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1.1 INTRODUCTION

With the onset of the information revolution, teachers, parents, and administrators have confronted with shifting paradigms in order to prepare their students for the 21st Century. Everyone including the students have confronted with a new leadership style called efficacy. Leadership ultimately has to come from within the person. Effective school reform included students, parents, teachers, and principals who were willing to assume leadership roles (Mestinek, 2000).

Instructional leadership has become an increasing important aspect of reforming and improving the performance of schools. Apart from school’s principal who is undertaking instructional leadership of school, at a micro levels classroom teacher also is concerned as an instructional leader since s/he is dealing directly with learning behaviors such as student achievement and establishing a productive school climate. Instructional leadership (teacher or principal) should also have a direct effect on student achievement because they are the key establishing a productive school climate. Instructional leadership behaviors, such as defining and communicating goals; monitoring and providing feedback on the teaching and learning process; and promoting school-wide professional development evoke a climate that promotes a focus on teaching and learning. Further, each of the dimensions describes roles and behaviors of the instructional leader that guide the creation of classroom climate and school climate that promotes an emphasis on academic rigor (Blasé & Blasé, 1999, Sheppard, 1996; Murphy, Weil, Hallinger, Mitman, 1982; Bossert et. al, 1982).
The current research adds to a small group of studies that suggests ways to the leaderships which can foster higher levels of student achievement in their schools. The instructional leadership is critical but most likely works through school climates that emphasize academic achievement and have strong cultures of trust and collective efficacy. Instructional leadership of teacher/principal is critical because of various reasons. A great number of studies have reported that teacher/principal can influence directly all learning activities which usually happen in school. Thus, it is being said that effective school is a function of interaction between different parts of school structure or in other word school climate in general. (Alig-Mielcarek; Hoy, K., 2001). In this interaction, instructional leadership and teacher efficacy in the classroom that are systemically associated with school climate- in special meaning- have been receiving much attention by researchers.

Following paragraphs will show why pay attention to these concepts are important. It will clear first by the construct definitions of each concept.

1.2 LEADERSHIP:

There has been a steady increase in the study of leadership in recent years. Early research concentrated on what were thought to be the essential precursors to leadership- personality and physical traits (Owens, 1987). Weber’s (1947) separation of charismatic leadership from position based leadership promoted the belief that leadership was more of a consequence of a set of human actions based on emotional power that engaged the support of others (Solomon, 2003, p.202). When Ciulla (2003) tracked variations in the definitions of leadership from the 1940s she noted that in the 1990s the support for the leader was more an inter-dependent relationship between the leader and the led, which was significantly different from the traditional view of leadership.

In education Sergiovanni (1984) identified multiple dimensions of leadership he termed “leadership forces”. These were technical, human, educational, symbolic, and cultural. Inclusion of the educational force was significant and typifies early differentiation between the leadership of schools and
that of other organizations. Sergiovanni (1984, p.6) described the educational force as “expert knowledge about matters of education and schooling”. Most recent models of educational leadership emphasize the importance of school leaders being heavily involved in the school’s instructional program (Hargreaves, Earl, Moore & Manning, 2001; Hill, 2001, 2002; Schlechty, 2001). Murphy & Hallinger (1992) noted that in the 1980s, principals needed to become curriculum and instructional leaders if they were to coordinate local school improvement. This dimension of school Leadership is termed instructional leadership (Blase & Blase, 1998; Gupton, 2003; Lashway, 1995, 2002; Murphy & Hallinger, 1992; National Association of Elementary School Principals 2002).

Leithwood (1999:8) perceives instructional leadership as an approach to leadership that emphasizes the behavior of educators as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students. This definition perceives instructional leadership as the leadership that puts instruction and learning at the centre. Hopkins (2001) contends that instructional leadership is about creating learning opportunities for both students and teachers. This definition embraces both the development of educators and learners.

1.3 PRINCIPALS’ (HEADMASTERS’) INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS:

Current definitions of instructional leadership are richer and more expansive than those of the 1980s. Originally, the role involved traditional tasks such as setting clear goals, allocating resources to instruction, managing the curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, and evaluating teachers.

Today, it includes much deeper involvement in the "core technology" of teaching and learning, carries more sophisticated views of professional development, and emphasizes the use of data to make decisions (Deborah King 2002). Attention has shifted from teaching to learning, and some now prefer
the term "learning leader" over "instructional leader" (Richard DuFour 2002).

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2001) frames instructional leadership in terms of "leading learning communities." In NAESP's view, instructional leaders have six roles: making student and adult learning the priority; setting high expectations for performance; gearing content and instruction to standards; creating a culture of continuous learning for adults; using multiple sources of data to assess learning; and activating the community's support for school success.

The three major functions of instructional leadership were defining mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school climate. (Hallinger and Murphy 1985) . Mission was defined in terms of framing and communicating goals. Instruction was elaborated in terms of supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating curriculum, and monitoring student progress. A positive school climate was created by principals protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, maintaining high visibility, providing teaching incentives, enforcing high academic standards, and providing incentives for student’s . Similarly, these functions determined and covered the responsibilities of teacher in the classroom such as dealing with teaching professional standards, incentive for students managing time and materials and so on.

1.4 SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE: HOW DOES IT RELATE TO PRINCIPALS’/HEADMASTERS’ INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS?

Organizational climate is a broad term that refers to teachers' perceptions of their general work environment; it is influenced by the formal and informal structures of the school as well as by the personalities of the teachers and the leadership behavior of the principal. Put simply, the set of internal characteristics that distinguishes one school from another and influences the behavior of teachers is its organizational climate. The climate may roughly be conceived as the
personality of the school; that is, personality is to individual as climate is to organization.

Just as individuals have personalities, so too, do schools. It is this "personality" of the school that Halpin (1966) described as the organizational climate of the school; that is, personality is to the individual what organizational climate is to the organization. (Hoy, K. 1990)

Researchers have used various definitions of climate; Hoy and Miskel (2005, p. 185) defined school climate as "the set of internal characteristics that distinguish one school from another and influence the behaviors of each school's members." Kottkamp (1984) suggested that climate consists of shared values, interpretations of social activities, and commonly held definitions of purpose. Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (1991, p. 10) stated that "school climate is the relatively enduring quality of the school environment that is experienced by participants, affects their behavior and is based on their collective perception of behavior in schools." A positive school climate can enhance staff performance, promote higher morale, and improve student achievement (Freiberg, 1998). Heck (2000) and Goddard et al. (2000) linked school climate and student achievement. "School climate may be one of the most important ingredients of a successful instructional program.

The five dimensions of school climate that finally emerged fell into two categories: two of the dimensions described principal behavior; the other three focused on teacher behavior, in particular, teacher relationships with students, colleagues, and superiors... (Hoy, K. 1990)

School organization climate, which refers to the environment or personality of a school, was another critical factor in determining effective schools (Johnson & Johnson, 1996).
Clearly, school climate is multi-dimensional and influences many individuals, including students, parents, school personnel, and the community. Several studies have established links between instructional leadership and the climate of the school at level of both the principal and the teacher (Lane, 1992; Hallinger & Murphy, 1987; Hoy et al., 1991; Sergiovanni, 1995).

At level of principal the school principal—the leader—is a critical force in determining school climate, student and teacher attitudes and instructional practices. When schools are effective, it is largely because they have effective principals” (drake&roe, 1986). Hord (1984) and Terry (1988) identified the principal as the key factor in determining an effective school. In their study of effective school principals, Day, Harris, and Hadfield (2001) reported that this group of leaders promoted a climate of collaboration for exploring new strategies. In the Day study, the leaders emphasized learning through personal and professional development of students and staff, and the research concluded that morality, emotion, and social bonds between and among all school members also fueled motivation and commitment (Day et al., 2001). Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, and McCleary (1990) proposed that effective principals employed and empowered strong collaborative teams, especially at the secondary level. Researchers also confirmed that successful administrators had supportive staff that had a part in the decision-making process (Shanahan, 1988).

At level of teacher instructional leadership refers to generally manage classroom as a system. Instructional management, behavioral management is two related tasks which doing well could be lead to effective school climate. Constructivist lesson plans, student engagement in project-based learning, strategies incorporating multiple learning styles, and varied performance assessments in an effort to improve attendance and retain students in classroom has been considered as facts that will link school climate effectiveness with teacher’s efficiency as a leadership (March & Peters, 2002).
1.5. HOW DOES THE PRINCIPALS’ HEADMASTERS’ INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS INFLUENCE ON TEACHER EFFICACY?

At level of teacher one other factor that might have an impact on how teachers perform in the classroom is teacher efficacy. Defined as the extent to which a teacher believes he or she has the capacity to affect student performance, teacher efficacy has been related to individual differences in teachers’ feedback toward and expectations for students (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) and to teachers’ control orientations (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Moreover, teacher efficacy has been positively associated with academic achievement in students (Anderson, Greene, & Loeven, 1988; Ashton & Webb, 1986). According to Bandura (1993), links between efficacy and achievement might be explained by the type of learning environments teachers create for their students. For instance, teacher efficacy could play a role in the goals teachers set for themselves and their students, how motivated teachers are to create a positive learning environment, how much effort they expend in teaching students, and how they react when faced with difficult situations. Each of these factors could lead to positive or negative instructional practices, which could then impact student achievement .Given the potential importance of teachers’ sense of efficacy for instructional effectiveness and student achievement, it is important that members of the educational community understand possible factors that might enhance or hinder these beliefs. Efficacy beliefs of the teachers were compelling indicators of the school organizational effectiveness and climate, which resulted in positive student outcomes (Barker, 1986; Bobbett, 2001; Olivier, 2001).

Studying teacher efficacy have examined the relations between teachers’ sense of efficacy and student and classroom variables (e.g., Guskey, 1982, 1987; Raudenbush, Rowan, & Cheong, 1992; Smylie, 1988), and a smaller number of studies (e.g., Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993; Lee, Dedrick, & Smith, 1991; Warren &
Payne, 1997) have looked at relationships between teacher efficacy and the organizational context of schools. These latter studies have focused on context variables such as organization of classes, principal behavior, and opportunities for innovation, teacher collaboration, staff development, teacher influence, and faculty morale.

Teachers’ efficacy has a direct impact on student achievement in the classroom (Armor et al., 1976; Ashton & Webb, 1986; Ashton, Webb & Doda, 1982; Berman & McLaughlin, 1977; Dembo & Gibson, 1985; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Tracz & Gibson, 1986; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). However, mitigating factors such as the influence of leadership and professional development experiences play a role in the degree of efficacy that teachers possess. More specifically, self-efficacy may be strengthened through the influence of the building principal or leader. Teachers who are comfortable with the working environment, which feel supported by administration, and perceive the principal to use his/her administrative influence with others for the teachers’ benefit, tend to have higher efficacy beliefs (Leithwood, 1977). Additionally, professional development impacts efficacy when the knowledge and skills that are acquired are pertinent to the teachers’ classroom situation (McLaughlin & Berman, 1977; Scribner, 1998). Professional development that is appropriate for teachers will create teacher motivation, allowing teachers to engage students in learning situations for a greater length of time (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Finally, the interaction of leadership and professional development relates to the principal as well as teachers. Quality leaders will engage in the professional development experience along with the teachers. A reciprocal effect is that participation in the activities will further enhance leadership qualities by giving insight into the needs and wants of the faculty.

Having these submissions, this study has been made an attempt to find out how the principals’ instructional leadership behaviors in two separate educational system – centralized in Iran versus decentralized system in India-influenced
teachers’ perception of efficacy secondary levels. As well, the question is whether principals’ leadership behaviors could be lead different types of school organization climates. Although numerous investigations have identified significant relationship between mentioned variables, however, few have examined this relationship in different context which considered in this study.

1.6 NEED OF THE STUDY

Today, technology and communication have created new challenges in the field of education especially in the area of planning, for the educational leaders. Informal of education is already exceeding the formal education in the contemporary world and, thus, new expectations of this informal education are being formulated. Hence, there is a fear and worry about whether, in the present situation, we can satisfy these anticipations or not, and in what condition the consumers, i.e. students, of the formal educational system will be, considering the increasing trend of expectations. Therefore, macro and micro educational leaders and planners have already started to reflect on remedies which can help overcome the panic. School climate is number one factor which engrosses minds and it involves managers, teachers, educational material, human relations etc. Any challenge in this climate directly affects performance and output of the educational system.

Nowadays, the formal schooling, specifically in developing countries, appears to be suffering mostly from this challenging area, and obviously this weakness contributes to the development of quantitative and even qualitative enigmas in the educational system of these countries at different levels. In other words, this impeding factor can be enlisted among those which cause such obstacles as decline of teaching and management profession and even high rate of drop-outs.
Through a sharp view, one can figure out that the current schooling climate in these countries is not molded in the standards which are devised to satisfy the trends of expectations in a desirable and potential school climate, and/or at least it enjoys the lowest rank in the hierarchical scale of these standards, of which the following are of practical use to the school managers:

1. Encouraging teachers attend professional development activities.
2. Planning, professional development regard needs of teachers and students.
3. Developing school goals that promote high standards and expectations for all students.
4. Observing and monitoring the classrooms to ensure classroom interaction along with school goals.
5. Promoting and academic learning climate.
6. Developing a supportive work environment.

Moreover, the standards of importance to teachers are:

1. Engaging and supporting all students in learning (effective environment).
2. Understanding and organizing subject matter for students learning.
3. Planning instructional and learning activities for all students.

Furthermore, theoretically speaking, in the present study, school climate in these countries is of ‘controlled type’ which enjoys the least efficiency (Arani, 2003).

Controlled school climate and teachers’ mutual efficacy and susceptibility which they impose on type of climate are great importance through a second view on the devised standards which are aimed at acquiring a climate via the managers and through considering the features of the controlled school climate, such as
highly task-oriented climate, dictatorial manner, less group involvement, negligence of human aspects and communication, and lack of satisfaction, one can conclude that the conflict between the two, the manager and school climate, straightforwardly affects teachers’ disposition towards the school leadership, school climate, and their vocational status quo. Hence, they may in effect get divested of a dynamic reflection.

By virtue of the studies carried out in this field, teachers’ low efficacy, inflexibility in adopting educational innovations and applying teacher/task-oriented techniques to control their classes, bringing on differences while evaluating students’ educational progress educational inequality in their teaching that is, paying much attention to the fast learners and neglecting slow learner, etc. All are indicative of their attitudes and dispositions towards the school climate inclusive of school leadership (Zimmermann, 2004). New research that captures more than just a principal’s actions may help to paint a more complex picture of leadership and help to explain just how those leaders influence the school climate and teacher and student measures.

With a precise consideration of aforementioned analysis, the researcher in this study, while identifying the school climate type in secondary schools in Mysore city (INDIA), and Amol city (IRAN), is determined to scrutinize the relationship between teachers’ attitudes towards teacher efficacy and instructional leadership with the current given school climate (Huff, 2006).

The present study is comparatively conducted in two culturally and educationally different atmospheres of INDIA and IRAN, and secondary school level serves as the population base. It appears essential to develop a dynamic and dialectic process as well as harmony between standards, instructional leadership, teachers’ view towards these two, on one hand, and teaching process, on the other hand, because at this level compared with other levels, the decentralized
educational system, thanks to subjects, seems to appear more conspicuously discernible.

1.7 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

The present study is entitled: “Instructional Leadership Behaviors of Secondary School Principals (Headmaster), Teacher Efficacy and School Organizational Climate- A Comparative Study in Mysore (INDIA) and in Amol (IRAN)”.

1.8 Objectives of the study

1. To study principals’ /headmasters instructional leadership behavior as perceived by secondary schools teachers in Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran).

2. To the study the pattern of school organizational climate types of secondary schools teachers in Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran).

3. To study teacher efficacy levels of secondary school teachers in Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran).

4. To study relationship between principals’ /headmasters' instructional leadership behaviors as perceived by teachers and teacher efficacy in secondary schools in Mysore (India) and in Amol (Iran) with reference to:
   - Male and Female teachers
   - Length of teaching experience
   - Subject of teaching
   - Type of school
5. To study relationship between types of school organizational climate and instructional leadership behavior of principals/headmasters secondary schools as perceived by teachers in Mysore (India) and Amol (Iran).

6. To study relationship between types of school organizational climate and instructional leadership behaviors of principals/headmasters secondary schools as perceived by teachers both in Mysore (India) and Amol (Iran). when type of school ordered.

7. To study the relationship between teacher efficacy levels and school organizational climate as perceived by secondary schools teachers in both in Mysore (India) and Amol (Iran).

8. To compare school organizational climate types, principals’ /headmasters’ instructional leadership behaviors, and teachers’ perception of teacher efficacy in secondary schools of Mysore (India) and Amol (Iran).

9. To suggest measures to improve instructional leadership behaviors in secondary schools in both the countries.

1.9 Research questions

1. What is the dominant type of school organizational climate both in Mysore (India) and Amol (Iran)?

2. Is there any significant relationship between type of school organizational climate, and teachers’ perception of teacher efficacy in secondary schools of Mysore (India) and Amol (Iran)?
3. Does principals’ /headmasters' instructional leadership behaviors as measured by NSL affect teachers’ perception of teacher efficacy in secondary schools of Mysore (India) and Amol (Iran)?

4. Does principals’ /headmasters' instructional leadership behaviors affect school organizational climate as measured by the scale employed?

5. Is there any difference in secondary teachers' sense of efficacy (personal efficacy and general teaching efficacy) respectively to demographic variables in Mysore (India) and Amol (Iran)?

1.10 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 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).

1.11 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).

1.12 VARIABLES USED IN THE STUDY:

A. Dependent Variables
   1. School Organizational Climate
   2. Teacher Efficacy Level

B. Independent variables/ Background variables
   1- Principals' /headmasters' instructional Leadership Behavior
   2- Teachers Background Variables
2.1 Gender: Male and Female

2.2 Length of teaching experience
   - Below 10 year's experience
   - 11-20 years experience
   - 21-and above experience

2.3 Type of school
   - Government school and Private school

2.4 Educational background:
   - Art and Science

1.13 OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF THE KEY TERMS USED:
1.13.1 Principals’ (headmasters’) Instructional Leadership behaviors:

   Relates to the ability to provide direction and exercise influence over others in an effort to achieve shared goals (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003).


   1. **Fostering vision and goals:** Behavior on the part of the principal aimed at promoting cooperation among school staff members and assisting them to work together toward common goals. New models of schools as professional learning committees emphasize the importance of shared goals and effort.

   2. **Holding high expectation:** Behavior demonstrates the principal's
expectations for excellence quality, and high performance on the part of the school staff. Effective expressions of high expectations help people see that what is being expected in fact possible.

3. Providing intellectual stimulation: Behavior on the part of the principal that challenges school staff members to reexamine some of the assumptions about their work and rethink how it can be performed. Principals provide information and resources to help people see discrepancies between current and desired practices. They enable teachers and others to understand and gain mastery over complexities of necessary changes.

4. Providing individualized support: Behavior on the part of the principal that indicates respect for school staff members and concern about their personal feelings and needs. Principals provide incentives and structures to promote change, as well as opportunities for individual learning and appropriate means for monitoring progress toward improvement.

5. Developing collaborative decision-making structure: Behavior on the part of the principal aimed at identifying new opportunities for his or her school leadership team and developing, articulating, and inspiring others with his or her vision of the future. Effective principals help their schools to develop and endorse visions that embody the best thinking about teaching and learning, and they guide others to reach these goals. They communicate the vision clearly and convincingly.

6. Symbolizing good professional practice: Behavior on the part of the principal that sets an example for others to follow consistent with the values the principal espouses. By modeling desired dispositions and actions, principals can enhance others' beliefs about their own capacities and their enthusiasm for change.
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1.13.2 SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE:

Refers to “the set of internal characteristics that distinguishes one school from another and influences the behaviors of its members. In more specific terms, “school climate is the relatively stable property of the school environment that is experienced by participants, affects their behavior, and is based on their collective perceptions of behavior in schools” (Hoy, Hoffman, Sabo, & Bliss, 1996 p.42). Operationally, Organizational climate of a school refers to the teachers, administration, students, building, location and their influence on each other, the interaction among various role participants in the Organization. In other words the distinct climate atmosphere or personality perceived by persons in particular building is a result of the manner in which action of each hierarchical level of the Organization interacts with each other and with incumbents of other hierarchical level. It is also called educational atmosphere of the institution and it is interaction of persons and environment in terms of organizational behavior. There are eight dimensions in school organization climate and type of school climate is a function of dimensions which are focusing on in schools. Dimensions are consisting of:

1. **DISENGAGEMENT**: refers to the teacher’s tendency to be ‘not with it’. This dimension describes a group, which is ‘going through the motions ‘a group that is ‘not in gear’ with respect to the task at hand .it corresponds to the more general concept of anomic as first described by Durkhein. In short, this subtest focuses upon the teacher’s behavior in a task-oriented situation.

2. **ALIENATION**: refers to the behaviors patterns among the group (faculty) including the leader (the principal), which are characterized as highly formal and impersonal .it reveals the degree to which the principal ‘goes by the book ‘and adheres to policies rather than dealing with the
teachers in an informal, face situation it also indicates the emotional distance between the group and the leader; and at the same time, among the group members.

3. **ESPRIT** refers to teacher’s morale. The teachers feel that their social needs are being satisfied, and that they are, at the same time, enjoyed a sense of accomplishment in their job.

4. **INTIMACY** refers to teachers enjoyed of friendly social relations with each other this dimension describes a social needs satisfaction, which is not necessarily associated with task-accomplishment.

5. **PSYCHOLOGICAL HINDRANCE** refers to the feeling among the group members that the principal burdens them with routine duties, management demands and other administrative requirements, which they consider as unnecessary. At the same time perceive the principal as highly dictatorial in his behavior. he is not adjusted to feedback from the staff. his style of communication tends to be uni-dimensional.

6. **CONTROL** refers to the degree to which the principal’s behavior can be characterized as bureaucratic and impersonal in nature. Although task-oriented in behavior, the extent to which he tries to raise the degree of effectiveness and efficiency by helping the group work towards the common goal by providing ad equated operational guidance and secretarial services.

7. **PRODUCTION EMPHASIS** refers to the behavior of principal, which is characterized by close supervision of the staff. He is highly directive and plays the role of a ‘straw boss’. His communication tends to go in only one direction, and he is not sensitive to feedback from staff.

8. **HUMANIZED THRUST** refers to the behavior of principal, which is marked by his attempts to motivate the teachers through personal example. he does not ask the teachers to give themselves any more than
they willingly give of themselves. The behavior of the principal, though unmistakably task-oriented, and tender-heartedly. He attempts to do something extra for them in humanistic terms, and consequently his behavior is viewed favorably by the teachers. (Sharma, 1978).

A profile of these dimensions in each school would determine the type of climate which is dominated in school.

1. **Open climate** - refers to an environment in which teachers obtain social needs satisfaction as well as job satisfaction and enjoy a sense of accomplishment in their job. They perceive their principal (leader) as highly considerable and democratic in behavior and hence the group’s members as well as the principal feel at peace. So the group enjoy a high degree of integration and authenticity of behavior.

2. **Autonomous climate** - refers to an environment in which the teachers enjoy a friendly relationship and a high degree of group moral. They satisfy their social needs to a great extent and enjoy a moderate degree of job accomplishment. Absence of active leadership mixed with average controls on the part of the principals is perceived as an element of Psychological Hindrance.

3. **Familiar climate** - is characterized by the conspicuously friendly behavior of both the principal and the teacher. The teacher have established personal friendship among themselves and socially; at least everyone is a part of a large happy family. Social needs satisfaction is extremely high. The principal exercises leadership in an indirect manner and tries to keep production satisfactory. This behavior is job oriented but does not hinder the social needs satisfaction on the part of the teachers.
4. **Controlled climate** refers to an environment, which can be characterized as highly, task-oriented at the cost of social needs satisfaction of the members (teachers). Leadership acts stem from only one side, and in a dictatorial manner. Group involvement is never encouraged. The human aspect of the individual is neglected and communication is always one side. Teachers get little job satisfaction, out of task accomplishment.

5. **Paternal climate** refers to a situation in which there is little scope for the members to satisfy their social needs and derive job-satisfaction. The faculty has to work in the principal wants but at the same time the principal, as a paternal guardian of the school faculty, does not ignore the individual interest and hence his behavior is perceived as highly considerate.

6. **Closed climate** is characterized by a high degree of apathy on the part of all members of the organization. The organization is not moving. This climate lacks authenticity of behavior. The principal constrains the emergence of leadership acts from the group. The group members secure neither social need satisfaction nor job satisfaction stemming from task accomplishment.

1.13.3 Teacher Efficacy

In a review of virtually all sources dated between 1974 and 1997 that used the term teacher efficacy, this concept has been connected with a multitude of critically important educational variables, such as student achievement and motivation, student self-esteem and prosaically attitudes, school effectiveness, teacher adoption of innovations, the success of program implementation, teacher’s referral decisions for special education, teacher’s professional commitment, teacher’s classroom management strategies, teacher absenteeism and teacher stress and burnout (Brouwers
Perceived teacher efficacy has been defined as “He extent to which teacher believes he or she has the capacity to effect student performance” or as “teachers’ belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated. (Guskey & passaro, 1994). Ashton (1984) reports there are eight dimensions to teacher efficacy.

a. A sense of personal accomplishment, the teacher must view the work as meaningful and important.
b. Positive expectations for student behavioral and achievement. The teacher must expect students to progress.
c. Personal responsibility for student learning: accept accountability and shows a willingness to examine performance.
d. Strategies for achieving objectives: Must plan for student learning, set goals for themselves, and identify strategies to achieve them.
e. Positive affect: Feels good about teaching, about self and about students.
f. Sense of control: Believe he/she can influence student learning.
g. Sense of common teacher / student goals: develops a joint venture with students accomplish goals.
h. Democratic decision-makings: Involves students in making decisions regarding goals and strategies.

Wool folk and Hoy (1990) found to yield significant factor loadings. The two subscales reflecting general or teaching efficacy and personal efficacy were each altered to reflect internal and external control dimensions. Thus, the existences of four possible dimensions of efficacy (personal internal, personal external, general internal and general external beliefs) were
investigated. So, the definition of teacher efficacy and subscale are explained following:

13.3.1 Teacher Efficacy Scale: Teacher efficacy can be defined as teachers’ beliefs in their abilities to organize and execute courses of action necessary to bring about desired results (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, & Hoy, 1998).

13.3.2 General Teaching Efficacy (GTE): tend to focus on the ability of teachers to help or reach students beyond the external factors that impact the learning process (e.g., Anderson, Greene & Lowen, 1988; Ghaith & Yaghi, 1997; Lin & Gorrell, 1998; Ross, 1994). Rich, Lev, and Fischer (1996) provide a definition that exemplifies this orientation when they describe teacher efficacy as “a teacher’s general feeling that the education system is capable of fostering satisfactorily student academic achievement despite negative influences external to the teacher” (p. 1016). This definition, and others like it, have led to the suggestion that this construct is more an assessment of locus of control or outcome expectancy rather than self-efficacy, which is rooted in the individuals’ beliefs about their own abilities (Guskey & Passaro, 1994; Tschannen-Moran et al. 1998).

13.3.3 Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE): focus on two key components, the individual’s ability to perform actions and the power of those actions to influence student learning (e.g., McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978; Meijer & Foster, 1988; Ross, 1994, 1992; Soodak & Podell, 1996, 1993). A typical definition of personal teaching efficacy was put forth by Soodak and Podell (1996) this definition states that personal teaching efficacy is “a teacher’s belief about his or her ability to perform the actions needed to promote learning or manage student behavior successfully” (p. 406).