

The Effects of Leadership Behavior on Efficacy: A Comparative Study of Faculty of Two Universities from Iran and India

Meimanat Lonita Tabbodi* and N. N. Prahallada**

Department of Education, NCERT, University of Mysore, Mysore, Karnataka, India
*E-mail: *<ltabbodi@yahoo.com>, **<nnpurahallad@yahoo.com.co.in>*

KEYWORDS Leadership Behavior. Efficacy. University Faculty. India. Iran. Shiraz University. Mysore University.

ABSTRACT The present study examined the effects of leadership behavior on faculty efficacy of Department of Humanities in University of Mysore (India) and University of Shiraz (Iran). The data were collected from amongst the faculty of the two selected universities including 174, of whom 93 were from India and 81 from Iran. The instruments used were the Leadership Behavior and the Pareek Faculty Efficacy Questionnaire. First, it was hypothesized that there would be a relationship between the department heads' leadership behavior and their faculty efficacy and that the heads' leadership behavior and faculty efficacy of the related departments of the two universities would not be significantly different. The results, approving the first assumption, revealed that there was a significant relationship between leadership behavior and faculty efficacy. Moreover, it was found out that the department heads' leadership behavior and faculty efficacy of the Department of Humanities of the two universities were consequentially distinct.

INTRODUCTION

Behavior leadership perspective assumes, like trait leadership perspectives, that leadership is central to organizational performance. However, the focus is on leaders' behavior rather than leaders' personal traits/characteristics. Hersey and Blanchard (1988) reported that this approach initiated at Michigan and Ohio State universities in 1945. Various studies were carried out with the intention of identifying leader behaviors that account for effectiveness. Their findings reveal two major forms of leader behaviors: Consideration and Initiating Structure (Hersey and Blanchard 1988).

A highly considerate leader is sensitive to his subordinates' feelings and strives to make things pleasant for them. In contrast, a leader high in initiating structure emphasizes completion of the task (Schermmerhorn 2000). The results indicate that it is important that a leader be high on being considerate and initiating structure. However, Hoy and Miskel (1991) maintain that it may be difficult to match a leader's behavior with effectiveness if appropriate behaviors cannot be linked to different situations, as situational factors affect the effectiveness of leader's behavior, even when a leader is high on people as well as on tasks dimensions.

Leadership is likely to play a role in self-efficacy formation because leaders help clarify roles and provide social support for employees, so it can be affected positively and organizational outcome is also positively influenced (Bennett, Liden and Settoon 1996; Yuki 1994).

Over the years, teacher efficacy has been studied extensively in various contexts and on theoretical foundation. Efficacy was first recognized as a significant factor in teacher's work in the Rand Corporation's seminal studies of planned educational change, (Berman and McLaughlin 1977). Since those studies, teacher efficacy has been included with the increasing frequency in research on teachers and their work. Self-efficacy is thought to be a generative self-precept. It is grounded in histories of learning experiences, tasks and task accomplishments. However, self-efficacy is not simply a reflective imprint of past experiences. It may exceed, match or remain below the level of actual performance and accomplishment because of the way of individuals' interpreting the performance and accomplishment.

In the past two decades, researchers have found links between student achievement and teacher's beliefs in their own instructional efficacy (Hoy et al. 1998), and teachers' beliefs about the collective efficacy of their institute (Goddard and Woolfolk 2000).

Widely acknowledged in the literature on teacher efficacy is the Bandura's (1986) proposal that efficacy includes two aspects. Factor analysis

Postal Address:
Meimanat Lonita Tabbodi
11, 1st main, 1st Stage, Vijayanagar, Mysore, 570 017,
Karnataka, India

work by Dembo and Gibson (1984) indicates that one dimension involves a general sense that in particular settings, certain behaviors will lead to certain outcome (general teaching efficacy). In institutes, colleges, schools or universities, this might be translated into a belief that use of certain teaching techniques, for example rapid-fire questioning, will result in certain learning outcome such as remembering facts in social studies. The second dimension relates specifically to an individual's beliefs in his own ability to bring about desired results (personal teaching efficacy). For teachers, this involves belief in their own effectiveness in using methods competently to foster student learning. This second belief is sometimes referred to as personal teaching efficacy (Okefor and Poole 1989).

Bandura (1986) defined self-efficacy as people's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances. Hence, according to Bandura, self-efficacy is grounded in perceptions of personal ability instrumentality and control and is linked to specific future acts.

Lanier and Sedlak (1989) presented yet a different meaning, defining efficacy as the power that teachers have to bring about the desired student learning that is grounded in knowledge about practice and opportunity to apply that knowledge. This definition is applied not only to the teachers' work with students in the classroom but also to the professional and public leadership.

Research has found that self-efficacy positively predicts job attitudes (Saks 1995), training proficiency, and job performance (Luthans and Stajkovic 1998), and it acts as a buffer ameliorating the negative affects of work stressors on employees' psychological well being (Bliese and Jex 1999). At the group level of analysis, collective efficacy has been conceptualized as being analogous to self-efficacy (Bandura 1997; Brass et al. 1995). Collective efficacy is defined as a group's shared beliefs in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given levels of attainments (Bandura 1997). Similar to the research on self-efficacy, studies on collective efficacy have shown that it positively predicts group motivation and performance (e.g., Gully, et al. (1996)) and as a buffer of stressor strain relations (Bliese and Jex 1999). Thus, efficacy beliefs at both the individual level (self-efficacy) and group level (collective efficacy)

are related to important individual and organizational outcomes (like students from school or employees in any organization). Eden (1992) has identified leadership as a predictor of self-efficacy, and the mechanisms through which leadership behaviors relate to self-efficacy.

Ashton and Webb (1986) found out that principals' behavior supports teachers' work and influences teacher efficacy and their students' achievement. Bassler et al. (1986.) believed that teachers' competence and behavior of principals may have reciprocal effects. The teacher who feels competent may, in turn, promote supportive and facilitative behaviors of principals. Any research is rich with evidence that teachers' sense of efficacy significantly relates to the student achievement and changes in teacher behavior (Ross 1993); however, studies indicate that principals need to be persuaded to act this strong and positive linkage and focus on the condition to help teachers acquire and sustain feelings of competence and worth (Rossmiler 1992), because their behavior relates to their leadership behavior and influences their organizational output.

Rossmiller (1992) found that principals' work with teachers was the area most likely to affect the quality of teachers' work life; however, with the exception of one private school, principals showed little concern and no systematic attempt to provide teachers with frequent feedback on their performance. Newmann et al. (1989) provide evidence to support these results because organizational factors and principal responsiveness were found to be more significantly related to teacher efficacy than demographic features over which practitioners have no control.

The present study considers the effects of leadership behavior on faculty efficacy of the Department of Humanities of the universities of Mysore (India) and Shiraz (Iran). The main purpose of this study is to assess leadership behavior and efficacy levels among the faculty. The secondary objectives are to investigate the influence of leadership behavior on efficacy of the faculty groups, and finally to compare the effects of leadership behavior on efficacy of faculty groups in universities of Mysore (India) and Shiraz (Iran).

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The sample included 174 faculty of the

Department of Humanities, of whom 93 were from University of Mysore (India), and 81 of them from University of Shiraz (Iran). The sample participants were selected from amongst the total number of faculty and heads in these two universities, which comprised the population of the study.

Instrumentation

Leadership Behavior Questionnaire: This questionnaire was developed by Fleishman (1973). It consists of 48 items divided into two independent areas of leadership called 'Consideration' and 'Initiating Structure'. The first area includes 28 items and the second area is made up of 20 items. A scale is designed to find answers to the questions, "What does Head of your department actually do?" All the 48 items are presented with a 5-point scale (continuous answer) that has scoring weights of 1 to 5, depending on the item orientation to the total dimension. The highest is 112 for 'Consideration' and 80 for 'Initiating Structure'. Item analysis of the scale using SPSS program resulted in Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient of 0.82.

Faculty Efficacy Questionnaire: This questionnaire as cited in Bansal (2002) was developed by Pareek. The scale consists of 20 items. Role effectiveness can be assessed through this instrument. The scoring pattern followed is +2, +1, and -1. The regular scale was completed by all faculty members and heads of departments of Humanities in University of Mysore (India) and University of Shiraz (Iran).

Procedure

The questionnaires were administered individually amongst heads and faculty members of Humanities Departments of the two universities. In the questionnaires stipulated, the responder was explained about the research objectives and was requested to read each question carefully and then encircle one of the

options which best described his opinion regarding each item. The researchers distributed 130 questionnaires in University of Mysore - a leadership behavior and a faculty efficacy questionnaire for each subject. In all, 110 questionnaires were distributed in University of Shiraz. Finally, the investigators collected 93 (71%) questionnaires from University of Mysore and 81 (87%) from University of Shiraz.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this study, the investigators have endeavored to explore the attitudes of heads of departments towards the respective faculty of the selected universities in Mysore (India) and Shiraz (Iran), and to see how they were influenced.

Table 1 reveals the results of Karl Pearson coefficient of correlation test between leadership behavior of heads of department of Humanities and the entire faculty's efficacy.

The results indicate that there is a direct and positive correlation between leadership behavior of heads of department of Humanities and faculty efficacy in the two selected universities since the calculated "r" value ($r = 0.258$, $P = 0.001$) is significant at 1% level. Meanwhile, R^2 (Coefficient of determination) is 7%. The results show that faculty have positive attitudes towards their leadership behavior. This factor can affect the actual efficacy and achievement of students in any organization. In other words, factor of leadership behavior of heads of department is very important in sharing patterns of management. So managers can increase organization's performance by utilizing this leadership style.

In India, the results reveal that there is a direct and positive correlation between leadership behavior of heads of department of Humanities and faculty efficacy, because the calculated "r" value ($r = 0.243$, $P = 0.019$) is significant at 5% level. Meanwhile, R^2 (Coefficient of determination) is 6%. The percentage expresses six percent of variance of faculty efficacy is due to leadership style.

Table1: Results of test of correlation coefficient between leadership behavior and faculty efficacy in the selected universities.

	Variables	r	P	Result
Total	Leadership behavior and efficacy	0.258**	0.001	S
India	Leadership behavior and efficacy	0.243*	0.019	S
Iran	Leadership behavior and efficacy	0.283**	0.01	S

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In Iran, results show that there is a direct positive correlation between the leadership behavior of heads of department of Humanities and faculty efficacy since the calculated "r" value ($r=0.283$, $P=0.01$) is significant at 1% level. Meanwhile, R^2 value is 8%.

In general, the results indicate that factor of leadership behavior of heads of departments has affected the faculty efficacy, and the coefficient of correlation concerning the two studied factors in Iran is stronger than that in India.

On the other hand, the results reveal that the mean of the two major dimensions of leadership behavior namely, consideration and initiating structure, is higher in India than in Iran. This problem raises the question of whether or not the relationship between leadership behavior and faculty efficacy is true.

To answer this question, the researchers used the partial correlation coefficient test, where factor of job satisfaction acted as an intervening variable. As the calculated results show, 3.8% of variance of leadership behavior and faculty efficacy is due to job satisfaction that is 2.01 percent in India and 6.01% in Iran¹.

Hence, since faculty members of Iranian universities have higher job satisfaction than Indian university faculty, the relationship between leadership and faculty efficacy in Iran is stronger than that in India. That is, factor of efficacy indirectly and leadership behavior directly had a weak role to play in faculty efficacy. In other words, the results reveal that the effect the leadership behavior has on faculty efficacy in India is really higher than that in Iran.

The main finding of the study was that there was a direct and positive correlation between leadership behavior and faculty efficacy.

Findings of the present study show that factor of leadership behavior of heads of departments affect faculty efficacy in the two selected universities. It means that leadership behavior is very important in management patterns. In other words, the heads' work and behavior can affect the quality of faculty performance directly and their students' achievement indirectly.

On the whole from this study, it was observed out that leadership behavior can directly affect the faculty efficacy and that sometimes other factors, which may often be left unnoticed, may influence it indirectly. In this study, factor of job satisfaction was identified as an intervening

variable affecting faculty efficacy indirectly. According to the results obtained principals' behavior in India impacted faculty efficacy more than that in Iran.

Although in this research it is emphasized that leadership behavior has an impact on faculty efficacy, the following points deserve mentioning: The mean leadership behavior in India is higher than that in Iran. This could be due to the impact of a number of intervening variables, i.e. job satisfaction, rate of salary, his commitment and interest in the organization, etc. Our research on job satisfaction revealed that job satisfaction can, as an intervening variable, affect the organizational efficacy. The results of relative correlation coefficient revealed that 3.8% of the variance of leadership behavior and efficacy is the result of the impact exerted by job satisfaction.

NOTE

1. The statistics reported on job satisfaction of faculty members were extracted from the body of the researcher's Ph.D. dissertation. In fact, they have not been discussed in detail in the present paper to avoid any deviation from the pre-defined objectives of the present study.

REFERENCES

- Ashton PT, Webb RB 1986. Teacher Efficacy: A Motivational Paradigm for Effective Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(5): 28-32.
- Bandura A 1986. Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change. *Psychological Review*, 84: 191-215.
- Bandura A 1997. *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: Freeman.
- Berman P, McLaughlin MW 1977. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Factors Affecting Implementation and Continuation. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Hersey P, Blanchard KH 1988. *Management of Organizational Behavior Utilizing Human Resources*. 5th Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Eden D 1992. Leadership and Expectations: Pygmalion Effects and Other Self-fulfilling Prophecies in Organizations. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3: 271-305.
- Fleishman EA 1973. Patterns of Leadership Behavior Related to Employee Grievances and turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 15: 43-56.
- Gibson S, Dembo M 1984. Teacher Efficacy: A Construct Validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76: 569-582.
- Goddard RD, Hoy WK, Woolfolk Hoy A 2000. Collective Teacher Efficacy: Its Meaning, Measure, and Effect on Student Achievement. *American Education Research Journal*, 37(2): 479-507.

- Gully SM, Gully SM, Incalcaterra KA, Joshi A, Beaubien JM 1996. A Meta-analytic Investigation of Team Efficacy, Potency, and Performance: Interdependence and Levels of Analysis as Moderators of Observed Relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(5): 819-832.
- Hoy WK, Miskel CG 1991. *Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice*. 4th Edition. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Jex SM, Bliese PD 1999. Efficacy Beliefs as a Moderator of the Impact of Work-related Stressor: A Multilevel Study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84: 349-361.
- Lanier JE, Sedlak MW 1989. *Teacher Efficacy and Quality Schooling*. In TJ Sergiovanni and JH Moore (Eds.): *Schooling for Tomorrow: Directing Reforms to Issues That Count* (Boston and Bacon).
- Lindsley DH, Brass DJ, Thomas JB 1995. Efficacy-performance Spirals: A Multilevel Perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 20: 645-678.
- McLaughlin MW, Marsh DD 1977. Staff Development and School Change. *Teachers College Record*, 80: 6994.
- Newmann FM, Rutter RA, Smith MS 1989. Organizational Factors that Affect Schoolence of Efficacy, Community, and Expectations. *Sociology of Education*, 62: 221-138.
- Poole MG, Okeafor KR 1989. The Effects of Teacher Efficacy and Interactions Among Educators on Curriculum Implementation. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 4: 146-161.
- Rosenholtz SJ, Bassler O, Hoover-Dempsey KH 1986. Organizational Conditions of Teacher Learning. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 2(2): 91-104.
- Ross JA 1993. Research on Teacher Efficacy. *The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education*, Trent Valley centre.
- Rossmiller RA 1992. The Secondary School Principal and Teachers' Quality of Work Life. *Educational Management and Administration*, 20(2): 132-146.
- Schermerhorn JR 2000. The Impact of Participative Leadership Behavior on Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Commitment in Chinese State-owned Enterprises: The Moderating Role of Organizational Tenure. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, online www.springer.com, September, 2006.
- Settoon RP, Bennett N, Liden RC 1996. Social Exchange in Organizations: Perceived Organizational Support, Leader-member Exchange and Employee Reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81: 219-227.
- Saks AM 1995. Longitudinal Field Investigation of the Moderating and Mediating Effects of Self-efficacy on the Relationship Between Training and Newcomer Adjustment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80: 211-225.
- Stajkovic AD, Luthans F 1998. Self-efficacy and Work-related Performance: A Meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124: 240-261.
- Tschannen-Moran M, Woolfolk Hoy AW, Hoy WK 1998. Teacher Efficacy: Its Meaning and Measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68: 202-248.
- Yukl G 1994. *Leadership in Organizations*. 3rd Edition, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.