

# *Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Leadership Styles of School Leaders: Implications for Teacher Development*

---

Alexander Kyei Edwards\*\*1, Selina Afriyie<sup>2</sup>, Samuel Kwadwo Aboagye<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Centre for Educational Policy Studies, University of Education, Winneba, Ghana

<sup>2</sup> and <sup>3</sup> Department of Educational Leadership, University of Education, Winneba, Kumasi Campus, Ghana

## *Abstract*

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the concept of self-efficacy and school leadership styles among educators of public senior high schools in Ghana. Utilizing the correlational design paradigm and a stratified random sampling technique, participants (N=120) responded to a survey questionnaire with three sections and 56 items. A positive correlation between respondents' Principal Self-efficacy Scale (PSES) and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was established ( $r=.54$ ). School leaders who are highly efficacious quite often used transformational leadership style ( $r=.57$ ). There was a significant difference in self-efficacy levels among gender groups ( $t=.78$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p=.56$ ). This discovery is very significant for further research into gender disparity and inclusivity. The study recommended to Ghana Education Service as the largest employer of teachers in Ghana to practically measure and develop aspiring school leaders through in-service training with contents associated with self-efficacy, self-concepts, and self-motivation. Self-efficacy concept should be recommended for continuous professional development; teachers especially should develop their self-concepts: self-beliefs, self-leadership to enhance their potentials, classroom leadership, and instructional delivery. To buttress this recommendation, educational leaders should watch their leadership styles that augment personal and organizational (school) performance among service teachers.

## Keywords

Ghana Education Service, Multifactor Leadership, School Leadership Style, Self-efficacy, Principal Self-efficacy Scale (PSES)

## INTRODUCTION

School improvement is very often associated with teaching and learning results, which are also dependent on teacher education, curriculum activities, and socio-dynamics prevalent in any school culture. Research is still investigating ways to raise academic performances, teacher productivity, with emphasis on leadership for learning (MoE/GES/TED, 2014) and by applying theory and practice for the C12st school system (Hopkins, 2005). In this respect, Niyazi's (2013) assertion that there are many factors that affect the ability of the teacher to produce the required results holds truth. One of such

factors is the self-efficacy of the individual teachers to be productive, and second factor is the leadership practices of the school heads and teachers. These are crucial for interrogation as to how the relationship between self-efficacy and leadership styles may have implications on the kind of teacher development in the Ghana education system.

In Ghana researchers agree with global research that school performance is greatly affected by school leadership, which tends to affect the school climate and culture for learning (Aboagye, Anamuah-Mensah and Sam, 2018). School leadership practices (Edwards and Aboagye, 2015), and instructional delivery practices of teachers (GES, 2017) also account for school performance levels. Our teachers are trained to be able to offer their services and deliver results. But the general performances at schools are still far away from the expected achievement levels. This may be attributed to leadership for learning issues (GES/TED Handbook, 2014; MoE/GES/TED, 2014). School leadership is recognized as an important pillar for school performance, teacher effective teaching and learning performance, and for creating a conducive school climate for teaching and learning. Ghana Education Service, which is the major employer of teachers reports that without proper school leadership all efforts to raise performances in schools become difficult. This is consistent with research which shows the effect of school leadership is a reflection of what happens in schools, the school ecology, and the 'know how' of teachers as they (school leaders) think about the business of education (Leithwood and Steinbach, 1995; McCormick, 2001; Sergiovanni, 1991; Snowden and Gorton, 2002). Snowden and Gorton see effective school leadership styles as needed in schools if stakeholders are looking for significant change in performance results.

School leadership style is defined by Hallinger (2003) as the methods employed to get results in teaching and learning within a school setting. It is the methods or behaviours applied by school leaders to get results. They apply different transformative strategies, modalities, behaviours, and situational approaches to a variety of issues according to their personal awareness, knowledge, and skills. That becomes the summation of what school leadership is all about. Most of these school leadership practices are based on conceptual models learned during teacher training, lessons on the job dominated by teacher continuous development strategies, and the kind of human performance strategies applied during in-service training (InSET), which include instructional delivery practices, transformative processes, management of resources, relational characteristics, and professionalism. Surprisingly, within the education sector many of these strategies are put in place, school leaders exemplify as expected in school leadership, and they are predominated in School-based InSET sessions.

However, effective school leadership involves behaviours that teachers put up in terms of performance and this affects students to bring the necessary results. These must of necessity come from best practices, the application of standards, supervision of teaching and learning, and judicious management of school resources. School leadership that builds capacity of teachers is focused on coordinating, controlling, supervising and developing curriculum and instruction in the school for achievable results (Bamburg and

Andrews, 1990; Hallinger and Murphy, 1985). Avery (2004) argues that there is no single leadership paradigm, nor single style, that is considered the most effective. Instead, a school leader may adopt a leadership style that suits the context of a situation in which there is bound to be a leader-followers interaction, (in this case, headteacher-teacher relationship). So school leaders exercise their styles, behaviours, and abilities in relationship to their personal beliefs, ambitions, and aspirations in any given situation. This however may lead to misinterpretation such as undemocratic style.

In addition, school leadership performance must affect individual teachers' inputs, processes, and performance levels. Meaning that school leadership styles may relate with teachers' personal self-belief, self-efficacy, and a collective achievement at the school as an organizational level (Rummler and Brache, 1995). Rummler and Brache (1995) call for organizational structure and strategies to effect performance levels. So within the framework of individual performers' ability is the concept of self-efficacy which is defined by Bandura (1977) as the level of confidence and beliefs to successfully accomplish a given task. Teacher self-efficacy leads to attaining a desired teaching and learning goal. Robbins and Judge (2011) share a similar view that self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in performing a task. Therefore in this context a teacher or school leader's self-efficacy is accentuated by a self-belief and "a judgment of his or her capabilities to structure a particular course of action in order to produce desired outcomes in his or her school" (Tschannen-Moran and Gareis, 2004, p. 573).

The issue is that in Ghana, most secondary schools face poor school leadership and it is reflected in poor academic performance. For the past five years, over 150 schools have been branded as poor performing secondary schools by the World Bank standards. These schools are engaged in Secondary Education Improvement Project (SEIP) to reverse the poor performance and poor quality of education delivery at that level (GES, 2017; GES/TED Handbook, 2014; SEIP/World Bank Report, 2014). SEIP has identified leadership potentials to transform failing schools yet missed because of lack of comprehensive teacher capacity building (Edwards and Aboagye, 2015). Most trained teachers lose the sense of self-confidence and momentum brought from colleges of education when they face with discouraging situations. Some teachers' job performances plummet and their satisfaction low. Sometimes this is the result of school leader failures to support teachers, motivate them, and build their self-confidence. This affects their self-efficacy and outputs.

Another issue is socio-cultural attitudes of school leadership that are flawed in dealing with subordinates (teachers) as important piece in the puzzle of school business. There have been instances where teachers relinquish their post because of leadership behaviour. There are many complaints of teachers not satisfied with treatments and conditions of services, which mostly call for creative and different leadership styles especially in conflict practices, leader-member relationships, and instructional supervision practices. The challenge therefore becomes teacher self-efficacy affected by inherent and well-entrenched school cultures. Most often in an attempt to challenge the

processes of school administration, cultural dynamics, and teaching and learning conditions, the school head and teachers are plunged into conflicts, and parents-teacher associations (PTA) are called in to solve issues. Culturally, self-efficacy becomes an important evidence in an individual's behaviours with reference to self-perception, self-belief, self-regulation, and judgment about his/her capacity to handle different and difficult situations. And for that matter research is consistent when it comes to the demonstration of self-efficacy and performance and leadership approaches to situations (McCormick, Tanguma and Lopez-Forment, 2002).

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between teacher participants' self-efficacy and school leadership styles among selected public senior high school (SHS) in Ghana. Therefore the following research questions are raised:

1. What are the prevalent school leadership styles and self-efficacy levels of respondents (SHS heads and teachers) in the Kumasi Metropolis?
2. What is the relationship between self-efficacies and leadership style of heads of schools?
3. Are there differences among genders in terms of self-efficacy and school leadership styles?

The study is significant because there is minimal research in Ghana when it comes to establishing the relationship between self-efficacy and leadership styles. However, this association has an implication on teacher education and professional development. Teaching work is naturally difficult and self-rewarding in nature. Teachers are losing self-confidence, self-beliefs, and questioning their choice of work (Ball and Forzani, 2017). There is very little evidence available for consideration in ways to building self-efficacy in teacher preparation, school leadership, and professional aptitudes within the Ghana education system. The current teacher certification introduced by the Ministry of Education through the National Teaching Council is evidence of the government making sure to get the best teachers; yet the guidelines are not highlighting teacher leadership self-efficacy and teacher/school leadership styles or behaviours much needed in the certification processes. Such prior facta association exists and it is significant in policy discussions, practical engagements, research and training and development. More importantly, the entire teacher education curriculum leadership in Ghana needs to examine capacity building within the framework of self-concepts.

## REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

### Self-efficacy and Leadership Styles

Theoretically, studies have shown a correlation between self-efficacy and performances (Bandura, 1982; McCormick, et al., 2002). McCormick et al. strongly assert that school leaders' performance is based on their levels of self-efficacy. The social learning theory proposed by Albert Bandura (1977/1982) supports the integration of behaviourism and social learning to interpret the interaction among person, behaviour and environment

that affect human performance. Bandura suggests in performance analysis we ought to examine individual's perception of self-efficacy particularly in (i) outcome expectations and (ii) efficacy expectations. Outcome expectations relate to the anticipated results based on individuals' actions. While efficacy expectations relate to how confident an individual believes in carrying out an action to reach an expected goal.

According to Demir (2008), leadership self-efficacy correlates with leadership styles particularly in any given school environment. Another study finds significant disparity in school culture, human capital development and performance-related activities in schools due to individual approach to leadership (Anamuah-Mensah, Sam, and Aboagye, 2018). Anamuah-Mensah et al. (2018) see the relationship between leadership styles with other extraneous factors controlled to determine the school culture as high impact factors on school performance.

Conceptually, many studies have established strong relationship between school leadership style and leadership perceived self-efficacy by cases of behavioural functions (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson, 2008; LISA, 2009). Hersey et al. (2008) ascertain leadership behaviours or styles in (i) task-orientation, (ii) relations-orientation and (iii) participative leadership behaviour. These leadership orientations (styles) are evident in situational leadership performance, which reflects individual leadership self-beliefs. The relationship between leadership styles and leadership self-efficacy affect communication behaviours such as listening, facilitating, supporting and delegating (Hersey, et al., 2008; Vandever and Menefee, 2010). Leadership self-efficacy prioritizes tasks performance higher than interactions and the personal needs of individual members (Vandever and Menefee, 2010). With such instances leadership tends to be autocratic, overly laissez-faire, losing confidence and yet it is the result of perceived self-efficacy levels overwhelmed by task at hand.

#### Perceived Self-efficacy

Perceived Self-efficacy (PSE) is psychologically pronounced by internal locus of control, self-oriented belief partly due to a self-conception of behavioural functions, efforts, and responsiveness to tasks. The term is the influence of individualized tactics, analytic strategies, and subsequent organizational demands, expectations and choices in performance otherwise simulated by organizational environment (Chemer, May and Watson, 2002). This PSE culminates leadership self-beliefs, self-motivation, and internalized confidence that supports significant accomplishments. PSE has also been found to mediate individual engagement and interactions with tasks and colleagues (Luthans and Petersons, 2002). Therefore PSE may or may not support task-orientation and relationship-orientation.

It is situational, individualized belief in accomplishing tasks in any situation. According to Osterman and Sullivan (1996), school leaders with strong PSE have been found to be persistent in pursuing their goals, flexible and willing to adapt strategies to meeting contextual conditions, and confident in inspiring a shared vision. Such leaders remain

focused, steadfast in their efforts, and ready to innovate in the midst of unsuccessful attempts. In other words, when PSE is high the leader perceives confidence and exercises strong belief to deliver. The differences in PSE levels are shown in school leaders with internally-based personal power, such as expert, informational aptness, and high level of referent power, when carrying out their roles (Lyons and Murphy, 1994). Contrarily, low PSE levels among school leaders lead to inability to see opportunities, challenge the processes (Kouzes and Posner, 2012), and even develop support system, overcome issues and adapt quickly (Osterman and Sullivan, 1996). School leaders with low level PSE are quick to quit, refer to past failures, and demonstrate anxiety, stress, and frustration. And according to Lyons and Murphy (1994), such low PSE levels tend to exhibit low self-esteem, low self-efficacy, institutionalized power base (refereeing to authorities that brought them), and demonstrate leadership styles as in coercion, positional, and reward power (Hersey et al., 2008), which Fieldley refers to as favourability contingencies in management terms.

### Types of Self-Efficacy and School Leadership Styles

**Self-Efficacy Types:** Bandura (1986) identified four major categories of experiences that influence self-efficacy levels. First, past personal performance or accomplishment may influence self-efficacy. McCormick et al. (2002) point out that succeeding in a previously challenging activity provides the strongest information for changing efficacy beliefs. It is the little wins that boost morale in job performance for individuals to 'challenge the processes' (Kouzes and Posner, 2012). Although self-efficacy is flexible, individualized, it usually comes from sources of past performance experiences (Dawes, and Horan, Hackett, 2000; Jones, Lane and Stevens, 2002).

The second category is vicarious learning experiences which are obtained through observing new skills and strategies in others. In exemplary leadership, modeling the way for others is deemed important (Kouzes and Posner, 2012), observing others perform successfully can improve people's belief in their own capabilities to perform same, and such vicarious learning helps build encouraging persistence in efforts. For instance, you watch someone climbs and it improves your self-belief. This type of self-efficacy is prevalent in self-efficacy for instructional leadership. Bandura concludes that observing others to accomplish is beneficial for people to successfully and confidently succeed in similar tasks. This self-efficacy is instructional in nature, transferable by observation, and repeatable by instructional self-efficacy.

The third category is verbal persuasion as in social influences of motivational and morale nature. Positive feedback, morale, from a credible person such as a coach, mentor, teacher, or parent build and sustain a sense of confidence (self-efficacy). A person's self-efficacy can also be increased, when the heart is encouraged by the school leadership. That type is moral self-efficacy in leadership. Leadership utilizes verbal support and encouragement strategies that motivate in order to create new opportunities - before asking for the hand seek the heart - (Kouzes and Posner, 2012).

The fourth category is emotional arousal, which is psychological condition, mood state such as anxiety and other negative psychological states. Robbins and Judge (2011) emphasize that emotional arousal leads to an energized state which can drive a person to complete a task. The person gets “psyched up” and performs better. The better one feels physically and emotionally, the more efficacious one will feel. People often rely, to some extent, on their emotional reactions to situations or tasks to help determine if they can cope and be successful at it. Negative emotional arousals are stressful reactions that often lead to fear, and cause people to doubt their competency (Bandura, 1977). On the other hand, positive emotional arousals and anxiety towards a task can lead people to be more motivated to perform successfully and increase feelings of satisfaction from the task.

It is important, therefore, that techniques to reduce negative and increase positive emotions be used to build self-efficacy. McCormick et al. (2002) affirm that any of the four categories of experience described above can affect the self-efficacy estimate. However, it is important to recognize that the actual influence of any one of the sources on a person’s judgment of self-efficacy depends upon how the individual evaluates the information. Again, it is not just the “objective character of the information that matters, but the “subjective” interpretation of what has been experienced. Estimation of personal experience is a cognitive process, for that matter, performing a task successfully will not necessarily produce a positive change in the performer’s self-efficacy as Bandura (1997) pointed out. McCormick et al. (2002) conclude that a number of personal, social, and situational variables affect what performances are selected and how they are interpreted and combined to form the efficacy estimate.

In addition, research has shown that there are two major influences on individual’s performance in any environment: (i) the type of leadership practice and (ii) individual’s personal motivation, which resonant self-belief or self-efficacy.

Types of School Leadership Styles: School leadership styles or practices play pivotal and multifaceted roles in setting the direction for schools through instructional and transformational practices (Edwards and Aboagye, 2015; Hallinger and Heck, 1998). Edwards and Aboagye confirm that many Ghanaian teachers have the potentials but it’s the transformative styles exercised by school leaders, administrators, and teachers themselves that bring about improved educational outcomes (Leithwood and Jantzi, 1999). Most school leaders are fond of practicing the following styles: (i) democratic or autocratic (ii) transformational or transactional, (iii) Laissez-faire or situational.

According to Afful-Broni (2004), the common leadership styles found among Ghanaian educators (i.e., school leaders) is either democratic or autocratic. Democratic is where leaders tend to consult on matters of importance and ask for subordinates’ opinions of contributions (Yukl, 2010). Here participatory leadership is practiced and the locus of control is not necessarily with the school leader. The leader is able to empower others to function alongside in decisions of quality, acceptance, processes, and changes (Afful-

Broni, 2004; Yukl, 2010). Autocratic style is the contrast of democratic leadership style.

Transformational style is where the subordinates “feel trust, admiration, loyalty, and respected” and are therefore ready to cooperate with leadership for change (Yukl, 2010). Transformational style brings followers’ motivation up, performance high, and ensures effective leadership. Transactional style on the other hand borders on ‘give and take’; it is the contrast of transformational leadership style (Yukl, 2010), whereby followers are motivated by “appealing to their self-interest and exchanging benefits” (Yulk, 2010. P. 321). Transactional leadership style is a product-oriented approach that focuses on the exchange that occurs between leaders and their followers (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Northouse, 2014). In contrast is the transformational style which result in needed change.

Laissez-faire style of leadership is contrasted with situational here in the sense that leadership tends to be ‘hands-off’ and approaches matters, based on situational variables (Hersey et al. 2008). Avolio and Bass (2004) portray laissez-faire leadership as a non-leadership model. This style is described as the absence of leadership, characterized by hands-off approach. To some researchers laissez-faire school leaders provide little or no effort to help the follower grow personally (Northouse, 2014; Snowden and Gorton, 2002). But, Hallinger (2003) argues that instructional and transformational styles are the preferred leadership styles for school leaders. Hallinger shares a similar view that instructional leadership style focuses predominantly on the role of the school leaders in coordinating, controlling, supervising, and developing curriculum and instruction in the school. Therefore based on situations at school, instructional style may be practiced minimally. Instructional leadership style allows leaders to lead from a combination of expertise and charisma. They are known to be hands-on school leaders “hip-deep” in curriculum and instruction, and are not afraid to work with teachers to improve teaching and learning. Instructional leaders are known to be goal oriented, focusing on the improvement of students’ academic outcomes, fostering high expectations and standards for students, and motivating teachers to do same (Hallinger, 2003).

In sum, there is a good sense of individual’s self-efficacy influencing the style of leadership exhibited in schools. Self-concepts explain behaviours and dispositions. Evidence of leader-member relationship stems from leaders’ traits and behaviours that are influenced by self-efficacy towards responsibilities, tasks, managerial and instructional styles. School leadership styles may also adjust to collective efficacy based on personal experiences, vicarious learning among colleagues, verbal persuasions, which may set the tone for emotional arousal. Whereas transformational brings change, based on charisma and behaviours, transactional leadership style brings active factors of contingent-reward and management-by-exception; but laissez-faire leadership style consists of passive management-by-exception and an avoidant approach to leadership and in situations.



## METHODS

A correlational design is used appropriately for this study because it allows variables to show either positive or negative relationship without experiment. Ary, Jacob and Razavieh (2002) explain that correlation design examines the relationship between two or more existing (non-manipulated) variables. There is an element of post-facto, whereby the self-reporting data already existed regarding the two study variables: Self-efficacy and school leadership styles (Donaldson and Grant-Vallone, 2002; Fraenkel and Wallen, 2006).

A sample of 210 teachers and heads of schools in the Kumasi Metropolitan area were targeted. The entire population of SHS heads and teachers in the selected secondary schools in the Metropolis was used. The sampling technique was therefore census and purposive. Purposive because they have the information needed to determine their respective self-efficacy and leadership styles. The interest was on the self-efficacy levels of all teachers and how their variations may or may not relate to the school leadership style.

The survey questionnaire used for the study was researchers-adopted from already published instruments: (i) Principal Self-efficacy Scale (PSES) (Tschannen-Moran and Gareis, 2004) and (ii) Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Avolio and Bass, 2000). MLQ utilises a 5-point Likert scale (1=none at all to 5=very frequently) to measure leadership styles from five factors: (i) charisma, (ii) inspirational motivation, (iii) idealised influence, (iv) individualised consideration, and (v) intellectual stimulation. Scores from MLQ shows transformational and transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles. PSES measures school leaders' self-efficacy using 18-items to assess capability to perform three facets of school leadership. PSES utilizes a 9-point Likert scale (1 = none at all to 9 = a great deal).

Data analyses started with cleaning and simplifying for statistical soundness (Mertler and Vannatta, 2005). Descriptive distributions, central tendencies, Pearson r, and the independent t-test were reported to establish the demographic differences and relationships.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### Demographics Results:

The results came from responses (n=120), a response rate of 57.14%, who provided usable data. Table 1 provides the demographic distributions, which can be summed up as having majority as male (60.0%), and aged between 41-60 years (62.5%). Most respondents have not less than five years experiences in the teaching service, and are ranked at least as Principal Superintendent. This shows the teaching man-power strength of the Kumasi Metropolitan area. The respondents are experienced, matured, and are ready for directorship (65.0%).

**Table 1: Demographic Details of the Respondents (N=120)**

Variable	n	%
Gender		
Male	72	60.0
Female	48	40.0
Age		
21-30	8	6.7
31-40	37	30.8
41-50	29	24.2
51-60	46	38.3
Years in Service		
< 5 years	23	19.2
6-10 years	31	25.8
11-15 years	35	29.2
16 -20 years	11	9.2
20-25 years	12	10.0
26-30 years	8	6.6
Rank/Status		
Principal Superintendent	42	35.0
Asst. Director II	29	24.2
Asst. Director I	25	20.8
Deputy Director	24	20.0

*Source: Field study, 2016*

### Results by Research Questions

Research Question 1: What are the prevalent school leadership styles and self-efficacy levels of respondents (SHS heads and teachers) in the Kumasi Metropolis?

According to Table 2, the prevalent school leadership style claimed by the respondents is transformational (M=2.76, sd=0.83). This means that all things being equal there is bound to be effective changes in the way leadership is practiced in most of the schools. Again, the principal self-efficacy believed to be prevalent in the schools is in instructional leadership (=3.35, sd=0.79). This is probably due to the fact that trained teachers are efficacious when it comes to delivering of instructions in the classroom.

**Table 2: Respondents’ School Leadership Style and Principal Self-Efficacy (N=120)**

Construct	Variables	Mean	SD
Leadership Style		2.76	0.83
	Transformational	2.940	0.45
	Transactional	2.825	0.42
	Laissez-faire	0.744	0.34
Self-Efficacy			
	Efficacy for Management	3.33	0.71
	Efficacy for Instructional leadership	3.35	0.79
	Efficacy for Moral leadership	3.27	0.72

*Source: Field study, 2016*

Furthermore, factors that determine leaders’ self-efficacy were assessed in three dimensions, thus, management, instructional and moral. Under management issues, handling the time demand of the job was ranked the first factor that affect efficacy for school management followed by maintaining control of daily schedule with mean of 3.52 and 3.49 respectively, indicating that these factors are great deal (mean  $\approx$  4) in dealing with management efficacy of school leaders. Handling the required paperwork of the job and priorities among competing demands of the job, managing stress and shaping operational policies and procedures that are necessary to manage were all rated quite a bit deal (mean  $\approx$  3) factor for efficacy for playing management role in the school setting.

**Table 3: Self-reported Efficacy in the Various Determinants of Self-Efficacy (N =120)**

	Mean	SD
<b>Efficacy for Management</b>		

Handle the time demands of the job?	3.52	0.63
Maintain control of your own daily schedule?	3.50	0.68
Handle the paperwork required of the job?	3.34	0.75
Priorities among competing demands of the job?	3.27	0.75
Cope with the stress of the job?	3.16	0.78
Shape policies and procedures necessary to manage the school?	3.14	0.82
<b>Efficacy for Instructional leadership</b>		
Create a positive learning environment in the school	3.61	0.57
Facilitate student learning in your school	3.60	0.59
Raise student achievement on standardized tests	3.32	0.66
Generate enthusiasm for a shared vision for your school	3.22	0.75
Manage change in the school	3.18	0.76
Motivate teachers (colleagues)	3.15	0.87
<b>Efficacy for Moral Leadership</b>		
Promote acceptable behaviour among students	3.61	0.71
Handle effectively the discipline of students in the school	3.58	0.63
Promote school spirit among a large majority of the students	3.32	0.65
Promote ethical behaviour among other school personnel	3.21	0.89
Promote the prevailing values of the community in the school	2.09	0.85
Promote a positive image of the school when it comes to media	2.02	1.17

*Source: Field study, 2016*

For instructional leadership efficacy, creating positive learning environmental and facilitating students learning were considered to be a great deal (mean≈4.00) factors for determining instructional efficacy while raising students’ achievement on standardized test, generating enthusiasm for a shared vision, managing changes and motivation were also rated quite high as a factor that determines efficacy for instructional leadership role in the school.

Efficacy for playing moral leadership role was also assessed and the results displayed in Table 3. From the table, it can be observed that, promoting acceptable behaviour and handling effectively the discipline of students were rated a great deal (mean ≈ 4) factor for determining efficacy for moral leadership. Promoting school spirit among students and promoting the ethical behaviour among other school personnel were rated quite a bit deal factor for determining efficacy of moral leadership while promoting the prevailing values of the school community and promoting a positive image of the school were also rated very little deal (mean ≈ 2) factors for determining efficacy for moral leadership role.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between self-efficacies and leadership style of heads of schools?

The relationship between self-efficacy and leadership styles was assessed and the results revealed that there was statistically significant positive correlation between school leaders’ self-efficacy and the leadership styles adopted (Kendall’s tau-b = 0.407, n = 120, p < 0.05). This implies that the leadership style leaders adopt is associated with the level of self-efficacy of that leader. Clearly from Table 4, it can be seen that there was significant correlation between leadership style and all the three different self-efficacies. For instance, the correlation co-efficient of efficacy for moral leadership and efficacy for instructional leadership is positive 0.450 with 0.000 alpha level, which means that the two are related positively.

**Table 4: Relationship between leadership styles and Self-Efficacies (N=120)**

Kendall’s Tau -  
b Correlations  
Matrix

		Leadership Style	Managerial Ld. Self-Efficacy	Instructional L Self-Efficacy	Moral Ldship. Self-Efficacy
Leadership Style	Correlation Coefficient	1.00	0.300**	0.366**	0.367**

	Sig. (1-tailed)	-	0.000	0.000	0.000
Managerial Leadership Self-Efficacy	Correlation Coefficient		1.000	0.390**	0.319**
	Sig. (1-tailed)		-	0.000	0.000
Instructional Leadership Self-Efficacy	Correlation Coefficient			1.000	0.450**
	Sig. (1-tailed)			-	0.000
Moral Leadership Self-Efficacy	Correlation Coefficient				1.000
	Sig. (1-tailed)				-

Source: Field data (2016) \*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 (One tailed)

A simple regression analysis was carried out to examine whether leaders self-efficacy reliably predicts the kind of leadership style to be adopted and also to measure the extent to which the leaders' self-efficacy levels relate to specific leadership style of the respondents.

The result of the final regression analysis can be found in Table 8. It can be seen that, leaders' leadership style is a statistically significant predictor of their self-efficacy as almost 62% of the variation of leaders' self-efficacy can be attributed to the leaders' leadership style ( $R=0.618$ ). Also  $R^2 = 0.382$  meaning that, about 38% of the variance in leaders' self-efficacy can be predicted by the different leadership styles adopted by the leaders. In this sense, the study can postulate that respondents' self-efficacy level in the SHS depends largely on the leadership styles adopted by school leaders.

**Table 5: Simple Regression Analysis of Self-efficacy and Leadership Styles (n=120)**

Variable	Beta	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	Sig.
Constant	1.630	0.618	0.382	72.99	0.000 <sup>a</sup>

Source: Field data (2016). Predictor: (Constant) leadership style a. Dependent variable: self-efficacy

Research Question 3: Are there Differences in self-efficacy levels among gender groups?

To answer this research question, an independent sample t-test was performed to ascertain the differences that exist in self-efficacy levels among gender groups. Table 6 shows the results that there is no statistical significant differences in all factors of self-efficacies. For instance, gender differences in efficacy for management showed no statistical significance ( $t(117) = -2.69, p = .11$ ). This suggests both male and female school leaders believe themselves equally when it comes to management matters. Also, there was no significant differences in efficacy for instructional leadership among gender groups ( $t(117) = -1.09, p = .85$ ). This implies that both male and female leaders have equal abilities to handle instructional issues. Finally, there was no significant differences in efficacy for moral leadership among the gender groups ( $t(117) = -2.30, p = .24$ ). This is equally important because literature still support gender differences when it comes to moralization (Lovett and Jordon, 2010). This shows that both school leaders have the ability to address moral matters equally.

**Table 6: Independent t-test for Variances in Self-efficacy among Gender Groups**

t - test for equality of mean

	Gender	N	M	Std.	t	df	Sig.
Efficacy for Management	M	72	3.23	.48	-2.69	117	.11
	F	48	3.46	.41	-2.78		
Efficacy for Instructional Leadership	M	72	3.34	.48	-1.09	117	.85
	F	48	3.40	.49	-1.08		
Efficacy for Moral Leadership	M	72	3.18	.55	-2.30	117	.24
	F	48	3.40	.43	-2.42		

$p = 0.05$  level. Gender M = Male, F = Female Source: Field study, 2016.

Finally, results displayed in Table 6 show that when it comes to self-beliefs in performance such as in management, instructional leadership, and moral leadership gender does not matter much. The male can be high in self-efficacy in all those areas; and so can the female teacher be also. What matters is the individual self-belief to accomplish

tasks in the school. For there is no significant differences in gender when it comes to efficacies in this case.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Conclusion

Based on the study findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

The findings of the study revealed that the prevalent school leadership style is transformational. The school system in Ghana has leadership who actually believe in transformation, yet we still have challenges in getting results. This study result is similar to that of Edwards and Aboagye (2015) which saw potentials in educators from Ghana. Similarly, respondents show high perceived leader's self-efficacy. They have more confidence in the ability to succeed. Leaders with low self-efficacy are likely to give up, in difficult situations while those with high self-efficacy will strive harder to face the challenges squarely. High self-efficacy levels help leaders to 'challenge the process' (Kouzes and Posner, 2012) and that is reflected on claims to believe in transformational practices.

The present study confirmed that confidence in school leaders' leadership capabilities was positively related to critical leadership styles or behaviours. The results of the study proved that school leaders with high self-efficacy often adopt transformational styles. School leaders, must therefore, understand their self-efficacy in management, instructions, and moral dimensions, so as to adopt appropriate leadership styles to improve their self performance.

Since the results of the study postulate that there were no statistical significant differences among gender groups in the three efficacy levels, namely; efficacy for management, efficacy for instructional leadership and efficacy for moral leadership, GES and all stakeholders must ensure equality and equity in positions of influence in schools. Everybody matters in getting things done especially in education. This notwithstanding, male and female school leaders must share ideas when the need arises. On the basis of this evidence one can confidently say that self-efficacy is a promising concept in teacher education, training and development in Ghana education system, and the same could be an effective leadership tool for school leaders as studies have shown (Swindon and Gordon, 2010).

### Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations may hold:

First, it is important for aspiring school leaders, Colleges of Education and Universities responsible for teacher training in Ghana to underscore the importance of self-belief. The University of Education, Winneba (UEW) and University of Cape Coast (UCC) should of necessity develop people to have self-efficacy and belief in accomplishments. Teacher education curriculum developers, teacher education reforms by T-Tel, Human Resource



Management and Development (HRM&D) division in Ghana Education Service (GES), and other stakeholders should concern themselves with individual ability to belief in self-concepts, self-efficacies, self-leadership to get maximum results.

Second, the study revealed that self-efficacy is built when aspiring school leaders learn to master the art of working with people to solve problems and also achieve a common goal. HRM&D division in GES should endeavour to organize and train frequently school leadership through contents relevant to developing self-efficacies in management, instructions, and moral leadership. In-service training for heads of schools should focus on self-efficacy development and leadership styles to equip them with awareness, knowledge, and skills about different abilities and accomplishments. Getting results in performances should be the driving force in the work of teaching. It is naturally intricate and demands more self-beliefs of 'can-do' attitude.

Third, the HRM&D division in GES should ensure that recruitment and posting of school leaders is purposeful, geared towards teachers with proven self-confidence, who have had quality experiences in accomplishing tasks, relating with people as in leadership, and can demonstrate the ability to make things happen even in challenging and conflicting situations. Teachers with knowledge of different leadership styles and practices should be encouraged to take up responsibilities in secondary schools. Secondary education is very important in building human capacity of a nation, hence teachers must show self-beliefs in getting results.

Fourth, the study indicated that self-efficacy concept is an effective tool in leadership development. Both correlates positively. Therefore, it is recommended that teacher education institutions such as UEW and UCC and Colleges of Education should reform their syllabi along the lines of developing positive aptitudes, encouraging self-efficacy concept in their curricula, and teaching leadership styles for different situations (Hersey et al., 2008).

Fifth, the study is recommending a strict policy on non-discrimination. This study indicated that there were no significant differences in gender when it comes to self-efficacies in management, instructional leadership and moral leadership. It is recommended to circuit supervisors and school inspectors in the various district education offices, to note that discrimination based on gender is illegal and counter-productive. Especially, in the rural areas of Ghana female teachers should not be encouraged in taking up school leaders and sharing ideas about teacher leadership, classroom management, and instructional practices. Already majority of school leaders in the Kumasi Metropolis are men. Female teachers should be given the chances and resources to develop leadership abilities and styles. Traditionally, women are confined to certain areas of the teaching work (i.e., basic level classrooms), having to fight and navigate work-balance life (Edwards and Oteng, in press), and they are discouraged from higher level responsibilities by the society. The study is recommending that what male teachers believe they can do, the female teacher can do likewise. There should be

an affirmative action towards the recruitment of female school leaders since there is evidence that women also have their own capabilities and self-beliefs to be results oriented (Rosenthal, 1995).

#### Limitations and Implications for Further Research

Basically, there were three challenges which confronted this study. These are to do with research design: the target population characteristics, the low response rate, and the survey instrument administration. First, the study focused on 210 respondents, 10 heads of schools and 200 teachers holding administrative and management position but only 120 respondents (57.1%) presented usable data. This has a limitation on generalizability. Secondly, participants were limited to public SHS teachers and headship who might have been exposed to leadership styles in theory but not in practice and could have responded based on head-knowledge. This affects the data integrity and inferences about the relationship between the two study variables: self-efficacy and school leadership styles.

Thirdly, and more importantly, the associational research design is flawed with *priori facto* and presumptions (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2006). Particularly with self-reporting of school leaders, the design has always been problematic (Donaldson and Grant-Vallone, 2002). Respondents' honesty and integrity are taken for granted in most surveys, yet they come with uncompleted items and missing data. In this case a direct observation research practice is recommended.

Finally, characteristically, the participants are not representative enough. These are teachers in the metropolitan or urban areas, for this reason participants may not reflect the 'real' efficacy beliefs expressed by their colleagues who live and teach in the rural areas. A nationwide sample which could be more representative is highly recommended. A study involving a much larger population is suggested to effect policy discourse in Ghana education sector regarding the nexus between such important concepts in capacity building. The limitations on this study is significant because there is so much at stake in education in making the new Ghana government policy on secondary education highly successful by looking at school leadership performances and teacher self-beliefs nationwide.

#### REFERENCES

---

- Aboagye, S. K., Anamuah-Mensah, J., & Sam, F. K. (2018). Perceptions of teachers' about JHS headteachers' leadership styles, teacher commitment, school culture and academic performance within Ejisu Juaben Municipality. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*, 6(3), 82-90.
- Afful-Broni, A. (2004). *Theory and practice of educational leadership in Ghana*. Accra, Ghana: Yamens Press.
- Ary, D., Jacob, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education*. California: Thompson Learning.
- Avery, G. C. (2004). *Understanding leadership: Paradigms and cases*. London: Sage.

- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2000). *Multi-factor leadership questionnaire* (2nd Ed.) California: Mind Garden Inc.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass B. M. (2004). *Multi-factor leadership questionnaire*. Mind Garden, Inc., www.Mindgarden.com
- Ball, D. L. & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 60(5), 497-511
- Bamburg, J., & Andrews, R. (1990). School goals, principals and achievement. *School Effectives and School Improvement*, 2(3), 175-191.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological Review*: 84 (2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37 (2), 122-147.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Plato Alto, CA: consulting Psychologist Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio B. J. (1994). *Improving organisational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dawes, M. E., Horan, J., and Hackett, G. (2000). Experimental evaluation of self-efficacy treatment on technical/scientific career outcomes. *British Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, 28, 87-100.
- Demir, K. (2008). Transformational leadership and collective efficacy: The moderating roles of collaborative culture and teacher's self-efficacy. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 33, 93-112.
- Donaldson, S. I., & Grant-Vallone, E. J. (2002). Understanding self-report: Bias in organisational behaviour research. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(2), 245-260.
- Edwards, A. K. & Aboagye, S.K. (2015). Assessing school leadership challenges in Ghana using leadership practices inventory. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(4), 168-181
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (6th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- GES (2017). *School leadership and management: A manual for second cycle schools in Ghana*. Accra, Ghana: GES
- GES/TED Handbook (2014). *Leadership for change: A Handbook for GES management staff*. Accra, Ghana: GES/Teacher Education Division/ UNICEF
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 34-67.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck R. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9 (2), 157-191.

- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional the leadership behaviour of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86 (2), 175-191.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H. & Johnson, D. E. (2001). *Management of organisational behaviour: Leading human resource* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Hopkins, J. (2005). *Instructional Leadership and School Improvement*, National College of School Leadership.
- Jones, L., Lane, A. M., & Stevens, M. J. (2002). Coping with Failure: The effects of self-esteem and coping on changes in self-efficacy. *Journal of Sport Behaviour*, 14(25), 331-334. San Houston State University.
- Kendall, C. (1985). *The creative leader*: US Naval Institute Proceedings. U.S.A Published in military intelligence.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2012). *Leadership, the challenge: The most trusted source of becoming a better leader*. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Leithwood, K., & Steinbach, R. (1995). *Expert problem solving: Evidence from schools and district leaders*. New York: State University of New York.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999). The relative effects of principal and teacher sources of leadership on student engagement with school. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(Suppl.), 679-706.
- Lyons, C. A., & Murphy, M. J. (1994). Principal self-efficacy and the use of power. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, (Eric Document No. 373 421) April, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- McCormick, M. J. (2001). Self-efficacy and leadership effectiveness: Applying social cognitive theory to leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8 (1), 22-33.
- McCormick, M. J., Tanguma, J., & Lopez-Forment, A. S. (2002). Extending self-efficacy theory to leadership: A review and empirical test. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 1 (2), 34-49.
- Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2005). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical application and interpretation*. (3rd ed.). California: Pyrczak Publishing.
- MoE/GES/TED, (2014). *Leadership for learning: A Manual/Handbook for headteachers and circuit supervisors*. Accra, Ghana: Ghana Education Service/UNICEF
- Niyazi, O. (2013). Investigation of the primary school principals' sense of self-efficacy and professional burnout: *Middle-East Journal of scientific Research* 15(5), 682-691.
- Northouse, P. G. (2014). *Leadership theory and practice*: California: Sage.
- Osterman, K., & Sullivan, S. (1996). New principals in an urban bureaucracy: A sense of efficacy. *Journal of School Leadership*, 6, 661- 690.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2011). *Organisational behaviour*. (14th Ed.). New York: Prentice Hall.
- Rosenthal, P. (1995). Gender differences in managers' attributions for successful work performance. *Women in Management Review*, 10, 26-31.

- Rummler, G. A. & Brache, A. P. (1995). *Improving performance: How to manage the white space on the organization chart* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers
- Sekyere, E. A. (2010). *Teachers' guide on topical issues for promotion and selection interviews*. Kumasi: Afosek Educational Consult.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). Constructing and changing theories of practice: The key to preparing school administrator, *Urban Review*, 23, 39-49.
- Snowden, P. E., & Gorton, R. A. (2002). *School leadership and administration: Important concepts, case studies, and stimulations* (6th Ed.). New York: McGraw Hill Companies
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis C. R. (2004). Principal's sense of efficacy: Assessing a promising construct. *Journal of Education Administration*, 42(5), 573-585.
- Vandaveer, R. C., & Menefee, M. L., (2010). *Human behaviour in organisation* (2nd Ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organisations*. (7<sup>th</sup> Ed.) New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.