Head Teachers' Instructional Leadership Practices and School Climate at Secondary Schools

Muhammad Akram* Ashfaque Ahmad Shah** Abdul Rauf***

Abstract

This research was designed to study teachers' perceptions of instructional practices of their head teachers and school climate at secondary school level in Punjab, Pakistan. Two thousand male and female secondary school teachers from two districts of Punjab (Lahore, Okara) were selected conveniently as a sample of the study. One instrument—The Instructional Leadership Questionnaire (ILQ)—was developed by the researchers, while The School Level Environment Questionnaire (SLEQ) was adopted for the study. Both the questionnaires demonstrated higher level of reliability as 0.92 and 0.90 respectively. Pearson correlation was used to measure the relationship between Instructional Leadership practices and school climate, while Independent samples t-test was used to compare the mean score of male and female, and urban and rural secondary school teachers on instructional leadership practices as well as school climate. No significant difference was found between male and female teachers' perceptions on instructional leadership practices unlike the case for school location, where the difference was found statistically significant. However, no significant differences were found between teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership practices and school climate based on teacher school location. Present study revealed positive correlation between instructional leadership practices and school climate. This finding invites further research, for example, to study the impact of this relationship on students' academic achievement and/or teachers' job satisfaction. Multiple regression analysis revealed that 32% of variance in school climate was significantly predicted by instructional leadership.

Keywords: Instructional Leadership, School Climate, Collaboration, Decision Making, Instructional Innovation.

This Article can be cited as:
Akram M., Shah A., Rauf A., (2018). Head Teachers' Instructional Leadership Practices and School Climate at Secondary Schools, Journal of Arts and Social Sciences II (V). [1]

* Muhammad Akram, Assistant Professor Division of Education, University of Education, Lahore
makram@ue.edu.pk
** Ashfaque Ahmad Shah, PhD Scholar Depertment of Education, University of Sargodha, Pakistan
multanxa@gmail.com
*** Abdul Rauf, PhD Scholar, Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore
proffabdulrauf@gmail.com

Introduction

Most of us are members of at least one organization, an institution, a professional association or a library etc. An organization consists of group of people who work together to achieve the institutional goals. A school also consists of more than two members who work to distribute knowledge and highlight dormant faculties of students under instructional leadership of school leader. The success of an institute depends upon support and effective instructional leadership (Sergiovanni, 2001). Instructional leadership is composed of various factors including personal characteristics, school personnel, and school climate (Zepeda, 2012). Instructional leadership means the leadership that focuses the instructional activities as well as commitment to increase students' achievement (Blase & Phillips, 2010). According to Zepeda (2012) strong instructional leadership upholds brilliance and excellence in education.

Traditionally, head teachers in schools have been considered as planner, organizer, director, inspector, and evaluator of teaching and learning process (Sergiovanni, 1996); the new concept , however, takes head teacher as resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, visibly present, and curriculum implementer (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). Principal as instructional leader is involved in developing the school vision, bringing innovation in teachers' teaching methods, promoting staff performance, developing cooperative school climate,

organizing instructional activities, producing effective school climate, and maintaining and developing coordination among instructional activities in the schools (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). The ultimate target of instructional leadership is to improve school performance, make school climate friendly, develop coordination among school staff, and enhance students' achievement (Zepeda, 2012).

Instructional leadership targets on developing democratic vision and group work among school staff and values system in school to strive jointly for the success of school by achieving goals (Leithwood & Mascall, 2007). Sergiovanni (2007) stated that instructional leadership functions in schools as instructional resource, resource provider, communicator, visible presence, and curriculum implementer. Pratley (1992) stated that an instructional leader recognizes the present culture of school before bringing reform in it. Mortimore and Smith (1979) stated that instructional leader in school promotes school climate conducive to teaching and learning. Fullan (2009) endorsed the idea of school principal as changing agent of school climate.

School climate, the other variable of the study, plays very important role in school performance. School climate is essential component of school composition. Nature of school life, values, norms, and interaction in school staff is called school climate (Sergiovanni, 1996). Keefe and Kelley (1990) defined school climate as norms, values, interactions among teachers, instructional and learning activities and

structure of school is school climate. School climate consists of standards, ethics, and the prospects that sustain school community to experience collectively and feel physically and psychologically safe (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). In healthy school climate, teachers perform instructional activities and feel appreciated, and students and parents work collectively with school instructional leadership to achieve school goals and objectives (Leithwood & Polin, 1992). Hallinger (2005) stated that friendly school climate affects students learning and achievement positively. Cranston, Ehrich, and Kimber (2006) stated that school heads can develop effective school climate to teach and learn in their schools.

The study is significant for school principals to steer their priorities for the improvement of their students' learning, improve working ability of teaching staff and make school climate effective for teaching and learning. The study results will be significant for the administrative authority of school wing to observe their principals' role as resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, visible presence, and curriculum implementer to improve school performance. This study is significant for the person who is partly or wholly concerned with teaching and learning activities, at secondary school level especially, and in education in general, to improve his teaching, learning, and make school climate effective.

Study results are significant for instructional leaders to recognize their role as instructional leader in school to affect school climate positively. Instructional leadership is to develop school vision and enhance instructional practices in school (Greve, Palmer & Pozner, 2010). Instructional leadership is to promote instructional innovation and provide feedback to the students and teachers on their classroom performance. Instructional leadership intends to implement curriculum in school by following the government policies regarding curriculum implementation in schools (Marks & Printy, 2003). Instructional leadership is to develop collaborative school climate and make school resources available (Sergiovanni, 2001). Instructional leadership functions as instructional resource for teachers to consult for any instructional concerns or problems (Freiberg, 1998). Study results are directly significant for instructional leader to function as instructional resource and resource provider.

The study addresses the following research questions.

1. Is there any relationship between instructional leadership and school climate?

2. Do male and female secondary school teachers perceive differently of their principals as instructional leaders and school climate?

3. Do urban and rural secondary school teachers perceive differently of their principals as instructional leaders and school climate?

Review of the Related Literature

Instructional leadership is relatively a new concept emerged during 1980 and 1990. Several instructional models have been presented by various researchers. Hallinger (2003), for example, presented a model having three key dimensions of instructional leaders' role in school as: (i) defining school's mission (ii) managing the instructional programs (iii) promoting a positive school learning climate. These three dimensions of instructional leadership give empirical picture of instructional leadership in school.

Murphy (1990) presented instructional leadership model that had four basic framework of instructional leadership in school. Author presented dimensions as: *Developing mission and goals in school, managing the educational production function, promoting an academic learning climate,* and *developing a supportive school environment. Developing mission and goals of school* is consistent with Hallinger (2003), it requires instructional leader to frame school goals collaboratively and make it sure to be known by the school community to support in its completion (Murphy, 1990).

Coughlan (2013) instructional leadership model consists of five essential domains which were consistent with two earlier models of Hallinger (2003) and Murphy (1990). *Defining school's mission*, it requires instructional leader to develop common goals and visions for school collaboratively with staff (Coughlan, 2013). *Promoting positive learning climate*, it requires instructional leader to develop positive and collaborative school climate for teaching and learning by communicating school vision to every concerned stakeholder of school, and establishing high expectations and learning environment in school (Coughlan, 2013).

Dimensions of Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership has various aspects to study because it plays various roles in school. According to Jacobson (2001) instructional leadership includes various dimensions. The current study involves the following dimension reviewed based on the literature. A brief description of each dimension is given below.

School *principal as instructional resource* is considered as resource provider. School teachers find guidance of instructional leaders to improve their instructional skills. Instructional leader promotes staff development activities in school for his school teachers (Marshall, 1991). Instructional leader is considered as more knowledgeable and skilled about pedagogical skills and provides kind supervision to

his staff (Mulford, Johns & Edmunds, 2009). Instructional leader in school mobilizes resources and district support to achieve academic goals (Leithwood & Polin, 1992).

Instructional leader as *instructional resource* improves instructional performance of school teachers. Determined educational goals are presented and communicated to the concerned staff in a formal seating before deciding new and required curriculum (Girvin, 2005). Key task of an instructional leader is to become instructional resource to improve instruction, professional skills of teachers, and learning of student in their respective schools or institutions (Weindling, 1990). According to Stark (1998) principal is instructional resource in the school.

Instructional leader in school as *communicator* conveys school vision to the concerned personnel who work for the achievement of these visions (Day, 2001). Instructional leader develops interactional activities with his teaching staff to help staff to develop and improve teaching strategies in school (Knezek, 2001). Instructional leader often arranges formal discussions related to the achievements and performance of students and teachers in school during a specific school term (Glickman, 2002). Instructional leader uses clearly communicated criteria for the judgments of teachers' performance in school (Day, 2001). Instructional leader communicates school goals and visions to the concerned stakeholders and make it clear of what the school is all about (Eastman, 1990). Instructional leader

communicates clearly to the staff about pedagogical skills and their effectiveness in instruction (Dwyer, 1986).

Another important aspect of instructional leadership is his or her *visible presence* in school. It means to observe and assess the classroom instructional activities which are being run under his supervision (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp 1991). Classroom instruction observation and supervision and teacher evaluation may occur simultaneously or separately by the instructional leader (Freiberg, 1998). Instructional supervision and teacher evaluation are exactly the function to judge the quality of work of teachers in the classroom teaching by the results and other data which are collected by the instructional leader by using different techniques (Day, 2001).

Instructional leader has a key function in successful curriculum implementation in school (Zepeda, 2012). In the process of curriculum implementation include establishing change, communication of what curriculum implies provision of sufficient human and material resources for the success and implementation of curriculum in true sense (Brewer, 1993). Girvin (2005) stated in study that the key role of instructional leader is to promote instructional vision of the institute to improve students' learning. Instructional leader provides opportunity to the teachers to solve the classroom problems regarding school curriculum

implementation (Freiberg, 1998). Instructional leader makes sure that school syllabus is divided into units on monthly basis (Hoy, Tarter & Kotkamp, 1991). Instructional leader provides environment conducive to implement school curriculum and teach and learn (Greve, Palmer & Pozner, 2010).

School Climate

Various definitions of school climate have been given by researchers as set of school characteristics that differentiate one school from other and leave effects on the behavior of school personnel (Hoy, 1990). School climate is composed of shared values, practice of social activities, and common purpose based activities of school members in school (Sergiovanni, 2001). School climate is defined as enduring quality of school environment which is practiced by members of school. School climate is defined as perception of collective behavior in school (Marshall, 1991).

School climate is considered an entity in school where every student is encouraged to avail opportunities of learning, improve learning style, and habits of study (Hoy & Tarter, 1990). School where all the students are treated equally and honestly in instructional matters is climate friendly school (Freiberg, 1998). School climate is considered effective where ethnic difference are minimized and all students are provided respects without minding cultural beliefs and practices in school (Marshall, 1991).

School climate is effective where students are clearly communicated consequences of breaking school rules and rewards of following the school rules in school premises (McDougall & Beattie, 1998). School climate is a phenomenon of school where students feel themselves safe and protected and staff feels motivated to teach and learn and parents are encouraged and welcomed on the involvement in instructional activities (McDougall & Beattie, 1998).

According to Hoy and Tarter (1990) the schools where climate is weak, staff remains unhappy and is unsatisfied with their works and jobs. In additions, neither teachers nor the students show their optimism in participation and performance in instructional activities and they are not valued for their learning outcomes in real sense (Hoy, 1990). Unhealthy schools are not productive in instruction and teaching work (DuFour & Eaker, 1998). Students spend their time without any effective learning outcomes in unhealthy school climate (Bryk, 2003). Schools having positive school climate provide and promote high educational standards and suitable instructional leadership (Sergiovanni, 2001). For present study school climate model presented by Johnson and Steven (2006) was selected to find the relationship between instructional leadership and school climate at secondary school level in Pakistan.

Dimensions of School Climate

School climate is necessary constituent of school. Instructional leadership affects school climate significantly (Fullan, 2009). School climate can be viewed with its dimensions. Johnson and Stevens (2006) gave five school climate dimensions. Those dimensions are as collaboration, student relations, school resources, decision making, and instructional innovation. School climate dimensions are discussed in following pages.

School climate is effective if there is *collaboration* among teaching staff and school leader. School climate is collaborative if classroom instructional activities are carried with coordination with staff and head teacher of school (Johnson & Stevens, 2006). School climate is collaborative if teachers get opportunities to work with other teachers regularly and support each other for the development of teaching skills and planning instructional programs (Johnson & Stevens 2001).

School climate is viewed as positive where *student relations* are good and cooperative. Students cooperate with each other in classroom activities and learning situation. Students behave with others in well and humane manners in school under the supervision of instructional leadership (Maciel, 2005). Majority of the students are well mannered and respectful to the school staff in effective climate of school. Students respect and give honor to the teachers in the school where school climate is

effective for teaching and learning. Students' behavior is recognized by the respectful and honoring behavior with teaching staff and others in school (Lord, 2001).

School climate is viewed as effective where supply of equipment and *resources is adequate* and timely available. School resources include all those aids which are used for teaching and learning purpose in classroom or out of classroom (Carter, 1990). Effective school climate ensures instructional resources and equipment consistently accessible for the teachers to teach and students to learn. Effective school climate provides opportunity to every teacher and student to get benefit from school resources for teaching (Johnson & Stevens, 2001).

Democratic *decision making* is essential dimension of school climate. Decision related school objectives or lesson planning are made together in school. Effective school climate involves every stakeholder in decision making process in school (Fullan, 2009). School climate is considered conducive for teaching if school teachers are frequently asked to participate in decision making about the school performance and ends (Hallinger, 2005). School climate is viewed effective if teachers are asked and involved in decision making about the vision and

instructional strategies of the school (Tedla, 2012).

Instructional innovation is very important dimension of school climate. Effective school climate stimulates teachers to use new teaching approaches in school for teaching (Johnson & Stevens, 2006). School climate is viewed as effective if new and different ideas for teaching and learning are tried out by the staff in school (Maciel, 2005). Teaching staff is innovative in effective school climate (Carter, 1990). Effective school climate motivates staff to implement new courses or curriculum frequently where there is instructional innovation (Fullan, 2009).

Various studies had found relationships between instructional leadership and school climate in different countries. Bryk (2003) conducted study to find the relation of measures of instructional leadership and school climate at secondary school level. Author suggested that instructional leadership measures were significantly positively correlated with school climate. Teachers' perceptions about their 31 principals were compared with the perceptions of principals' on their own instructional leadership style. Findings revealed that perceptions of teachers were correlated with school climate.

Sahin (2011) conducted a study on the relationship between instructional leadership patterns and school climate. Results show positive relationship between instructional leadership patterns and school climate. Findings of this study revealed that teachers were inclined to identify climate optimistic in their schools. Study

findings further indicate that leadership style matters a lot on the formation of school climate.

Bambale (2013) conducted study on the relationship between behavior of instructional leadership and school climate. Results indicate that both the variables are significantly correlated in their dimensions, decision making, innovations, communication, advocacy, evaluation, and staff development. Skilled and learned principals can develop school climate effective. Study further reveals that principals must remember that instructional leader who never listen critical comments may make wrong decisions about school. Results show that principals should perceive teachers' need to strengthen them for better education.

Gu (2014) identified the relationship between instructional leadership behavior and school climate at secondary school level. The author used quantitative method, involving 340 secondary school teachers as sample of study. Instruments used for data collection were about instructional behavior, developed by the author. School climate survey used for data collection was developed by Johnson and Stevens (2001). Data were analyzed by running, percentage, correlation, stepwise and hierarchical multiple regression statistics. Findings of this study indicated that instructional leadership behavior factors i.e. giving feedback, giving praise,

encouraging and supporting diverse teaching and learning approach are positively significantly correlated with school climate.

Eastman (1990) conducted study to find principal's effect as instructional leader on school climate. Population of study was public elementary school principals and teachers across the United State of America. Sample included 5250 public school districts, 9800 public schools, 9800 public school principals and 47440 public school teachers. The results showed that instructional leadership style significantly affected school climate.

Krug (1992) empirically proved that there was a strong relationship between instructional leadership and student learning outcomes. Krug established, "it seems reasonable to conclude that the empirical evidence for link between instructional leadership and student learning outcomes is strong, particularly in the early school years".

Review of related literature is summarized as school principals are instructional leaders in their schools. They have power, authority, and position to impact the climate of the school. Instructional leaders are considered very valuable person in the school. Instructional leader is considered as resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, visible presence, and curriculum implementer in school. Instructional leader is considered as knowledgeable and professionally

skilled person in school. Instructional leader is expected to run school collaboratively, develop positive student relationship among students and teachers, make school resources available for teaching and learning, practice democratic decision making style, and motivate staff to use innovative instructional strategies in school. Literature reveals that principal must identify role as shared instructional leader by democratic decision making style.

Literature reviewed asserts that instructional leadership is not a role; rather it is a function of collaborative struggle of all the stakeholders. Instructional leader possesses the vision to envision the needs of teachers and communicate targets of school and improves the school climate to make the school successful. Literature review suggests that collaboration, student relation, school resources, democratic decision making, and instructional innovation are essential dimensions of school climate. The literature shows that there is dearth of studies on the relationship between instructional leadership and school climate especially in Pakistan. This study is an endeavor to fill this gap.

Schools' climate in its entirety is chiefly responsible for what students achieve during their schooldays. Research work cited in preceding paragraphs confirms that instructional leadership plays pivotal role in defining school climate; which is directly as well as indirectly responsible for students' academic achievement and their overall

development as efficient learners. This is the only yardstick to justify schools' existence. Owing to the literature reviewed, the researchers find it interesting to investigate into the instructional leadership and school climate (intended to be explored in this study) for better outcome (to be suggested for future research work) in the form of students' success at school, and thereafter the labor market. The researchers are interested in studying if there is any relationship between instructional leadership and school climate in local context.

Methodology

It is a descriptive study and survey method was used to collect data from the respondent and by nature a correlational. Pearson correlation and t-test for independent samples were used to analyze the collected data. The researchers used multistage sampling technique to select desired sample size for the study. Two districts of Punjab (Lahore and Okara) were selected conveniently as clusters. The lists of the boys and girls, rural and urban high schools in each cluster were taken from their respective District Education offices. Based on these lists, 48 public secondary schools [24 boys and 24 girls (12 rural and 12 urban)] were selected conveniently from each cluster. In total, 2000 teachers from 98 schools were selected as sample of the study

Two five point Likert scales were used for data collection. The first one, instructional leadership questionnaire, was developed by the authors to find out secondary school teachers' perceptions of their head teacher as an instructional leader. The scale was developed on five factors which could help researcher to find the ratings of instructional leadership at secondary school level by the teachers. At first step five factors were identified based on the literature and questionnaire included 23 items. *Principal as resource provider* was measured with four items. Sample items were "my principal promotes staff development activities; he is knowledgeable about instructional resources" and "my principal is considered as instructional resource person in school". *Principal as instructional resource* factor was measured with four items. Sample items were "my principal encourages teachers to use instructional strategies", and "principal's teacher evaluation helps teachers to improve their teaching".

Principal as communicator factor was measured with six items. Sample items were "I improve instructional practices in results of interaction with my principal" and "my principal provides feedback to teachers regarding their classroom performance". *Principal as visible presence* factor was measured with four items and sample items were "my principal makes classroom observations" and "my principal is an active participant in staff development activities". *Principal as curriculum implementer* factor was measured with five items and sample items were "principal

provides opportunities to the teachers to solve the problems related to implement curriculum" and principal appreciates teachers' contribution towards curriculum implementation". Instructional leadership questionnaire had five response scales as. 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = seldom, 4 = frequently, and 5 = always. It meant that teachers would check never if they perceived that their head teachers never performed as instructional leader regarding the relevant factor. It was further assumed that the teachers would select always if they perceived that their head teachers always performed as instructional leader in their schools.

Exploratory factor analysis was run with 23 items, using Principal Component Analysis using Varimax rotation. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .84, above the commonly recommended value of .6, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi 2$ (153) = 1149.761, $p < .05$). Given with overall model, factor analysis was considered to be suitable with all 23 items.

Second tool of this study was *School Level Environment Questionnaire* (SLEQ) for school climate construct that was adopted with duly permission of Johnson and Joseph (2006). This scale was to get the teachers' perceptions on school climate construct. This scale has five factors i.e. *collaboration, student relation, school resource, decision making,* and *instructional innovation*, with 21 items. Collaboration was assessed with six items. Student relation was assessed with four

items. School resource was assessed with four items. Decision making was assessed with three items. Instructional innovation was assessed with four items. School climate questionnaire had five response scales described as: strongly disagree, disagree, no response, agree, and strongly agree. These descriptions were also assigned numerical values as: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = no response, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree.

Exploratory factor analysis was also run with 21 items, using Principal Component Analysis using Varimax rotation. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was found to be .87, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi 2$ (153) = 1138.681, $p < .05$). Given with overall model, factor analysis was considered to be suitable with all 21 items.

Pilot testing was conducted for both the questionnaires i.e. instructional leadership and school climate because first one questionnaire was developed by the researcher and second one was borrowed. Second one had not been used in Pakistani context. Therefore pilot testing was necessary. In pilot testing both questionnaires were given to 100 teachers, selected conveniently from district Okara (male and female). The response rate remained 85%. Statistical analysis of pilot testing gave the reliability measures of instructional leadership questionnaires as .82 and school climate questionnaires as .80. Reliability measure of school climate scale

was .85 by the original author (Johnson and Steven, 2006). It shows that reliability of the both questionnaires was found high.

The researchers personally visited 98 schools in two clusters, got permission from the head teachers for data collection, got consent of each secondary schools teacher who was willing to participate in the study, and distributed 2540 questionnaires among male and female, urban and rural secondary school teachers. For data collection in girls' high schools, the researchers got help of the head mistresses who distributed questionnaires among their teachers and collected data for the study. The researchers received exactly 2000 questionnaires back. The return rate was 80%. All ethical issues regarding confidentiality and safety of the data were addressed and ensured to the participants before data collection.

Results

Descriptive statistics on instructional leadership were calculated using SPSS 20 version. Detailed results are given in Table 1.

Table 1: ***Descriptive statistics of Instructional Leadership factors (N=2000)***

	Factors	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**S.D.**
1	Resource Provider	5	20	13.31	3.48
2	Instructional Resource	4	20	13.17	3.68
3	Communicator	6	30	20.28	4.96
4	Visible Presence	5	20	13.29	3.95
5	Curriculum Implementer	6	25	17.22	4.47

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of the data about instructional leadership scale. The table shows that the highest mean score was found for

instructional leader as communicator (M =20.28, S.D. =4.961), followed by instructional leader as curriculum implementer (M =17.22, S.D. = 4.475). The lowest mean value of teachers' perception regarding instructional leadership practices was found for instructional resource dimension (M =13.17, S.D. =3.681).

Descriptive statistics were also calculated regarding teachers' perspectives of school climate factors. Detailed results are in Table 2.

Table 2: ***Descriptive Statistics of School Climate Factors (N=2000)***

	Factors	**Min.**	**Max.**	**Mean**	**S.D.**
1	Collaboration	7	30	20.18	4.73
2	Student Relation	4	20	13.77	3.58
3	School Resource	4	20	12.85	3.56
4	Decision Making	3	15	10.01	2.83
5	Instructional Innovation	4	20	13.09	3.54

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of the data about school climate scale. The table shows that the highest mean score was found for school climate factor collaboration (M =20.18, S.D. =4.73), followed by student relation dimension (M =13.77, S.D. = 3.58). The lowest mean value of teachers' perception regarding school climate was found for decision making (M =10.01, S.D. =2.83).

Pearson correlation was run to measure the relationship between the dimensions of instructional leadership practices and the factors of school climate. (See Table 3)

Table 3: ***Relationship between Instructional Leadership and School Climate factors***

		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		Resource Provider	Instructional Resource	Communi-Cator	Visible Presence	Curriculum Implementer
1	Collaboration	.63*	.68*	.68*	.69*	.65*
2	Student Relation	.55*	.57*	.66*	.63*	.61*
3	School Resource	.61*	.62*	.65*	.67*	.66*
4	Decision Making	.60*	.64*	.65*	.66*	.67*
5	Instructional Innovation	.60*	.64*	.66*	.63*	.67*
	*= Significant>.001					

According to Table 3, all variables of instructional leadership and school climate were significantly correlated with each other. The highest significant positive relationship was found between visible presence and collaboration, $r=.69$, $p<.01$, followed by collaboration with instructional resource and communicator, $r=.68$, $p<.01$. The lowest positive significant relationship was found between resource provider and student relation, $r=.55$, $p<.01$. In overall, instructional leadership and school climate were significantly positively correlated with each other, $r=.72$, $p< .01$. The results indicated that as the teachers score on instructional leadership increased, their score on school climate also increased.

Further, multiple regression analysis was run to measure the impact of instructional leadership on school climate. The model in Table 4 showed that instructional leadership significantly predicted school climate. The results of the regression indicated that four of five indicators (except decision making) explained

32.8% of the variance (R^2=32.8, F(4,996)=2570.448, p<.01.

Table 4: ***Impact of Instructional leadership on School Climate***

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	44.520	2.414		18.442	.000
	Instructional leadership	.343	.027	.602	12.556	.000
a. Dependent Variable: School Culture						

Further it was found that instructional leadership significantly predicted collaboration (β = .38, p<.001, as did student relations (β = .32, p<.001, school relations (β = .30, p<.001, and instructional innovation (β = .29, p<.001).

A t-test for independent sample was used to compare male and female, and rural and urban teachers' perceptions of their head teachers as instructional leaders. The results showed that male and female teachers did significantly differ on *instructional leadership* construct with overall model as *t*(1999) = -1.348, p =.178.

Further, the study also found that rural and urban teachers did not significantly differ on their perceptions of *instructional leadership practices*, *t*(1999)= .759, p= .448. See Table 5.

Table 5: ***Gender Based Comparison of Teachers Perceptions of Instructional Leadership***

Factors	Gender	N	Mean	S.D.	T	Sig.

Overall	Male Female	1077 924	76.76 78.85	17.695 18.315	-1.348	.001
Overall	Urban Rural	1037 963	77.61 76.99	18.052 18.030	.759	.448

T-test for independent samples was also conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of the climate of their schools**.** Table 6 shows that male and female teachers did not significantly differ on *school climate* with overall model as *t*(1999)=-1.134, p=.257. Also, no significant difference were found between rural and urban teachers' perceptions of *school climate t*(1999), .693, p= .489.

Table 6: ***Gender Based comparison of Teachers Perceptions of School Climate***

Factors	Gender	N	Mean	S.D.	T	Sig.
Gender Overall	Male	1076	69.55	15.170	-1.134	.257
	Female	924	70.33	15.545		
Location Overall	Urban	1037	70.20	15.477	.693	.489
	Rural	963	69.72	15.278		

Discussion and Conclusion

This study was conducted to correlate and compare teachers' perspectives of instructional leadership practices of their head teachers and school climate. The study found that Instructional leadership and school climate constructs were significantly correlated with each other. Instructional leadership factor, *resource provider*, is positively correlated with school climate factors as collaboration, student relations, school resources, decision making, and instructional innovation. Greve, Palmer and Pozner (2010) stated the function of instructional leader as resource provider in

school. Teachers find instructional leader as an instructional resource person in school. Instructional leadership is correlated with school climate in schools. Marks and Printy (2003) stated that instructional leader is knowledgeable about instructional activities and resources and promotes staff development activities in the school. Instructional leader as resource provider effects school climate factor collaboration.

Study findings elaborate that instructional leader as *instructional resource* encourages teachers to use instructional strategies, helps teachers to interpret students' results, improves teachers' teaching performance, and is consulted by the teachers who have instructional concerns or problems. Instructional leader as instructional resource is correlated with school climate factors. These findings are supported by previous studies. Freiberg (1998) stated that instructional leader as instructional resource functions as resource person in school for teachers who have any concern about instructional activities and effects school climate. Marks and Printy (2003) elaborated that instructional leader in school encourages teachers to use new and fresh instructional activities for teaching to improve school climate for teaching and learning.

Study findings state that instructional leader as *communicator* assists teachers to improve instructional practices, arranges formal discussions concerning instruction and students' achievement, provides clear goals of what school is all about, and

provides feedback to teachers regarding their classroom performance. Instructional leader as communicator positively correlated with school climate and effects school climate. Study findings are supported by various studies as, Sergiovanni (1996) concluded a study that instructional leader is well communicator in school and communicates school goals clearly and in time to the concerned staff and effects school climate positively significantly. Instructional leader provides feedback to the teachers and students on their classroom performance and school climate for teaching and learning (Hoy, 1990).

This study also found that instructional leader remains visibly present in school during teaching hours and makes classroom observations, is accessible to teachers to discuss matters related to instruction, and actively participates in staff development activities. Instructional leader as visible presence is significantly positively correlated with school climate factors. Previous researches regarding this finding state that instructional leader is active agent in school to observe class, accessible by teachers, builds both the teachers and students and manages and participates in staff development activities. Instructional leader as visible presence effects school climate positively significantly (Johnson & Stevens, 2006; Hoy, 1990; Freiberg, 1999).

Study revealed, further, that instructional leader in school as *curriculum implementer* provides opportunity to the teachers to solve the classroom problems regarding school curriculum implementation, helps teachers to divide syllabus into units on monthly basis, provides environment conducive to implement school curriculum. Instructional leader as curriculum implementer makes sure that teachers follow government policies regarding curriculum implementation, and appreciates teachers' contribution towards curriculum implementation and is significantly positively correlated with school climate.

The study found that instructional leadership predicted school climate. The findings of this study are aligned with the study of (Grizzard, 2008) and Kelley, Thornton, & Daugherty (2005) who found significant relationship between instructional leadership and school climate.

Comparison based results found that male and female secondary school teachers were not similar in their perceptions of *instructional leadership practices* of their head teachers contrary to the *school climate*. However, no difference was found between urban and rural secondary school teachers' perceptions of *instructional leadership practices* of their head teaches and *school climate*.

The results of this study are consistent with the findings of other studies

(Greve, Palmer & Pozner, 2010); (Eastman, 1990); (Marks & Printy, 2003); (Bambale, 2013). It is concluded that principals at secondary school level are working as instructional leaders rather than manager and administrators only. Related literature revealed that principals should be instructional leaders rather than manager and administrators only. School leaders' role as instructional leader is recommended by majority of the researchers. Present study revealed that school climate possessed collaboration, positive student relation, innovation in teaching and teachers, democratic decision making, instructional resources are available at secondary school level.

Johnson and Stevens (2006) conducted study on the relationship of school climate and instructional leadership and concluded high relationship between these variables. Present study results are consistent with this study also. The findings of this study are supported by the previous studies which state that instructional leader as curriculum implementer helps teachers to implement curriculum with full spirit, divides syllabus into sub units on monthly basis, and appreciates teachers' contribution in curriculum implementation. Instructional leadership effects school climate significantly positively in schools (McDougall & Beattie, 1998).

Present study confirms positive correlation between *instructional leadership practices* and *school climate*. This paves the way for further research, for example, to study its impact on students' academic achievement and/or teachers' job satisfaction.

References

Bambale, A. J. A. (2013). *The Mediating Effect of Psychological Ownership on the Relationship Between Servant Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Kano, Nigeria* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Utara Malaysia).

Blase, J., Blase, J., & Phillips, D. Y. (2010). Handbook of school improvement. *How high-performing principals create high-performing schools. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin*.

Brewer, D. J. (1993). Principals and student outcomes: Evidence from US high schools. *Economics of Education Review*, *12*(4), 281-292.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational leadership*, *60*(6), 40-45.

Carter, C. J., & Klotz, J. (1990). What principals must know before assuming the role of instructional leader. *NASSP Bulletin, 74*(525), 36-41.

Coughlan, T. (2013). *Service academies and student transitions: an exploratory study* (Doctoral dissertation, Unitec Institute of Technology).

Cranston, N., Ehrich, L. C., & Kimber, M. (2006). Ethical dilemmas: the "bread and butter" of educational leaders' lives. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *44*(2), 106-121.

Day, C., Harris, A., & Hadfield, M. (2001). Challenging the orthodoxy of effective school leadership. *International journal of leadership in education*, *4*(1), 3956.

DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional Learning Communities at Work TM: Best Practices for Enhancing Students Achievement*. Solution Tree Press.

Dwyer, D. C. (1985). Understanding the principal's contribution to instruction 1. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *63*(1), 3-18.

Eastman, W. D. (1990). Managerial styles and perceived effectiveness of principals. *Education Canada*, *30*(2), 12-15.

Freiberg, H. J. (1998). Measuring School Climate: Let Me Count the Ways. *Educational leadership*, *56*(1), 22-26.

Freiberg, H. J. (1999). *School climate: Measuring, improving, and sustaining healthy learning environments*. Psychology Press.

Fullan, M. (2009). *The Jossey-Bass Reader on Educational Leadership*. John Wiley & Sons.

Girvin, N. (2005). The principal's role in k-12 professional development.

Glickman, C. D. (2002). *Leadership for learning: How to help teachers succeed*. ASCD.

Greve, H. R., Palmer, D., & Pozner, J. E. (2010). Organizations gone wild: The causes, processes, and consequences of organizational misconduct. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *4*(1), 53-107.

Grizzard, T. (2008). The impact of instructional leadership on school climate: A model for principal and teacher improvement. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, *68*(9-A), 3680.

Gu, S. L. (2014). *The relationships between instructional leadership behavior, school climate and teacher efficacy in secondary schools in Kedah* (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Utara Malaysia).

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of education*, *33*(3), 329-352.

Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and policy in schools*, *4*(3), 221239.

Hoy, W. K. (1990). Organizational climate and culture: A conceptual analysis of the school workplace. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, *1*(2), 149-168.

Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). *Open schools, healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate*. Corwin Press.

Jacobson, L. (2001). Ga. Governor acts fast to turn up the heat on failing schools. *Education Week*, *20*(33), 8.

Johnson, B., & Stevens, J. J. (2001). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis of the School Level Environment Questionnaire (SLEQ). *Learning Environments Research*, *4*(3), 325-344.

Johnson, B., & Stevens, J. J. (2006). Student achievement and elementary teachers' perceptions of school climate. *Learning Environments Research*, *9*(2), 111122.

Keefe, J. W., & Kelley. (1990). Comprehensive assessment and school improvement. *NASSP Bulletin*, *74*(530), 54-63.

Kelley, R. C., Thornton, B., & Daugherty, R. (2005). Relationships between measures of leadership and school climate. *Education-Indianapolis Then Chula Vista-*, *126*(1), 1-7.

Knezek, E. J. (2001). Supervision as a selected instructional leadership behavior of elementary principals and student achievement in readin.

Krug, S. E. (1992). Instructional Leadership, School Instructional Climate, and Student Learning Outcomes. Project Report. National Center for School Leadership, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1208 W. Springfield, Urbana, IL 61801

Leithwood, K. A., & Poplin, M. S. (1992). Transformational Leadership. Educational *leadership*, *49*, 5.

Leithwood, K., Mascall, B., Strauss, T., Sacks, R., Memon, N., & Yashkina, A. (2007). Distributing leadership to make schools smarter: Taking the ego out of the system. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *6*(1), 37-67.

Lord, C. (2001). Instructional leadership teams and school climate: a descriptive study of leadership behaviors and indicators of climate in secondary schools. (*Dissertation Abstracts International) 54(01), 67-79.*

Maciel, R. G. (2005). *Do Principals Make a Difference?: An Analysis of Leadership Behaviors of Elementary Principals in Effective Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas--Pan American).

Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational administration quarterly*, *39*(3), 370-397.

Marshall, C. (1990). Educational Policy Dilemmas: Can We Have Control and Quality and Choice and Democracy and Equity?.

Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McDougall, M., & Beattie, R. S. (1998). The missing link? Understanding the relationship between individual and organisational learning. *International Journal of Training and Development*, *2*(4), 288-299.

Mulford, W. R., Johns, S. M., & Edmunds, W. J. (2009). Successful school principalship in Tasmania: Case studies.

Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. *Advances in educational administration: Changing perspectives on the school*, *1*(Part B), 163-200.

Pratley, D. C. (1992). *A study of middle level principals' involvement in instructional leadership*.

Robinson, V. M. (2007). *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why* (Vol. 41). Winmalee: Australian Council for Educational Leaders.

Sahin, S. (2011). The Relationship between Instructional Leadership Style and School Culture (Izmir Case). *Educational Sciences: Theory And Practice*, *11*(4), 1920-1927.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1996). *Leadership for the schoolhouse: How is it different? Why is it important?*. Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers, 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, CA 94104.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective*. Allyn & Bacon/Longman Publishing, a Pearson Education Company, 1760 Gould Street, Needham Heights, MA 02494. Web site: http://www. abacon. com..

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2007). The supervisor's educational platform. *Supervision: A redefinition (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill*.

Stark, M. (1998). No slow fixes either: How failing schools in England are being restored to health. *No quick fixes: Perspectives on schools in difficulty*, 3444.

Tedla, B. A. (2012). Instructional Leadership and School Climate a Case Study of a Secondary School in Eritrea.

Wahlstrom, K. L., & Louis, K. S. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *44*(4), 458-495.

Walberg, H. J. (1984). Families as partners in educational productivity. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *65*(6), 397-400.

Watson, N. (2001). Promising Practices: What Does It Really Take To Make A Difference? *Education Canada*, *40*(4), 4-6.

Weindling, D. (1990). The secondary school head teacher: New principals in the United Kingdom. *NASSP Bulletin*, *74*(526), 40-45.

Zepeda, S. J. (2012). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts*. Eye on Education.