

# The Relationship Between Principals' Instructional Leadership and Teachers' Efficacy in Xuzhou, China

Zhou Entong<sup>1</sup> and Nor Azni Abdul Aziz<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Foundations of Education, Faculty of Educational Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Foundations of Education, Faculty of Educational Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia*

*Corresponding Author Email: <sup>2</sup>nor.azni@upm.edu.my*

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v13-i10/19068> DOI:10.6007/IJARBSS/v13-i10/19068

**Published Date:** 25 October, 2023

## Abstract

Teachers' efficacy is directly linked to how strongly they believe they can influence students' learning as well as how hard and persistent they work to make sure that happens. Some research suggests that principals' instructional leadership plays an important role in improving teacher efficacy, but empirical research in the Chinese context is still lacking. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between principals' instructional leadership and teachers' efficacy in junior high schools in Xuzhou, China. This is a quantitative descriptive and correlational study using the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) constructed by Hallinger (1983) and the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) constructed by Megan Tschannen - Moran and Anita Woolfolk Hoy (2001). The study sample consisted of 180 teachers from four secondary schools in Xuzhou, China. Results were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, and Pearson correlation analysis. The study's main findings showed that the efficacy of teachers was significantly positively correlated with the instructional leadership of principals. This study also discovered that both principals' instructional leadership and teachers' efficacy were high. Therefore, this study supports other findings that the more principals practice instructional leadership behaviors, the more they will improve teacher efficacy.

**Keywords:** Principals' Instructional Leadership, Teachers' efficacy, PIMRS, TSES

## 1. Introduction

The improvement of educational quality has become a focal point of educational reform and development in nations all over the world since the beginning of the twenty-first century, and the oversight and surveillance of instruction quality improvement in schools

have been constantly improved (Harris et al., 2017). Teachers are essential to a school's smooth operation, and all teachers must be committed to their work for it to be successful, whether it be teaching or other academic duties (Qian et al., 2017). A stable and passionate team of teachers can drive a school forward to achieve its educational goals and vision.

Teachers have a strong belief in their ability to teach effectively, which is also referred to as teacher efficacy (Chen, 2017). Teachers' teaching behaviors are rooted in their teaching literacy and teaching experience, and they also need to have strong teaching beliefs. Teacher efficacy is both a major component of teachers' professionalism and teaching beliefs, as well as an important indicator of teacher effectiveness and educational quality (Liu et al., 2017).

The significance of teacher efficacy has recently received increased attention in China. Lack of teacher efficacy can negatively affect student achievement and the implementation of quality education (Ma & Marion, 2019). The efficacy of teachers has a strong connection with the perseverance and effort they expend in guaranteeing student success, as well as with their confidence in their ability to have an impact on students' learning. It is difficult for a school to produce quality education if its teachers are stressed, unmotivated to teach, and discontented and resistant to their work (Al-Mahdy et al., 2018).

Principals can encourage teachers to feel a sense of purpose and more efficacy in their work in those schools that perform better (Zheng et al., 2019). By identifying the school's vision and mission, guiding instructional and learning initiatives, as well as fostering a learning environment, the principal's instructional leadership pays attention to the teaching of teachers and student achievement (Manaseh, 2016). As demonstrated by Al-Mahdy et al. (2018) and Zheng et al. (2019), teacher engagement, effectiveness, and professional development are significantly impacted by the principal's instructional leadership.

The national, local, and course management systems for schools have given principals more autonomy but have also presented them with unprecedented challenges. Principals have to satisfy parental and societal standards for student achievement while reacting to the indication for educational reform on the national level and actively implementing the idea of quality education (Liu et al., 2017). Principals in Shanghai placed first among the 48 countries and regions that took part in the investigation in terms of time devoted to teaching and curriculum matters, which accounted for 27% of their total work time, considerably more than the OECD average (16.3%), according to data results from TALIS (2018), the third round of the Teacher Teaching and Learning International Survey Project. Thus, the role of such significant instructional leadership by Chinese principals for teachers and students becomes a question for reflection.

## **2. Research Problems**

Numerous studies have demonstrated a beneficial relationship between higher levels of teacher efficacy and both teachers' psychological health and students' motivation (Han & Wang, 2021). Meanwhile, principals' instructional leadership has a significant positive relationship with teachers' efficacy and indirectly contributes to students' academic achievement through the mediating role of teachers (Al-Mahdy et Al., 2018). In order to increase the quality of education, it is important to highlight the beneficial impact of principals' instructional leadership on the efficacy of educators. However, China is currently implementing educational reforms to promote quality education, but student achievement remains the main indicator of educational outcomes. The demand for student achievement from all sectors of society has led to low teacher efficacy among Chinese teachers and has affected the implementation of

quality education. Although the Chinese government has introduced a series of policies for teacher efficacy, these are not sufficient alone (Zheng et al., 2019). Furthermore, there is still a scarcity of empirical research on relevant variables in the Chinese context as a consequence of the late start of investigations on principals' instructional leadership and teacher efficacy in China (Liu et al., 2017). As a result, the goal of this research is to investigate the relationship between principals' leadership of instruction and the efficacy of teachers in Xuzhou, China.

### **3. Research Objectives**

The objectives of this research are to provide novel ideas for enhancing teachers' efficacy and principals' leadership in China based on explanations of principals' instructional leadership and teachers' efficacy:

- a) Determine the level of instructional leadership of principals in Xuzhou, China.
- b) Determine the level of teachers' efficacy in Xuzhou, China.
- c) Determine whether there is a significant relationship between principals' instructional leadership and teachers' efficacy in Xuzhou, China.

### **4. Literature Review**

#### **a. Instructional Leadership**

Instructional leadership, according to the definition by Hallinger and Murphy (1985), is the behavior of principals in leading and managing instruction in schools to facilitate teachers' teaching and students' learning. School leaders can lead teachers and staff to do excellent work that will improve the school (Shatzer et al., 2013). Instructional leadership has its roots in the Effective School Movement of the 1960s. Since then, many scholars identified "leadership" as one of the factors that influenced school development. The movement focuses on the factors that influence school effectiveness, arguing that besides a known environment, appropriate pressure, and systematic supervision, among the most critical elements affecting student achievement is instructional leadership (Silva et al., 2011). The Effective School Movement highlights how important instructional leadership is and portrays a principal who can make effective decisions as decisive, hard-working, and an important individual who is in close contact with all the people in the school as an information center (Murphy, 1983).

As instructional leadership theory develops, that is thought that the principal, as a resource provider, should effectively manage people, materials, finances, and opportunities to achieve school goals and vision (Andrews & Soder, 1987). Also, as one of the major developers of the school's educational program, the principal should have knowledge of curriculum and teaching, promote pedagogic change, enable direct intervention with teachers, hold high aspirations for teachers and students, pay close attention to what is happening in the classroom, overhaul the school's curriculum, and care about student progress (Hallinger, 2011). School leaders should remain focused on teachers' improvement and enhancement because of their importance in improving instructional quality in schools.

In the mid-1980s, Hallinger and Murphy developed an elaborated explanation of the instructional leadership concept and a systematic framework of theory for detecting its influence (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Hallinger and Murphy (1985) state that the instructional leadership of the principal is demonstrated by the principal having clear instructional goals and effectively conveying the goals of the school to parents and teachers.

Principals promote teacher professional development and student learning by evaluating and monitoring instructional progress. As a result, they developed the most recognized model for three-dimensional analysis of instructional leadership, which entails establishing the school's goals, managing the instruction, and promoting a supportive learning environment (Hallinger, 2011).

Several studies of instructional leadership carried out by educational scholars since the late 20th century have shown that schools managed by principals who can use instructional leadership well typically achieve better instructional outcomes (Liu & Hallinger, 2020). The principal's instructional leadership has two main works on a school: the organization (such as the mission, goals, aspirations, learning environment, and faculty participation) as well as the results (such as student achievement) (Hallinger, 2018).

According to Liu and Hallinger (2021), the mean scores indicate that Chinese principals have high levels of instructional leadership. The results are very similar to previous research conducted by Hallinger in emerging regions (Hallinger & Wang, 2013). Chinese principal leadership has a high degree of field-based accountability and effectiveness within the Chinese context highly centralized policy environment and top-down management. And Chinese principals placed more emphasis on instructional supervision and less on instructional improvement. In addition, several studies noted that Chinese principals devote the majority of their time to administrative tasks, although they also value instructional improvement and cultivating a field-based school climate and learning context. (Cravens, 2014; Jiang et al., 2010; Qian & Walker, 2019).

#### **b. Teacher Efficacy**

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) defined teacher efficacy as the knowledge, abilities, and dispositions that teachers need to effectively carry out a particular teaching task in a particular context. Bandura's theory of social cognition and theory of self-efficacy are the cornerstones of teacher efficacy (Bandura, 1977, 1993). In other words, it is about the degree to which educators believe they can achieve educational goals in educational settings and as educators, represents a particular kind of self-efficacy. Teachers in middle and low-performing schools are less effective than those in outstanding schools (Mosoge et al., 2018). Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) argued resources and leadership practices provided by schools affect teacher perceptions of instructional efficacy. Various aspects of the teachers themselves and the school environment can impact teacher efficacy.

When the self-efficacy theory is put into practice in teaching activities, teachers who have high educational efficacy are much more probable to commit to teaching in order for students to learn smoothly, as demonstrated by Bandura (1977). In contrast, ineffective teachers have difficulty engaging in serious teaching, and this in turn affects student learning (Woolfolk et al., 1990). A meta-analysis showed a small but significant mean association of teacher efficacy with student academic achievement (Kim & Seo, 2018). New teachers with stronger efficacy beliefs and more positive attitudes are more likely to be successful in schoolwork (Savolainen et al., 2020).

With the development of theories, Tschannen and Hoy developed a new three-dimensional model of teacher efficacy after analyzing and summarizing many theories and models of teacher efficacy. It includes three dimensions: teaching skills, student participation, as well as managing the classroom (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Chinese teachers were found to have moderate levels of teacher efficacy in multiple investigations that used the TSES scale, and that teacher efficacy was positively correlated with teacher self-efficacy

beliefs, principal instructional leadership, professional development opportunities, and teacher collaboration. Zhang et al., (2019) found that professional development opportunities, particularly those focused on increasing teacher efficacy, have a positive impact.

In recent years, research on teacher efficacy has grown exponentially worldwide. Previous teacher efficacy research has shown that it is related to burnout, principal instructional leadership, mood, well-being, reflection, and interpersonal abilities for communication (Fathi et al. 2021; Wang & Derakhshan, 2021). Moreover, the challenges of educational reform, heavy teaching tasks, school evaluation system, and imperfect training system also were factors influencing teachers' efficacy.

### c. Relationship Between Instructional Leadership and Teacher Efficacy

Some research findings in China indicate a positive relationship between principal instructional leadership and teacher efficacy. Principal instructional leadership behaviours such as teaching supervision, curriculum development, and teacher support are positively correlated with teacher efficacy in China. Zheng et al. (2019) discovered that principals' instructional leadership has a positive impact on Chinese teachers' efficacy, particularly in managing the classroom and teaching strategies. Similarly, Li et al. (2017) discovered that principal support and curriculum development are positively related to teacher efficacy in China. Furthermore, many studies have used principal instructional leadership as a moderating variable and discovered that it positively influences teacher efficacy and that it may indirectly impact student achievement through teacher efficacy (Al-Mahdy et al., 2018; Hallinger et al., 2017; Ma & Marion, 2019).

## 5. Conceptual Framework

Figure 1 graphically depicts the conceptual framework of this study, as well as the test of relationships between variables. The main goal of this study was to establish a relationship between principals' instructional leadership and teachers' efficacy. On the one hand, teachers' opinions of principal instructional leadership served as the study's independent variable. This study examined instructional leadership in terms of defining the school's mission, managing the instructional program, and building a good school learning climate, in accordance with Hallinger & Murphy's (1985) definition and model of instructional leadership. On the other hand, the study's dependent variable was teacher efficacy. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy's (2001) definition and modeling of teacher efficacy served as the foundation for this study, which examined teacher efficacy with regard to engagement with students, administration of the classroom, and instructional methods.



**Fig. 1 The Relationship Between Principals' Instructional Leadership and Teachers' Efficacy**

## 6. Methods

This research was a quantitative descriptive and correlational study. In this study, correlational research using a survey was selected because it describes the relationship between two or more variables and the extent of the relationship between them (Gall et al.,



2014). The method is frequently employed to ascertain relationships between variables and to gather reliable information due to its adaptability and efficiency (Hopkins, 2013). The efficacy of teachers is the dependent variable in this study, and the independent variable is the instructional leadership of the principals. In Xuzhou, China, this study intends to ascertain the relationship between the efficacy of teachers' and principals' instructional leadership. In addition, simple random sampling was used in this study. According to Hallinger's (1982) study, principals must serve for at least one year and participant teachers must serve with their principals for one year. Based on this, the researcher randomly selected 200 teachers from the teachers in Xuzhou middle schools as the final sample through computerized random numbers.

The questionnaire for this study was split into three main sections to gather information that would help answer all of the research questions. The first section, Section A, asked five questions to gather demographic data from the participants. In Section B, teachers' views of the principal instructional leadership were evaluated using the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) (Hallinger, 1982). The Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), which was used to gauge teacher efficacy, is the last item in Section C. On the one hand, the Hallinger (1982) PIMRS scale is a diagnostic tool for principals and their specialization in instructional leadership, reflecting principals' overall competencies in instructional leadership and variations in their focus across functional areas. It evaluates the effectiveness of a principal's instructional leadership in three areas: articulating the school's mission, fostering a supportive learning environment, and overseeing curriculum and instruction. There are a total of 50 items in the dimensions, which are divided into 10 functional elements. The following Likert scales based on: Almost Never, Seldom, Sometimes, Frequently, and Almost Always are used in this instrument to ask teachers to describe the frequency level of principals' instructional leadership behaviors. However, due to its reliability, this study utilized the TSES created by Megan Tschannen-Moran and Anita Woolfolk Hoy (2001). The 24 items on the instrument are divided into three categories: methods of instruction, management of the classroom, and student engagement. The TSES rates teacher responses on the following 5-point Likert scale: None At All, Very Little, Some Degree, Quite A Bit, and A Great Deal.

Before data collection, the reliability of the instrument needed to be verified. First, two experts were invited to validate the content and format of the instrument. They had extensive experience in this field of research. To ensure the suitability and sufficiency of the instrument, the experts carefully examined the study objectives and questionnaire. Following that, a pilot test was carried out. The pilot study involved a small number of respondents to test the applicability of the test questions and the level of respondents' understanding of the program. This pilot study included an overall of 30 teachers who weren't taking part in the main study. The findings demonstrated this research instrument's high reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.931).

Finally, the statistical data analysis method was used to answer the research questions. On one hand, teachers' responses were described by descriptive statistics, which included frequency, mean, percentage, and standard deviation. The study's findings were used to offer demographic information to respondents as well as to identify principals' instructional leadership and teachers' efficacy levels. Pearson correlation analysis, on the other hand, was used to determine the existence and magnitude of the connection between principals' instructional leadership and teachers' efficacy in Xuzhou.

**Table 1 Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.931	.934	74

## 7. Results

### 7.1 Demography Profile of Respondents

Table 2 provides information about the participants' gender, age, educational attainment, teaching experience, and length of time spent working with the current principal. Firstly, according to the statistical results, the percentage of male teachers who participated in this survey was 50.6% (N=91), and 49.4% (N=89) of female teachers. It means the gender distribution of teachers is relatively balanced. Next, among the 180 respondents, 37 teachers were 25 years old and below (20.6%), 66 teachers were 26 to 35 years old (36.7%), and 51 teachers were 36 to 45 years old (28.3%). There were 26 teachers over 45 years old (14.4%). Third, as far as educational attainment, the largest percentage of faculty with a bachelor's degree was 135 (75%). In addition, there were 34 teachers (18.9%) with master's degrees. However, only 11 teachers (6.1%) have a doctoral degree, which still needs to be improved. Fourth, the distribution of teachers' responses regarding teaching experience showed that 53 teachers (29.4%), had less than one year of teaching experience by the finish of the school year. Totally 31 teachers with 2 to 4 years of teaching experience accounted for 17.2%. A total of 19 teachers with 5 to 9 years of teaching experience accounted for 10.6%. In addition, 19.4% of teachers had 10 to 15 years of instruction experience, for a total of 35 teachers. Finally, there were 42 teachers with more than 15 years of teaching experience (23.3%). Fifth, by the finish of the school year, when asked how long they had been collaborating with the present principal, 66 of them (36.7%) declared they had at least one year of experience working for them. A total of 38 teachers have been working with their current principal for 10 to 15 years (21.1%), compared to 27 teachers who had worked with them for 2 to 4 years (15%), and 24 teachers for 5 to 9 years (13.3%). Finally, there were 25 teachers (13.9%) who had worked with their current principal for more than 15 years. The distribution characteristics of the number of years the sample worked with the principal showed that a total of 87 teachers worked with the current principal for more than 5 years (48.3%). Also, nearly half of all respondents have been employed with their current principal for a greater length of time, indicating that teachers and principals have more job stability and less job mobility.

**Table 2 Demography Profile of Respondents**

Demographic Characteristics		Frequency	%
<b>Sex</b>	Male	91	50.6
	Female	89	49.4
<b>Age</b>	Under 25 years	37	20.6
	26-35 years	66	36.7
	36-45 years	51	28.3
	Over 45 years	26	14.4
<b>Level of Education</b>	Bachelor	135	75.0
	Master	34	18.9
	Doctorate	11	6.1
<b>Years experience</b>	1 year	53	29.4
	2-4 years	31	17.2
	5-9 years	19	10.6
	10-15 years	35	19.4
	Over 15 years	42	23.3
<b>Years that you have worked with the current</b>	1 year	66	36.7
	2-4 years	27	15.0
	5-9 years	24	13.3
	10-15 years	38	21.1
	Over 15 years	25	13.9
<b>Total</b>		<b>180</b>	<b>100</b>

## 7.2 Level of Principals' Instructional Leadership

The overall average and standard deviations for the three aspects of instructional leadership are given in Table 3. Overall, teachers viewed principal instructional leadership to be high ( $M=3.82$ ,  $SD=0.56$ ), indicating that teachers perceived principal instructional leadership to be high in Xuzhou, China. Principals were deemed to engage in all three instructional leadership behaviors on a scale of occasionally to almost always. The first dimension of "Defining the School Mission" included two job functions: setting the goals of the school and conveying the vision of the school. The mean for "Defining the School Mission" is 3.86, with a standard deviation of 0.76. The second dimension of "Managing the Instructional Program" combines three job functions: overseeing and assessing instruction, curriculum collaboration, and observing student growth. = The "Management of the Instructional Program" dimension of instructional leadership received the highest overall score, with an average of 3.89 and a standard deviation of 0.60. The following activities are part of the "Developing the School Learning Climate Program," which is the third dimension: Maintains Teaching Time, Encourages Specialized Development, Keeps High Visibility, Providing Teachers with Motivation, and Offers Motivation for Learning. Building the School Learning Climate Program had the lowest average ( $M = 3.77$ ,  $SD = 0.62$ ) across all dimensions.



**Table 3 Level of Principals' Instructional Leadership**

Dimensions of Principal Instructional Leadership	N	M	SD
Defining the School Mission	180	3.86	0.76
Managing the Instructional Program	180	3.89	0.60
Developing the School Learning Climate Program	180	3.77	0.62
<b>Total</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>0.56</b>

Scale: 1=Almost Never, 2=Seldom, 3=Sometimes, 4=Frequently,5=Almost Always

### 7.3 Level of Teachers' Efficacy

Table 4 presents the average and standard deviation of the Classroom Administration, Instructional Methods, and Engagement of Students dimensions of teachers' efficacy. Teachers described their perceptions of effectiveness in these dimensions as ranging from Some Degree to A Great Deal. Teachers' perceptions of efficacy were highest for the Classroom Management dimension (M=4.01) with a standard deviation of 0.94. While teachers' perceptions of efficacy were lowest for the Instructional Strategies dimension (M=3.63, SD=0.78). The results showed that middle high school teachers in Xuzhou, China, had higher levels of teacher efficacy (M=3.83, SD=0.64).

**Table 4 Level of Teachers' Efficacy**

Dimensions of Teacher Efficacy	N	M	SD
Efficacy in Student Engagement	180	3.86	0.87
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	180	3.63	0.78
Efficacy in Classroom Management	180	4.01	0.94
<b>Total</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>0.64</b>

Scale: 1= None At All, 2= Very Little, 3= Some Degree, 4= Quite A Bit, 5= A Great Deal

### 7.4 Relationship between Principals' Instructional Leadership and Teachers' Efficacy

The technique of correlation is to examine the connection between two variables. To identify whether there is a meaningful connection between principals' instructional leadership and teacher efficacy in Xuzhou, Pearson correlation analysis was used in this study. School principal leadership of instruction and the dimensions of teacher efficacy were combined into a composite and an overall score was used to address this question. According to Cohen's (1988) explanatory recommendation, correlation coefficients in the range of 0.10 to 0.29 are considered weakly correlated, 0.30 to 0.49 are considered moderately correlated, and 0.50 to 1.0 are considered strongly correlated. Relevant analysis findings are presented in Table 5, and a strong correlation was found between the two variables. In other words, the findings show a statistically significant link between teacher efficacy and principal leadership in instruction. And the relationship was strongly positive ( $r = .704$ ,  $n = 180$ ,  $p\text{-value} = .000$ ), indicating that in schools where principals exercise stronger leadership in instructional areas, teacher efficacy is higher. In short, the outcomes suggest a significant correlation or association between principals' leadership in instruction and teachers' efficacy in Xuzhou, China, also that teacher efficacy is higher when principals consistently demonstrate instructional leadership skills and behaviors in their schools.

**Table 5 Pearson Correlation of the Principal's Instructional Leadership and the Teachers' Efficacy**

		Principals' Instructional Leadership	Teachers' Efficacy
<b>Principals' Instructional Leadership</b>	Pearson Correlation	1	.704**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	180	180
<b>Teachers' Efficacy</b>	Pearson Correlation	.704**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	180	180

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

## 8. Discussion and Conclusion

Firstly, the outcomes told that principals in the current study area were at a high level of instructional leadership overall. Of its three dimensions, "Managing the Instructional Program" had the highest average rating, while "Establishing a Positive School Learning Environment" was the lowest-rated dimension on average. Similarly, Qian et al., (2017) also described various aspects of principal functions in Eastern China and summarized the characteristics of Chinese principals' practices in a highly centralized educational policy environment through a comparative analysis. The results show that despite the complexity of their practices, Chinese principals can maintain a very strong sense of efficiency and responsibility for education quality. This is about the current context of exam-oriented education in China, where the teaching and learning quality will be directly evaluated as one of the most important criteria for principals' leadership abilities. Therefore, Chinese principals place a lot of emphasis on the management of instruction in their schools. Moreover, the findings showed that participating principals scored the lowest on the Building School Learning Climate Program part. This reflects the objective truth that Chinese primary and middle school principals focus more on administrative leadership and instructional outcomes than on creating a good school climate. This is very similar to several studies that have found that Chinese principals lack efforts in instructional enhancement and fostering a shining school climate and studying atmosphere because they put most of their duration and focus into accomplishing administration work and the pursuit of educational outcomes at the expense of the vital about building a school studying environment plan (Cravens, 2014; Jiang et al., 2010; Liu et al., 2016; Qian & Walker, 2019; Liu & Hallinger, 2021).

Second, the study discovered that teachers in Xuzhou, China, possessed higher rates of teacher efficacy. This is also about the educational context in China, where the high pursuit of student achievement has been one of the important reasons for teacher efficacy. Among the 3 aspects, the highest average value of teacher efficacy was found in the classroom administration dimension while the lowest mean value of efficacy was found in the instructional strategies dimension. This has the same results as the study of Zheng et. al., (2019). Teacher classroom management is a mandatory course for prospective teachers in China. Only teachers with good classroom management and student management skills can

pass the assessment and get the opportunity to be inducted. However, unlike classroom management and student management, it is often difficult for teachers to improve their instructional strategy skills to a great extent through a short period of study. On the contrary, teachers' efficacy in the instructional strategy dimension often needs to be improved through continuous learning and practice. Thus, the low perceived efficacy of participating teachers in instructional strategies is largely related to the lack of self-confidence of teachers due to the absence of continuous access to learning opportunities.

Finally, correlation analyses showed a highly significant correlation, or a significant positive relationship, between the principals' instructional leadership and teacher efficacy. In other words, teachers' efficacy is stronger when they perceive stronger principals' instructional leadership. Like the findings of Han and Wang (2021) in China, principals can motivate teachers to increase their efficacy beliefs, work input, and reflection by establishing a positive climate, setting clear school goals, and Promoting Professional Development, etc. Therefore, high levels of principal instructional leadership can help teachers be more effective, which can help the school achieve its objectives and vision.

## 9. Suggestions

Principals and educational administrators should concentrate on how instructional leadership can increase the efficacy of teachers. Principals should actively engage in interactions between educators and pupils, maintain open lines of communication with teachers and students, and foster an environment that supports student learning, according to the teachers who agreed to participate in this study. Since principals are not as visible as they should be, this study's teachers recommend. Additionally, while concentrating on teaching, principals should pay attention to both the breadth and depth of teacher preparation, plan a variety of multi-platform teacher training activities, and motivate teachers to get involved in preparation for education and research. Finally, the Ministry of Education focuses on training principals in the skills to create a positive climate and principals should increase their interaction with students and faculty.

## 10. References

- Al-Mahdy, Y. F. H., Emam, M. M., & Hallinger, P. (2018). Assessing the contribution of principal instructional leadership and collective teacher efficacy to teacher commitment in Oman. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 69, 191–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.10.007>
- Andrews, R., & Soder, R. (1987). Principal leadership and student achievement. *Educational Leadership*, 44(6), 9-11.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived Self-Efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117–148. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2802\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3)
- Chen, C. (2017). Teachers' Teaching Efficacy on the International Perspective: Evidences from TALIS Survey. *Global Education*, (4), 11-22.
- Cohen, S. (1988). Perceived stress in a probability sample of the United States.
- Cravens, X. C. (2014). The cross-cultural validity of the Learning-Centered Leadership framework and its assessment instrument for principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*.

- Fathi, J., Greenier, V., and Derakhshan, A. (2021). Self-efficacy, reflection, and burnout among Iranian EFL teachers: The mediating role of emotion regulation. *Iran. J. Lang. Teach. Res.* 9, 13–37. doi: 10.30466/IJLTR.2021.121043
- Gall, M.D., Gall, J.P., & Borg, W.R. (2014). *Applying educational research: How to read, do, and use research to solve problems of practice*. Pearson Higher Ed.
- Hallinger, P. (1982). *Principal instructional management rating scale*. Sarasota, FL: Leading Development Associates.
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699>
- Hallinger, P. (2020). Science mapping the knowledge base on educational leadership and management from the emerging regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America, 1965–2018. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(2), 209-230.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the Instructional Management Behavior of Principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461445>
- Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2013). *Measurement properties of the principal instructional management rating scale*. Sarasota, FL: Leading Development Associates.
- Hallinger, P., Hosseingholizadeh, R., Hashemi, N., & Kouhsari, M. (2017). Do beliefs make a difference? Exploring how principal self-efficacy and instructional leadership impact teacher efficacy and commitment in Iran. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(5), 800–819. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217700283>
- Han, Y., & Wang, Y. (2021). Investigating the Correlation Among Chinese EFL Teachers' Self-efficacy, Work Engagement, and Reflection. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.763234>
- Harris, A., Jones, M., Cheah, K. S. L., Devadason, E., & Adams, D. (2017). Exploring principals' instructional leadership practices in Malaysia: insights and implications. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(2), 207–221. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jea-05-2016-0051>
- Hopkins, D. (2013). Instructional leadership and school improvement. In *Effective leadership for school improvement* (pp. 65-81). Routledge.
- Jiang, M., J. Chen, and P. Lyu. 2010. Cultivating Principal Leadership within School Context and Culture: A Study of 331 Principals in Pudong District, Shanghai. *Global Education*, 39 (8): 78–83.
- Kim, K. R., & Seo, E. H. (2018). The relationship between teacher efficacy and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 46(4), 529–540. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6554>
- Li, M., Wang, Z., Gao, J., & You, X. (2017). Proactive personality and job satisfaction: The mediating effects of self-efficacy and work engagement in teachers. *Current Psychology*, 36(1), 48-55.
- Liu, S. N., & Hallinger, P. (2020). Unpacking the effects of culture on school leadership and teacher learning in China. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 174114321989604. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219896042>
- Liu, S., Hallinger, P., & Feng, D. (2016). Learning-centered leadership and teacher learning in China: Does trust matter? *Journal of Educational Administration*.
- Liu, S., Xu, X., Grant, L., Strong, J., & Fang, Z. (2017). Professional standards and performance evaluation for principals in China: A policy analysis of the development of principal

- standards. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 45(2), 238–259. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143215587304>
- Ma, X., & Marion, R. (2019). Exploring how instructional leadership affects teacher efficacy: A multilevel analysis. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 47(4), 445–459. <https://doi.org/10.1177/174114321988874>
- Manaseh, A. M. (2016). Instructional leadership: The role of heads of schools in managing the instructional programme. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 4(1), 30–47. <https://doi.org/10.17583/ijelm.2016.1691>
- Mosoge, M. J., Challens, B. H., & Xaba, M. I. (2018). Perceived collective teacher efficacy in low-performing schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 38(2), 1-9.
- Murphy, J. (1983). Instructional leadership: A conceptual framework. *Planning and Changing*, 14(3), 137-49.
- OECD. (2018). TALIS - The OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey - OECD. [www.oecd.org](http://www.oecd.org). <https://www.oecd.org/education/talis/>
- Putwain, D. W., & von der Embse, N. P. (2018). Teacher self-efficacy moderates the relations between imposed pressure from imposed curriculum changes and teacher stress. *Educational Psychology*, 39(1), 51–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2018.1500681>
- Qian, H., & Walker, A. (2019). Reconciling top-down policy intent with internal accountability: the role of Chinese school principals. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 31(4), 495–517. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-019-09309-4>
- Qian, H., Walker, A., & Li, X. (2017). The west wind vs the east wind: instructional leadership model in China. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(2), 186–206. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jea-08-2016-0083>
- Savolainen, H., Malinen, O.-P., & Schwab, S. (2020). Teacher efficacy predicts teachers' attitudes towards inclusion – a longitudinal cross-lagged analysis. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 26(9), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1752826>
- Shatzer, R. H., Caldarella, P., Hallam, P. R., & Brown, B. L. (2013). Comparing the effects of instructional and transformational leadership on student achievement. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(4), 445–459. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143213502192>
- Silva, J. P., White, G. P., & Yoshida, R. K. (2011). The direct effects of principal–student discussions on eighth-grade students' gains in reading achievement: An experimental study. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(5), 772-793.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783–805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0742-051x\(01\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0742-051x(01)00036-1)
- Wang, Y., & Derakhshan, A. (2021). Review of the book: Investigating dynamic relationships among individual difference variables in learning English as a foreign language in a virtual world, by M. Kruk. System.102531
- Woolfolk, A. E., Rosoff, B., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Teachers' sense of efficacy and their beliefs about managing students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 6(2), 137–148. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051x\(90\)90031-y](https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051x(90)90031-y)
- Zhang, L. F., Fu, M., Li, D. T., & He, Y. (2019). Emotions and teaching styles among academics: the mediating role of research and teaching efficacy. *Educational Psychology*, 39(3), 370-394.

Zheng, X., Yin, H., & Li, Z. (2019). Exploring the relationships among instructional leadership, professional learning communities, and teacher self-efficacy in China. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 47(6), 843–859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218764176>