

THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON TEACHER COMMITMENT IN GHANAIAN BASIC SCHOOLS

Peace Kumah

P. O. Box AF 1459, Adenta Flats, Accra, Ghana
pckumah@gmail.com

Abstract

Purpose – This paper presented research intended to determine the type of leadership style that is practiced by leaders in Ghanaian private and public basic schools. The study aimed at assessing the effects of leadership styles on teacher commitment.

Design/methodologies/approach – The quantitative survey method was used to collect data from 356 participants involving directors, circuit supervisors, head teachers, and teachers in both private and public basic schools. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X and the Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment survey instruments were employed. The Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) was employed and Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was used to analyze the data.

Findings – Results indicated that transformational leadership style does not significantly influence teacher commitment, 4.2% ($R^2 = .042$), indicating that transformational leadership style is partially practiced. The transactional leadership style accounted for 21.3% ($R^2 = .213$) in teacher commitment, indicating the most practiced leadership style in basic schools in Ghana. However, Laissez-faire leadership style has insignificant effect on teacher commitment, thus 1.3% ($R^2 = .013$).

Originality/value – Relatively, there are little empirical study of the effect of leadership styles on teacher commitment in Ghanaian basic schools. This study found that transactional leadership style is predominantly practised in Ghanaian basic schools. For improved educational outcomes, this study provided policy-makers and practitioners guidelines and strategies to adopt to enhance teacher commitment and development of transformational leaders in basic schools.

Keywords: Teacher Commitment, Leadership style, Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Laissez-faire Leadership.

INTRODUCTION

The importance of education in socio-economic development of nations cannot be over-emphasized. In its recent publication, the World Bank (2011) reported that through quality education people acquired knowledge and skills which enabled the individuals to "become healthier, secure better jobs, earn more, and have greater voice in their affairs" (p. 2). In spite of the benefits quality education offers and the increasing budget on basic school education in Ghana, the standards of education as shown from pupils' academic achievements revealed a falling trend. Basic school education consists of six years primary and three years junior high, making a total of nine years. Figures released from the West African Examinations Council, WAEC (2012) revealed that in 2007, 61.28% of the candidates passed the BECE (Basic Education Certificate Examination) examination; 62.16% pass rate was recorded in 2008; 50.21% pass rate in 2009; 49.12% pass rate in 2010; and in 2011 pupils achieved only 46.93% pass rate. The constant decline in the educational standards since 2009 calls for urgent attention and research for national development.

Several interventions were implemented by the Government of Ghana to improve educational sector by increasing educational budget. In the 2009 budget, the Capitation Grant, which was aimed at supporting access, participation and educational quality, was increased by 50 percent, amounting to GH¢15.8 million (approximately \$7.8 million). In 2012, the Capitation Grant was increased to GH¢32.1 million (approximately \$16.5 million) (Government of Ghana, 2013). This indicates that within a three-year interval, the budget allocation for education improvement increased more than twice.

What accounts for low standards of education at the basic schools (primary and junior high schools) in Ghana in spite of increasing educational budget? An earlier study mentioned lack of effective leadership, exhibited through different styles of leadership portrayed by educational leaders and teacher commitment (Oduro et al., 2007). The major issue facing educational policy makers and practitioners in Ghana is how to provide effective leadership and to obtain commitment from teachers to ensure higher quality education. According to Leu and Price-Rom (2006), the "educational quality in developing countries has become a topic of intense interest, primarily because of countries' efforts to maintain quality" (p. 1). The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Group on Education Sector (2005) found that ineffective and inefficient leadership and management contributed immensely to falling standards of education. Oduro et al. (2007) remarked that it is time researchers examine the extent to which school leaders provide leadership that meets the quality learning needs of their pupils.

The intent of this study is to determine the leadership style of educational leaders in Ghanaian basic schools and to assess the effect of their leadership styles on teacher commitment. The rationale was to gain a better understanding of the impact of leadership styles of educational leaders on teacher commitment and to identify leadership style that enhances teacher commitment. The study, therefore, assesses the extent to which leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) influence teacher commitment by answering the following research questions:

- a) What impact does transformational leadership style have on teacher commitment?
- b) What impact does transactional leadership style have on teacher commitment?
- c) What impact does laissez-faire leadership style have on teacher commitment?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership Theories

Different leadership theories evolved over the years. The great man theory was propounded in the mid 1920's. According to the great man theory, the leader is the greatest person in an organization because through his actions and behaviour the organization will be successful. The theory assumed that great leaders are born and not made. However, Burke (1976) argued that it is possible to develop a person to become a great leader and believed that the great man theory is not applicable in modern organizations. Over the years, research has led to the expansion of the great man theory and several leadership theories such as path goal theory (House, 1996), servant leadership theory (Greenleaf, 1991), situational leadership (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972), and many other leadership theories have evolved. Recent findings suggested three categories of leadership in the field of organizational leadership. These are transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire (Rukmani et al., 2010), which were largely used in a number of studies.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership was proposed by Burns (1978) and further expanded by Bass and many others (e.g., Bass 1985, Bass and Avolio, 1997; Bass and Riggio, 2006; Sosik and Jung, 2010). Transformational leadership model consists of four core components: Charisma or Idealized Influence (attributed or behavioural), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration.

The *Idealized Influence* leaders set high moral standards, straight ethical conduct, and are confident about the future. Such leaders are role-model for their followers (Lee & Chang, 2006). The *Inspirational Motivation* leaders provide their followers with challenges and participation in shared goals and undertakings. The *Intellectual Stimulation* leaders emphasize on creativity and innovation, broad and open-mindedness to question, make long-term assumptions, and reframe questions to solve traditional problems with new methods and mindsets. According to Avolio and Bass (1999), *Intellectual Stimulation* leaders seek new ways of doing things, are risk takers, and hardly hold on to the *status quo*. The *Individualized Consideration* leaders are genuinely concerned with specific needs of their followers for personal growth and achievement and try to satisfy their needs and expectations (Bass 1985).

In educational institutions, transformational leadership is all about change (Jean Brown, 1991). According to Hallinger (2003), transformational leaders influence the conditions that directly affect the quality of curriculum and instruction delivered to pupils in the classroom, focusing on variables in the change process by encouraging continuous learning among teachers, sharing knowledge, and working with the society to achieve broader organizational goal. Transformational leaders react to environmental circumstances and try to create and shape the environment. Leithwood (1992) developed transformational model of school leadership. Leithwood claimed that “the four I’s” of transformational leadership (individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation and idealized influence) identified by Bass and Avolio (1994) were “essential skills for school instructors

and their leaders if they are to overcome the 21st Century challenges” (as cited in Marzano et al, 2005, p.14). Therefore, is it expected that when the instructors and their leaders practice transformational leadership, they may bring about change, exhibit more commitment to work, and boost educational standards.

Transactional Leadership

Bass (1978) asserted that transactional leaders motivate their followers by attracting or appealing to their self-interests, combine bureaucratic authority and legitimacy in the organization, emphasize on high standards, assignments and achievement of task based goals. Transactional leaders believe in completion of task, use of rewards and punishment system in the organization to motivate their followers to achieve their individual and organization goals; while recognizing that reward must follow attainment of a set goal (Bass, 1978). Bass and Avolio (1994) and Antonakis et al. (2003) classified transactional leadership behaviour into contingent rewards, management by exception (active) and management by exception (passive).

The *Contingency Reward* leaders clarify the tasks that need to be achieved and use reward to satisfy the results (Nicholson, 2007). Bass (1985) stated that in managing contingent rewards, transactional leaders must use a reasonable amount of involvement, commitment and loyalty as well as performance levels from followers. The *Management by Exception (active)* leaders actively monitor the work of the followers and ensure that predefined standards are met (Antonakis et al 2003). This leadership style uses corrective criticism, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement to correct errors while *Management by Exception (passive)* leaders only intervene when there is a problem. Transactional leaders may influence the level of teacher commitment, considering its various dimensions.

Laissez-Faire Leadership

Laissez faire leaders demonstrate no leadership in any way; that is, they take off their hands, look on and let things ride on. They abdicate responsibility, delay decisions, do not satisfy the needs of followers, and provide no feedback for subordinates (Avolio and Bass, 2004; Northouse, 2007). Laissez-faire leaders are overall inactive in relations with followers (Barbuto, 2005) and do not attempt to help followers develop (Northouse, 2007). Lee and Chang (2006) found that laissez-faire leaders are ineffective, unproductive and produce worker dissatisfaction. Therefore, laissez-faire leadership is a complete absence of effective leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Northouse, 2007), which is contrary to transformational leadership. But how can laissez-faire leaders influence teacher commitment and what will be its effect on educational standards?

Theories of Employee Commitment

According to Mowday and et al. (1982), organizational commitment is the employee's allegiance and devotion to the organization in achieving organizational goals. The most popular definition of commitment is multi-dimensional approach of Ying and Zaman (2009), which is based on three facets: a) affective commitment, which is an employee's emotional attachment to identification with and involvement in the organization, b) continuance commitment, which is commitment based on the costs levels of leaving the

organization, and c) normative commitment, which is an employee's feelings and sense of obligation to stay and remain in the organization.

Management and behavioural science literature considered employee commitment as the main factor in the relationship between individuals and organizations. According to Khurram et al. (2010), the most important factor that promotes the attachment of the individual to the organization is commitment. An employee is said to be committed to an organization if he/she is willing to continue his relationship with the organization and devote positive effort to achieving organizational goals (Mowday, 1998; Raju and Srivastava, 1994). High level of employee commitment leads to high performance and organizational effectiveness.

Allen and Meyer (1996) divided organizational commitment into three dimensions. The *Affective Commitment* dimension is based on the fact that the employees derive or get their identities from the organization and strongly wish to stay with the organization. The *Continuance Commitment* is based on the cost of leaving or lack of alternatives. This implies that the amounts of capital invested by individuals within an organization coupled with lack of job opportunities are seriously considered. The *Normative Commitment* refers to the employee's feeling the sense of obligation to stay and remain in the organization.

Meyer and Allen (1997) identified three factors that affect employees' commitment to the organization: profession or career, commitment to manager, and the personality of the boss. Allen and Meyer (1998) found that affective commitment limits or eliminates negative dimensions like turnovers, less job performance, absenteeism and organizational citizenship behaviour. Committed employees are more likely to accept organizational change and development for competition and less likely to engage or involve in withdrawal behaviour (Iverson and Buttigieg, 1998). The success or failure of an organization depends largely on employee commitment (Lee and Chang, 2006). Hence, commitment is critical to the success of educational establishments.

Leadership Styles and Employee Commitment

Previous studies compared and contrasted leadership and organizational commitment. Bass and Avolio (1994) asserted that there is positive influence on employee's commitment when transformational leaders encourage their followers to think critically and creatively. Walumbwa and Lawler (2003) supported the findings of Bass and Avolio and claimed that transformational leaders can motivate and increase the motivational level of followers by understanding their needs and assisting them in solving problems creatively. In addition, Lee (2004) noted positive correlation between transformational leadership and organizational commitment. Therefore, employees are committed to the organization if they trust and have confidence in their leaders who practice transformational leadership. However, these studies were conducted in the industries. The governing structure, culture and work ethics in educational sector vary from that of the industry and the findings on leadership styles and its effect of teacher commitment might differ between the two sectors.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design, Population and Sample

The study employed a quantitative survey to assess the extent of leadership styles on teacher commitment. Forty four private and public basic schools were selected and the researcher used random sampling technique to select 450 samples from the selected school. The population comprised of directors, circuit supervisors, head teachers, and teachers in both private and public basic schools in Greater Accra metropolitan area of Ghana. The participants were selected because of their leadership roles in the schools. The directors, for example, coordinate and provide oversight responsibility of the district directorates; the heads of institutions have managerial roles, and in some cases, perform teaching duties; while the circuit supervisors are assigned groups of schools to ensure effective teaching and learning (MOE, 2002). All the participants were professional teachers with at least certificate 'A' and assumed various levels of roles and responsibilities.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X (used to collect data on leadership styles) and the Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment (used to collect data on commitment) survey instruments were employed. The questionnaire was self-administered to the participants. The data collected were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Scientists) version 16.0. The study employed Linear Regression Analysis to analyze the data in order to adequately answer the research questions. The independent variable was leadership style (that is transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire) and the dependent variable was employee commitment.

Data Collection Instruments

For the first instrument, the participants responded to 45-items Likert-type statements on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X of the three major leadership styles. Leadership constructs were represented by a mean score on a 5-point scale, where 4 (*Frequently, if not always*) represents the maximum score of the scale, 3 (*Fairly often*), 2 (*Sometimes*), 1 (*Once in a while*), and 0 (*Not at all*) represents the minimum score. The second instrument was the TCM commitment instrument. The participants responded to 18-items Likert-type statements on the commitment instrument of the three major types of commitment (i.e., affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment). Items on the commitment instrument were represented by a mean score on a 7-point scale, where 7 (*Strongly agree*) represents the maximum score of the scale, 6 (*Agree*), 5 (*Slightly agree*), 4 (*Undecided*), 3 (*Slightly disagree*), 2 (*Disagree*), and 1 (*Strongly disagree*) represents the minimum score.

DATA ANALYSIS

Characteristics of the Respondents

Out of the total of 450 who were given the questionnaire, 356 completed the survey, representing 79.1% response rate. From the questionnaires that were received, 60.7% of the participants were from the public schools and 39.3% were from the private schools; 46.6% were males and 53.4% were females; and 7.9% of the participants had 0-3 years of experience, 13.5% had 4-6 years of experience, 19.4% had 7-10 years of experience, 24.0%

had 11-15 years of experience, 22.9% had 16-20 years of experience, and 12.3% had over 20 years of experience.

Description of the Data

Table 1 showed the summarised descriptive statistics of the transactional leadership style, transformational leadership style, three component commitment model, and the laissez faire leadership style.

Table 1. Distribution of Mean Scores on Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X and the Three-Component Model

Testing of Hypotheses

The research questions evaluated the extent of leadership styles on teacher commitment. The four hypotheses tested the impact of leadership styles on teacher commitment. When testing for all the four hypotheses, TCM (teacher commitment) was assigned the dependent variable, and the TF (transformational leadership style), TS (transactional leadership style), and LF (laissez-faire leadership style) were the predictor variables.

The Impact of Transformation Leadership Style on Teacher Commitment

H₀₁: *There is no significant impact of transformational leadership style on teacher commitment as measured by Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X and the TCM Employee Commitment survey.*

The simple linear regression analysis of the impact of TF on TCM is represented in the following model where β_0 and β_1 denote a constant and a slope (coefficient of regression) respectively.

$$TCM = \beta_0 + \beta_1 TF$$

The mean score on the TCM was 4.12 ($N = 214$; $SD = .84$) and the mean score on the TF was 2.63 ($N = 214$; $SD = .68$). The results indicated that 4.2% ($R^2 = .042$) of the variance in employee commitment (TCM) was explained by the transformation leadership style (TF) (see Table 2). The test statistic was not significant ($F(1, 212) = 9.275$; $p > 0.001$), showing that transformation leadership style (TF) does not significantly influence TCM (see Table 3). Hence, the null hypothesis was supported and would not be rejected. Table 4 confirmed the

impact of TF on employee commitment ($t(212) = 3.045; p > .001$), suggesting that transformational leadership style does not make significant contribution to teacher commitment, indicating that there are other factors that might contribute to teacher commitment.

Table 2. Model Summary for Regression of TCM on Transformation Leadership (TF)

Table 3. ANOVA for Regression of TCM on Transformation Leadership (TF)

Table 4. Coefficients for Regression Model of TCM on Transformation Leadership (TF)

The Impact of Transactional leadership Style on Teacher Commitment

H₀₂: *There is no significant impact of transactional leadership on teacher commitment as measured by Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X and the TCM Employee Commitment survey.*

The simple linear regression analysis of the impact of TS on TCM is represented in the following model where β_0 and β_1 denote a constant and a slope (coefficient of regression) respectively.

$$TCM = \beta_0 + \beta_1 TS$$

The mean score on the TCM was 4.10 ($N = 215; SD = .85$) and that of TS was 2.05 ($N = 215; SD = .57$). The results indicated that 21.3% ($R^2 = .213$) of the variance in employee commitment (TCM) was explained by the transactional leadership style (see Table 5). The test statistic was significant ($F(1, 213) = 57.647; p < 0.001$), showing that transactional leadership style significantly and positively influences TCM (see Table 6). Hence, the null hypothesis was not supported and would be rejected. From Table 7, transactional leadership style affects employee commitment ($t(213) = 13.890; p < .001$), suggesting that transactional leadership makes contribution to the model.

Table 5. Model Summary for Regression of TCM on Transactional Leadership (TS)

Table 6. ANOVA for Regression of TCM on Transactional Leadership (TS)

Table 7. Coefficients for Regression Model of TCM on Transactional Leadership (TS)

The Impact of Laissez-faire Leadership Style on Teacher Commitment

H₀₃: *There is no significant impact of laissez-faire leadership style on teacher commitment as measured by Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X and the TCM Employee Commitment survey.*

The simple linear regression analysis of the impact of LF (laissez-faire leadership) on TCM is represented in the following model where β_0 and β_1 denote a constant and a slope (coefficient of regression) respectively.

$$TCM = \beta_0 + \beta_1 LF$$

The mean score on the TCM was 4.13($N = 259$; $SD = .81$) and that of LF was 1.34($N = 259$; $SD = .91$). The results indicated that 1.3% ($R^2 = .013$) of the variance in employee commitment (TCM) was explained by the laissez-faire leadership style (LF) (see Table 8). The test statistic was not significant ($F(1, 257) = 3.502$; $p > 0.001$), showing that LF does not significantly influence TCM (see Table 9). Hence, the null hypothesis was supported and would not be rejected. Table 10 confirmed that LF does not significantly impact employee commitment ($t(259) = 13.890$; $p > .001$), suggesting that laissez-faire leadership style does not make significant contribution to teacher commitment.

Table 8. Model Summary for Regression of TCM on Laissez-faire leadership (LF)

Table 9. ANOVA for Regression of TCM on Laissez-faire leadership (LF)

Table 10. Coefficients for Regression Model of TCM on Laissez-faire leadership (LF)

The Impact of Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-faire Leadership Styles on Teacher Commitment

H₀₄: There is no significant impact of leadership style (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) on teacher commitment as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X and the TCM (Three-Component Model) Employee Commitment survey.

The multiple linear regression analysis of the impact of TF (transformational), TS (transactional), and LF (laissez-faire) leadership styles on teacher commitment (TCM) is represented in the following model, where β_0 is a constant; β_1 , β_2 , β_3 , denote the coefficients of regression; and ε represents any other factor that may affect employee commitment.

$$TCM = \beta_0 + \beta_1 TF + \beta_2 TS + \beta_3 LF + \varepsilon$$

The mean score on the teacher commitment was 4.10($N = 171$; $SD = .86$), the mean score on the TF was 2.63($N = 171$; $SD = .69$), the mean score on the TS was 2.07($N = 171$; $SD = .59$), the mean score on the LF was 1.43($N = 171$; $SD = .90$). The results indicated that 21.3% ($R^2 = .213$) of TCM was explained by the TF, TS, LF (see Table 11). The test statistic was significant ($F(3, 167) = 15.027$; $p < 0.001$), showing that TF, TS, LF significantly influence employee commitment (see Table 12). Therefore, the null hypothesis would be rejected. Table 13 showed that the three variables affect TCM at various levels of significance. The following are the absolute values of the standardized estimate, (b) of these factors, from largest to smallest: TS ($b = .672$, $t = 5.558$, $p < 0.001$), TF ($b = .046$, $t = .451$, $p < 0.001$), and LF ($b = -.033$, $t = -.419$, $p > 0.001$). The analysis suggested that the independent variables explaining the greatest amount of variance in TCM were in order of

predicative value: TS, TF, and LF. The coefficient of regression model revealed that TS contributed most significantly to the model and LF's contribution was the least.

Table 11. Model Summary for Regression of TCM on TF, LF, TS Leadership Styles

Table 12. ANOVA for Regression of TCM on TF, LF, TS Leadership Styles

Table 13. Coefficients for Regression Model of TCM on TF, TS, LF leadership

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The first research question enquired whether the transformational leadership style has an impact on teacher commitment. The transformational leadership style indicated only 4.2% of the variance in teacher commitment, showing that there are other factors that contribute to teacher commitment. That is, transformational leadership style does not significantly influence teacher commitment in the study's environment. This also indicated that transformational leadership style is only partly practiced in the basic schools in Ghana. Lack of transformational leadership practices in Ghanaian basic schools mean that leaders do not articulate a vision that motivate and inspire teachers to be committed and put in extra effort to attain organizational goals. This may have contributed to the poor educational outcomes.

The second research question determined the impact of transactional leadership style on teacher commitment. The results indicated that 21.3% of the variance in teacher commitment was explained by the transactional leadership style, showing that transactional leadership style positively influences teacher commitment. This also indicated that transactional leadership style was mostly practiced in basic schools in Ghana. The implication of this result is that educational leaders in Ghanaian basic schools focus greatly on compliance and completion of task (e.g., giving of a number exercises, preparing teaching and learning materials, lesson notes preparation, etc.), which are bureaucratic (Bass, 1978) and not necessarily gaining commitment from the teachers. Leaders also depend on contingent reward and punishment to gain teacher commitment. This might mean that teachers only follow stiff rules to avoid punishment. As a result of stringent procedures, innovation to explain some concepts to the understanding of pupils may be lacking, resulting in the falling trend of educational standards.

The third research question determined the impact of laissez-faire leadership style on teacher commitment. It was found that 1.3% of the variance in employee commitment accounted for by laissez-faire leadership style. This showed that laissez-faire leadership style do not significantly influence teacher commitment. Thus, employees are not committed to their work when the leaders practice laissez-faire leadership style. The practice of laissez-faire leadership style is not predominant in the study's environment.

Finally, the effect of transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership on teacher commitment was conducted. The result indicated that 21.3% of the variance in teacher commitment was explained by the transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership. That is, there are other factors that influence teacher commitment not included in the model. Other possible factors such as teacher competency, job satisfaction, remuneration, performance, and working environment in educational sector can affect teacher commitment. The result also showed that transactional leadership style contributes greatly to teacher commitment, followed by

transformational leadership, while laissez-faire leadership contributes only insignificantly. Therefore, the transactional leadership style is pre-dominant in basic schools. With high level of transactional leadership in Ghanaian basic schools, coupled with falling standards of students' academic achievement, it is expected that leaders should turn to transformational leadership style. That is, transformational leadership is essential skills for school instructors and their leaders in today's school administration (Marzano et al., 2005; Leithwood, 1992).

CONCLUSION

The rationale of this study was to gain a better understanding of the effect of leadership styles of educational leadership on teacher commitment. The study sought to determine leadership style that enhances teacher. The results of the study indicated that the dominant leadership style practiced in Ghanaian basic schools is transactional leadership. Transformational leadership, regarded as the highest leadership style in full range leadership development model (Bass and Avolio, 1997), is partially practiced. Laissez-faire leadership had a very low score. It is expected that when transformational leadership style is practiced, teacher commitment will be enhanced, and there would be an improvement in educational standards.

Based on the findings, the study recommends a change in the leaders' style of leadership to transformational leadership, which is required in order to motivate teachers to be more committed and work harder. Kedsuda et al. (2007) found that transformational leaders produce higher leadership outcomes than transactional leaders. The study recommends that the Ministry of Education should organize frequent leadership training programs, seminars, and workshops for leaders in educational sector. The training programs should include articulation of institutional vision, employment relations, and strategic achievement of institutional goal; all of which form a crucial area of transformational leadership. Moreover, the ministry should provide effective supervision and monitoring of teachers and heads of schools. Though this study provides policy-makers and practitioners guidelines and strategies to enhance leadership and teacher commitment in basic schools, it did not investigate how the various sub-constructs of the main leadership styles could affect commitment. These were not investigated; as such there will be further studies in these areas.

References

- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B.J., and Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). "Context and Leadership: An Examination of the Nine-factor Full-range Leadership Theory Using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.14, pp. 261–295.
- Avolio, B. J. and Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Third Edition Manual and Sampler Set*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden, Inc
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., and Jung, D. I. (1999), "Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 72 No.4, pp. 441-463.
- Barbuto (2005). "Motivation and Transactional, Charismatic, and Transformational Leadership: A Test of Antecedents", *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, Vol. 11, 4: pp. 26-40
- Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1994), *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Bass, B. (1985), *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*, Free Press, New York, NY.
- Bass, B. M. (1995), "Theory of transformational leadership redux", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 463–478.
- Bass, B.M. (1999), "Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 8, No.1. pp. 9-32.
- Bass, B. M., and Riggio, R. (2006), *Transformational leadership (2nd ed.)*, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
- Brown, R. J. (1991), "Cooperatives in managerial transition: What is the least disruptive way to introduce change?" *Management Quarterly*, Vol. 32 No1, pp. 22-24.
- Burke, W. W. (1979), "Leaders and their development". *Group and Organization Studies*, Vol.43, pp. 273-281.
- DeJaeghere J.G., Chapman D.W. and Mulkeen A. (2006), "Increasing the supply of secondary teachers in sub-Saharan Africa: a stakeholder assessment of policy options in six countries". *Journal of Education Policy*. Vol. 21 No. 5, pp. 515-533.
- Hallinger, P. (2003), "Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership". *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol.33 No.3, pp. 329-346.

- Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K. H. (1972), *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources (2nd ed.)*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- House, R. J. (1996), "Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory". *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 7 pp. 323–352.
- Iverson, R.D. and Buttigieg, D.M. (1999), "Affective, normative and continuance commitment: can the 'right' kind of commitment be managed?" *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 36 No.3, pp. 307–333.
- Lee, Y. and Chang, H. (2006), "Leadership style and innovation ability: An empirical study of Taiwanese wire and cable companies". *Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge*, Vol. 9 No.2, pp. 218-222.
- Leithwood, K. (1992), "The move toward transformational leadership". *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 49.No.5, pp. 8-12.
- Marzano, R.J., Waters, T. and McNulty, B .A. (2005), *School leadership that works*, McREL, Denver, CO.
- Meyer, J. P. and Allen, N. J. (1996), "Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 49, pp. 252–276.
- Meyer, J. and Allen, N. (1997), *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, & application*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Ministry of Education, MOE (2002), "Education Sector Review", Retrieve from www.moe.gov.gh/docs/ESR%20Reports/Chapter%206-9.pdf
- Mowday, R.T., (1998), "Reflections on the study and relevance of organizational commitment," *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 8 No.4, pp. 387-401.
- Nicholson, (2007). "Leading Where it Counts: An Investigation of the Leadership Styles and Behaviors that Define College and University Presidents as Successful Fundraisers", *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, Vol.7, pp. 256–270.
- Northouse, G. (2007), *Leadership Theory and Practice*, (3rd ed.), New Delhi, Sage Publications, Inc. Thousand Oak, London.
- Khurram, Kashif and Muhammad (2010), "HR Practices and Leadership Styles as Predictors of Employee Attitude and Behavior: Evidence from Pakistan" *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol.4 No. 3.
- Sosik, J. J. and Jung, D. I. (2010), *Full range leadership development: Pathways for people, profit and planet*, Routledge, New York, NY.
- Oduro, Dachi, Fertig, and Rarieya, (2007), Examining Educational Leadership and Quality in Developing countries, *EdQual*, No. 9

Raju and Srivastava (1994), "Factors Contributing to Commitment to the Teaching Profession", *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 8 No. 5, pp.7 –13

Republic of Ghana (2009), Budget statement and economic policy. Retrieve from www.ghana.gov.gh

The World Bank (2011), Promoting Gender Equality through Human Development Retrieved from www.worldbank.org

Ying and Kamarul (2009). "The moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationships between leadership behavior and organizational commitment and between organizational commitment and job satisfaction and performance". *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, Vol. 30 No.1, pp. 53-86.

Peace Kumah s currently a doctoral student of SMC University, Switzerland, pursuing Business Administration. She holds MBA (Human Resource Management) degree from Wisconsin International University College, Accra, Ghana in 2013. She obtained her Bachelor degree in Education (2007) from the University of Cape Coast, Ghana. She has several years of teaching experience and occupies leadership positions in various educational institutions. She has published in both local and international journals. Her research interest includes organization leadership and motivation, change management, and employment relations.

Table 1. Distribution of Mean Scores on Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X and the Three-Component Model

		TS - Transactional Leadership Style	TF - Transformational Leadership Style	TCM - Three Component Model (Commitment)	LF - Laissez-faire Leadership Style
N	Valid	248	243	287	304
	Missing	108	113	69	52
Mean		2.05	2.62	4.13	1.38
Std. Deviation		.57	.69	.81	.95
Minimum		.83	.35	1.00	.00
Maximum		5.75	4.00	6.28	3.75

Table 2. Model Summary for Regression of TCM on Transformation Leadership (TF)
Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.205 ^a	.042	.037	.82663	1.618

a. Predictors: (Constant), TF

b. Dependent Variable: TCM

Table 3. ANOVA for Regression of TCM on Transformation Leadership (TF)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	6.338	1	6.338	9.275	.003 ^a
	Residual	144.863	212	.683		
	Total	151.201	213			

a. Predictors: (Constant), TF

b. Dependent Variable: TCM

Table 4. Coefficients for Regression Model of TCM on Transformation Leadership (TF)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.454	.225		15.319	.000
	TF	.253	.083	.205	3.045	.003

a. Dependent Variable: TCM

Table 5. Model Summary for Regression of TCM on Transactional Leadership (TS)

Model Summary ^b				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.462 ^a	.213	.209	.75819

a. Predictors: (Constant), TS

b. Dependent Variable: TCM

Table 6. ANOVA for Regression of TCM on Transactional Leadership (TS)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	33.138	1	33.138	57.647	.000 ^a
	Residual	122.444	213	.575		
	Total	155.582	214			

a. Predictors: (Constant), TS

b. Dependent Variable: TCM

Table 7. Coefficients for Regression Model of TCM on Transactional Leadership (TS)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.686	.193		13.890	.000
	TS	.689	.091	.462	7.593	.000

a. Dependent Variable: TCM

Table 8. Model Summary for Regression of TCM on Laissez-faire leadership (LF)

Model Summary ^b				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.116 ^a	.013	.010	.81344

a. Predictors: (Constant), LF

b. Dependent Variable: TCM

Table 9. ANOVA for Regression of TCM on Laissez-faire leadership (LF)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.317	1	2.317	3.502	.062 ^a
	Residual	170.053	257	.662		

Total 172.371 258

a. Predictors: (Constant), LF

b. Dependent Variable: TCM

Table 10. Coefficients for Regression Model of TCM on Laissez-faire leadership (LF)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.991	.090		44.328	.000
	LF	.104	.056	.116	1.871	.062

a. Dependent Variable: TCM

Table 11. Model Summary for Regression of TCM on TF, LF, TS Leadership Styles

Model Summary ^b					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1	.461 ^a	.213	.198	.77439	

a. Predictors: (Constant), TF, LF, TS

b. Dependent Variable: TCM

Table 12. ANOVA for Regression of TCM on TF, LF, TS Leadership Styles

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	27.035	3	9.012	15.027	.000 ^a
	Residual	100.146	167	.600		
	Total	127.181	170			

a. Predictors: (Constant), TF, LF, TS

b. Dependent Variable: TCM

Table 13. Coefficients for Regression Model of TCM on TF, TS, LF leadership

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		

1	(Constant)	2.636	.297		8.875	.000
	LF	-.033	.078	-.034	-.419	.676
	TS	.672	.121	.456	5.558	.000
	TF	.046	.102	.037	.451	.653

a. Dependent Variable: TCM