship among transformational teaching and student motivation and learning. *The Journal of Effective Teaching, 14* (3), 5-20. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1060434.pdf

Nugent, T. T. (2009). The impact of teacher-student interaction on student motivation and achievement (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida). Retrieved from http://etd.fcla.edu/CF/CFE0002884/Nugent_Tisome_T_200912_EdD.pdf

Pounder, J. S. (2004). *The classroom leaderhip styles of Hong Kong university teachers: A case study of teachers in a business school* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (UMI No. U187876)

Pounder, J. S. (2005). Transformational classroom leadership: Developing the teacher leadership notion. *HKIBS Working Paper Series 056-045*. Retrieved from: http://commons.ln.edu.hk/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1041&context=hkibswp

Pounder, J. S. (2008a). Transformational classroom leadership: A novel approach to evaluating classroom performance, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33* (3), 233-243. doi: 10.1080/02602930701292621

Pounder, J. S. (2008b). Full-range classroom leadership: Implications for the cross-organizational and cross-cultural applicability of the transformational-transactional paradigm. *Leadership, 4* (2), 115-135. doi: 10.1177/1742715008089634

Richter, K. G., & Lara-Herrera, R. (2017). Characteristics and pedagogical behaviors of good EFL instructors: The views of selected Southeast Asian and Mexican SLTE students. *RELC Journal, 48* (2), 180-196. doi: 10.1177/0033688216645473

Ryan R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25* 54-67. doi: 10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

Salinas, H. (2012). The role of student self-reported spirituality and perceptions of community college instructor transformational leadership style on the overall rating of teacher effectiveness (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (UMI No. 3574618)

Sanchez, C. A. G., Gonzalez, B. S. G., & Martinez, C. J. L. (2013). The impact of teacher-student relationship on EFL learning. *HOW, A Colombian Journal for Teachers of English, 20,* 116-129. Retrieved from https://www.howjournalcolombia.org/index.php/how/article/view/26

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46,* 327-369. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x

Truscott, J. (1999). What's wrong with oral grammar correction? *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 55*, 437-455. doi: 10.3138/cmlr.55.4.437

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16,* 255-272. doi: 10.1016/jslw.2007.06.003

Walumbwa, F.O., Wu, C., & Ojode, L. A. (2004). Gender and instructional outcomes: The mediating role of leadership style. *The Journal of Management Development, 23* (2), 124-140. doi: 10.1108/02621710410517229

Weaver, R. R., & Qi, J. (2005). Classroom organization and participation: college students' perceptions. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76* (5), 570-601. doi: 10.1080/00221546.2005.11772299

Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic Content Analysis* (2nd Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Webrinska, D. (2009). A profile of an effective teacher of English: A quatitative study from Poland. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 36,* 306-315. Retrieved from http://www.efdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/yonetim/icerik/makaleler/1606-published.pdf

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. doi: 10.3102/00346543074003255

Young, S., & Shaw, D. G. (1999). Profiles of effective college and university teachers. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70* (6), 670-686. doi: 10.1080/00221546.1999.11780803