

THE FACTORS INFLUENCING LEADERSHIP SELF-EFFICACY AND ITS EFFECT ON THE LEADERSHIP SELF-EFFICACY AMONG THE MANAGERS IN AN ORGANISATION

S.Sharmila 1, Dr. B. Sripirabaa 2

Research Scholar 1, Associate Professor 2

Department of Management, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore, India

ABSTRACT

The life of modern-day leaders is more demanding than ever. Inside every organisation, every employee needs to motivate themselves and also other employees around; they need to work across organisation boundaries and improve their efficiency to achieve growth. Self efficacy being the cornerstone of leadership, there is need to improve their own leadership self efficacy to face all uncertainties and challenges in the business environment. This paper is an attempt to identify the factors that would influence leadership self efficacy and its effect on the same. Four factors i.e. Emotional Intelligence, Self-confidence, Self resilience and Learning goal orientation have been taken for the study. The data is collected during period between January and May 2019, from 695 employees occupying the Middle level and Junior level positions selected at random from the organizations within the manufacturing engineering industries in Coimbatore district. The results show that all the factors have their positive influence over the leadership self efficacy. And self-confidence plays an important role in enhancing one's self-belief about skills, traits and intuitions about taking up leadership attempts. The study also suggests that employees should effectively manage their emotions and others' emotions effectively which would enhance their leadership self efficacy eventually.

I INTRODUCTION

Leadership is something that prevails in every levels of organisation, where each individual is expected to overcome the obstacles, changes, challenges and perform well. When dealing with the need of leadership and traits or skills needed for it to develop, study of self-efficacy becomes an important one. Unless employees trust in themselves that they have the abilities to achieve what they aim for, they have little encouragement in perform the activities with difficulties. Thus, the core motivators of performing a task have to be rooted in the deep belief that one's action would make a difference (Bandura,1997,2006). The belief that an employee can successfully perform the behaviour necessary to yield a certain outcome is known as self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). Hence self-efficacy becomes the cornerstone of leadership.

Many articles have focused on the importance of self-efficacy and factors contributing to its development among the employees of various fields. In an article by Anita (2002), self-efficacy theory has been extended to the leadership. However, there are limited studies which gave importance on the study of factors that influence the leadership self-efficacy. With reference to Albert Bandura's concept, the antecedents of self-efficacy theory are used to frame out the factors that influence leadership self-efficacy. In every industry, strong, efficient leadership is necessary to run businesses smoothly. Engineering industry is no exception. Leadership is more than simply managing a team or making a schedule but also encompasses a number of qualities and abilities, and engineering leadership is a skill an engineer can benefit from at any level. Engineering Industrial leadership roles demand certain skills and qualities that could be identified and developed for self-development and also the development of the organisation as a whole. They are stated by Akkansas State University, 2016 as:

- Ability to asses risk and take initiatives
- Delivering on time and taking prompt decisions in face of obstacles and constraints
- Being flexible at times of changes and uncertainties

Economy of Coimbatore is heavily influenced by Information Technology, Engineering & Textiles. Coimbatore is called the Manchester of South India due to its extensive textile industry, fed by the surrounding cotton fields. It is a leader in heavy engineering product manufacturing. It accounts for about USD 307.69 million worth of domestic pumps. Coimbatore's motor and pump industry supplies over 40% of India's requirements. Coimbatore would be possible and promising area to carry out the research. Thus, in particular, this study will examine the factors that influence Leadership Self-Efficacy (LSE) among the employees of managerial positions in the engineering-based organisations in Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

II LITERATURE REVIEW

Today's leaders face unprecedented challenges as organizations struggle to adapt to ever-accelerating rates of change both internally and with the external environment in which they are embedded. Such change challenges not only the knowledge, skills and abilities of leaders, but perhaps even more important, the self-conceptualizations of their leadership capabilities and psychological resources to meet the ever-increasing demands of their roles. Central to leadership and its development, Bandura (1997) states that efficacy is the most pervasive among the mechanisms of agency and provides a foundation for all other facets of agency to operate. Self-efficacy has been defined as "beliefs in one's capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands" (Wood & Bandura, 1989: 408). The higher levels of self-efficacy provide the internal guidance and drive to create the agency needed to pursue challenging tasks and opportunities successfully (Carver and Scheier, 1998; Cropanzano et al., 1993; Lord and Brown, 2004; Mischel and Shoda, 1998; Shamir et al., 1993). Several researches on self-efficacy have widely revealed how the motivational construct of self-efficacy influences the choice of activities, the stated and level of the goals set, efforts and persistence towards the task to be accomplished and the subsequent performance (Bandura & Wood, 1989; Chemers, 2001). However, out of all the studies Stajkovic and Luthans (1988a) considered in their meta-analysis which stated self-efficacy is strongly and positively associated with work-related performance, none of the studies was found to have directly address leadership performance (McCormick 2002). Self-efficacy in a leadership situation, or leadership efficacy, simply referred to as one's overall belief in his or her general ability to lead (Murphy, 1992; Hoyt et al 2003). There are several factors which influence leadership self-efficacy among employees in the work place, which could be both organisational and individual factors.

Individual factors are pertaining to individuals' skills, abilities and capabilities with respect to psychological mindset, goal sets, and personal improvement both professionally and personally. For example: Internal locus of control (Paglis and Green, 2002), Emotional intelligence (Villanueva and Sanchez, 2007), Learning goal orientation (LGO) (Hendricks and Payne, 2007; McCormick, 1999), self-resilient (Garfield, 1986 and Stoltz, 1997) and self-confidence (Bass, 1990; House & Aditya, 1997; Northouse, 2001, Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). Past experiences and the number of leaderships attempts a person carries out is also taken into account as a factor to study the leadership self-efficacy. This factor is considered to be one of the sources of self-efficacy according to Albert Bandura in his socio cognitive theory.

The present paper focuses on the self-efficacy among the respondents in their managerial positions and the factors that enable their leadership self-efficacy. The factors included are Emotional Intelligence (EI), Learning Goal Orientation (LGO), Self-confidence (SC) and Self-resilience (SR).

2.1 Theoretical Background

2.1.1 Leadership Self efficacy

Leadership self-efficacy (LSE) was found to predict leadership behaviour and distinguish leaders from non-leaders. Further, prior leadership experiences predicted leadership self-efficacy judgments. In the leadership literature, the self-efficacy of the leader has been given many names, including leader efficacy (e.g. Leithwood & Doris, 2008), leadership efficacy (e.g. Chemers et al., 2000), leader self-efficacy (e.g. Hannah et al., 2008: 670), and leadership self-efficacy, (e.g. McCormick, 2001), all of which have been measuring the same concept of an efficacy that is associated with leadership-specific tasks. According to Paglis (2010), due to the lack of agreement or consensus in the literature, on the definition of leadership and how it looks like, it has made researchers to diverge in their approaches to studying LSE. She further argued that this has made it much more difficult for researchers to study LSE, leading to several researchers having their own definitions, but most of the researchers have given it a broad definition. Shehu Inuva (2012), studied the relationship between leadership self-efficacy and direct leadership behaviour among the branch managers in some commercial banks in Nigeria. And the study concluded that managers high in project credibility LSE are found to be task oriented which increases their leadership behaviour. In a review of related literature on LSE, Hannah et al., (2008) observed that the concept of leadership efficacy has received relatively little attention in the leadership literature.

2.1.2 Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence (EI) is the ability to manage one's own emotions and understand others' emotions to enhance the relationship with people around. Daniel Goleman first introduced EI to the general public through his 1995 book Emotional Intelligence in which he defined EI as the ability to recognize, understand, and manage one's own and others' feelings and emotions. Bar-On (1997) followed suit in coining the term Emotional Quotient (EQ), and his own model of EI proposed a connection of emotional and social knowledge to various skills and traits in order to help people adapt to the rigors of the social environment. Grewal & Salovey (2006) discussed how EI can lead to positive life outcomes and successful relationships through choices made by accurately analysing and interpreting emotional life. A study was made by Afsaneh Ghanizadeh (2009) in his research on over 97 Iranian EFL University Students, to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence and

self-efficacy. The results demonstrated that there is a positive association between the two constructs. A case study was carried out by Ming-Ten Tsai, Chung-Lin Tsai and Yi-Chou Wang (2011) in Banking Industry, Taiwan, which studied the relationship between leadership style, emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and organizational commitment. This study found that a supervisor's emotional intelligence has a significant positive influence on his/her personal leadership style, that a supervisor with high emotional intelligence is able to perform excellent leading skills to elevate the employee self-efficacy, and that employee's self-efficacy results in a significant positive influence on organizational commitment. And also found that leader with high EI who performs excellent leadership style is able to improve employees' self-efficacy. The relationship between students' Emotional intelligence and their sense of self efficacy was studied by Mohammed Reza (2011). This study concluded that there is positive relationship between them and has led to several recommendations for further research. Another study done by Yvette Ramchunder and Nico Martins (2014), Emotional Intelligence, along with self-efficacy, was studied as one of the attributes to play a role in leadership effectiveness among police personnel. This study concluded that there are positive correlations between the constructs and leader effectiveness.

2.1.3 Learning Goal Orientation

Learning Goal Orientation (LGO) is the ability of a person to view the situation as a learning opportunity for personal growth. A learning goal orientation is one type of goal orientation. Researchers have agreed that there are two types of goal orientation, and they have labelled these learning (mastery, task-involved) goal orientation and performance (ego-involved, ability-focused) goal orientation (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Elliot & Dweck, 1988; Maehr & Midgley, 1991; Nicholls, 1984). A learning goal orientation involves a focus on learning, mastering tasks, trying to gain understanding, and improving competence according to self-imposed standards. Scholars have started paying attention to the social effects of LGO beyond learning and work performance, including leadership (Coad & Berry, 1998; Sosik et al., 2004). Learning-oriented individuals are more willing to share critical information at work, and engage in backing up behaviours (Poortvliet, Janssen, Van Yperen, & Van de Vliert, 2007; Porter, 2005). LGO shows positive relationships with a variety of proximal outcome variables such as learning strategies and feedback seeking and distal consequences such as job performance and creative performance (Hirst et al., 2009; Payne, Young court, & Beaubien, 2007). It is found that individuals with LGO set goals in terms of competence development instead of ability demonstration (Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988), and thus enact more functional self-regulation that leads to better performance in the long term (Porath & Bateman, 2006; VandeWalle, Brown, Cron, & Slocum, 1999; see also meta-analyses of Cellar et al., 2011; Payne et al., 2007). Although there is only limited research on the relationship between LGO and leadership recognition, a careful scrutiny of the nomological network of LGO, and of leadership emergence (e.g., Foti & Hauenstein, 2007; Taggar, Hackett, & Saha, 1999), indicates that such relationship is highly likely, particularly if mediated by behaviours such as context role behaviour. Wenqin Zhang and Dongdong Wong (2016), explored the effects of Job autonomy on individual engagement and creativity among 45 team managers in 14 companies by using LGO as a moderating variable along with the performance pressure. This study concluded that LGO not only was significantly and positively related to Work engagement and creativity but also mitigate the negative performance pressure on the relationships between job autonomy and the dimensions of engagement.

2.1.4 Self Confidence

Self-confidence (SC) is the degree of an individual's level of certainty about his or her ability to handle things. The ancient Chinese philosopher, Lao Tzu, who wrote about leadership in his troubled times, observed that confidence is a person's greatest friend. Terms such as "self-confidence," "self-efficacy," "perceived ability," and "perceived competence" have been used to describe a person's perceived capability to accomplish a certain level of performance. Bandura (1977) poses self-confidence as a common cognitive mechanism for mediating people's motivation, thought patterns, emotional reactions, and behaviour. Self-confidence thus has been used in different research to study different elements related to people, situation and environment. Self-confidence is traditionally viewed as valuable to leadership performance. Leaders who are confident welcome challenges and set difficult goals (Luthans, Luthans, Hodgetts, & Luthans, 2001). Not only is confidence said to help leaders take the risks needed to persevere in working towards their visions and objectives (Black & Porter, 2000; Northouse, 1997), but a leader's confidence increases the follower's willingness to work toward the leader's objectives (Luthans & Peterson, 2002). Chusmir and Koberg and Mary D. Stecher (1992) studied gender differences in self-confidence among working managers in two situations (work and social family) as well as relationships between self-confidence, personal adjustment, and gender identity. Results of this study showed that contrary to commonly held beliefs, the women and men managers were not significantly different in self-confidence in either situation, but both were higher in self-confidence at work than the same gender was in the social/family environment. Jodyanne Kirkwood (University of Otago, New Zealand, 2009) studied how self-confidence affects women entrepreneurs in their start-up decision, and about how it affects entrepreneurs' decisions and actions in their ongoing business, under gender comparative approach. The results show that women exhibit a lack of self-confidence in their own abilities as entrepreneurs compared to men. But for some women, entrepreneurial self-confidence grew over their time in business. Jennifer Van Dyk, Siedlecki and Fitzpatrick, (2016) focussed in determining relationships between confidence levels and self-efficacy

among nurse managers. The study concluded that experience in the role as a nurse manager is an important component of self-confidence and self-efficacy. Teresa Martha (2017) studied the importance of confidence in leadership role, by following two Swedish leadership programmes (UGL and DL). The study found out that increased confidence in leadership role is crucial for employee satisfaction and on other hand, when confidence weakens, it results in employee dissatisfaction. The author strongly commented that confidence in leadership role seems important for having positive outcomes of leadership.

2.1.5 Self resilience

Self-resilience (SR) is the ability to pick oneself up after disappointments, to manage criticism, and to motivate oneself in managing the emotions productively in uncertainties. Self-resilience is not an individual attribute; instead, resilience is a developmental process that shifts relative to changes in cognition, emotion, and the social environment (Masten, Best, Garmezy, 1990). The resilience process leads to reasonably positive adaptation within the context of adversity (Luthar, Chicchetti, and Becker, 2000). The need for individuals who are resilient in leadership roles seems apparent and is discussed in the literature through a variety of related constructs (e.g., Cooper & Sawaf, 1993; Sergiovanni, 1992; Schein, 1992; & Stoltz, 1997). Schein (1992) suggested effective leaders embrace errors. A lack of recovery from conflict or the failure of systems to be resilient is disruptive to the organization and devastating to the individual (Schein, 1992). As the nature and complexities of all organizations have changed, the expectations for people to rebound from failures or problems have increased. These expectations also imply that leaders must quickly learn from problems and take the organization in the direction that will most benefit it after the problem or failure has been resolved (Schein, 1992). Stoltz (1997) specifically discusses the need for resiliency in leadership. He defines successful leaders as persons who are able to turn unexpected losses into opportunities for greater success. Stoltz emphasized the notions that current organizational environments yield chaos through constant change and that leadership skills of the present and future need to incorporate this responsibility to survive and make use of conflict (Stoltz, 1997). Cooper and Sawaf (1997) examined leadership in corporate settings and determined a high need for resiliency and renewal for executives to survive in leadership positions. Siebert (2005) describes resilient people as people who help their communities, have advantages over other workers, and are retained and rewarded more frequently, rising to leadership positions. The study on 693 white collar employees working in private sector with more than 1000 employees was carried out by Cemal Zehira and Elif Narcikarab, (2016) in Turkey proved the effect of authentic leadership style on resilience of employees and individual productivity, in recovering from adversity and thriving when faced with high levels of positive change. Garfield (1986) suggested that resilient people recognize and often cultivate certain aspects of behaviour that psychologists have come to know as hardiness. He further explains his observations that peak performers not only have resistance to stress but resistance under stress. A study on the relationship between humble leadership and its effect on employee resilience was carried out by Yanhan Zhu, Shuwei Zhang and Yimo Shen (2019). The result of the study shows that a very little is known about the relationship between leadership and employee resilience. The findings illuminated leadership as a new activator of employee resilience that can be developed. This can be achieved by increasing appreciation of employees' contributions and exhibiting openness to new ideas, which goes beyond traditional resilience-building channels (Bardoel et al., 2014; Britt et al., 2016; Rego et al., 2017).

2.2 Objectives of the study:

- To assess the factors that influence leadership self-efficacy
- To investigate the influence of these factors over leadership self-efficacy among managers

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The population for the study includes engineering sector in India. The present research felt the population too exhaustive. Coimbatore has a cluster of organizations that related to engineering sector as discussed in "Introduction". Hence, as a representation of the engineering product manufacturers in India, the study identifies its sampling frame as those companies manufacturing engineering products (both heavy and light) in Coimbatore district. Consequently, the study identifies the companies that are registered with the CII and CPC within the boundaries of Coimbatore district. The sample size employed is 695 and the sampling method used is Simple random sampling. The sample for this research constitutes the employees occupying the Middle level and Junior level positions selected at random from the above organizations spread over the various departments. Data is collected during period between January and May 2019.

3.1 Measurement:

The scaling technique is a tool used to convert the qualitative information into a quantitative one. This study adopts Likert's 5-point scaling technique to assess the level of opinion of the respondents on the various aspects relating to the study. The

questionnaire consists of two parts. Part 1 focuses on the demographic profile of respondents and the part 2 relates to the factors such as Emotional Intelligence, Leadership self-efficacy, Self Confidence, Self-resilience and Learning Goal Orientation.

The details of the measures used for the study are presented in following Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Measures for the study

Construct	Author	Number of Items
Emotional intelligence (EI)	Wong and Law (2004)	16
Self-Resilience (SR)	Nicholson Mcbride Resilience Questionnaire by Nicholson Mcbride Fisher Ltd (2004)	12
Learning Goal Orientation (LGO)	VandeWalle's (1997) 3-Factor Model	5
Self-confidence (SC)	Mindtools by James Manktelow (1996)	14
Leadership self efficacy	Bobbio and Manganelli (2009)	21

Reliability and validity are concepts used to evaluate the quality of research. They indicate how well a method, technique or test measures something. Reliability is about the consistency of a measure, and validity is about the accuracy of a measure.

3.1.1 Reliability

According to Carmines and Zeller (1979) reliability concerns the extent to which an experiment, test or any measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials. Reliability of the instrument is ensured after ensuring the content validity of the constructs, sequence of the questions in each construct and the inference of the questions through literature review and expert opinion. It is about the consistency of a measure. It is the degree to which measurements are free from error and therefore yield consistent results. The CITC (Corrected Item-to-Total Correlation) score measures the extent of each item's contribution to the internal consistency of the instrument while the overall consistency of the instrument is captured by Cronbach's Alpha (Cronbach, 1951). For a construct to be considered as consistent, Cronbach's alpha value should be 0.70 or above (Robinson et al., 1991; Robinson and Shaver, 1973). The "reliability analysis" option of SPSS 20.0 was employed in this study to calculate the CITC values for each of the constructs.

3.1.2 Content validity

Cohen, Manion & Morrison (2008) define content validity as a form of validity that ensures that the elements of the main issue to be covered in a research are both a fair representation of the wider issue under investigation and that the elements chosen for the research sample are addressed in depth and breadth. Content validity in this study is ensured since all items are adapted from relevant studies previously published in peer-reviewed journals. In addition, experts in academia and practitioners were asked to review the instrument and provide feedback on whether the items adequately covered the relevant dimensions of the topics being covered. 3 practitioners and 3 academicians were contacted for content validation.

3.1.3 Convergent validity

The convergent validity for each construct is determined by checking the average variance extracted (AVE) values and their correlation coefficients. The AVE represents the proportion of the overall variance in the items of a latent construct that is explained by the latent construct itself. AVE represents the average squared loading (i.e. average communality) of the items constituting a latent construct. A latent construct is deemed to have acceptable convergent validity if it had an AVE greater than 0.5. Convergent validity is assessed by checking whether the AVE of each construct is greater than 50 percent and composite reliability greater than 70% (Fornell&Larcker 1981; Diamantopoulos &Winklhofer 2001; Rossiter 2002).

3.1.4 Discriminant validity

After ensuring convergent validity, discriminant validity of the constructs is ensured. Discriminant validity measures the extent to which the items of a construct did not correlate well with items of other constructs and shares more variance with its own items than with other constructs (Chin, 1998). Sufficient discriminant validity exists when the square root of the AVE of a construct exceeds the correlations between the latent construct and all other latent constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Gefen et al., 2000). Following the above guidelines, the square roots of the AVE values of the latent constructs are calculated for the constructs. The values are compared with the absolute value of the construct correlation between the latent constructs.

Table 3.1.4 a) Data for conditions regarding validity

S.no	Construct	EI	LGO	SC	SR	Condition for Validity
1	Cronbach alpha coefficient	0.775	0.732	0.833	0.760	> 0.7
2	Composite reliability	0.825	0.824	0.866	0.820	> 0.7
3	AVE	0.532	0.498	0.535	0.638	> 0.5

Table 3.1.4 b) Data for Discriminant measure for the constructs

Constructs	Correlation matrix and Square root of AVE's (reported diagonal)			
	EI	SR	LGO	SC
EI	0.582			
SR	0.521	0.632		
LGO	0.368	0.546	0.696	
SC	0.197	0.293	0.131	0.670

IV. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Percentage analysis of Demographic profile:

The demographic factors included in the research are age, gender, marital status, education, designation, overall experience and experience in the current organisation. This being the initial step in the data analysis, it gives an overview of the characteristics of the respondents.

Table 4.1: Demographic Profile

Demographic profile	Description	Percentage
Age (years)	Below 25	10%
	26-35	40%
	36-45	30%
	46-55	15%
	Above 55	5%
Gender	Male	74%
	Female	26%
Marital status	Married	72%
	Unmarried	24%
	Separated	4%
Educational qualification	UG Engineering	24%

	UG Arts and Science	21%
	UG Commerce and Management	16%
	PG Engineering	9%
	PG Arts and Science	15%
	PG Commerce and Management	10%
	PhD	5%
Designation	Manager	39%
	Executive	26%
	Assistant Manager	35%
Experience (years)	Less than 5	15%
	6-10	41%
	11-15	14%
	15-20	10%
	Above 20	19%
Experience in current organisation (years)	Less than 5	30%
	6-10	41%
	11-15	17%
	15-20	6%
	Above 20	6%

From the table, it is inferred that maximum of the respondents are male which accounted 74%. Nowadays many sectors like service, medical, education, academics, IT, have male and female working population equally distributed. Since being engineering sector female population is low when compared with other sectors. This study indicated that there is no equal proportion in gender in an engineering sector. Among the 695 respondents considered for the study, majority of 277 respondents belong to the age group between 26-35 years and the second being 211 respondents belonging to the age 36-45 years. Only 35 respondents are above 55 years of age. With regard to this study about leadership self-efficacy enhancement in an organisation, the younger generation and mostly male gender dominates in exhibiting their interest in taking up leadership activities. It is also inferred that 72% of the respondents are married and 24% of them are unmarried. Further, regarding educational levels, maximum (24%) of the respondents' qualification is UG Engineering followed by 21% of respondents' qualification is UG Arts and Science. The reason could be that the respondents belong to the manager level cadre is technically oriented organisation (engineering sector) and so the number of under graduated are more when commerce and management. Regarding the designation of the respondents, majority of respondents 39% belong to the manager level followed by 35% belonging to assistant manager. Since this study focused more on the manager level cadre of employees, the result came accordingly. By studying the inferences regarding overall experience of a respondent, 41% of the respondents have overall experience between 6 to 10 years holding the majority whereas only 10% of the respondents are between 15 to 20 years. This shows that person with an average of 6 to 10 years of experience would believe in himself/herself in taking up leadership activities in organisation. Surprisingly, the second major respondents are of experience with above 20 years. And, with regard to the experience in the current organisation where they are currently working, 41% of the respondents have experience between 6 to 10 years and with the least of 6% belonging to the age group between 15 to 20 years and above 20 years. Thus, this segment of the study indicates that the proportion of young people is more than elders.

In a nutshell, this study about the factors enhancing the leadership self-efficacy considers this demographic profile as a healthy environment, since a majority of the respondents are youngsters who belong to both technical and management parts of organisation.

4.2 Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis is performed to find the relationship between the leadership self-efficacy factors and leadership self-efficacy.

Table 4.2: Correlation analysis: Association between leadership self-efficacy and the factors taken for the study

Variables	Pearson correlation	Sig. (2 -tailed)	Inference
EI	.043	.257	NS
SR	.120**	.001	S
LGO	.192**	.000	S
SC	.580**	.000	S
S: Significant NS: Not Significant ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)			

The above table represents the correlation analysis results that is carried out between the leadership self-efficacy and the various factors taken for the study. The results show that among the factors taken for the study. Self-resilience ($r=0.120$; $p<0.001$), Learning Goal orientation ($r=0.192$; $p<0.000$), and Self Confidence ($r=0.580$; $p<0.000$) have significant positive correlation with leadership self-efficacy. Emotional intelligence ($r=0.043$; $p=0.257$) is positively correlated with leadership self-efficacy but not at 1% or 5% level of significance. Among the factors considered for correlation with leadership self-efficacy, Self-confidence is highly correlated with leadership self-efficacy. This implies that employees believe that presence of self-confidence help them to initiate leadership specific tasks. Especially Self-confidence is traditionally viewed as valuable to leadership performance. As in accordance with the previous studies made by many researchers, this result goes in hand with the previous studies that are made on self-confidence and leadership. When it comes to self-resilience and learning goal orientation, both helps to an extent for the respondents to enhance their belief about their leadership skills and traits. Whereas, though emotional intelligence is positively correlated, this factor has no significant over the leadership self-efficacy. This implies that many people in leadership roles are struggling to manage their emotions effectively to exhibit their leadership behavior.

4.3 Regression analysis

Regression analysis is carried out to find out which factors of Leadership self-efficacy (LSE) (independent variables) have its significant effect on the Leadership self-efficacy (dependent variable). The below table represents the regression analysis that is carried out between the factors influencing leadership self-efficacy and leadership self-efficacy

S.NO	Items (Constant)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	2.439	.136		17.884	.000
1	SC5	.088	.012	.211	7.391	.000
2	SC4	.078	.010	.238	7.445	.000
3	LGO3	.131	.016	.266	8.250	.000
4	LGO4	-.060	.014	-.118	-4.465	.000
5	SC13	.027	.011	.071	2.334	.020
6	SC11	.064	.010	.176	6.497	.000

7	SC2	-.061	.012	-.130	-5.117	.000
8	SC6	.047	.013	.118	3.608	.000
9	SC9	.045	.011	.116	4.111	.000
10	OEA2	-.101	.016	-.168	-6.178	.000
11	SC1	-.057	.013	-.130	-4.489	.000
12	ROE1	.069	.017	.113	4.036	.000
13	SEA4	-.077	.016	-.127	-4.804	.000
14	OEA1	.105	.020	.152	5.378	.000
15	SR2	-.042	.013	-.079	-3.282	.001
16	UEO3	.042	.016	.064	2.573	.010
17	LGO1	.049	.014	.104	3.525	.000
18	SC12	.038	.013	.088	2.961	.003
19	SR6	.055	.016	.092	3.359	.001
20	SR3	.036	.012	.075	3.018	.003
21	LGO5	-.041	.017	-.069	-2.456	.014
22	ROE2	-.043	.020	-.061	-2.184	.029
23	UEO4	.052	.017	.085	3.142	.002
24	UOE2	-.045	.019	-.063	-2.327	.020
Dependent Variable: AVGLSE						
R2 = 0.682; Adj. R2 = 0.670; F = 59.784; Sig. = 0.000						

From the above table, it is inferred that, out of the factors taken for the study, there are over 24 items that have a significance influence over the dependent variable, Leadership Self Efficacy. The adjusted R Square value is found to be 0.670, which implies that these factors have 67% variability over Leadership self-efficacy and the regression model is significant (F= 59.784; $p < 0.000$). The items that have influenced are discussed below, in detail under respective factor.

4.3.A Self confidence

There are over 9 items under the factor self-confidence that have their influence over LSE. They are listed over in the table below:

S NO	ITEMS	β
1	SC1: Doing things to meet up their own expectations	-0.130
2	SC2: Handling new situations with ease and comfort	-0.130
3	SC4: Avoid doing difficult things	0.238
4	SC5: Keep on trying	0.211
5	SC6: Working hard to solve problems	0.118
6	SC9: Working hard still not accomplishing goals	0.116
7	SC11: Wanted to experience success early in the process	0.176
8	SC12: Lessons learnt by overcoming obstacles	0.088
9	SC13: Believing hard work helps to achieve goals	0.071

Above table shows that there are over nine items under Self-confidence that have their influence over the dependent variable LSE. Among the items, the item SC4 ($\beta = 0.238$ positive; $t = 7.445$ positive; $p < 0.000$) i.e. Avoid doing difficult things has the highest positive influence over the leadership self efficacy. This could be because employees tend to believe that they have more self-confidence by doing things in which they are good at rather doing things which they believe to be difficult. Whereas the items SC1 ($\beta = 0.130$ negative; $t = 4.489$ negative; $p < 0.000$) i.e. Doing thing to meet up their own expectations and SC2 i.e. Handling new situations with ease and comfort ($\beta = 0.130$ negative; $t = 5.117$ negative; $p < 0.000$) have the negative influence over the dependent variable. The reasons could be the employees fail to fulfil their own expectations and may give importance to external expectations and appreciations for improving the self-confidence. And also, when it comes to new experiences and situations, employees tend to fail to face those situations with ease and comfort. These may hinder their self-confidence which would have its effect on their leadership self efficacy.

4.3.B Learning Goal Orientation

The items LG03, LGO1, LGO4 and LGO5 have their influence over leadership self efficacy. The below table have listed the factors under the factor Learning Goal Orientation.

SNO	ITEMS	β
1	LGO3: Learning new skills through challenging tasks	0.266
2	LGO4: Development of working ability is insignificant to taking risks	-0.118
3	LGO1: Open to challenging work environment	0.104
4	LGO5: Preference to work in situations demanding ability and talent	-0.069

Above table shows that, the item LGO3 ($\beta = 0.266$ positive; $t = 8.250$ positive; $p < 0.000$) i.e. the ability and interest to learn new skills through challenging tasks has the highest positive influence over leadership self efficacy, as the employees who wanted to learn new skills and develop their ability, look forward for challenging and difficult tasks in an organisation to develop their leadership self efficacy. On the other hand, the item LGO4 ($\beta = 0.118$ negative; $t = 4.465$ negative; $p < 0.000$) i.e. the thought that development of working ability is insignificant to taking risks has the highest negative influence over the dependent variable. This may be due to the reason that employees never take up risks in order to develop their working ability. Hence taking risks is considered to have negative influence over learning goal orientation which may be due to their fear or reluctance. This would eventually lower their leadership self efficacy.

4.3.C Emotional Intelligence

There are over 8 items under the factor Emotional Intelligence that have their influence on leadership self-efficacy, which are listed in the table as below:

S NO	ITEMS	β
1	ROE1: Ability to control temper to handle difficulties	0.113
2	OEA1: Ability to know others' emotions through their behaviour	0.152
3	UEO4: Self-encouragement to try level best	0.085
4	UEO3: Self-motivation	0.064
5	OEA2: Good observer of others' emotions	-0.168
6	SEA4: Awareness about their state of happiness	-0.127
7	UOE2: Believing to be competent	-0.063
8	ROE2: Capability to control their emotions	-0.061

Above the table shows that there are over eight items that have their influence over LSE. Among the items, item OEA1 ($\beta = 0.152$ positive; $t = 5.378$ positive; $p < 0.000$) i.e. the ability to know others' emotions through their behaviour has the highest positive influence over LSE. This shows that the employees who tend to understand others' emotions, have the ability to take

steps accordingly to tackle any situations with ease and comfort. On the other hand, the item OEA2 ($\beta = 0.168$ negative; $t = 6.178$ negative; $p < 0.000$) i.e. being the good observer of others' emotions has the highest negative influence over leadership self efficacy. This may be due to the reason that when employees become the observers of others' emotions, some tend to take it too cautious and personal, that may prevent them to take any initiatives in the organisation. This may hinder their leadership self efficacy eventually.

4.3.D Self Resilience

The items SR2, SR6 and SR3 under the factor self resilience, have influence over the leadership self efficacy. The items are listed below in the table

SNO	ITEMS	β
1	SR2: Ability to influence	-0.079
2	SR3: Taking criticisms sportively	0.075
3	SR6: Finding solutions to problems	0.092

Among the items listed above in the table, the item SR2 ($\beta = 0.079$ negative; $t = 3.282$ negative; $p = 0.001$) i.e. ability to influence has the negative influence over LSE. This may be due to a reason that employees when fail to influence things which are beyond their control, they tend to get worried which stops them from persevering. This would hinder their leadership self efficacy. On the other hand, the item SR6 ($\beta = 0.092$ positive; $t = 3.359$ positive; $p = 0.001$) i.e. the ability to find solutions to problems has the positive influence over the dependent variable leadership self efficacy. Thus, the employees who keep on trying and end up solving the problems, tend to have more self resilience which increases their leadership self efficacy.

V. CONCLUSION

As a matter of fact, development of leadership is gradually emerging as a new strategy for the human resource development team. Even if the goal is clear and accepted, top executives find it difficult to identify potential leaders throughout the organization to engage in the leadership development/change management process. These may be executive team members, people in key positions, people who have shown a passion for this specific change, people who are deemed to be "high potential," or some combination of these characteristics. Thus, the need of leadership-oriented behaviour among all levels of organisation is demanded. Since only few studies were made to study about the leadership self-efficacy and self-efficacy in leadership context, this study attempts to find out certain factors that would enhance the leadership self-efficacy. The study was successful in identifying some factors pertaining to an individual like Emotional Intelligence (EI), Self-confidence (SC), Self-resilience (SR) and Learning Goal Orientation (LGO) that would enhance their leadership belief. The findings of the study came up with the result that self-confidence plays an important role in enhancing one's self-belief about skills, traits and intuitions about taking up leadership attempts. This would enhance leadership self-efficacy effectively. This also helps the individuals to give more importance in managing their emotions effectively which would increase their stability and consistency in handling tough uncertain situations. The study thus confirms that organisations can go on for conducting leadership development programmes that concentrates on leadership and personal effective skills. This would improve employees personally and professionally, thus fosters a healthy work environment for both employees and organisations to grow parallelly resulting in a good business environment in the world.

REFERENCES

1. Afsaneh Ghanizadeh (2009), The relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' emotional intelligence and their self-efficacy in Language Institutes.
2. Anita Sohn López-Forment (2002), Extending Self-Efficacy Theory to Leadership: A Review and Empirical Test, Volume 1, Issue 2.
3. Bandura, A. (1977), "Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioural change", Psychological Review, Vol. 84 No. 2, pp. 191-215.
4. Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1990). Origins and functions of positive and negative affect: A control-process view. Psychological Review, 97(1), 19-35.
5. Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1998). On the self-regulation of behavior. New York: Cambridge University Press.

6. Chemers, M. M., Hu, L.-t., & Garcia, B. F. (2001). Academic self-efficacy and first year college student performance and adjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(1), 55–64.
7. Hannah S, Avolio B, Luthans F, Harms P (2008) Leadership efficacy: Review and Future Direction. *The Leadership Quarterly*, pp: 669-692
8. Jennifer Van Dyk, Sandra L. Siedlecki, and Joyce J. Fitzpatrick(2016), Frontline nurse managers' confidence and self-efficacy,
9. Jodyanne Kirkwood (2009), Motivational factors in a push-pull theory of entrepreneurship, ISSN: 1754-2413
10. Leonard H. Chusmir, Christine S. Koberg & Mary D. Stecher(1992), Self-confidence of managers in work and social situations: A look at gender differences, *Sex Roles* volume 26, pages497–512.
11. Ming-Ten Tsai¹, Chung-Lin Tsai² and Yi-Chou Wang (2011), A study on the relationship between leadership style, emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and organizational commitment : A case study of the Banking Industry in Taiwan Vol.5(13), pp. 5319-5329
12. Murphy, S.E. (1992), “The contribution of leadership experience and self-efficacy to group performance under evaluation apprehension”, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.
13. Paglis and Green, 2002, Leadership Self-efficacy and Managers' Motivation for Leading Change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, pp: 215-235
14. Scherer, R. F., Adams, J. S., Carley, S. S., & Wiebe, F. A. (1989). Role model performance effects on development of entrepreneurial career preference. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 13(3), 53–71.
15. Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization science*, 4(4), 577- 594.
16. Teresa Martha (2018), The importance of confidence in leadership role: A qualitative study of the process following two Swedish leadership programmes, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* ISSN: 0143-7739
17. VandeWalle, D. (1997). Development and validation of a work domain goal orientation instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57(6), 995–1015.
18. Wenqin Zhang and Dongdong Wong (2016), “Exploring the Effects of Job Autonomy on Engagement and Creativity: The Moderating Role of Performance Pressure and Learning Goal Orientation”, *J Bus Psychol* (2017) 32:235–251
19. Wood. R. & Bandura, A. (1989), 'Social cognitive theory of organisational management'. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(3): 35\–3H4.
20. Ramchunder, Y. & Martins, N. (2014). The role of self-efficacy, emotional intelligence and leadership style as attributes of leadership effectiveness. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology/SA Tydsrifvir Bedryfsielkunde*, 40(1), Art., #1100, 11 pages.
21. Garfield, C.A. (1986). *Peak Performers: The new heroes of American business*. New York: W. Morrow.
22. Yanhan Zhu, Shuwei Zhang and Yimo Shen (2019) Humble Leadership and Employee Resilience: Exploring the Mediating Mechanism of Work-Related Promotion Focus and Perceived Insider Identity