



Diá-logos

ISSN: 1996-1642

ISSN: 2958-9754

eduardo.menjivar@udb.edu.sv

Universidad Don Bosco

El Salvador

Kwadwo Aboagye, Samuel; Ayikue Assumpta, Mary
Leadership Styles of Headteachers, Teacher Commitment
and Academic Performance within Ejisu Municipality
Diá-logos, vol. 16, núm. 29, 2024, Julio-Diciembre, pp. 29-42
Universidad Don Bosco
Soyapango, El Salvador, El Salvador

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.61604/dl.v16i29.359>

Disponible en: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=814383517003>

- ▶ [Cómo citar el artículo](#)
- ▶ [Número completo](#)
- ▶ [Más información del artículo](#)
- ▶ [Página de la revista en redalyc.org](#)

redalyc.org

Sistema de Información Científica Redalyc
Red de revistas científicas de Acceso Abierto diamante
Infraestructura abierta no comercial propiedad de la academia

Leadership Styles of Headteachers, Teacher Commitment and Academic Performance within Ejisu Municipality

Estilos de Liderazgo de los Directores,
Compromiso Docente y Rendimiento
Académico en el Municipio de Ejisu

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.61604/dl.v16i29.359>

Samuel Kwadwo Aboagye¹

University of Education, Winneba, Ghana

Correo: skaboagye@aamusred.edu.gh,

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2802-3288>



Mary Ayikue Assumpta²

University of Wisconsin Milwaukee, USA

Correo: maayikue@aamusted.edu.gh,

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0107-8658>



Recibido: 30 de abril de 2024

Aceptado: 12 de septiembre de 2024

Para citar este artículo: Kwadwo, S., y Ayikue, M. (2024). Leadership Styles of Headteachers, Teacher Commitment and Academic Performance within Ejisu Municipality, *Diálogos*, (29), 29-42

¹Doctor of Educational Leadership, University of Education, Winneba, Ghana, Lecturer at Akenten Appiah-Menkah University of Skills Training and Entrepreneurial Development, Kumasi, Ghana.

²Doctor of Philosophy in Urban Education, University of Wisconsin Milwaukee, USA, Lecturer at Akenten Appiah-Menkah University of Skills Training and Entrepreneurial Development, Kumasi, Ghana.



Nuestra revista publica bajo la Licencia Creative Commons: Atribución-No Comercial-Sin Derivar 4.0 Internacional

Resumen

Este fue un estudio de encuesta destinado a descubrir la relación entre los estilos de liderazgo, el compromiso de los docentes y el rendimiento académico dentro del municipio de Ejisu. Los investigadores seleccionaron intencionalmente a 50 directores y 210 profesores, utilizando la calculadora de tamaño de muestra de Raosoff. Se utilizó un conjunto de cuestionarios cerrados que comprendían 67 ítems para los encuestados. Los datos se analizaron mediante estadística descriptiva, prueba T y análisis de correlación. El estudio descubrió, entre otras cosas, que estilos de liderazgo como el democrático, transaccional, autocrático, situacional y laissez-faire influyeron significativamente en el compromiso de los docentes en las escuelas seleccionadas para el estudio. Sin embargo, el estilo de liderazgo de laissez-faire tuvo una influencia negativa en el compromiso de los docentes. También se reveló que los estilos de liderazgo democrático y transaccional tuvieron un efecto positivo en el rendimiento académico y fue estadísticamente significativo. Por lo tanto, el estudio recomendó que la Dirección Municipal de Educación organice seminarios sobre estilos de liderazgo, compromiso docente y rendimiento académico para los directores, sus auxiliares y todos los jefes de departamento, para que conozcan no sólo la influencia que estos estilos de liderazgo tienen en el compromiso docente y académico, desempeño sino también las relaciones positivas entre estos conceptos en la gestión de cualquier sistema escolar en términos de desempeño académico positivo.

Palabras clave

Estilos de liderazgo, director, compromiso docente, rendimiento académico.

Abstract

This was a survey study aimed at finding out the relationship between leadership styles, teacher commitment, and academic performance within the Ejisu Municipality. The researchers selected 50 headteachers purposively and 210 teachers, using the sample size calculator by Raosoff. A set of closed-ended questionnaires was used, and this comprised 67 items for the respondents. The data was analyzed, using descriptive statistics, T-tests, and correlation analysis. The study discovered, among other things, that leadership styles such as democratic, transactional, autocratic, situational, and laissez-faire significantly influenced teacher commitment in the schools selected for the study. However, laissez-faire leadership style had a negative influence on teacher commitment. It was also revealed that democratic and transactional leadership styles had a positive effect on academic performance, and it was statistically significant. The study, therefore, recommended that the Municipal Education Directorate should organize seminars on leadership styles, teacher commitment, and academic performance for headteachers, their assistants, and all heads of department so they know not only the influence these leadership styles have on teacher commitment, and academic performance but also the positive relationships between these concepts in the management of any school system in terms of positive academic performance.

Keywords

leadership styles, headteacher, teacher commitment, academic performance.

Introduction

Background to the study

School leadership calls for certain characteristics, demands, and roles which are performed, based on individual styles and beliefs. The school leader, for example, acts as an instructional leader to manage the nature of teaching and learning in the school; as a curriculum implementer to ensure the attainment of suitable standards; as a relational expert when it comes to dealing with teachers, parents, and students; and still supervising administration and management of scanty resources (Amunga, Were, & Ashioya, 2020). According to Lambrecht, Lenkeit, Hartmann, Ehlert, Knigge and Spörer (2022), school leadership goes beyond organizational leadership, since school leadership demands individualized styles.

Leadership practices or behaviors exhibited by the leader in the course of playing his role as the school leader can be described as his style. Such leadership styles could be democratic, laissez-faire, autocratic or situational, transformational, and transactional (if you are talking about behaviors) as some people describe them. The leadership styles employed by the headteacher go a long way to determining the level of improvement of schools. For instance, many scholars agree that the type of leadership style or leadership behavior that goes with transformational leadership will help schools

to change positively (Edwards & Aboagye, 2015). However, a leader may practice two, three, or more styles in his or her leadership functions, depending on situations and the kind of relationship existing between him or her and the staff, particularly, the teachers. Whatever styles a leader exhibits may be influenced by his/her socio-cultural practice.

If there is a culture of trust in terms of relationship between and among the headteacher, the teachers and other staff members, there is likely to be school success. This is so because there is the belief that school success depends on the commitment level of all stakeholders of the school, which invariably affects the atmosphere for teachers and other staff to commit to their respective roles and performances. Teacher commitment, in this respect, is crucial, considering the influence it exerts on teaching and learning.

Most studies, in talking about teacher commitment, dwell mostly on teacher absenteeism, lateness, contact hours, learners' support, etc. In most cases, however, the teacher performs multi-dimensional functions to keep the learning atmosphere conducive. These multi-dimensional functions include, attending to *immediacy*, *unpredictability*, and *simultaneity* in classroom management (Arends, 1994). In this context, the teacher's ability to manage instructional delivery in a conducive, learning environment may result from how leadership performs in the school system.

The effort of the headteacher in creating a conducive learning environment, in most cases, is aimed at not only eliciting an appreciable level of teacher commitment but also improving the academic performance of students. Studies have shown that teacher commitment and conditions for academic performance will depend on the style of leadership for change (Roesminingsih & Trihantoyo, 2022). In other words, headteachers' leadership is responsible for creating the conditions for appropriate teacher commitment and academic performance. Such a conducive school environment promotes teaching and learning and encourages teacher commitment.

Statement of the problem

Data from the GES/Statistics Services indicate that there is a great concern for schools to raise academic performance, particularly in certain subject areas, such as Mathematics, Science, and Technology. Anamuah-Mensah and colleagues raised the alarm in a nationwide report (Ghana, 2014) on poor performance in Integrated Science and Core Mathematics with about 60% obtaining poor grades. The same report pointed out that second-year students at Junior High School (JHS2) performed poorly in international assessments such as, Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). Many concerned citizens of Ejisu Municipality have expressed a similar situation regarding education outcomes in the area. Stakeholders of education within the Ejisu Municipality, in particular, are interested in following the trends in education, concerning teacher commitment. In this respect, gathering the views of headteachers and teachers on the relationship between leadership styles of headteachers, teacher commitment, and academic performance of students within the Ejisu Municipality in this study could be deemed as important. The study had the objectives of:

1. Finding out the influence of headteachers' leadership styles on teacher commitment, and
2. identifying the relationship between leadership styles of headteachers, teacher commitment and academic performance of students within the Ejisu Municipality.

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What is the influence of headteachers' leadership styles on teacher commitment?
2. What is the relationship between leadership styles of headteachers, teacher commitment, and the academic performance of students within the Ejisu Municipality?

In terms of significance, the study primarily sought to add to the wealth of knowledge on the practice of school leadership. Through the research, recommendations could be made to the leaders and other stakeholders of education concerning the need for improved teacher commitment on their various campuses. Other information that might come up through the research will provide a useful guide for future research on leadership styles, teacher commitment, and academic performance. Significantly, the study will contribute to educational reforms and policy-making decisions at the basic level. Finally, it will contribute to the scholarly literature on African educational systems, especially in the area of school leadership.

Review of literature

Over the past decade, school leadership has assumed increased importance. The principal's role as a school manager has shifted toward a direct responsibility for classroom results as measured by students' academic improvement. In turn, school leaders are obligated to positively influence the teachers to help raise students' performance. This paradigm shift generates a school-wide need to focus on school improvement. Teachers experience direct contact with students and control over the content and the climate of the classroom (Walker & Graham, 2021). Consequently, school heads must seek methods to raise students' achievement by adopting leadership styles that can influence teachers to help raise students' academic performance. The review specifically looked at different styles and behaviours.

The choice of these styles was based on their popularity and simplicity. In addition, the researchers considered the nature of respondents, and the issues to be raised in a study at a setting such as school leadership. The review further looked at teacher commitment and academic performance because of their assumed relationships with leadership styles.

Leadership styles

All formal organizations are established for purposes, and owners of such organizations desire that the purposes of those organizations are attained at reduced costs and with much ease (Lammers, 2019). In ensuring that the purposes of organizations stay within attainable limits, goals have to be followed and it is through effective leadership that goals can stay focused with little or no deviations (Nawaz & Khan, 2016).

Leadership ought to acquire the necessary skills, methods, and styles needed to handle various individuals within various organizations. (Berkey, 2004) is of the view that leadership is a craft that must be administered to achieve the mission of the organization.

Democratic leadership

This is the type of leadership style, which is open to members of the organization for their contribution towards the running of that organization. It is worth recognizing, however, that despite this openness in democratic leadership, the leader helps his staff to operate as colleagues, collaborators, a team, and partners. Here, healthy discussions lead to group decisions. This style of leadership, according to (Afful-Broni, 2004), is characterized by responses of co-operation, enthusiasm, acceptance of more responsibility, and recognition of the worth of each worker. To Afful-Broni, the leader, here, considers himself or herself as first among equals.

The leader who practices a democratic leadership style might have his beliefs stemming from Douglas McGregor's Theory Y, which shows a lot of respect to the average human being. Theory Y assumptions include the fact that people by nature: have integrity; work hard towards objectives to which they are committed; assume responsibility within commitments; desire to achieve; are capable of directing their own behavior; want their organization to succeed; are not passive and submissive; are not stupid; and will make decisions within their commitments.

Autocratic leadership

This type of leadership style is the direct opposite of democratic leadership in the sense that the leader here is quite domineering in his actions and decisions (Harms, Wood, Landay, Lester & Lester, 2018). With this style of leadership, the leader seems to be the only dreamer whose dreams have to be forced into reality. For the realization of his dreams, according to Harms et al., (2018) the autocratic leader determines and sets out the policies within the organization. Nawaz and Khan (2016) believe that members of the organization are assigned duties without their consent.

Under autocratic leadership, the leader does not entertain suggestions or initiatives from subordinates. There is little or no room for consultation. According to (Afful-Broni, 2004), communication is virtually non-existent, or if it exists at all in the organization, it hangs up precariously in a manner where its benefits can hardly be realized. When the leader issues directives, no individual or groups have the audacity to question but must carry out the directives. Even experts can be ignored before vital decisions are taken. This style of leadership, to (Afful-Broni, 2004), is characterized by threats, warnings, dismissals and coercion. Views expressed contrary to those of the leader are seen as attempts to undermine or sabotage the leader. Members within an organization where this leadership style operates, live in fear and intimidation. The presence and absence of the leader dictate the behavior of members of the organization put on. There is the view that the sense of fear, doubt, and disregard shown through this leadership style has received it other names such as authoritarian, dictatorial, military, "master says" leadership, and others. (Samuel, Jophus, & Francis, 2019).

Psychologists are of the view that this kind of leadership style has its roots in leaders' sense of fear and feelings of insecurity (Beatty, 2013). Not much is achieved, in the absence of such leaders. Such leaders' style of leadership might stem from their entrenched belief in McGregor's Theory X, which derides people as naturally: lacking

honesty; being essentially lazy and eager to work as little as possible; dodging duty; not being interested in achievements; being incapable of directing their behavior; being indifferent to organizational needs; preferring to be directed by others; not being very bright; and avoiding making decisions whenever possible (Samuel et al., 2019).

Laissez-faire leadership

What is said about democratic and autocratic leadership lends credence to the fact that the two leadership styles are at the extreme, opposing ends of the field of play for leadership styles (Ahmed & Simha, 2023). Between the two extreme styles could lay other leadership styles. However, lying directly in the middle of democratic and autocratic leadership styles is the type of leadership tagged, among the francophone nomenclature, as laissez-faire which means "let them do what they wish" (Afful-Broni, 2004), an expression which seems to emanate directly from the leader who, for reasons best known to him or her, practices this style. A person may be in a leadership position without providing clear direction, leaving the group to choose its path in achieving aims (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 2017). Subordinates are given a free hand in deciding their policies and methods of achieving the goals of such policies. In this leadership style, there are no particular rules and regulations. Absolute freedom and autonomy are bestowed on members of the organization.

Leadership behaviors

There are certain behaviors that leadership will put on, depending on the circumstances and the desired purpose for achievement. In this respect, mention can be made of leadership behaviors or types like Transformational leadership, Transactional leadership, Situational leadership, etc.

Transactional and transformational leadership

The emotional relationship between a leader and his followers is the basis of transactional leadership. Hamstra, Van Yperen, Wisse, & Sassenberg, (2014) and Burns (1978) stated that the relations of most leaders and followers are transactional – leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another. Decuyper & Schaufeli (2020) and Chemers (1997), explains transactional theory of leadership as being focused on motivating follower through fair exchanges and by clarifying mutual responsibilities and benefits. Chemers sees this theory as implying that levels of influence rest solely on the followers' perceptions of authority and its legitimacy.

In his 1990 study conducted for the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Bass offers that transactional leadership can provide stability, structure and readiness during times of crisis or urgency (Bass, 1990). Transactional leadership simply focuses on the transactions between leaders, colleagues, and followers (Bass, 1990). This exchange is based on the leader discussing with others what is required and specifying the conditions and rewards. These, others will receive if they fulfill those requirements (Bass, 1990).

Contrarily, transformational leadership focuses on the intellectual perceptions of the leader. (Burns, 1978) introduced transformational leadership by identifying intellectual leaders; he explained that intellectual leaders seek to change their social milieus.

He contended that the concept of intellectual leadership brings in the role of conscious purpose drawn from values. Intellectual leadership, therefore, leads us to the discovery of transforming leadership. Out of the varying motives of people, out of the combat and competition between groups and between persons, out of the making of countless choices and the sharpening and steeling of purpose, arise the elevating forces of leadership and the achievement of intended change (Bass, 1990). Transformational leadership can be seen as transactional leadership expanded to the extent that transformational leaders motivate others to do more than they originally intended and often even more than they thought possible. They set expectations that are more challenging and typically achieve higher performances (Bass, 1990).

(Yulk, 2013) recognized the feelings of trust, respect, and admiration towards the leader as a product of transformational leadership. He identifies three avenues of transforming and motivating followers: (1) making them more aware of the importance of task outcomes; (2) inducing them to transcend their self-interest for the sake of the organization or team; (3) activating their higher-order needs. Yulk describes the discovery of higher-order needs as a product of transformational leadership contrasts with the exchange, compliance product of transactional leadership. In his view, enthusiasm and commitment are common attributes of transformational leadership while transactional leadership will often provide nothing more than compliance with leader requests.

Situational leadership

In this section, a review of the synthesis of leadership styles defined as situational theory was conducted to illustrate the flexibility of the principal's choices. The use of a combination of leadership styles creates a myriad of tools for the leader. Situational leadership theory presents the principal with the transformational and transactional tools to proceed in the best interest of the school that is focused on teacher effectiveness (Blase, 1999).

Teacher relationships with administrators are of low consideration until an internal change is implemented which requires authoritative monitoring and accountability (Raza & Sikandar, 2018, Blanchard & Hersey, 1979). As purveyors of situational leadership, Blanchard and Hersey depict situational leadership as less dependent on the level of management and more dependent on the maturity of the teachers supervised.

Teacher perception of school leadership as researched by (Blase, 1999) is determined by the situation presented. Their 1999 qualitative study focused on the analysis of the administrative leadership styles as related to teacher perception. Their pragmatic presentation of analytical data leads the reader toward an understanding of the role of the principal in a teacher-focused school environment.

Hallinger and Heck presented a caution present in situational leadership theory through their findings in a meta-analysis of 42 studies. Only after the principal establishes a culture of accountability and control, should the level of engagement change toward the transfer of leadership (Hallinger, P., & Heck, R., 1998). Nevertheless, the authors found no positive results in a school leader's push for increasing student achievement without seeking to improve teacher capacity.

The importance of teacher commitment

The quality of an education system and the profession of educators within a system depend mainly on the teachers who guide and carry out most of the tasks and activities of education that take place within the schools and institutions in the system (Pedaste, Leijen, Poom-Valickis & Eisenschmidt, 2019). Moreover, the teachers play a very significant role in supplying, supporting and promoting instruction and learning of high quality. Working in both classrooms and other groups, teachers are under pressure to provide for and sustain high levels of performance, attitude and behavior in those whom they teach.

Many studies have shown that the quality of teaching was a major influence on student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Moreover, Coubergs, Struyven, Vanthournout, and Engels, (2017) identified quality of instruction as a key variable in his model of school learning alongside opportunity to learn, both of which were dependent on the teacher. It is not surprising that teachers and their commitment to their work are exposed to scrutiny and sometimes, critical comments from politicians, policy makers, employers, parents, students and other stakeholders (Couborgs et al., 2017).

Quality education cannot be achieved without the efforts of dedicated and highly committed teachers. Committed teachers must inculcate and nurture values that will guide the subsequent use of the learning of both knowledge and skills in the wider world outside the classroom and lecture theatre. Wang, Strong, Zhang & Liu, (2021) advanced two strong reasons why teacher commitment should be emphasized in the field of education. First, commitment was an internal force coming from within teachers themselves who had needs for greater responsibility, variety, and challenge in their work as their level of participation in education had grown. Second, external forces were directing both reform and development in education and seeking higher standards and greater accountability that were dependent upon each teacher's combined efforts, as well as the sustained efforts of the teachers within each school or institutional group.

The concept of academic performance

There is no question that much is expected from our educational system in terms of preparing future citizens, workers, and leaders. To that end, schools are expected to influence students' learning, socialization, and even vocational preparedness. The educational system in Ghana is largely examination oriented. The quality of education tends to be evaluated in terms of the number of students passing national examinations (Sekyere, 2010).

Despite the attention paid to a broad definition of educational outcomes, however, academic performance remains central.

It is an academic performance that is central to the efforts of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* to make schools accountable for assessing and improving student performance annually (Linn, Baker, & Betebenner, 2002). Furthermore, limitations in academic performance represent the primary implication for most students receiving special education services, and those limitations, if left unaddressed, constrain students' ability to pursue further education and get well-paid employment after schooling.

Although the importance of academic performance is rarely questioned, unanimity regarding its measurement has been elusive. The measurement of academic performance continues to be a controversial topic among policymakers, measurement experts, and educators (Kubiszyn & Borich, 2024).

Measuring academic performance can occur at multiple levels and serve multiple purposes. For example, classroom teachers often conduct formative and summative tests to evaluate students' mastery of course content and provide grades for students. State tests are designed primarily to measure progress at the school level. In particular, graduation tests are used to determine whether a student has mastered the minimum content and competencies required to receive further education or certificate (Nawaz & Khan, 2016).

Although performance on standardized tests receives the greatest attention in discussions of students' academic performance, teachers' evaluations of performance as indicated in course grades represent a common metric of student performance that often is more directly tied to the day-to-day business of teaching and learning than are annual standardized test scores. Grades serve a number of important functions. They communicate to students and parents, information about students' mastery of course content. In high school, a passing grade also is the criterion for a course's contribution to accumulated credit for graduation. Finally, grades provide information for consideration in college admissions (Sekyere, 2010).

However, as a measure of academic performance, teacher-given grades have well-known limitations. Grades are composite measures that account not only for students' content mastery but often for other factors, such as their class participation, attitudes, progress over time, and attendance. Both general and special educators are known to consider these various factors when grading, but to emphasize different factors. For example, special education teachers are less likely than general educators, to consider homework or attendance to be important in grading student performance, but are more likely to consider in-class participation to be important (Berkey, 2004). Moreover, substantial variations in grading practices occur across teachers and schools. Despite these complicating factors, student grades still are an important indicator within the academic performance outcome domain for students because they indicate success by a teacher's standards and success relative to other students in a given classroom.

Educators and the public have repeatedly, expressed concern over factors that influence students' performance in examinations. The most outstanding factor has to do with the organizational management of schools. For instance, Linn et al. (2002) noted that to improve students' performance head teachers are required first to improve the management of the schools. This can be done by setting a clear vision for the schools and communicate this vision to students, supporting its achievement by giving instructional leadership, provision of resources, and being visible in every part of the institution.

Lack of vision in the management of schools often leads to an imbalance in the allocation and use of resources. This is why Sergiovanni (2001) pointed out that poor results in education are related to the resources allocated to it. If this parameter is not recognized, it becomes very difficult to understand why school continues to perform poorly in national examinations. For example, in schools where parents are doing their

best in providing school facilities, such as science equipment, textbooks, and physical structures, the blame for poor performance is shifted to teachers. One of the core functions of schools is to take human raw materials (students) and convert them into something more valuable as employable adults. Of paramount importance, therefore, is the proper management of teachers, for their absence will invariably lead to low productivity on the part of the teachers.

Methodology

The study which was quantitative used the descriptive research design. Target population was 730 head teachers and teachers from 72 schools. Fifty schools were selected and the accessible population was 510. Fifty head teachers were chosen through census. Out of the 460 teachers, 210 of them were selected through samples size calculator by Raosoft (i.e., $N = 510$, $n = 260$, i.e. 50.98%). Instrumentation – questionnaire (closed-ended, all anchored on a 5-point Likert scale type) was used and respondents self-reported their views on heads’ leadership styles, and teacher commitment. Academic performance was measured through students’ reports.

The questionnaire was pilot-tested outside the study area, and the reliability of the questionnaire items was tested to generate Cronbach’s alpha ranging between .70 and .90 for the three variables. Sample demographics were first analyzed with descriptive statistics, using frequency and simple percentages (for categorical variables) and means, standard deviations (for the three main variables), and independent sample t-test. The research questions were answered using multiple regression.

Results

Leadership styles such as democratic, transactional, autocratic, situational, and laissez-faire significantly influenced teacher commitment in the schools selected for the study. However, laissez-faire leadership style had a negative influence on teacher commitment. However, democratic and transactional leadership styles had a positive effect on academic performance and it was statistically significant.

Descriptive statistics

Independent T-test analysis (headteachers)

The independent T-test was conducted, in respect of the headteachers, with the intention of highlighting the differences among demographic groups with regard to the study variables, particularly with gender groups. The results were found in Table 1.

Table 1

Independent t-test statistical scores for headteachers.

Variable/Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T	2-tailed sig	P
Democratic Leadership Style (Variable 1)						
Male	27	2.21	.94	-1.475	.147	
Female	23	2.61	.99	-1.469	.149	.922
Total/ Average	50	2.41	.965	-1.472	.148	

Laissez-faire Leadership Style (Variable 2)						
Male	27	1.98	.56	-.469	.641	.621
Female	23	2.05	.52	-.473	.639	
Total/ Average	50	2.01	.54	-.471	.640	
Autocratic Leadership Style (Variable 3)						
Male	27	3.56	.80	.074	.941	
Female	23	3.54	.94	.073	.942	318
Total/ Average	50	3.55	.87	.073	.941	
Situational Leadership Style (Variable 4)						
Male	27	3.64	.53	-.650	.519	
Female	23	3.74	.58	-.646	.522	.685
Total/ Average	50	3.69	.55	-.648	.520	
Transformational Leadership style (Variable 5)						
Male	27	2.10	.44	-.339	.736	
Female	23	2.14	.55	-.333	.741	
Total/ Average	50	2.10	.495	-.336	.738	.149
Transactional Leadership style (Variable 6)						
Male	27	3.83	.28	.672	.505	
Female	23	3.77	.33	.662	.511	
Total/ Average	50	3.80	.30	.667	.508	

Test of hypotheses

Research Question 1: do headteachers' leadership styles significantly influence teacher commitment within the Ejisu Municipality?

Regression estimates for the association between leadership style and teacher commitment.

Table 2

Regression estimates between leadership style and teacher commitment.

Variable	Regression Estimated [SE]	t-statistics
(Constant)	-2.41 [1.80]	-1.34 ^{NS}
Democratic	.47 [.14]	3.46 ^{***}
Laissez-faire	-.53 [.17]	-3.08 ^{***}
Autocratic	1.16 [.08]	15.32 ^{***}
Situational	.57 [.13]	4.51 ^{***}
Democratic	.47 [.14]	3.46 ^{***}
Transformational	-.03 [.08]	-.33 ^{NS}
Transactional	.31 [.06]	5.64 ^{***}
Model Summary		

R Square	.80
Adjusted R Square	.80
F [df]	169.83 [6]***

Test of hypotheses

Research Question 2: does teacher commitment significantly influence academic performance within the Ejisu Municipality?

Regression estimates for the association between leadership style and academic performance.

Table 3

Regression estimates between leadership style and academic performance.

Variable	Regression Estimated [SE]	t-statistics
(Constant)	46.08[.35]	131.81
Teacher Commitment	.28 [.04]	7.03***
Model Summary		
R Square	.98	
Adjusted R Square	.98	
F [df]	522.55 [2]***	

Test of Hypotheses

Research Question 3: does teacher commitment relate significantly with academic performance of students within the Ejisu Municipality?

Regression estimates for the association between leadership style and academic performance.

Table 4

Regression estimates between leadership style and academic performance.

Variable	Regression Estimated [SE]	t-statistics
(Constant)	41.91 [7.39]	5.68***
Democratic	.45 [.19]	2.37*
Laissez-faire	.34 [.09]	3.96***
Autocratic	-.56 [.18]	-3.20**
Situational	-.06 [.16]	-.40 ^{NS}
Transformational	.17 [.24]	.70 ^{NS}
Transactional	.35 [.15]	2.39*
Model Summary		
R Square	.97	
Adjusted R Square	.86	
F [df]	103.03[6]***	

Conclusion

It was a survey with simple questionnaire items on respondents' views on the relationship between leadership styles, teacher commitment, and academic performance. There was a sample size of 260 comprising 50 headteachers, purposively chosen through census and 210 teachers, selected out of 460 through a sample size calculator by Raosoft.

The study discovered that some leadership styles significantly influenced teacher commitment in the schools selected for the study. There is a positive relationship between teacher commitment and the academic performance of students within the Ejisu Municipality. Variances for the two groups (Male & female) were the same for all the variables.

Democratic and transactional leadership styles related positively to academic performance but laissez-faire had a negative relationship with academic performance. Variances for the two groups (Male & female) were the same for all the variables.

References

- Afful-Broni, A. (2004). *Theory and practice of educational leadership in Ghana*. Accra: Type Company Limited.
- Amunga, J., Were, D., & Ashioya, I. (2020). The Teacher-Parent Nexus in the Competency Based Curriculum Success Equation in Kenya. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 12(1), 60-76.
- Ahmed, S., & Simha, A. (2023). Autocratic leadership and abuse. In *Encyclopedia of Business and Professional Ethics* (pp. 159-161). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 3(18), 19-31.
- Berkey, J. (2004). *Leadership handbook of management and administration*. Michigan: Baker Books.
- Blanchard, K. H., & Hersey, P. (1996). Great ideas revisited. *Training & Development*, 50(1), 42-48.
- Beatty, B. R. (2013). *The emotions of leadership*. Educational Management: Major Themes in Education, 179.
- Blase, J. &. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 3(35), 349-378.
- Burns. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Haper & Row.
- Chemers, M. (1997). *An integrative theory of leadership*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Coubergs, C., Struyven, K., Vanthournout, G., & Engels, N. (2017). Measuring teachers' perceptions about differentiated instruction: The DI-Quest instrument and model. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 53, 41-54.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). *Teacher quality and students' achievement*. Boston: University Press.
- Decuyper, A., & Schaufeli, W. (2020). Leadership and work engagement: Exploring explanatory mechanisms. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*, 34(1), 69-95.
- Edwards, A. K. & Aboagye, S. K. (2015). Assessing school leadership challenges in Ghana, using leadership practices inventory. *International Journal of Education and Practices*, 3(4), 168-181.

- Ghana, M. o. (2014). *Report on Basic Statistics and Planning Parameters for Colleges of Education in Ghana 2012/2013*. Accra.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 19980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement Review*, 2(9), 157-191.
- Hamstra, M. R., Van Yperen, N. W., Wisse, B., & Sassenberg, K. (2014). Transformational and transactional leadership and followers' achievement goals. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29, 413-425.
- Harms, P. D., Wood, D., Landay, K., Lester, P. B., & Lester, G. V. (2018). Autocratic leaders and authoritarian followers revisited: A review and agenda for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 105-122.
- Kubiszyn, T., & Borich, G. D. (2024). *Educational testing and measurement*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Lambrecht, J., Lenkeit, J., Hartmann, A., Ehlert, A., Knigge, M., & Spörer, N. (2022). The effect of school leadership on implementing inclusive education: How transformational and instructional leadership practices affect individualised education planning. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 26(9), 943-957.
- Lammers, C. J. (2019). Power and participation in decision-making in formal organizations. In *Managing Democratic Organizations I* (pp. 129-144). Routledge.
- Linn, R. L., Baker, E., & Betebenner, D. (2002). Accountability systems: Implications of requirements of the no child left behind Act of 2001. *Educational Research*, 6(31), 3-16.
- Nawaz, Z. A. K. D. A., & Khan, I. (2016). Leadership theories and styles: A literature review. *Leadership*, 16(1), 1-7.
- Pedaste, M., Leijen, Ä., Poom?Valickis, K., & Eisenschmidt, E. (2019). Teacher professional standards to support teacher quality and learning in Estonia. *European journal of education*, 54(3), 389-399.
- Raza, S. A., & Sikandar, A. (2018). Impact of leadership style of teacher on the performance of students: An application of Hersey and Blanchard situational model. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 40(3), 73-94.
- Roesminingsih, E., & Trihantoyo, S. (2022). The impact of principal transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational change in elementary schools. In *Innovation on education and social sciences* (pp. 74-80). Routledge.
- Samuel, A. K., Jophus, A. M., & Francis, S. K. (2019). Junior high school head teachers' perceptions about their leadership styles within ejisu-juaben municipality. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 13(1), 131-139.
- Sekyere, E. A. (2010). *Teachers' promotion guide: On topical issues for promotion and selection interviews*. Kumasi: Afosek Educational Consult.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *The principalship: A reflective perspective*. (6. ed., Ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. H. (2017). *How to choose a leadership pattern*. In *Leadership perspectives* (pp. 75-84). Routledge.
- Walker, S., & Graham, L. (2021). At risk students and teacher-student relationships: student characteristics, attitudes to school and classroom climate. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25(8), 896-913.
- Wang, G., Strong, M., Zhang, S., & Liu, K. (2021). Preservice teacher professional commitment: A conceptual model and literature review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 104, 103373.
- Yulk, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations*. (8. ed., Ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/ Prentice Hall.