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Context, need of important of the study

Chapter V presents a summary of the purpose, procedures, and major findings of this research study. A discussion of the implications and recommendations for further study are also presented.

The literature supports the notion that instructional leadership behavior is desirable leadership styles of efficient principals/Headmasters who raise the levels of teacher efficacy and school climate. The findings of this study support that together instructional and leadership are useful for improving the quality of instruction. Therefore, the findings as measured in this study suggest that both leadership styles combined are as advantageous for assistant principals/headmasters as well as for principals. Instructional leadership works with pedagogical notions which influence efficacy on teachers and school climate and improves organizational performance or teachers’ achievement in the class. An example of an instructional leadership practice might involve helping teachers to solve instructional problems whereas an example of school climate might challenge teachers or students to do more than is expected.

As the process of teaching and learning comprises a complex mixture of a number of variables: teachers, students, curricula, resources, goals, values, beliefs, school culture, etc., principals facilitated the process through a variety of interactions that influence instruction directly or indirectly. It appeared that principals acted as direct instructional leaders when they worked with teachers and
others to shape the learning of students. They also acted as indirect instructional leaders by facilitating the shaping of conditions of the schooling process that were conducive to student learning like helping to set school-level standards of course taking, teacher selection and school procedures. The instructional leadership of the principal is an important function, but it does not work alone in producing higher levels of achievement; in fact, its role in these schools was indirect regard school organizational climate and direct interactions with teachers. Leithwood and Levin (2005), when, they posited that “considerable evidence now justifies the claim that the leadership behaviors have important effects on teachers’ motivation and pupil learning in the class” (p. 3). Principals will likely be more effective in enhancing teacher efficacy and student achievement if they turn their attention to developing a school climate with strong academic in school, having shared goals with teachers, providing feedback to teachers on student progress, listening to teachers and providing relevant professional development activities, increasing collective efficacy of the school, and promoting cooperation and trust between the faculty, parents, and students.

The term instructional leader has been in vogue for decades as the desire model for education leaders, especial principals (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, &Wahlstrom, 2004,p.4). Leadership principal have the impact of traits varies from situation to situation on school climate, teachers, students, parents and finally, inputs, teaching, learning and outputs in the schools.

An abundance of research studies and literature can be found regarding leadership behaviors, theories, instructional system and practices. Which researcher considered literature of review but instructional leadership behavior can be affect and changing on:

1. curriculum development,
2. instructional improvement,
3. pupil relations,
4. community relations,
5. financial, facility and equipments management,
6. building trust,
7. fostering collaboration and collegiality,
8. observing in classrooms,
9. conferring with teachers about teaching and learning,
10. maintaining visibility,
11. promoting a positive school climate,
12. knowledge of effective school practices
13. giving feedback and suggestions,

Researcher indicates that there are relations between principals/headmasters behaviors to teachers’ sense of general and personal teaching efficacy. Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) showed that school climate predicted general teaching efficacy and principal influences on teacher efficacy and elements of school organizational climate. School climate was conducive to development of teachers’ beliefs that they can influence student learning. It is positively related to teaching efficacy. Sofford (1995), examined “the direct influence of social systems dimensions of climate on teachers’ perceptions of their own sense of efficacy and supportive principal behavior and directive principal behavior were significantly correlated with personal teacher along with a positive effect on teaching efficacy. Restrictive principal behavior was negatively correlated with teacher efficacy; collegial and intimate teacher behavior were positively correlated personal efficacy; disengaged teacher behavior was negatively correlated with personal teaching efficacy.

Many of study showed that role of supportive principal/headmaster to create positive climate for teachers who reach to school goal by themselves. Unsupported maybe can creating a low efficacy, conflict climate and low moral satisfactions of job situation in school. So, principals/headmasters have direct and indirect influences on school climate and teacher efficacy.
Most of problem in the both countries on the literature of reviews showed that:

1. The principals/headmasters has not completely authorities to change of instructional in school.

2. Most of the principals/headmasters have not sufficient budgeting for prepared equipments regard to performance instructional systems in schools.

3. The principals/headmasters working as space of educational with Problems of centralization education and geographic scattering and variety of tribal in Iran, against decentralizations education and variety of languages, tribal, social status, religious tenets and educational system in India.

4. There are not any supports by principals/headmasters related to solving problem regard to teachers’ problems in the school and the principals/headmasters are executive instructional manager in their schools.

5. The principals/headmasters just to establish connection among of school and department of education and on the contrary in the both countries.

6. In the both countries the principals/headmaster would appointment by administrative board in private schools and or government officer, no choice by teachers vote.

7. Most of principals/headmasters just doing routine work in the school (e.g. arrangement time table for teachers, students, parents and so on).

8. The principals/headmasters have not supervision and control on the quality of teachers, students progress in along of academic year but also they have high expectations which to make successful outcome in their school and they have assessment regard their teachers.

9. Most of principals/headmasters do not know that how is the school organizational climate which have working there and Whether or not their behaviors establish an open, autonomous, familiar, controlled, paternal and close climates and how they should improve it.

10. In each of school teachers divided too few categories, especially as important course included (science); mathematic, physics, chemistry and etc
or art categories. The principals/headmasters are believe that science groups teachers important than art groups. It is maybe affect on high or low teacher efficacy and type of school organizational climate.

11. Access to schooling goal, quality and high performance can be with teachers’ collaborations and along with principals/headmasters supports. It can create a positive climate, high moral and high efficacy between colleagues, principals with high performance respect to school goals.

To reach to answer problems mentioned above, the problems have been examined through perceptions of teachers in Indian and Iranian secondary schools, this research explored how the influences of principals' instructional leadership behaviors on dimensions of teacher efficacy and school organizational climate. The study analyzed the perceptions of teachers on the principal’s/headmasters instructional leadership behaviors, comparing attributes of schools, of teachers, and of the principals. Teachers' perceptions provided a picture of principal’s instructional leadership behaviors.

**TOOLS USED FOR THE STUDY:**

The instrument applied in the present study by three questionnaires. They are:

1. The Nature of Leadership Survey (NSL)
2. Teacher Efficacy Scale questionnaire (TES)
3. School Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (SOCDQ)

1. The Nature of leadership Survey (NLS) was developed by Leithwood (1997) to measure teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ leadership behaviors. Leithwood (1997) and his associates developed the items in the survey from the definition of each leadership dimension. The questions on
The Nature of Leadership Survey (NLS) are presented in a Likert scale format (1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree).

2. Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES): This instrument was designed by Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) to measure two dimensions of teacher efficacy. The instrument includes 12 statements to measure PE and 10 statements to measure GTE. Teachers were asked to rate the statements on a 6-point scale. The rating was scored on Likert-type scale. The scale ranges from 1 for “strongly disagree” to 6 for “strongly agree”. A neutral point was not provided, to force the teachers to give a specific response that reflected their extend agreement with each item.

3. School Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (SOCDQ):
Was developed by Motilal Sharma (1978) (appendix C), South Gujarat university, India. Sharma’s study is one of the pioneer works in the field of organizational climate conducted in India. He translated Halpin’s test (SOCDQ)into Hindi and standardized it over a large sample in the state of Rajastan (Gupta,1985).The SOCDQ is an attempt to map and measure the domain of the climates of elementary schools along a continuum from open to closed. The instrument is composed of 64 Likert-type items, which teachers and principals use to describe the interaction patterns in their schools. The items are short, simple descriptive statements that measure eight dimensions of organizational life. Four of the dimensions or subtests refer to characteristics of the group (teacher) included: Disengagement, Alienation, Esprit, Intimacy; and remaining four pertains to the characteristics of the principal as leader included: Psychophysical hindrance, Production Emphasis, Humanized Thrust, Control. Also, For purposes of the discriminate analysis, the six school types were regrouped into only three types: open/Autonomous, Controlled/Familiar and Paternal/Closed.
Based on the SOCDQ scores of the teachers, it can be determined that each of these three groups had a similarity: (1) Open/Autonomous climates demonstrated high teacher morale, (2) Controlled/Familiar climates showed only satisfactory teacher morale and (3) teachers’ morale in the Paternal/Closed climates was low. The analysis then used SOCDQ dimension scores to predict one of these three group climate types. The following seven tables present the results of the discriminate analysis.

The results of the study are discussed in this chapter in further detail and conclusions drawn that suggest how the results contribute to the current body of knowledge on the desired management and leadership qualities valued by teachers. The results are based on a survey sent to all of the secondary schools teachers in India and Iran as identified by the Academic year in 2007-2008. The remaining school districts were identified as having a teacher. From this participant, randomly selected secondary teachers from each school in India and Iran were asked to complete the survey.

Data analysis was tabulated for all independent variables and dependent variables. The independent variables are: Principals’ (headmasters’) Instructional leadership behavior, gender, age, years of experience, type of school and educational background (art/science); the dependent variables are: School organizational climate and Teacher efficacy level.

Coded data were analyzed with the help of SPSS software. Coefficient contingency, F-test, MANOVA, Scheffe’s Post Hoc-test, Correlation and t-test were used to compare the Instructional Leadership behaviors, Teacher Efficacy and school organizational climate in secondary schools. Survey responses from secondary teachers representing 535 in India (262 Teachers and 63 Schools) and Iran (273 Teachers and 22 Schools) independent school districts were analyzed to provide answers to the following eight Hypotheses:
Hypotheses of the Study:

**H1:** There is no significant difference in school organizational climate of secondary schools in Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran).

**H2:** There is no significant difference between school organizational climate and teachers' perception of principals' /headmasters' instructional leadership behaviors in Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran).

**H3:** There is no significant difference among secondary schools teachers of Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran) in their perception of principals /headmasters instructional leadership behaviors.

**H4:** Male and female secondary schools teachers in Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran) do not differ significantly in their perception of principals /headmasters instructional leadership behaviors.

**H5:** There is no significant difference among secondary schools teachers in Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran) with different length of teaching experience in their perception of principals /headmasters instructional leadership behaviors.

**H6:** Secondary schools teachers of Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran) with teaching Art and Science subject do not differ significantly in their perception of principals /headmasters instructional leadership behaviors.

**H7:** Teachers working in Private and Government secondary schools in Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran) do not significantly in their perception of principals /headmasters instructional leadership behaviors.

**H8:** There is no significant difference between secondary schools teachers in Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran) in Teacher Efficacy.
**H9:** Male and female secondary schools teachers in Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran) do not differ significantly in their perception of Teacher Efficacy.

**H10:** There is no significant difference among secondary schools teachers in Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran) with different length of teaching experience in their perception of Teacher Efficacy.

**H11:** Secondary schools teachers of Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran) with teaching Art and Science subject do not differ significantly in their perception of Teacher Efficacy.

**H12:** Teachers working in Private and Government secondary schools in Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran) do not significantly differ in their perception of Teacher Efficacy.

**H13:** There is no significant relationship between teacher efficacy and type of school organizational climate in secondary schools of Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran).

**H14:** There is no significance relationship between teacher efficacy and secondary schools teachers' perception of principals'/headmasters' instructional leadership behaviors Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran).

**MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY:**

1. A non-significant association was observed between categories of school organizational climate and countries and H1 is accepted. In other words, pattern of school organizational climates were same for Iran and India. Comparatively, the number of school with percentage of familiar climates is more in Iran than in India. But highest numbers of schools with familiar and controlled climate are more in India.

2. A significant influence of school organizational climate was found on all dimensions of principal’s instructional leadership behavior, as we find that in all the dimensions Head masters in ‘closed type’ schools scored
significantly lesser than teachers working in other types of school organizational climate. In other words, ‘closed type’ and to some extent ‘paternal type’ of school organizational climate had negative impact on principal’s instructional leadership behavior. Hence H2 is rejected.

3. Only in one dimension ‘providing intellectual stimulation’ significant difference was observed between Iranian and Indian teachers, where Iranian’s teachers had higher scores than Indian teachers in principal’s instructional leadership behavior and in rest of the dimensions Iranian and Indian teachers had similar scores. H3 is rejected for the dimension ‘providing intellectual stimulation’ and accepted for rest of the dimensions.

4. Male and female teachers did not differ in their scoring on principals’ /headmasters' instructional leadership behaviors, as in all the dimensions, ‘F’ values revealed non-significant differences. Hence H4 is accepted.

Experience of teachers in their teaching did not influence their scoring on principals’ /headmasters' instructional leadership behaviors, as in all the dimensions ‘F’ values revealed non-significant differences. Hence H5 is accepted.

Teachers with science and arts background did not differ in their scoring on principals’ /headmasters' instructional leadership behaviors except for one dimension symbolizing good professional practice, where science teachers had higher scores, and according H6 is rejected for this dimension and accepted for rest of the dimension.

Teachers working in government school and private school did not differ in their scoring on principals’ /headmasters' instructional leadership behaviors as in all the dimensions ‘F’ values revealed non-significant differences in both countries. Hence H7 is accepted.
5. As far as the teaching efficacy is considered, it was observed that in personal efficacy Iranian teachers were better; where as in teaching efficacy, Indian teachers were found to be better. Hence, H8 is rejected totally.

6. Male and female teachers did not differ in their scoring on teacher efficacy, as in two dimensions, ‘F’ values revealed non-significant differences. Hence H9 is accepted.

   Experience of teachers in their teaching did not influence their scoring on teacher efficacy, as in two dimensions ‘F’ values revealed non-significant differences. Hence H10 is accepted.

   There is no significant difference between teachers' sense efficacy when ordered by subject taught (art/science) in both country. Hence H11 is accepted.

   There were no significant different between secondary teachers' sense of efficacy when ordered by type of school in both countries. Hence H12 is accepted.

7. In dimensions of school organizational climate (as measured by SOCI), type of schools did not have significant influence, in other words, teachers in government and private schools scores same in SOCI.

   a. In Principal’s Instructional leadership behaviour also, type of schools did not have significant influence, in other words, teachers in government and private schools scores rated their heads/principals same.

   b. Lastly, in teacher efficacy too, type of schools did not have significant influence, in other words, teachers in government and private schools scores had similar scores in both personal and teacher efficacy dimensions.
8. Only in personal efficacy, school organizational climate had significant influence, where teachers working in ‘closed type’ of schools had significantly lesser personal efficacy than teachers working in other type of school climates. Hence H13 is rejected for personal efficacy and accepted for ‘teacher efficacy’ as SOC did not have influence over teacher efficacy.

9. Significant and positive relationships were obtained for dimensions of principal’s instructional leadership behaviour and personal efficacy. Hence H8 is rejected for relationship between principal’s instructional leadership behaviour and personal efficacy. However, in teacher efficacy, principal’s instructional leadership behaviour correlated only with one dimension—holding high expectation, a negative relationship was obtained. For rest of the dimensions H14 is accepted.

DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

It is of great importance to a researcher to identify the limitation of the study, help him defend, more firmly, his finding. The following are the limitation of the present study:

1. To limit the data collection instruments to only questionnaire distribution.

2. To limit the sample population of the research to Secondary schools India and Iran.

3. To limit the statistical samples to 535 individuals from female and male Secondary schools teachers of India (262, teachers) and Iran (273).
IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The secondary school in India and Iran setting for this study yielded results that raise interesting insights about the leadership school principals/headmasters, teacher efficacy and school organizational climate. The researcher offers the following implications:

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR:

1. According to teachers’ responses to the questionnaire, teachers in Iranian and Indian secondary schools assess their principal’s/headmasters’ behavior as having an influence on teacher efficacy and school climate. This assessment of leadership was not contingent on the independent variables measured. Principal’s/headmasters’ leadership behaviors in secondary schools appear to be a good skill set for those who wish to become principals. These findings may enhance efforts to evaluate and prepare principals/headmasters for leadership.

2. If a principal does not have the capacity to use these instructional leadership behaviors, this research could help him/her and guide the assignment of tasks for assistant principals/headmasters or lead teachers in a shared leadership model.

3. These findings concur with similar research conducted in public/government schools. One could find promise in the learning community model for instructional leadership. The results suggest that the instructional leadership behaviors of principal/headmasters in secondary schools are well matched to the needs of the schools.
4. Instructional Leadership Behaviors that teachers rated high were taking time for teachers to reflect on the practice of education (Blase & Blase, 1998; Hord, 1997). Hord called for a community of learners among teachers and administrators to seek and share learning and then act on what they learned. Reflective thinking is also part of what Senge (1990) called systems thinking, looking for interdependencies that work to achieve the organizations shared vision. This study called for instructional leaders to ensure that the time is scheduled for educators to reflect on their experiences in order to inform their future choices.

5. School systems should develop professional and development plans for principals/headmasters.

6. School systems should implement instructional leadership academies for principals/headmasters in three phases: recruitment, initial stages, and experienced (to refresh).

7. School systems should implement procedures to ensure that principals/headmasters are in classrooms helping teachers improve instructions and establish a positives school climate.

TEACHER EFFICACY

1. Relationships between teachers’ sense of efficacy, receptivity to change and successful implementation of new ideas and innovations need further investigation. Teachers’ receptivity to change may be based on their trust in the principals/headmasters, a level of trust acquired as a result of past support during previously adopted change efforts.

2. The findings of the research have implications the policy makers who are interested in school improvement and the principal's influence in this process. The results highlighted instructional leadership behaviors identified
by teachers and principals across the Mysore (India) and Amol (Iran) that are supportive of teachers' sense of efficacy. Moreover, links were to the relationship of principal trust and effective instructional leadership behaviors. Persons interested in leadership dynamics supportive of the teaching process as a mean for school improvement will find the evidence of links between instructional leadership behavior and teacher efficacy are very useful.

**SCHOOL ORGANIZATION CLIMATE**

1. Principal/headmasters must ensure that professional development opportunities are available for them and assistant principals to learn about leadership behaviors that support an open climate.

2. The principal must be an instructional leader with clear and high expectations as well as an understanding of the mission must be part of an organization. Teachers, students, parents and the community must be committed to the vision.

3. Hiring practices should be observed meticulously to insure selection of the most highly qualified candidates for administrators and teachers.

4. Principals should seek feedback from their teachers concerning the perception of the school’s climate and leadership style on a regular basis as a continuous effort to maintain and improve conditions on the campus to promote maximum success for students.
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. This research study was limited to one district in Mysore (India) and in one district in Amol (Iran). The sample size consisted of a small pool of schools. A broader sample size across several districts is recommended.

2. The structures and processes in secondary school are very different than in primary and high-primary school. Research involving teachers from different school levels is necessary to examine the effects of principal leadership behaviors with Teacher Efficacy and school organizational climate and the instructional choices of teachers in secondary grades as compared to middle school grades.

3. A follow up study with teachers and principals at different points in time would provide data to determine trends. A trend study using various principal and teacher samples would provide valuable information to principals to determine what supports are valued by teachers undergoing educational reform respect to teacher efficacy and school organizational climate.

4. Research to determine ways to provide a feedback loop of information to principals in schools experiencing educational reform is needed. Study results would provide valuable assistance to teachers on the supports needed by principals in their schools and assist principals in improving their leadership behaviors.

5. Exploration of smaller and larger schools as related to instructional leadership, school organization climate and teacher efficacy related to the conducted.

6. Further studies should be conducted to determine the extent to which, the principal’s demographic variables, administrative experience, school enrollment, and number of teachers supervised influence the organization and behavioral climate of a school.