



Analysis Of The Relation Ship Between School Culture And Teacher Efficacy In Secondary Schools Of India And Ethiopia

Yaregal Taye Legesse^{1*}, Dr Jasraj Kaur²

¹Ph.D. Scholar, Faculty of Education and Information Science, Department of Education and Community Service, Punjabi University, Patiala, India, tayeyaregal78@gmail.com

²Professor, Email: gilljk@ymail.com

***Corresponding Author:** Yaregal Taye Legesse
tayeyaregal78@gmail.com

Citation: Yaregal Taye Legesse, et.al (2024), Analysis Of The Relation Ship Between School Culture And Teacher Efficacy In Secondary Schools Of India And Ethiopia, Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 30(3), 2646-2653
Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i3.7470

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This descriptive survey research aimed to study the relationship between school culture and teacher efficacy, examine school culture as a predictor of teacher efficacy and analyze the significant correlation and prediction difference of the two variables in Indian and Ethiopian contexts. 600 secondary school teachers-300 from Patiala in India and 300 from Awi in Ethiopia- were sampled using systematic sampling. For data collection, two adapted standardized Likert scale questionnaires were used. Pearson's correlation was used to check the significance of the correlation between the variables, and simple linear regression was used to check the prediction of school culture on teacher efficacy. Fisher's r-to-z transformation formula was used to compare the correlation difference between the areas of the two countries. The findings indicated that school culture and teacher efficacy were correlated in the three situations $r .648^{**}$, $.478^{**}$, and $.554^{**}$ $p < 0.01$ in the two merged areas, Indian Patiala and Ethiopian Awi data analysis results, respectively. School culture significantly predicted teacher efficacy $\beta = 0.272$ $p < 0.05$. There was no significant correlation difference between school culture and teacher efficacy $z 2.3938$ $p < 0.05$ in the two areas of the countries. (The authors report there are no competing interests to declare)

1. Introduction

Teachers are the education system's basic human resources who must be well equipped in knowledge, attitude, skill, methodology, etc., if the education quality is to be kept and the countries' fate is to be in the right direction. Since teachers play a significant role in mentoring students, they are considered the nation's builders (Brintha & Kumar, 2019). There is no other human resource body more than teachers to be responsible for students' knowledge acquisition. The main agents behind students' information acquisition are their teachers (Brown, 2016). Teachers are essential human resources in every educational system, and their success greatly influences the planning and execution of all educational initiatives. Teachers play a crucial role in education development and are the focal point for implementing all education areas (G.B, 2013).

More than any other body, current research results demonstrate the critical role that high-quality teachers play in enhancing children's academic achievement and school experiences. Teachers are a school's most valuable asset, so the current policy agenda must be substantively and methodologically refocused to emphasize the need for capacity building in teacher professionalism (and its evaluation) in terms of teaching standards related to what teachers should know and be able to do (Calaguas, 2012 & Ingvarson & Rowe, 2007)—also discussed the key role that teachers can play in the education system and the things that must be done, saying that the core of educational activities, particularly those about teaching and learning, is the teacher. The teaching and learning process will be disturbed and may fail in the absence of teachers. As a result, given the challenge of education to generate quality human resources that can compete globally, teachers' roles in education success are always enhanced in educational management. Teachers' work performance should also

always be improved. Because they work closely with students to provide guidance that will result in the desired graduation, teachers are among the members of the educational staff who have a role in determining the achievement of academic goals. Teachers are human resources who also function as agents, planners, and decision-makers in pursuing organizational objectives. The success of pupils in our schools is greatly dependent on their teachers. These people are the generation's shapers and the main providers of curriculum input, social-emotional growth, and attitude development for kids

Teacher efficacy is among the teacher qualities necessary for student achievement and effectiveness of schools. The foundation of school reform is teacher efficacy or the belief that a teacher has the skills and capacities to facilitate student learning. As a fundamental component of teacher efficacy, motivation affects three aspects of teaching: performance, commitment, and retention. Moreover, teachers use this motivation—sifted through efficacy levels—to assess the effect they will have on their students (Freeman & Carissa, 2008). Over the years, researchers have focused on studying teacher issues in the education system because of their pivotal role. Among the essential teacher-related factors is teacher efficacy, which has attracted considerable scholarly attention. (Y. Liu et al., 2021). Teachers' belief in student achievement and their ability to solve challenging issues plays a great role in student achievement and the effectiveness of a school. The belief that educators have in their skills and those of their colleagues to provide meaningful and sufficient teaching to support students' performance at or beyond mandated academic levels is one of the numerous factors that will determine the future success of the American educational system (Y. Liu et al., 2021). That is why this researcher took teacher issues as a research area and focused on teacher efficacy and teacher collaboration and the relationship of instructional leadership, school culture, and teacher collaboration with teacher efficacy.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1. Teacher Efficacy

Bandura's social cognitive theory is the foundation of teacher efficacy. The Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) developed by Bandura in 1977 serves as a key theoretical foundation for the concept of teacher efficacy. According to the hypothesis, people can create expectations that affect how they behave in the future. According to SCT (social cognitive theory), individuals use mechanisms of personal agency to contribute to their own psychosocial functioning causally. If people don't think their efforts will result in the intended results, they have little reason or motivation to take action in life. Personal efficacy beliefs are strong and essential to our human experiences.

"Beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" is how Bandura (1997) defined teacher efficacy (p. 3). These convictions in one's own ability have a variety of behavioral effects, influencing people's decisions and actions. According to Bandura (1997), teachers learn from other teachers' practices and become proficient at a task, encouraging perseverance, hard work, and, eventually task completion (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Efficacy beliefs also influence people's effort levels, persistence through difficulties, and resilience in adversity (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The higher an individual's sense of efficacy, the more effort, persistence, and resilience they will display. Individual behavioral/achievement outcomes (i.e., individual actions, effort/motivation, choices, verbal statement), social, environmental factors (i.e., people as models, resources, physical setting, and consequence of an action/feedback), and personal factors (i.e., beliefs, attitudes, expectations, and knowledge) interact and influence each other in the learning process, according to social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997). Perceived competence, or teacher efficacy, influences how hard teachers work and what kinds of problems they take on (Pas et al., 2012) Since teacher efficacy can affect the amount of effort put out, the goals that are set, and the motivation levels of teachers and instructional leaders, the notion is particularly significant to teachers.

2.2. School Culture

The word "culture" can signify many different things to various people. According to Inglis (2005), there are four typical definitions of culture: high culture, which includes the arts and other forms of expression; a refined person; cultural artifacts, such as books; and working-class culture, which refers to an entire way of life. My concept of culture will be based on the fourth term, which refers to an entire way of life. The following eight factors are provided by Inglis (2005) to support this concept of culture as a way of life in its entirety: a particular group of people's culture is made up of the ideas, values, and beliefs that are shared by that group, as well as its "characteristic" ways of thinking and feeling, each group has its "own" culture, which distinguishes one group from another, cultural practices have meanings-culture has significance, a group's ideals, values, and beliefs have a significant role in influencing how people behave, symbols and artifacts are vehicles for a group's ideals, principles, and beliefs, culture can be learned, culture is arbitrary and there is a close relationship between culture and many social power structures. This entire style of living encompasses a staggeringly wide range of "daily practices of being, doing, having, saying, seeing, eating, wearing, and talking". (DOĞAN et.al, 2017) mentioned the components of school culture and its impact as the set of shared values, beliefs, and standards known as school culture affects how teachers and administrators feel, think, and act in the workplace. The effectiveness of students may benefit from changes in school culture. Regarding student success in schools, school culture is a crucial factor

It is possible to think of school culture as a factor that can permeate and affect every part of a school. It can impact how staff members perceive problems, think through options, make decisions, and respond to situations at work (Hinde, 2004; Kruger, 2003). In some cases, it can be used as a gauge to assess how well the schools are doing when it comes to putting those goals into practice and attaining them (Öztürk et al., 2021). It can also be used as a trait that can distinguish between schools that perform well and poorly (Kruger, 2003:). Despite appearing to be a significant factor, school culture has a less pronounced effect on academic performance. Numerous circumstances surrounding academic success muddle and lessen its impact. The type of leadership, how pupils are observed and assessed, curriculum selections, and the relationships between instructors and students are just a few examples (Amtu et al., 2020).

A quantitative and qualitative study of School Culture, Teacher Efficacy, and Decision-Making by Bobbett (2001) collected data from 555 teachers in 34 schools. It revealed that there is a statistically significant and strong positive relationship between teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and the schools' professional culture. In Taiwan's distance education, (-Tsu Lin & Luetkehans, 2010) conducted a study on the impact of school culture on faculty efficacy, gathering information online from 400 teachers. According to the findings of the investigation, the faculty's confidence and teacher efficacy have increased as a result of the leaders' positive responses with manifest variables of reward, encouragement, and support as well as respect with its manifest variables of the expectation of faculty performance and keeping delivery of the new issues to faculty members. As a result, according to Lin (-Tsu Lin & Luetkehans, 2010), teachers have received more positive feedback from pupils and administrators, which has helped them gain confidence to support challenging pupils and apply creative teaching methods—basic traits of efficacious instructors.

3. Aims of the study

This study aimed to investigate the correlation between teacher efficacy and school culture. Additionally, an investigation into how school culture predicts teacher efficacy was planned. Furthermore, it sought to evaluate the relative importance of correlation and relationship variations across Ethiopian and Indian contexts. The following were the precise goals and theories of the research:

1. To study the relationship between school culture and teacher efficacy in Indian and Ethiopian secondary schools

Ho1: There is no relationship between school culture and teacher efficacy in Indian and Ethiopian secondary schools.

Ho 2: There is no correlation difference between school culture and teacher efficacy in Indian and Ethiopian secondary schools

2. To study school culture as a predictor of teacher efficacy in Indian and Ethiopian secondary schools.

3. Ho1: school culture will not be a significant predictor of teacher efficacy in Indian and Ethiopian secondary schools

Ho 2: There is no prediction difference between school culture and teacher efficacy in Indian and Ethiopian secondary schools

4. Methodology

A positivist research paradigm was this study's philosophical and/or methodological stance since it enabled the researcher to get data that matched the plan (Stadtländer, 2009). Thus, a quantitative approach to data collection and analysis was used. The researcher's chosen problem involved examining the relationship between teacher efficacy and school culture. Data that was already available was gathered from teachers to address this issue. In the research area, the problem has already arisen. As a result, quantitative techniques were used in a descriptive survey research design. According to Cohen et al. (2017), descriptive research describes and interprets what is.

The entire teacher population in Ethiopia's Awi zone and India's Patiala district served as the study's population. The researcher has selected one district, Patiala, and one zone, Awi, in the Punjab state of India and the Amhara region of Ethiopia, respectively, to conduct his study. The researcher selected 15 schools from the Patiala district and 15 from Awi, Ethiopia. Six hundred teachers were selected following systematic sampling, 300 from Indian Patiala and 300 from the Awi zone of Ethiopia.

5. INSTRUMENTATION

The first was the Teachers Efficacy Scale, created in 2001 by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy. It was used to assess how efficacious teachers thought they were. Three items were deemed to have weak inter-item values during the pilot phase, resulting in their cancellation. The original version of the test had a reliability of 0.94. Its reliability in the context of the research areas was determined to be 0.937, 0.877, and 0.933 in Indian, Ethiopian, and Indian-Ethiopian contexts, respectively. Gruenert and Valentine's (1998) School Culture Survey was the second tool. The

instrument consisted of 35 items; however, during the pilot phase, four items whose inter-item reliability was determined to be less than 0.3 were removed. Reliability for the Gruenert and Valentines (1998) scale was 0.82. The modified 31-item version's dependability was .934 in the Indian context, .962 in the Ethiopian context, and .963 in the Indo-Ethiopian context.

6. STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF THE DATA

The mean, standard deviations, standard errors, skewness, and kurtosis were computed as descriptive statistics. Using Pearson's correlation analysis, the relationship between teacher efficacy and school culture was examined. A correlation coefficient calculation was made. The analysis of the data was done with SPSS software. Since SPSS cannot calculate correlation differences, Fisher's formula of r to z transformation was utilized to compare the correlation difference between the two areas of the two countries. Simple linear regression was also computed to verify the prediction of school culture on teacher efficacy.

7. Results

Table 1: Total statistics

Table 1 Group Statistics

Locale, India and Ethiopia	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Mean in Both cases	Ske Both	Kur Both
C_MEAN India	300	4.4308	.44586	0.029	3.846	0.065	0.1
Ethiopia	300	3.7121	.75005	0.039			
TE_MEAN India	300	4.4333	.34551	0.023	4.1942	0.031	0.1
Ethiopia	300	3.9550	.47499	0.026			

This descriptive statistical table indicated the data's mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis. It also revealed that the distributions of teacher efficacy (TE) and school culture (C) variables were normal, with 0.065 and 0.031 skewness for each variable, respectively, and 0.1 kurtosis value for both variables. This data satisfied the skewness criterion, which ranges from -1 to 1, less than the critical value of the normal test statistic of 1.96 (Koylu & Cinar, 2013). According to this scholar, the present data has also met the normality criteria regarding kurtosis since its threshold is from -3 to 3. The descriptive statistics of variables C and TE are also displayed in the table. The table shows 600 observations, with 300 coming from Ethiopian Awi and 300 from Indian Patiala. The Ethiopian Awi data had mean scores of 3.7121 and 3.9550 for school culture and teacher efficacy, respectively. Still, the Indian Patiala data had mean scores of 4.4308 and 4.4333 for these two variables, respectively. Similarly, Ethiopia's standard deviations for school culture and teacher efficacy, at .75005 and .47499, were higher than those of Indian Patiala, at .44586 and .34551, respectively. Furthermore, the Ethiopian Awi standard errors of 0.039 and 0.026 for school culture and teacher efficacy, respectively, were greater than those of the Indian Patiala data, which had mean standard errors of 0.029 and 0.023, respectively. The results showed that errors were higher in the Ethiopian case than in the Indian case and that the Ethiopian data observation was more distributed or, on average, away from the mean than the Indian data.

Table 2. Correlation between C and TE, and correlation difference between the two countries

Correlates	The strength and significance of correlation with TE									z-score	Probability	Decision
	India-Ethiopia(both)			India			Ethiopia					
	N	r	Decision	N	r	Decision	N	R	Decision			
C	600	.648**	R	234	.478**	r	366	.554*	R	1.233	0.2177	accepted
TE	600	1		234	1	r	366	1				

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

Table 2 displays the correlation between teacher efficacy (TE) and school culture (C) and the correlation differences between the research domains of the two nations. There was a significant link between teacher efficacy and school culture in Ethiopian Awi, Indian Patiala, and Ethiopia-India, respectively, with r values of .554**, .478**, and .648**. Nevertheless, z 1.233 and $p=0.2177$, which p was larger than $p<0.05$, indicated the correlation coefficient difference between Ethiopian data .554** and Indian data .478** regarding school culture and teacher efficacy was not significant.

Table 3. Model Summary table values for both countries merged and for each country separately

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
Both countries	0.534	0.285	0.284	0.28563	1.564
Indian	0.54	0.291	0.289	0.29048	1.413
Ethiopia	0.515	0.266	0.263	0.28107	1.715

Table 3, the model summary table, shows that the model fit the data well because the independent variable, school culture, accounted for about 28.5 percent of the variation in the dependent variable. Additionally, it displayed the percentage of the dependent variable's change in the two countries' data merged as well as each country's data independently. There are three findings in this output table. The data analysis output results for the two countries' research areas data, Ethiopia's Awi zone, and India's Patiala—were displayed in the first, second, and third rows. Thus, in the two nations whose data were combined, Indian Patiala and Ethiopian Awi school culture explained 28.5%, 29.1%, and 26.6% (R^2 0.285, 0.291, and 0.266), respectively of the dependent variable teacher efficacy variation. In the Indian context, the standard deviations of the distributions were smaller than in the Ethiopian context, indicating that the values were closer to the mean, and the standard errors of the Indian data were lower than in the Ethiopian context. The mean scores of the two variables were higher in the Indian context than in the Ethiopian context. In the Indian context, the proportion of the dependent variable's change was larger than in the Ethiopian setting. We concluded from the mean ratings that teacher efficacy and school culture were more prevalent, demonstrated, and practiced in Indian Patiala than in Ethiopian Awi. The robust model fit and more comprehensive explanation of the impact of school culture on teacher efficacy suggested that, compared to Ethiopia, school culture in India performed a greater role in explaining teacher efficacy.

Table 4: coefficient table for both countries and for each country's data analysis result Separately

Country	Model	N	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig
			B	Std. Error	Beta		
Both	(Constant)		1.778	0.114		15.626	0
	C_M	600	0.521	0.034	0.534	15.444	0
	Locale, India and Ethiopia	2	-0.025	0.023	-0.037	-1.053	0.293
India	(Constant)		1.765	0.163		10.825	0
	C_M	300	0.528	0.048	0.54	11.072	0
Ethiopia	(Constant)		1.824	0.162		11.292	0
	C_M	300	0.503	0.048	0.515	12.57	0

Table 4 presented the individual contributions of the independent variable, school culture, in three different scenarios. The two data were analyzed separately to determine whether there was a significant mean difference in prediction between the two countries' separate observations. The 600 observation data from the two locations of the two countries merged were also analyzed. It showed how one unit change in the independent variable affected the dependent variable, teacher efficacy. Therefore, in the research areas of both countries, Ethiopian Awi and Indian Patiala, a one-unit change in the independent variable school culture changed teacher efficacy by 0.534, 0.54, and 0.515, respectively, at $p<0.05$ in all three cases. As the table illustrates, the Indian context had a higher prediction of school culture on

teacher efficacy ($\beta=.540$) than the Ethiopian context ($\beta=.515$). Similarly, the Indian data analysis result mean scores of C_M (school culture) 4.4308 and TE_M (teacher efficacy) 4.4333 were higher than the Ethiopian data results mean scores of 3.7121 and 3.9550 for school culture and teacher efficacy, respectively. The strength of the relationship between the two variables, or the capacity to predict school culture on teacher efficacy, was not statistically significant between the two countries ($\beta=-0.037$ $p=0.293$).

There was a negative connection between locale and the prediction of school culture on teacher efficacy $\beta=-0.037$. Given that Ethiopia's reference country was India, which had a code of 0, the impact of school culture on teacher efficacy was predicted to be 3.7 percent lower in Ethiopia. Additionally, the table showed no significant difference in the predictive power of school culture between the two countries' research areas, as it was deemed negligible at ($\beta=-0.037$ $p<0.293$). Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no prediction difference of school culture on teacher efficacy between the two countries' research areas was accepted.

8. Discussion

School culture and teacher efficacy were positively and significantly correlated with each other. In all three situations, that is, the data analysis of both countries in one, that of India and Ethiopia separately, school culture and teacher efficacy were significantly correlated $r=.648^{**}$, $.478^{**}$ and $.554^{**}$ $p<0.01$ respectively, where the correlation between school culture and teacher efficacy of Indian Patiala was low but still significant $p<0.01$, and the correlation of the two variables in Ethiopian and both countries case was moderate. Moreover, the simple linear regression analysis also showed that school culture significantly predicted teacher efficacy $\beta=.534$, $.540$, and $.515$ at $p<0.01$ for the two areas of the two countries, Indian Patiala and Ethiopian Awi. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected in all three cases, as the symbol R (rejected) was written in the decision column for each issue. That is, the two null hypotheses that there is no relationship between school culture and teacher efficacy in Indian and Ethiopian secondary schools and school culture will not significantly predict teacher efficacy in Indian and Ethiopian secondary school teachers were rejected. However, the null hypothesis that there is no relationship difference between school culture and teacher efficacy in Indian and Ethiopian secondary schools was accepted because the difference was found insignificant $z=1.233$, $p=0.2177$ ($p=0.293$). Similarly, the regression hypothesis that there is no prediction difference between school culture and teacher efficacy in Indian and Ethiopian secondary schools was also accepted $\beta=-0.037$ at $p=0.293$.

In relation to this study, (Tsu Lin & Luetkehans, 2010) revealed a positive association of $r=0.36$ between teacher self-efficacy and school culture. This was significant at $p<0.05$. Similarly, Washington Rouse's 2021 thematic qualitative analysis summary revealed that school culture highly influenced teacher efficacy. Malinen & Savolainen (2016) gathered information from 642 Finnish lower secondary school teachers to investigate the connection between teacher efficacy and school culture. The results showed a favorable correlation between teacher efficacy, all work resources, and teacher involvement. It was discovered that a positive and active school culture acted as a predictor of instructors' efficacy. Another team of researchers identified five essential components of school culture, Hasselquist et al. (2017), after distributing questionnaires containing the main variables to 171 teachers. These elements are district administrative support, school administrative support, colleague support, parental support, and facilities and financial support. This study paid Particular attention to the interpersonal aspects of school culture. The study's intended audience found that peer support was a statistically significant element in beginning instructors' efficacy when it came to cultural concerns (Hasselquist et al., 2017). All these studies showed that teacher efficacy and school culture were significantly associated; while some addressed all aspects, others focused only on the sub-dimensions of teacher efficacy and school culture. As a result, the current study was consistent with the literature, and in the setting of Ethiopian Awi and Indian Patiala, school culture and teacher efficacy increased together. In the two areas of the two countries, as school culture increased, teacher efficacy also increased. This must go on into the future as well. Furthermore, a study conducted by Min (2023) that gathered information from 605 primary school teachers discovered a favorable teacher-student rapport. This, in turn, increased the teachers' self-efficacy and outcome expectations when exercising their discretion in curriculum concerns. Furthermore, Min's research indicated that the classroom socially constructs teachers' character qualities, such as self-efficacy and outcome expectancies; in other words, school culture and teachers' efficacy were in good condition. Furthermore, each teacher's efficacy over the curriculum at the school or classroom level was significantly impacted by the school culture nurtured by strong teacher-principal and teacher-teacher relationships (Min, 2023).

Research comparing Ethiopia's and India's educational systems was widely available in the literature, but it was not directly tied to the researcher's current variables. Young Lives Policy Brief examined Peru, Vietnam, Ethiopia, and India in a report released on June 30, 2016, and found that India performed better than Ethiopia on most educational indicators. Power and water are two of the many facilities that Indian schools have better access to. 57.2% of private school teachers and 82.3% of public school teachers in India possess a bachelor's degree in

education, while 14.3% of private school teachers and 1% of public school teachers in Ethiopia attended universities. Ethiopia has a dropout rate of 29% compared to India at 28%, but Sime and Latchanna's (2018) study comparing the two countries' educational policies, structures, and histories revealed almost no differences. In a qualitative examination of early marriage in Ethiopia and India, Raj et al. (2019) discovered that students, educators, and society shared a similar understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of early child marriage. The study's results were presented here since there is a relationship between and an impact on all educational variables. The study indicated that, although the difference was not statistically significant, the mean scores for teacher efficacy and school culture in the Indian data were higher than those in the Ethiopian data.

9. Conclusion

Several investigations into the connection between teacher efficacy and school culture have established this relationship. It was discovered that this study supported the earlier research. Since the mean scores for Ethiopian, Indian, and both nations' data were above average—that is 3.7121, 4.4308 and 3.846—respectively, this study has informed us that the school culture in the two countries was conducive to teaching and learning. A comparable outcome was seen regarding teacher efficacy, given that Indian, Ethiopian, and both countries' mean scores of 4.1942, 3.9550, and 4.4333, respectively, were higher than average. The five-point Likert scale instrument has an average of 2.5. The study's other finding was that in all three scenarios—when the data from two nations was evaluated as a single entity and when the data from each country was analyzed independently—school culture and teacher efficacy were positively and significantly connected. Furthermore, teacher efficacy was predicted considerably by school culture. Though not statistically significant, the relationship between Ethiopian school culture and teacher efficacy was found to be stronger than that of India. The strongest link between teacher efficacy and school culture was found in the data from both nations. The higher mean score result and the substantial association between the two variables indicated that both countries' schools had efficacious teachers and a positive school culture. Moreover, teacher efficacy and school culture were correlated. In other words, when one grew, so did the other. Given that all three of the above-discussed scenarios had significant regression coefficients, the study also demonstrated that school culture can predict teacher efficacy. However, the correlation and regression capacity differences between the two nations were negligible. Based on these findings, more research on the effectiveness of teachers concerning the real implementation of school culture and teacher efficacy can be done. It is possible to do additional comparative studies between other nations and compare Ethiopia and India regarding other variables. Policymakers can benefit from exchanging experiences and revising policies following the recommendations of this comprehensive and recurrent study.

References

1. Amtu, O., Makulua, K., Matital, J., & Pattiruhu, C. M. (2020). Improving Student Learning Outcomes through School Culture, Work Motivation and Teacher Performance. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(4), 885–902.
2. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191
3. Bellibas, M. S., & Liu, Y. (2017). Multilevel analysis of the relationship between principals' perceived practices of instructional leadership and teachers' self-efficacy perceptions. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(1), 49–69. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-12-2015-0116>
4. Bobbett, J. J., & Ellett, C. D. T. C. (2001). *School culture, teacher efficacy, and decision-making in demonstrably effective and ineffective schools* (Vol. 3021421). Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College. https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses%0Ahttp://search.proquest.com/docview/250782710?accountid=13042%5Cnhttp://oxfordfx.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/oxford?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&genre=dissertations+&
5. Brintha, M., & Kumar, V. (2019). TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS CONSTRUCTS AT THE UPPER PRIMARY LEVEL. *The International Journal of Analytical and Experimental Modal Analysis*, 11(10), 1–9. <https://doi.org/ISSN NO: 0886-9367>
6. Brown, L. L. (2016). *Educator Perceptions of Instructional Leadership in the School Improvement Process* [East Tennessee State University]. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>
7. Calaguas, G. M. (2012). Teacher effectiveness scale in higher education: Development and psychometric properties. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2012.108>
8. Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2017). Research Methods in Education. In *Research Methods in*

- Education*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539>
9. Dogan, S., Şamil Tatik, R., & Yurtseven, N. (2017). Professional learning communities assessment: Adaptation, internal validity, and multidimensional model testing in turkish context. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri*, 17(4), 1203–1229. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2017.4.0479>
10. Freeman, C., & Carissa, F. (2008). *Teacher Efficacy and its Impact On Student Achievement Recommended Citation* [REGIS UNIVERSITY]. <https://epublications.regis.edu/theses/16>
11. G.B, E. (2013). Quality of Teachers and Academic Performance of Secondary School Students in Ondo State. *International Journal of Science*, 2(9), 140–144. <http://www.ijsciences.com>
12. Gruenert, S., & Valentine, J. (1998). School culture survey. Retrieved from <http://www.mllc.org/>
13. Hasselquist, L., Herndon, K., & Kitchel, T. (2017). School Culture's Influence on Beginning Agriculture Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Teacher Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 58(1), 267–279. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2017.01267>
14. Hinde, E. R. (2004). School culture and change: An examination of the effects of school culture on the process of change. *Essays in Education*, 12(March), 61–72.
15. Inglis, D. (2005). *CULTURE AND EVERYDAY LIFE*. Routledge.
16. Ingvarson, L., & Rowe, K. (2007). Conceptualising and Evaluating Teacher Quality: Substantive and methodological issues Australian Council for Educational Research. *Paper Presented at the Economics of Teacher Quality Conference Australian National University*, 1–27.
17. Koylu, H., & Cinar, A. (2013). 100 Statistical tests. *Meccanica*, 48(5), 1093–1115.
18. Kruger, A. (2003). Instructional leadership : the impact on the culture of teaching and learning in two effective secondary schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 23(3), 206–211.
19. Liu, Y., Bellibaş, M. Ş., & Gümüş, S. (2021). The Effect of Instructional Leadership and Distributed Leadership on Teacher Self-efficacy and Job Satisfaction: Mediating Roles of Supportive School Culture and Teacher Collaboration. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 49(3), 430–453. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220910438>
20. Malinen, O. P., & Savolainen, H. (2016). The effect of perceived school climate and teacher efficacy in behavior management on job satisfaction and burnout: A longitudinal study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 60, 144–152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.08.012>
21. Min, M. (2023). School culture, self-efficacy, outcome expectation, and teacher agency toward reform with curricular autonomy in South Korea: a social cognitive approach. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 43(4), 951–967. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2019.1626218>
22. Öztürk, M., Bulut, M. B., & Yildiz, M. (2021). Predictors of Teacher Burnout in Middle Education: School Culture and Self-Efficacy. *Studia Psychologica*, 63(1), 5–23. <https://doi.org/10.31577/SP.2021.01.811>
23. Pas, E. T., Bradshaw, C. P., & Hersfeldt, P. A. (2012). Teacher- and school-level predictors of teacher efficacy and burnout: Identifying potential areas for support. *Journal of School Psychology*, 50(1), 129–145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2011.07.003>
24. Sime, T., & Latchanna, G. (2018). Education System in Ethiopia and India: Comparative Analysis of Selected Educational Issues. *IRA International Journal of Education and Multidisciplinary Studies*, 11(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.21013/jems.v11.n1.p1>
25. Stadtländer, C. T. K.-H. (2009). Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed-Methods Research. *Microbe Magazine*, 4(11), 485–485. <https://doi.org/10.1128/microbe.4.485.1>
26. Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale Instrument. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(1), 783–805.
27. Tsu Lin, Y., & Luetkehans, L. (2010). *ABSTRACT THE EFFECT OF SCHOOL CULTURE ON FACULTY SELF-EFFICACY IN DISTANCE EDUCATION IN TAIWAN*. NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY.