Vol. 6, No. 1; April 2022
E-ISSN 2579-7484
Pages 299-230
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.29408/veles.v6i1.7842

Language Teacher Leadership in Developing Learning Progressivity Based on Conceptual and Instructional Capacities

***Khirjan Nahdi**
Universitas Hamzanwadi, Indonesia;

***Correspondence:**
khirjan.nw@gmail.com

Submission History:
Submitted: February 30, 2022
Revised: April 14, 2022
Accepted: April 20, 2022

Abstract

This article aims to identify the level of leadership of language teachers in developing students' learning progress based on conceptual and didactic qualities. This goal is achieved by answering the following questions: 1) the level of quality of concepts related to the progress of student learning; and 2) administrative components and educational processes. Question (1) was introduced with data from code A and question (2) was introduced with data from codes B and C. Data was collected through a survey of educational agendas using concept quality, management, and multi-rate indicators. Analyzes were performed by describing regression data. The results of this study indicate that respondents have a good idea of their students' learning progress. A conceptual understanding of learning progression is inversely related to the quality of learning and instructional management. Respondents continue to predominate as a motivator to achieve their learning goals through encouragement and guidance. On the other hand, they are still weak as moderators, designers, and initiators of learning objectives. A paradigm shift is needed in the teacher-student relationship.

Keywords: leadership, progressive, conceptual, educational, instructional

INTRODUCTION

Anthropologically, education is responsible for making people capable of self-regulation and maintaining their relationships with others. Gauchet (Haryatmoko, 2010) calls this responsibility an anthropological education class. Through education, people can facilitate relationships with others in the different needs of reproduction, maintenance and development in the human environment. In agreement with Gauchet, Delors (1998) revealed the importance of the main capital of the anthropological class of education in the form of various skills that enable people to understand themselves and to know others through the introduction of global about the world. The introduction of self and others is

placed within the framework of a reflection on the future. Thinking about the future is understood not by considering the amount of knowledge, but by the effectiveness of education in preparing individuals to embrace the future and expand their own knowledge.

Educational responsibility cannot be separated from learning activities because future possibilities education programs occur throughout the learning process. According to Hill (2009), learning as an educational program that creates the future is a process that stimulates other parties (teachers) to develop the capacity of each individual learner. Delors calls individual stimulation and competence the foundation of education. In addition, Delors mentions that there are four pillars of education, which are the skills that turn learners into individuals who are willing to learn, willing to learn to do something, learn to be someone, and learn to be someone. way of living with others.

Educational responsibility cannot be separated from learning activities, because educational agendas towards future capacity occur through the learning process. Learning as an educational agenda in the creation of the future according to Hill (2009) is a process of stimulating other parties (teachers) in developing individual learner capacities. Delors calls individual stimulation and capacity as the cornerstone of education. Furthermore, Delors mentioned that there are four pillars of education, namely competencies that make learning subjects into individuals who are ready to learn, ready to learn to do something, learn to be someone, and learn to live with other people.

The process of stimulation in the learning process, including language learning in senior high schools (SMA) in this study, is inseparable from the role of the stimulant, namely the teacher. The relationship between the teacher as a stimulator and the learning subject, as mentioned by Freire (2001) is a subject-subject relationship, not a subject-object relationship. In a subject-subject relationship, the language teacher and students are responsible for studying the object together to obtain meaning as a means of understanding future changes through the language they are learning. The context of the relationship between the subjects of study requires that each of them has an individual capacity as an external aspect which is developed in the learning process. Learning a language is not a routine transfer of linguistic competence quantitatively with the assumption that the learner comes with a void. Language learning should occur contextually, in parallel, by exemplifying, mutually creating opportunities for advancement, appreciation, critical and measurable. Through the language learning atmosphere, the demands of the role of the language teacher are illustrated as learning leaders who are able to create progressivity in learning processes and outcomes. Progressive learning is intended as a condition of positive change from time to time regarding processes, results, and appreciation of both as belonging to the subject of learning which makes language an instrument for dealing with future dynamics.

The subject-subject relationship requires the leadership capacity of the stimulant giver. Learning leadership according to Harris dan Muijs (2005) is a constructive leadership capacity through collaboratively creating meaningful knowledge. Constructed knowledge according to B. Reeves (2008) has a shared framework, mutual recognition, knowing each other's learning problems, there is analysis, and recommendations for improvement. According to Murphy (2005), building knowledge through a clear framework should be grounded in the principles of learning leadership. Murphy explained that these principles include: Begin with optimism about the emergence of effective outcomes, collaborative,

community-centered learning, service, context, and something different from previous learning outcomes in and out of the classroom. According to the three, learning leadership is leadership that promotes progress in learning. This study intends to find the leadership style of high school language teachers in developing students' learning progress. The basic assumption of this study is that learning progressivity is always associated between student content and learning models. That is, learning outcomes are solely determined by the capacity of students as subjects, not the teacher's leadership in learning. This condition makes the process and learning outcomes meaningless. Through the findings of this study, language teachers will consider teacher learning leadership as an aspect of the strategy in creating a meaningful language learning process for the future of learning subjects.

Teachers As Learning Leaders

Learning leadership has to be understood in the context of developing school capacities. The discussion of learning leadership is not in the context of learning leadership by school principals as mentioned by Bellibas, Bulut, Hallinger, & Wang (2016) or leaders in general as meant by Crevani, Lindgren, & Packendorff (2010), but learning leadership by teachers with all their professional responsibilities . Zaman@Taufiq & Sidhu (2013) stated that teacher learning leadership is the responsibility of making the school's mission a reality. One of the missions of the school is the effective learning of learning subjects. Learning leadership that streamlines the learning of learning subjects, as stated by Gençer & Samur (2016) is no longer concerned with transformational, democratic, charismatic, and authoritarian leadership styles, but learning leadership that maximizes all the potential of the learning community collectively for a common goal. Learning leadership that supports mission realization through effective learning is called by Abdullah & Md. Kassim (2011); Aziz & Baba (2011); Al-Mahdy, Emam, & Hallinger (2018); dan Ail, Taib, Jaafar, Salleh, & Omar (2015) as learning leadership that builds commitment, creativity, and collectivity of learning communities. Teachers with learning leadership who make learning community learning effective, mentioned by Tsai (2017) are not teachers who are only able to motivate the learning community to learn, but teachers who are able to encourage the productivity of learning processes and outcomes that show significant progressivity. In the end, it leads to the achievement of the school's mission.

Hallinger, Leithwood, & Heck (2010) cites Murphy's view of realizing the mission of the school as the responsibility of the principal and technically it is the responsibility of the teacher as a learning leader. Hallinger, et al. detailing it in several teacher actions, namely explaining the school's goals in learning, communicating them, evaluating student learning progressivity, translating the curriculum, evaluating progressivity, making time effective, increasing personal capacity, and giving awards for learning success. In another language, Delors in the same book as the previous quote says that the teacher as a learning leader must be responsible as mentioned by Halliger, et al. as art and science. As an art, teachers can take advantage of various ways of carrying out learning leadership duties, including information technology support. The teacher is not limited to the agenda of passing on information or knowledge, but presents knowledge in problem statements and puts problems in various perspectives. Specifically in language learning, such as Indonesian and English, Penner-Williams, Diaz, & Gonzales Worthen (2019) suggests that presenting knowledge in problem statements with various perspectives is practiced in the

instructional process and proven through student learning outcomes. Technically, a language teacher can arrange learning materials based on the context of the problems experienced by students and respond to them as instructional content.

Leadership in developing Progressive Learning

Learning leadership that develops student learning progressivity in this context is leadership about quality. Referring to the concept of quality in achieving excellence Juran (1995) explains, every community, including learning communities must focus on achieving the quality of learning at the targeted level. The context mentioned by Juran is a reciprocal responsibility between teachers and students. Topping (2002) calls it a process of self-development of a teacher and the development of others (students). Self-development can be in the form of individual enrichment of the learning material for which the instructional responsibility is. This process proved to be successful as Jita (2010) in the process of learning mathematics in sub-Saharan countries in Africa. Technically, the learning process is carried out through small groups in the classroom, as Keedy (1999) studied. The division of students into small groups allows each problem to be identified in a more focused manner. A reciprocal context that allows teacher-students to encourage each other to achieve quality together is a leadership process that brings results. The results referred to, according to Goleman (2003) can only be achieved through the existence of individual self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social abilities. The result, as stated by Goleman, is not the final context, but a gradual, ongoing process. Contextual reality, learning is possible to fail. Failure will trigger a shared spirit to work harder for better results. The spirit to always do better according to Kotter (1996) as a teacher as a 21st century learning leader by always viewing the quality improvement process as a continuous learning process.

The respirocal process in self and student development by the teacher is inseparable from thoughts about the shared responsibility between the teacher and the principal in realizing the school's mission. In this context, the school principal according to Polizzi, Ofem, Coyle, Lundquist, & Rushton (2019) must embrace all parties as a unified social system. The principal is responsible for guiding everyone in the social system to achieve common goals. Polizzi's statement is strengthened by Smith, Hayes, & Lyons (2017) that the principal's responsibilities include understanding the ecology of his leadership. Ecology here is meant as a geographical area and context in which the leadership process takes place. An understanding of ecology will help the principal understand the characteristics of the environment and the problems of the individual subsystems in it. Thus, every problem can be easily found a solution. Solving problems for each individual in the school social system is distributed into partial problems that teachers and students seek to solve in the instructional process. Solving problems that produce gradual results is what learning leadership seeks to encourage the progress of learning.

METHOD

This study was designed according to Creswell (2014) survey research. Data was collected through an instrument survey of 118 samples representing the population of Indonesian and English teachers in NTB. Two important questions in finding the language

teacher's leadership style are: 1) what is the language teacher's concept of student learning progressivity? 2) what are the stages of the teacher's stages in developing student learning progressivity? Question 1) Measured through the concept of progressivity (Code A): The progressivity development agenda is measured through learning and learning processes (Codes B and C), in full in the multi rater rubric in Table 1.

Table 1: Conceptual and Instructional Measurements

Code A (Aspect)	Indicator	Point
Learning Progressivity Concept	Successful learning is learning that is always colored by successful experiences	1
	Successful learning is learning that sometimes succeeds, sometimes fails	2
	Failed learning is learning that always fails	3
	Failed learning is learning that is dominantly failing than success	4
	Learning success is learning from failure, almost from success, then from success	5
Code B (Aspect)	**Indicator**	**Point**
Learning administration	Students know the concept of the material being studied	1
	Students explain concepts about the material being studied;	2
	Students mention the characteristics of the material being studied;	3
	Students compose something according to the material being studied; and	4
	Students apply the material they are studying	5
Code C (Aspect)	**Indicator**	**Point**
Instructional process	As a teacher, at the beginning of learning, I always start with an explanation of the learning objectives to be achieved;	1
	As a teacher, at the beginning of learning, I always direct students how to achieve learning goals	2
	As a teacher, at the beginning of the lesson, I encourage students to achieve learning goals	3
	As a teacher, at the beginning of learning, I detail indicators of achievement of learning objectives	4
	As a teacher, at the beginning of learning, I will determine the target achievement of learning objectives.	5

The data were analyzed using qualitative descriptive statistics, then the data obtained were analyzed with the help of a computer program *(SPSS 17.0 for Windows).*

1) The answer choices are calculated in code A, B, and C to determine the quality of the concept and the quality of the learning agenda;

2) Connect the conceptual quality of code A with the quality of the learning agenda for code B and C.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Response to Student Learning Progressivity Concept Indicator (Code A)

The conceptual capacity of the language teachers of 118 respondents is demonstrated through understanding based on the responses to the five Code A indicators, as shown in table 2 below:

Table 2. Distribution Frequency (Code A)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	20	16.9	16.9	16.9
	2	6	5.1	5.1	22.0
	5	92	78.0	78.0	100.0
	Total	118	100.0	100.0	

The conceptual quality aspect of student learning progressivity in table 2 consists of five indicators. All indicators are correct answer choices in stages 1-5. The survey data shows that most of the respondents have a good understanding in terms of the concept of student learning progressivity. Evidently, 92 respondents (78.00%) said that successful learning starts from failure, almost success, and finally success. It is clear that a person's success is not the result of never failing. Twenty respondents (16.90%) said that learning success is learning that is always colored by successful experiences. The common conditions in each class are individual character differences. As a learning leader, the teacher must know each individual character difference. The first step that must be done is to identify each character. Data on character differences becomes the basis for learning leaders to determine the learning strategies of the class they lead. Every difference in character is a learning problem.

The progressivity of learning is measured by a number of increases in the quantity and quality of learning processes and outcomes based on the learning problems faced by each learning subject. If a learning leader is able to make improvements, that is called learning progressivity. Conversely, if learning without ever experiencing failure, it is difficult to identify and determine learning achievement targets. The size of the improvement of learning processes and results quantitatively and qualitatively cannot be determined. Related to the concept of learning progressivity through the context of failure and success, teacher success is not only measured by success in encouraging and increasing the learning capacity of students who have good competence. Real success is when the teacher is able to encourage and facilitate students with various problems to become students who are successful in the process and learning outcomes according to the targets set together. The data in table 2 are still related to conceptual quality. The measure of success in encouraging and facilitating the progress of learning will be comprehensive if the quality of the concept is aligned with the technical administrative and instructional agenda in the following data.

Table 3. Distribution Frequency (Code B)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	34	28.8	28.8	28.8
	2	14	11.9	11.9	40.7
	3	2	1.7	1.7	42.4
	4	44	37.3	37.3	79.7
	5	24	20.3	20.3	100.0
	Total	118	100.0	100.0	

In line with data table 2, data table 3 regarding the quality of learning administration through the formulation of learning objectives with five indicators. All indicators are the correct answer choices according to the RASCH Model's multi rate points. Data table 3 Relates to teacher competence in administering learning in the form of formulating learning objectives. Table 3 shows the indicators of respondents' choices that vary. If you pay attention, the respondents are in two groups, namely the group that still survives with contextual patterns and practice patterns. 34 respondents (28.80%) formulated learning objectives for knowledge; 14 respondents (11.90%) formulate learning objectives for the concept; 2 respondents (1.70%) formulate learning objectives to mention characteristics; 40 respondents (33.90%) formulate learning objectives for compiling material by students; and 28 respondents (23.70%) formulate learning objectives to apply the material. If it is related to the progressivity agenda, the interesting conditions from the distribution of table 3 data based on the need for learning progressivity lie in the aspect of skills, not knowledge, concepts and characteristics. Aspects of knowledge, concepts, and characteristics are prior knowledge that students must have before they take part in the learning process. That is, prior knowledge is an agenda before the learning process takes place and students can carry it out on their own outside of class time.

The need for progressive learning is the context of applying concepts and knowledge, not the accumulation of conceptual competence and knowledge of the material being studied. Table 3 data still shows a number below 50% of respondent teachers think that learning objectives are related to the competency of formulating and applying learning materials. Hierarchically, knowledge, concepts, characteristics, formulation, and application constitute a series of competency levels in the domain of science. Commonly starts from knowledge, attitudes and skills. Knowledge is broken down into knowledge, concepts, principles, judgments and applications. All of them are learning responsibilities, but not all of them become access to learning in class. In instructional terms, teachers can facilitate the process of acquiring knowledge, concepts, and characteristics of learning materials through independent or group study processes outside of formal study time in class. Study time in class focuses on achieving learning progressivity through the application of theory and concepts, not spent on gathering knowledge and memorizing concepts.

Table 4. Distribution Frequency (Code C)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	66	55.9	55.9	55.9
	2	28	23.7	23.7	79.7
	3	10	8.5	8.5	88.1
	4	10	8.5	8.5	96.6
	5	4	3.4	3.4	100.0
	Total	118	100.0	100.0	

In line with the data in Tables 2 and 3, Table 4 has five indicators of correct answer choices with rates based on the Rasch Model. Table 4 relates to teacher competence in carrying out instructional activities for the needs of student learning progressivity. Table 4 shows 66 respondents (55.90%) respondents started instructional by explaining learning objectives to students; 28 respondents (23.70%) started by directing students on how to achieve goals; 10 respondents (8.50%) started learning by encouraging students to achieve learning goals; 10 respondents (8.50%) started learning by detailing indicators of achievement of learning objectives; and only 4 respondents (3.40%) started learning by setting targets for achieving learning objectives. Table 4 data is a continuation of table 2 and 3 data. Table 2 data is an indicator of conceptual capacity, table 3 data is an indicator of learning administrative capacity, and table 4 data is an indicator of skills in carrying out the learning process.

As a continuation of conceptual, administrative, to instructional practice, the data in table 4, especially in indicator 5, will align with indicator 5 in data tables 2 and 3. The condition of indicator 5 in table 2 is 78.00% (very high), indicator 5 table 3 at 23.70%, and indicator 5 table 4 at 3.40%. The condition is inversely proportional, that the conceptual quality is very good, the administrative quality decreases, and the instructional quality decreases greatly. There is nothing wrong with the data in table 4, but we discuss the progressivity of student learning by measuring the type and number of targets to be achieved in the learning process. Not that the formulation of goals is not important compared to the target objectives, but the instructional process in the context of progressivity is related to the type and number of targets, not mastery of the concept of learning objectives. The concept of learning objectives becomes a treasure outside of the process, because students have read learning objectives outside of class time.

Leadership Style Based on Data Confirmation Codes A, B, and C

The description of conceptual quality data in code A with the quality of the learning agenda for codes B and C is shown in table 5:

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.180[a]	.032	.016	1.569

a. Predictors: (Constant), CODE C, CODE B
b. Dependent Variable: CODE A

The ideal condition for the leadership of a language teacher in the progressivity of student learning is a parallel between conceptual quality, administration, and instructional agenda. If the conceptual quality is good, the administrative and instructional quality should also be good. This study shows an inverse comparison between conceptual quality, administrative and instructional quality. The keywords in the progressivity of learning are understanding student learning problems, being identified, alternative solutions formulated, and as a whole being represented in the learning objectives. Learning objectives are still conceptual because they are in the form of learning administration documents. The concrete action of achieving the goals occurs in the instructional process. The progressivity of the learning action is measured by the number of targeted learning goals. In fact, this condition is not proven through the instructional agenda, as illustrated in the data table 5. The condition is, the teacher starts the instructional process more by explaining the objectives, not what and how many targets to achieve. Psychologically the effects of action on knowledge of goals will be different from the effects of actions on form and number. If students are burdened with thoughts about what to do, their tendency will be to think about what to do or achieve. Thoughts about the amount to be achieved, they will lead to the quantity achieved.

Based on data relations tables 2, 3, and 4 it is proven that the majority of respondents have good quality concepts about student learning progressivity. Conceptual quality is inversely proportional to administrative and instructional quality. This tendency allows students to be more dominant in terms of the concept of what they are learning, rather than doing something according to the concept they understand. Concretely, students will be very proficient in linguistic competence scientifically but weak in terms of linguistic practices in all language functions. Referring to several theories of learning leadership as mentioned in the literature review section, it is understood that some language teachers (respondents) are still dominated by a motivator style that is dominated by agendas to encourage students to achieve goals. The hope is for language teachers to take on more of a role as facilitators, creators, and mentors in achieving learning goals. The purpose of this statement is that language teachers will work more closely with students in achieving targets in terms of the form and number of goals to be achieved. Instructional agendas related to the formulation and details of objectives can become a treasure of students' previously studied prior knowledge. Consequently, all learning administration documents have been prepared and distributed to students before the instructional process takes place. When the instructional process takes place, students are ready with their respective agendas independently or in groups with what must be done and how many agendas must be achieved. Of course, all of these processes occur with the language teacher being at the center of this process collaboratively with students.

The formulation and details of learning objectives are administrative treasures and have previously been understood by students before entering the instructional process. Consequently, the document in question has been prepared beforehand and becomes the student's prior knowledge. Two interesting discussion materials based on the data above. First, learning administration documents must be prepared and distributed to students

before entering the instructional process. Second, the role of the teacher from the motivator must be shifted to the teacher as a facilitator, initiator, and creator of the agenda for achieving the goals. The teacher is no longer a motivator who encourages students to achieve their learning goals, but works collaboratively to achieve learning goals.

The formulation and details of learning objectives are administrative treasures and have previously been understood by students before entering the instructional process. Consequently, the document in question has been prepared beforehand and becomes the student's prior knowledge. Two interesting discussion materials based on the data above. First, learning administration documents must be prepared and distributed to students before entering the instructional process. Second, the role of the teacher from the motivator must be shifted to the teacher as a facilitator, initiator, and creator of the agenda for achieving the goals. The teacher is no longer a motivator who encourages students to achieve their learning goals, but works collaboratively to achieve learning goals.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data and analysis it was concluded that language teachers (respondents) had good conceptual quality in terms of student learning progressivity. The conceptual quality of learning progressivity is inversely proportional to the quality of learning and instructional administration. Leadership capacity like this shows that language teachers (respondents) are still dominant as a motivator for achieving learning goals through encouraging and directing. Language teachers are still weak in their work as facilitators, creators, and initiators of achieving learning targets. This condition is not a bad condition, but requires a paradigm shift in the teacher-student relationship.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, J. B., & Md. Kassim, J. (2011). Instructional leadership and attitude towards organizational change among secondary schools principal in Pahang, Malaysia. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15, 3304–3309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.290

Ail, N. M. B. M., Taib, M. R. bin, Jaafar, H. bt, Salleh, W. A. R. bt M., & Omar, M. N. bin. (2015). Principals' Instructional Leadership and Teachers' Commitment in Three Mara Junior Science Colleges (Mjsc) in Pahang, Malaysia. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 191(2010), 1848–1853. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.512

Al-Mahdy, Y. F. H., Emam, M. M., & Hallinger, P. (2018). Assessing the contribution of principal instructional leadership and collective teacher efficacy to teacher commitment in Oman. Teaching and Teacher Education, 69, 191–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.10.007

Aziz, Z., & Baba, S. (2011). Instructional leadership enhanced creativity in smart classroom activities. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15, 1566–1572. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.332

B. Reeves, D. (2008). Reframing Teacher Leadership to Improve Your School (15th ed.). Virginia: ASCD.

Bellibas, M. S., Bulut, O., Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2016). Developing a validated instructional leadership profile of Turkish primary school principals. International

Journal of Educational Research, 75, 115–133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2015.10.002

Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Sage Publications.

Crevani, L., Lindgren, M., & Packendorff, J. (2010). Leadership, not leaders: On the study of leadership as practices and interactions. Scandinavian Journal of Management, 26(1), 77–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2009.12.003

Delors, J. (1998). Learning: The Treasure Within (2nd ed.). Paris: UNESCO.

Freire, P. (2001). Pedagogi Pengharapan (Edisi Bahasa Indonesia) (5nd ed.). Yogjakarta: Kanisius.

Gençer, M. S., & Samur, Y. (2016). Leadership Styles and Technology: Leadership Competency Level of Educational Leaders. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 229, 226–233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.07.132

Goleman, D. (2003). Kepemimpinan yang Mendatangkan Hasil (edisi Bahasa Indonesia oleh Nugraheny P., Diah (1st ed.; S. Bagastawa, ed.). Yogjakarta: Amara Books.

Hallinger, P., Leithwood, K., & Heck, R. H. (2010). Leadership: Instructional. International Encyclopedia of Education, 18–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.00443-7

Harris, Alma; Muijs, D. (2005). Improving Schools Through Teacher Leadership (1st ed.; A. Goodson, Ivor; Hargreaves, ed.). London: MPG Books.

Haryatmoko. (2010). Dominasi Penuh Muslihat: Akar Kekerasan dan Diskriminasi. Jakarta: Gramedia.

Hill, W. terjemahan B. I. oleh K. M. (2009). Theories of Learning (Teori-Teori Pembelajaran: Konsepsi, Komparasi, dan Signifikansi) (1st ed.). Bandung: Nusa Media.

Jita, L. C. (2010). Instructional leadership for the improvement of science and mathematics in South Africa. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 9, 851–854. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.247

Juran, J. M. (1995). Kepemimpinan Mutu: Pedoman Peningkatan Mutu untuk Meraih Keungulan Kompetitif (Edisi Bahasa Indonesia oleh Edi Nugroho) (1st ed.). Jakarta: Pustaka Binaman Presindo.

Keedy, J. L. (1999). Examining teacher instructional leadership within the small group dynamics of collegial groups. Teaching and Teacher Education, 15(7), 785–799. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(99)00022-0

Kotter, J. P. (1996). Leading Change (5th ed.). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Murphy, J. (2005). Connecting Teacher Leadership and School Improvement (5nd ed.; R. Livsey, ed.). California: Sage Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.

Penner-Williams, J., Diaz, E. I., & Gonzales Worthen, D. (2019). Sustainability of teacher growth from professional development in culturally and linguistically responsive instructional practices. Teaching and Teacher Education, 86, 102891. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102891

Polizzi, S. J., Ofem, B., Coyle, W., Lundquist, K., & Rushton, G. T. (2019). The use of visual network scales in teacher leader development. Teaching and Teacher Education, 83, 42–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.03.018

Smith, P. S., Hayes, M. L., & Lyons, K. M. (2017). The ecology of instructional teacher leadership. Journal of Mathematical Behavior, 46(March 2014), 267–288. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmathb.2016.12.005

Sumintono, Bambang; Widhiarso, W. (2014). Aplikasi Model RASCH untuk Penelitian Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial (2nd ed.; B. Trim, ed.). Yogjakarta: UGM.

Topping, P. A. (2002). Managerial Leadership (9th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

Tsai, K. C. (2017). Development of the teacher leadership style scale. Social Behavior and Personality, 45(3), 477–490. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.5751

Zaman@Taufiq, N. Z. S., & Sidhu, G. K. (2013). Listening Styles and Challenges of ESL Instructional Leaders in Institutions of Higher Learning. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 90(InCULT 2012), 558–565. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.07.126