

Principals' Leadership Styles Effects on Teachers' Self-Efficacy: Insights from Secondary Level School Teachers at Rawalpindi, Pakistan

Maria Nayab
*University of Wah,
Wah Cantt, Pakistan*

Abstract

This study aims to explore principals' leadership styles and their effects on teachers' self-efficacy. Data were collected from 510 secondary school teachers at district Rawalpindi, Punjab, Pakistan. Linear regression was used to determine the effect of leadership styles (i.e., autocratic, lassies-faire, democratic, transactional and transformational) on teachers' self-efficacy. The regression model identified revealed that the predictors have an effect of 69.6 percent on teachers' self-efficacy. The equation derived from the model shows that autocratic leadership style of the school principals has major (56.9%) contribution in the self efficacy of their teachers. Moreover, age of the respondent teachers, has, though very small, negative effect on their self efficacy. So, younger teachers tend to have higher self efficacy.

Keywords: Leadership styles' School leadership, Transformational leadership, Teacher self-efficacy; Teachers' perceptions

Introduction

Leadership is the ability to influence or encourage teachers to participate and accept aims objectives and goals (Yuki, 2010 & Regina Ekiyo et al.2019). Principals create a supportive environment that increases teachers' self-efficacy. In this context, five leadership styles, which are autocratic, democratic, lassies-faire, transformational, and transactional, have been identified by researchers like (Lewin, 1998 & Bass, 1990& Regina Ekiyo et al. 2019). Majority of the study had been done generally on leadership styles of principals' which are autocratic, democratic. The findings of this study contributed to filling the gap in the research literature related to lassies-faire, transformational and transactional styles. Self-efficacy of teachers is the confidence that is being held by them for their ability that is persuading students learning (Klassen, Tze, Betts, & Gordon, 2011). Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2010), further advanced teacher self-efficacy. They distinguish one of the most prominent roles of teacher in six factors inside the self-efficacy of teachers. These factors are instruction, adopting instruction to the individual needs of students, motivating students, maintaining discipline, and cooperating with colleague / parents and coping with change. Most of the studies displayed that leadership style and self-efficacy of teachers are directly related. The teacher self-efficacy influences leadership. Both these two variables are contributing to the success of an education institution.

Virga (2012) and Simmons (2013) found that there are numerous opportunities through which the leader builds their self-efficacy beliefs. This self-efficacy develops through distinct multiyear leadership program. Transformation, transaction, lassies-faire leadership style had capacity to build teacher self-efficacy at significant level (Akan, 2013). Some research studies on teacher self-efficacy mostly linked teacher self-efficacy to principal leadership style, fight for change, behavior of the institute citizen and students' academic success (Çalık, Koşar, Kılınç & Er, 2013). Previous study showed that transformational leadership in both low performance and high-performance schools has an effect on teachers' self-efficacy. The current study measures the effect of principals' leadership styles on teachers' self-efficacy.

Leadership and Principal leadership styles

Leadership is used in a broader perspective because it can be used in different systems so that it has many definitions which define the concept of leadership clearly. Northouse (2007) leadership is procedure in which leader guide their subordinates to achieve goals. The leadership duties are shared with the teachers can be seen more professionally and with more commitment to their on-job duties (Marks &Printy, 2003). There are some factors that are influencing teacher's performance in their job and which are then affecting their duty towards their job. According to Shastri, Mishra &Sinha, (2010) define leadership is the link between a person and a group of people. There are some joint goals where the groups of people act in like a team.

Leadership styles are defined as, leaders' strategy to influence others for achievement of predetermined goals and objectives (Mandell, 2003; Mohammed and Hossein, 2006). Principal leadership styles refer to the teacher professional growth through which the teacher is responsible for the implication of whatever development and changes occur in the educational field. Teachers share goals with the principals through participation learning opportunities and it enhances learning process (Blase&Blase, 2000). According to Enueme and Egwunyenga (2008) leadership styles is a method which is used by the leader if a leader approaches a suitable style for the teachers so that it brings change among the teachers. Moreover, teachers involve themselves and participate for the betterment of education. There are different leadership styles through which the people interact with others and lead in an organization which are autocratic leadership, democratic leadership, transformational, laissez-faire and transactional.

Teacher' self-efficacy

The self-efficacy in teachers is termed as teachers' trust for their capacity to affect the learning of students (Klassen, Tze, Betts & Gordon, 2011). Bangs and Frost (2012) also stated that teachers who ensure a great sense of teaching efficacy that is gained through experience have the ability to solve problems as they are more confident and the more important thing is that they learn from their good or bad experiences. Teachers who have an excessive level of self-efficacy is only because they perceive that they had control over the activities being done in their classroom or as per the policy of the school (Gibson &Dembo, 1984). Skaalvik (2010) established more concept of teachers' self-efficacy. The role of teachers is similar in all modern education systems derived from an analysis of the actual Norwegian educational program. Each one of the following dimensions refers to the role of the teacher and is intended to teach and adapt the instruction for the needs of each student, motivate them, maintain discipline through co-operation with coworkers and parents.

Leadership style and teacher self-efficacy

The leadership is important for the institutions. Through leadership the school moves towards improvement and whatever change occurs the leaders have the authority to implement positive improvement in the education programs based on the expectation and goals of the decision makers (Efendi, 2015). According to (Campo, 1993; Corrigan & Garman, 1999; Riehl & Sipple, 1996) Principals' leadership style is a big weapon through which the leaders achieve their goals. The self-efficacy in teachers is termed as teachers' trust for their capacity to affect the learning of students (Klassen, Tze, Betts & Gordon, 2011). There was a correlation between principal transformational leadership, the teacher self-efficacy of teachers and innovation of teachers with the results of a regression analysis. The self-efficacy of teachers even affected the link between

teacher leadership and creativity. The teacher was a mediator. This study revealed the part of transformational leaders in the growth and change of the level of innovation and self-efficacy between the teacher's leadership styles has a strong positive correlation with instruction teacher self-efficacy, adopt instruction to the individual needs of students, motivate student, maintain discipline, cooperate with colleague, and cope with change.

Methods/Participants

In this quantitative research, cross sectional survey design was used; the nature of this research was descriptive. Data was collected from secondary school teachers of district Rawalpindi to identify the leadership styles of their principals (they were currently working with), and their (teachers) own self-efficacy. Population of this study was secondary school teachers' of district Rawalpindi, both male and female. The convenient sampling technique was used to choose the sample. Demographic attributes of the participants were presented in table 1.1

Gender of the respondents	Frequency	Percent
Male	299	56.70
Female	219	42.90
Missing	2	4.00
Total	510	100.00

Table 1.1 shows frequencies percentages of participants by gender. All 510 participants were valid. Male were 299(56.70%) and female were 219 (42.90%).

Instruments

To measure variables two instruments were used leadership style and teacher self-efficacy. Questionnaires were established on five-point Likert-scale (Strongly disagree= 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral=3, Agree =4, strongly agree=5). There are five variables of principals' leadership styles which includes (democratic leadership styles, autocratic, Laissez-Faire leader style, and transactional and transformational leadership style) self-tool was developed for measuring leadership styles. To measure teachers self-efficacy which includes (instruction, adopt instruction to the individual needs of students, motivating students, maintain discipline, and cooperate with colleague / parents and to cope with change instrument developed by Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2007) was used and it was used with no change. Questionnaire was aimed to measure the effect of principals' leadership styles on self-efficacy of teachers at secondary level; therefore, teachers reported principal leadership style as well as their self-efficacy because teacher better understand their leadership style and the way they were supervised. To assure the appropriate establishment of variables and subscales, a factor analysis was performed. Reliability of the survey items was calculated using Cronbach's alpha coefficients on each of the variables identified by the factor analysis.

Research question:

What are the effects of leadership styles on teacher self-efficacy?

Table 1.2: *Correlation*

		Age of Respondents	Autocratic Leadership Style the principals	Democratic Leadership style the principals	Lassie-faire Leadership Style of the principals	Transformational Leadership Style of the principals	Transactional Leadership Style of the principals	Teachers SE
Professional Qualification of Respondents	<i>r</i>	.115 [*]	-.044	-.126 ^{**}	-.010	-.072	-.088	-.040
	<i>r</i> ²	1.32%	0.20%	1.59%	0.01%	0.53%	0.77%	0.16%
	<i>P</i>	.010	.334	.005	.817	.108	.053	.368
	<i>N</i>	495	479	495	495	493	489	497
Teaching Experience of Respondents	<i>R</i>	.299 ^{**}	.014	.013	-.065	-.027	-.077	.015
	<i>r</i> ²	8.94%	0.00%	0.02%	0.43%	0.07%	0.59%	0.02%
	<i>P</i>	.000	.766	.766	.145	.542	.089	.742
	<i>N</i>	497	482	497	497	497	494	500
Working in this school for the last	<i>R</i>	.208 ^{**}	-.042	-.072	-.101 [*]	-.040	-.102 [*]	-.038
	<i>r</i> ²	4.33%	0.17%	0.52%	1.02%	0.16%	.102*.102	0.15%
	<i>P</i>	.000	.361	.107	.024	.377	.024	.393
	<i>N</i>	500	484	500	500	499	495	503
Number of in-service training/courses attended	<i>R</i>	.120 ^{**}	.087	.103 [*]	.026	.017	-.036	.035
	<i>r</i> ²	1.44%	0.76%	1.06%	0.07%	0.03%	0.13%	0.12%
	<i>P</i>	.007	.054	.020	.552	.710	.419	.427
	<i>N</i>	507	491	507	507	506	502	510
Time spent with current principal	<i>R</i>	.186 ^{**}	-.017	-.076	-.068	-.043	-.050	-.019
	<i>r</i> ²	3.46%	0.03%	0.59%	0.46%	0.18%	0.25%	0.04%
	<i>P</i>	.000	.713	.085	.127	.336	.264	.672
	<i>N</i>	507	491	507	507	506	502	510
Autocratic Leadership Style of the principals	<i>R</i>	-.343 ^{**}		.555 ^{**}	.327 ^{**}	.539 ^{**}	.032	.784 ^{**}
	<i>r</i> ²	11.76%						
	<i>P</i>	.000		.000	.000	.000	.486	.000
	<i>N</i>	488		488	488	487	485	491
Democratic Leadership style of the principals	<i>R</i>	-.272 ^{**}			.340 ^{**}	.438 ^{**}	.009	.556 ^{**}
	<i>r</i> ²	7.40%			11.56%	19.18%	0.01%	30.91%
	<i>P</i>	.000			.000	.000	.837	.000
	<i>N</i>	504			504	504	499	507
laissez-faire Leadership Style of the principals	<i>R</i>	-.140 ^{**}				.235 ^{**}	.007	.369 ^{**}
	<i>r</i> ²	1.96%				5.52%	0.00%	13.62%
	<i>P</i>	.002				.000	.876	.000
	<i>N</i>	504				503	499	507
Transformational Leadership Style of the principals	<i>R</i>	-.265 ^{**}					.047	.557 ^{**}
	<i>r</i> ²	7.02%					0.22%	31.02%
	<i>P</i>	.000					.291	.000
	<i>N</i>	503					499	506

Table 1.2 reports correlation between demographics of respondents, principal leadership styles and teacher self-efficacy. As we have to find the effect of independent variables on teachers' self-efficacy, therefore the correlation of teachers' self efficacy with the independent

variables was reported here. There was negative and weak correlation between Professional Qualification of Respondents and Teachers' Self Efficacy (TSE), ($r=-.040, p<.368$) There was positive correlation between Teaching Experience of Respondents and Teachers SE ($r=.015p<.742$). There was negative correlation between Working in this school for the last and Teachers SE ($r=-.038p<.393$). weak correlation between Number of in-service training/courses attended and Age of Respondents ($r=.120p<.007$), There was positive correlation between Number of in-service training/courses attended and Autocratic Leadership Style the principals ($r=.087p<.054$), There was inverse correlation between Number of in-service training/courses attended and Democratic Leadership Style of the principals ($r=.103p<.020$), positive correlation between Number of in-service training/courses attended and laissez-faire Leadership Style of the principals ($r=.026p<.552$), There was positive correlation between Number of in-service training/courses attended and Transformational Leadership Style of the principals ($r=.017p<.710$), There was negative correlation between Number of in-service training/courses attended and Transactional Leadership Style of the principals ($r=-.036p<.419$), There was positive correlation between Number of in-service training/courses attended and Teachers SE ($r=.035p<.427$). There was weak correlation between Time spent with current principal and Age of Respondents ($r=.186p<.000$), There was negative correlation between Time spent with current principal and Autocratic Leadership Style of principals ($r=-.017p<.713$), There was negative correlation between Time spent with current principal and Democratic Leadership Style of the principals ($r=-.076p<.085$), There was negative correlation between Time spent with current principal and laissez-faire Leadership Style of the principals ($r=-.068p<.127$), There was negative correlation between Time spent with current principal and Transformational Leadership Style of the principals ($r=-.043p<.336$), There was negative correlation between Time spent with current principal and Transactional Leadership Style of the principals ($r=-.050p<.264$), There was negative correlation between Time spent with current principal and Teachers SE ($r=-.019p<.672$). There was strong negative correlation between Autocratic Leadership Style of principals and Age of Respondents ($r=-.343p<.000$), There was strong correlation between Autocratic Leadership Style of principals and Democratic leadership style of principals ($r=.555p<.000$), There was moderate correlation between Autocratic Leadership Style of principals and laissez-faire Leadership Style of the principals ($r=.327p<.000$), There was strong correlation between Autocratic Leadership Style of principals and Transformational Leadership Style of the principals ($r=.539p<.000$), There was weak correlation between Autocratic Leadership Style of principals and Transactional Leadership Style of the principals ($r=.032p<.486$), There was strong correlation between Autocratic Leadership Style of principals and Teachers SE ($r=.784p<.000$). There was weak inverse correlation between Democratic Leadership Style of the principals and Age of Respondents ($r=-.272p<.000$), There was moderate correlation between Democratic Leadership Style of the principals and Laissez-faire Leadership Style of the principals ($r=.340p<.000$), There was strong correlation between Democratic Leadership Style of the principals and Transformational Leadership Style of the principals ($r=.438p<.000$), There was weak correlation between Democratic Leadership Style of the principals and Transactional Leadership Style of the principals ($r=.009p<.837$), There was strong correlation between Democratic Leadership Style of the principals and Teachers SE ($r=.556p<.000$). There was weak correlation between laissez-faire Leadership Style of the principals and Age of Respondents ($r=-.140p<.002$), There was positive correlation between laissez-faire Leadership Style of the principals and Transformational Leadership Style of the principals ($r=.235p<.000$), There was weak correlation

between Laissez-faire Leadership Style of the principals and Transaction Leadership Style of the principals ($r=.007p<.876$), There was weak correlation between Laissez-faire Leadership Style of the principals and Teachers SE ($r=.369p<.000$). There was weak correlation between Transformational Leadership Style of the principals and Age of Respondents ($r=-.265p<.000$), There was weak correlation between Transformational Leadership Style of the principals and Transaction Leadership Style of the principals ($r=.047p<.291$), There was strong correlation between Transformational Leadership Style of the principals and Teachers SE ($r=.557p<.000$).

Table 1.3: Regression Analysis

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.790 ^a	.624	.623	.36348
2	.808 ^b	.654	.652	.34923
3	.820 ^c	.672	.670	.34028
4	.827 ^d	.683	.680	.33468
5	.833 ^e	.693	.690	.32975
6	.834 ^f	.696	.692	.32848

a. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic Leadership

b. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic Leadership, Transformational Leadership

c. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Democratic Leadership

d. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Democratic Leadership, Age of Respondents

e. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Democratic Leadership, Age of Respondents, Laissez-faire Leadership

f. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Democratic Leadership, Age of Respondents, Laissez-faire Leadership, Teaching Experience of Respondent

For the determination of leadership styles (autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transformational and transactional) and teacher self-efficacy linear regression was used. The variables were chosen based on the correlation analyses reported in Tables 1.2. A stepwise regression was conducted. The stepwise method was a procedure using multiple regressions. Table 1.3 reports a summary of the linear regression analysis for the leadership styles and teacher self-efficacy. The model summary shows a variation of .696 percent in 69 by model 6. The variables in model 6 were Autocratic Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Democratic Leadership, Age of Respondents, Laissez-faire Leadership, and Teaching Experience of Respondents

Table 1.4: Anova

ANOVA^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	99.505	1	99.505	753.175	.000 ^b
	Residual	59.980	454	.132		
	Total	159.486	455			
2	Regression	104.236	2	52.118	427.319	.000 ^c

	Residual	55.250	453	.122		
	Total	159.486	455			
3	Regression	107.147	3	35.716	308.443	.000 ^d
	Residual	52.339	452	.116		
	Total	159.486	455			
4	Regression	108.967	4	27.242	243.202	.000 ^e
	Residual	50.518	451	.112		
	Total	159.486	455			
5	Regression	110.555	5	22.111	203.347	.000 ^f
	Residual	48.931	450	.109		
	Total	159.486	455			
6	Regression	111.039	6	18.506	171.517	.000 ^g
	Residual	48.447	449	.108		
	Total	159.486	455			

a. Dependent Variable: Teachers SE

b. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic Leadership Style the principals

c. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic Leadership Style the principals, Transformational Leadership Style of the principals

d. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic Leadership Style the principals, Transformational Leadership Style of the principals, Democratic Leadership style the principals

e. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic Leadership Style the principals, Transformational Leadership Style of the principals, Democratic Leadership style the principals, Age of Respondents

f. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic Leadership Style the principals, Transformational Leadership Style of the principals, Democratic Leadership style the principals, Age of Respondents, Lassie-faire Leadership Style of the principals

g. Predictors: (Constant), Autocratic Leadership Style the principals, Transformational Leadership Style of the principals, Democratic Leadership style the principals, Age of Respondents, Lassie-faire Leadership Style of the principals, Teaching Experience of Respondents

Table 1.5

Coefficients

Model	Un-standardized		Standardized	<i>T</i>	<i>P</i>
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	.451	.131		3.432	.001
Autocratic Leadership Style of the principals	.046	.003	.569	16.741	.000
Transformational Leadership Style of the principals	.036	.007	.154	4.980	.000

Democratic Leadership style the principals	.019	.005	.120	3.773	.000
Age of Respondents	-.085	.019	-.133	-4.569	.000
Lassie-faire Leadership Style of the principals	.032	.008	.111	3.981	.000
Teaching Experience of Respondents	.039	.019	.058	2.118	.035

a. Dependent Variable: Teachers Self-Efficacy

Table 1.5 reports the standardized beta coefficients (B) for the variables. Teacher self-efficacy were predicted by autocratic leadership style of the principal (B = .569), Transformational (B = .154), Democratic (B = .120), Age of respondents (B= -.133), Lassies-faire (B= .111), Teaching experience of respondents (B=.058).

Data analysis

Identifying the level of data for each variable before starting the data analysis is one of the most important decisions for reaching valid results. To analyze research question, linear regression was used to find out predictors. The variables were chosen based on the correlation analyses.

Findings

Linear regression was used to determine the leadership styles (autocratic, democratic, lassies-faire, transformational and transactional) and teacher self-efficacy. The model summary shows a variation of 69.6 percent by model six. The variables in model six were Autocratic Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Democratic Leadership, Age of the Respondents, Lassie-faire Leadership, and Teaching Experience of Respondents, see table 1.3 and 1.4. Teachers' self-efficacy was predicted by autocratic leadership style of the principal (B = .569), Transformational (B = .154), Democratic (B = .120), Age of respondents (B= -.133), Lassies-faire (B= .111), Teaching experience of respondents (B=.058). The following equation is the mathematical model of the explanation. (See table 1.5)

$$TSE=0.451+0.569AL+.154TL+.120DL-.133AR+.111LL+.058TE$$

Where

TSE is teachers' self efficacy,

AL is Autocratic leadership,

TL is Transformational Leadership,

DL is Democratic Leadership,

AR is age of the respondents,

LL is Lassies-faire leadership, and

TE is Teaching Experience.

The equation above shows that autocratic leadership style of the school principals has major (56.9%) contribution in self efficacy of their teachers. In 69.6% only 12.7% of the self efficacy was predicted by Transformational, Democratic, Age of respondents, and Lassies-faire leadership styles. Teaching experience of respondents (B=.058). Moreover, age of the respondent teachers, has, though very small, negative effect on their self efficacy.

Discussion

The existing literature offered significant information about leadership role that is more effective in nurturing the workforces' attitude and behavior which are further required for attaining the various tasks and goals. In this regard, different research studies endorsed the effective role of leadership towards workforces' performance, commitment, motivation, self-confidence and self-efficacy. This study explored the leadership role (through different styles) towards self-efficacy of the teachers in educational context. The results show the significance of leadership towards the teachers' self-efficacy which have been confirmed through results from existing research studies to make clear the position of current study in the existing database of knowledge. The research findings confirm that transformational leadership style and its attributes of intellectual stimulation and individual consideration are the strongest predictors of teachers' self-efficacy. These findings are in line with the other studies conducted within the field, through which, the transformational leadership style proves to be correlated and to predict teachers' self-efficacy (Hipp, 1996; Nir & Krano, 2006; Walker & Slear, 2011; Kurt, Duyar, & Çalik, 2011). These findings differ markedly from previous research conducted within the field. Numerous studies have confirmed that principals with transactional leadership style are less likely to have teachers with high self-efficacy in their schools (Hipp, 1996; Hipp & Bredeson, 1995; Mascall, 2003)

Conclusion

The leadership is all about the inspiration of followers/workforces towards the desired goals leading to development and success of institutions. This phenomenon (leadership) has been widely explored in different context including academic institutions with diverse outcomes. In this regard, different leadership styles are effective towards the inspiration of workforces among which some have been explored in this study in connection to self-efficacy of the teachers in educational context. Keeping in view the existing trends in research (leadership literature), this study was an effort to examine the principal's leadership styles towards the workforces (teachers) efficacy in academic institutions hailing from Pakistan. The current study offered significant results (along with its validation/confirmation through the existing literature) which thus helped in reaching the conclusion. From the results, it was concluded that the model summary shows a variation of .696 percent in 69 by model 6. The variables in model 6 were Autocratic Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Democratic Leadership, Age of Respondents, Laissez-faire Leadership, and Teaching Experience of Respondents.

Reference

- Abdullah, A. G. K. A., Ling, Y. L., & Kader, Z. S. A. (2016). Principal's transformational leadership and teacher's creativity: mediating role of self-efficacy. *Management Research Journal*, 5, 1-7.
- Atsebeha, A. T. (2016). Principals' leadership styles and their effects on teachers' performance in the Tigray region of Ethiopia. *University of South Africa: Pretoria, South Africa*.
- Adebakin O.I & Gbadamusi E.A (1996). The practices of organizational leadership. Ibadan. Adeogun printing press.
- Adeyemi, T. O (2004). *Educational administration An Introduction*. Lagos: Atlantic Associated Publishers. 71-86.
- Akan, D. (2013). The Relationship between School Principals' Leadership Styles and Collective Teacher Efficacy. *Educational Research and Reviews*, v8 n10 p596-601.
- Al-Alwan, A. F., & Mahasneh, A. M. (2014). Teachers' self-efficacy as determinant of students' attitudes toward school: A study at the school level. *Rev. Eur. Stud.*, 6, 171.
- Andriani, S., Kesumawati, N., & Kristiawan, M. (2018). The Influence of The Transformational Leadership And Work Motivation On Teachers Performance. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 7(7).
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *The leadership quarterly*, 6(2), 199-218.
- Avolio, B., Bass, B., & Dung, I. (1996). *Construct validation of the multifactor*
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current Theories, Research, and Future Directions. *Annual Review of Psychology* 60 (2009), pp. 421-449. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621.
- Bangs, J., & Frost, D. (2012). Teacher self-efficacy, In J. M. Selesho (Ed.). *Voice and leadership: Towards a policy framework for education international*.
- Barnett, H., Craven, R. & Marsh, A. (2005). What type of school leadership satisfies teachers? A mixed method approach to teachers' perceptions of satisfaction, Australian Association for Research in Education.
- Bass B. M. (1990). Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: theory research and managerial applications 3rd edition. NY: Free Press**
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1997). *Full range leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(2), 207.
- Bass, B.M. & Riggio, R.E. (2006). Transformational leadership. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B.M. (1981). Stogdill's handbook of leadership (rev. ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bell, R. M. (2013). Charismatic leadership case study with Ronald Reagan as exemplar. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 6(1), 66-74
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 130-141.

- Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(5), 662–683.
- Brooks, S., Giles, C., Jacobson, S., C., Johnson, L., & Yimaki, R. (2007). Successful leadership in three high-poverty urban elementary schools, *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6(4), 291-317.
- Brown, F. & Reilly, M. 2008. The Myers-Briggs type indicator and transformational leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, 28(10):916-932.
- Bass, B. (2015). *Bass & Stogdills handbook of leadership* (3rd Ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Çalık, T., Koşar, S., Kılınç, A. Ç., & Er, E. (2013). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin değişime direnme davranışları ile öz yeterlikleri arasındaki ilişki. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(4), 1-16.**
- Campo, C. (1993). Collaborative school cultures: How principals make a difference. *School Organization*, 13(2), 119–127.**
- Canary, H.E. & McPhee, R.D. 2011. *Communication and organisational knowledge*. Routledge: New York.
- Ch, A. H., Ahmad, S., Malik, M., & Batoool, A. (2017). Principals' Leadership Styles and Teachers' Job Satisfaction: A Correlation Study at Secondary Level. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 39(3), 45-56.
- Chaudhry, A. Q., & Javed, H. (2012). Impact of transactional and laissez faire leadership style on motivation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(7), 258-264.
- Cherry, K. (2018). Leadership styles and frameworks you should know. Retrieved from
- Cherry, K. (2019). Leadership styles and frameworks you should know. *Verywell Mind*.
- Clark, R. A., Hartline, M. D., & Jones, K. C. (2009). The effects of leadership style on hotel employees' commitment to service quality. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 50(2), 209-231.
- Clark, R., Hartline, M., & Jones, K. (2010). The effects of leadership style on hotel employee's commitment to service quality, *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 50(2)
- Cohen, E. (2015). Principal leadership styles and teacher and principal attitudes, concerns and competencies regarding inclusion. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 186, 758-764.
- Corrigan, P. W., & Garman, A. N. (1999). Administrative update: Transformational and transactional leadership styles for mental health teams. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 35(4), 301–312.**
- Chukwusa, J. (2018). Autocratic leadership style: Obstacle to success in academic libraries. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1.
- Dale Jr, J. (2012). The correlation of the perceived leadership style of middle school principals to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy.
- Damanik, E. (2014). Principal leadership style and its impact on school climate and teacher self-efficacy in Indonesian schools (Doctoral dissertation, Curtin University).
- Djigić, G., Stojiljković, S., & Dosković, M. (2014). Basic personality dimensions and teachers' self-efficacy. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 112, 593-602.
- Demir, A., & Budur, T. (2019). Roles of leadership styles in corporate social responsibility to non-governmental organizations (NGOs). *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 5(4), 174.
- Dolatabadi, H. R., & Safa, M. (2010). The effect of directive and participative leadership style on employees' commitment to service quality. *International Bulletin of Business Administration*, 9(1), 31-42.

- Enueme, C. P., & Egwunyenga, E. J. (2008). Principals' instructional leadership roles and effect on teachers' job performance: A case study of secondary schools in Asaba Metropolis, Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 16(1), 13-17.
- Espinoza, S. M. (2013). *The effects of principal's transformational leadership behaviors on teacher leadership development and teacher self efficacy*. The University of Texas-Pan American.
- Evangelista, A. B. (2014). Domains of leadership behavior of administrators as determinants of self-efficacy of faculty in engineering and ICT schools. *International Proceedings of Economics Development and Research*, 70, 115.experienced middle school teachers.
- Efendi, N. (2015). Islamic Educational Leadership. Yogyakarta: Kalimedia.**
- Fackler, S., & Malmberg, L. E. (2016). Teachers' self-efficacy in 14 OECD countries: Teacher, student group, school and leadership effects. *Teaching and teacher education*, 56, 185-195.
- Fusco, K. (2019). Technology Leaders' Impact on Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Integration of Instructional Technology in Secondary Schools.
- Gulmez, D., & Negis Isik, A. (2020). The Correlation between School Principals' Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Leadership Styles. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 12(1).
- George, J. M., & Zhou, J. (2001). When openness to experience and conscientiousness are related to creative behavior: an interactional approach. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(3), 513.
- Gunter, H. 2001. Leaders and leadership in education. London: SAGE.
- Gibbs, C. (2003). Explaining effective teaching: Self-efficacy and thought control of action. Journal of Educational Enquiry, 4, 1–14.**
- Gibson, S. & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A constructed validation.**
- Goldman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*. 78-90
- Goodnight, R. (2011). Laissez-faire leadership. *Encyclopedia of Leadership*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Goroshit, M., & Hen, M. (2014). Does Emotional Self-efficacy Predict Teachers' Self-efficacy and Empathy?. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 2(3), 26-32.
- Guo, Y., Justice, L. M., Sawyer, B., & Tompkins, V. (2011). Exploring factors related to preschool teachers' self-efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(5), 961-968.
- House, R. J. (1968). Leadership training: Some dysfunctional consequences. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 556-571.
- Hukpati, C. A. (2009). *Transformational leadership and teacher job satisfaciton: a comparative study of private and public tertiary institutions in Ghana* (Master's thesis, University of Twente).
- Hardman, B. K. (2011). Teacher's perception of their principal's leadership style and the effects on student achievement in improving and non-improving schools.
- Hoyle, J. R. Leadership Styles (2012). *Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and Administration*. Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Reference Online.
- Hatton, C., & Emerson, E. (1993). Organizational predictors of staff stress: Satisfaction and intended turnover in a service for people with multiple disabilities. *Mental Retardation*, 6, 388–395.
- Helber, J. D. (2015). Self-efficacy and instructional leadership: Does mentoring make a difference?

- Maulana, R., Helms-Lorenz, M., & van de Grift, W. (2015). A longitudinal study of induction on the acceleration of growth in teaching quality of beginning teachers through the eyes of their students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 51, 225-245.
- Hoxha, L., & Hyseni-Duraku, Z. (2017). The Relationship between Educational Leadership and Teachers' Self-efficacy. *The European Journal of Social & Behavioural Sciences*, 20(3), 2508-2519. <https://www.vervwellmind.com/leadership-styles-2795312>
- Hoy, A. W. (2000, April). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching. In *annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA*.
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. *The elementary school journal*, 93(4), 355-372.
- Ismail, A., Mohamad, M. H., Mohamed, H. A. B., Rafiuddin, N. M., & Zhen, K. W. P. (2010). Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles as a Predictor of Individual Outcomes. *Theoretical & Applied Economics*, 17(6).
- Jay, A. (2014). The Principals' Leadership Style And Teachers Performance In Secondary Schools Of Gambella Regional State (Doctoral dissertation, Jimma University).
- De Jong, J. P., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2007). How leaders influence employees' innovative behaviour. *European Journal of innovation management*.
- Kaminski, J. L. (2013). High school principals' leadership styles and their impact on teacher efficacy.
- Kanungo, R.N., Mendonca, M. (1996). *Ethical dimensions of leadership*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Kythreotis, A., Pashiardis, P., & Kyriakides, L. (2010). The influence of school leadership styles and culture on students' achievement in Cyprus primary schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(2), 218-240. doi:10.1108/09578231011027860
- Kass, E. (2013). "A Compliment is all I need"—Teachers Telling Principals How to Promote Their Staff's Self-Efficacy. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 59(2), 208-225.
- Keskes, I. (2014). Relationship between leadership styles and dimensions of employee organizational commitment: A critical review and discussion of future directions. *Intangible Capital*, 10(1), 26-51.
- Kurt, T., Duyar, I., & Çalik, T. (2012). Are we legitimate yet? A closer look at the casual relationship mechanisms among principal leadership, teacher self-efficacy and collective efficacy. *Journal of Management Development*.**
- Kirk, J. M. (2016). *Principal Leadership and Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy: A Meta-Analysis* (Doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University).
- Klak, T. (2019). *Building Teacher Self-Efficacy to Improve Student Literacy*.
- Klassen, R. M., Tze, V. M. C., Betts, S. M., & Gordon, K. A. (2011). Teacher efficacy research 1998–2009: Signs of progress or unfulfilled promise? *Educational Psychology Review*, 23(1), 21–43.**
- Kosar, S. (2015). Trust in school principal and self-efficacy as predictors of teacher professionalism. *Egitimve Bilim*, 40(181).
- Lambersky, J. (2016). Understanding the human side of school leadership: Principals' impact on teachers' morale, self-efficacy, stress, and commitment. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 15(4), 379-405. *leadership questionnaire form 5X* (Report 96-1). Binghamton, NY: Binghamton

- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999). The relative effects of principal and teacher sources of leadership on student engagement with school. *Educational administration quarterly*, 35(5), 679-706.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Leyser, Y., Zeiger, T., & Romi, S. (2011). Changes in self-efficacy of prospective special and general education teachers: Implication for inclusive education. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 58, 241–255.
- Lieberman, A. (1995). Practices that support teacher development: Transforming conceptions of professional learning. *Innovating and evaluating science education*, 95(64), 67-78.
- Lieberman, A. (1995). *The work of restructuring schools: Building from the ground up*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Limsila, K., & Ogunlana, S. O. (2008). Performance and leadership outcome correlates of leadership styles and subordinate commitment. *Engineering, construction and architectural management*.
- Limsila, K.; Ogunlana, S.O. (2007). Performance and leadership outcome correlates of leadership styles and subordinate commitment. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 15(2): 164-184.
- Lyons, J. B., & Schneider, T. R. (2009). The effects of leadership style on stress outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 737- 748.
- Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2012). *Leadership: Theory, application, and skill development* (5th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College
- Mandell, B. (2003). A question about women and the leadership option, in Rhode, D. (Ed.), The difference difference makes, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.**
- Moss, S. A., & Ritossa, D. A. (2007). The impact of goal orientation on the association between leadership style and follower performance, creativity and work attitudes. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 3(4), 433-456.
- Marks, H., & Printy, S. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 39(3), 370-97.**
- Marturano, A. (2008). Understanding Leadership: Is It time for a Linguistic Turn. *Leadership at the Crossroads*, 3, 117-131.
- Mehdinezhad, V., & Mansouri, M. (2016). School Principals' Leadership Behaviours and Its Relation with Teachers' Sense of Self-Efficacy. *International Journal of Instruction*, 9(2), 51-60.
- Meristo, M., & Eisenschmidt, E. (2014). Novice teachers' perceptions of school climate and self-efficacy. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 67, 1-10.
- Michael, A. (2010). Leadership style and organizational impact. Retrieved from: <http://www.ala-apa.org>.
- Mohammad M, A., & Hossein Y, M. (2006). A study of relationship between managers' leadership style and employees' job satisfaction. Leadership in Health Services, 19(2), 11-28.**
- Moore-Johnson, S. (1990). *Teachers at work: Achieving success in our schools*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mullins, J., & Linehan, M. (2005). Leadership and followership in public libraries: transnational perspectives. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*.

- Malmberg, L. E., Hagger, H., & Webster, S. (2014). Teachers' situation-specific mastery experiences: teacher, student group and lesson effects. *European journal of psychology of education*, 29(3), 429-451.
- Munir, F., & Khalil, U. (2016). Secondary School Teachers' Perceptions of Their Principals' Leadership Behaviors and Their Academic Performance at Secondary School Level. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 38(1), 41-55
- Naile, I., & Selesho, J. M. (2014). The role of leadership in employee motivation. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(3), 175.
- Ninković, S. R., & Knežević-Florić, O. Č. (2018). Transformational school leadership and teacher self-efficacy as predictors of perceived collective teacher efficacy. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(1), 49-64.
- Nir, A. E., & Kranot, N. (2006). School Principal's Leadership Style and Teachers' Self-Efficacy. *Planning and Changing*, 37, 205-218.**
- Niyazi, Ö. Z. E. R. (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, Peter, G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.**
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). Culture and leadership. *Leadership: Theory and practice*, 4, 301-340.**
- Okumbe, J.A.(1998). Educational management theory, a comparative evolution to general theory. Nairobi: Nairobi University Printery
- Oyedemi NB (1998). Management in education principle and practice, Lagos ARAS Publishers, pp. 54-72.
- Ololube, N. P. (2013). Educational Management, Planning and Supervision: Model for Effective Implementation. Owerri: Springfield Publishers.
- Ololube, N. P., Dudafa, U. J., Uriah, O. A., & Agbor, C. N. (2013). Education for Development: Impediments to the Globalization of Higher Education in Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Foundations and Management*, 1(2), 109-130.
- Parker, W. C. (2003). Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Pearce, M. L. (2017). The effects of instructional leadership on teacher efficacy.
- Pradeep, D. D., & Prabhu, N. R. V. (2011). The relationship between effective leadership and employee performance. In *International Conference on Advancements in Information Technology* (Vol. 20, pp. 198-207).
- Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2006). The content validity index: are you sure you know what's being reported? Critique and recommendations. *Research in nursing & health*, 29(5), 489-497. profesionalisme (KPP). Utusan Malaysia, p. 7.
- Puni, A., Agyemang, C. B., & Asamoah, E. S. (2016). Leadership styles, employee turnover intentions and counterproductive work behaviours. *International Journal of innovative research and development*, 5(1), 1-7.
- Ediger, M. (2014). The changing role of the school principal. *College Student Journal*, 48(2), 265-268.
- Riel, C., & Sipple, J. W. (1996). Making the most of time and talent: Secondary school organizational climates, teaching task environments and teacher commitment. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(4), 873-901.
- Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A. & Sanghi, S. (2007). *Organizational Behavior*. (12th ed.). India: Pearson: Prentice Hall.

- Roslee Talib (2011, Desember 14). Penambahbaikan sekolah melalui komuniti pembelajaran
- Ross, J. A. (1994). The impact of an inservice to promote cooperative learning on the stability of teacher efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10, 381–394.
- Ross, J. A. (1995). Strategies for enhancing teachers' beliefs in their effectiveness: Research on school improvement hypothesis. *Teacher College Record*, 97(2), 227–251.
- Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2006). School leadership and student achievement: The mediating effects of teacher beliefs. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, 798-822.
- Richard L. Hughes, Robert C. Ginnett, Gordon J. Curphy (2009). *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience*, McGraw-Hill Irwin
- Raziq, M. M., Borini, F. M., Malik, O. F., Ahmad, M., & Shabaz, M. (2018). Leadership styles, goal clarity, and project success. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*.
- Sahin, S. (2004). The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles of school principals and school culture (The case of İzmir, Turkey). *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 4(2).
- Sakız, H., Ekinçi, A., & Sarıçam, H. (2019). Teachers' perceptions of their school managers' skills and their own self-efficacy levels. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1-19.
- SHASTRI, R.K.; SHASHI MISHRA, K.; SINHA, A. (2010). Charismatic leadership and Management organizational commitment: An Indian perspective. African Journal of Business, 4(10): 1946-1953.**
- Saleem, H. (2015). The impact of leadership styles on job satisfaction and mediating role of perceived organizational politics. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 172(27), 563-569.
- Simmons, M. L. (2013). Teachers' Perceptions of Their Self-Efficacy and Effects of Principal Leadership Practices on Self-Efficacy Beliefs in Low and High-Performing Elementary Schools in South Carolina.
- Singh, N. (2017). *Effects of the Principal's Emotional Intelligence, Leadership Toxicity, and School Culture, on Teacher Self-Efficacy*. ProQuest LLC. 789 East Eisenhower Parkway, PO Box 1346, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. Journal of educational psychology, 99(3), 611.**
- Skaalvik, E.M. & Skaalvik, S. (2010) Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. Teaching and Teacher Education 26(4), 1059–1069.**
- Sadeghi, A., & Pihie, Z. A. L. (2012). Transformational leadership and its predictive effects on leadership effectiveness. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(7).
- Shafie, B., Baghersalimi, S., & Barghi, V. (2013). The relationship between leadership style and employee performance: Case study of real estate registration organization of Tehran Province. *Singaporean Journal of Business, Economics and Management Studies*, 51(1119), 1-9
- Smylie, M. A. (1988). The enhancement function of staff development: Organizational and psychological antecedents to individual teacher change. *American Educational Research Journal*, 25(1), 1–30.

- Tsegay, T. & Wogari, N. 2006. Transformational leadership development. Reinventing the principalship. Institute for Educational Leadership. Unpublished. Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Tian, M. (2011). Distributed leadership and teacher's self-efficacy: The case studies of three Chinese schools in Shanghai.
- Timothy C. & Obiwuru (2011). Effect of leadership style on organizational performance: A survey of selected small-scale enterprises in Ikosi-Ketu council development area of Lagos State, Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(7).
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 944–956.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2014). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Tarsik, N. F., Kassim, N. A., & Nasharudin, N. (2014). Transformational, Transactional or Laissez-Faire: What Styles do University Librarians Practice?. *Journal of organizational management studies*, 2014, 1.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. H. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783–805.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Salloum, S. J., & Goddard, R. D. (2015). Context matters: The influence of collective beliefs and shared norms. Martin, LE, Kragler., Quatroche, DJ, Bauseman, KL *International Handbook of Research on Teachers' Beliefs*, 301-316. University, Center for Leadership Studies.
- Veliu, L., Manxhari, M., Demiri, V., & Jahaj, L. (2017). THE INFLUENCE OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON EMPLOYEE'S PERFORMANCE. *Management (16487974)*, 31(2).
- Van Der Vliet, E. 2006. Autocratic leadership around the globe: Do climate and wealth drive leadership culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37(1): 42-59.
- Virga Jr, J. J. (2012). *Examining the perceptions and sources of the self-efficacy beliefs of principals of high-achieving elementary schools (Doctoral dissertation)*.**
- Wahjosumidjo. (2010). *Kepemimpinan Kepala Sekolah*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Walker, J. (2009). *The impact of leadership behaviors on the efficacy of new and***
<https://wisetoast.com/types-of-leadership-styles/>
- Weber, E. T. (2013). *Democracy and leadership: on pragmatism and Virtue*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Yuki, G. (2010). *Leadership in Organization (ed. 7th)* University at Albany State.**
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organization*. New York, University at Albany, State University of New York: Pearson.**
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Kepemimpinan Dalam Organisasi. Edisi Kelima*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.**
- Zhang, J. H. (2008). *Educational Leadership*. Shanghai: East China Normal University Press.
- Zee, M., Koomen, H. M. Y., & de Jong, P. F. (2018). How different levels of conceptualization and measurement affect the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and students' academic achievement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 55, 189-200. doi: 10.1016/j.cedpsych.2018.09.006
- Zee, M., & Koomen, H. (2019). Engaging Children in the Upper Elementary Grades: Unique Contributions of Teacher Self-Efficacy, Autonomy Support, and Student-Teacher Relationships. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 1-19.