

A Moderating Effect of Leadership Tenure on the Relationship between Leadership Self-Efficacy and Effective Leadership Behaviour

Shehu Inuwa Galoiji^{a*}, Fais Ahmad^a, Husna Johari^a

Department of Business, University Utara Malaysia, Kedah, 06010, Malaysia

*Corresponding author: mogaloiji@yahoo.com

Article history

Received :4 April 2013
Received in revised form :
25 July 2013
Accepted :15 October 2013

Abstract

This study aims to examine the influence of leadership self-efficacy on effective leadership behavior with a moderating effect of leadership tenure in Nigerian commercial banks. Based on the existing literature review conducted, a conceptual framework was developed based on suggestions for future studies to test this relationship. Self-efficacy theory was used to explain the relationship among the constructs considered in this conceptual model. The study used a survey design which was aided by the use of questionnaire. A sample of 358 branch managers of the Nigerian commercial banks was drawn through a stratified random sampling. A combination of descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse the data collected using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) for Windows. The findings of this study revealed that leadership self-efficacy has a significant positive relationship effective leadership behaviour. In the same vein, further investigation using hierarchical multiple regression shows that the moderating effect of leadership tenure on the leadership self-efficacy and effective leadership behavior relationship was found not to be significant. Finally, discussion, managerial and policy implications, recommendations and suggestion for future research were also highlighted in the study.

Keywords: Leadership self-efficacy; effective leadership behavior; leadership tenure; managerial job performance

© 2013 Penerbit UTM Press. All rights reserved.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The study on leadership and what makes it effective can never be over emphasised. Yukl (1989) observed that since the beginning of the 19th century, there was proliferation of research studies on the leadership phenomenon aimed at enhancing the ability to predict effective leadership in organisations (Bowers & Seashore, 1977; Hendricks & Payne, 2007). Leadership has been adjudged in work situations as an important phenomenon due to its connection, to some extent, on what people usually assume and the extent they demonstrate it to the effectiveness of organisations (Bowers & Seashore, 1977). They further argued that although effectiveness has been usually operationalised, it has been assumed as a unitary characteristic, which defines some form of commonly accepted theorem showing that leadership is not unitary, but a combination of related ones that always enhances effectiveness.

Organisations of all sizes are engaged in a competitive environment, and hence need the right kind of leadership to survive. Organisations with effective leaders tend to innovate, respond to changes in markets and environments, creatively address challenges, and sustain high performance (Vardiman *et al.*, 2006; Amagoh, 2009). Researchers in the fields of organisational behaviour and leadership have examined leadership styles and their effects on such job-related variables as job

satisfaction, job stress, role conflict, job performance and organisational commitment (Humphreys *et al.*, 2003; MacKenzie *et al.*, 2001; Stock and Hoyer, 2002; Lee, Kimb, Son, Lee, 2011). Individual leadership characteristics that may influence effective leadership include intelligence, dominance, gender role, generalised self-efficacy, self-monitoring, emotional intelligence, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and extraversion (McCaughey and Douglas, 2004; Kim, 2007). Additionally, self-regulatory, self-motivational, empowering, and transformational leadership skills and behaviours affect leadership effectiveness (e.g. Conger, 1999; Manz and Sims, 2001).

In a bid to link the construct of efficacy to leadership domain, Gist (1989) reported that there exist limited studies or theory building contributions that link efficacy to leadership. Previous studies have shown how self-efficacy relates to performance outcomes (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Therefore, researchers also extended the construct of self-efficacy to leadership (Semadar, Robins, & Ferris, 2006; Singer, 1989, 1991; Taggar & Seijts (2003); Wood & Bandura, 1989a; Hannah, 2006; Onglatco, Yuen, Leong, & Lee, 1993; Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Chemers, Watson, & May, 2000; Finn, Mason, & Bradley, 2007; Hendricks & Payne, 2007; Hoyt, 2005; Kane, Zaccaro, Tremble, & Masuda, 2002; Larson & Borgen, 2006; Jenkins, 1994; Ng *et al.*, 2008. However, Hannah *et al.*, (2008) observed that the concept of leader efficacy is one area that has received relatively

little attention. Hence, it is so surprising given that effective leadership requires high levels of agency and confidence.

Anderson *et al.*, (2008) improved on the work of Paglis and Green (2002) by presenting 18 taxonomies of LSE and nine taxonomies of effective leadership. They recommended that the meaningful relations observed in their study provide an avenue for future studies. Furthermore, it will be of tremendous importance for future researches to be conducted based on rigorous and valid research. Based on this recommendation, this study considers five of the dimensions of LSE and three of the dimensions of effective leadership behaviour. By so doing, it is expected that this study will contribute to the body of knowledge by extending the work of Anderson *et al.*, (2008) on their new taxonomy.

1.1 Literature Review

1.1.1 Leadership self-efficacy (LSE) and effective leadership behaviour

The most popular area having much interest in the research on leadership efficacy and other work related outcomes is leadership efficacy and effective leadership behaviour relationship (Paglis, 2010). Murphy and Ensher (1999) assessed twice the quality of relationships and characteristics over an eight week period. They investigated the contribution of team member characteristics towards the development of leader-member exchange. It was found that leadership self-efficacy (LSE) relates to leaders' own ratings of leader-member exchange and not that of followers as LSE correlates with perceptions of follower performance. The result of Kane *et al* (2002) showed that LSE related significantly to a leader's goal level, strategies and functional leadership behaviours.

Using expectancy-valence models of career choice, self-efficacy theory and attribution theory, Singer (1989, 1991) found that individuals with higher levels of leadership aspiration scored higher on their self-efficacy, effectiveness, abilities in matching their self-efficacy and ease of access. Furthermore, in another study using a set of middle managers, Singer (1991) reported that all the forms of LSE related positively with positive attitudes of leadership characteristics. McCormick (1999), in a study, examined whether sex-role identity and goal orientation influenced LSE development by conducting fifteen week leadership training with students in control classes. It was found that LSE was stable over time as the students were assessed before and after the intervention. In the same vein, McCormick *et al.*, (2002) extended Bandura's (1986) self-efficacy concept to the leadership domain by predicting the proposition of high LSE required, though not a sufficient factor contributing to leadership performance. Whether LSE will associate with more previous experiences in leadership roles and that more attempts are required to assume leadership roles were tested. It was found that LSE positively correlated with both prior leadership experience and attempt to assume leadership positions as it distinguished leaders from non-leaders. Thus women were found to have significantly lower LSE compared to men.

In line with gender matching, Mellor *et al.*, (2006) found that being encouraged to serve as a shop steward was significantly associated with higher efficacy for leadership and the effect was augmented when the leader and follower are of the same gender. Furthermore, female participants in this study were found to be less confident about their leadership capabilities than men. This result is in concord with McCormick *et al.*, (2002) and other studies in the business area, as it was found that most female managers' report lower self-confidence than their male counterparts (Morris, 1998; Morrison, 1992; Tsui, 1998; White, De Santis & Crino, 1981). The possible explanation on the

outcome of this studies is summed up by McCormick (2002) as he observed that the fact that leadership is presently regarded by many cultures as a male task, some form of social role pressures may likely cause women to avoid leadership roles.

In a study aimed at studying the levers of change, Paglis and Green (2002) tested a theoretical model of LSE and its relationship to leadership attempts. The factor analysis of the study presented three factors i.e. direction-setting, gaining followers' commitment and overcoming obstacles to change. Higher manager self-esteem, internal locus of control, follower abilities and organisational support for change relate to general LSE. Further, LSE is significantly associated with higher organisational commitment and leadership attempts by managers. This result is consistent with studies by McCormick *et al.* (2002), Chan and Drasgow (2001) and Hendricks and Payne (2007) on individuals' attempts/motivation to lead. However, Finn *et al.* (2007) argued that the study of Paglis and Green (2002) only considered managerial efficacy of driving change related behaviour or initiatives. In their study, they tested the effects of executive coaching programmes to develop various characteristics associated to leadership. After the executive training, they reported that not only is LSE trainable but that it manifests into positive leadership behaviour.

In line with the call for more research on the relationship between LSE and effective leadership behaviour, Anderson *et al.*, (2008), improved on the work of Paglis and Green (2002) to construct taxonomy of LSE and that of effective leadership. The researchers argued that LSE has all the necessary potentials to aid in the predicting of effective leadership in organisations; as such, a comprehensive and empirically derived taxonomic structure is needed to aid in hypothesis development and theory formation. It is on the laudable effort of Paglis and Green (2002) that Anderson, *et al.*, (2008) built upon the work in three areas, i.e. to construct two separate tools for LSE and effective leadership; their taxonomic structure of LSE and effective leadership and LSE-effective leadership behaviour relationship. Anderson *et al.*, (2008), therefore conducted their study by first interviewing a set of executives which they later used the response to construct reliable measurement to both leadership efficacy-effective leadership behaviour.

Their result yielded 18 dimensions of LSE while that of effective leadership based on multi-source yielded nine effective leadership dimensions. Finally, in phase 3 of the study, they examined the relationship between LSE and effective leadership. They reported a significant relationship between some dimensions of leadership efficacy and effective leadership as some of the ratings were supported in the study. Anderson *et al.*, (2008) conducted a study to measure the LSE-effective leadership relationship. The subsequent result showed that Self-Discipline LSE associated with Impartial Leadership. Challenge LSE was associated with exhibiting Creative and Strategic Leadership. The negative loading of Involve LSE in combination with a positive loading of Tenacious Leadership showed a negative relationship; hence, Convince LSE and Project Credibility LSE loaded positively, whereas Serve LSE loaded negatively with influential leadership. The above result further gave an impetus to the present study as recommended by Anderson *et al.*, (2008). Furthermore, as the work of Anderson *et al.*, (2008) is not predictive in nature, the above result based on this study will be built based on hypothesis development to be tested from the framework. This leads to the following hypothesis:

H1 Leadership self-efficacy (LSE) significantly influences effective leadership behaviour

1.1.2 Leadership Tenure

In situations where people spend long period of time in their organisations, and as they succeed in climbing their organisations' hierarchy, they tend to become more convinced of the wisdom of their organisations' ways of doing things (Salancik, 1977; Hambrick & Fukutomi, 1991). Hence, these people will become more committed to their prior actions which typically is characterised by strategic choices. According to Wu, Levitas and Priem (2005), empirical research examining leaders' tenure is relatively sparse (i.e. Barker & Mueller, 2002; Miller, 1991; Miller & Shamsie, 2001). Furthermore, hypothesis on CEO life cycle have looked at CEO tenure and overall firm performance (i.e., Hambrick & Fukutomi, 1991; Miller, 1991). Leaders in organisations tried to build up for the organisation a considerable level of human capital through social connections built on respect and knowledge of the firm throughout their tenure (Amihud & Lev, 1981; Wu, Levitas & Priem (2005).

Since some decades ago, Eitzen and Yetman (1972), as cited in Hambrick and Fukutomi (1991), reported to have found the relationship between coaching tenure and team performance to be curvilinear. They argued that the longer the coaching tenure, the greater the team's success, although after a period of thirteen years on average, the team performance faces decline steadily. They argued that the authors thus provided little interpretation of the result. Eacott (2010) reported that demographic variable of tenure has the moderating effect on its strategic leadership and management relationship. The findings of the study in sum contradicted previous studies though it shows no difference as it is statistically significant but has raised the question of tenure and its effect on practice. Miller (1991) found that tenure is related to performance and environment and further matches financial performance.

Simsek (2007), in a study, tested a model and reported the CEO tenure, to some extent, indirectly influences the performance through TMT risk taking propensity with the firm's pursuance of entrepreneurial initiatives. Miller and Shamsie (2001) reported that the experimentation on the product line declined in the course of the executive tenure which shows an inverse U-shaped on the top executive-organisational performance relationship; thus, the experimentation of the product line helps financial performance of the organisation in the late period of top executives' tenures. Based on the upper-echelons framework, Finkelstein and Hambrick (1990) conducted a study on the effects of top-management and team tenure. Executive-team tenure relates to strategy and performance; thus, long-tenured managerial teams follow more on persistent strategies.

Wu, Levitas and Priem (2005) found a curvilinear overall CEO tenure-invention relationship and found an interaction effect of CEO tenure and technological dynamism on invention. It further showed that technological dynamism had shifted. Hambrick & Fukutomi (1991) proposed a model of the dynamics of CEO's tenure. They argued that CEOs in the course of their stay in office, work on phases or seasons to which all the phases or seasons give rise to its distinct pattern of attention. This includes response to mandate, experimentation, and selection of an enduring theme, convergence, and dysfunction. Only those CEOs who are at least satisfactory performers are likely to last until the later stages (Allgood & Farrell, 2000; Wu, Levitas & Priem, 2005).

Leadership tenure is considered as the moderating variable between the LSE-effective leadership behaviour relationships. Anderson *et al.*, (2008) recommended that time spent on managerial position can serve as a moderator between LSE and

effective leadership behaviour. This study aims to see whether leadership tenure influences the relationship between LSE and effective leadership behaviour. The work of Eacott (2010) reported that the demographic variable of tenure moderates the effect of strategic leadership on the management of public primary school principals. Hence, the following hypothesis:

H2 Leadership tenure moderates the relationship between leadership self-efficacy (LSE) and effective leadership behaviour

1.1.3 Self-efficacy Theory

This research uses the self-efficacy theory as the underpinning theory. The relationship between LSE and effective leadership behaviour was explained by the self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1986). Bandura (1997) defined self-efficacy as "belief in one's capabilities to organise and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments". The stronger the perceived self-efficacy, the higher the goals people set for themselves, the firmer their commitment to them (Gist, 1984; Bandura & Wood 1989). Self-efficacy is an important motivational construct that influences choices, goals, effort, coping, persistence, and performance (Hoyt *et al.*, 2003).

The self-efficacy theory has received tremendous attention in the past as researchers have shown how powerful this motivational construct is in influencing the activity choice of a person towards level of choices they made on their task in the face of difficulties (Chemers, 2001). Prominent among such studies is the meta-analysis by Stajkovic and Luthans (1998). This study shows a correlation between self-efficacy and work-related outcomes. According to Hannah *et al.*, (2008), self efficacy has shown some sort of positive relationship with various forms of human performance (e.g. Holden, 1991; Multon *et al.*, 1991; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). In linking the theory to leadership, researches in the past had also shown the effectiveness of LSE in the predicting of leadership at individual, group and organisational levels (e.g. Hoyt *et al.*, 2003; Hoyt, 2005). The work of Watson *et al.*, (2001) reported that individual self-efficacy relates to some form of performance as also efficacy and performance were both significantly higher for trainees with instructors that expected them to perform at higher levels. In other words, Bandura and Wood (1989) found managerial efficacy significantly and positively predicting future performance while the result of Chemers *et al.*, (2000) showing that LSE is not related to non-leadership performance outcomes. It is on this that this study uses the theory to explain LSE and managerial job performance relationship.

Table 1 Moderation test of leadership tenure on the relationship between leadership self-efficacy (LSE) and effective leadership behaviour

Independent Variables	Std Beta	Std Beta	Std Beta
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Self-Discipline LSE	0.022	0.022	0.023
Involve LSE	0.074	0.076	0.064
Serve LSE	0.553	0.553	0.544
Challenge LSE	-0.03	-0.029	-0.035
Project Credibility LSE	0.08	0.081	0.093
Moderating Variable			
Self-Discipline LSE × Tenure	-0.087		
Involve LSE × Tenure	-0.081		
Serve LSE × Tenure	0.028		
Challenge LSE × Tenure	-0.063		
Project Credibility LSE × Tenure	-0.027		
R ²	0.328***	0.329***	0.346***
Adj. R ²	0.328	0	0.017
R ² Change	39.804	0.248	2.099
F-Change	0	0.619	0.065

2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Sample and Procedure

This study uses the probability sampling technique. According to Sekaran (2003), probability sampling gives each respondent equal chance of being chosen as a sample. For this purpose, stratified sampling was adopted. Haunt and Tyrell (2004) stated that in a stratified sample, the sampling frame is divided into non-overlapping groups or strata. A sample is drawn from each stratum which would give a clearer representation leaving no stone unturned. To determine the number of sample size in this study, the Dillman's (2000) method of choosing a sample size was employed. Using the formula for choosing the sample size, it arrived at: $n=357.4096856$ approximately $n= 358$ sample size for number of bank branches.

2.2 Research Design

This study uses a descriptive and correlational type of survey design. This type of design is considered suitable for collecting primary data. Descriptive type of studies are usually undertaken in organisations so as to learn about or describe characteristics of a group, i.e. age, level of education, job status or years of service (Sekaran & Baugie, 2009). This study uses the questionnaire form of data collection. Questionnaire has an advantage as it is less time consuming and not much skill is needed, unlike interview (Sekaran & Baugie, 2009); it also enables creating rapport with the respondents, providing clarification and ability to collect the data. The questionnaires in this study are two-fold (self and subordinate rating). Furthermore, the population of this study comprises the branch managers of the 24 commercial banks in Nigeria with their 5118 branches that cut across the 36 states of the country, plus the nation's capital, Abuja. Hence, the unit of analysis in this study is individual unit of analysis (Anderson *et al.*, 2008; Watson *et al.*, 2001; Semadar *et al.*, 2006); as individual

branch managers of the banks were considered the unit of analysis of this study.

2.3 Measures

The measurements used in this study were adapted from the work of past researchers in this area. LSE measures and that of effective leadership behaviour were adapted from the taxonomy of LSE by Anderson *et al.*, (2008); hence the dimensions of LSE considered in this study are self-discipline, involve, serve, project credibility and challenge LSE. These measures were found in various studies in the past, i.e. Anderson *et al.*, (2008); Blake and Mouton (1982); Fleishman (1975); Bass (1990).

3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The respondents of this study were asked to describe some of their demographic information which includes gender, age, marital status and level of education. In this study, it shows that the males are relatively much higher than females. The male respondents totalled 376 (91.0%) while the females were 37 (9.0%) of the respondents. The age bracket of the respondents shows that those with age bracket of 26-35 years are 52 (12.6%), 36- 45 269 (65.1%) of the respondents, while the age bracket of 46–55 years has 92 (22.3%). The marital statuses considered in this study are single, married, divorced, widowed, separated and others (Please specify). Single respondents recorded 36 (8.7) of the total respondents, married respondents 377 (91.3). The level of education considered includes only two categories recorded some number of the respondents. This are HND/B.Sc./BA or equivalent with 330 (79.9%) and the category of M.Sc./M.A./MBA with 83 (20.1) respondents.

3.1 Mean and Standard Deviation

The criteria of the mean score that is used to determine the level of agreement among the variables was considered based on a

mean score of 2.99 or less than that to be “Low”, a mean score of 3.00 to 4.99 as “Moderate” and 5.00 or higher than that is considered as “High”. The result shows that the five LSE dimensions were measured in order to see their means and the standard deviations based on the response of the respondents. Of all the five dimensions of LSE, self-discipline LSE was perceived most highly by the respondents ($M = 4.395$, $SD = 0.0562$). The mean scores of the remaining LSE dimensions as seen from the Table are: involve LSE ($M = 4.289$, $SD = 0.667$) serve LSE ($M = 4.248$, $SD = 0.6528$), challenge LSE ($M = 4.297$, $SD = 0.6590$) and project credibility LSE ($M = 4.384$, $SD = 0.6204$). Almost all of the variables (independent variable) in this study show they are perceived moderate by the respondents. The effective leadership behaviour has three dimensions. Directional leadership behaviour is perceived higher than the other dimensions by the respondents ($M = 4.376$, $SD = 0.5802$). This shows that there is need for high level of directive leadership from the part of the leaders in order to attain their managerial job performance. Relational leadership behaviour was experienced by the respondents as ($M = 4.299$, $SD = 0.6154$). Effective communication behaviour also recorded ($M = 4.299$, $SD = 0.6154$).

3.2 Factor Analysis

The result/output of the factor analysis on LSE shows that the first factor which is labelled Project credibility has five items. It has an Eigen value of 3.353 with its factor loading ranging from 704 to 812 as it accounts for 16.767% of the total variance in the data. The second factor has a total number of four items. This factor is labelled as Challenge LSE. In this case, it has an Eigen value of 2.462% with factor loadings that range from 747 to 808. The third factor conducted in this analysis is Serve LSE. It has four items to measure and the result shows that it has an Eigen value of 2.256% and contributes 11.281% of the total variance. The factor loading ranges from 716 to 832.

3.3 Moderation Test

The next factor is labelled as Involve LSE as the factor has an Eigen value of 2.020% and contributes 10.099% of the total variance. This factor also has four measures and factor loadings that range from 711 to 802. Its original name Involve LSE is also retained. The last factor in this test was the Self-discipline LSE. This factor initially had four items but one item was deleted, thereby leaving it with three items to measure the factor. It has an Eigen value of 1.973% and contributed 9.864% of the total variance. The factor loading of this factor ranges from 798 to 840 and its original name is also retained. \

Among the factors that represent effective leadership behaviour is the directional leadership behaviour. This factor has five measure items to measure it and all of them prove to be significant and appropriate as no item was deleted. It has an Eigen value of 3.462% and contributes 26.629% of the total variance in the data as its factor loading ranges from .748 to .814. The next factor under effective leadership behaviour is relational leadership behaviour. Initially it had seven items that measure it but the factor analysis rotated matrix reduced the items to five measures. The factor has an Eigen value of 2.793% and contributes 21.488% of the total variance in the data. Its factor loading ranges also from 746 to 827.

The last factor in this study is strategic leadership behaviour. However, after deletion, the factor was renamed to effective communication behaviour. This is because the communalities of the item did not reach the required above .50 range. The factor was left with three items with an Eigen value of 1.895% and a total variance contribution of 14.579%. The factor was renamed

effective communication behaviour. The higher loadings of a factor influence the name of the factor that was renamed (Hair *et al.*, 2010). The factor ranges from 792 to 810.

3.4 Reliability Test

The result of the reliability test conducted shows that the overall Cronbach Alpha value of LSE is above the required range. The dimensions of the independent variable show that self-discipline LSE has a value (.76), involve (.73), serve (.78), project credibility (.81) and challenge LSE (.78) and the overall LSE shows a reliability of (.64). This shows that the Cronbach Alpha value ranges within .64 to .81. These values have met the required minimum value needed as suggested by scholars (Nunnally, 1978; Flynn, Schroeder, & Sakakibara, 1994; Hair *et al.*, 2010). In the same vein, it shows that the overall Cronbach Alpha value of effective leadership behaviour is at .71. Based on the dimensions, the directional leadership behaviour shows a Cronbach Alpha value of (.85), relational leadership (.85) and effective communication (.72). The values also range from .71 to .85. This also meets the required Cronbach Alpha value as suggested by scholars (Nunnally, 1978; Flynn, *et al.*, 1994; Hair *et al.*, 2010).

3.5 Regression Analysis

To ascertain the level of leadership self-efficacy (LSE) and effective leadership behaviour relationship, hypothesis was developed as *Leadership self-efficacy significantly influences overall effective leadership behaviour*. This hypothesis was tested using the regression analysis. The result of this regression shows that leadership efficacy explains 11.2% of the model ($R^2 = .115$, $F\text{-Change} = 53.170$ and recorded a beta value of $\beta = .338$, $p < .01$). In sum, it supported the hypothesis which states LSE influences the overall effective leadership behaviour as the relationship was found to be significant. In relation to the dimensions of this study, based on the dimensionality of the two variables (LSE-effective leadership behaviour dimensions), the findings of the study shows that Project credibility LSE significantly influence directive leadership while Serve LSE significantly influence relational leadership. In furtherance, the result shows that only one out of the dimensions each influence directional or relational leadership behaviour.

In order to test whether leadership tenure moderates the relationship between LSE and effective leadership behaviour, the steps recommended by Sharma, Durand and Gur-Arie (1981) was followed. A hierarchical multiple regression was conducted. The result of the analysis on the moderating effect of leadership tenure on LSE-effective leadership behaviour relationship from Step 1 shows that the factors that were entered explain 0.328% of the variance. Then, in step 2, the leadership tenure was entered and the total variance explained by the model stood at 0.329%. In step 3, the interaction terms that were entered, resulted in additional variance, explaining up to 0.346%. Then, the significant F change from step 1 to 2 was significant at level 1% but the F change in step 2 to 3 was not significant. The beta coefficient of the individual interaction terms between leadership tenure and serve LSE stood at $\beta = .051$, $t = 1.160$. According to Sharma *et al.* (1981), this result signifies that there was no moderation. This suggests the leadership tenure did not moderate the relationship between LSE and effective leadership behaviour. The second hypothesis of this study is therefore not supported.

3.6 Discussion

In response to the call for more research to be conducted on the LSE-effective leadership behaviour by Paglis and Green (2002),

Hannah *et al.* (2008) and Anderson *et al.* (2008), the research objective of this study is to examine the relationship between LSE and effective leadership behaviour. The findings of this association was found to be significant. Furthermore, based on the dimensionality of the two variables, the findings of this objective shows that Project credibility LSE significantly influence directive leadership while Serve LSE significantly influence relational leadership. Based on the foregoing findings, it can be concluded that the leadership self-efficacy significantly influence the effective leadership behavior of the managers in Nigeria commercial banks. The leadership self-efficacy based on its dimensions shows that project credibility LSE significantly influence directive leadership, hence it can be concluded that managers project credibility LSE strongly associate with directive leadership. Thus it is concluded that managers high in project credibility LSE are found to be task oriented in the Nigeria commercial banks. Further, it was found that managers high in serve LSE relates to their relational leadership behavior. Logically it can be concluded that managers that tend to be efficacious in serve LSE are relational in their behavior towards the stakeholders in the Nigeria commercial banks.

This result is in concord with McCormick *et al.*, (2002), Chan and Drasgow (2001) and Hendricks and Payne (2007) on individuals' attempts/motivation to lead. Murphy and Ensher (1999) found that LSE relates to leaders' own ratings of leader-member exchange. The result of Kane *et al.*, (2002) shows that LSE related significantly to leader goal level, leader strategies and functional leadership behaviours. Subsequently, Paglis and Green (2002) found support for leader behaviours of setting a direction, gaining commitment to change goals and overcoming obstacles to change.

The second objective of this study was to see whether leadership tenure moderates the relationship between LSE and effective leadership behaviour. The main objective is to see whether leadership tenure i.e. the time spent on managerial position moderates the relationship between LSE and effective leadership behaviour. Thus it was hypothesised as *Leadership tenure moderates the relationship between LSE and effective leadership behaviour*. A hierarchical multiple regression was conducted and the result shows that leadership tenure did not moderate the relationship between LSE and effective leadership behaviour. This result is not in concord with previous study of Eacott (2010) as it was found that leadership tenure moderates the relationship between strategic leadership behaviour and principal leadership performance.

■4.0 CONCLUSION

4.1 Theoretical Contribution

One of the contributions of this study is the study context. It is argued by Anderson *et al.* (2008) that past researches that were conducted between LSE and effective leadership were mostly conducted in either a military setting, university (Hoyt, Murphy, Halverson, & Watson, 2003; Prussia *et al.*, 1998; Chemers, Watson, & May, 2000; Hoyt *et al.*, 2003; Wood & Bandura, 1989) or other non-business environments (e.g., Chemers, Watson, & May, 2000); did not use leaders' job performance as the criterion (e.g., Hoyt *et al.*, 2003; Wood & Bandura, 1989); or did not assess self-efficacy dimensions specific to the leadership domain (e.g., Prussia *et al.*, 1998). This study considers the context of this study in the Nigeria commercial banks which is a business organisation as it is a financial institution.

According to Suanes and Parellada, (2011), vast researches in the past on leadership and what makes it effective had been

conducted in the UK, US and Asia, neglecting Africa and other continents as limited studies exist there. They argued whether effective leadership as studied in the literature can be understood in the African context. Considering the fact that this study is conducted in Africa, i.e. in the Nigerian context, it is expected that this study has contributed to the gap that exists and enhance the research culture in the African context.

4.2 Methodological Contribution

This study also contributes to the methodology adopted in this study. As the items or instruments of this study were adapted from past researches, it is imperative that the validity and the reliability of the measure are tested. The Cronbach Alpha value of the items in this study all loaded above .60 which is the recommended value. As such, by validating these items, it is hoped that this study has contributed to the body of knowledge on the method especially in the African context. The second contribution based on method is the formulation and testing of hypothesis, as part of this study is aimed at extending the study by Anderson *et al.*, (2008).

4.3 Managerial And Policy Implications

Consequently, this study has provided empirical evidence that LSE has a significant relationship with effective leadership behaviour. By implication, LSE of the leaders in the Nigerian banking sector is directly related to their effective leadership behaviour in the sector. Consequently, the leaders in the Nigerian banking sector should channel their energy towards ensuring that their confidence in their ability to judge or challenge themselves on the task ahead will subsequently affect their behaviour towards achieving the desired goal. This is in line with what Paglis (2010) observed that managers' judgments about their leadership capabilities affect their behaviour. In the same vein, various researchers have agreed that LSE is seen as leader's judgement of his/her ability to effectively carry out the behaviours that comprises the leadership role (Chemers *et al.*, 2000; Kane *et al.*, 2002; Murphy and Ensher, 1999). Based on this however, it is recommended that the leaders in the Nigerian banking sector should understand that their self-efficacy is one of the vital ingredients needed in order for them to have effective leadership behaviour. Effective leaders are regarded as highly committed to their duties, resilient and confident. Thus, it should also be observed that leaders should note that their leadership efficacy will lead to their effective behaviour.

The result of the moderating effect of leadership tenure on the LSE and effective leadership behaviour is one of the empirical evidence that this study has provided. By implication, leaders in the Nigerian banking sector should understand that the time they spent on managerial job performance does not moderate their level of performance. Consequently however, this result is extended to the regulating body of the banks to understand that the leadership efficacy- effective leadership behaviour of the leaders in the banking sector is not moderated by leadership tenure. In the past, the Nigerian banking sector is replete with overstay of the CEOs; thus it introduced the tenure limit. The result of this study will go a long way in helping the regulators on the role of tenure in the Nigerian banking sector. Furthermore, it should be understood that the interaction between leadership tenure and LSE is a significant requirement for managerial performance.

4.4 Implication for Self-Efficacy Theory Into Practice

In concord with the empirical evidence provided by the result of this study i.e. the significant relations between LSE and effective leadership behaviour, this study recommends that the theoretical work of Bandura on the self-efficacy theory of sources of cognitive information can be practically applied in order to increase LSE in the Nigeria banking sector. According to the self-efficacy theory, efficacy development techniques include mastery experiences, vicarious learning, social persuasion, and arousal (Bandura, 1997). Bandura (1997) stated that the most potent antecedents to the creation of efficacy beliefs are mastery experiences based on past performance accomplishments (Hannah *et al.*, 2008; Anderson *et al.*, 2008). Thus McCormick *et al.*, (2002) reported that prior leadership experiences were found to predict leader efficacy. On this note, managers, CEO's and regulators should consider the applicability of self-efficacy theory into practice.

4.5 Limitations of the Study

This study is not without some limitations or shortcomings. The first limitation of this study is that although there are a lot of variables that can be considered to measure LSE and leadership behaviour, this study is limited to some dimensions of the Anderson *et al.*, (2008) taxonomy of LSE and effective leadership behaviour. The LSE taxonomy of Anderson *et al.*, (2008) consists of 18 dimensions while the leadership behaviour consists of nine dimensions. This study considers five LSE dimensions and three leadership behaviour dimensions, thus not considering other also important dimensions of the two taxonomies. This can be seen as a result of the need for a parsimonious model.

Secondly, the data collection of this study is limited to within three months; hence it can be considered a relatively short period. Though this is because of limited resources and time, the study is constrained to these factors. However, long period of time needed to collect data is considered a limitation. The third limitation of this study is that the study considered only the commercial banks in Nigeria. As such, other financial institutions were not considered. This will limit the result of this study as other sectors i.e. small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and other manufacturing industries were not considered.

4.6 Suggestions for Future Research

To overcome some of the limitations of this research, this study recommends that future studies should consider other dimensions of the Anderson *et al.*, (2008) LSE and effective leadership taxonomies. Thus, future studies should consider the other dimensions of interest. The period of data collection in this study tends to be limited to within the period of three months. Hence, this study recommends that future researchers should consider longitudinal study in order to have enough time for data collection. This study uses subordinate rating to assess the leadership behaviour and managerial job performance. Future

studies may consider both subordinate, peer and superior rating in order to measure the leadership behaviour and managerial job performance of the leaders under study. This study is limited to the Nigeria commercial banks; therefore future researchers should consider other financial institutions. Furthermore, it is recommended that future researchers should consider other sectors other than the banking system.

References

- [1] A. Bandura and R. Wood. 1989. Effect of perceived controllability and performance standards on self-regulation of complex decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 56: 805–814.
- [2] A. D. Stajkovic, and F. Luthans. 1998. Self-efficacy and Work-related Performance: A Meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*. 124: 240–61.
- [3] A. S. Tsui and S. J. Ashford. 1994. Adaptive Self-regulation: A Process View of Managerial Effectiveness. *Journal of Management*. 20(1): 93–121.
- [4] A. Semadar, G. Robins, and G. Ferris. 2006. Comparing the Validity of Multiple Social Effectiveness Constructs in the Prediction of Managerial Job Performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 27: 443–461.
- [5] D. W. Anderson, H. T. Krajewski, R. D. Goffin, and D. N. Jackson. 2008. A leadership Self-efficacy Taxonomy and Its Relation to Effective Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly* 19: 595–608.
- [6] G. Yukl, A. Gordon, and T. Taber. 2002. A Hierarchical Taxonomy of Leadership Behavior: Integrating A Half Century of Behavior Research. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*. 9: 15–32.
- [7] Flury, B., & Riedwyl, H. 1988. *Multivariate Statistics: A Practical Approach*. London: Chapman and Hall. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-1217-5>.
- [8] Hair, J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. 2010. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 7th ed. Upper saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education International.
- [9] I. T. Robertson, and G. Sadri. 1993. Managerial self-efficacy and Managerial Performance. *British Journal of Management*. 4: 37–45.
- [10] L. S. Sanusi. 2010. The Nigerian Banking Industry: what went wrong and the way forward Being the full text of a Convocation Lecture delivered at the Convocation Square, Bayero University, Kano, on Friday 26 February, 2010 to mark the Annual Convocation Ceremony of the University Central Bank of Nigeria Governor's Speech.
- [11] Norusis, M. J. 1999. *Guide to Data Analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [12] N. Mat. 2008. Cross-Functional New Product Development (NPD): Characteristics, Dynamics and NPD Performance. PhD Thesis submitted to Universiti Sains Malaysia.
- [13] O. Awoyemi. 2009. Corporate Governance–Financial Crisis and the Nigerian Leadership Meltdown, MD/CEO of *Proshare Nigeria* September 28, 2009.
- [14] Proshare. 2009. The Bull in the China Shop - The New Paradigm in Nigerian Financial Sector In association with mbc newscorp ISSN 1597 – 8842 the state of the market report, Issued on August 22 Vol.1 No. 21.
- [15] R. M. Baron and D. A. Kenny. 1986 The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 51(6): 1173–1182.
- [16] S. R. Giessner, D. van Knippenberg and E. Sleebos. 2009. License to Fail?: How Leader Group Prototypicality Moderates the Effects of Leader Performance on Perceptions of Leadership Effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*. 20: 434–451.
- [17] Tabachnick, G. B., & Fidell, S. L. 2007. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 5th ed. New York: Pearson Educational Inc.
- [18] U. Sekaran and R. Bougie. 2010. *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approaches*. 5th ed. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd
- [19] W. G. Zikmund. 1994. *Business Research Methods*. Dreyden Press, Chicago.