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ABSTRACT: This study assessed the influence of principal leadership styles and teachers’ work-related flow experience on teachers’ productivity in Osun state, Nigeria. Descriptive survey research design was employed and both probability and non-probability sampling techniques were used to select two-hundred (200) respondents. Validated quantitative instruments tagged ‘Work-Related Flow Questionnaire’ (WRFQ), ‘Leadership Styles Questionnaire’ (LSQ) and ‘Teachers’ Productivity Questionnaire’ (TPQ) with reasonable reliability coefficient were used to obtain information from the participants. Regression analysis was used to achieve all the three objectives as well as research questions. Empirical outcomes revealed that principal leadership styles-transformational, laissez-faire and transactional leadership styles had negative, and positive influence on teachers’ productivity with $t (273) = (-.480; -2.710 & 0.633)$ respectively. Moreover, teachers’ work-related flow had positive and significant effect on teachers’ productivity as $t (273) = 3.18$ and $p = .002 < 0.05$. And that 55.8% variation that took place in teachers’ productivity was as a result of combine influence of teachers’ work-related flow experience and principal leadership styles. The study concluded that principal leadership styles and teachers’ work-related flow experience have a long way to go in determining teachers’ effectiveness in academic and non-academic oriented exercises. Recommendations consisted of principal’s application of varieties of leadership styles base on the prevailing circumstances of the school activities and frequent organisation of leadership training for potential and existing head of schools among others were suggested for the concerned stakeholders of education within the studied areas and beyond.
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1. Introduction

Teachers are regarded as valuable inputs in the production function of any country’s educational apparatus. This is due to their importance among other resources, given their role in ensuring effective and efficient coordination and utilisation of all types of educational resources in order to achieve the organization’s objectives. This is in line with the Federal Government of Nigeria (2013) which states that no society can advance beyond the quality of its variable inputs into the teaching profession in particular and the educational system in general. This indicates that, all other things being equal, the quality of education obtained by recipients in any society is consequence upon the level of competency attained and shown by teachers.

Teachers are individuals who, in theory, are qualified to exert positive influence on others (learners) through the transmission of knowledge, competences, or values within formal academic settings in order to achieve good and successful teaching (Aransi, 2020). To achieve good teaching, teachers must develop the ability to teach curriculum content in accordance with disciplinary standards of adequacy and completeness, as well as ensure that the methods and instructional aids used during teaching-learning interactions are age-appropriate, morally defensible, and undertaken with the goal of improving learners’ content competence.
While successful teaching necessitates teachers developing the ability to persuade students to internalise a tolerable and acceptable level of skill from the information being taught (Berliner, 2005). Teacher’s ability to achieve high level of productivity and performance by considering good and successful teaching, as well as other commendable practises in school settings, can be attributed in part to school organisational variables-leadership styles of principals and personal characteristics of instructors- work-related flow experience.

School leadership is the process of enlisting and guiding the talents and energies of teachers, students and parents towards achieving common educational aims (Ayoro & Onyeike, 2020). In this study, principal leadership styles are described as deliberate actions taken by the head of the school which aimed at ensuring that members of staff (both academic and non-academic) and other stakeholders of education are provided with direction and motivated to implement master plans of the school settings in order to attain educational goals. Literature revealed plethora types of leadership styles, in this context, however, principal leadership styles are considered from a tripod types-transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles. Transformational leadership style, often known as charismatic leadership style, is characterised by a variety of leadership strategies aimed at inspiring followers to follow the leader’s actions and motivating them to use their own strengths (Khan, Ismail, Hussain, & Alghazali, 2020). Goal formulation, resource management, output monitoring and control, and sharing of responsibility for new ideas between the head and subordinates are all characteristics of transactional leadership style (Lucey, 2017). Non-involvement, indifference, being absent when needed, and disregarding achievements and difficulties are all characteristics of laissez-faire leadership style Gameda and Lee (2020).

Ayoro and Onyeike (2020) reported a positive relationship between leadership styles and teachers’ productivity. These scholars examined leadership styles from aggregate perspective neglecting that examination from disaggregate point of view would intimate the stakeholders of education with those components that could be beneficial or detrimental to teachers’ productivity. Okoye and Emeghebo (2020) reported positive and significant relationship between transactional and transformational leadership styles and lecturers’ productivity. These scholars focused on tertiary institution where specific instructional strategies are not encouraged and even instructors are allowed to embrace lecture method coupled with dishing out the course outline at the very beginning of the classroom contact which would never be effective and productive at the secondary school levels. In their study at secondary school phase, Obidi, Prudence, Izuchukwu, and Uchechukwu (2020) reported a negligible negative and significant positive relationship between principals’ transformational and transactional leadership styles and teachers’ productivity. Aside from the fact that the study was restricted to those teachers teaching Business Studies, it neglected to incorporate the third component of the leadership style. Lumumba, Simatwa, and Jane (2021) submitted that laissez faire leadership style was a negative function of primary teachers’ trainings ‘college organisational performance in Kenya. Nwachukwu and Emunemu (2021) noted that there was no significant relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and teacher effectiveness in public secondary schools in Ibadan North Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria.

Work-related flow refers to situations in which a person is totally immersed in a controllable scenario that includes tough or difficult tasks/activities that require some expertise, and for which the person is fully motivated and focused on their intrinsic aspects (Basyouni & El Keshky, 2021). Three characteristics of employees’ work-related flow are total immersion in an activity (absorption), uttermost delight of which one is not necessarily conscious, and intrinsic motivation (Bakker, 2008). Work-related flow is a condition of strong interest in a task that has been linked to high levels of productivity, confidence, attention, ease, and automaticity (Harris, Vine, & Wilson, 2017). Flow is defined as a state of being in which performance is automatic and occurs without conscious effort. When a person is engaged in an intrinsically motivated task, self-awareness fades, and surprisingly, when the task is completed, a feeling of self arises and grows. An individual’s time perception changes during work-related flow experiences. Hours appear to be minutes, and when a person is unable to establish work-related flow, the opposite perceptual effects can occur (Basyouni & El Keshky, 2021).

Each of the work-related flow parameters according to Hofslett and Vivoll (2009) was positively connected to employees’ self-reports of task performance. Bakker (2008) discovered that flow was a significant predictor of other performance reports. Work enjoyment was found to be the most important predictor of task performance, whereas intrinsic work motivation was found to be the most important predictor of task completion. Demerouti (2006) found that work-related flow was predictive of other job
performance ratings (task and contextual performance), especially for conscientious individuals. Employees who were able to direct their flow experiences toward the correct items and activities benefited the most. Employees who often engaged in information sharing (knowledge seeking and contributing) had higher flow, which predicted creativity. Employees who reported increased attention focus and enjoyment as a result of information sharing were more likely to come up with new ideas, solve difficulties, and be creative in their work Yan, Davison, and Mo (2013). There is need to note at this juncture that work-related flow experience has significant implications for employees’ job performance and creativity. Aside from inconclusive arguments as regards the nexus between leadership styles and teachers’ productivity coupled with contextual gap, attention has not been fully tailored towards incorporating teachers’ work-related flow variable into the model of leadership styles and employees’ productivity. Hence, this study stands to fill the great lacuna in the literature.

1.1. Objective of the Study

The study’s broad objective was to take a look at assessing the influence of leadership styles, and work-related flow experience on teachers’ productivity in Osun State, Nigeria. While, specific objectives are to:

i. Ascertain the impact of leadership styles (laissez-faire, transactional and transformational leadership styles) on teachers’ productivity within the studied location.

ii. Determine the influence of work-related flow experience (absorption, enjoyment and intrinsic motivation) on teachers’ productivity within the studied location.

iii. Find out the combined influence of work-related flow experience and leadership styles on teachers’ productivity within the studied location.

1.2. Research Questions

The following questions were enumerated to guide the study.

i. What is the influence of leadership styles on teachers’ productivity within the studied location?

ii. To what extent does work-related flow experience predict teachers’ productivity within the studied location?

iii. What is the combined influence of leadership styles and work-related flow experience on teachers’ productivity within the studied location?

2.1. Conceptual Framework

Figure 1 represents the study’s conceptual framework. The framework explains that secondary school teachers’ productivity vis-à-vis instructional strategies, classroom management and students’ engagement as well as other academic and non-academic exercises that are germane for effective and smooth running of the
school settings are the function of head teachers’ leadership styles and teachers’ work-related flow experience. However, the positive and significant nexus between head teachers’ leadership style (transactional leadership style) and teachers’ productivity are associated with the role being played by headteachers as demonstrated in the path-goal leadership theory. With respect to relationship between work-related flow experience and teachers’ productivity, the positive and significant influence of work-related flow (intrinsic motivation, enjoyment and immersion/absorption) in predicting teachers’ productivity is attributed to the analysis of self-determination theory.

2.2. Theoretical Framework
2.2.1. Path-Goal Leadership Theory

Path-Goal Leadership Theory proposed by House in 1968. This theory explains the influence of leadership style on employees’ level of productivity through demonstration of innovative work behaviour. In the path goal theory, a school head is expected to work towards the attainment of the set educational goals and continually communicate them with subordinates (teachers) in order to achieve them. In addition, this theory advocates that the school head should delegate roles to subordinates according to their work experience, abilities, skills, and knowledge. This may in part account for existence of the offices like Vice-Principals (Administration and Academic) coupled with Heads of Departments. Head of class stream among teachers as well as appointment of school prefects and class captain to mention a few. Leader, according to this theory is in position to define task roles by removing obstacles to performance and promote group cohesiveness and team effort. As this would make the leader to increase personal opportunities for satisfaction and improved work performance by reducing stress, making external controls and people’s expectations explicit and clearer.

This theory reiterates that leaders may enhance in improving the performance of subordinates (teachers) by enhancing goal achievement as follows; when subordinates are confused, the leader tells them what to do and shows them a clear path to follow. When the path is shown, the subordinates (teachers) become satisfied and motivated, so they accept leaders’ behaviour thus performing effectively. The leader’s behaviour further enhances the subordinates work environment through directing, controlling, supervising, rewarding, proper communication, delegation of duties and joint decision making between principals and teachers thus enhancing good performance among the workers. By doing so, teachers’ expectations become high, thus their performance would be enhanced. This is to deduce from the tenet of the theory that the behaviour of the leader would be considered productive and acceptable to subordinates (teachers) only if they continue to see the leader as a source of personal opportunities to improve performance. This theory fails to take into consideration motivational drive that is personal and internal to the subordinates.

2.2.2. Self-Determination Theory

Self-Determination Theory, introduced by Deci and Ryan (1985), is a social-cognitive theory of motivation that has been widely applied to organisational research. The theory emphasises the importance of motivation for achievement, particularly intrinsic motivation. The theory examines the human tendency to grow in a positive way and identifies three core needs that help with that progress. Autonomy, competence, and relatedness are the three needs. Intrinsic motivation is a concept that explains a person’s innate desire for assimilation, mastery, spontaneous curiosity, and exploration, which is critical to cognitive and social growth and a major source of enjoyment and vitality throughout life (Ryan, 1995). According to Harter (1978) no single phenomenon is more accurately reflect the good and actual possibilities of human nature than intrinsic drive/motivation, the natural need to seek out novelty and challenges, to stretch and exercise one's capabilities, to explore, and to learn. Even in the absence of explicit rewards, children in their healthiest stages are energetic, inquisitive, inquiring, and playful from the moment of birth. Hence, this theory supports high level of employees’ productivity (teachers) as occasioned by personal traits such as intrinsic motivation, work enjoyment and immersion/absorption.

3. Methodology
3.1. Research Design

The study employed descriptive survey research design. As descriptive survey research design was conceived as one in which a group of people or items is studied by collecting and analysing data from only a few people or items considered to be representative of the entire target group. The design was considered
appropriate for this study because the study aimed at obtaining data to describe the situation that exist among the variables of interest. Besides, it however gives no room for manipulation of variables, as it aims at neither adds to nor subtracts from the existing fact. Hence, the study intended to establish the relationship among teachers’ work-related flow, principal’s leadership styles and teachers’ productivity level.

3.2. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

The study’s targeted population consisted of all public secondary school teachers in Irewole/Isokan/Ayedada federal constituency of Osun West Senatorial District, Osun State, Nigeria. Both probability and non-probability sampling techniques were used in the study. Purposive sampling technique was used to select all public secondary schools employed for the research. Stratified random sampling technique was employed by forming/designing the strata based on demographic characteristics of the respondents (gender, work experience, department, and age range among others) per sampled schools and simple random sampling techniques was used to select two-hundred (200) respondents. This technique avails each element as a sub-set of universal set equal chance of being chosen in the study.

3.3. Instrumentation

Qualitative instruments tagged ‘Work-Related Flow Questionnaire’ (WRFQ), ‘Leadership Styles Questionnaire’ (LSQ) and ‘Teachers’ Productivity Questionnaire’ (TPQ) were used. A modified version of the work-related flow scale postulated by Chen and Huang (2016) contained thirteen (13) items on three subscales with absorption four (4), enjoyment four (4) items and intrinsic motivation five (5) was employed. With respect to leadership styles, the study adapted a modified version of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire construct with three sub-scales consisting of laissez-faire leadership style (four items), transactional leadership style (six items) and transformational leadership style (six items) postulated by Pahi, Umran, Ab Hamid, and Ahmed (2015) used in the context of public hospitals employees in Pakistan. According to the requirements of the present study, MLQ was modified to measure the leadership styles of the public secondary school principals as perceived by teachers. As all the ‘I’ was replaced with S/he or my principal, for example ‘I’ provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts was modified to ‘S/he’ or my principal provides others with assistance in exchange for their efforts’. The literature supports MLQ as a reliable and valid measure for the assessment of leadership styles (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003). A self-designed teachers’ productivity questionnaire was used which consisted of three sub-scales—productivity in instructional strategies, students’ engagement and classroom management with five items each totalling fifteen items. Examples of these items are ‘I apply varieties of assessment strategies during teaching-learning process’, ‘I monitor students to follow school rules and regulations’, and ‘I foster students’ creativity’ for productivity in instructional strategies, classroom management and students’ engagement respectively.

3.4. Validity, Reliability and Method of Data Analysis

In order to ensure the validity of the instruments used for this study, the instrument was subjected to content validity measurement which involved face, content and predictive validity. On the face and content validity, the items were presented in simple and unambiguous language for ease understanding by the respondents and were also logically and systematically arranged in line with the research objectives enumerated. The researcher also ensured validity of the instruments by making sure that the contents of the instrument was consistent with both the objectives and research questions.

The instrument was trail-tested among thirty (30) teachers outside the geographical scope of the study. The internal consistency reliability coefficient was obtained with the aid of Cronbach Alpha reliability technique. The justification for using this technique was based on the fact that the items on research instrument, that is, questionnaire have no right or wrong answer and it allowed respondents to rate the degree or extent to which they agree or disagree with a statement on a particular scale. The reliability coefficients of 0.79, 0.81 and 0.77 were obtained for Teachers’ Work-Related Flow, Principal Leadership Styles and Teachers Productivity Questionnaire respectively. This buttressed that the instrument was adequate, relevant and consistent in measuring the attributes of interest to the study. The administration of the research instrument was done by the researchers in company of three trained research assistant who familiar with the terrain of the study’s scope. However, the research assistants were briefed on the objectives, guidance,
approach and explanation to be given to the respondents on how to fill the questionnaire if the need arises. Regression analysis was used to achieve all the research objectives and answer research questions.

4. Results

4.1. Analysis Based on Research Questions

Research Question 1: What is the influence of principal leadership styles (laissez-faire, transactional and transformational leadership styles) on teachers’ productivity?

| Table 1. Summary of the regression result showing the influence of leadership styles on teachers’ productivity. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients B | Std. Error | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t | Sig. |
| (Constant) | 56.937 | 5.647 | | 10.083 | 0.000 |
| Transformational Style | -0.116 | 0.242 | -0.053 | -0.480 | 0.633 |
| Transactional Style | 0.235 | 0.231 | 0.118 | 1.017 | 0.312 |
| Laissez-faire Style | -0.804 | 0.297 | -0.329 | -2.710 | 0.008 |

Table 1 presents the summary of the regression result showing the influence of leadership styles on teachers’ productivity. The empirical outcome reveals that transformational, and transactional leadership styles had insignificant negative, and positive influence on teachers’ productivity vis-à-vis classroom instructional strategies, classroom management and students’ engagement with $t$ (273) = (-0.480, 1.017); $p$ = (0.633 & 0.312 > 0.05) respectively. While, laissez-faire leadership style has negative and significant effect on teachers’ productivity with $t$ (273) = -2.710 and $p$ = 0.008 < 0.05. Moreover, with a-unit increase in head teachers’ enforcement of transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles principles, there is a decline in teachers’ productivity in terms of their effectiveness in instructional strategies, classroom management and students’ engagement by .116 and .804 respectively. With regard to transactional leadership style, a unit increase result into 0.235 positive increase in teachers’ productivity.

Research Question 2: To what extent does work-related flow predicts teachers’ productivity?

| Table 2. Summary of the regression result showing the level with which teachers’ work-related flow experience predict teachers’ productivity. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients B | Std. Error | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t | Sig. |
| (Constant) | 31.842 | 6.422 | | 4.958 | 0.000 |
| Work-Related Flow | 0.515 | 0.162 | 0.324 | 3.176 | 0.002 |

Table 2 presents the summary of the regression result showing the level with which teachers’ work-related flow experience predict teachers’ productivity. The empirical finding indicates that teachers’ work-related flow has positive and significant effect on teachers’ productivity which consists of instructional strategies, classroom management and students’ engagement as $t$ (273) = 3.18 and $p$ = 0.002 < 0.05. However, with one-unit increase in teachers’ work-related flow which revolves round three vital areas consists of absorption, enjoyment and intrinsic motivation, there is a noticeable increased in teachers’ productivity by 0.52.

Research Question 3: What is the combined influence of leadership styles and work-related flow on teachers’ productivity within the studied location?

| Table 3. Summary of the regression result showing the combined influence of leadership styles and work-related flow experience on teachers’ productivity. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | R | R-Square | Adjusted Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
| 1 | 0.397$^a$ | 0.558 | 0.517 | 7.897 | 1.785 |

Note: a. Predictors: (Constant), Work-Related Flow, Transformational, Transactional, laissez-faire.

Table 3 presents the summary of the regression result showing the combined influence of leadership styles and work-related flow experience on teachers’ productivity. The empirical model reveals that 55.8% variation
that take place in teachers’ productivity vis-à-vis instructional strategies, classroom management and students’ engagement is as a result of joint influence of teachers’ work-related flow experience and principal leadership styles variables as depicted by coefficient of determination (that is R-Square).

5. Discussion of Findings

On part of the principal leadership styles and teachers’ work-related flow nexus, the empirical outcomes showed that transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles had inverse relationship with teachers’ productivity, while transactional leadership style had positive and insignificant influence on teachers’ productivity. This indicated that with one-unit increase in headteachers’ demonstration of transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles while overseeing the curriculum activities of the teachers within their control resulted into decline in the productivity level of the teachers under consideration. Also, with one-unit increase in the application of transactional leadership style by headteachers would stimulate teachers’ productivity positively.

This showcased that headteachers with laissez-faire leadership style would always exhibit attitudes comprised non-involvement towards curriculum and co-curriculum activities of the school, show indifference to any academic or non-academic oriented issues of the school, overlook academic achievement, absent when needed with inability to give clear cut direction about mode of implementing and enforcing school rules and regulations which may discourage members of academic staff to invest more efforts during teaching-learning interactions and thereby making subject teacher’s classroom discussion unproductive. This study corroborated recent research finding conducted by Lumumba et al. (2021) wherein laissez faire leadership style was reported of having negative association with organisational performance of primary teachers training colleges in Lake Victoria Region of Kenya.

There is need to note that headteacher with transactional leadership style usually work towards the means of attaining educational goal among his/her academic and non-academic members of staff, managing educational resources of the school, coupled with constant monitoring and controlling of school outputs. Hence, the style embraces method of sharing things including innovative ideas between both the leader and follower for the purpose of reaching the predetermined goals. This was in agreement with submission made by Obidi et al. (2020) in which a significant positive relationship between transactional leadership style and teachers’ productivity among secondary schools in Awka Education Zone of Anambra State was acknowledged. The study also corroborated (Ayor & Onyeike, 2020) who reported that there was a positive relationship between leadership styles and teachers’ productivity of mission secondary schools in Delta State, Nigeria.

In addition, in spite the fact that headteacher with transformational leadership style usually aimed at encouraging academic and non-academic members of staff to pursue the leaders’ actions as well as motivate them, the academic members of staff under this leadership style might not wish to fully engage their capabilities during teaching-learning processes without being monitored which would have adverse effect on their degree of productivity vis-à-vis instructional strategies, classroom management and students’ engagement. The finding was in consonance with Odunlami, Ali, and Ishak (2018) submission where application of transactional leadership style by the school head was considered to be better predictor of teachers’ productivity than nexus between transformational leadership style and teacher productivity.

As regards teachers’ work-related flow and productivity, the empirical result revealed a positive and significant effect of teachers’ possession of work-related flow traits on productivity which comprised instructional strategies, classroom management and students’ engagement. However, with one-unit increase in teachers’ work-related flow which revolved round three areas consisted of absorption, enjoyment and intrinsic motivation, there would be always noticeable positive increased in teachers’ productivity. This is to say that when employees where in this context teachers are goal oriented and hardworking, their work-related flow experience would strongly influence their job productivity in teaching profession. This means that teachers with educational goal and achievement orientation mindset would enjoy their involvement in academic and non-academic exercise and thereby attaining favourable performance within the school setting. The outcome supported (Li-Chuan & Chen-Lin, 2012) who showed that work-related flow experience was a positive predictor of elementary schools’ teachers job performance in Taiwan.

Finally, it was discovered that more than half of the variation that took place in teachers’ productivity was as a result of the combined influence of work-related flow and principal leadership styles. This buttressed that
these two variables played a great role in determining teachers’ productivity vis-à-vis instructional strategies, classroom management and students’ engagement.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

The study concluded that teachers’ work-related flow experience (absorption, enjoyment and intrinsic motivation) and principal leadership styles (laissez-faire, transactional and transformational leadership styles) have on individual and joint basis contributed in predicting teachers’ productivity towards instructional strategies, classroom management and students’ engagement, with laissez-faire, and transformational leadership styles considered to be detrimental to teachers’ productivity during teaching and learning processes. Based on the empirical findings emanate from this research work, the following suggestions were raised for stakeholders of education.

i. School heads are advised to embrace and apply varieties of leadership styles while overseeing the affair of the school in order to accommodate different needs of the teachers necessary to stimulate productivity during teaching and learning interactions and possibly in all facets of the school activities.

ii. Stakeholders of education both governmental and non-profit organizations should endeavor to organize leadership training and development programs for both potential and existing heads of schools so as to acquaint them with prerequisite knowledge and skills pertinent towards facilitating and maintaining positive school tones and enhance overall productivity among members of staff.

iii. Teachers are implored to discharge their role wholeheartedly by exhibiting work-related flow by means of expressing absorption, enjoyment and intrinsic motivation during academic oriented and non-academic inclined exercises rather than allow any form of distraction or expect external reinforcement.

iv. Teachers are advised to disregard those leadership styles that could be detrimental to their degree of productivity, instead, they should endeavor to build on some of the fundamental qualities expected of them as an individual practicing in teaching profession. As this would go along way to achieve high level of productivity regardless of the prevailing headteachers leadership styles.
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