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Abstract: The main purpose of this study were to identify teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership including the examination of several constructs (frame the school goals, communicate the school goal, supervise & evaluate instruction, coordinate the curriculum, monitor student progress, protect instructional time, maintain high visibility, provide incentives for teachers, promote professional development and provide incentives for learning) and organizational climate, and to determine the relationship between teachers’ instructional leadership and organizational climate at Santichon Islamic School, Bangkok, Thailand, in the academic year of 2016-2017. A questionnaire was used to investigate the teachers’ level of instructional leadership and organizational climate as a source of data. A total of 87 full time teachers from Santichon Islamic School were selected as the participants in this study. The study found that the level of teachers’ instructional leadership was “moderate”, but the level of teachers’ organizational climate was “high”. In addition, there was no significant relationship between teachers’ instructional leadership and organizational climate.
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Introduction

Since the learning outcome for students is focused on this paradigm. Especially, in 21st century, instructional leadership is a center of educational leadership due to its effectiveness in the student performance. Presently, Thailand still in the process of changing traditional practice from principal to model of principal to act as instructional leaders and share nature of instructional leadership among school stuff. Therefore, the graduates of Islamic private school are thus disadvantage, when they come to qualifying for university entrance examination of finding a job in the labor market. Instructional leadership has often been found to influence positively the students’ achievement and also effect on school effectiveness. Though many people
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agree that instructional leadership develop teachers’ ability to enhance instruction as Seong and Ho (2011) revealed their study that to increase quality of instruction, instructional leadership is required to combine with leadership skills. The amount of instructional leadership action including 3 dimensions (defining schools’ mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting school learning climate. Moreover, school administration is multidimensional and complicated process. Organizational climate gets involved in school administration as a key factor to improve educational quality. For this reason, many scholars have indicated that, organizational climate has impact on teachers’ job performance and students’ achievement in school.

In addition, studies on the relationship between instructional leadership and organizational climate are not widely conducted in Thailand. Therefore, this researcher was interested in investigating teachers’ perceptions towards instructional leadership and organizational climate that helped Thai educational system especially for Islamic school.

Objectives:
The followings were the research objectives for this quantitative study.

1. To identify the teachers’ perception of instructional leadership in Santichon Islamic school, Bangkok, Thailand.
2. To identify the teachers’ perception of organizational climate in Santichon Islamic school, Bangkok, Thailand.
3. To determine the relationship between the teachers’ perception of instructional leadership and organizational climate in Santichon Islamic school, Bangkok, Thailand.

Literature Review

Instructional leadership
Haninger and Murphy (1985) proposed a conceptual model which describes the defining and measuring the instruction leadership function for school leader. This model known as PIMRS (Principal Instruction Management Rating Scale). The PIMRS model dived into 3 dimension which are (1) defining the schools’ mission, (2) managing the instructional program, and (3) promoting a school learning climate (Halinger and Murphy, 1985). In these three dimensions, including 10 instructional leadership function

Function (1): Framing the schools’ goal refers to schools’ principal setting the objectives which school stuffs concentrate their determination during the year school (Halinger and Murphy, 1985).

Function (2): Communicating the schools’ goal explores a variety of channel to communicate to the school community in order to encourage developing school achievement and accomplishing schools’ mission. Salleh (2013) mentioned that, communicating and explaining schools’ goal is an important function for a schools’ principal who expected to act as instructional leader.
Function (3): Coordinating the curriculum discusses coordinating between principals and their staff for align the curriculum with standards, assessment and policies that will ensure efficiency for school management.

Function (4): Supervising & evaluating the instruction relates to the improvement of the quality of teaching and learning. Supervising and evaluating might be arranged through collaborative activity to all teachers which can support and increase teachers’ competency (Ekyaw, 2013).

Function (5): Monitoring student progress refers to how principal and teachers observe and check the result of students’ progress. Haling and Lee (2013) mentioned that to monitor student progress teachers and other school administration have to share data and collaborate with principal.

Function (6): Protecting instructional time focuses on to maintain the classroom run smoothly and avoid interrupted conditions. Hicks (2014) demonstrated that classroom instruction can be interrupted by announcement made to the class or even students making the permission to entering classroom.

Function (7): Providing incentives for teachers explores how providing teacher with financial incentives affect to student achievement. Providing teacher with financial incentives based on student achievement is one possible process to increase student achievement and improve the quality of selecting teaching as profession (Fryer, 2011).

Function (8): Providing incentives for learning focuses on teachers provide a learning that motivate for their children. Hicks (2014) pointed out that providing opportunities for students to be positively admitted from their teachers and college can help them to achieve the high achievement.

Function (9): Promoting professional development explores the important of professional development which require to all teachers in school to take. Gaining the professional development, they need to be effective in their roles.

Function (10): Maintaining high visibility refers to increasing interaction among teachers and students in school. The visibility of principals on the school campus demonstrates that they value these interactions among teachers and students as high on their list of priorities (Hicks, 2014).

Organizational climate
Stringer (2002) proposed a conceptual model and measurement of organizational climate which describe organizational climate and play a curial role in measuring, are discussed as following:

Dimension (1): Structure considers employees’ sense of well arrange and having a clarification of their roles and their responsibilities. Having a clear structure in organization procreates an effective performance of each activity and contributes the all members in organization.

Dimension (2): Recognition refers to the feeling of organizational member who receive the reward for a job well done. Musllins (2002) mentioned that reward and recognition are pleasurable result of the organizational member of their outstanding performance.

Dimension (3): Responsibilities reflect the organizational members’ feeling they are recognized to solving problem, performing current duties and making certain...
decisions without taking into consideration by others organizational members. Latif (2010) stated that the members of organization perceived the sense of trust and satisfaction, when they taking the responsibility for performing their job.

Dimension (4): Support refers to entrusting and helping each other. Organizational climate can make a progress through perceived organizational support. When members of organization perceive positive organizational support in the organization, it increases the affection between employee and organization and will strengthen the work motivation, high productivity and job satisfaction (Musllins, 2002).

**Background of Santichon Islamic School, Bangkok, Thailand**
Santichon Islamic School was founded from Santichon instititute in 1984. A decade later, in 1989 Santichon Islamic School started operation for the provision of primary islamic education, enjoyed continual development and growth in terms of its student population, educational staff and infrastructure. Currently, Mr. Prasert Mussari is serving as the President and Mr. Manat Boonchom is serving as a director of Santichon Islamic School. Now, Santichon Islamic School is currently offering education from kindergarten to upper secondary school (Grade 12) under the MoE, Ministry of University Affairs and the National Council on Education (a unit under the Prime Minister’s Office)

**Conceptual Framework**
Figure 1 is the conceptual framework of this study based on the theory presented above.
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**Figure1: Conceptual Framework of This Study**
Procedure
The research was a quantitative, correlational study and used a questionnaire consisted of two parts. All eighty-seven full time teachers in academic year of 2017 at Santichon Islamic School in Bangkok were selected as the participants of this study to express their perceptions on instructional leadership and organizational climate in the research questionnaire.

The first part of the questionnaire consisted of two section. The first section requests basic demographic information from the teacher, the gender, the number of years teaching, and the teaching grading. The second section was designed to evaluate the level of teachers’ perceptions on instructional leadership toward (1) Framing the schools’ goals, (2) Communicating the schools’ goals, (3) Coordinating the curriculum, (4) Supervising & evaluating instruction, (5) Monitoring student progress, (6) Protecting instructional time, (7) Providing incentives for learning, (8) Providing incentives for teachers, (9) Promoting professional development, (10) Maintaining high visibility. For this section, there were a total of 50 functions under 10 constructs.

The second part of the questionnaire was designed to evaluate the level of teachers’ towards (1) Construct, (2) Recognition, (3) Responsibility and (4) Support. For this part, there were a total of 12 statements under 4 domains. Statement 1-3 were provided to seek domain (1) Construct. Statement 4-6 were provided to seek domain (2) Recognition. Statement 7-9 were provided to seek domain (3) Responsibility. Statement 10-12 were provided to seek domain (4) Support. The participants answered the question in the questionnaire based upon on their perceptions towards instructional leadership by choosing five rating scale as mentioned as following: (1) Very High, (2) High, (3) Moderate, (4) Low, and (5) Very Low. To determine teachers’ perceptions towards instructional leadership, a score of 5 or the scale of 4.51-5.00 meant the respondents’ perceptions on their instructional leadership was very high (Almost Always), while a score of 1 or the scale of 1.00-1.50 meant the respondents’ perceptions on their instructional leadership was very low (Almost Never), to the related statements in the questionnaire. The details of interpretation of scores and scale of the participants’ perceptions levels towards instructional leadership were displayed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.51-5.00</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.51-4.50</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.51-3.50</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.51-2.50</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00-1.50</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants also answered the question in the questionnaire based organizational climate by choosing five rating scale as mentioned as following: (1) Very High, (2) High, (3) Moderate, (4) Low, and (5) Very Low. To determine teachers’ perceptions towards organizational climate, a score of 5 or the scale of 4.51-5.00 meant the respondents’ perceptions on their instructional leadership and
organizational climate was very high (Strongly Agree), while a score of 1 or the scale of 1.00-1.50 meant the respondents’ perceptions on their instructional leadership and organizational climate was very low (Strongly Disagree), to the related statements in the questionnaire. The details of interpretation of scores and scale of the participants’ perceptions levels towards organizational climate were displayed in Table 2.

Table 2: Interpretation of Questionnaire Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.51-5.00</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.51-4.50</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.51-3.50</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.51-2.50</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00-1.50</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean and Standard Deviation were used to analyzed the data of Objective 1 and 2, teachers’ perception towards instructional leadership and organizational climate. Pearson Product Moment Coefficient was used to analyze the data of objective 3, which determine the relationship between instructional leadership and organizational climate at Santichon Islamic School.

Findings

Research Objective One

As Table 3 showed, the overall total mean score of teachers’ perceptions towards instructional leadership at Santichon Islamic School in Bangkok, Thailand was 3.49, which means the participants generally received moderate in the range scale of 2.51-3.50. The highest mean score of teachers’ perceptions towards instructional leadership was 3.84 in construct 10: Incentives for learning, which meant the participants received high level from their perceptions in construct 10. In addition, the lowest mean score of teachers’ perceptions towards instructional leadership was 3.10 in construct 7: Incentives for teachers, which meant the participants received moderate level from their perception in construct 7. The detail information is provided in the following table.

Table 3: Summary of Overall Teachers’ Perceptions towards Instructional Leadership at Santichon Islamic School (N=87)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Leadership</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frame Goals</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate Goals</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision/Evaluations</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Coordination</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Progress</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protects Time</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for Teachers</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Summary of Overall Teachers’ Perceptions towards Instructional Leadership at Santichon Islamic School (N=87)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Leadership</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for Learning</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Objective Two

As Table 4 showed, the overall total mean score of teachers’ perceptions towards organizational climate at Santichon Islamic School in Bangkok, Thailand was 3.62, which means the participants generally received moderate in the range scale of 3.51-4.50. The highest mean score of teachers’ perceptions towards organizational climate was 3.63 in domain 3: Responsibility, which meant the participants received high level from their perceptions in domain 3. In addition, the lowest mean score of teachers’ perception towards organizational climate was 3.40 in domain 4: Support, which meant the participants received moderate level from their perception in domain 4. The detail information is provided in the following table.

Table 4: Summary of Overall Teachers’ Perceptions towards Organizational Climate at Santichon Islamic School (N=87)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Objective Three

As seen in Table 5, the probability significance of difference was .287 in the Pearson’s Product-Moment Correlation between the level of teachers’ instructional leadership and organizational climate, which was more than 0.5 level of significant. The research hypothesis was rejected, as there was no relationship between the level of teachers’ instructional leadership and organizational climate.

Table 5: Pearson’s Product-Moment Correlation between the Level of Teachers’ Instructional Leadership and Organizational Climate (N=87)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers’ Instructional Leadership</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Organizational Climate</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>No significant Relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

1. Teachers’ Perceptions towards Instructional Leadership

The teachers’ perception towards instructional leadership in this study was 3.49, which indicated that the level of teachers’ instructional leadership was moderate. As
the result of this study found only four subscales (Framing goal, Supervising/Evaluating, Academic standard and Incentive for learning) mean scores of teachers’ instructional leadership are stated as high.

In addition, the participants perceived that they were “moderate level” (Ranked from the lowest score to highest score; Incentive for teachers, monitoring progress, protecting time, Professional development, curricular coordination and communicating goal) should strictly emphasize.

Firstly, incentive for teachers motivates teachers to improve their quality of teaching as Fryer (2011), pointed out that providing teacher incentive aligned with measuring student performance is possible way to improve the quality of teachers and increase student achievement.

Secondly, monitoring progress. Monitoring progress is not only teacher task, but also for school principal to take this task too. Halinger and Lee (2013) stated that, principals share the information with teachers by referring students’ performance.

Thirdly, promoting professional development. Professional development causes the effective in school as advice by Hicks (2014) new teachers, experienced teachers and principals should take years to expand their professional development skills.

Fourthly, protecting instructional time. Keeping instructional time helps students concentrate on the tutorials. Since, even making official announcement or requesting permission to enter the classroom can interrupt the classroom (Hicks, 2014). In addition, Yim (2012) concluded in his study, to provide excellent education through Christian spirit, Life University needs instructional leadership by focusing on student learning which means instructors protect instructional time.

Fifthly, coordinating the curriculum. According to Shanon and Blysma (2004) stated that principal should coordinate with teachers to conduct the curriculum with standards throughout standard, assessment and policy in order to expand teachers’ knowledge.

Lastly, Communicating school goal. According to the result, principal and teachers do not use a variety of channels to communicate as it should be. So, the researcher suggested that principal expected to perform as instructional leader need the skills of communicate and explain the school goal throughout to school stakeholders.

2. Teachers’ Perceptions Towards Organizational Climate
The teachers’ perception towards organizational climate in this study was 3.62, which indicated that the level of teachers’ instructional leadership was high. As the result of this study found all subscales of organizational climate were regarded as high except the teachers’ perception toward support, which was moderate. Thus, according to this study, Teachers’ perceptions towards support need to improve in the school to make school more affective, as Muslins (2002) also suggested that positive organizational support in organization increases the effecting between employees and strengthens the motivation of work, job satisfaction and high productivity. In addition, another research which conducted by Kumar (2015) on perceptual differences about organizational climate and job satisfaction between teaching staff and non-teaching staff, the result revealed that there is a significant positive between organizational
climate and job satisfaction between teaching staff and non-teaching staff. Josapht and Vinitwatanakhu (2016) recommended on their research that for better improvement of organizational climate, school principal should pay more time for building and supporting teamwork among the teachers in school. All in all, many researchers approved that organizational climate affects to any organization in one way or another.

3. Relationship between Instructional Leadership and Organizational Climate
The data from the research indicated that probability significance of 2.87, is more than .05, therefore, the research hypothesis was rejected, which mean there was no significant between teachers’ perceptions towards instructional leadership and organizational climate.

However, many studies proved that organizational climate significantly influenced teachers’ work motivation. For example, Selamat Samsu and Kamalu (2013) confirmed the impact of organizational climate on teachers’ job performance as they illustrated that the teachers who work in secondary school in the district of Klang, Selangor, Malaysia were unable to handle their responsibility and climate of organization in school was unhealthy. Furthermore, school s’ principal still has to maintain and increase the level of instructional leadership and organizational climate anyway. According to Ladyon’s (2014) study the organizational climate significantly influenced teachers’ work motivation which collegial leaders and school community were two significantly factors from organizational climate that impact teachers’ work motivation of selected school in Prachinburi, Thailand.
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