

THE IMPACT OF SCHOOL LEADERS' MANAGEMENT STYLE ON TEACHERS' SELF-EFFICACY AND STRESS LEVELS AMONG ISRAELI-ARAB EDUCATORS

RODAYNA BADIR

Kaye College- Israel

<https://doi.org/10.37602/IJSSMR.2025.9113>

ABSTRACT

The study's main aim is to examine the contribution of the school principal's management style, teacher self-efficacy, and personal and professional background to the prediction of perceived stress levels among 321 teachers from Arab schools in Arab-Israeli society. However, the participants were administered self-efficacy and stress questionnaires, a Pearson correlation test and Multiple Regression analyses were used. The results indicated that there was a significant negative relationship between teachers' collective efficacy (CTE) and stress at work. Also, the researcher found that CTE does not serve as a moderator between leadership style and perceptions of stress. Furthermore, the results also revealed that Arab-Israeli teachers prefer the transactional style to achieve their work more than the transformational style.

Keywords: Stress at Work, Teacher Stress, Management style, Self-efficacy

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Stress at the workplace is unavoidable due to the demands of the contemporary work environment. However, there is growing recognition that teacher stress is a widespread issue across various educational contexts. Teachers are more likely to experience psychological anguish and poorer work satisfaction than other employees. The majority of teachers may suffer stress at work, despite the causes for this varying. Certain instructors may be less susceptible to stress than others, even in situations where work-related stress is comparable. Therefore, it seems natural that one should raise the relationship between stress at work, management style, and self-efficacy.

In this connection, this study aims to examine the contribution of the school principal's management style (transformational, transactional), teachers' self-efficacy, and personal and professional background to the prediction of perceived stress levels among teachers.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Stress at work

Stress as a concept usually refers to a personal feeling of distress that may be manifested in many forms of personal expression (Shernoff et al., 2011; Ayub et al., 2018). The degree of stress at work is often related to the intensity of conflict between individuals' commitment to their family and their commitment to work. In the workplace, one of the main stressors among employees is workload (Oplatka, 2012; Klein & Badir, 2021). However, from the World Health

Organization's (WHO) view, because of the demands of the modern workplace, stress at work is inevitable. Depending on the circumstances and individual traits, stress that a person finds acceptable might even help employees stay focused, inspired, and capable of working and learning. Nevertheless, stress results from that tension when it gets out of control or becomes excessive. Stress may harm a worker's well-being as well as productivity.

Given this, workplace stress can be caused by several factors, from heavy workloads and over-promotion to bullying and blame culture, according to (Ni Business Web), Workplace stress is frequently caused by: (1) high workloads, which results in individuals feeling rushed, stressed out, and overwhelmed; unrealistic deadlines and excessive amounts of work. (2) Inadequate workloads lead individuals to believe that their abilities are not being fully used. People may feel less confident in their careers as a result. (3) Lack of control, or not being able to direct one's own job activities, etc.

According to Tziner and Sharoni (2014), the General Stress Theory offers an integrative theoretical framework in which subjective processes in the employees themselves (personal characteristics such as locus of control and flexibility) are related to sources of stress arising from the objective or external environment (structured stress stimuli such as fear of injury, working in very hot environments, etc.). Based on this theory, it is possible to understand the circumstances in which certain situations are more stressful than others, and how people react to these circumstances. Theory says, stress occurs when individuals perceive their resources to be unstable, threatened, or wasted, or when they are unable to obtain or preserve resources with the means at their disposal. In this regard, the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory argues that resources are the key components to determining individuals' appraisals of events as stressful or not, and resources define how individuals are able to cope with stressful situations. As a result of the strong association with broader life conditions, according to Buchwald & Schwarzer (2010), COR theory can augment our understanding of stress and coping, particularly in complex learning situations in which students and teachers have differential access to resources.

2.2 Teacher's stress

The experiencing of unpleasant negative emotions by a teacher, arising from any element of their employment, such as anger, frustration, worry, melancholy, and anxiousness, is known as teacher stress. Research on teacher stress has grown significantly since the early 1970s and is currently a prominent area of study in several nations. (Kyriacou & Chien, 2004). In his study under the topic of (Teacher Stress: Prevalence, Sources, and Symptoms) (1978), to investigate the prevalence, sources, and symptoms of stress among England school teachers, Kyriacou's findings revealed that one-fifth of the teachers said that teaching was either highly stressful or very stressful. The teachers' biographical traits didn't seem to have much of an impact on their self-reported stress levels as teachers. 'Pupils' negative attitudes towards work', 'trying to uphold/maintain principles and standards', and 'covering lessons for absent instructors' were among the stressors with relatively high mean scores. Kyriacou's added four elements were identified through a main component analysis of the stressors: "pupil misbehavior," "poor working conditions," "time stress," and "poor school ethos." However, 'exhaustion' and feeling 'frustrated' were the most commonly reported symptoms of stress. (Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978).

However, it appears that the sources of stress do not come only from the four factors mentioned above; sometimes stress is imposed "from above", - The Ministry of Education-, which includes among others; lack of support, limitations on local powers, lack of autonomy, bureaucracy, the obligation to perform several duties simultaneously, demands for high achievements, and low wages (Ayub et al., 2018). Additionally, we may add advanced technology, which has permeated schools and is changing how students behave as well as the work environment for instructors, to the basic demands already present in the learning environment (Buskila and Levi, 2020). In Israel, as in many other countries, however, the education system has been implementing neoliberal reforms in recent decades to raise the professional image of teaching and improve its quality. These reforms greatly increase the burden placed on teachers and the stress they experience (Shechter, 2015). On this point, Oplatka (2017) argues that the excessive documentation required from schools in recent years by the Ministry of Education as well as the test regime that schools impose must be moderated because of the dropouts from the profession they are causing among teachers and administrators.

Based on this, the stress at work that teachers experience has multiple causes, related to the students, the learning environment, the school, the Ministry of Education, or the teachers themselves. Personal sources of stress may be poor teaching skills, low teaching self-efficacy, and various personality tendencies, such as a tendency to intense emotional responses (Adi-Rakach & Gonen, 2013; Ayub et al., 2018). Thus, teachers now have more obligations than they did in the past. Teachers now play a kind of entirely new function as a result of innovations in education and language teaching. Teachers are increasingly seen as more than just knowledge carriers; they are expected to interact with students on a deeper level, connect with them, and take an interest in their inner worlds (Arnold, 2011).

2.3 Management style

Management style refers to a series of behaviors adopted by managers to influence subordinates (Skakon, Neilsen, Borg, & Guzman, 2010). The theory of leadership styles offers two main models:

1. Transactional leadership, and
2. Transformational leadership.

Transformational leadership, on the one hand, which is considered to be of higher quality, is marked by leaders acting to serve the interests of their followers by creating awareness and acceptance of the group's goals and tasks (Bass & Riggio, 2006). This leadership style creates intellectual stimulation and can engender changes in the followers' expectations and aspirations. It reshapes rather than accepting established norms (Popper, 2007). According to Gonen and Zakhai (1999), this style of leadership is characterized by the greater motivation of subordinates to action. The researchers enumerate four dimensions of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration.

On the other hand, transactional leadership: in contrast to the transformational leadership style, it reflects a reciprocal relationship between leader and subordinates, in which leaders promise

subordinates a reward for the proper execution of their instructions and punish deviations from and violations of the leaders' instructions (Popper 2007). In other words, it is a type of managerial leadership constructed based on rewards and punishments to achieve optimal job performance from their subordinates. From Gonen and Zakhai's (1999) viewpoint, when employees (subordinates) are motivated by external considerations of expediency in this style, they may at best reach the required level of performance but not beyond. Yet, the connection between a leader and their subordinates is predicated on beliefs that hold that in exchange for the leader providing something the employees desire, such as pay, the employees would carry out their jobs as directed by the transactional leader (STU web, 2014). However, Lutkevich (2022) explains that the three approaches to transactional leadership are the following:

- A backup plan: Reinforcement theory and extrinsic motivation through a system of incentives, penalties, and rewards are used by transactional leaders. If they meet their targets, employees are eligible for bonuses and other benefits.
- Exception-based active management: To foresee difficulties and respond appropriately to them, transactional leaders by default rely on active monitoring.
- Management that is passive by exception: Transactional leaders don't become involved with the team by default; they only step in when performance standards aren't being reached by employees.

According to Florida Tech Web, the central difference between transactional leadership and transformational leadership as a management style can be summed up as follows: transactional leadership looks at how to get things done, and transformational leadership looks at how to motivate people to do things.

2.3 Management style and stress at work

Management style is related to a wide range of behaviors, motivations, and psychological states of subordinate employees, such as mental well-being and feelings of stress at work (Skakon et al., 2010; Verma & Madhavi, 2017). Even so, in stressful work environments, managers have the power to moderate or intensify their employees' stress levels (Major & Lauzun, 2010). Therefore, it was found that school principals who do not adequately address issues of emotional and interpersonal importance to teachers may impinge on the work environment, cause mental stress, and drop out of the profession (Wangui et al., 2016). This evidence was indicated by the research literature, which found a relationship between management style and stress at work (Thompson et al., 2005; Wu, Kwong, Liu, & Resick, 2012). Klein (2012) contends that stress among teachers may be caused by a conflict between them and principals regarding one or more important issues: curriculum planning, receiving explanations about future classroom placement, or changes in the study system imposed by the school principal. The school environment is a factor that also affects the level of stress teachers experience.

However, Aspland and Patel (2014) indicate a negative relationship between transformational leadership and symptoms of burnout and stress (headache, fatigue, and irritability). Another study confirmed that the transformational leadership style reduces perceived stress among employees due to the support, encouragement, and emotional involvement that characterize this style (Lyons & Schneider, 2009). Teachers' perceptions of the quality of transformational leadership affect their work satisfaction, school effectiveness, and teachers' perceptions of

students' achievements. It was also found that these positive perceptions create a more comfortable work environment and lower stress levels among teachers (Atkin-Plunk & Armstrong, 2013). On the other hand, Sosik & Godshalk (2000) claim that the consequences of the transactional leadership style are detrimental to subordinates and may even make them feel more stressed out due to the uncertainty they experience. Workplace stress was reported by subordinates of transactional supervisors at the level of stress dimensions.

1. leadership behaviors, (transactional contingent reward and laissez-faire leadership styles).
2. Mentoring functions (career growth and psychological support).

This style of management also increased chronic stress because managers intervened only in cases of malfunctions or mistakes and gave mostly negative feedback to employees, by testing the relationships between transformational, transactional, and no leadership styles and facets of chronic stress (i.e., excessive work and social demands, dissatisfaction with work and social recognition, performance stress, and social conflicts) while controlling for subordinates' demographics and hierarchical levels. In their study, Rowold & Schlotz (2009) showed a negative correlation between discontent and one of the transformational leadership dimensions, namely, individualized consideration. However, after adjusting for all other transformational and transactional leadership styles, the transactional subscale of management by exception passive was positively correlated with four markers of chronic stress (i.e., excessive work and social demands, dissatisfaction with work and social recognition, performance pressure, and social conflicts).

2.5 Self-efficacy

According to Bandura's social cognitive theory (Bandura, 2006), self-efficacy is related to individuals' beliefs, feelings, and perceptions about their ability to successfully deal with a specific situation. These beliefs reflect how individuals approach the challenges facing them, thus predicting their ability to deal with the various situations. Four main sources of individuals' sense of self-efficacy can be enumerated: (a) experience of control; (b) experiences of satisfaction provided by the social environment; (c) environmental support indicating that individuals are capable of dealing with the situation facing them; d) inner feelings and emotions, which indicate the individuals' abilities and weaknesses (Fisher, 2014; Collie et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2020).

However, Kass, (2000) argues that the concept of a teacher's sense of self-efficacy grew out of Bandura's (1986) cognitive social learning theory, which received extensive attention in the professional field in general and in the teaching field in particular. Gradually, it also received attention in school psychology studies due to its implications for teaching effectiveness, teaching methods, and students' academic achievements (Klassen et al., 2014). Important research has shown that teachers with high self-efficacy experience higher levels of job satisfaction, and lower levels of work-related stress, and find it easier to deal with their students' discipline problems. Therefore, understanding the main antecedents of self-efficacy may be beneficial to teachers' well-being and work efficiency, as well as to the school atmosphere (Djigić et al., 2014).

2.6 Self-efficacy and management style

In his research, Klassen (2014) highlights the main factors that influence self-efficacy: the attitude of staff and management, professional development, peer learning, and previous experience. However, Renzulli Center for Creativity (2013) agreed with Klassen viewpoint and added: past performance, vicarious experiences (observing others perform), verbal persuasion, and physiological cues, which are the weakest influences of the four presented here. It is interesting to note how principals can influence their staff positively, from giving encouragement and a kind word to empowering and expanding the teachers' capabilities (Chen et al., 2020).

Friedman and Kass (2000) also found that high self-efficacy is related not only to low levels of stress at school but also to leadership that exhibits concern for teachers' needs. Thus, school principals can play a crucial role in helping teachers develop self-efficacy by fostering a positive and supportive environment, providing timely recognition and feedback, and encouraging critical thinking skills. Principals can even inspire teachers by convincing them that they have the potential to achieve high standards in their professional careers. This self-belief helps to instill motivation in the teachers, which ultimately leads to high levels of self-efficacy.

In addition to influencing human behavior, self-efficacy beliefs have an impact on people's emotions and ideas. People who have a low sense of their own efficacy are more likely to overestimate the difficulty of activities. These beliefs serve as a fertile environment for depressive and unsuccessful sentiments, as well as anxiety and powerlessness. Conversely, a high sense of self-efficacy fosters sentiments of challenge and calmness when faced with challenging tasks. Bandura (1997) used these arguments to state that self-efficacy plays a key role within human agency. In such an event, Kass (2000). Argue that other sources that positively affect teachers' self-efficacy are observing other teachers who face similar challenges, verbal encouragement, and social support from colleagues. He added that self-efficacy is situation-based and varies according to the assessment of the difficulty of the task, the availability of resources, the perception of obstacles, and the time allotted for a task. Therefore, teachers' self-efficacy may be affected by how they perceive the stress factors - the obstacles - in the environment that may hinder performance.

2.7 Self-efficacy and stress at work

Teachers' stress and their self-efficacy are consistently presented in a negative relationship, and they yield different cognitive, emotional, and behavioral responses among teachers. For example, high self-efficacy is negatively correlated with teachers' work stress and burnout. On the contrary, teachers' self-efficacy is positively correlated with work satisfaction and commitment (Skaalvik, 2017). Additionally, teachers' self-efficacy, namely teachers' beliefs in their ability to effectively handle the tasks, obligations, and challenges related to their professional activity, plays a key role in influencing important academic outcomes (e.g., students' achievement and motivation) and welfare in the working environment (Barni, et al. 2019).

However, self-efficacy has a great impact on how teachers manage stress levels and workloads (Djigić et al., 2014). On first sight, teachers with high self-efficacy have a better perception of their own skills, which they use properly to manage their environment. These skills can be especially helpful for managing workloads and dealing with the day-to-day challenges of classroom teaching. Studies show that teachers with higher levels of self-efficacy can better manage work stress because of their competence, which improves their students' academic results and yields better interpersonal relationships between teachers and students and more fruitful collaboration between teaching staff members and management (Chen et al., 2020). On the other hand, teachers with lower levels of self-efficacy tend to be more easily overwhelmed in situations that require problem solving or quick thinking. Ultimately, teacher self-efficacy is an important factor when considering how individual teachers respond to the demands of teaching (Collie et al., 2012).

Teachers with high self-efficacy suffer less from stress, mental fatigue, alienation, and general burnout resulting from teaching and experience higher self-realization and satisfaction. Gilbert et al. (2014) argue that it was also found that high self-efficacy predicts professional, organizational, and emotional commitment compared to the lack of commitment among those with a low sense of self-efficacy. A high sense of efficacy encourages individuals to be more involved in work, to set themselves more challenges, and to feel high self-worth. Conversely, low self-efficacy leads to emotional withdrawal at work, feelings of stress, and finally, to drop out from the system (Friedman, Kass, 2000).

2.8 Purpose of the Study

As noted earlier, much research has been conducted on self-efficacy and stress, but little has been carried out or reported on the relationship between these two factors among Arab-Israeli teachers. Therefore, this study is mainly limited to examining the contribution of the school principal's management style, teacher self-efficacy, and personal and professional background to the prediction of perceived stress levels among the Arab-Israeli teachers in Arab society in Israel.

The main two factors, teacher self-efficacy and stress, are of current concern at all levels of education and, both are affected, among other factors, by the principal's management style to contribute to teaching effectiveness. Therefore, the researcher tried to detect this relationship, and how those factors are related.

In summary, the present study seeks to examine the contribution of the school principal's management style, teacher self-efficacy and personal and professional background to the prediction of perceived stress levels among teachers. To this end, the present study seeks: first, to investigate the relationship between management style and stress; second, self-efficacy and management style; and third, self-efficacy and stress at work. among the teachers' in the Arab society in Israel.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

Participants and procedures

A. Participants

The participants in this study consisted of 321 teachers (258 females and 63 males), aged between 27 and 60 years old, with a range of between 5 and 30 years of teaching experience. (169) teachers held BA degrees, (152) MA degrees, in one of these fields: English language teaching, English translation, and English literature. However, the participants were selected from Arab schools in Arab society in Israel.

The study was carried out at the beginning of the second semester (2023). The participants took the questionnaires home, filled them in, and submitted them to the researchers within a week. To receive reliable data, the researchers explained the purpose of the study to the participants and assured them that their information was designed for scientific research purposes.

B. Procedures

1. **Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).** The questionnaire was developed by Bass and Avolio (1993) to examine the frequency of behaviors attributed to the leader. The questionnaire contains 18 items referring to two leadership styles: transformational and transactional. For example, behaves in ways that build up appreciation for him. Internal reliability for the original questionnaire was good: for transformational leadership, $\alpha = 0.9$; for transactional leadership, $\alpha = 0.69$.
2. **Teacher Self-Efficacy Questionnaire.** The teachers' perception of self-efficacy is examined through the professional self-efficacy questionnaire for teachers developed by Friedman and Kass (2001). The questionnaire contains 29 items whose responses are rated on a five-point Likert-type scale (from 1=not at all to 5=to a very great extent), which expresses the teachers' level of knowledge. A low score indicates low self-efficacy and a high score indicates high skill self-efficacy. The questionnaire tests four dimensions of reference to teachers' sense of self-efficacy:
 - Pedagogical influence
 - Influence at the school level
 - Lack of confidence
 - Informal communication
3. **Teachers Stress Inventory (TSI) – The original questionnaire (Fimian, 1988)** was translated into Hebrew by the researchers of the present study. The completed translation was examined by a language editor and then distributed to Arab and Jewish teachers in order to ascertain their clarity (Klein & Badir, 2021).

The questionnaire contains 10 categories of factors that affect stress among teachers: time management (8 items), work-related stress (6 items), professional stress (and distress) (5 items), professional investment (4 items), discipline and motivation (6 items), affective manifestations (5 items), manifestations of fatigue (5 items), cardiac manifestations (3 items), gastronomic manifestations (3 items), behavioral manifestations (4 items). The teachers participating in the study were asked to indicate the intensity of the feelings they experienced on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (not significantly) to 5 (very significantly). The score was calculated by taking the means of all the items. The higher the score, the higher the intensity of stress experienced by the teachers in the study. Overall, the reliability of the original questionnaire was $\alpha = 0.93$, with reliability for each of the categories ranging from $\alpha = 0.8$ to $\alpha = 0.94$ (Fimian, 1988).

Overall reliability for the Hebrew version was $\alpha = 0.89$. Reliability for the internal categories ranged from $\alpha = 0.8$ to $\alpha = 0.9$.

3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Results

1. Cronbach's Table.

Table 1. Cronbach's α , Range, Means, Standard Deviation, Quartiles and Median N = 321

	Cronbach's α	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD	Q1	Median	Q3
Transformational leadership	.917	0.00	5.00	3.39	0.85	2.90	3.54	4.00
Transactional leadership	.805	1.00	5.00	3.46	0.83	3.00	3.40	4.00
CTE	.877	1.00	5.00	3.61	0.75	2.76	3.66	4.08
stress perceptions	.922	1.02	4.71	2.71	0.63	2.28	2.76	3.13

2. The Correlations Between the stress perceptions and Study Variables (Transformational and transactional) leadership.

As shown in Table 2, the means of the variables studied were intermediate: transformational leadership was 3.39 (SD=.85), transactional leadership was 3.46 (SD=.83), CTE was 3.61 (SD=.75) and stress perceptions were 2.71 (SD=.63).

In addition, it can be seen that the reliability of the research tool is high in all of the research variables.

Table 2. Correlations Between the Study Variables N = 321

	1	2	3	4
Transformational leadership	-			
Transactional leadership	.44**	-		
CTE	.47**	.78**	-	
stress perceptions	.13*-	.12*-	.11*-	-

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

There is a relationship between teacher collective efficacy (CTE) and teachers' stress perceptions at work among Israeli Arab teachers", a Pearson correlation test was used. Table 2 shows a negative relationship between CTE and teachers' stress perceptions at work ($r = -.11$, $p < .05$).

There is a relationship between transformational leadership and teachers' stress perceptions at work among Israeli Arab teachers", a Pearson correlation test was used.

Table 2 shows a negative relationship between transformational leadership and teachers' stress perceptions at work ($r = -.13$, $p < .05$).

There is a relationship between transactional leadership and teachers' stress perceptions at work among Israeli Arab teachers", a Pearson correlation test was used. Table 2 shows a negative relationship between transactional leadership and teachers' stress perceptions at work ($r = -.12$, $p < .05$).

In addition, Table 2 shows that the relationship between transformational style and perception of stress was higher than the relationship between transactional style and stress.

There is a relationship between teacher collective efficacy (CTE) and transformational leadership style among Israeli Arab teachers; a Pearson correlation test was used. Table 2 shows a positive relationship between CTE and transformational leadership style among Israeli Arab teachers ($r = .47$, $p < .01$).

There is a relationship between teacher collective efficacy (CTE) and transactional leadership style among Israeli Arab teachers; a Pearson correlation test was used. Table 2 shows a positive relationship between CTE and transactional leadership style ($r = .78$, $p < .01$).

In addition, Table 2 shows that the relationship between transactional leadership style and teacher collective efficacy (CTE) was higher than the relationship between transformational leadership style and teacher collective efficacy (CTE).

To create the three comparison subgroups—participants with (1) low levels of CTE,

(2) average levels of CTE and (3) high levels of CTE; the quartiles were used as cutoff points (2.76 and 4.08, respectively; see Table 2).

C. The Relationship between CTE levels, leadership style, and stress perceptions

Table 3. Means, Standard deviation, and ANOVA results for CTE levels by leadership style and stress perceptions N=321

Levels of CTE	Transformational leadership Mean (SD)	Transactional leadership Mean (SD)	stress perceptions Mean (SD)
High	3.89 (.63)	4.14 (.58)	2.76 (.67)

Intermediate	3.40 (.80)	3.59 (.59)	2.75 (.56)
Low	2.95 (.82)	2.69 (.66)	2.62 (.65)
<i>F ANOVA</i>	<i>F (2) = 36.04***</i>	<i>F (2) = 38.02***</i>	<i>F (2) = 1.57</i>
Source of differences	High–Intermediate: .48* High–Low: .93* Intermediate–Low: .45*	High–Intermediate: .54* High–Low: 1.44* Intermediate–Low: .89*	

*p<.05

Table 3 shows the analysis of variance (ANOVA) F-test results for the three groups of CTE (high, intermediate, and low), the leadership style, and stress perceptions. Differences were found between high and intermediate-level relationships and transformational leadership / transactional leadership (p<.001). There were also differences between the high- and low-level relationships to transformational leadership / transactional leadership (p<.001) and between the intermediate and low-level relationships and transformational leadership / transactional leadership (p<.001).

On the other hand, there were no differences between CTE level relationships and stress perceptions.

CTE will moderate the relationship between leadership style and perceptions of stress. As a result, the researcher found that CTE does not serve as a moderator between leadership style and perceptions of stress.

D. The Relationship between CTE and perceptions of stress

Although Table 4 shows that when CTE is high, the relationship between transformational leadership and perceptions of stress is low but not significant, when CTE is low, the relationship between transformational leadership and perceptions of stress is high.

Also, when CTE is high, the relationship between transactional leadership and perceptions of stress is low, and when CTE is low but not significant, the relationship between transactional leadership and perceptions of stress is high.

Table 4. Correlations between study variables by CTE levels N=321

	CTE Levels	Transformational leadership	Transactional leadership
stress perceptions	Low	-.26**	-.27**
	High	.004-	-.15

** $p < .01$

B. Discussion

As changing the educational curriculum system is a hard mission for the Education Ministry, it is necessary to deepen understanding of teachers' stress perception factors at work in order to reduce the influence of those factors. To this end, the present study sought to examine the relationship between self-efficacy, stress at work, and the management style among Arab-Israeli teachers.

The results indicated that there was a significant negative relationship between teachers' collective efficacy (CTE) and stress at work. The size of this correlation indicates that the higher the teachers' collective efficacy, the less likely they were to experience stress in their work.

This is in accordance with previous theoretical and empirical studies on the role of (CTE) and stress at work, though these are limited, particularly Israeli-Arab teachers are concerned, and sparse in the English language context.

As Bandura (2000,1997) pointed out, people with high confidence in their capabilities handle stress related factors effectively and approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than threats to be avoided. With respect to stress, it is mainly the perceived inefficacy that makes the person judge a situation as stressful rather than the qualities of the situation per se. depending on, the teachers who have self-efficacy skills take a stronger benefit than those with less self-efficacy, to manage work stress.

In the management style case, the research also demonstrated that a relationship between teacher collective efficacy (CTE) and transformational leadership style among Israeli-Arab teachers ($r = .47, p < .01$) is lower than transactional leadership style ($r = .78, p < .01$). that means the Israeli-Arab teachers prefer the transactional leadership style; given that transactional leaders can motivate, inspire staff, and direct positive changes in groups. This can be justified from the author's point of view; because the transactional approach uses rewards and punishments to motivate, this strategy creates differential rewards such as (money, a higher position, reduced classes in the semester, assigned administrative work instead of teaching, a bonus at the end of the semester, etc.). Someone who fails the score may be demoted, fired, or miss out on the reward.

However, the result of the present study is completely consistent with what was indicated by Gonen and Zakhai's (1999) and (Popper 2007). Transactional leadership it reflects a reciprocal relationship between a leader and subordinates, in which leaders promise subordinates a reward for the proper execution of their instructions and punish deviations from and violations of the leaders' instructions (Popper 2007).

It should be noted that the present study revealed that, when CTE is high, the relationship between transactional leadership and perceptions of stress is low. The same is true in the case of transformational leadership styles. This result confirms that the CTE does not serve as a moderate factor between leadership style and perception of stress at work. That is exactly what the study found. In other words, the management style also plays a role in the levels of stress

at work. In this regard, the present study and another's show that a transactional style of leadership results in higher performance. One of the main advantages of this leadership style is that it creates clearly defined roles. People know what they are required to do and what they will be receiving in exchange. However, this style allows leaders to offer a great deal of supervision and direction if needed (Hussain, et al. 2017). In addition, the style of transactional is used by various corporations and sports teams, including Microsoft, Starbucks, and the Green Bay Packers (lanier,2023).

4.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In summary, the results of the present study led to the conclusion that enhancing teachers' self-efficacy tends to have a positive influence on diminishing their stress. This in turn may lead to improvements in teachers' welfare, prosocial behavior, motivation, teaching effectiveness, and, accordingly, students' achievement. Consequently, the researcher recommends underlining the importance of designing package training for educational activities for Arab-Israeli teachers to teach them how to enhance their self-efficacy (CTE). And facing work stress. Also, the researcher recommends focusing on Bandura's social cognitive theory (Bandura, 2006; 1997), which increases efficacy. Moreover, it should priorities the four main sources of individuals' sense of self-efficacy as shown in a study by Fisher (2014); Collie et al. (2012); and Chen et al. (2020).

On the other hand, based on the association relationships between CTE and the role of management style in perceptions of stress at work, the researcher recommends that the transactional strategy in the management style should be given more attention than the transformational style. In the interim, the transactional system is excellent at creating a structure that puts rules first, ensuring that objectives are met on schedule and that resources are used as efficiently as possible. And that is the preferred method among Arab-Israeli teachers, which has a positive effect on students' learning.

Finally, the researcher advises dealing with the findings of the current study as a special case applied to Arab-Israeli teachers, within their own culture in Arab Israeli society, and organizational culture at work. These results may differ if the variables are tested in another society with a different culture, as the Nair, et al. (2021) study concluded.

Based on these findings, there is a need for research examining the relationship between self-efficacy and the culture of Arab-Israeli teachers.

REFERENCES

1. Adi-Rakach, A. & Gonen, S. (2013). School principals' perceptions about superintendents' role and the municipal councils' role in varied school surroundings. *Iunim Bachinuch*, 33, 105–130. Hebrew
2. Arnold, J (2011). Attention to Affect in Language Learning. *Anglistik. International Journal of English Studies*, 22/1,11-22, University of Seville.
3. Aspland, T., & Patel, F. (2014). Enabling leadership in teaching and learning: Balancing creativity and compliance agendas in Australian higher education. *International Leadership Journal*, 6(1), 23-46.

4. Atkin-Plunk, C. A., & Armstrong, G. S. (2013). Transformational leadership skills and correlates of prison warden job stress. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 4, 551-568. doi:10.1177/0093854812460036
5. Ayub, A., Hussain, M. A., & Ghulamullah, N. (2018). Causes and impact of work stress on teacher's performance in urban primary schools. *Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 6(1), 81-100.
6. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company New York. Stanford University. Retrieve from. file:///C:/Users/pji/Downloads/Albert_Bandura_Self_Efficacy_The_Exercis.pdf
7. Bandura, A. (2006). Adolescent Development from an Agentic Perspective. In F. Pajares, & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents* (pp. 1-43). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing
8. Barni, D. Danioni, F. & Benevene, P.(2019). Teachers' Self-Efficacy: The Role of Personal Values and Motivations for Teaching. *Front. Psychol.*, 12 July 2019. Sec. Organizational Psychology. Volume 10 – 2019. Retrieve from. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01645/full>
9. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 17, 112-121.
10. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
11. Buchwald, P.; Schwarzer Impact, C. (2010) of Assessment on Students' Test Anxiety. *International Encyclopedia of Education* (Third Edition). Retrieve from. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/psychology/conservation-of-resources>
12. Buskila, Y. & Hen-Levi, T. (2020). Teachers without air: Mapping the stress factors of teachers' work. *Gilui Da'at* 16, 74-91.
13. Chen, H. C., Wang, J. Y., Lin, Y. L., & Yang, S. Y. (2020). Association of internet addiction with family functionality, depression, self-efficacy and self-esteem among early adolescents. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(23), 8820.
14. Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2012). School Climate and Social-Emotional Learning: Predicting Teacher Stress, Job Satisfaction, and Teaching Efficacy. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104, 1189-1204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029356>
15. Djigić, G., Stojiljković, S., and Dosković, M. (2014). Basic personality dimensions and teachers' self-efficacy. *Proc. Soc. Behav. Sci.* 112, 593–602. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1206
16. Fimian, M. J. (1988). The alpha and split-half reliability of the Teacher Stress Inventory. *Psychology in Schools*, 25, 110-118.
17. Florida Tech Web,(n.d). The Difference Between Transactional and Transformational Leadership. Retieve from. <https://www.floridatechonline.com/blog/psychology/the-difference-between-transactional-and-transformational-leadership/>
18. Friedman, Y. & Kass, A. (2000). Teacher's self-efficacy: The concept and its measurement. *Henrietta Szold Institute*, Tel Aviv.
19. Gilbert, B, R., Adesope O., & Schroeder, N. L. (2014). Efficacy beliefs, job satisfaction, stress and their influence on the occupational commitment of English-medium content teachers in the Dominican Republic, *Educational Psychology*, 34 (7), 876-899.
20. Gonen, A. & Zakai, A. (1999). *Leadership and leadership development – from theory to practice*. Tel Aviv: Ministry of Defense.

21. Hussain A. et.al. (2017). Transactional leadership and organizational creativity: Examining the mediating role of knowledge sharing behavior. Retriv from. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23311975.2017.1361663>
22. Kass, E. (2000). The professional self-efficacy of teachers. Survey of findings in the literature in a three-dimensional division of the term. (SOURCE?)
23. Klassen, R. M., and Tze, V. M. C. (2014). Teachers' self-efficacy, personality, and teaching effectiveness: a meta-analysis. *Educ. Res. Rev.* 12, 59–76. doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2014.06.001
24. Klein, J. (2012). The open-door policy: Transparency minimizes conflicts between school principals and staff. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 26, 550-564. doi:10.1108/09513541211251389
25. Klein, J., & Badir, R. (2021). Outcomes of the Work and Family Conflict Among Arab Israeli Female Teachers. *Education and Society*, 39(1), 25-46.
26. Kyriacou, C., & Chien, P. (2004). Teacher stress in Taiwanese primary schools. Department of Educational Studies University of York, United Kingdom. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 2004
27. Kyriacou, C., & SUTCLIFFE, J. (1978). Teacher stress: Prevalence, sources, and symptoms. *British journal of educational psychology*, 48(2), 159-167. Retrieve from. <https://bpspsychub.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1978.tb02381.x>
28. Lanier, S. (2023). What Is Transactional Leadership and How Can It Benefit Your Team. Retrieve from. <https://blog.hubspot.com/the-hustle/transactional-leadership>
29. Lutkevich, B. (2022). transactional leadership. Technical Features Writer. Retieve from. <https://www.techtarget.com/searchcio/definition/transactional-leadership>
30. Lyons, J. B., & Schneider, T. R. (2009). The effects of leadership style on stress outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 737-748. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.06.010
31. Major, D. A., & Lauzun, H. M. (2010). Equipping managers to assist employees in addressing work-family conflict: Applying the research literature toward innovative practice. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 13, 69-85. doi:10.1080/10887151003761275
32. Nair; Et. al. (2012). The impact of organisational culture on occupational stress: Comparison of the SME IT sectors in India and the UK. published in Munich personal Re PEc Archive. 2 March 2021. University of Wales Trinity Saint David, University of Brunel, University of Wales Trinity Saint David. Retrieve from. https://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/109014/1/MPRA_paper_109014.pdf
33. NI Business Info Web. How to deal with stress, Common causes of stress at work. . Retrivd from: <https://www.nibusinessinfo.co.uk/content/common-causes-stress-work>
34. Oplatka, Y. (2012). Teachers' workload: Commentary, factors, influences and work plan. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University.
35. Oplatka, Y. (2017). A new look at Ofek Hadash. *Hed Hachinuch*, 91: 98-99.
36. Popper, M. (2007). Transformational leadership: A psychological view. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University.
37. Renzulli Center For Creativity, (2013). The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented (1990-2013). Retrieve from. https://nrcgt.uconn.edu/underachievement_study/self-efficacy/se_section2/
38. Rowold, J., & Schlotz, W. (2009). Transformational and transactional leadership and follower's chronic stress. *Leadership Review*, 9(Spring), 35-48

39. Shechter, H. (2015). *Let us lead: School principals leading the reform*. Tel Aviv: Ramot Publishers, Tel Aviv University.
40. Shernoff, E. S., Mehta, T. G., Atkins, M. S., Torf, R., & Spencer, J. (2011). A qualitative study of the sources and impact of stress among urban teachers. *School Mental Health, 3*(2), 59-69. doi:10.1007/s12310-011-9051-z
41. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2017). Motivated for teaching? Associations with school goal
42. Skakon, J., Neilsen, K., Borg, V., & Guzman, J. (2010). Are leaders' well-being, behaviours and style associated with the affective well-being of their employees? A systematic review of three decades of research. *Work & Stress, 24*, 107-139. doi:10.1080/02678373.2010.495262
43. Sosik, J. J., & Godshalk, V. M. (2000). Leadership styles, mentoring functions received, and job-related stress: A conceptual model and preliminary study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 365-390. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200006)21:4<365: AID-JOB14>3.0.CO;2-Hstructure, teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 67*, 152-160.
44. STU online (2014). What is Transactional Leadership? How Structure Leads to Results. November 25, 2014. Retrieve from. <https://online.stu.edu/degrees/education/what-is-transactional-leadership/>
45. Thompson, B. M., Kirk, A., & Brown, D. F. (2005). Work based support, emotional exhaustion, and spillover of work stress to the family environment: A study of policewomen. *Stress & Health, 21*, 199-207. doi:10.1002/smi.1056
46. Tziner, A., & Sharoni, G. (2014). Organizational citizenship behavior, organizational justice, job stress, and work family conflict: Examination of their interrelationships with respondents from anon-western culture. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizations, 30*(1), 35-42. Retrieved from <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/2313/231330193005.pdf>
47. Verma, R., & Madhavi, K. (2017). The effect of postural education on decreasing the severity of neck pain in female school teachers: a prospective cohort study. *International Journal of Therapies and Rehabilitation Research, 6*(1), 24.
48. Wangui, M.F., Ombui, K., & Iravo, M. (2016). Effects of work-related stress on teachers' performance in public secondary schools in Kikuyu sub country, Kenya. *International Journal of Science and Research, 5*(5), 1645- 1652
49. WHO, (2020). Occupational health: Stress at the workplace. 19 October 2020 | Q&A. Retrieve from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/ccupational-health-stress-at-the-workplace>
50. Wu, L. Z., Kwong, H. K., Liu, J., & Resick, C. J. (2012). Work-to-family spillover effects of abusive supervision. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 27*, 714-731. doi:10.1108/02683941211259539