



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Stefinee Pinnegar,
Brigham Young University, United States

*CORRESPONDENCE

Panya Akkaraputtapong
✉ panya.a@chula.ac.th

RECEIVED 06 June 2025

ACCEPTED 26 June 2025

PUBLISHED 21 July 2025

CITATION

Akkaraputtapong P, Nguyen HTM, Ngo HT
and Ngo NTH (2025) Correction: A teacher
leadership model validation for in-service
teachers. *Front. Educ.* 10:1642346.
doi: 10.3389/feduc.2025.1642346

COPYRIGHT

© 2025 Akkaraputtapong, Nguyen, Ngo and
Ngo. This is an open-access article distributed
under the terms of the [Creative Commons
Attribution License \(CC BY\)](#). The use,
distribution or reproduction in other forums is
permitted, provided the original author(s) and
the copyright owner(s) are credited and that
the original publication in this journal is cited,
in accordance with accepted academic
practice. No use, distribution or reproduction
is permitted which does not comply with
these terms.

Correction: A teacher leadership model validation for in-service teachers

Panya Akkaraputtapong^{1*}, Hoa Thi Mai Nguyen²,
Ha Thanh Ngo³ and Nga Thi Hang Ngo⁴

¹Department of Educational Policy Management and Leadership, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand, ²School of Education, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia, ³Business School, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia, ⁴Tay Bac University, Son La, Vietnam

KEYWORDS

teacher professional development, educational leadership, Teacher Leader Model Standards (TLMS), scale development, model validation

A Correction on

A teacher leadership model validation for in-service teachers

by Akkaraputtapong, P., Nguyen, H. T. M., Ngo, H. T., and Ngo, N. T. H. (2025). *Front. Educ.* 10:1503997. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2025.1503997

In the published article, there were minor mistakes in the main text. The statement for factor extraction criteria was displayed as “Upon the factor extraction, the author removed the items with factor loading less than ± 0.40 (Hair et al., 2019), cross-loading items with less than 0.15 difference from its highest factor loading, and items having communalities less than 40 (Worthington and Whittaker, 2006).” There were errors related to authorship reference, pronoun agreement, and expression of the item communality threshold value.

A correction has been made to the section **Results**, subsection 3.1 *Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)*, Paragraph 3:

“Principal axis factoring was performed as this study focused on scale validation (Hair et al., 2019), and promax oblique rotation was employed because the factors were expected to be correlated (Hair et al., 2019). The number of plausible factors was determined as seven based upon the theoretical foundation (Watkins, 2018). Upon the factor extraction, the authors removed the items with factor loading less than ± 0.40 (Hair et al., 2019), cross-loading items with less than 0.15 difference from their highest factor loading, and items having communalities less than 0.40 (Worthington and Whittaker, 2006). Factor extraction and rotation were rerun after the removal of each item, and a total of 21 items were removed along the process. The rerun seven-factor solution revealed that two factors obtaining less than two items, which would not yield a meaningful interpretation (Williams et al., 2010). These factors and their items were thus deleted (Worthington and Whittaker, 2006), and a five-factor solution was administrated. Three more items were also then removed based on the theoretical relevance.”

The original version of this article has been updated.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated

organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.