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Great leaders move us. They ignite our passion and inspire the best in us. When we try to explain why they are so effective, we speak of strategy, vision, or powerful ideas. But the reality is much more primal: Great leadership works through the emotions.

(Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002, p.1)

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Today, more than any other time, significance was attached to an efficient and fruitful education for the benefit of youths who are tomorrow’s builders of society. An educational management, having to take into accounts the political moreover, cultural surroundings and beliefs existing in the society, ought to devise appropriate planning towards the enhancement of the young generation.

School reform has been in the forefront of controversy for decades. In recent years, principals have been elevated in the eyes of many as a key element of school reform (Cotton, 2003). Principals have seen as instructional leaders who shape teacher, school climate and learner beliefs and behaviors. Purpose of the study is to explore the perceptions of secondary school teachers regarding secondary school principals, concerned with the instructional leadership, the teacher efficacy and the school organizational climate.

Principals can determine effective strategies to support future instructional leadership endeavors with a clearer perception of what teachers expect and what fellow principals/ headmaster are putting into practice (teacher efficacy).
The purposes served by this review of literature are fourfold. First, this review of literature will carefully examine the available report on “instructional leadership”. This will begin with a review of the leadership component of instructional leadership including definitions, sources, and types of leadership in general organizations and schools. Secondly, descriptions and results of current study the “relationship between school climate and instructional leadership” through multiple backgrounds and perspectives were present. Third part study is to explore the studies connected with the “relationship between instructional leadership and teacher efficacy in secondary school. Finally, research reports which provides support for the investigation of the interaction between school climate and teacher efficacy are reviewed.

2.2 INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

Historically, the earliest descriptions of principal did not specifically identify instructional leadership as key role. The initial job descriptions of the 1860s typically included maintenance of the building, discipline, classification of students, establishing rules and regulations, and scheduling classes (Beach & Reinhartz 2000). Role as "instructional leader" begins to appear more often during the 1960s, and the importance of that role for a principal has grown in recent years. With the pressures of the No Child Left behind Act of 2002 and state accountability standards to increase student performance, principals, now more than ever, must focus on leadership behaviors that promote learning for all.

The tasks performed by educational leaders and the social context of schools have changed dramatically from the early 19th century to present. During the 19th century, state departments of education were small and weak, usually consisting of very few employees with limited power, and the federal government had little influence over public schools (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Schools were small institutions managed locally. 'Leadership in schools' was unrecorded until the formation of the Department of Superintendents in 1866.
Preparation of school administrators evolved into formal programs sponsored by universities. Training of school administrators remained informal until the scientific management movement in the 1920s. A 1929 study by Fred Ayer (as cited in Tyack & Hansot, 1982) reported that, principals and superintendents performed many of the same tasks with the same frequency. Although they taught classes, performed clerical tasks and served as community liaisons, their leadership role for teachers, who were mostly female, was paternalistic, serving as the "Official chaperone for all teachers" (Tyack & Hansot, 1982, p. 177).

As the social and political contexts have changed and as the role of governments have increased in education, the role of the principal have also changed. School leaders have been challenged to remain focused on teaching and learning, and to work as instructional leaders (Franklin, 2000). "The term 'instructional leader' has been in vogue for decades as the desired model for education leaders especially principals" (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004, p. 4). However, instructional leadership remains a controversial characteristic of school research because of disagreement and misunderstanding about "what leadership is and how it works" (Lezotte, 1992, p. 14).

Love (2007), this study investigated teachers’ perceptions of leadership effectiveness of female principals compared to male principals. The sample groups were teachers from a school district in Middle Tennessee. The purpose of this study was to explore how effective teachers perceived their male or female principal to be in the workplace. Teacher participants scored their principal in the areas of supervisory activities, participatory activities, student interactions, staff interactions, daily school affairs, instructional issues, and long term organizational issues. They were also asked to indicate how often they thought effective leadership behaviors occurred and how often they thought each behavior should occur. Two hundred surveys were sent to elementary, middle, and high school teachers in twelve schools. Women principals headed
six of the schools, and male principals headed six of the schools. The 200 teachers were randomly selected, and 132 responded to the survey.

Ten hypotheses were tested using independent sample t-tests. It was found that teachers with male principals reported more areas where male principals were effective. When teachers were asked their preference of male or female principal, male and female teachers reported having “No Preference” in relation to gender of the principal. The teacher’s years of experience did not have a significant main effect on the principal’s perceived leadership effectiveness. Based on a 2x4 Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA), it was further found that male principals scored higher on effective leadership behavior currently occurring in their schools.

**GRIZZARD (2007)**, the purpose of this study was to develop a model of instructional leadership to build capacity in existing principals in Tennessee. Three elementary schools served as the control group, and three middle schools served as the experimental group. The intervention consisted of the principals of schools in the experimental group receiving training in instructional leadership and clinical supervision techniques, participating in book readings and discussions, and implementing clinical supervision techniques within the school. The study examined the impact of instructional leadership on the overall school climate and the six dimensions of school climate: supportive principal behavior, directive principal behavior, restrictive principal behavior, collegial teacher behavior, committed/intimate teacher behavior, and disengaged teacher behavior. The study also examined the effect the intervention had on the number of times a principal observed a teacher for improving instruction.

The study found that the instructional leadership training and the implementation of clinical supervision techniques did not have a statistically significant impact on school climate. However, the study found that there was a statistically significant difference in the number of teacher observations by the principal for the purpose of improving instruction for those principals who had the instructional leadership training and implemented clinical supervision
techniques and those who did not have the training and did not implement clinical supervision. Furthermore, the study also found there was a significant difference in the number of teacher observations by the principal as reported by the teacher before, after the principal participated in the instructional leadership training, and implemented clinical supervision techniques. Effective schools have leaders who maintain and support an academic emphasis. In order to maintain an academic emphasis with a focus on instruction, it is essential that principals be visible in classrooms. This study has proven that principal visibility does increase with appropriate training.

Anderson (2006), this study examined the relationship of high school principals' perceptions of instructional leadership behaviors to school size and to student achievement in Texas. A random sample of 190 secondary principals participated in the study. The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) was used to obtain principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership behaviors. Results indicated a relationship between principals' perceptions of leadership behaviors and school size. Principals of larger schools reported more involvement in leadership behaviors in Dimension I that define the school's mission and one subset-communicating the school's goals; in Dimension II that manage the instructional program and two subsets-coordinating the curriculum and monitoring student progress; and in one Dimension II subset-providing teacher incentives. These findings concur with instructional leadership research that suggests it is important to establish and communicate clear goals and to manage the instructional program. These findings contradict effective schools research that concludes principals are a key to student achievement.


2.2.1 Leadership Theory

During the 1980s, principals were proclaiming the undisputed educational leaders of their schools. Considerable discussion ensued in the literature over whether this leadership was derived more from an individual's expertise or from managerial skills. Others sought to distinguish school leadership from instructional leadership, and management from instructional leadership, viewing each as important but separate functions (Pajak & McAfee, 1992, p. 21)

An abundance of research studies and literature can be found regarding leadership styles, theories, and practices. Ralph Stodgill was one of the early theorists to study leadership traits or the trait approach to leadership. He reviewed 124 trait studies completed between 1904-1947 grouping the traits into five general categories: capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation, and status. He further identified traits such as intelligence and alertness and grouped them into one of the five categories (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Further, Stodgill found a number of traits (e.g., above-average intelligence, dependability, participation, and status) that consistently differentiated leaders from non-leaders. He concluded that the trait approach by itself had yielded negligible and confusing results. He asserted that a person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits because the impact of traits varies from situation to situation. As a consequence, Stodgill
added a sixth factor associated with leadership-situational components (Hoy & Miskel, 1996, p. 377).

Trait theory studies continued over the next two decades, mostly conducted by industrial psychologists that focused their research on leader traits and their relationship to leader effectiveness. This was a slightly different approach from Stodgill's, which compared leaders with non-leaders. Two decades later, Stodgill would return to continue his trait studies research (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Stodgill's work dominated both educational and industrial organizations for at least four decades. In a recent study, *Re culturing for Collaboration and Leadership* (1999), Leonard & Leonard state: ... Several conceptualizations have enjoyed preeminence, among them the trait, situational, and contingency approaches. The trait or "great man" perspective of the first half of the century attempts to identify specific physical or psychological characteristics that attracted loyal followers. Situational leadership theory attends more to the situation than to the person, particularly in terms of an organization's vein; the contingency perspective of leadership emphasizes apparent dissimilarities in organizational circumstances. (p. 237)

Two studies in the early 1950s at Ohio State University and the University of Michigan is of interest. The Ohio State Leadership Studies measured two basic aspects of leader behavior, initiating structure and consideration (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Initiating structure was defined as the degree to which leaders define and structure their own roles and the roles of subordinates toward the attainment of the organization's formal goals. Consideration was defined as the degree to which the leader acts in a warm supporting way and shows concern for subordinates. (Hughes & Ubben, 1994, p. 7)
As a result of the study, one of the earliest and most popular leadership behavior instruments was developed Hemphill and Coons and was later revised by Andrew Halpin (Rossow & Warner, 2000). The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) has been widely used to identify leadership behaviors of school administrators.

The major thrust of the instrument centers on the concepts of initiating structure and consideration (Drake & Roe, 1994). Effective leadership behavior tends most often to be associated with frequent behaviors on both dimensions. Simultaneously, the Michigan Studies investigating leadership styles of ineffective and effective managers were conducted at the University of Michigan (Drake & Roe, 1994).

Behavioral comparisons of ineffective and effective managers revealed that effective managers had a task orientation that generally focused on such administrative functions as planning, coordinating, and facilitating. This did not occur at the expense of good interpersonal relations. However, Effective managers were more likely to treat subordinates considerately and to allow them some degree of autonomy in deciding how to conduct their work and at what pace. (Hughes & Ubben, 1994, p. 7)

The decades of the 1950s and the 1960s contributed numerous theories to the concept of leadership and effective leader behaviors. Bass (1981) targets the theories of Argyris, Blake and Mouton, Likert, and McGregor as having been highly influential.

McGregor's Theory X asserted that people are passive and resistant and must be directed (Theory X); and the opposing theory (Theory Y) proposes that people possess motivation and the arrangement of the organization will provide the impetus for the fulfillment of their needs (Bass, 1981). Argyris postulated, "It is the very nature of organizations to structure member roles and to control performance in the interest of achieving specified objectives" (Bass, 1981, p. 7).
Blake and Mouton developed the Managerial Grid, their work being conceptually related to the Ohio and Michigan studies. "The Grid is based on two (attitudes) about the workplace: concern for people and concern for production. Concern for people closely parallels the concept of consideration, and concern for production is comparable to initiating structure" (Hughes & Ubben, 1994, p. 8).

"Maslow's (1943) human need theory, McGregor's (1960) Theory X and Theory Y, Hackman and Oldman's (1976) Job Design Theory, are all concerned with people's job satisfaction and motivation and assume that these job attitudes are a determining factor of their performance" (Cheng, 1996, p. 2). Additionally, Likert suggests, "leadership is relative processes in that leaders must take into account the expectations, values, and interpersonal skills of those with whom they are interacting" (Bass, 1981, p.34). these four theories are often categorized as humanistic approaches to leadership (Bass, 1981).

Definitions of leadership vary from author to author and are as numerous as the many writings on the topic "The leader is the individual in a group given the task of directing and coordinating task-relevant group activities" (Fiedler, 1967, p. 8). Fiedler's work is related to three contingency variables: "leader-group relations, the degree of structure in the task, and the position power of the leader" (Hughes & Ubben, 1994, p. 9).

Fiedler's theory departed from conventional thinking because it added a situational component to the model. Even though Stogdill's early trait studies acknowledged a situational component existed between the leader and subordinate, that situational component had not been accepted as convention at the time Fiedler constructed his theory.

Fiedler distinguishes between "leadership behavior" and "leadership style".Leadership behavior requires specific direction from the leader in coordinating the work of the group. Leadership style refers to the personal need structure of the leader to motivate behavior in interpersonal situations (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Fiedler's contingency theory claims, "The effectiveness of a
given pattern of the leader behavior is contingent upon the demands imposed by the situation" (Bass, 1981, p. 32).

Principals are cast into powerful symbolic roles whether this is their intention or not. Taking no action in some situations may be as powerful as taking any action (Sergiovanni et al., 1987). The Path-Goal Theory of Leadership was articulated by House in 1971 after intermittent beginnings going back to the 1950s. This theory has a situational component stating that leaders perform optimally when they adapt to the needs of the situation. The four categories of leader behavior are supportive, directive, participative, and achievement-oriented leadership (Hughes & Ubben, 1994).

Henry Mintzberg's work in the seventies was different in that he identified tasks that the leader or manager performed. He writes, "The manager can be defined as that person in charge of an organization or one of its sub units" (Mintzberg, 1989, p. 15). Managers' roles are derived from formal authority and include interpersonal relationships. Mintzberg offers three role categories with ten components:

1. **Interpersonal roles**: figurehead, leader, liaison,
2. **Informational roles**: monitor, disseminator, and spokesman,

Leadership theory in the 1970 centered on the interpersonal relationships between the leader and subordinates within the environment of the organization.

Throughout the next two decades, a merging of educational theory and business theory seemed to take place in both the educational and business arenas. This era also produced a unique blend of scholarly writings from both the researchers and practitioners' perspectives. In Thomas Peters and Robert
Waterman's *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies*, a lengthy discussion is devoted to early academic theorists such as McGregor, Argyris, Likert, and Bennis. Simultaneously, educators began to investigate theories from the business field.

Roueche and Baker did an extensive study on the characteristics of successful principals and subsequently compared their findings to those of Peters and Waterman concerning the effectiveness of executives in what they considered the best-run companies in the nation (Kimbrough & Burkett, 1990, pp. 20).

The common skills they found were as follows:

1. Flexibility in autonomy and innovation,
2. Cohesiveness within the organization,
3. Commitment to school mission,
4. Recognition of staff,
5. Problem solving through collaboration,
6. Effective delegation,

Similarly, W. Edwards Deming's total quality management system spurred educators to improve customer satisfaction and school services on a continual basis (Hughes & Ubben, 1994). Although Joseph M. Juran was a significant figure in the development of total quality management theories, W. Edwards Deming is the most influential figure in the development and history of total quality management (Greenwood & Gaunt, 1994). Many school organizations attempted to adapt Deming's fourteen points, the concept of continuous improvement, the four cornerstones, and the theory of profound knowledge to the educational setting. An adaptation of Deming's fourteen points for schools is listed below:

1. Pursue continuous improvement of curriculum and learning diligently and constantly,
2. Adopt the system of profound knowledge in your classroom
and school as the prime management tool,

3. Build quality into teaching and learning and reduce the inspection of quality into work after the event,

4. Build a partnership relationship with colleagues, students, colleges, and employees,

5. Constantly improve the system, within which teaching/learning takes place,

6. Take every opportunity to train in new skills and to learn from your pupils,

7. Lead; do not drive or manipulate,

8. Drive out fear of punishment; create joy in learning,

9. Collaborate with colleagues from other departments and functions,

10. Communicate honestly, not through jargon and slogans,

11. So far as possible create a world without grades and rank order,

12. Encourage and celebrate to develop your student's pride in work,

13. Promote the development of the whole person in students and colleagues,

Site-based management, another trend of the 1980s, is a strategy for decentralizing the decision-making process. A process shifts the power of authority from higher-level individuals to front line workers or stakeholders. Mintzberg defines power in his book, *Power in and around Organizations*, as "the capacity to effect (or affect) organizational outcomes (Mintzberg, 1983, p. 4). Despite trends throughout the nation toward increased centralization, there is a developing movement toward site-based management and the principal's management and leadership styles are a critical factor in the effectiveness of the school plan (Sergiovanni et al., 1987).

The basic thrust of the many models or systems of the 1980s seemed to influence the decision-making processes and systematic planning of the entire organization. Sergiovanni, a theorist ahead of his time, said: The emphasis seems to have shifted from educational leadership to organizational leadership for principals. That is, principals are prepared knowing less about educational program matters and more about organizational matters relating to leadership behavior, communication, decision making, and morale. (Sergiovanni and Elliot, 1975, p. 88)

Another systematic approach is called management by objectives, which implies different things to different people. Peter Drucker is credited with bringing the process to literature (Hughes & Ubben, 1989) "Management by objectives is a sound procedure for developing organization-wide responses consistent with the goals established in the strategic planning process" (Hughes & Ubben, 1989, p. 400).

There are four essential elements of management by objective process:

(1) Concrete, measurable, performance-based goals,
(2) Participation of subordinates in goal setting,
(3) Periodic review sessions to discuss performance and progress toward goals, and
(4) Commitment to the process at all organizational levels
Many models call for educators to integrate the concepts into the educational organizational structures for the purpose of continuous improvement. Goodlad ads: innovation is accepted and even applauded when it is designed and carefully explained (over and over) as a way of performing these basic functions better. The wise change agent stresses not the forms of the new but the merits of doing established things better. (Goodlad, 1975, p. 8)

In another study, Pajak and McAfee contend that principals should be curriculum leaders. From the review of the literature and their own research, they found that "successful principals understand how the curriculum is organized and how learning activities, material, and instructional outcomes fit into that organization" (Pajak & McAfee, 1992, p. 23).

2.2.2 Behavior theories

According to Chemers (1995), it was the increasing acceptance of the view that the trait theory failed to identify the foundation of effective leadership that lead to the advent of the "behavior period" of leadership research, especially with the landmark study of leadership styles published by Kurt Lewin and his associates (1947). Research then began its focus on the specific behaviors of effective leaders (The Leadership Forum, 2003). Behavioral theories assert that the most important aspect of leadership is not who the leader is, but rather what the leader does in various situations. Thus, successful leaders can be distinguished from unsuccessful leaders by their particular style of leadership behavior. The human relations school of thought was one area that had a tremendous impact during the behavior period. As opposed to the trait theory concept that leaders were born not made, the human relations idea held that leadership skills and effective behaviors can be developed and learned regardless of an individual's inherit traits (The Leadership Forum).The majority of researchers tended to group leadership behavior into two dimensions. Although various researchers have developed their own terms, the behaviors studied primarily centered on: (a) those categorized as relationship oriented, such as interpersonal warmth, concern for the feelings of subordinates, and the
use of two-way communication; and (b) those categorized as task oriented, such as directive, goal facilitation, and task-related feedback (Chemers, 1995). Three studies of this genre most often referred to are: (a) Blake and Mouton's managerial grid, (b) the Ohio State Studies, and (c) the University of Michigan Studies.

Blake and Mouton (1964) based their development of the managerial grid on the basic premise that two variables can be found in organizations: concern for people and concern for productivity. The system they developed identifies the possible combinations of those variables. As shown in Figure 1, leaders are placed on the grid based on their score for each variable. Although scores could place a leader within the confines of any of the various grids, Table 1 provides an explanation for each of the pure leadership styles found within the managerial grid.
**Description**

1. 1. Style Low concern for production and a low concern for people. Leaders place their primary emphasis on staying out of trouble.

1, 9 style High concern for people and a low concern for production. Leaders try to create a secure, happy environment for their people and assume that they will not meet their organization's production goals.

9.1 style High concern for production and low concern for people. This is the opposite of the 1, 9 style and leaders see the personal needs of their people as irrelevant to the goal of ensuring the organization is productive.

hell5, 5 style A compromise between concern for people and production. Leaders try to find a middle-of-the-road approach that will balance the needs of their people and the needs of the organization.

9.9 style High concern for people and high concern for production. Leaders to develop committed high-performance work groups and teams that will result in high satisfaction and high productivity. Two other well documented studies from the behavioral era came from the work of researchers at Ohio State University and at the University of Michigan (as cited in Bass, 1990).
The overall objective of the Ohio State studies was to investigate the determinants of leader behavior and to identify the effects of leadership style on workgroup performance and satisfaction. Two dimensions were identified:

1. **Initiating Structure** - The leader organizes the work and assigns the tasks and defines what each subordinate is to do.

2. **Consideration** - The leader shows concern for subordinates and exhibits behavior that involves trust, mutual respect, friendship, and a concern for the follower. Other researchers, while agreeing with the two dimensions, labeled them Job-Centered versus Employee-Centered. The University of Michigan researchers followed this thought as they looked to identify styles of leader behavior that resulted in increased production and satisfaction. Their dimensions were:
   
   **a. Job-Centered** - The leader practices close supervision to control outcomes through legitimate reward. Primarily interested in production and individual subordinate work performance.

   **b. Employee-Centered** - The leader is people-oriented and works to build effective work groups and teams, with an emphasis on delegation of responsibility and a concern for employee needs and personal growth. Interested in high performance through satisfied, high performing workers.

This idea of leadership behaviors was reinforced by Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy (1996) when they determined that although leaders may be able to adapt their behavior toward individuals and situations, leaders do have dominant behavioral tendencies. Some leaders may have a more natural tendency toward building personal relationships, while other leaders may be more task-oriented.

While the identification of two leadership dimensions was a big step forward in leadership research, it, like the trait theory that preceded it, failed to reliably relate specific behaviors to overall leadership effectiveness and predictable organizational outcomes. Both of these research periods focused on finding the one, best style of leadership. These periods did make great strides in the overall area of leadership research.
However, what the consensus of the research during those times failed to identify was that there is no "one size fits all" universally accepted style of leadership that will be effective in all situations (Chemers, 1995).

2.2.3 What is School Leadership?

At the core of most definitions of leadership are two functions: providing direction and exercising influence (Hallinger & Heck, 1996). Leaders organize and work with others to accomplish shared goals. Principals, who are the educational leaders of their schools, work with others to create a shared sense of purpose and direction. Principals also establish the conditions that encourage others to be effective. In education, the final result is increasingly focused on student achievement (No Child Left Behind Act). This includes the development of academic goals and the learning of appropriate social and personal behaviors.

Marzano et al. (2005) conducted a Meta analysis of the research concerning educational leadership and its relationship to student achievement and successful schools. One conclusion from Marzano et al.'s research was that leadership had significant effects on student learning, second only to the effects of quality of curriculum and the quality of the teacher's instruction. In order to learn, students need access to high-quality instruction and a well-designed curriculum.

Following these two points, students benefit most from the positive effects of strong school leadership. This case study of schools with high quality indicated that the principals of these schools influenced learning mainly by inciting effort around aggressive school-wide goals and providing the conditions and resources that helped teachers become successful.

Kenneth Leithwood conducted numerous empirical studies related to the effects of leadership behaviors and positive school outcomes (Leithwood, 1990, 1994, 1995; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1996). These studies were conducted in
schools that were undergoing organizational reform and primarily compared principals who were successful at school improvement with their less-effective peers. Leithwood's (1996) study reported positive effects of principal leadership behaviors based on teachers' perceptions of such behaviors. Leithwood used a theoretical framework adapted from the work of Lord and Maher (as cited in Leithwood & Jantzi, 1996) to explain cognitive processes associated with teachers' development of leadership perceptions.

According to Lord and Maher, there are two ways teachers' perceptions of leadership behaviors are formed: (1) information on leadership prototypes is stored in the teacher's long-term memory, and the recognition of principal leadership behavior is activated by observed behavior on the part of the principal and compared to leadership behaviors stored in the long-term memory and (2) through a series of observable events and experiences in which the principal is involved, perceptions of the principal result from the teacher's judgment that those events had desirable results. Lord and Maher explained that "The influence associated with leadership depends on a person's behavior being recognized as leadership by others who thereby cast themselves into the role of followers (p. 513)."

According to Leithwood (1990, 1994, & 1995) and his colleagues (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1996), a core set of leadership behaviors provides the foundation for successful school leadership. These leadership behaviors are well suited to such challenges (school reform) because of their potential for building high levels of commitment to one complex and uncertain nature of the restructuring agenda, and for fostering growth in the capacities school staffs must develop to respond productively to this agenda (1996, p 515).

These leadership behaviors include:

1. Provides vision. 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.

2. Models appropriate behavior. 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.

3. Fosters the acceptance of group 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.

4. Provides 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. Provides 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.

6. Holds high performance expectations: 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.

7. The leadership of any organization is complex and demands certain competencies. Successful educational organizations identify an educational leader who can focus the group's attention and efforts
toward a common goal or vision. Leaders establish a direction and vision, serve as role models, are effective communicators, provide convincing leadership, bring out the best in people, are proactive, and are able to make decisions in a time of crisis (Pullan, 2001). Our educational institutions require a versatile leader who has multi-tasking abilities to perform the necessary daily tasks, which includes providing the necessary resources to establish positive school climate and supports to teachers to improve student achievement and to existence assert school organizational climate.

2.2.4 History of Instructional Leadership

The concept of instructional leadership is thought to have gained popularity during the 1960s. During this time period, the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) sponsored a program for 55 individuals, who were aspiring to become school administrators. These would-be principals participated in a two-year program that included a year-long internship. Interns were matched with schools that wished to improve their instructional programs and with a university faculty member. At the conclusion of the two-year program, participants reported that their most important task as a principal was to improve the instructional program (Trump and Karasik, 1967).

Jenson (1967) authored Elementary School Administration, a textbook, which divided the principal's responsibility into six areas:

- Administrative management;
- Instructional leadership;
- School-community relations;
- Child guidance;
- Plant supervision
- and Personnel

He maintained that instructional leadership was to be the top priority of an elementary principal. Studies in the 1970s constructed early definitions of
instructional leadership and identified sources of leadership. Gordon (1971) conducted a study of teachers and their perceptions of principals as instructional leaders. He found that teachers perceived principals as having a low level of expertise regarding instruction, and he suggested that principals redefine their roles and responsibilities to become instructional leaders. Brieve (1972) identified four major steps for principals to become instructional leaders:

- administrating,
- supporting,
- Coordinating,
- And initiating.

He further divided these four steps into specific activities a principal should perform to improve instruction.

In the late 1970s, Edmonds (1979) found compelling evidence that effective schools resulted from strong instructional leadership. He identified five avenues that affected student achievement:

- Strong administrative leadership,
- High expectations for student achievement,
- An orderly environment,
- Emphasis on basic skills,
- And frequent monitoring of student progress.

Studies during the 1980s were drawn predominately from the effective schools literature (Andrews & Soder, 1987; Hallinger, 2001; Hallinger, 2003; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Rossow, 1990). Effective schools research has produced specific criteria found in the ‘most effective schools. The most outstanding schools have the following characteristics:

- A principal who serves as an instructional leader, sets high goals, inspires staff to achieve the goals
- *A safe orderly school environment*
- Cooperation among staff; teamwork
- Protection of academic learning time
• Systematically monitored student progress (Portin, Shen, & Williams, 1998; Southworth, 2002).

The same research identified the principal as instructional leader as one of the most important ingredients of an effective school (Christie, 2000; Lezotte, 1992; Ubben & Hughes, 1987).

The instructional leadership movement lost momentum largely because of unrealistic expectations that the principal could be an expert in all subject areas and because it failed to recognize the needs of the teaching staff and school culture (Deal & Peterson, 1991; Poplin, 1992; Rosenho1tz, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1994).

Research began to focus on leadership styles and student achievement rather than on the roles of principals as instructional leaders. School leadership research became focused on the principal as transformational, and as an agent of change (Fullan, 2002; Hallinger, 2003).

The publication of A Nation at Risk (1983), which described America's public schools as mediocre, emphasized the role of the principal as a major factor in school success, refocusing educational research on the principal as an instructional leader. The publication cited declining test scores, quality of teachers, poor academic standards, and substandard student conduct as proof of public school failure.

Thus, national, state, and local educational policy makers attempted to turn the tide of educational decline with a focus on basic skills and with a principal who served as an instructional leader (Fisher, 2003; Hallinger, 2001). Texas adopted performance domains and descriptors in the appraisal process for administrators that included instructional management.

The administrator promotes improvement of instruction through activities such as the following:

• Monitoring student achievement and attendance;
• Diagnosing student needs; helping teachers design learning
experiences for students; encouraging the development and piloting of innovative instructional programs;

- And facilitating the planning and application of emerging technologies in the classroom.

"Despite ardent advocacy for stronger principal instructional leadership, some scholars at that time noted the paucity of systematic investigation into this role" (Hallinger, 2001, p.3). According to Hallinger (2001), one factor that hindered an understanding of the principal's role and its contribution to school improvement was the lack of a valid, reliable instrument to explore the role.

Therefore, Hallinger (1983) developed the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS). In a review of the research on the effects of principal leadership, Hallinger (2001) noted that the PIMRS was the most commonly used instrument in studies between 1980 and 1996 that researched instructional leadership. Based upon the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (Hallinger, 1983), Hallinger and Murphy (1985) identified three dimensions of instructional leadership:

- Definition of the school's goals,
- Management of the instructional program,
- And promotion of a positive school climate.

They clarified two behaviors that defined the school's mission, which were "framing the school's goals and communicating them to important audiences" (p. 221). They identified several job functions that managed the instructional program.

These job functions were:

- "Supervising and evaluating instruction,
- Curricular coordination,
- Monitoring student progress,
- Protecting instructional time,
- And promoting instructional movement and professional development" (p. 222).

- They identified additional job functions that promoted a positive
school climate as:

- "Maintaining visibility,
- Providing incentives for teachers,
- Enforcing academic standards,
- And providing incentives for learning" (p. 223).

However, research in the 1990s continued to explore the role of the principal as instructional leader as it related to student achievement: According to Lkontos (1992), instructional leadership was a top-down leadership approach from a principal who knew bests what to teach in each subject and how to teach it. Lezotte (1992) disagreed. He identified two misunderstandings about what instructional leadership was and how it worked: A common misunderstanding is that strong instructional leadership means the principal runs the school and teachers like a tyrannical slaveholder.

Those who think this have not kept up with literature on effective leadership. Effective leaders lead through commitment, not authority. People follow because they share the leaders' dreams, not because they are afraid.

A second misunderstanding involves professional autonomy and individual freedoms. These critics think a teacher who publicly becomes part of the principal's shared vision abdicates professional autonomy. This is misguided, not doing justice to teachers, who have a basic need to be a part of a community of shared values (p. 14). Sheppard (1996) synthesized the research on instructional leadership behaviors, especially those behaviors linked to student achievement. For clarification of the concept of instructional leadership, he distinguished between the narrow and broad definitions. For him the "narrow definition focuses on instructional leadership as a separate entity from administration" (p. 326). For Sheppard, the broad perspective of instructional leadership was defined as interactions between leaders and followers.

His research contradicted other research findings that had concluded that teachers were often negatively affected by routine instructional leadership.
behaviors. In contrast, Sheppard confirmed a positive and strong relationship between effective instructional leadership behaviors exhibited by principals and teachers' commitment, professional involvement, and innovativeness. Sheppard (1996) identified 10 behaviors of principals that were positively connected to teachers' professional growth and performance:

- Framing school goals,
- Communicating school goals,
- Supervising and evaluating instruction,
- Coordinating curriculum,
- Monitoring student progress,
- Protecting instructional time,
- Maintaining high visibility,
- Providing incentives for teachers,
- Promoting professional development,
- And providing incentives for learning.

Of these, Sheppard found that promoting teachers' professional development was the most influential instructional leadership behavior at both the secondary and the elementary levels. At the secondary level, Sheppard found that framing the school's goal was also an important behavior for principals. Effective schools research linked successful schools to the skillful leadership of principals (Hallinger, 2003; Sheppard, 1996).

Hallinger (2003) observed that the similarities of the research on instructional leadership included the following:

1. The school principal, as the instructional leader, would focus on coordination, control, supervision, and development of curriculum and instruction
2. Instructional leadership was seen as the role of the elementary school principal
3. Instructional leaders were seen as directive
4. Instructional leaders possessed expertise and charisma and worked directly with teachers to improve teaching and learning.

5. Instructional leaders were focused on goals to improve student achievement.

6. Instructional leaders built culture with their high expectations and high standards.

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996) recognized the importance of principals in creating schools conducive to both student and teacher success and has recommended that principals who understood teaching and learning should be prepared and retained.

Markow and Sheer (2003), directors of the MetLife Survey concluded that "… More and more emphasis is being place on [school] leadership. The school principal is increasingly regarded as the primary factor in implementing reform and raising student achievement" (p. 3). Principals were, according to Hausman, Crow, and Sperry (2000), essential to the development of effective schools. They found that good principals focused on "what is best for students" (p. 1). Southworth (2005) found that principals' influence on what happens in the classroom has taken three forms: direct effects by which the leader directly influences student outcomes; indirect effects by which the leader influences student outcomes indirectly through other variables; and reciprocal effects by which the leader influenced teachers and teachers influenced leaders. For Southworth, monitoring also involved classroom visitations, teacher observations, and feedback. Principals communicated by creating opportunities for teachers to talk with and share ideas with collegeagues and leaders. The impetus of the communication was focused on teaching and learning. Such communication allowed articulation and processing to occur.

The three strategies, modeling, monitoring, and communicating, interacted and supported each other. A combination of the three strategies created powerful learning for leaders and for teachers, which informed teachers' actions and improved student learning (Southworth, 2005).
In spite of the numerous studies that, have examined the direct and indirect impact of instructional leadership on teacher quality, student achievement and school climate, the results have been mixed. Leitner (as cited in Hallinger, 2001); Heck, Larson, and Marcoulides (1990); and Basker and Witziers (as cited in Hill, 2002) found little or no relationship between instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement.

At the same time, Andrews and Sodder (1987); Blase and Blase (1999); and Hallinger and Heck (1998) found a significant relationship between instructional leader behavior and student achievement. Instructional leaders influenced the actions of teachers in the classroom because they had powerful behavioral, affective, and cognitive effects on teachers (Blase & Blase, 1999).

Andrews and Soder (1987) found a powerful relationship between the principal as instructional leader and student achievement whereas Leitner (as cited in Hallinger, 2001) concluded there was no significant relationship between the principal as instructional leader and student achievement.

Heck, Larson, and Marcoulides (1990) stated that researchers had produced no empirical evidence that principals who devoted more time to instructional leadership directly affected higher student academic achievement. Basker and Witziers (as cited in Hill, 2002) found an extremely small effect. Hallinger and Heck (1998) found a significant, measurable indirect effect between the principal as an instructional leader and student achievement. Perhaps the most complete studies to date were conducted by Sheppard (1996) and Hallinger (2003). Sheppard (1996) found that promoting the professional development of teachers was the most influential instructional leadership behavior for elementary and secondary principals. Hallinger (2003) conceptualized a model for examining instructional leadership in three dimensions: framing the school's goals, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school climate. Hallinger (2003) concluded that school principals indirectly affect student achievement and quality by influencing "what happens in school and in classrooms"(p. 333).
2.2.5 Definitions of Instructional Leadership

A definitive definition of the principal as instructional leader does not exist, thus creating inconsistencies in leadership research and literature. Neither a singular definition of instructional leadership nor a specific set of guidelines for an instructional leader exists (Flath, 1989; Hill, 2002).

Table (1) provides an historical perspective of definitions for the principal as an instructional leader. As early as 1895, the Committee of Fifteen charged the principal with the duty of supervising instruction (Cohen; 1974).

*Table 1- Definitions of Principal as Instructional Leader*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee of Fifteen</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>supervises instruction fifteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMurray</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>organizes content and methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barr, Burton &amp; Bruechner</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Improves teaching and learning; evaluates methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moehlman</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>facilitates instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagman</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>teaching activities, plans, selects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenson</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Instructional leader first, then manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes &amp; Ubben</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>improves learning and teaching by influencing teacher behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews &amp; Soder</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>is an instructional resource, communicator, visible presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach &amp; Reinhartz</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>works collaboratively with teachers to enhance teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leithwood &amp; Riehl</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>to the ability to provide direction and exercise influence over others in an effort to achieve shared goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A plethora of definitions used by researchers between 1978 and 2006 indicates the lack of consistency for defining instructional leadership. Perhaps instructional leadership is not unlike leadership, for as Greenberg and Baron (2003) noted, "Leadership resembles love; it is something most people believe they can recognize but often find it difficult to define" (p. 470). The lack of consistency in instructional leadership may be attributed to the different lenses researchers have used to view instructional leadership.

Some researchers viewed instructional leadership as interactions between the principal as instructional leader and the teachers (Acheson & Smith, 1986; Andrews, Basom & Basom, 1991, Blase & Blase, 1994; Hughes & Ubben, 1978; Murphy, 1988). Others viewed instructional leadership as having specific knowledge and skills for classroom instruction (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2005; DuFour & Eaker, 1999; Shellard, 2003; Southworth, 2005). Still others viewed instructional leadership as providing support and development to enhance teaching and learning (Greenfield, 1987; Keefe & Jenkins, 1991; persell & Cookson, 1982; Smithe & Pie1e, 1997). Instructional Leadership Behaviors and Teacher Interactions One view of instructional leadership was the lens of the principal's interactions with teachers. Hughes and Ubben (1978), using this lens, defined instructional leadership as actions by administrators and other faculty to improve learning and teaching by influencing classroom teacher behavior.

Acheson and Smith (1986) stated that instructional leadership was "directly related to the process of instruction where teachers, learners, and the curriculum interact" (p. 3). Murphy (1988) defined instructional leadership as it was directly related to learning and to teaching. Acheson (1985) narrowed his definition of instructional leadership to the times when the principal made direct contact with the teacher(s) about the instructional process. Andrews, Basom, and Basom (1991) defined instructional leadership as the actions taken by the principal with the staff to influence teaching which influenced student learning. Portin, Shen, and Williams (1998) stated that instructional leadership was the role of the principal to supervise the curriculum, improve the instructional
program, work with staff to identify a vision and direction for the school, and build a close and congruent working relationship between the school and its community.

Sergiovanni (1990) found dimensions of leadership that contributed to teachers' sense of efficacy, commitment, and motivation. These qualities in teachers were linked to student achievement gains (Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990). In a study conducted by Blase and Blase (1994), good principals made informal visits to classrooms. Teachers perceived these visits positively as evidence of the principal's interest in the classroom. The principal's high visibility enhanced teachers' sense of security, self esteem, and motivation.

Blase and Blase (2001) defined the principal as instructional leader and found that principals who were instructional leaders had the following characteristics: A primary focus on instruction, a learning culture, participatory decision making for instruction, and agreement and support among stakeholders. They identified three instructional leadership themes: talking to teachers, encouraging professional growth for teachers, and advocating reflection. Within each theme, specific behaviors were identified. The specific behaviors identified with talking with teachers included trust building, group development, collaboration, providing peer mentors, classroom observations, teacher conferences about teaching and learning, teacher empowerment, and high visibility. Specific behaviors identified with providing professional growth for teachers included knowledge of programs, encouragement of innovative practices, staff development, teacher support and praise, and feedback. Specific behaviors identified with fostering teacher reflection included skills for reflection, promoting a learning community, increasing research skills, providing questioning models, using data for evaluation, and respecting teacher autonomy. Instructional Leadership Behaviors as Knowledge and Skills.

Another lens for viewing instructional leadership derived from the Effective Schools research that viewed principals as possessing a base of knowledge and skills for classroom instruction. Effective schools research in the
1970s and 1980s described strong principals as those who had definite ideas about teaching and a clear understanding of the operation of their schools (DuFour & Eaker, 1999). In their own study, DuFour and Eaker (1999) concluded that principals who were instructional leaders were focused on student achievement, fixated on results. Darling-Hammond, et al (2005) determined that principals must know instruction well to serve as instructional leaders. Shellard (2003) concluded that instructional leadership was the knowledge and skills principals possessed to effectively support the academic program.

Southworth (2005) determined that principals monitored by analyzing student data and by acting upon the information."Data are not an additional part of the work, as if they were an appendage to the teaching process; they are integral part of leadership and teaching" (p. 79).

2.2.6 Principal as an Instructional Leader

Kimbrough and Burkett, (1990), express that the administrative functions have become complex and an extensive amount of research and literature has documented the complexity and importance of the role of the principal over many decades. Hughes and Ubben (1989) identify two dimensions of the principal ship as managerial and leadership behaviors. Principals apply these behaviors to the five main functions below:

1. Curriculum development,
2. Instructional improvement,
3. Pupil relations,
4. Community relations,
5. Financial and facility management (Hughes and Ubben, 1989)

Further, Ubben and Hughes (1987) contend that instructional leadership has a place in the school, stating “The key individual for providing instructional leadership in a school is the principal" (p. 17).

Educators have long known intuitively that school leadership makes a difference. Many early studies on school effectiveness, for example, reported that leadership, specifically instructional leadership, was one of several defining
characteristics of successful schools. Nonetheless, this notion of instructional leadership remained a vague and imprecise concept for many district and school leaders charged with providing it. Since the early 1970's, many thoughtful, experienced, and competent scholars and practitioners have offered theories, anecdotes, and personal perspectives concerning instructional leadership (Waters, Marzano & McNulty, 2003, p. 2).

However, the notion that effective principals have certain effective leadership behaviors has emerged recently in the literature. Further, certain behaviors exhibited by effective principals have been identified in the current research with patterns of similar behaviors. Researchers Blase and Blase (2004) reported three main categories of effective leadership behaviors: talking with teachers, promoting teachers' professional growth, and fostering teacher reflection. Each category consisted of several related behaviors:

Talking With Teachers:

1. Building trust,
2. Developing the group,
3. Fostering collaboration and collegiality,
4. Supporting peer coaching,
5. Observing in classrooms,
6. Conferring with teachers about teaching and learning,
7. Empowering teachers,
8. Maintaining visibility, Promoting Teachers' Professional Growth
9. Studying literature and proven programs,
10. Supporting practice of new skills, risk taking, innovation, and creativity,
11. Providing effective staff development programs,
12. Applying principles of adult growth and development,
13. Praising, supporting, and facilitating teachers' work,
14. Providing resources and time,
15. Giving feedback and suggestions,
**Fostering Teacher Reflection:**

1. Developing teachers' reflection skills in order to construct professional knowledge and develop sociopolitical insights,
2. Modeling and developing teachers' critical study (action research) skills,
3. Becoming inquiry oriented,
4. Using data to question, evaluate, and critique teaching and learning,

In a recognition program honoring outstanding principals developed by the United States Department of Education, the following behaviors of principals has been noted:

1. Knowledge of effective instructional programs,
2. Understanding of child growth and development,
3. Support of teachers,
4. Well-designed and coordinated instructional programs,
5. Use of academic time,
6. Frequent assessment of student achievement,
7. Supervision of instruction,
8. Constructive feedback to teachers,
9. Ability to communicate - write and speak,
10. Ability to apply technology to management - use of spreadsheets, word processors, data bases, etc.,
11. Understanding of the political process,
12. Knowledge of effective school practices,
13. Understanding of leadership theories and principles,
A two-year study of the relationship between principal leadership and student academic achievement conducted by Andrews and Soder (1987) and drawn from teacher assessments of their principals found that certain behaviors of principals are associated with reading and mathematics achievement. The study was collaboration between the University Of Washington College Of Education and the Seattle School District. All staff in the district were administered a questionnaire (Staff Assessment Questionnaire) designed to measure eighteen strategic interactions between the principals and the teachers. Overall, principals who were identified as strong leaders demonstrated greater gains in the academic achievement of students. Principal behaviors noted in the study were the principal as a resource provider, instructional resource, and communicator, and the visible presence of the principal.

Heck, Larson, and Marcoulides (1990) reported a study in which the purpose was to "test a theoretical causal model concerning how elementary and secondary school principals can influence school-wide student achievement through the frequency of implementation of certain instructional leadership behaviors" (p. 94). The instrument used in the study was the Instructional Activity Questionnaire (IAQ), which identified thirty-four instructional leadership behaviors over three subscales; it was based on a five-point Likert-type scale (Larsen, 1987, reported in Heck et al., 1990). The theoretical model developed was based on previous models found in related literature.

The initial study conducted by Heck et al. (1990) concluded the following: The instructional leadership role of the principal is one key element in a conceptual framework that recognizes the importance of the school's social context in determining student achievement. Clearly, instructional leadership is a multidimensional construct. How the principal and teachers are able to organize and coordinate the work life of the school shapes not only the learning experiences and achievement of students, but also the environment in which the work is carried out. The identification of a set of principal instructional leadership behaviors that are directly associated with school achievement outcomes serve as the basis for developing criteria to evaluate the effectiveness.
of principal performance and lead to more effective preparation programs for school administrators. (p. 123)

Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) promote a balanced leadership framework based on a 30-year quantitative analysis and an exhaustive review of the literature on leadership. Through their meta-analysis of approximately 70 studies, 2,094 schools, 1.1 million Students, and 14,000 teachers, they found a substantial relationship between leadership and student achievement (Waters et al., 2003). This study identified 21 specific leadership responsibilities correlated with student achievement:

1. **Culture** - fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation,
2. **Order** - establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines,
3. **Discipline** - protects teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their teaching time or focus,
4. **Resources** - provides teachers with materials and professional development, necessary for the successful execution of their jobs,
5. **Curriculum, instruction, assessment** - is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices,
6. **Focus** - establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school's attention,
7. **Fosters** - shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation,
8. **Visibility** - has quality contact and interactions with teacher and students,
9. **Contingent rewards** - recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments,
10. **Communication** - establishes strong lines of communication with teachers and among students,
11. **Outreach** - is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders,
12. **Input** - involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies,
13. Affirmation - recognizes and celebrates school accomplishments and acknowledges failures,
14. Relationship - demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff,
15. Change agent - is willing to and directly challenges the status quo,
16. Optimizer - inspires and leads new and challenging innovations,
17. Ideals/beliefs - communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling,
18. Monitors Evaluates - monitors the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning,
19. Flexibility - adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent,
20. Situational awareness - is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems,
21. Intellectual stimulation - ensures that faculty and staffs are aware of the most current theories and practices and make the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school's culture (Waters et al., 2003, p. 4).

King (2002) describes instructional leadership as "anything that leaders do to improve teaching and learning in their schools and districts" (King, 2002, p. 64). She further identifies the behaviors of instructional leaders as being learning leaders, focusing on teaching and learning, developing leadership capacity in others, creating the conditions for professional learning, using data to inform decisions, and using resources creatively (King, 2002).
A recent study funded by The Wallace Foundation focused on whether principals should be "real instructional leaders" (Portin, Schneider, De Armond, & Gundlach, 2003). The study identified seven critical functions and actions, the first of which is instructional leadership "It was clear that all schools needed someone who assured the quality of instruction" (Portin et al., 2003, p. 19). Further, every teacher and principal interviewed talked about the importance of having someone to guide the curriculum. Some principals talked about visiting classrooms and providing feedback to teachers (Portin et al., 2003). Other functions of leadership cited by the researchers included cultural, managerial, human resource, strategic, external development, and micro political leadership.

In research conducted by Hallinger and Murphy (1987) emphasized that instructional leadership "must be defined in terms of observable practices and behaviors that principals can implement" (p. 55). Further, it is very difficult to assess principals' behaviors if they have not been clearly defined (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987). Therefore, the principal's role comprises three dimensions of instructional leadership activity: defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting the school learning climate" (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987, p. 57). Each dimension then contains a job function, and each job function contains various principal behaviors.

Hallinger (1982, 1983, and 1990) developed the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) to assess and study instructional leadership. The instrument contains ten specific instructional leadership functions within the three dimensions:

Defining the School's Mission
1. Framing the School's Goals,
2. Communicating the School's Goals,

Managing the Instructional Program
1. Supervising and Evaluating Instruction,
2. Coordinating the Curriculum,
3. Monitoring Student Progress,

Promoting a Positive School Learning Climate
1. Protecting Instructional Time,
2. Promoting Professional Development,
3. Maintaining Visibility,
4. Providing Incentives for Teachers,
5. Providing Incentives for Learning (Hallinger, 2001, p. 6).

Additionally, the instrument contains 50 critical principal instructional leadership behaviors. The instrument may be used as a principal self-assessment instrument and as an instrument for supervisors and teachers to record their perceptions of principals' instructional leadership behaviors (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987). According to Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom (2004), Hallinger's model has been the most researched.

As noted earlier, one of the most widely used instruments was initially researched by the Personnel Research Board of the Ohio State University in the early nineteen fifties as the focused shifted from leadership traits to leadership behaviors (Hanson, 1996). The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed based on the work of both Hemphill and Coons and Halpin and Winer. Andrew Halpin's version specifically identified the dimensions of initiating structure and initiating consideration, and the relationship of these two dimensions was used to predict subordinate performance (Rossow & Warner, 2000). Halpin defined the two dimensions as follows:

1. **Initiating structure** - refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between him and members of the workgroup, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedures.

2. **Consideration** - refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his staff. (Halpin, in Rossow & Warner, 2000, p. 164)
2.2.7 Leadership in the Secondary Schools

There is an absence of research that definitively documents the methodology for leaders and constituents to construct leadership and connect to secondary school improvement (Foster, 2005). Findings support that leadership initiatives in the secondary school setting portrayed competent administrators and teacher leaders contributing to the overall school success. The consistency of leadership behaviors provide persistence, and image the principal that is trustworthy, honest and moral (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000). School vision is a reality that is established through consistency, the ability of the leader to influence others, and the initiative to introduce new ideas for supporting the community (Chemers, 2001). Central to the secondary school setting is the development of commitment and consensus within the learning community that is relationship oriented (Barnett et al., 2000). Sergiovanni (2000) suggested that of equal importance to strong leadership is the total amount of leadership evident throughout the school setting.

Research indicated that principals who exhibit a sense of fairness contribute to reducing ambiguity and unpredictability, and contribute to the solidarity of teachers.

Moreover, this same sense of fairness eliminates communication barriers among teachers and allows for support building (Blase, 1987). Recent research indicated that sharing responsibility throughout the organization by enlisting the support and help of others at various levels is of the utmost importance (Fullan, 1992; Hopkins, Harris, & Jackson, 1997). Schools must be lead by skillful leaders but the replication of leadership must exist throughout the learning community (Day, Harris, Hadfield, Toley, & Beresford, 2000). Principals in the secondary school setting foster a commitment to professionalism and encourage the belief that all students can learn by supporting opportunities for collaborative practices. Findings indicated teachers viewed structures and policies portraying the school's vision as contributing to the change in teaching practices (Elmore et al., 1996; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991; Griffin, 1995;
Rosenholtz, 1989). This vision must be labeled as practical, logical, and exercising applicability or followers will consider it as being unrealistic (Berson, Shamir, Avolio, & Popper, 2001).

The decisions of teachers to follow administrators rest entirely upon perception of leadership as it exists, the credibility of principals that are able to lead (Chemers, 2001).

As Day (2000) concluded, "rational models that focus on the development of only behavioral skills and competencies are insufficient to meet the needs of those new and aspiring heads who wish to become and remain successful in the changing times" (p. 59). Leadership involves a complex and confusing map of competencies and skills that are learned, connected, nurtured and even abandoned when the situation necessitates. Leadership is a progressive journey that captures the continual movement of going forward (Fink, 2000). Knowing by context effective classroom appraisal and attending to details is functional and entails unceasing efforts. The literature suggested leadership is its own intellectual discourse, building a bridge between professional trust and collaborative efforts. In creating excellence in academia, the secondary school setting examines the principal's role in depth and uniquely recognizes the centrality for promoting and exhibiting change.

School improvement is a critical factor in providing established guidelines that recruit, support, and hold accountable stakeholders. Sammons (1999) reported that evidential studies of school effectiveness have indicated that both primary and secondary leadership is a key factor. A different era calls for new leadership directives at each level but emphatically at the secondary school level in which preparing students for post secondary opportunities is crucial. The evolution of leadership has been consistently documented and provides a formidable amount of usable information (Day et al, 2000; Donaldson, 2001; Leithwood, 2000; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001; Newmann et al., 2000; Elmore, 2000). Viewing leadership from these lenses is with the caveat that limitations and boundaries are non-existent, and suggests that
leadership is building toward a new era that links organizational culture and leadership behaviors where teachers are at the center (West et al, 2000; e.g. Frost & Durrant, 2002; Harris, 2003). Secondary school improvement is an indicator of student achievement. The commitment of teachers in the workplace connecting to and collaborating with competent administrators to reinforce and redefine a shared communal spirit and social influence sculpts leadership architecture. Schools' continual challenge is to be opened up to public scrutiny, consistently restructure, continually change governance and collaborative procedures, face accountability issues, clarify academic effort and performance, and institutionalize sound instructional practices (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbeck, 1999). To this resolve, the secondary school of today must advocate total school commitment of teachers and leaders and school organizational climate in developing and responding to this instructional agenda.

2.3 School Organizational climate

2.3.1 Theoretical Perspectives of Organizations

Organizational theory has been the focus of researchers for many decades. Initially, the focus was on how organizations were managed. Then, the focus shifted to the structure or design of the organization. Eventually, the pendulum swung to the human relations aspect of organizations and how employee satisfaction impacted productivity (Razik & Swanson, 2001). These historical perspectives will be examined and used as a springboard for exploring the current approaches being used to understand organizations today.

Classical organizational theory emerged in the early 1900s. It began with the work of Frederick Taylor who applied scientific management principles to the work situation in factories in order to increase efficiency (Mintzberg, 1989; Razik & Swanson, 2001). Within this approach, management planned and designed the work to be performed. The manager picked the best people and the best way to complete the task. It was up to this manager to monitor progress and reward or punish accordingly (Razik & Swanson). Although Taylor was viewed as a pioneer in this area, Mintzberg and Kaiser (1992) both believe this
approach to management removed creativity, initiative, and motivation, as well as promoted alienation on the part of the employees. Taylor's "scientific management" theory focused on the leader as manager and did not take into account other factors that could impact the productivity of an organization.

Beginning in the 1940s, Max Weber (1962) expanded on Taylor's work and focused on the structure of organizations with regard to their effectiveness. As Kaiser (1992) writes, an organizations structure "was seen as a contributor to the cohesiveness of those within it and the productivity of the organization as a whole" (p. 10). As such, Weber placed importance on hierarchical control, division of labor, and rules and regulations to improve efficiency (Razik & Swanson, 2001). These earlier approaches led to a concern for and focus on the needs of those working in the organization.

Many pioneers in human relations theory tried to highlight the importance of people as another resource in achieving organizational goals. Human relations theory developed out of reactions to both scientific management and classical organization theory, but focused on the needs of those working within the organization. As early as the 1920s, Elton Mayo conducted one of the first experiments to determine if changes in the work environment affected productivity (Razik & Swanson, 2001). It was determined that a change in efficiency did not occur because of the manipulation of the work environment or, in this case, lighting. In fact, higher levels of efficiency were attributed to increased attention and social interactions among and between the employees and management (Kaiser, 1992; Razik & Swanson). Thus began the focus on interpersonal relationships and the importance of employee satisfaction and motivation.

This past research led to additional studies that tried to conceptualize the nature of the workplace to determine its relationship to the productivity and satisfaction of employees (Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998; Moran & Volkwein, 1992). This focus began back in the 1950s when social scientists such as Chris Argyris (1954) studied variations in work environments. This
early pioneer conducted a study of bank employees to determine the factors that comprise an organizational climate. His findings suggested that an atmosphere built on trust and openness would help surface conflict and make it easier to implement changes that would improve the organization.

Current theoretical perspectives value the importance of past findings with regard to structure, management, and human relations as they relate to organizations. A "systems" approach combining these past perspectives began to emerge in the 1970s. The basic assumptions of this view still contend that schools and organizations are comprised of various parts, and that these parts are interrelated and act upon one another (Kaiser, 1992; Razik & Swanson, 2001). This perspective began to conceptualize the importance of an organization's ability to function in and adapt to external influences. For adaptation and change to occur, leaders need to learn and look for ways to improve themselves and their organizations, and model this practice so that others will value learning as well (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Senge (1990) posits that in order to stay competitive, an organization needs to "learn faster than its competition"(p. 4). As defined by Senge, a learning organization is one that "continually expands its capacity to create its future" (p. 14). He describes five elements of a mental ecology necessary for the healthful development of a learning organization. Described as the "Five Disciplines," systems thinking, personal mastery, shared vision, team learning and mental models serve as tools for developing a learning organization. In addition, the Five Disciplines function as the core of an organization's operational culture. For the disciplines to operate, they must be developed simultaneously and integrated with one another.

Bolman and Deal (1997) also emphasize the importance of learning across all levels of an organization in order to survive in a rapidly changing and complex environment. These same authors contend that all organizations can be described as complex, surprising, deceptive, and ambiguous. These properties make it more difficult for people to learn "better and faster" which are necessary
for survival in a competitive market. These authors synthesized the literature surrounding organizations into four frames: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic. According to Bolman and Deal, leaders need to apply a multi-frame approach to organizations in order to create a deeper and more holistic picture. The structural and human resource frames are associated with management, while the political and symbolic frames are associated with leadership (Thompson, 2005). However, each one gives insight into how leaders strive to achieve organizational goals.

Each frame or perspective has helped leaders find clarity and meaning among the difficulties encountered within an organization. The structural frame incorporates the earlier work of Taylor and Weber and maintains the importance of increasing efficiency through coordination and control (Thompson, 2005). "Differentiation" or division of labor is still valued as a way to increase efficiency based on the assumption that this approach will "ensure predictability, uniformity, and reliability" (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p.41). However, Bolman and Deal emphasize that the structures should match that organization's goals, strategies, technology, and environment. Structures need to pertain to the specific circumstances of the organization and problems arise if the structure does not fit the situation.

The human resource frame centers on the needs and relationships of the members. A leader operating through this frame understands the symbiotic relationship that exists between an organization and its members. According to Thompson (2005), leaders operating from this perspective try to achieve goals through meaningful and satisfying work, which are a result of the fit between the individual and the organization. Therefore, this reinforces the importance of hiring the right people whose personal goals match that of the organization (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Collins, 2001).

Within the political framework, it is important for the leader of a school or organization to understand the use of power and its impact on the allocation of resources (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Leaders working within this framework
understand the competing forces at play among individuals and groups whose values and beliefs may differ. As a result, conflict and tension arise between competing parties both internal and external to the school or organization. Many researchers have established the importance of a leader's ability to manage conflict and disequilibria by understanding the differing perspectives of those involved with the organization (Evans, 1996; Fullan, 2001; Heifitz, 1994).

The symbolic framework looks beyond actual events that occur within an organization or school and places emphasis on what they mean (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Thompson, 2005). Leaders operating within this framework seek to achieve organizational goals through symbols such as myths, stories, rituals, and ceremonies (Bolman & Deal). The assertion is that people use symbols to create meaning, and interwoven in these symbols are the underlying values and beliefs embedded in the organization that provide direction toward attaining the shared goals (Bolman & Deal; Thompson).

This multi-frame approach to viewing organizations encompasses much of the past literature. As a result, people aspiring to lead will better understand the complexity involved in achieving organizational goals using multiple perspectives. This depiction of organizations can be used to better understand the challenges faced by leaders within schools and the impact their actions have on individuals working within them.

2.3.2 Organizational Climate

Organizational climate, as defined by Hoy and Feldman (1999), is the "set of internal characteristics that distinguishes one organization from another and influences the behavior of its participants" (p. 85). As such, it is important for organizations to reflect on what sets them apart from other organizations and how these differences impact the interpersonal relationships among stakeholders. Parsons (1967) was the first to describe three distinct levels of responsibility and control required by an organization or school to meet its needs: the technical, managerial, and institutional levels. He identified these
needs as a school's ability to adapt to its environment, to set and achieve goals, to create a cohesive and collaborative work environment, and to clarify and protect the established purpose of the school (Hoy & Feldman; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000). Sweetland and Hoy posit that the "operational measures" identified within each level can be used as key aspects when measuring school climate (p. 707).

The technical level of control focuses on the "actual processes of learning" (Parsons, 1967, p. 41). Hoy and Feldman (1999) and Sweetland and Hoy (2000) expanded on this concept to include the teaching-learning process. According to Razik and Swanson (2001), this subsystem is described as one focused on the end result of students' ability to perform tasks. Sweetland and Hoy write that it is the responsibility of the teachers and administration to address issues that interfere with effective instruction and learning. Key aspects within this level focus on the morale, cohesiveness, and academic emphasis present within the school (Hoy & Feldman). This can be described in terms of the trust, friendliness, and enthusiasm that the staff exhibit. Additionally, this speaks to their level of job satisfaction within an educational environment that promotes high but attainable academic expectations.

The managerial level focuses on the ability of the leader to "control the internal administration of the organization" (Hoy & Feldman, 1999, p. 86). This aspect of organizational or school climate focuses on the practices leaders use to motivate their followers, attain and distribute resources, promote collegiality and collaborative relationships, and build commitment to the organization (Hoy & Feldman; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000). Similarly, leaders need to be able to work with those external to the organization in order to manage the internal subsystems, resulting in higher task and academic performance by the students. Therefore, principals or headmasters need to set high academic standards and clearly articulate their expectations for performance for both teachers and students (Hoy & Feldman).
The institutional level refers to the boundaries established to protect the school from external influences. All schools operate in a complex and dynamic environment. As Hoy and Feldman (1999) state, "Teachers need a buffer between themselves and hostile outside forces" (p. 86). Assessing teachers' perceptions of the leader's ability to protect them and the school from undue pressure can provide insight into the demands being placed on this organization. Many studies of school climate emanated from the work of Argyris (1954) and Parsons (1967) resulting in a conceptual framework used by many researchers.

2.3.3 Theoretical Perspectives of School Climate

The study of school climate has its roots in the study of organizational climate, which continues to be a focus for many researchers (Hoy et al., 1998; Hoy et al.; 1991; Moran & Volkwein, 1992). The studies on school climate, both past and present, emphasize, "Shared perceptions" about policies, practices, and procedures used in schools.

Halpin and Croft conducted one of the most well known studies of organizational climate in schools in 1963. The study, conducted in 71 suburban elementary schools, was originally designed to measure teachers' perceptions of factors that contributed to a school's climate. The emphasis was placed on the relationship between the leader's behavior and the teacher's behavior. These two researchers conceptualized school climate on a continuum from open to close-which was also use to examine school climate within this study (Hoy et al., 1991). Research in the area of school climate continues today because of its significant impact on those learning and working within a school. The influence of school climate on educational outcomes and the perceptions of those affected by the atmosphere that is created continue to be an important area of focus.

Many researchers who have studied school climate continue to differ in their definition of the construct. Common terms used to describe the differences in organizations are atmosphere, personality, tone, or ethos (Owens, 2004). Kowalski (2003) describes school climate as a fluctuation from the feelings one
gets when walking into a school to the feelings conveyed to a person about the organization's priorities. The work of Tagiuri in the late 1960s is often used as a tool to conceptualize school climate (Hoy et al., 1991; Kowalski; Marion, 2002; Owens; Sackney, 1988). Tagiuri (1968) defined climate as the total environmental quality within an organization. He further explains that the four foundations that create the total environment are ecology, milieu, social systems, and culture. For the purpose of the present study, school climate was defined as the interactions of these four foundations that create the "enduring quality of the school environment that is experienced by participants, affects their behavior, and is based on their collective perceptions of behavior in schools" (Hoy & Miskel, 1996, p. 8). Thus, the interaction of these foundations creates the enduring quality of the school. These four foundations can individually and collectively influence teachers' perceptions of the climate that is present within a school.

2.3.4 Leadership and School Organization

Both Conger (1989) and Kanter (1981) view the traditional bureaucracy as a structure that creates a culture of powerlessness. To Kanter, schools exemplify this situation. Of particular relevance to this project, Kanter views a lack of clearly measurable indicators of teachers' contributions to the school organization as an element that reinforces a sense of powerlessness.

Employees whose work behavior is under constant scrutiny tend to feel powerless because their discretion is often limited. Although the process of education is watched closely by many school officials and members of the community, the results are notoriously hard to measure. It has been said that educational systems are characterized by a multiplicity, ambiguity, and diffuseness of goals. Under these circumstances, it is difficult to specify standards that can then be used to measure and recognize individual contributions. (Kanter, 1981, p. 222).
Kanter (1981) criticized the use of standardized test scores or other "highly routinized standards" as substitutes for authentic indicators of educators' individual or collective contributions to school performance. Although, her discourse took place before the recent emphasis on standards and accountability, having to meet externally imposed standards and goals (for many failing schools, often unattainable goals) ironically, "exacerbate the problem that we are trying to fix" (Elmore, 2003, p. 6).

The result may be an even more pervasive sense of powerlessness, conceptualized by Fullan as (1998) dependency that school leaders must take decisive action to break away from.

Kanter's (1981) notion of an empowering school environment involves participatory leadership, problem-solving task forces, and decision-making teams, which have since gained increasing prominence in schools. However, evaluation remains the most neglected and least visible practice in educational literature. As an organizational theorist, Kanter understood the importance of having clear-cut indicators of performance. Stated explicitly "More translation of vague goals into measurable statements of results is clearly needed, particularly as these can help provide recognition for effective members of educational systems" (Kanter, 1981, p.222). Not surprisingly, some educational leaders advocate the use of 360-degree feedback, which has become an accepted and popular practice in business organizations (Dyer, 2001; Santeusanio, 1998).

Reflecting, Kouzes and Posner's (2003) notion of the leaders' character as a central factor in creating an ethical or non-ethical culture, Peterson and Deal (1998) view school leaders-principals, teachers, and parents-as central to transforming a "toxic" school culture into a strong, positive culture. Toxic cultures are permeated by fragmentation, conflict, lost sense of purpose, and hopelessness. Peterson and Deal note that even schools with a generally positive culture may harbor toxic subcultures in the form of disgruntled stakeholders who seek to infect others with their sense of frustration, alienation, and hopelessness. At the same time, the authors take the stance that most schools
have not reached the point of a toxic culture, although admittedly, many have cultural patterns that do not serve the best interests of students, staff, or community.

- Peterson and Deal (1998) outlined the features of schools characterized by strong, positive cultures:
- Educators have a shared sense of purpose and display a powerful emotional commitment to teaching.
- The underlying norms favor collegiality, improvement, and hard work.
- Rituals and traditions celebrate student accomplishment, student innovation, and parents' commitment.
- The "informal network of storytellers, heroes, and heroines provides a social web of information, support, and history" (p. 29).
- Success, joy, and humor are found in abundance

Peterson and Deal (1998) offered several examples of schools that have created powerful cultures committed to student learning. Each school has developed a unique culture that reflects the school's mission and fits the needs of the school community. The examples include a Navajo school that has incorporated Navajo culture into its architecture as well as its classrooms, and a school serving economically disadvantaged students in Detroit. Although the emphasis in each school is different, they share one defining characteristics: dedicated school leaders, including principals, teachers, and often, parents and community members.

Leithwood (1992) was one of the first educational leadership theorists to recommend that school administrators develop the qualities of transformational leaders. Leithwood notes that Bass and Avolio (1994) view transactional and transformational leadership practices as complementary. However, he emphasizes that the authors have referred to transformational leadership as "value added" because it offers the prospect for affecting organizational change that transactional leadership does not. Whereas transactional leadership provides
incentives (in the form of extrinsic and intrinsic rewards) for organizational members to fulfill the demands of their jobs “transformational leadership provides the incentive for people to attempt improvements in their practice” (Leithwood, 1992, p. 9). Leithwood (1992) and his colleagues undertook a series of studies to examine the impact of leadership practices on schools undergoing reforms. Their research suggests that transformational leadership tend to pursue three basic goals: 1) helping staff members to develop and sustain a collaborative, professional school culture; 2) fostering teachers' professional development; and 3) helping teachers engage in joint problem solving more effectively.

The most significant findings related to the strategies school leaders employed in working with teachers to resolve problems (Leithwood, 1992). Transformational school leaders worked to provide a wide range of perspectives from which to interpret the problem by actively soliciting different interpretations, clearly articulating their own interpretations, and placing individual problems within the context of the whole school and the direction it was taking. In addition, these school leaders helped to generate alternative solutions, ensuring that ultimately, decisions were made on the basis of multiple sources of input as opposed to making quick decisions based on preconceived solutions. In Senge's (1990) model, these school leaders successfully engaged faculty members in the honest and open dialogue and discussion that is essential to organizational learning. The transformational school leaders also shared the belief that their staff could collectively generate better solutions than the principal could alone (Leithwood, 1992). This belief underlies the actions of empowering leaders (Conger, 1989).

In essence, the behavior of the transformational school leaders studied by Leithwood (1992) exemplified some of the best tenets of contemporary theories of leadership while marking a dramatic break with the authoritarian leadership style that has historically characterized the principal's role.
Several studies have established a connection between leadership and school climate within the public school setting. School climate can be defined as the learning environment created through the interaction of human relationships, physical setting, and psychological atmosphere (Perkins, 2006), which affects people's behavior, and is based on their collective perceptions (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). It has been determined that principals play a major role in creating a school climate that improves the productivity of both teachers and students (Ubben & Hughes, 1992). If the principal of a public school has the ability to influence the climate of that school (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998) then, one can conclude that the behavior of the headmaster can also play a role in shaping the school climate within an independent school.

Barr, in Capella University (2006), examined the relationship of principal’s leadership style(s) and positive school climate in secondary schools. Research studies strongly support the fact that the leadership of the school principal impacts directly on the climate of the school and, in turn, on student achievement. The purpose of the study is to identify the leadership styles of secondary school principals in Central Texas and surrounding areas to determine if a specific leadership style promotes a positive school climate. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ-RS) and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) were administered to teachers and principals as well as demographic data were collected. The research questions explored teacher’s perceptions of the principal leadership style and school climate. Analysis determined if there is a relationship between principals’ view of their leadership as compared to teachers’; major themes of leadership style among the principals; and key themes of teachers’ behavior. Descriptive statistics summarized the data characteristics of the dependent variable (school climate) and the independent variable (principal leadership style). Inferential statistics was utilized to test for statistical significance. The results of the analysis of the study indicate principals and teachers have similar perceptions of their leadership style. This study also found that having a positive leadership
style will not only lead to a more positive school climate, but it may also lead to more positive teacher behaviors.

**Thomasson (2006)**, study examined the relationship between organizational climate and student achievement on the Virginia Standards of Learning tests. A total of 1,061 teachers in 47 schools across the Commonwealth of Virginia responded to the climate survey. The survey instrument was the Organizational Health Inventory for Elementary Schools (OHI-E). This brief survey instrument examined five aspects of school climate.

They were Teacher Affiliation, Collegial Leadership, Resource Influence, Institutional Integrity, and Academic Emphasis. Third and fifth grade Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) tests were the measure of student achievement in English, mathematics, science, and social studies. This study also examined the effects of socioeconomic status as measured by the percentage of students receiving free and reduced price lunches.

There was a significant positive relationship between overall school climate and third grade performance on the mathematics SOL test and fifth grade performance on the social studies SOL test. Socioeconomic status was significantly negatively correlated with SOL scores in third grade math, science, and social studies and all fifth grade tests except mathematics.

**Letcher (2006)**, Leadership styles have been a topic of study for many years. In the school arena, school climate has caused much discussion among educational leaders. Data was gathered in 5 small rural junior/senior Pennsylvania high schools with a student population under 500. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the Organizational Climate Questionnaire for Secondary Schools (OCDQ-RS) were the two instruments used. The MLQ rates the teachers' perception of the type of leadership style the principal uses. The OCDQ-RS rates the teachers' perception of the climate in the school. A comparison was done between the teachers' perception of the principals' leadership style and the teachers' perception of the school climate.
The findings suggested that a leader does not fall into one defined leadership category. Leaders often show characteristics of more than one leadership style. Three of the schools surveyed showed some correlation between the teachers' perception of the principal's leadership style and the teachers' perception of school climate. In all of the school, there was a strong cohesiveness among the members of the faculty. The small size of the district and faculty may be in direct correlation with the positive feelings the faculty have toward one another.

**Buckingham (2006),** this descriptive study used quantifiable data in the form of questionnaires to gather information needed to examine the relationship between headmasters' leadership practices and teachers' perceptions of organizational climate in the independent school setting. In addition, the Leadership Practices Inventory Observer Form (Kouzes & Posner, 2003) was used to gather information regarding the leadership practices of the headmaster. Finally, the Organizational Climate Index (Hoy, 2003), was used to gather teacher perceptions of organizational climate. The findings of this study confirmed a correlation between these to variables. Additionally, there was no significant difference in the way teachers' perceived organizational climate in the independent school setting according to their background characteristics.

**Pomroy (2005),** the goal of this study was to explore the links between principal-teacher communication and school climate the perspectives of teachers and principals. A comparative case study methodology was employed. Three Maine principals and 22 teachers their small elementary schools were interviewed using structured interview protocols and open-ended follow-up questions. Teachers were asked about their principals' communication and its impact on their professional practice. Principals were asked to describe their own communication patterns. Both groups were asked questions concerning three indicators of positive school climate: team identity, the principal's vision, and participatory decision making. These findings support the proposition that principals' patterns and styles of communication shape teachers' conception of the professional climate.
Gerrish (2005), In this context this present study sought to determine the current working conditions of middle schools within the state of Washington, as well as to examine the relationship between teacher working conditions as evidenced by the constructs of organizational climate and health with emotional intelligence competencies, viewed as internal thought processes, of the principals of those schools. The used Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire for Middle Schools (OCDQ-RM) or the Organizational Health Inventory for Middle Schools (OHI-M). While several relationships were found, one significant relationship was notable; that of the emotional intelligence competency of transparency with the organizational climate component of teacher openness. Transparency is defined as maintaining standards of honesty and integrity, and teacher openness is a summary measure that includes teacher commitment to student social and academic success, teacher collegiality among colleagues, and teacher disengagement.

Kelly, Thornton, and Daugherty (2005) recently established that "teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership effectiveness are related to school climate" (p. 17). Research conducted by Stone (2003) using the Leadership Practices Inventory (Kouses & Posner, 2003) found significant relationships among all five leadership practices and the school culture, as perceived by teachers in public schools. However, no difference was found in the leadership practice of the principal based upon school level (e.g., elementary, middle or high school). Therefore, examining teachers' perceptions of headmasters' leadership practices can lead to a better understanding of how these individuals contribute to the school climate in independent schools and impact their ability to be effective.

School climate has also been linked to teacher morale, productivity, and satisfaction (Brown et al., 2001; Lumsden, 1998). Lumsden established that the principal is most influential in creating a school climate that impacts teacher morale. As well, she reports a relationship between high teacher morale and increased student performance. Ubben and Hughes (1992) espouse that the principal's leadership style can promote or limit teachers' effectiveness, thus impacting a teacher's ability to be productive.
A school's climate can be measured by assessing the collective perceptions held by members existing within the organization. Researchers have established that background variables can influence a teacher's perception of his or her surroundings. One variable that has been studied is the gender of the teacher. Taylor and Tashakkori (1995) indicated that females and especially females with more teaching experience, reported having higher job satisfaction. Wilson, Pentecoste, and Baily (2001) found that males' perceptions of school climate were found to be more negative than those of females. Bulach, Booth, and Pickett (1999) examined principals' supervisory behaviors but found no difference in teachers' perceptions according to gender. Years of teaching experience can also affect one's perception of school climate.

In examining the characteristics of a good school climate, Sutherland (1994) found that teachers with less experience felt less connected to their school because they had limited understanding of their work environment. Other studies found that years of experience did not have an effect on a teacher's perception of school climate (Bulach et al., 1999; Wilson, Pentecoste, & Baily, 2001). These same studies examined whether level of education impacts attitude towards one's surroundings. The results indicated that no difference in teachers' perceptions of their supervisory climate (Bulach et al.) and no effect on teachers' perceptions of school climate (Wilson et al.) when broken down by level of education.

Research has been conducted to determine if teachers' instructional level influences their perceptions of school climate. Bulach et al. (1999) did find a significant difference in the supervisory climate because of a person's teaching assignment. Elementary teachers were significantly more positive than middle and secondary teachers. Using the Leadership Practices Inventory in her study, Stone (2003) did not find a significant difference in leadership practices of the principal within public schools based upon teacher's instructional level. Another study conducted in urban elementary schools using the LPI found no significant differences in teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership behaviors based on age, gender, years of teaching experience or educational level (Bankes, 1999). Overall, these studies were conducted in a public school setting.
traditionally organized as separate schools for elementary, middle, and secondary grades. Thus, the present study examined if teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership behavior on school climate were influence by a combined configuration of high moral climate, only satisfaction climate, and low moral school climate in secondary schools.

Additional research in public schools emphasizes the link between leadership, school climate and teacher efficacy. Waters et al. (2003) argue that a relationship exists between leadership and student achievement so much so that if a principal improves his or her leadership abilities, student achievement will increase as well. Similarly, Holt and Smith (2002) assert that student achievement is influenced by the school climate which, in turn, is a direct result of the leadership within a building. Additionally, Chapman (1998) found that student achievement is higher in schools where teachers reported that their principals created an environment in which they were treated as professionals.

The linkages between leadership school organizational climate and teacher efficacy have been establish through years of research in the government and private schools setting. This study examined the leadership practices of headmasters/principals who have the power, authority, and position to influence the climate that exist within secondary schools. In the complex and dynamic environment of secondary schools, it is essential that leaders assess their role in affecting the efficacy of their teachers in this setting. By examining teacher perceptions of headmasters/principals leadership behaviors and their impact on school climate, those in the secondary school setting can develop a better understanding of the role leaders play in the success and longevity of these type of schools.

### 2.4 TEACHER EFFICACY

#### 2.4.1 Efficacy Theory

Bandura's (1977) social learning theory provided the foundation from which the concept of teacher efficacy used in this study was developed. Bandura posited a central processor of efficacy information in which "people process,
weigh, and integrate diverse sources of information concerning their capability, and they regulate their choice behavior and effort expenditure accordingly" (p. 212). He defined two concepts of efficacy: efficacy expectations and outcome expectations.

Outcome expectancy is, defined as a person's estimate that a given behavior will lead to certain outcomes. An efficacy expectation is the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes.

Bandura (1994) defined self-efficacy "as people's beliefs about their capability to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives" (p.1). An individual's perception of efficacy can influence activity choice as well as the amount and duration of effort that will be expended to achieve the activity.

Bandura suggested a person's efficacy expectations would become a function of the level and duration of effort he or she would expend in the face of obstacles and difficulties. The stronger one's sense of self-efficacy, the greater the efforts to succeed will be. He further explained that one's concept of self-efficacy comes from a variety of sources of information presented by direct and in-direct experience.

According to Bandura (1977, 1994) a person's sense of efficacy is derived from four sources: (a) performance accomplishments or mastery experiences, (b) vicarious experiences from social models, (c) verbal or social persuasion, and (d) emotional arousal or stress reduction. In performance accomplishments, success in an activity raises expectations for mastery, while failure can lower expectations. Repeated successes develop a strong sense of efficacy that can withstand an occasional failure.

Vicarious experiences provide another source of information in the development of efficacy. Live or symbolically modeled behavior can support one's sense of efficacy, especially if the person(s) modeling the behavior is
considered by the observer to be like him or herself. Verbal or social persuasion can increase an individual's belief in potential success, thus encouraging greater effort. However, verbal persuasion alone is not sufficient, as an individual needs to have the skills to perform the task successfully.

Furthermore, while positive emotions or moods can support perceived self-efficacy, increased stress and tension related to performance can diminish it. Bandura (1994) suggested reduction of stress and negative perceptions support the modification of efficacy beliefs. In his study of efficacy, Bandura (1994) concluded that individuals not only base actions on their sense of personal efficacy, but also act according to their sense of collective efficacy. This sense of collective efficacy refers to a group's sense that through unified efforts, problems can be solved and situations improved. Group efficacy, like personal efficacy, influences: (a) activity choices, (b) effort expended, as well as (c) the endurance of effort in the face of obstacles.

Educational researchers applied these self-efficacy concepts to the teaching profession. The classroom teacher daily confronts the challenges of (a) diverse student needs, (b) curriculum and instructional decisions, (c) district and campus change efforts as well as (d) the expectations of parents and the community. There is little doubt that a teacher's efficacy perceptions would play an important role in their professional performance and success.

2.4.2 Teacher Efficacy

In what has become a seminal study on teacher efficacy, researchers for the Rand Corporation analyzed factors that contributed to success in raising reading scores in selected Los Angeles minority schools? One of the results of this study was the conclusion that a teacher's sense of efficacy had an effect on student achievement. The researchers determined that a teacher's sense of being able to reach or impact their students, as well as their commitment and morale, helped to determine how much children learn (Armor, Conry-Oseguera, Cox, King, McDonnell, Pascal, Pauly & Zellman, 1976). This finding has been supported throughout years of research on teacher efficacy (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Brownell & Pajares, 1996; Corbett, Wilson & Williams, 2005; Henson, 2001; Smylie, Conley, & Marks, 2002; Spillane & Louis, 2002; Tschannen-
In this initial study of teacher efficacy (Armor, et al., 1976), the researchers measured teachers' sense of efficacy using a simple two-question survey. The questions included:

1. When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can't do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment.

2. If I try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students. (p. 31)

Armor, et al., (1976) combined teachers' responses to these two questions into one measure of efficacy, which they defined as "the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to produce an effect on the learning of students" (p. 31). The researchers reported that students with teachers who had a strong sense of efficacy showed more advancement in schools. Smylie, Conley, and Marks (2002) further documented this importance of teacher efficacy in supporting educational change efforts stating, "... lessons learned from recent school improvement efforts have shown that improvement depends less on structural changes than on the development of teachers' knowledge, abilities, and commitment, which are more likely to change the social organization and culture of schools" (p. 18).

Building upon the Rand study of teacher efficacy, Ashton, Olejnik, Croker and McAuliffe (1982) developed the Webb Efficacy measure which was a forced-choice scale. The Efficacy Vignettes (Ashton, Buhr, & Crocker, 1984) were also developed as means to measure teacher efficacy. Ashton and Webb (1986) reported the Rand measure of teacher efficacy had a significant correlation with the Webb Efficacy scale but not the Efficacy Vignettes. The researchers concluded these results supported the existence of two independent dimensions in the construct of teachers' sense of efficacy. However, the researchers also reported that the Webb Efficacy scale had inadequate internal consistency and the Efficacy Vignettes, although strong in internal consistency,
did not correlate with student achievement (Ashton & Webb, 1986).

Ashton (1984) established the following dimensions that differentiated high from low efficacy teachers. High efficacy teachers have: (a) a sense of personal accomplishment, (b) positive expectations for student behavior and achievement, (c) personal responsibility for student learning, (d) strategies for achieving objectives, (e) positive affect, (f) sense of control, (g) sense of common teacher-student goals, and (h) democratic decision-making.

Brown (1999) determined that when individuals have low self-efficacy about what they can accomplish, they limit their participation in an endeavor and are more likely to give up at an initial sign of difficulty. Their limited efficacy beliefs created barriers to their professional development. This is supported by Tschannen-Moran, Hoy and Hoy (1998) who reported, "Teacher efficacy will be determined, in part, by the individual's comparative judgment of whether his or her current abilities and strategies are adequate for the teaching task in question" (p. 233).

Based upon the results of their Teacher Efficacy Study, Ashton and Webb (1986) suggested that teachers differed in their efficacy attitudes, and these differences were reflected in teacher behaviors and students' performance. They determined that the construct of teacher efficacy was valuable in understanding teachers' definitions of their role, work attitudes and interactions with students. This concept was confirmed by Brownell and Pajares (1996) who studied teachers' judgments of their ability to successfully educate students who had diverse learning and behavior difficulties. The researchers determined that teachers' efficacy beliefs were a context-specific judgment of capability in a particular instructional endeavor. They found that the quality of pre service preparation and collegiality with other special education teachers had a strong direct effect on teachers' efficacy beliefs.

Gibson and Dembo (1984) determined two dimensions of teacher efficacy related to Bandura's (1977) concepts of efficacy expectation and outcome expectation. Personal teacher efficacy (PTE) was related to efficacy expectation and reflected a teacher's "belief that one has the skill and abilities to
bring about student learning" (p. 573). Further, general teaching efficacy (GTE) was related to "the teacher's belief about the general relationship between teaching and learning" (p. 573) and corresponded to outcome expectations.

Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, and Hoy (1998) defined teacher efficacy as "the teacher's belief in his or her capability to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context" (p. 232). The researchers proposed an integrated model of teacher efficacy. This model reflected Bandura's (1977, 1994) four sources of self-efficacy information: (a) mastery experiences, (b) physiological and emotional arousal, (c) vicarious experience, and (d) social persuasion. Further, Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, and Hoy suggested that cognitive processing, or interpretation of this information, influenced teachers' analysis of teaching tasks and their assessment of their personal teaching competence for the tasks. The authors indicated that the analysis of teaching task was related to a general teaching efficacy and the assessment of personal teaching competence for a task was related to personal teaching efficacy.

Goddard, Hoy, and Woolfolk (2004) argued "teachers' sense of efficacy is a significant predictor of productive teaching" (p. 4). Moreover, when considering teachers' sense of efficacy and its impact on student learning, Milner and Hoy (2002) determined the importance of context and its impact on teachers' experiences and teacher efficacy. Teachers' sense of efficacy related to the context of available support was investigated by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2002). The researchers conducted a study involving a group of 155 in-service teachers including novice and experienced teachers.

Their findings indicated no significant differences in teacher efficacy beliefs between groups related to age, gender, and race or teaching context. However, teaching level and number of years of experience did seem to influence efficacy with elementary teachers exhibiting significantly higher overall efficacy than either middle or high school teachers.

Teachers with five or more years of experience showed a higher overall sense of efficacy than novice teachers. Further, perceived support was
correlated to efficacy for novice teachers rather than experienced teachers, which according to the researchers, seemed to emphasize the importance of the beginning years of teaching in developing teacher efficacy. Additionally, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2002) suggested that structural changes in the schools and more opportunities for professional development could help increase the efficacy of teachers of older children.

One of the structural changes in schools working toward school improvement includes the increase in collaboration and collegiality among staff members. Spillane and Louis (2002) confirmed the importance of collegiality in the development of teachers, indicating that teachers who develop a network of colleagues with whom they discuss teaching practices are more likely to improve their instructional practice in a way that improves student achievement. More specifically, Hoy (2004) suggested schools that provide opportunities for teachers to learn, reflect and share enhance teachers' sense of efficacy.

Hoy (2004) summarized the importance of teacher efficacy stating, "Beliefs matter, self-efficacy is a powerful belief, and teachers can make a difference for their students and themselves through self-efficacy" (p. 3). Teachers can make this difference on a collective level as well as a personal level. According to Ross, Hogaboam-Gray and Gray (2003) "Collective teacher efficacy refers to teacher perceptions that they constitute an effective instructional team, capable of bringing about learning in students" (p. 3). Goddard, Hoy and Woolfolk (2004) determined "a strong sense of collective efficacy enhances teachers' self-efficacy beliefs while weak collective efficacy beliefs undermine teachers' sense of efficacy, and vice versa" (p. 10.).

Ross, Hogaboam-Gray and Gray (2003) surveyed 2,170 teachers in 141 elementary schools in a large school district in Ontario, Canada to examine the antecedents of collective teacher efficacy. The study's results indicated that there is a reciprocal relationship between a school's collective teacher efficacy and the achievement of its students. They further determined that teacher ownership of school processes was a significant predictor of collective teacher
efficacy. Additionally, prior student achievement, although significant, was a weaker predictor of collective teacher efficacy.

Research has shown that teachers consider their principals to have a significant impact on the school and thus on their teaching experience (Joffres & Haughey, 2001). Elliott (2000) reported findings on the importance of the principal within the school setting suggesting three critical results:

1. The principal is the most important reason why teachers grow - or are stifled on the job.
2. The principal is the most potent factor in determining school climate.
3. The principal is the key to a good school. The quality of the educational program depends on the school principal. (p. 64)
4. Effective principals promote the certainty that teachers can and do impact student achievement. (Hipp, 1997). Further, principals promote the structures and dynamics in the day to day life of schools that develop and nurture teacher efficacy as well as collective efficacy of the school's teaching staff' (Hoy, 2004).

2.4.3 Factors Influencing Teachers' Efficacy

Many factors seem to influence individual teacher's efficacy. As early as 1984, researchers began to recommend the careful examination of variables that might influence teachers' efficacy. Gibson and Dembo (1984) suggested, "Relationships with situational and organizational variables should be investigated because teacher efficacy is likely to be situation specific and may not generalize from one setting to another" (p. 579). The importance of these factors influencing teachers' efficacy cannot be overstated.

Newman, Rotter, and Smith (1989) explored the effects of organizational improvements on the alienation of teachers using a random sample of 353 public schools. They found that organizational features (orderly student behavior, encouragement of innovations, teachers' influence in decision making) had a much greater impact on teachers' sense of efficacy than did background feathers (ability, urban/city, school size). This work underscores the importance of organizational factors impacting teachers' efficacy.
According to Schein (1985), principals can positively influence teachers' efficacy through various means. Schein maintains that administrative behaviors such as modeling, inspiring with purpose, and rewarding congruent behaviors send powerful messages to teachers and positively impact teachers' efficacy. Schein contends that principals' leadership behaviors influence their staffs much more than their words do. Hipp and Bredeson (1995), building upon Schein's work, determined: although principals' behaviors are primarily indirect sources of influence on student achievement, modeling, inspiring group purpose, and providing contingent rewards are powerful mechanisms principals can use to promote learning through teacher efficacy. Teachers and students are constantly scanning and looking for symbolic cues regarding what is valued in school. Thus, deliberate emphasis on these behaviors needs to permeate the principal's daily work (p. 148).

Hoy and Woolfolk (1983) found that teachers who feel their principals are sufficiently influential with their supervisors, provide resources, and buffer teachers from disruptive factors, while allowing them flexibility over classroom affairs, create a context that allows efficacy to develop.

Principals seem to be able to control or strongly influence most of the factors that influence teachers' efficacy. Lortie (1975) found that principals are perceived as being a greater resource than are parents or colleagues in creating the conditions needed to develop teachers' sense of efficacy. Their position allows them privileges, which can relate directly to teachers' working conditions and provide for technical assistance, and timely reassurance teachers need to overcome the uncertainties of their work.

Principal preparation programs across the country focus on leadership as an integral part of the process for preparing prospective principals... We know leadership has been and might be framed in many ways. Kouzes and Posner, for example, talk about leadership as challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart.
Others have their own unique frame, including Robert Evans who writes about the authentic leader as an individual who understands and respects the human condition, readiness levels for change, and situational leadership styles (Berube, Morrison, VonKrosigk, & Stader, 2002).

Although recognizing teachers' feelings of success have repeatedly been connected with students' accomplishments, research further suggests that such feelings may also be linked to alterable variables within an organization that can be improved by principals' work with teachers. By virtue of their role, principals are in a unique position to stimulate the professional work contexts that nurture, support, inspire, and reassure teachers about the quality of their practice:

If principals and supervisors focus on the positive results of teacher behaviors and talk about them in terms of factors under teachers' control, such as effort and planning that have gone into a lesson, teachers will be more likely to make similar attributions. In general, helping teachers feel a greater sense of control over their professional lives in school will increase their sense of teacher efficacy and make for a greater effort, persistence, and resilience (Tschannen Moran et al., 1998, p. 239).

Hipp and Bredeson (1995) found that symbolic forms of instructional leadership by the principal greatly influence teachers' work. Furthermore, they found that the principal is often the key factor in facilitating decisions that alter the working conditions in the school, thereby influencing teachers' efficacy. Although principals may assume their behaviors support and encourage teachers' efficacy, this may not be the case. Hipp and Bredeson (1995) found that teachers and principals often interpret leadership behaviors differently. They believe that the differences in perceptions may be attributed to the different roles each holds. While principals may believe the reasons for their actions are purposeful and obvious, teachers may not necessarily have the same interpretation. What may seem clear to principals, such as an attempt to exercise leadership to influence teacher efficacy positively, may not be interpreted by teachers in the same manner.
Based upon teachers' perceptions of their own efficacy, and their perceptions of their building administrator, the present study will clarify the impact of leadership behaviors and characteristics on teachers' efficacy by answering the following question:

### 2.4.4 Principal/ Headmaster Leadership and Teacher Efficacy

In 1995, Kristine Hipp conducted a study involving 280 teachers and ten principals from ten middle schools in Wisconsin. The participants completed the Nature of Leadership portion of Leithwood's (1993) *The Change Process in Secondary Schools* (1993). In addition, teachers completed a personal data sheet and an adapted version of Gibson and Dembo's (1984) teacher efficacy scale (TES). Upon completing data analysis, three sites were selected for case study examination: (1) the school with the highest reported general teaching efficacy; (2) The school with the highest reported personal teaching efficacy; and (3) the school with the lowest average reported general and personal teaching efficacy. Interviews were conducted with thirty-four teachers from the three schools and the principals in all ten schools to identify the leadership behaviors of principals that strengthen teacher efficacy, to verify the constraints that limit the influence of those leadership behaviors, as well as to understand salient personal and organizational factors related to teachers' sense of efficacy. Multiple data sources were utilized involving quantitative survey data, telephone interviews with principals, structured interviews with teachers and principals, observational data, and researcher field notes (Hipp, 1995).

The study revealed direct principal's behaviors, as well as indirect symbolic forms of instructional leadership that influence teachers' work and its outcomes. It identified ten leadership behaviors that impact teacher efficacy: (1) models behavior, (2) believes in teacher capacity, (3) inspires group purpose, (4) promotes teacher empowerment and shared decision making, (5) recognizes teacher efforts, (6) provides personal and professional support, (7) manages student behavior, (8) promotes a sense of community, (9) fosters teamwork and collaboration, and (10) encourages innovation and continual growth (Hipp, 1995). The principal is designated as the key to facilitating decisions that affect
the working conditions of the school as well as the professionals who work in it. Hipp's (1996) study concludes:

If a strong sense of efficacy motivates teachers to higher levels of competence and success, then an increased focus on this teacher attribute is critical. Nonetheless, if school leaders continue to ignore teachers' sense of efficacy and environmental conditions affecting their work, then committed young teachers, as well as experienced teachers, will begin to question their potential to affect change in student behavior; and worse yet, may decide to leave the profession. (p. 31)

The findings of King (2000) revealed that the need for principals to focus on cultivating the interpersonal relationships with teachers to foster the growth of teachers general and personal efficacy beliefs. Principals should strive to develop relationships that are more positive with teachers because the promotion of the relationship influences teachers' individual instructional skills and abilities. The researcher also concludes that principals can influence student achievement if teachers view them as being sensitive, trustworthy, consistent, and respectful in their relations towards teachers (King, 2000).

Another study in 2002 from the University of Connecticut by Elliott examined the relationship between teacher efficacy and principal leadership behaviors and the extent to which the relationship is affected by teacher background variables of gender, years of experience and educational level in elementary schools. The study explored how a principal's day-to-day behavior relates to a teacher's sense of efficacy.

In Phase 1 of the study participants consisted of teachers and principals in ten elementary schools in educational reference group B in Connecticut. The schools were classified by the state department of education in educational reference groups (ERG) to enable educators to fairly compare groups of districts with similar characteristics. Educational reference group schools were selected because they were rated as having high socioeconomic populations with ample
resources available for education, which created favorable working conditions for teaching and learning. All teachers in the ten schools received Gibson and Dembo's TES and NLS (Leithwood, 1997) along with a personal data form to identify teacher background information. The NLS was used to measure teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership behaviors and the TES measured teachers' efficacy as general or personal teaching efficacy (Elliott, 2000).

In Phase 2 three schools with the highest aggregated efficacy scores were selected for follow-up interviews to answer the fourth research question. The researcher also interviewed teachers from one of the schools with the lowest efficacy scores. Teachers from each of the four schools were randomly selected from those that had indicated on their personal data sheet that they would be willing to participate in follow up interviews (Elliott, 2000).

The quantitative findings related to the first three questions indicated a significant correlation was demonstrated between individual support and general teaching efficacy. No other leadership behaviors characterized in Leithwood's constructs were reported to have a significant relationship to teacher efficacy, either general or personal. Data analysis also indicated significant difference between gender and general teaching efficacy with a higher level demonstrated by female teachers as compared to male teachers. However, no significant gender differences appeared for personal teaching efficacy. Neither were there significant differences between years of experience or educational level and general teaching efficacy or personal teaching efficacy (Elliott, 2000).

When combined effects of background variables and leadership behaviors on general and personal teaching efficacy were examined, only individualized support fosters vision and goals, and collaborative decision-making were able to explain general teaching efficacy. The same combination of variables delivered no significant predictors of personal teaching efficacy (Elliott, 2000).

In the follow-up interviews of phase two, which addressed question four, the leadership category of individualized support was the category with the most
identifiable input. Respondent teachers indicated that their principal's individual support was quite critical to their efficacy. Teachers also identified goals as being important road maps for instruction. Collaborative decision-making was described as being an important aspect of teacher efficacy in that it helped develop certainty of practice. The teachers viewed their principals as hard workers who modeled expected behavior and communicated reciprocal expectations for the staff. Also, three aspects of the principal's work were described as having a negative impact on the principal/teacher work relationship. Those being managerial aspects symbolized as central office responsibilities, the demand of time required in meetings for special needs students, and the principal's ability to foster respectful, trusting relationships with the staff (Elliott, 2000).

Staggs (2002) conducted a study that considered the relationships among teacher perceptions of principal leadership, teacher efficacy and school health in schools at the end of a five-year improvement program. The school improvement program was the Venture Capital Initiative Program from Ohio's Commitment to School Renewal project of 1993. The Ohio program encouraged systematic change and awarded grants to individual schools that chose to implement the program. To participate and receive the grant, the school had to document support of 80% of the professional staff. The participants in the study were teachers from 103 schools who had participated in the Venture Capital Initiative Program for five years, whose principal had been with the school for all five years of participation and who chose to participate in the study. Each teacher was sent The Organizational Health Inventory and the TES to be completed at a planned faculty meeting. Two thousand five hundred fifteen surveys were received for analysis.

The results of the study generally indicated the principal leadership is, significantly related to teacher efficacy at all academic levels. A task oriented focus by the principal appeared to promote the sense of teaching, but other variables also contributed to the prediction of the magnitude of a teacher's level of efficacy (Staggs, 2002).
General efficacy at the high school level was the only area that did not appear to be related to teacher perceptions of school health. In addition, academic emphasis and institutional integrity were found to be significantly related to teacher efficacy at all school levels with the satisfaction of instrumental needs being a substantial predictor of teacher efficacy. Teaching experience at the middle and high school levels appeared to have a negative impact on teacher efficacy and elementary results reported a positive effect. Gender does not seem to be a critical connective component at the middle school level, but reportedly does so at the elementary and high school levels.

Teacher perceptions of principal leadership were reportedly correlated significantly with general teaching efficacy, but not personal teaching efficacy in the elementary schools. Middle school teacher perceptions of principal leadership were found to be positively correlated with both types of teaching efficacy. High school teacher perceptions of principal leadership indicated a significant correlation with personal teaching efficacy, but not to general teaching efficacy. Teacher perceptions of school health were correlated significantly with both types of teaching efficacy in the elementary, middle, and high schools.

Ross and Gray (2004), from the University of Ontario, reported in a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in 2004 of a study they conducted to examine transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values in relation to the mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy.

The study investigated the mediating effects of teacher efficacy by comparing two models derived from Bandura's social-cognitive learning theory. The first model hypothesized that transformational leadership would contribute to teacher commitment to organizational values exclusively through collective teacher efficacy. The second model predicted that leadership would have direct effects on teacher commitment and indirect effects through teacher efficacy (Ross & Gray, 2004).

Study participants were 3074 teachers from 218 elementary schools in
two large school districts in Ontario, Canada. The teachers responded to a 46 item Likert-scale survey that acquired responses for five variables: (1) transformational leadership, (2) collective teacher efficacy, (3) teacher commitment to school mission, (4) teacher commitment to school as a professional learning community, and (5) teacher commitment to school-community partnerships (Ross & Gray, 2004).

The main finding of the study was that collective teacher efficacy is a partial mediator of the effects of transformational leadership on teacher commitment to organizational values. More specifically, Ross and Gray's (2004) study indicated three important findings.

1. Transformational leadership has a notable impact on the collective teacher efficacy of the school. The leadership/efficacy relationship matters because of the well established connection between collective teacher efficacy and student achievement.

2. Collective teacher efficacy strongly predicted commitment to community partnerships. The influence of the principal on community partnerships was entirely mediated by collective teacher efficacy. The influence of leadership on teacher commitment to community partnership through collective efficacy matters because researchers have forged strong consistent links between parent involvement in their children's education and higher student achievement.

3. Transformational leadership had direct effects on teacher commitment, independent of agency beliefs. Commitment to school mission was the strongest outcome, one that is especially important given evidence that it is a strong predictor of group effectiveness. Commitment to professional community also matters because of the association of professional community with productive school change (p. 16).

The study concluded that the principal has the responsibility to offer a variety of opportunities to improve the collective beliefs of the campus staff. In conclusion the researchers recommend three administrative actions:

First principals should overtly influence teacher interpretations of school and classroom achievement data. The critical leadership task is to help teachers identify cause-effect relationships that link their actions to desired outcomes.
Teachers need to recognize which of their skills contribute to achievement, that they control the acquisition and exercise these skills, and that they need to take responsibility for the successes and failures of their students;

Second, principals should help teachers set feasible, proximal goals to increase the likelihood of mastery experiences; and

Third, they need to provide teachers with access to high quality professional development and provide constructive feedback on their skill acquisition (Ross & Gray, 2004, p. 18).

Azodi (2006), researcher examined that, identify principal leadership behaviors teachers and principals perceive supportive of teacher efficacy. The study further examined the relationship between principals' trust in teachers, students, and parents and their perceptions of leadership behaviors supportive of teacher efficacy.

Teachers and principals have similar views on a number of principal leadership behaviors supportive of teacher efficacy. Support for student learning and support for teachers were among the most important behaviors identified. Communication and collaboration as well as creating and maintaining a vision for the school were deemed necessary for leadership. The correlation analysis of leadership behaviors and principal trust indicated there was a significant relationship between these variables. Although a number of the correlations had a small effect size, there were a sufficient number of medium effect size results to indicate the relationship between principal trust and principal leadership behaviors would benefit from further study. Overall teachers rated the principal leadership behaviors supportive of teacher efficacy lower than principals. However, all but two responses were in the important to very important range.

Lewandowski (2007) Studies have shown that teachers are a direct link to student achievement. Teachers with a strong sense of self-efficacy nurture students toward academic accomplishments. Teachers with a weak sense of self-efficacy tend to surrender in the presence of difficulty. How then, do schools promote teachers’ self-efficacy through leadership and professional
development experiences provided to teachers? This mixed-method study examined teachers’ perception of their self-efficacy and the impact of leadership and professional development on that efficacy. One-hundred ninety-two teachers from 17 rural elementary schools throughout western Pennsylvania completed the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1993). Teachers’ personal teaching efficacy (PTE) mean scores were used to identify schools with extreme measures. Teachers of three schools identified as possessing overall high PTE, and teachers of two schools identified as possessing overall low PTE completed the Nature

Knobloch (2007), the purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which teacher participation in decision making and its constructs contributed to variance in collective teacher efficacy and its constructs over and above that explained by student achievement, socio-economic status, principal experience, and school level. Survey methodology was employed. Goddard's (2002) Collective Teacher Efficacy Scale (CTES) and Russell's (1992) Teacher Involvement and Participation Scale (TIPS) were used to measure their respective domains. The unit of analysis for the study was the school. Data were collected from 11 elementary schools, 11 middle/intermediate schools, and 10 high schools in one Virginia school district.

The findings suggested that teacher participation in decision-making accounted for statistically significant variance in collective teacher efficacy and its constructs over and above that explained by socio-economic status, student achievement, school level, and principal experience. Additionally, two decision-making constructs contributed to variance in collective efficacy and its constructs. The goals, mission, and vision decision-making construct accounted for variance in collective teacher efficacy and task analysis while the facilitating procedures and structures construct accounted for variance in group competence.

Melia of New York University, (2007) researched two models of alternate route to teacher certification at the same urban university. The research
investigated if the kind of preparation and content of an alternate-route program influence teacher efficacy, satisfaction, and retention among elementary teachers, in an urban setting. A comparative study was designed in which data was compiled through a review of university records and a survey of all graduates in the programs from 2001-2006. The programs are differentiated by duration, selection processes, and program content prior to teaching responsibilities, and are distinguished as the gradual entry program and the accelerated entry program. Various statistics determined that the programs differ from each other in perceptions of program components as the Gradual Entry teachers had higher mean scores for field experience, coursework, and supervisory support, and the ease of adjustment to teaching. Both groups rated peer support similarly high and university mentoring similarly low. The Accelerated Entry teachers were significantly more likely to report difficulty in the adjustment process. The Gradual Entry teachers had higher means on measure of efficacy and satisfaction at the .05 and .01 levels of significance respectively. Both groups had high rates of retention at 95.5% for the Gradual Entry and 89.5% for the Accelerated Entry after an average of three years teaching. The Gradual Entry teachers were more likely to move from an urban school than the Accelerated Entry teachers. Further research is recommended about the influence of cohort size, salary, and field experience models on rates of efficacy, satisfaction, and retention.

Ryan (2007), the study examined the relationship between teachers' sense of efficacy and teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership qualities that enhance and/or diminish the teachers' sense of efficacy. The study's outcomes reported that total respondent data indicates a generally positive relationship between these two variables. Subgroup analysis revealed varying results with diminishing relationships measured from elementary to secondary teachers. Qualitative information gathered from teachers with strong efficacy reported strategies that foster teacher efficacy, make teachers feel good about teaching and inhibit the development of teacher efficacy. The study recommends that principals and school administrators be especially knowledgeable of the six components of transformational leadership as well as
the three aspects of teacher efficacy examined in this study. Being mindful of how daily leadership decisions not only fit within the transformational leadership constructs, but more importantly, how they affect good classroom teaching practices, should help principals plan and initiate strategies and programs that create a campus atmosphere more conducive to comprehensive learning.

2.5 School Climate, Teacher Efficacy and Effective Schools

The multidimensional construct of school effectiveness presented by Hoy and Miskel (1991) encompasses the social-emotional growth of students. The job satisfaction of teachers, student achievement, effective use of resources ability adapt to the environment and goal attainment. Although school effectiveness is generally, equate with student achievement effective schools must build capacity in order to continue to achieve their goals. They must be innovative and adaptable to adjust to ever changing goals. There was one standard for reading and math achievement in the 1960's, there is another standard for achievement in the 1990's. Unless an organization is able to efficiently use its resources in a changing political environment. it will be unable to achieve its official goals. However, in an environment of scarcity and negative public pressure, it is much more difficult to achieve the stated organizational goals.

In the parsimonious view of a healthy school climate conducted by Hoy, Hannum and Tschannen-Moran (1998), the dimensions of a healthy school climate examined was Academic Press, Environmental Press Collegial Leadership and Teacher efficacy. These were also correlated to the socio-economic status of students in New Jersey middle schools. The results were that after socio-economic status. Environmental Press and Academic Press are the best predictors of student achievement. Collegial Leadership and Teacher Efficacy closely follow these dimensions of climate.

According to Hoy, Hannum and Tschannen-Moran, Environmental Press "is strong pressure the parents and community to change school policy
and influence the functioning of the school." Academic Press according to Hoy, Hannum: and Tschannen Moran (1998) is "the combination of teachers setting high, but reasonable goals. Students responding positively to the challenge of these goals and the principal applying the resources and exerting influence attain these goals."

Teacher Efficacy is teacher behavior characterized by commitment to students respect for the competence of colleagues, Friendliness and engagement in the teaching task. Finally, Collegial Leadership, as defined by Hoy, Hannum and Tschannen-Moran is "behavior of the principal that was supportive and egalitarian while being neither directive nor restrictive."

In Mott's Index of Perceived Organizational Effectiveness (1972), quality, efficiency, adaptability and flexibility were measured through an eight-item survey. Hoy and Miskel adapted this measure of effectiveness and correlated it with their measures of openness, health and student achievement. The results were that all of the measures of quality were substantially correlated with the index of effectiveness. This is a logical result, considering that the constructs of Academic Press. Environmental Press, Collegial Leadership, and Teacher Efficacy are in many respects analogous to the properties of quality, efficiency, flexibility, and adaptability as defined by Mott.

Bandura's (1993) self-efficacy concept provides us with some framework for the development of Academic Press and Teacher Professionalism. Teachers who believe in their ability to have a positive effect on student learning (Ashton. 1985) create an arena for Academic Press and possess a higher degree of Teacher Efficacy.

According to Hoy and Miskel (1966), sense' efficacy develops item four primary sources of experience—mastery experience, which is actual performance successes: modeling, by providing knowledge and conveying strategies: verbal persuasion, which is used to motivate: and finally, physiological arousal by enhancing physical well-being.
Wayne Hoy and Anita Woolfolk (1993) conducted correlation and regression analyses on two dimensions of teacher efficacy and aspects of a healthy school climate. They found that "a healthy school climate was conducive to the development of teachers' beliefs that they can influence student learning." However Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) also found that only institutional integrity and teacher morale were predictors of general teaching efficacy. Specifically, Hoy, in his 1991 research study, found that school health is positively related to both school effectiveness and student achievement in high schools. In the 1991 Hoy study, they found that except for environmental press ($r=.08, p<.05$), all zero-order correlations between elements of climate and effectiveness ($r=.53, .58$), were for collegial leadership, teacher Efficacy and academic press respectively.

Researchers indicate that school climate is related to teacher's sense of general and personal teaching efficacy (Newman ET al. (1989) and Ashton et al. (1983). In the 1993 Hoy and Woolfolk study, the authors found that three elements of school climate predicted general teaching efficacy. The statistical analyses showed that principal influence ($r=.26, p<.01$), academic emphasis ($r=.23, p<.01$), experience ($r=.17, p<.05$), and educational level ($r=.21, p<.01$) were significantly related to personal teaching efficacy (Hoy and Woolfolk, 1993). Empirical researchers also proved that three other elements of school climate institutional integrity ($r=.18, p<.01$) academic emphasis ($r=.16, p<.05$) and experience ($r=.23, p<.01$), predicted general teaching efficacy.

Uline et al. (1979) created a model to illustrate the relationship between instrumental activities, expressive activities and perceived organizational effectiveness. In this model they combined Parsons's adaptation and achievement into the single element of Instrumental Activities. They also combined integration and latency into the element called Expressive Activities. The Expressive Activities are dividing into Teacher Trust in Colleagues, Teacher Trust in Principal and School climate. Organizational climate is pan of the operational definition for school climate in this study; therefore, the model depicts a relationship, which the present researcher is investigating.
Using the Uline model of organizational effectiveness as a framework for the present hypothesis, all of the aforementioned variables can be manipulate to determine their relationship to school effectiveness. That is to say, because school climate is one element of Expressive Activities, and Academic Press has reflected in students' achievement in reading, mathematics, and writing, positive results in these areas should predict positive overall school effectiveness. The other variable included in the hypothesis is teacher efficacy. Teacher efficacy is the perceptions of teachers in a school that the efforts of the faculty will have a positive effect on students. This definition is analogous to that of teacher trust in colleagues, which is one of the elements under Expressive Activities If the teacher efficacy in a school is positive and the school climate is positive then it is logical to hypothesize that the organizational effectiveness will be positive. Likewise the individual variables of teacher efficacy and school climate should each demonstrate a positive correlation to school effectiveness.

2.6 Relationship among Teacher Efficacy, Organizational Climate, and Principals /Headmasters’ Support

Equally important as impact of Principals / Headmasters instructional leadership behavior, on teacher efficacy and school organizational climate in secondary school. Miller (1991) posits that factors like perceived administrative support actually influence teacher efficacy beliefs. These beliefs relate to the outcome of teaching certain types of students. In particular, teachers who are effective in instructing minority students are more likely to practice collaborative planning, work with principals who exhibit supportive behavior, and possess a high sense of personal efficacy. Ross (1992) also noted that high efficacy teachers were able to benefit more from collaboration with their peers, than teachers with a low sense of self-efficacy.

Likewise, Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) studied the relationship between teacher efficacy and "aspects of social organization often called 'school
climate" (p. 356). They found that organizational characteristics that are associated with student achievement are indicative of the health of a school. These characteristics include "warm collegial relations and high academic expectations" (p. 356). Specific school climate variables that affect personal teacher efficacy include collegial relations and strong principal leadership. Hoy and Woolfolk concluded that there is a reciprocal relationship between efficacy and the school organization, i.e., that climate affects efficacy, and efficacy affects perceptions of climate. They stated that the school organization specifically aspects of school climate, "may be related to teachers' sense of general and personal teacher efficacy" (p. 361).

McCartney et al. (1995) also discussed the notion that teaching efficacy "can be influence by organizational or support variables, including positive relationships with staff and administrators" (p. 70). They contend that positive collegial relationships can enhance efficacy because teacher attitudes are influenced by productive contact with other individuals in an organizational setting. Ross (1995), too, noted that collaboration with other teachers, a variable under the control of the school, affected teacher efficacy.

Teacher collaboration influences teacher efficacy in various ways. Teachers may feel that they are more efficacious due to their helping one another and the subsequent increase in their ability to help students learn. Collaboration influences teacher efficacy by creating these shared norms and purposes that influence outcomes for both teachers and their students. Ross further discusses the notion that collaboration is relate to teacher and school variables and that teacher efficacy is "an effect-not cause-of collaboration" (p. 240). The researcher hypothesizes that teachers who are high in teacher efficacy may elicit supportive administrative practices and, principals in turn, may influence teacher collegiality which could increase teacher efficacy. Ross concludes that enhancing collaboration in schools influences teacher efficacy.

Sofford (1995) examined "the direct influence of social systems dimensions of climate on teachers' perceptions of their own sense of efficacy"
Sofford found that supportive principal behavior and directive principal behavior were significantly correlated with personal teacher efficacy; restrictive principal behavior was negatively correlated with teacher efficacy; collegial teacher behavior and intimate teacher behavior were positively correlated with personal teacher efficacy; disengaged teacher behavior was negatively correlated with personal teacher efficacy; and there were no significant correlations found among the social systems dimensions of teacher behavior and teaching efficacy. Sofford also noted that supportive principals/Headmasters behavior had a positive effect on teaching efficacy.

In addition, Brownell and Pajares (1996) found factors that specifically affect the judgment of teachers in addressing learning and behavioral difficulties of students. These factors include supportive principal behavior and collegiality with fellow teachers. They contend that general education teachers who are supported by their principals "will exhibit more efficacious beliefs about instructing students with disabilities than those who are unsupported" (p. 13). These researchers found that schools with supportive principals/Headmasters result in more collegial interactions that give teachers confidence to deal with uncertainties; they are more apt to share expertise and seek advice from colleagues. Thus, collegiality had an effect on the teachers' efficacy beliefs. This study found that the more teachers collaborate, the more likely they are to view themselves as being capable of addressing issues of students with learning and behavior problems. Initially, however, the supportive principals/Headmasters behavior promotes collegiality with teachers in general education. These teachers, thus, who received support from their principals reported more collaboration with their colleagues in general education.

In addition, Hipp (1997) agrees that the principal can support teachers by inspiring collegiality if the principal believes and conveys that teachers positively influence student outcomes. Leadership behaviors of principals that reinforce this teacher efficacy include creating a positive school climate for success and fostering both teamwork and collaboration. Enderlin-Lampe (1997) affirms how important it is for principals/Headmasters to realize the
relationship between their behaviors and the impact on teacher efficacy. This researcher also found that increased teacher efficacy could be attributed to supportive principals/Headmasters and a collegial faculty. Yet, data are limited to describe the effect of leadership behaviors of principals/Headmasters on teacher efficacy.

2.7 Summary

The studies recently respect in second chapter reveal that large numbers of studies have been conducted in three areas of instructional leadership behavior, Teacher Efficacy and School Organizational Climate. It was focuses on many variables were compare with each other under difference parameter in general organizations and educational systems. In the literature of review, the follow points are highlights:

1. The instructional leadership of the principal is an important function, but it does not work alone in producing higher levels of achievement. Instructional leadership is no magic bullet; but it is part of the principal’s arsenal to develop a school context in which teachers and students are successful. It is time to move beyond of leadership to the hard work of understanding the complex nature of improving student achievement in schools. The instructional leadership of the principal is critical, but most likely works through school climates that emphasize academic achievement and have strong cultures of trust and collective efficacy, all school properties that the principal can influence directly and that are conducive to effective instructional leadership of both teachers and principals. Research reflects the tremendous amount of effort that has gone into identifying what makes an effective leader in educational climate for teacher efficacy in the class. Although researchers may not agree on specific concepts and definitions of leadership, it is apparent that, based on the amount of historical and current research, the desire to identify quality leadership traits continues to be a primary goal for both researchers and practitioners.
2. This review also highlighted the research that has been done to illustrate the importance of teacher efficacy with regard to both school organization climate and Instructional leadership. While this work has revealed that teacher efficacy has been and continues to be a contributor to positive educational outcomes, we must also recognize the wholes in this research. Specifically, efficacy -knowledge research should guide the professional development of pre-service and practicing teachers.

Finally, based on the understanding developed by those foundational theories and the work of many researchers, the construct of efficacy continues to evolve as we seek to understand its meaning and role in the teaching experience. Given the theoretical and methodological confusion in this work, it is important to begin any investigation of teacher efficacy with a firm grounding in how this and related terms are defined in the research and operationalized in the literature. Specifically, developing a deep understanding of previous and current definitions of teacher efficacy, as well as the evolution of this construct in the research literature, will allow us to better understand the research findings that employ this term and to assess the meaning and importance of the findings reported.

Teachers' beliefs have been found to be a determining factor in successful and unsuccessful student learning. High levels of efficacy in teachers are clearly related to many positive aspects of schools. While there is an abundant amount of research concerning teachers' efficacy, one key component of this construct has not been closely examined: that is the influence of the building principal on teachers' efficacy. Situational and organization features, often determined by the building principal, seem to influence teacher efficacy. Further study is necessary to distill the precise behaviors and characteristics of principals in building a teacher's sense of efficacy.

3. School climate refers to the impressions, beliefs, and expectations held by members of the school community about their school as a learning environment, their associated behavior, and the symbols and institutions
that represent the patterned expressions of the behavior. It includes the explicit mission and policies expected to create positive relationships, attitudes or dispositions and perceptions. A positive school climate includes an identifiable, open and nurturing school ethos that attempts to foster a sense of responsibility and efficacy among students and staff. There is mutual respect and collaboration among administrators, teachers, students, parents, and the community. Therefore could say that a "sunny" school climate is positive and has high levels of trust, clear visibility of the direction taken, and possibility for steady progress. A "partly sunny" climate has patches of difficulty to be overcome, but generally a sunny outlook. In a "cold but clear" climate there may be agreement on what is needed but and lack of trust and difficulty in moving ahead. A "slippery" climate has unseen hazards.