

CHAPTER-4
ANALYSIS AND
INTERPRETATION

CHAPTER-4

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

The fourth chapter deals with data analysis, interpretation of the data and also discusses the findings. It is through the analysis that a researcher becomes able to answer the research questions being put forth. It provides an opportunity for the researcher to link the results with the available literature and with the previous studies.

The main objective of this chapter is to summarize the information obtained through surveys by using various statistical tools and techniques like correlation, t-test and regression for analyzing and interpreting the data and for drawing the results and conclusion. In this study, the following statistical methods were used for the data analysis.

1. Principal Component Analysis
2. Correlation
3. t-test
4. Regression

4.2 Objective wise interpretation

The analysis and interpretation of data on the basis of sequence of objectives are given as under

4.2.1 Objective-1 To identify the leadership practices prevailing in the high and low performing schools

Table 4.1

KMO and Bartlett's Value for Leadership Practices in High Performing Schools

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.824
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2634.270
	df	903
	Sig.	.000

The above table 4.1 shows the value of KMO which represents the adequacy of a sample. This value of KMO is .824 which is more than .50 and therefore, the KMO value is considered as acceptable and indicates that principal component analysis can be further used for the study. The Bartlett's test value of Sphericity is 2634.270 and this value is significant at 0.05 significance level. Therefore, it is considered significant as the value of $p < 0.05$. It informs that the sample is good for applying principal component analysis.

Table 4.2

Total Variance Explained for Leadership Practices in High Performing Schools

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% Variance	Cumulative %
1	10.018	23.299	23.299	10.018	23.299	23.299
2	2.483	5.776	29.074	2.483	5.776	29.074
3	2.199	5.113	34.188	2.199	5.113	34.188
4	1.760	4.092	38.280	1.760	4.092	38.280
5	1.667	3.877	42.157	1.667	3.877	42.157
6	1.551	3.608	45.765	1.551	3.608	45.765

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES, PROFESSIONAL CAPITAL & SCHOOL CULTURE

7	1.320	3.069	48.833	1.320	3.069	48.833
8	1.227	2.852	51.686	1.227	2.852	51.686
9	1.188	2.763	54.449	1.188	2.763	54.449
10	1.172	2.726	57.174	1.172	2.726	57.174
11	1.098	2.553	59.727	1.098	2.553	59.727
12	1.045	2.430	62.157	1.045	2.430	62.157
13	.980	2.280	64.437			
14	.959	2.230	66.667			
15	.952	2.215	68.882			
16	.901	2.095	70.977			
17	.844	1.962	72.939			
18	.820	1.906	74.845			
19	.770	1.791	76.635			
20	.756	1.758	78.393			
21	.703	1.636	80.029			
22	.641	1.491	81.519			
23	.585	1.360	82.879			
24	.578	1.345	84.224			
25	.553	1.287	85.512			
26	.539	1.253	86.765			
27	.514	1.195	87.960			
28	.483	1.123	89.082			
29	.478	1.112	90.194			
30	.445	1.035	91.229			
31	.422	.981	92.210			
32	.407	.947	93.157			
33	.387	.899	94.056			
34	.362	.842	94.898			
35	.336	.782	95.680			
36	.311	.723	96.403			
37	.283	.658	97.061			
38	.262	.610	97.671			

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES, PROFESSIONAL CAPITAL & SCHOOL CULTURE

39	.234	.544	98.215
40	.212	.494	98.709
41	.204	.475	99.184
42	.181	.421	99.604
43	.170	.396	100.000

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Table 4.3

Components Matrix for Leadership Practices in High Performing Schools Showing the Items Falling Under Different Dimensions

	Components											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
01	.646											
02	.655											
03							.496					
04												.441
05	.515											
06										.467		
07	.607											
08						.442						
09	.627											
10		.467										
11	.562											

12	.531		
13	.520		
14	.509		
15	.463		
16		.477	
17	.483		
18	.516		
19	.655		
20	.647		
21	.576		
22		.463	
23	.370		
24	.531		
25		.440	
26			.482
27	.701		
28	.580		
29	.507		
30	.442		
31	.424		
32	.659		
33		.392	

34	.740
35	.484
36	.561
37	.587
38	.603
39	.545
40	.607
41	.527
42	.659
43	.457

The table 4.2 represents principal component analysis by rotation matrix. The above table represents that the statements 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 come under the dimension-1, statement 10, 32 and 34 come under the category of dimension-2, item 42 and 43 fall under dimension-3, item 22 falls under dimension -4, item 8 and 33 come under dimension-6, items 3, 16 and 25 fall under dimension -7 statement 6 comes under the dimension-10, statement 4 and 26 come under the dimension-12.

The principal component analysis is conducted to identify the effective dimension of leadership practices in high performing schools. The data was analysed through the SPSS version 21 to analyze the 43 items of the questionnaire explaining the effective dimensions of the leadership practices in high performing schools. The analysis of the

data was done through Varimax rotation method to reduce the items into dimensions or groups with factor loading .40.

The table with principal component analysis demonstrates 12 principal components with Eigen value larger than 1.0 and results in 62.12 % of the total variance. 43 items out of 43 items have been shown above because the factor loading is more than .40.

The table shows that dimension (component)-1 represents the effective dimension of the leadership practices in high performing schools because maximum variation caused in the leadership practices in high performance schools is explained by dimension-1. The above result shows that 23.29 % of the variance in leadership practices of high performing schools is explained by dimension -1. This can also be interpreted that the leadership practices in high performing schools are mostly represented by dimension-1. This shows that the variation caused in the leadership practices adopted in high performing schools is mostly explained by dimension -1. This dimension includes the support, encouragement, opportunities, and resources provided to the teachers. The relation with parents and community, sharing of knowledge and expertise with the teachers, collaborative atmosphere of teaching in the institution, the problems of the school are solved with the cooperation of the staff, open and flexible communication with the staff members, providing help to the staff while facing any problem, organization of professional development programs and in-service training programs, appreciation provided to the teachers for their good performance, different roles given to the teachers and their active engagement in the decision making, providing opportunities to the staff for initiating change, taking the opinion of the staff related to various academic and administrative functions, friendly relation with the subordinates, the leader having clarity in his own ways of working and his actions are based on moral

values, giving priority to the career development of the staff, helps the group members to feel comfortable, acts as a role model for the staff, vision and goals of the school are developed in collaboration and are based on all-round development of the staff members.

(Refer to the table no. 4.49 for a clear understanding of contributing and non-contributing dimensions of leadership practices adopted by leaders of high performing schools)

Table 4.4

KMO and Bartlett's Test Value for Leadership Practices in Low Performing Schools

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.778
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2278.120
	df	903
	Sig.	.000

Table 4.4 shows the value of KMO which represents the adequacy of a sample. This value of KMO (.778) is more than .50 and therefore, the KMO value is considered acceptable. It indicates that principal component analysis can be used for the study. The Bartlett's test value of Sphericity is 2278.120 and this value is significant at 0.05 significance level. Therefore, it is considered significant as the value of $p < 0.05$. It informs that the sample is good for applying principal component analysis.

Table 4.5*Total Variance Explained for Leadership Practices in Low Performing Schools*

Component	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9.711	22.584	22.584	9.711	22.584	22.584
2	2.927	6.806	29.390	2.927	6.806	29.390
3	2.210	5.139	34.529	2.210	5.139	34.529
4	1.815	4.221	38.750	1.815	4.221	38.750
5	1.753	4.076	42.825	1.753	4.076	42.825
6	1.573	3.659	46.484	1.573	3.659	46.484
7	1.453	3.380	49.864	1.453	3.380	49.864
8	1.423	3.308	53.172	1.423	3.308	53.172
9	1.349	3.137	56.309	1.349	3.137	56.309
10	1.241	2.886	59.195	1.241	2.886	59.195
11	1.096	2.548	61.743	1.096	2.548	61.743
12	1.070	2.487	64.230	1.070	2.487	64.230
13	1.017	2.364	66.594	1.017	2.364	66.594
14	.991	2.305	68.899			
15	.925	2.152	71.051			
16	.850	1.977	73.028			
17	.820	1.908	74.936			
18	.782	1.818	76.754			
19	.757	1.760	78.515			

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES, PROFESSIONAL CAPITAL & SCHOOL CULTURE

20	.736	1.711	80.225
21	.653	1.518	81.743
22	.646	1.503	83.246
23	.624	1.451	84.697
24	.573	1.332	86.029
25	.545	1.268	87.297
26	.507	1.179	88.476
27	.480	1.116	89.592
28	.462	1.074	90.666
29	.429	.997	91.663
30	.422	.981	92.644
31	.403	.937	93.581
32	.350	.813	94.394
33	.317	.738	95.132
34	.310	.720	95.852
35	.282	.657	96.509
36	.252	.585	97.094
37	.247	.574	97.668
38	.209	.486	98.154
39	.201	.469	98.622
40	.173	.402	99.025
41	.157	.364	99.389
42	.135	.314	99.704
43	.127	.296	100.000

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Table 4.6

Component Matrix for Leadership Practices in Low Performing Schools Showing the Items Falling Under Different Dimensions

	Components												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
01			.450										
02			.458										
03				.502									
04		.412											
05			.557										
06						.423							
07						.422							
08												.461	
09	.285												
10		.590											
11	.549												
12	.599												
13				.432									
14	.539												
15	.681												
16	.586												
17	.389												
18	.561												
19	.639												

20 **.509**

21 **.519**

22 **.411**

23 **.456**

24 **.469**

25 **.530**

26 **.442**

27 **.626**

28 **.579**

29 **.620**

30 **.503**

31 **.602**

32 **.546**

33 **.547**

34 **.533**

35 **.570**

36 **.691**

37 **.683**

38 **.525**

39 **.555**

40 **.634**

41 **.473**

42 **.525**

43 **.583**

The table 4.5 represents principal component analysis by rotation matrix. The above table represents that the statements 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 fall under the category of dimension-1, statement 4, 10, 32 and 34 come under the category of dimension-2, statement 01, 02, 05 comes under the dimension -3, statement 3 and 13 come under the dimension-4, items 22 and 26 comes under dimension-5, items 6, 7 & 23 fall under dimension-6 and item 8 falls under dimension-12 .

The main purpose of the principal component analysis is to identify the effective dimension of leadership practices in low performing schools. The data were analysed through the SPSS version 21 to analyze the 43 items of the questionnaire explaining the effective dimension of the leadership practices in low performing schools. The data were analysed through the Varimax rotation method to reduce the items into dimensions or groups with factor loading .40.

The table 4.5 with principal component analysis demonstrates 13 principal components with Eigen value larger than 1.0 and results in 66.59 % of the total variance. 43 items out of 43 items have been shown above because the factor loading is more than .40.

The table above shows that the maximum variation in leadership practices of low performing schools is explained by dimension-1 and dimension-2. The above result shows that 22.58% of the variance in leadership practices in low performing schools is explained by dimension -1 and 6.81 % of the variance in leadership practices of low performing schools is explained by dimension-2. This can also be interpreted that the leadership practices in low performing schools are mostly represented by dimension-1 and dimension-2.

This dimension-1 includes the relation with parents and community, sharing of knowledge and expertise with the teachers, collaborative atmosphere of teaching in the institution, open and flexible communication with the staff members, providing help to the staff while facing any problem, dignity and respect for teachers, organization of professional development programs and in-service training programs, appreciation provided to the teachers for their good performance, involvement of subordinates in making decisions and follow the rules and regulations, providing opportunities to the staff for initiating change, taking the opinion of the staff related to various academic and administrative functions, friendly relation with the subordinates, the leader is having clarity in his own ways of working and his actions are based on moral values, leader sacrifices his own interest to meet the needs of others, giving priority to the career development of the staff, helps the group members to feel comfortable, leader acts as a role model for the staff, an orderly and safe environment is created in the school, leaders role is defined clearly within the group, vision and goals of the school are developed in collaboration and are based on all round development of the staff members, goals of school promote high expectation and standards for every student and outcomes of the school are achieved as per the expectations of the leader. Dimension-2 represents the supervision of school activities, providing autonomy to the teachers, emphasizing the leaders view point as compared to others, and caring about the personal wellbeing of others.

(Refer to the table no. 4.50 for a clear understanding of contributing and non-contributing dimensions of leadership practices adopted by leaders of low performing schools)

4.2.2 Objective-2 To identify the school culture of the high and low performing schools**Table 4.7***KMO and Bartlett's Test for School Culture in High Performing Schools*

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.877
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2305.675
	df	465
	Sig.	.000

The value of KMO is used as a measure of sample adequacy. The value of KMO obtained is .877 which is greater than .50 and therefore, it depicts that principal component analysis can be used for data analysis. The value of Bartlett's test of Sphericity is 2305.68 and is significant at 0.05 level of significance which shows that sample is adequate for applying principal component analysis (PCA).

Table 4.8*Total Variance Explained for School Culture in High Performing Schools*

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9.428	30.411	30.411	9.428	30.411	30.411
2	2.389	7.707	38.119	2.389	7.707	38.119
3	1.948	6.283	44.402	1.948	6.283	44.402
4	1.485	4.791	49.192	1.485	4.791	49.192
5	1.360	4.389	53.581	1.360	4.389	53.581
6	1.263	4.076	57.657	1.263	4.076	57.657
7	1.165	3.759	61.416	1.165	3.759	61.416

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES, PROFESSIONAL CAPITAL & SCHOOL CULTURE

8	1.009	3.255	64.670	1.009	3.255	64.670
9	.985	3.177	67.847			
10	.871	2.810	70.657			
11	.812	2.619	73.275			
12	.757	2.441	75.717			
13	.681	2.198	77.915			
14	.625	2.015	79.929			
15	.581	1.874	81.804			
16	.578	1.866	83.669			
17	.522	1.685	85.355			
18	.485	1.565	86.920			
19	.443	1.430	88.349			
20	.418	1.349	89.698			
21	.403	1.301	90.999			
22	.378	1.220	92.219			
23	.351	1.134	93.353			
24	.324	1.044	94.397			
25	.308	.995	95.391			
26	.298	.962	96.353			
27	.273	.882	97.235			
28	.236	.760	97.995			
29	.233	.750	98.745			
30	.223	.718	99.463			
31	.166	.537	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Table 4.9

Component Matrix for School Culture in High Performing Schools Showing the Items Falling Under Different Dimensions

	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
01					.453			
02	.513							
03	.569							
04	.485							
05						.476		
06	.706							
07	.682							
08	.564							
09	.737							
10	.688							
11	.646							
12	.663							
13	.618							
14	.690							
15	.474							
16	.418							
17	.561							
18	.447							
19	.513							

20	.604	
21		.517
22		.626
23	.518	
24	.562	
25	.445	
26	.574	
27		.485
28	.656	
29	.655	
30		.437
31		.505

Table 4.8 represents principal component analysis by rotation matrix. The above table represents that the statements 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 come under the dimension-1, statement 21, 22 come under the category of dimension-2, statement 30 and 31 comes under the dimension-3, statement 1 comes under the dimension-5, items 5 and 27 comes under dimension-6.

The objective of the principal component analysis is to check the effective dimension of the School culture questionnaire in high performing schools. The data were analysed through the SPSS version 21 to analyze the 31 items of the questionnaire explaining the effective dimension of the School culture questionnaire in high performing schools. The analysis of the data was done through the Varimax rotation method to reduce the items into dimensions or groups with factor loading .40.

The table with principal component analysis demonstrates 8 principal components with Eigen value larger than 1.0 and results in 64.67 % of the total variance. 31 items out of 31 items have been shown above because the factor loading is more than .40.

It shows that dimension (component)-1 represents the effective dimension of school culture in high performing schools. The above result shows that 30.41 % of the variance in school culture is explained by the dimension -1. This can also be interpreted that the leadership practices in high performing schools are mostly represented by dimension-1. This shows that the deviation occurred in the school culture is mostly explained by dimension -1.

This dimensions represents leaders trust on professional judgment of teachers, leaders facilitating teachers, teachers are make aware about the issues in the school, rewards are given to the teachers for experimenting new things, leaders prefer risk bearing and developing new ways in teaching, instruction and managing time, encouragement for sharing of ideas, opportunities are given for dialogue, considerable time is given to the teachers for planning together, teachers observe each other's teaching, work together and share their ideas with one another and the disagreements are openly discussed, mission of the school is supported by the teachers and reflects the values of the community and provides a sense of direction to them, a sense of shared purpose is developed among the staff , teachers value the ideas of other teachers, teachers work cooperatively and are committed to school goals, frequent communication between teachers and parents about students performance and is a key factor for student engagement, commitment and learning.

(Refer to the table no. 4.51 for a clear understanding of contributing and non-contributing dimensions of School Culture adopted by leaders of high performing schools)

Table 4.10

KMO and Bartlett's Test for School Culture in Low Performing Schools

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.807
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1720.123
	df	465
	Sig.	.000

From Table 4.10, it can be interpreted that the value of KMO is .807 and as this value is greater than 0.50 so it shows the adequacy of the sample. It also shows that principal component analysis can be used for further analysis.

Table 4.11

Total variance explained for school culture in low performing schools

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	8.783	28.331	28.331	8.783	28.331	28.331
2	2.285	7.372	35.702	2.285	7.372	35.702
3	2.008	6.476	42.178	2.008	6.476	42.178
4	1.656	5.343	47.521	1.656	5.343	47.521
5	1.363	4.396	51.917	1.363	4.396	51.917
6	1.277	4.119	56.036	1.277	4.119	56.036
7	1.166	3.762	59.798	1.166	3.762	59.798

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES, PROFESSIONAL CAPITAL & SCHOOL CULTURE

8	1.090	3.517	63.314	1.090	3.517	63.314
9	.954	3.077	66.391			
10	.918	2.961	69.352			
11	.829	2.673	72.025			
12	.814	2.626	74.651			
13	.729	2.350	77.001			
14	.693	2.237	79.237			
15	.654	2.108	81.346			
16	.626	2.020	83.365			
17	.585	1.886	85.251			
18	.557	1.797	87.048			
19	.532	1.716	88.764			
20	.444	1.432	90.196			
21	.418	1.350	91.546			
22	.390	1.259	92.805			
23	.368	1.186	93.990			
24	.342	1.102	95.093			
25	.315	1.017	96.110			
26	.263	.849	96.959			
27	.244	.786	97.746			
28	.208	.671	98.416			
29	.183	.589	99.005			
30	.163	.527	99.532			
31	.145	.468	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Table 4.12

Component Matrix for School Culture in Low Performing Schools Showing the Items Falling Under Different Dimensions

	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
01							.493	
02	.579							
03	.606							
04	.528							
05					.505			
06	.584							
07	.559							
08	.605							
09	.572							
10	.546							
11	.593							
12	.598							
13	.565							
14	.659							
15			.492					
16	.569							
17	.423							
18			.414					
19			.584					

20	.553	
21	.529	
22	.547	
23	.632	
24	.689	
25	.592	
26	.577	
27	.391	
28		.492
29	.567	
30		.564
31	.534	

The table 4.11 represents principal component analysis by rotation matrix. The above table represents that the statements 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31 come under the dimension-1, statement 15, 18 and 19 come under the category of dimension-3, statement 28 and 30 comes under the dimension-4, statement 5 fall under the dimension-5, items 1 comes under dimension-7.

The main objective of the principal component analysis is to check the effective dimensions of School Culture as used in the questionnaire about low performing schools. The data were analysed through the SPSS version 21 to analyze the 31 items of the questionnaire explaining the effective dimensions of the School Culture in low

performing schools. The analysis of the data was done through the Varimax rotation method to reduce the items into dimensions or groups with factor loading .40.

The table 4.11 with principal component analysis demonstrates 8 principal components with Eigen value larger than 1.0 and results in 63.31 % of the total variance. 31 items out of 31 items have been shown above because the factor loading is more than .40.

Further, the table shows that dimension (component)-1 represents the effective dimension of School Culture in low performing schools. The above result shows that 28.34 % of the variance in school culture is explained by dimension -1. This can also be interpreted that the School Culture in low performing schools is mostly represented by dimension-1. This shows that the changes occurred in the school culture are mostly explained by the dimension -1.

This dimension-1 represents leaders trust on professional judgment of teachers, leaders facilitating working of teachers, teachers are kept aware about the current issues in the school, rewards are given to the teachers for experimenting new things, leaders support risk taking and adoption of new methods in teaching, instruction and time management, encouragement for sharing of ideas, opportunities are given for dialogue, considerable time is given to the teachers for planning together, teachers observe each other's teaching, work together and share their ideas with one another, mission of the school is supported by the teachers and provides a sense of direction to them, a sense of shared purpose is developed among the staff , teachers value the ideas of other teachers, teachers work cooperatively and are committed to school goals, teachers regularly discuss the progress of students, teachers and parents have common expectation for students performance, parent and community involvement is a key factor for student

engagement, commitment and learning, students freely discuss the feelings and problems with the teachers.

(Refer to the table no. 4.52 for a clear understanding of contributing and non-contributing dimensions of School Culture adopted by leaders of low performing schools)

4.2.3 Objective-3 To identify the professional capital of the high and low performing schools

Table 4.13

KMO and Bartlett's Test For Professional Capital in High Performing Schools

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.767
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3740.906
	df	630
	Sig.	.000

The value of KMO as shown in the above table is .767 which represents the adequacy of a sample. This value of KMO is acceptable and is considered perfect. As the value of KMO is greater than .50, it shows that principal component analysis can be conducted for the analyses of the data. Next, the value of Bartlett's test Sphericity is 3740.906 which is more than 0.05 and is therefore, significant at 0.5 level of significance and it further shows that principal component analysis can be conducted on the data.

Table 4.14*Total Variance Explained for Professional Capital in High Performing Schools*

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9.260	25.722	25.722	9.260	25.722	25.722
2	4.628	12.856	38.577	4.628	12.856	38.577
3	2.490	6.917	45.494	2.490	6.917	45.494
4	2.091	5.808	51.302	2.091	5.808	51.302
5	1.699	4.718	56.021	1.699	4.718	56.021
6	1.517	4.215	60.236	1.517	4.215	60.236
7	1.316	3.655	63.891	1.316	3.655	63.891
8	1.257	3.493	67.384	1.257	3.493	67.384
9	1.055	2.930	70.315	1.055	2.930	70.315
10	.934	2.594	72.908			
11	.898	2.495	75.404			
12	.820	2.278	77.681			
13	.747	2.076	79.757			
14	.648	1.800	81.558			
15	.610	1.694	83.252			
16	.548	1.523	84.775			
17	.533	1.481	86.256			
18	.514	1.427	87.683			
19	.456	1.267	88.950			

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES, PROFESSIONAL CAPITAL & SCHOOL CULTURE

20	.437	1.214	90.163
21	.422	1.172	91.335
22	.381	1.058	92.393
23	.369	1.026	93.419
24	.319	.887	94.307
25	.281	.780	95.087
26	.264	.734	95.821
27	.244	.676	96.497
28	.201	.560	97.057
29	.191	.530	97.587
30	.169	.468	98.055
31	.160	.444	98.499
32	.138	.383	98.883
33	.122	.339	99.222
34	.105	.292	99.514
35	.098	.273	99.787
36	.077	.213	100.000

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4. 15

Component Matrix for Professional Capital in High Performing Schools Showing the Items Falling Under Different Dimensions

	Component								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
01				.522					
02				.497					
03			.422						
04	.608								
05		.514							
06		.568							
07		.519							
08						.452			
09	.528								
10	.536								
11		.471							
12				.545					
13	.695								
14	.610								
15	.663								
16	.737								
17		.602							
18		.540							
19	.633								

20	.468	
21	.615	
22	.626	
23	.737	
24	.466	
25	.532	
26	.593	
27	.462	
28	.465	
29		.561
30	.562	
31	.476	
32	.505	
33	.540	
34		.485
35	.584	
36	.608	

The table 4.15 represents principal component analysis by rotation matrix. The above table represents that the statements 4, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36 come under the dimension-1, statement 5, 6, 7, 11, 17, 18, 20, 32 come under the category of dimension-2, statement 3 comes under the dimension-3, item 1, 2 and 12 fall under dimension-4, statement 29 comes under the dimension-5, item 8 comes under dimension-6, item 34 fall under dimension-7.

The purpose of the principal component analysis is to check out the effective dimension of professional capital in high performing schools. The data were analysed through the SPSS version 21 to analyze the 36 items of the questionnaire explaining the effective dimension of the professional capital questionnaire in high performing schools. The analysis of the data was done through the Varimax rotation method to reduce the items into dimensions or groups with factor loading .40.

The table with principal component analysis demonstrates 8 principal components with Eigen value larger than 1.0 and results in 70.31 % of the total variance. 36 items out of 36 items have been shown above because the factor loading is more than .40.

It shows that the effective dimension of professional capital in high performing is represented by dimension-1 and dimension-2. The above result shows that 25.72 % of the variance in professional capital is explained by dimension -1 and 12.85 % of the variation is caused by dimension-2. This can also be interpreted that the professional capital in high performing schools is mostly represented by dimension-1 and dimension-2. This shows that the variation caused in the professional capital in high performing schools is mostly explained by dimension-1 and dimension-2.

The dimension-1 represents that the teachers regularly search for the opportunities to grow professionally in terms of improving their teaching, assignment of classes to teachers as per their talent and expertise, priority given to attracting highly effective teachers, high expectations for the learning of the students, examine and improve the instructional practice, students work in collaboration with the teachers, teachers examine the reasons for difference in students achievement, using the new methods of teaching, teachers participate in meetings of collaboration, improved the ways of teaching as a result of collaboration, influenced the students learning by working

together in collaboration, decisions are based on moral values, adapt the teaching strategies as per the learning needs of students, change the plan of the lesson without losing the intended objective, providing evidence of what is working and what is not working in my lesson , mentor and coach one another, decisions are based research evidence and practice, passion in my work improves the judgment, teaching is up to date . Dimension -2 represents the teachers are provided professional development opportunities to improve their teaching, providing the feedback that the teachers need to improve their professional practice, teachers with limited experience of teaching are placed in the classroom with the highest needs, teachers are provided opportunities to learn from each other's teaching and offered feedback to them and professional support and guidance, displaying teaching practice in front of others

(Refer to the table no. 4.53 for a clear understanding of contributing and non-contributing dimensions of Professional Capital adopted by leaders of high performing schools)

Table 4.16

KMO and Bartlett's test for Professional Capital in Low Performing Schools

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.835
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2559.700
	df	630
	Sig.	.000

The value of KMO is used as a measure of sample adequacy and the KMO value obtained i.e. .835 is considered acceptable and perfect because it is greater than .50. The value of KMO is .835 which further depicts that principal component analysis can

be used for data analysis. The value of Bartlett's test of Sphericity is 2559.700 which is significant at 0.05 level of significance and also shows that the sample is adequate for principal component analysis (PCA). On the basis of the KMO value and Bartlett's test of Sphericity value, the data was further analyzed using PCA.

Table 4.17*Total Variance Explained For Professional Capital in Low Performing Schools*

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	10.870	30.194	30.194	10.870	30.194	30.194
2	3.107	8.631	38.825	3.107	8.631	38.825
3	2.158	5.994	44.818	2.158	5.994	44.818
4	1.874	5.206	50.024	1.874	5.206	50.024
5	1.505	4.181	54.205	1.505	4.181	54.205
6	1.350	3.749	57.954	1.350	3.749	57.954
7	1.168	3.246	61.200	1.168	3.246	61.200
8	1.103	3.064	64.264	1.103	3.064	64.264
9	1.078	2.994	67.258	1.078	2.994	67.258
10	.995	2.764	70.022			
11	.929	2.582	72.604			
12	.901	2.502	75.106			
13	.775	2.154	77.260			
14	.755	2.097	79.357			

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES, PROFESSIONAL CAPITAL & SCHOOL CULTURE

15	.649	1.804	81.160
16	.613	1.702	82.863
17	.566	1.571	84.434
18	.548	1.522	85.956
19	.504	1.401	87.357
20	.473	1.313	88.669
21	.432	1.200	89.869
22	.396	1.099	90.968
23	.382	1.061	92.029
24	.356	.988	93.017
25	.349	.969	93.986
26	.307	.853	94.839
27	.272	.756	95.595
28	.267	.741	96.336
29	.227	.631	96.967
30	.215	.597	97.564
31	.196	.544	98.108
32	.180	.501	98.608
33	.161	.447	99.055
34	.126	.350	99.405
35	.122	.339	99.744
36	.092	.256	100.000

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 4.18

Component Matrix For Professional Capital of Low Performing Schools Showing the Items Falling Under Different Dimensions

	Component								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
01				.385					
02				.538					
03			.407						
04				.461					
05			.507						
06	.480								
07					.513				
08	.367								
09	.583								
10	.531								
11		.591							
12				.482					
13	.647								
14	.690								
15	.781								
16	.661								
17	.512								
18	.511								
19	.615								
20	.418								

21	.702	
22	.680	
23	.655	
24	.451	
25	.757	
26	.683	
27	.628	
28	.559	
29	.721	
30	.628	
31	.624	
32		.443
33	.556	
34	.447	
35	.635	
36	.612	

The table 4.17 and 4.18 represents principal component analysis by rotation matrix. The above table represents that the statements 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36 come under the dimension-1, statement 11, 32 come under the category of dimension-2, statement 3 & 5 comes under the dimension-3, statement 1, 2, 4 and 12 come under the dimension-4, item 7 comes under dimension-5.

The main objective of the principal component analysis is to identify the effective dimension of the professional capital questionnaire in low performing schools. The data

were analysed through the SPSS version 21 to analyze the 36 items of the questionnaire explaining the effective dimension of the professional capital questionnaire in low performing schools. The analysis of the data was done through the Varimax rotation method to reduce the items into dimensions or groups with factor loading .40.

It can be seen from the table that principal component analysis demonstrates 8 principal components with Eigenvalue larger than 1.0 and results in 63.31 % of the total variance. 36 items out of 36 items have been shown above because the factor loading is more than .40.

It further shows that dimension (component)-1 represents the professional capital of low performing schools. The above result shows that 30.19 % of the variance is explained by dimension -1 and 5.21 % of the variance is explained by dimension-4. This can also be interpreted that the professional capital in low performing schools is mostly represented by dimension-1 and dimension-4. This shows that the variation caused in or by the professional capital is mostly explained by dimension-1 and dimension-4.

The dimension-1 represents the career opportunities provided to the teachers, access, and consultation to teachers who can support the teaching, assigned classes to teachers as per their talent and expertise, priority is given on attracting highly effective teachers, high expectations for the learning of the students, examine and improve the instructional practice, students work in collaboration with the teachers, teachers examine the reasons for difference in students achievement, observe other teachers teaching and providing feedback to them, using the new methods of teaching, teachers participate in meetings of collaboration, improved the ways of teaching as a result of collaboration, influenced the students learning by working together in collaboration,

decisions are based on moral values, adapt the teaching strategies as per the learning needs of students, change the plan of the lesson without losing the intended objective, providing evidence of what is working and what is not working in my lecturer , mentor and coach one another, decisions are based research evidence and practice, passion in my work improves the judgment, teaching is up to date.

The dimension-4 represents the learning of disadvantaged students, preparing students for the next grade, and searching for professional learning opportunities to improve teaching.

(Refer to the table no. 4.54 for a clear understanding of contributing and non-contributing dimensions of Professional Capital adopted by leaders of low performing schools)

4.2.4 Objective-4 To find out the relationship between leadership practices and school culture of high and low performing schools

The relationship between leadership practices and the school culture of high performing schools is studied with the help of data provided by teachers and principals. The relationship among the dimensions of leadership practices and school culture is also studied to get a deeper understanding of the relationship.

Table-4.19

Correlation Between Leadership Practices and School Culture of High Performing Schools Based on the Data of Teachers

Category	N	df	r-value	p-value	Table values	Result
Leadership Practices and school culture	156	154	.613	.000	*.147 **.193	Significant

*Significant at 0.05 Level **Significant at 0.01Level

The above table 4.19 depicts that the calculated value of r is .61 which is greater than the tabulated value for the degrees of freedom 154 at 0.01 significance level. This predicts that leadership practices and the school culture of high performing schools are significantly related. The relationship is also confirmed by the value of p which is .000 and is lower than the significance value at 0.01 significance level. Hence, the stated hypothesis that Leadership Practices and School Culture of high performing schools are not related to each other stands rejected.

Table-4.20

Correlation Between Leadership Practices and School Culture of High Performing Schools Based on the Data of Principals

Category	N	df	r-value	p-value	Table values	Result
Leadership Practices and school culture	12	10	.87	.000	*.575 **.707	Significant

*Significant at 0.05 Level **Significant at 0.01 Level

The calculated value of r is .87 which is more than the table value of r for the degrees of freedom 10 at 0.01 significance level shows that the leadership practices and school culture of high performing schools are significantly related. The relationship is also confirmed by the value of p which is .000 and this value is lower than the significance value at 0.01 significance level which also shows that leadership practices and school culture of high-performance schools are related. Hence, the stated hypothesis that Leadership Practices and the School Culture of the high performing schools are not related to each other is rejected.

Table 4.21

Correlation Between the Dimensions of Leadership Practices and School Culture of High Performing Schools

	CL	TC	UP	CS	LP
MIS Pearson correlation	.325	.293	.153	.106	.412
Sig two tailed	.000	.000	.056	.190	.000
N	156	156	156	156	156
IR Pearson correlation	.325	.344	.287	.210	.346
Sig two tailed	.000	.000	.000	.009	.000
N	156	156	156	156	156
PD Pearson correlation	.560	.446	.290	.277	.502
Sig two tailed	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	156	156	156	156	156

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES, PROFESSIONAL CAPITAL & SCHOOL CULTURE

LRD Pearson correlation	.360	.462	.293	.441	.445
Sig two tailed	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	156	156	156	156	156
MTW Pearson correlation	.470	.479	.265	.420	.315
Sig two tailed	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000
N	156	156	156	156	156
SVS Pearson correlation	.420	.278	.212	.258	.452
Sig two tailed	.000	.000	.008	.001	.000
N	156	156	156	156	156

Note: The full forms of the dimensions of leadership practices as used in above table are as follows: MIS= Monitoring and Instructional Support IP= Interpersonal Relationship PD=Professional Development LRD= Leadership Responsibilities Distribution MTW= Modeling the Way SVS = Shared Vision of School

The full forms of the dimensions of school culture as used in the above table are as follows: CL = Collaborative Leadership TC= Teacher Collaboration UP= Unity of Purpose CS= Collegial Support LP= Learning Partnership

It can be interpreted from table 4.21 that a significant relationship between monitoring instructional support and every dimension of school culture except collegial support was seen in which the p-value is greater than 0.05. It can also be visualized that there is a significant relationship between interpersonal relationship and all the dimensions of

school culture as the value of p is less than 0.05. The above table also shows that the value of p between professional development and all the dimensions of school culture is less than 0.05 which shows that professional development and all the dimensions of school culture are significantly related. Similarly, a significant relationship between leadership responsibilities distribution and all the dimensions of school culture is found as the value of p is less than 0.05. The next dimension, modeling the way and all dimensions of school culture are also related as the value of p is less than 0.05. Further, it is observed that the shared vision of the school and the dimensions of school culture are related as the value of p is less than 0.05. Therefore, it is concluded that the dimensions of leadership practices and the dimensions of school culture of high performing schools are significantly related.

The relationship between leadership practices and the school culture of low performing schools is studied with the help of data provided by teachers and principals. The relationship among the dimensions of leadership practices and school culture is also studied to get a deeper understanding of the relationship.

Table 4.22

Correlation Between Leadership Practices and School Culture of Low Performing Schools Based on the Data of Teachers

Category	N	df	r-value	p-value	Table values	Result
Leadership Practices and school culture	123	121	.57	.000	*.174 **.227	Significant

*Significant at 0.05 Level

**Significant at 0.01 Level

The table 4.23 depicts that the calculated value of r is .57 which is more than the tabulated value for the degrees of freedom 121 at 0.01 significance level. This shows that leadership practices and the school culture of low performing schools are related to each other. The same result of the relationship is confirmed by the p-value as the value of p is .000 which is lower than the significance value at 0.01 level of significance. Thus, the stated hypothesis that Leadership Practices and the School Culture of the low performing schools are not related to each other stands rejected.

Table-4.23

Correlation Between Leadership Practices and School Culture of Low Performing Schools Based on the Data of Principals

Category	N	df	r-value	p-value	Table values	Result
Leadership Practices and School Culture	9	7	.86	.003	*.666 **.797	Significant

*Significant at 0.05 Level

**Significant at 0.01Level

The table 4.23 shows that the calculated value of r is .86 which is greater than the table value for the degrees of freedom 7 at 0.01 level of significance. This predicts a significant relationship between the leadership practices and school culture of low performing schools. However, the value of p is .003 which is lower than the significance value at 0.01 level of significance which also shows that there is a significant relationship between leadership practices and the school culture of low performing schools. Hence, the stated hypothesis that Leadership Practices and the School Culture of the low performing schools are not related to each other stands rejected.

Table 4.24

Correlation Between the Dimensions of Leadership Practices and School Culture of Low Performing Schools

		CL	TC	UP	CS	LP
MIS	Pearson correlation	.360	.121	.149	.272	.229
	Sig two tailed	.000	.184	.028	.002	.011
	N	123	123	123	123	123
IR	Pearson correlation	.667	.414	.497	.445	.362
	Sig two tailed	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	123	123	123	123	123
PD	Pearson correlation	.526	.455	.368	.213	.167
	Sig two tailed	.000	.000	.000	.018	.065
	N	123	123	123	123	123
LRD	Pearson correlation	.316	.319	.321	.310	.223
	Sig two tailed	.000	.000	.000	.000	.013
	N	123	123	123	123	123
MTW	Pearson correlation	.402	.270	.295	.376	.388
	Sig two tailed	.000	.003	.001	.000	.000
	N	123	123	123	123	123
SVS	Pearson correlation	.435	.482	.352	.152	.120
	Sig two tailed	.000	.000	.008	.093	.187
	N	123	123	123	123	123

Note: The full forms of the dimensions of leadership practices as used in above table are as follows: MIS= Monitoring and Instructional Support IP= Interpersonal

Relationship PD=Professional Development LRD= Leadership Responsibilities
Distribution MTW= Modeling the Way SVS = Shared Vision of School

The full forms of the dimensions of school culture as used in above table are as follow:

CL = Collaborative Leadership TC= Teacher Collaboration UP= Unity of Purpose CS=
Collegial Support LP= Learning Partnership

It can be interpreted from the table 4.24 that there is a substantial relationship amid monitoring instructional support and all the dimensions of school culture except teacher collaboration in which the p-value is greater than 0.05. It can also be seen that there is a substantial relationship between interpersonal relationship and all the dimensions of school culture as the value of p is less than 0.05. The tabulated values also shows that the value of p between professional development and the dimensions of school culture is less than 0.05 which shows that there is a meaningful relationship between professional development and all the dimensions of school culture except learning partnership in which the p-value is greater than 0.05. It can also be visualized that there is a significant relationship between leadership responsibilities distribution and all the dimensions of school culture because the value of p is less than 0.05. It can also be interpreted that there is a substantial relationship between modeling the way and all the dimensions of school culture because the value of p is less than 0.05. Further, it is deduced that there is a substantial relationship between the shared vision of school and three dimensions of school culture such as collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration, and unity of purpose because the value of p is less than 0.05. However, no significant relationship between the shared vision of school and unity of purpose, and learning partnership was observed. Hence, it can be interpreted that the dimensions

of leadership practices and the dimensions of school culture of low performing schools are substantially related except a few dimensions as discussed above.

4.2.5 Objective-5 To find out the relationship between leadership practices and professional capital of high and low performing schools

The relationship between leadership practices and professional capital of high performing schools is studied with the help of data provided by teachers and principals. The relationship among the dimensions of leadership practices and professional capital is also studied to get a deeper understanding of the relationship.

Table 4.25

Correlation between leadership practices and professional capital of high performing schools based on the data of teachers

Category	N	df	r-value	p-value	Table values	Result
Leadership Practices and Professional Capital	156	154	.324	.000	*.147 **.193	Significant
*Significant at 0.05 Level			**Significant at 0.01 Level			

It is inferred from the above table that as the calculated value of r (.32) is more than the table value at 0.01 significance level for the degrees of freedom 154, so, it reveals a meaningful relationship amid the practices adopted by a school leader and professional capital of high performing schools. However, the value of p is .000 and as it is lower than the value at 0.01 level of significance, so it reveals a substantial relationship between leadership practices and professional capital of high performing schools.

Hence, the stated hypothesis that Leadership practices and the Professional Capital of the high performing schools are not related to each other is refuted.

Table-4.26

Correlation Between Leadership Practices and Professional Capital of High Performing Schools Based on the Data of Principals

Category	N	df	r-value	p-value	Table values	Result
Leadership Practices and Professional Capital	12	10	.75	.000	*.575 **.707	Significant
				*Significant at 0.05 Level	**Significant at 0.01 Level	

Table 4.26 depicts that the calculated value of r (.75) is greater than the table value corresponding to degrees of freedom 10 at 0.01 level of significance. Thus, it shows that a weighty relationship between the leadership practices and professional capital of high performing schools exists. This relationship is further confirmed by the value of p which is .000 and it is lower than the value at 0.01 significance level. Hence, the hypothesis stating that Leadership practices and the Professional Capital of the high performing schools are not related to each other is refuted.

Table 4.27

Correlation Between the Dimensions of Leadership Practices and Professional Capital of High Performing Schools

	HC	SC	DC
MIS Pearson correlation	.149	.218	.174
Sig two tailed	.000	.006	.030
N	156	156	156
IR Pearson correlation	.109	.337	.139
Sig two tailed	.117	.000	.083
N	156	156	156
PD Pearson correlation	.251	.359	.012
Sig two tailed	.002	.000	.886
N	156	156	156
LRD Pearson correlation	.176	.261	.062
Sig two tailed	.028	.001	.441
N	156	156	156
MTW Pearson correlation	.180	.332	.040
Sig two tailed	.025	.000	.622
N	156	156	156
SVS Pearson correlation	.300	.241	.193
Sig two tailed	.000	.002	.016
N	156	156	156

Note: The full forms of the dimensions of leadership practices as used in the above table are as follows: MIS= Monitoring and Instructional Support IP= Interpersonal

Relationship PD=Professional Development LRD= Leadership Responsibilities Distribution MTW= Modeling the Way SVS = Shared Vision of School

The full forms of the dimensions of Professional Capital as used in the above table are as follows: HC= Human Capital SC= Social Capital DC= Decisional capital

It is noticed from the table 4.27 that the dimensions: of monitoring instructional support are significantly related to social and decisional capital and it is so concluded because of the value of $p < 0.05$. It can further be construed that interpersonal relationships and social capital are significantly related. However, there is no significant relationship between interpersonal relationships and human capital, and decisional capital because the value of p is greater than 0.05. Professional development is also related to human capital and social capital. However, no relationship between professional development and the decisional capital is found because the p -value is greater than 0.05. The data also shows a substantial relationship between leadership responsibilities distribution and human and social capital because the value of p is less than 0.05 but on the other hand, leadership responsibilities distribution is not related to decisional capital because the value of p is greater than 0.05. Modeling the way practice of leaders is related to human and social capital but it is not related to decisional capital because the p -value is greater than 0.05. Another dimension, the shared vision of the school is related to all the dimensions of professional capital because the p -value is less than 0.05. It can be interpreted that four dimensions of leadership practices such as interpersonal relationship, professional development, leadership responsibilities distribution, and modeling the way do not show any relationship with the decision capital in schools with high performance. Importantly, all leadership practices are related to human and social capital in high performing schools.

The relationship between leadership practices and the professional capital of low performing schools is studied with the help of data provided by teachers and principals. The relationship among the dimensions of leadership practices and professional capital is also studied to get a deeper understanding of the relationship.

Table 4.28

Correlation Between Leadership Practices and Professional Capital of Low Performing Schools Based on the Data of Teachers

Category	N	df	r-value	p-value	Table values	Result
Leadership Practices and Professional Capital	123	121	.26	.003	*.174 **.227	Significant
				*Significant at 0.05 Level	**Significant at 0.01Level	

It can be seen from the table 4.28 that the calculated value of r is .26 is above the table value of r for the degrees of freedom 121 at 0.01 significance level. This shows that the leadership practices and professional capital of low performing schools are significantly associated. In addition, the value of p is .003 which is lower than the significance value at 0.01 significance level, it also shows a substantial association between the practices of school leaders and the professional capital of low performing schools. Hence, the stated hypothesis that leadership practices and the professional capital of low performing schools are not related to each other is refuted.

Table 4.29

Correlation Between Leadership Practices and Professional Capital of Low Performing Schools Based on the Data of Principals

Category	N	df	r-value	p-value	Table values	Result
Leadership Practices and Professional Capital	9	7	.79	.010	*.666 **.797	Significant

*Significant at 0.05 Level

**Significant at 0.01 Level

The table 4.29 reveals that the calculated value of r is .79 which is greater than the table value for the degrees of freedom 7 at 0.01 significance level. This shows a significant association between the leadership practices and professional capital of low performing schools. However, the value of p is .010 which is lower than the significance value at 0.01 level of significance and also indicates a significant association between leadership practices and the professional capital of low performing schools. Hence, the stated hypothesis that Leadership Practices and the Professional Capital of the low performing schools are not related to each other is not accepted.

Table 4.30

Correlation Between the Dimensions of Leadership Practices and Professional Capital of Low Performing Schools

		HC	SC	DC
MIS	Pearson correlation	.064	.003	.054
	Sig two tailed	.482	.973	.550
	N	123	123	123
IR	Pearson correlation	.256	.310	.302
	Sig two tailed	.004	.000	.001
	N	123	123	123
PD	Pearson correlation	.087	.061	.016
	Sig two tailed	.339	.505	.857
	N	123	123	123
LRD	Pearson correlation	.103	.296	.301
	Sig two tailed	.258	.001	.001
	N	123	123	123
MTW	Pearson correlation	.073	.103	.052
	Sig two tailed	.421	.256	.567
	N	123	123	123
SVS	Pearson correlation	.223	.162	.235
	Sig two tailed	.013	.073	.009
	N	123	123	123

It can be interpreted from table 4.30 that there is no significant association between monitoring instructional support and all the dimensions of professional capital because the p-value is more than 0.05. Further, it reveals a noticeable association between interpersonal relationships and all the dimensions of professional capital because the value of p is less than 0.05. There is no significant association between professional development and all the dimensions of professional capital because the value of p is above 0.05. The data also shows that leadership responsibilities distribution is related to social and decisional capital as the value of p is less than 0.05. However, there is no significant association between leadership responsibilities distribution and human capital. There is also a significant relationship between modeling the way and all the dimensions of professional capital because the p-value is greater than 0.05. Thereafter, a substantial relationship between the shared vision of the school and human and decisional capital is found. However, the shared vision of the school is not related to social capital because the value of p is above 0.05. It is also found that no significant relationship exists between monitoring instructional support, professional development, modeling the way dimensions of leadership practices, and dimensions of professional capital of low performing schools. On the other hand, leadership responsibilities distribution is related to human capital, and the shared vision of the school is related to social capital in low performing schools.

4.2.6 Objective- 6 To find out the relationship between school culture and professional capital of high and low performing schools

The relationship between school culture and the professional capital of high performing schools is studied with the help of data provided by teachers and principals. The

relationship among the dimensions of school culture and professional capital is also studied to get a greater understanding of the relationship.

Table-4.31

Correlation Between School Culture and Professional Capital of High Performing Schools Based on the data of Teachers

Category	N	df	r-value	p-value	Table values	Result
School Culture and Professional Capital	156	154	.35	.000	*.147 **.193	Significant
				*Significant at 0.05 Level	**Significant at 0.01 Level	

Table 4.31 depicts that the calculated value of r is .35 is higher than the table value for the degrees of freedom 154 at 0.01 significance level. This shows that the culture of schools and the professional capital of high performing schools are significantly related to each other. However, the value of p is .000 which is lower than the significance value at 0.01 significance level which also manifests a substantial relationship between the culture of schools and the professional capital of high performing schools. Thus, the hypothesis stating that School Culture and the Professional Capital of the high performing schools are not related to each other is not accepted.

Table 4.32

Correlation Between School Culture and Professional Capital of High Performing Schools Based on the Data of Principals

Category	N	df	r-value	p-value	Table values	Result
School Culture and Professional Capital	12	10	.93	.000	*.575 **.707	Significant
*Significant at 0.05 Level				**Significant at 0.01 Level		

The above table depicts that the calculated value of r is .93 which is greater than the table value for the degrees of freedom 10 at 0.01 level of significance. This shows that there is a significant relationship amid the school culture and the professional capital of high performing schools. However, the value of p is .000 which is lower than the significance value at 0.01 level significance which also manifests that the culture of high performing schools and their professional capital are related to each other. Therefore, the hypothesis stating that the School Culture and Professional Capital of the high performing schools are not related to each other is repudiated.

Table 4.33

Correlation Between the Dimensions of School Culture and Professional Capital of High Performing Schools

		HC	SC	DC
CL	Pearson correlation	.368	.366	.086
	Sig two tailed	.000	.000	.288
	N	156	156	156
TC	Pearson correlation	.207	.347	.021
	Sig two tailed	.000	.000	.793
	N	156	156	156
UP	Pearson correlation	.233	.255	.091
	Sig two tailed	.003	.001	.261
	N	156	156	156
CS	Pearson correlation	.155	.263	.096
	Sig two tailed	.053	.001	.232
	N	156	156	156
LP	Pearson correlation	.289	.430	.172
	Sig two tailed	.000	.000	.032
	N	156	156	156

It can be interpreted from table 4.33 that a significant association between collaborative leadership and human and social capital because the value of p is less than 0.05 except for decisional capital in which the p-value is greater than 0.05. Also, a significant relationship between teacher collaboration and human and social capital was seen because the value of p is less than 0.05. However, between teacher collaboration and

decisional capital, no association was observed because the p-value is greater than 0.05. Further, a significant relationship between the unity of purpose and human and social capital was seen because the value of p is less than 0.05. However, no relationship between the unity of purpose and decisional capital was seen. Further, it depicted a significant association between collegial support and human and social capital because the value of p is less than 0.05. However, there is no significant association between collegial support and decisional capital. It can also be interpreted that there is a significant relationship between learning partnership and all the dimensions of professional capital because the value of p is less than 0.05. Hence there is a significant relationship between different dimensions of school culture and human and social capital but no significant association between four dimensions of school culture such as collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration, unity of purpose, and collegial support with decisional capital of high performing schools. However, a significant association between the learning partnership dimension of school culture and decisional capital in high performing schools.

The relationship between school culture and the professional capital of low performing schools is studied with the help of data provided by teachers and principals. The relationship among the dimensions of school culture and professional capital is also studied to get a better understanding of the relationship.

Table-4.34

Correlation Between School Culture and Professional Capital of Low Performing Schools Based on the Data of Teachers

Category	N	df	r-value	p-value	Table values	Result
School Culture and Professional Capital	123	121	.44	.000	*.174 **.227	Significant
*Significant at 0.05 Level				**Significant at 0.01 Level		

The table 4.34 depicts that the calculated value of r is .44 which is higher than the tabulated value for the degrees of freedom 121 at 0.01 significance level which reveals a significant correlation between the culture of schools and the professional capital of low performing schools. In addition, the value of p is .000 which is lower than the significance value of 0.01 significance level also manifests a significant correlation between the culture of schools and the professional capital of high performing schools. Thus, the formulated hypothesis that the School Culture and Professional Capital of the low performing schools are not related to each other stands repudiated.

Table 4.35

Correlation Between School Culture and Professional Capital of Low Performing Schools Based on the Data of Principals

Category	N	df	r-value	p-value	Table values	Result
School Culture and Professional Capital	9	7	.95	.000	*.666 **.797	Significant
*Significant at 0.05 Level				**Significant at 0.01 Level		

The table 4.35 depicts that the calculated value of r is .95 and as it is greater than the tabulated value for the degrees of freedom 7 at 0.01 significance level, so, it shows a significant relationship amid the culture of schools and the professional capital of low performing schools. The result is also confirmed by the value of p which is .000 and as this value is lower than the significance value at 0.01 significance level, so, it clearly shows that school culture and the professional capital of low performing schools are related. Thus, the hypothesis stating that the School Culture and Professional Capital of the low performing schools are not related to each other stands repudiated.

Table 4.36

Correlation Between the Dimensions of School Culture and Professional Capital of Low Performing Schools

		HC	SC	DC
CL	Pearson correlation	.321	.406	.335
	Sig two tailed	.000	.000	.000
	N	123	123	123
TC	Pearson correlation	.245	.366	.239
	Sig two tailed	.006	.000	.008
	N	123	123	123
UP	Pearson correlation	.201	.276	.227
	Sig two tailed	.026	.002	.012
	N	123	123	123
CS	Pearson correlation	.122	.358	.318
	Sig two tailed	.177	.000	.000
	N	123	123	123
LP	Pearson correlation	.235	.328	.294
	Sig two tailed	.009	.000	.001
	N	123	123	123

It can be interpreted from table 4.36 that a significant association between collaborative leadership, human and social, and decisional capital because the value of p is less than 0.05. It also shows a strong relationship amid teacher collaboration and all the dimensions of professional capital because of the value of $p < 0.05$. It further shows that unity of purpose and all the dimensions of professional capital are related because

the value of p is less than 0.05. Also, a significant association between collegial support and social and decisional capital was seen because the value of p is less than 0.05. On the other hand, no significant relationship between collegial support and human capital was observed because the p-value is greater than 0.05. Further, it reveals that learning partnership and all the dimensions of professional capital are related because the value of p is less than 0.05. So, a meaningful relationship between all the dimensions of school culture and dimensions of professional capital of low performing schools is found except for the dimension of collegial support and human capital.

4.2.7 Objective-7 To study the difference between the leadership practices of high and low performing schools

Table 4.37

Difference Between the Leadership Practices of High and Low Performing Schools

Category	N	M	S.D	df	t- Value	P- Value	Table values	Result
High Performing Schools	156	162.57	18.39	277	2.002	.046	*1.96	Significant
Low Performing Schools	123	166.38	13.41				**2.58	Significant
*Level of significance 0.05					** Level of Significance 0.01			

Table 4.37 reveals that the value of t is 2.00 for the degrees of freedom 277 which is greater than the table value at 0.05 significance level. It indicates a significant difference amid the leadership practices of low and high performance schools. It is further confirmed by the p-value which is .046. As this value is less than the value at .05 significance level, so it clearly shows a significant difference between the

leadership practices of high and low performing schools. Hence, the hypothesis stating that High and low performing schools adopt same leadership practices stands rejected.

The difference between leadership practices dimensions of low and high performing schools is understood with the help of t-test as shown in table 4.38 below.

Table 4.38

Difference in Dimensions of Leadership Practices Between the High and Low Performing Schools

Dimensions	Category	N	M	SD	df	t-value	p-value	Table value	Result
Monitoring	HPS	156	32.19	4.09	277	1.97	0.05	*1.96	Significant
	LPS	123	31.28	3.36				**2.58	Not Significant
Instructional support	HPS	156	28.94	3.42	277	1.96	0.05	*1.96	Significant
	LPS	123	29.62	2.82				**2.58	Not Significant
Interpersonal relationship	HPS	156	23.01	3.36	277	1.98	0.04	*1.96	Significant
	LPS	123	22.23	2.93				**2.58	Not Significant
Professional development	HPS	156	24.13	3.34	277	3.69	.000	*1.96	Significant
	LPS	123	25.54	2.88				**2.58	Significant
Leadership Responsibilities distribution	HPS	156	40.08	5.11	277	2.003	.046	*1.96	Significant
	LPS	123	40.44	4.73				**2.58	Not Significant
Modeling the Way	HPS	156	16.70	2.43	277	0.04	0.96	*1.96	Not Significant
	LPS	123	16.69	2.06				**2.58	Not Significant

*Level of Significance 0.05

**Level of Significance 0.01

The calculated values of t for the df 277 are 1.94, 1.80, 1.98, 3.69, and 2.00 respectively for the six dimensions of leadership practices. The t values of all dimensions except the shared vision of the school are greater than the table values at 0.05 significance level which shows that high and low performing schools differ in terms of their leadership practices related to interpersonal relationship, professional development, leadership responsibilities distribution and modeling the way. In addition, the values of p for these dimensions are 0.05, 0.05, 0.04, .00, and .046 which is less than the value of 0.05 which further confirms that a difference in the dimensions of leadership practices of low and high performing schools exists except for the shared vision of the school.

4.2.8 Objective-8 To study the difference between the school culture of high and low performing schools

Table 4.39

Difference Between the School Culture of High and Low Performing Schools

Category	N	M	S.D.	df	t- Value	P- Value	Table values	Result
High performing Schools	156	121.20	14.95	277	2.88	.004	*1.96	Significant
Low performing Schools	123	26.16	13.69					

*Level of significance 0.05

** Level of significance 0.01

The calculated value of t is 2.88 for the degrees of freedom 277 which is greater than the table value at 0.01 significance level. It indicates a significant difference between

the two categories of schools. Further, the value of p is .004 which is lower than the value at .05 level of significance, it also shows a significant difference between the school culture of these schools. Thus, the hypothesis stating that the School Culture of high and low performing schools doesn't differ from each other is not accepted.

The difference is further understood by studying the difference among dimensions of both types of schools as shown in the table below.

Table 4.40

Difference in Dimensions of School Culture Between the High and Low Performing Schools

Dimensions	Category	N	M	SD	df	t- value	p- value	Table value	Result
Collaborative leadership	HPS	156	34.50	4.82				*1.96	Significant
	LPS	123	35.16	4.29	277	2.33	.020	**2.58	Significant
Teacher collaboration	HPS	156	22.08	4.35				*1.96	Significant
	LPS	123	23.80	4.02	277	3.40	.001	**2.58	Significant
Unity of purpose	HPS	156	22.44	2.90				*1.96	Not Significant
	LPS	123	22.68	3.39	277	1.56	0.65	**2.58	Not Significant
Collegial support	HPS	156	25.10	3.43				*1.96	Significant
	LPS	123	25.63	3.83	277	2.02	.044	**2.58	Not Significant
Learning partnership	HPS	156	20.37	3.37				*1.96	Significant
	LPS	123	19.73	3.01	277	2.23	.026	**2.58	Not Significant

*Level of significance 0.05

** Level of Significance 0.01

Table 4.40 shows that the calculated values of t for the degrees of 277 are 2.33, 3.40, 1.56, 2.02, and 2.23 respectively for the various dimensions of school culture. The calculated t value for collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration, and learning partnership is greater than the table value of t test and it shows that there is significant difference amid low and high performing schools with respect to these dimensions. On the other hand, the t-test value of unity of purpose and collegial support is less than table value of t-test at 0.05 level of significance. It shows no difference between high and low performing schools with respect to their unity of purpose and collegial support.

4.2.9 Objective-9 To study the difference between the professional capital of high and low performing schools.

Table 4.41

Difference Between the Professional Capital of High and Low Performing Schools

Category	N	M	S.D	df	t- Value	P- Value	Table values	Result
High performing Schools	156	162.57	14.39	277	1.952	.056	*1.96	Not Significant
Low performing Schools	123	163.38	13.41				**2.58	Not significant
*Level of significance 0.05					**Level of Significance 0.01			

The value of t for the degrees of freedom 277 is 1.95 which is less than the value shown in the table at 0.05 significance level. It indicates no significant difference between the professional capital of high and low performing schools. Hence, the hypothesis stated

that the Professional Capital of high and low performing schools doesn't differ from each other is accepted.

The results are further understood by studying the difference among dimensions of both types of schools as shown in the table below.

Table 4.42

Difference in Dimensions of Professional Capital Between the High and Low Performing Schools

Dimension	Category	N	M	SD	df	t-value	p-value	Table value	Result
Human capital	HPS	156	44.22	7.71	277	1.65	.100	*1.96	Not Significant
	LPS	123	45.67	6.71				**2.58	Not Significant
Social capital	HPS	156	46.84	7.98				*1.96	Not Significant
	LPS	123	47.53	7.75	277	.725	.469	**2.58	Not Significant
Decisional capital	HPS	156	47.71	6.07				*1.96	Not Significant
	LPS	123	47.56	6.81	277	.203	.840	**2.58	Not Significant

The values of t for human capital, social capital, and decisional capital are 1.65, .725 & .203 respectively which are lower than the t-value depicted in the table at 0.05 significance level. It shows that there is no difference in dimensions of professional capital of high and low performing schools. Hence, the stated hypothesis Professional Capital of high and low performing schools doesn't differ from each other stands accepted.

4.2.10 Objective-10 To study the effect of leadership practices on the school culture and professional capital of high performing schools

Table 4.43

Model Summary on the Effect of Leadership Practices on School Culture and Professional Capital of High Performing Schools

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
1	.624	.389	.382	13.124

Predictors: (Constant), school culture, professional capital

Table 4.44

ANOVA Table on the Effect of Leadership Practices on School Culture and Professional Capital of High Performing Schools

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	16811.345	2	8405.673	48.805	.000
Residual	26351.347	153	172.231		
Total	43162.692	155			

Table 4.45

Coefficients Summary on the Effect of Leadership Practices on School Culture and Professional Capital of High Performing Schools

Model	Unstandardized		Standardized	T	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	69.078	10.559		6.542	.000
School Culture	.641	.076	.570	8.445	.000
Professional Capital	.120	.066	.123	1.830	.069

The table 4.43 depicts the value of r as .624 which reveals a significant association of leadership practices with school culture and professional capital in high performing schools. The value of r square is .389 which shows about 39 percent variation in school culture and professional capital is explained by leadership practices. However, from the coefficients table, it can be interpreted that the p -value of school culture and professional capital is .000 and .069 respectively which shows that leadership practices have a significant effect on school culture in high performing schools because its p -value is less than 0.05. On the other hand, the p -value of professional capital is more than .05 and it shows that there is no significant effect of leadership practices on professional capital of high performing schools. Therefore, it can be concluded that leadership practices affect school culture but don't affect professional capital in high performing schools.

4.2.11 Objective -11 To study the effect of leadership practices on the school culture and professional capital of low performing schools

Table 4.46

Model Summary on the Effect of Leadership Practices on School Culture and Professional Capital of Low Performing Schools

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
1	.568	.323	.311	11.947

Predictors: (Constant), school culture, professional capital

Table 4.47

ANOVA Table on the Effect of Leadership Practices on School Culture and Professional Capital of Low Performing Schools

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	8163.300	2	4081.650	28.594	.000
Regression	17129.106	120	142.743		
Residual	25292.407	122			
Total					

Table 4.48

Coefficients Summary on the Effect of Leadership Practices on School Culture and Professional Capital of Low Performing Schools

Model	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	91.584	10.761		8.511	.000
School Culture	.573	.086	.559	6.687	.000
Professional Capital	.015	.066	.019	.228	.820

The table 4.46 shows that r-value is .568, thereby, revealing a significant association of leadership practices with school culture and professional capital in low performing schools. The value of r square is .323 which predicts that 32 percent variation in school culture and professional capital is explained by leadership practices. However, from the coefficients table, it can be interpreted that the p-value for school culture and professional capital is .000 and .820 respectively. It shows that leadership practices have a significant effect on school culture in low performing schools because the value of p is less than 0.05 but on the other hand, leadership practices does not affect professional capital in low performing schools as revealed by the value of p which is more than 0.05. Therefore, it can be revealed that leadership practices influence the school culture of low performing schools but have no effect on the professional capital of low performing schools.

Table 4.49*Description of Contributing Leadership Practices Dimensions of High Performing Schools*

Leadership practices of high performing schools		
Dimensions 1 (as given by PCA)	Contributing	Non -Contributing
Monitoring and Instructional Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provides opportunities for teachers to learn from one another. 2. Support the teachers to adopt innovative teaching practices. 3. Encourages the implementation of new methods of teaching by which higher order learning is facilitated. 4. Provides resources to the staff for achieving the objectives of the institution. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The instructions of the classroom are evaluated by the achievement of the students. 2. Does not supervise all the activities of school on regular basis. 3. Provides feedback to the teachers for their teaching. 4. Provides autonomy to the teachers for organizing their teaching.
Interpersonal relationship	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Helps in building up the relation with parents and the community. 2. Shares his expertise and knowledge with the teachers. 3. Creates a collaborative atmosphere of teaching in the institution. 4. Solves the problems of school with the cooperation of the staff. 5. Communicates openly and flexibly with the staff. 6. Always remains with the staff while facing any problem. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does not pay attention to the needs of the students. 2. Staff members are not treated with dignity and respect.
Professional development	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Organizes professional development programs for teachers. 2. Encourages staff (teaching and non-teaching) to participate in in-service training programs. 3. Provides opportunities to teachers for sharing their knowledge from in service training programs among other staff members. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does not help in developing the skills of teaching among the teachers.

	<p>4. Meetings of the staff are conducted as a source of their professional development.</p> <p>5. Appreciate teachers for their better performance.</p>	
Leadership Responsibilities distribution	<p>1. Different roles are given to the teachers for running the institution.</p> <p>2. Involves staff members in the decision-making process.</p> <p>3. Provides opportunities to the staff for initiating change.</p> <p>4. Opinion of the staff is considered in decision making process related to various administrative school functions.</p>	<p>1. Subordinates follow the rules and regulations</p> <p>2. Staff co-operates on different matters</p>
Modeling the way	<p>1. Maintains friendly relation with the subordinates.</p> <p>2. Has Clarity in his own ways of working.</p> <p>3. Moral values guide the actions of a Leader.</p> <p>4. Priority is given to the career development of others.</p> <p>5. Helps members of the group to feel comfortable.</p> <p>6. Acts as a role model for staff members.</p>	<p>1. Emphasize my point of view at the expense of others.</p> <p>2. Sacrifices his own interests to meet the needs of others .</p> <p>3. Does not care about the personal well being of other.</p>
Shared vision of school	<p>1. Creates an orderly and safe environment in the school</p> <p>2. Role of the leader is defined clearly within the group</p>	<p>1. Vision and Goals of the school are developed in collaboration with the staff</p> <p>2. Vision of the school is based on the all round development of the students, teachers and community</p>

Table 4.50*Description of Contributing Leadership Practices Dimensions of Low Performing School*

Leadership practices of low performing schools		
Dimension-1	Contributing	Non-Contributing
Monitoring and Instructional Support* (absence of monitoring instructional support as contributing leadership practice indicates that teachers of low performing schools are not provided sufficient instructional support)	NIL	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provides opportunities for teachers to learn from one another. 2. Support the teachers to adopt innovative teaching practices. 3. The instructions of the classroom are evaluated by the achievement of the students. 4. Does not supervise all the activities of school on regular basis. 5. Encourages the implementation of new methods of teaching by which higher order learning is facilitated. 6. Provides feedback to the teachers for their teaching. 7. Provides resources to the staff for achieving the objectives of the institution. 8. Provides autonomy to the teachers for organizing their teaching

Interpersonal relationship	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Helps in building up the relation with parents and the community. 2. Shares his expertise and knowledge with the teachers. 3. Creates a collaborative atmosphere of teaching in the institution. 4. Solves the problems of school with the cooperation of the staff. 5. Communicates openly and flexibly with the staff. 6. Always remains with the staff while facing any problem. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does not pay attention to the needs of the students. 2. Staff members are not treated with dignity and respect.
Professional development	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Organizes professional development programs for teachers. 2. Encourages staff (teaching and non teaching) to participate in in-service training programs. 3. Provides opportunities to teachers for sharing their knowledge from in service training programs among other staff members. 4. Meetings of the staff are conducted as a source of their professional development. 5. Provides appreciation to teachers for their better performance. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does not help in developing the skills of teaching among the teachers.

Leadership Responsibilities distribution	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Involves staff members in the decision-making process. 2. Subordinates follow the rules and regulations 3. Provides opportunities to the staff for initiating change. 4. Opinion of the staff is considered in decision making process related to various administrative school functions. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Different roles are given to the teachers for running the institution. 2. Staff co-operates on different matters 3. Provides opportunities to the staff for initiating change.
Modeling the way	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintains friendly relation with the Subordinates. 2. Has Clarity in his own ways of working. 3. Moral values guide the actions of a Leader. 4. Sacrifices his own interests to meet the needs of others . 5. Priority is given to the career development of others. 6. Helps members of the group to feel comfortable. 7. Acts as a role model for staff members. 8. Creates an orderly and safe environment in the school. 9. Role of the leader is defined clearly within the group 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Emphasize my point of view at the expense of others. 2. Does not care about the personal well being of other.
Shared vision of school	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vision and Goals of the school are developed in collaboration with the staff 2. Vision of the school is based on the all-round development of the students, teachers and community 3. Goals of the school promote high expectations and standards for every student 	

	4. Outcomes of the school are achieved as per the expectations of the leader	
Dimension-2 Lack of supervision and care	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does not supervise all the activities of school on regular basis. 2. Does not pay attention to the needs of the students. 3. Emphasize his point of view at the expense of others. 4. Does not care about the personal well being of other. 	

Table 4.51

Description of Contributing School Culture Dimensions of High Performing Schools

School Culture in high performing schools		
Dimensions	Contributing	Non-contributing
Dimension-1 • Collaborative leadership	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leaders in this school trust the professional judgments of teachers. 2. Leaders in our school facilitate teachers working together. 3. Teachers are kept informed on current issues in the school. 4. Teachers are rewarded for experimenting with new ideas and techniques. 5. Leaders support risk-taking and innovation in teaching. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School Leaders value teachers' ideas. 2. My involvement in policy or decision making is not taken seriously. 3. School Leaders protect instruction and planning time.

	<p>6. School Leaders protect instruction and planning time.</p> <p>7. Teachers are encouraged to share ideas.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher collaboration 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers have opportunities for dialogue and planning across grades and subjects. 2. Teachers spend considerable time planning together. 3. Teachers take time to observe each other's teaching and provide developmental feedback to each other. 4. Teachers teach others what they know about teaching, learning and leading. 5. Teachers work together to develop and evaluate programs and projects. 6. Teaching practice disagreements are voiced openly and discussed. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unity of purpose 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers support the mission of the school. 2. The school mission provides a clear sense of direction for teachers. 3. The school mission statement reflects the values of the community. 4. Teaching-learning practices reflect the values of the community. 	

	5. A sense of shared purpose is developed among the staff members.	
• Collegial support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teacher's ideas are valued by other teachers. 2. Teachers work cooperatively in groups. 3. Teachers are committed to school goals and to their students. 4. Teachers regularly discuss the progress of the students. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers trust and respect each other 2. Teachers are willing to help out whenever there is a problem
• Learning Partnership	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers and parents communicate frequently about student's performance. 2. In our School, Parent and community involvement is a key factor for student engagement, commitment and learning. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers and parents have common expectations for student performance. 2. Parents are encouraged to visit the school any time. 3. Students freely discuss their feelings, problems and concerns with their teachers

Table 4.52*Description of Contributing School Culture Dimensions of Low Performing Schools*

School Culture in Low performing Schools		
Dimensions	Contributing	Non-contributing
Dimension-1		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborative leadership 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Leaders in this school trust the professional judgments of teachers. Leaders in our school facilitate teachers working together. Teachers are kept informed on current issues in the school. Teachers are rewarded for experimenting with new ideas and techniques. Leaders support risk-taking and innovation in teaching. School Leaders protect instruction and planning time. Teachers are encouraged to share ideas. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> School Leaders value teachers' ideas My involvement in policy or decision making is not taken seriously
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher collaboration 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers have opportunities for dialogue and planning across grades and subjects. Teachers spend considerable time planning together. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching practice disagreements are voiced openly and discussed.

	<p>3. Teachers take time to observe each other’s teaching and provide developmental feedback to each other.</p> <p>4. Teachers teach others what they know about teaching, learning and leading.</p> <p>5. Teachers work together to develop and evaluate programs and projects.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unity of purpose 	<p>1. Teachers support the mission of the school.</p> <p>2. The school mission provides a clear sense of direction for teachers.</p> <p>3. A sense of shared purpose is developed among the Staff members</p>	<p>1. The school mission statement reflects the values of the community.</p> <p>2. Teaching learning practices reflects the values of the community.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collegial support 	<p>1. Teachers trust and respect each other.</p> <p>2. Teachers are willing to help out whenever there is a problem.</p> <p>3. Teacher’s ideas are valued by other teachers.</p> <p>4. Teachers work cooperatively in groups.</p> <p>5. Teachers are committed to school goals and to their students.</p> <p>6. Teachers regularly discuss the progress of the students.</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning Partnership 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers and parents have common expectations for student performance. In our School, Parent and community involvement is a key factor for student engagement, commitment and learning. Students freely discuss their feelings, problems and concerns with their teachers. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers and parents communicate frequently about student's performance. Parents are encouraged to visit the school any time.
--	---	--

Table 4.53

Description of Contributing Professional Capital Dimensions of High Performing Schools

Professional Capital in high performing schools		
Dimensions	Contributing	Non-contributing
Dimension-1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human capital 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I regularly search for professional learning opportunities to improve my teaching. I am assigned to the class(es) that are best suited to my talent and expertise. Our school places a high priority on attracting highly effective teachers. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I am able to advance the learning of the most disadvantaged students. When students from my class move on to the next grade they are prepared for their class work in my subject area(s).

		<p>3. There is only so much that I can do as a teacher; if a student doesn't put in the effort, it is not always my fault.</p> <p>4. I can readily access and consult with specialists who can support my teaching practice.</p> <p>5. I feel that I have little influence when it comes to making school-wide decisions related to student learning</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social capital 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My colleagues and I have high expectations for the learning of all students. 2. I have time built into my regular school schedule to examine and improve my instructional practice with other teachers 3. I regularly examine student work in collaboration with other teachers. 4. I work with other teachers to look into the reasons for differences in student achievement across classes. 5. I share and try out new teaching methods with my colleagues to enhance student learning. 	

	<p>6. I regularly participate in teacher collaboration meetings where our principal is involved.</p> <p>7. I have improved the way I teach as a result of collaborating with other teachers at my school.</p> <p>8. I have positively influenced student learning by working together with other teachers at my school.</p> <p>9. I collaborate with teachers from other schools to improve teaching and learning in my and their classrooms.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decisional capital 	<p>1. Most decisions that guide my professional practice are based on a set of moral values that are shared with the other teachers at my school.</p> <p>2. I have developed an extensive set of teaching strategies to adapt my instruction to the learning needs of each student.</p> <p>3. I am confident that when a lesson isn't going as planned, I can change the plan immediately without losing the intended objectives of the lesson.</p> <p>3. On any given day, I would be able to provide evidence of what worked and what didn't in my lesson.</p>	<p>1. It has become second nature to me to reflect on how well my lessons are going while I am teaching.</p> <p>2. I regularly analyze and act on data related to student performance with colleagues.</p>

	<p>4. I regularly take time to reflect on what didn't work in my teaching and figure out how to do things better next time.</p> <p>5. I am confident in my ability to mentor or coach other teachers.</p> <p>6. Most decisions in my teaching are based on a combination of research evidence and practical experience.</p> <p>7. The passion I have for my work improves the judgments I make in the classroom.</p> <p>8. My teaching is up to date with current educational research about effective practice.</p>	
<p>Dimension-2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for professional development 	<p>1. I am offered the professional development needed to improve my teaching practice.</p> <p>2. My school provides me with career opportunities that improve my professional growth and practice.</p> <p>3. I am provided with feedback I need to improve my professional practice by administrators in my school.</p> <p>4. In my school, teachers with little teaching experience are often placed in classrooms with the greatest needs.</p>	

5. I am **provided with opportunities** to observe other colleagues teaching.
6. I **provide feedback to my colleagues** about their classroom practice
7. I **rely on the teachers** I work with in this school for professional guidance and support
8. If other teachers visited my classroom, I would be uncomfortable displaying my teaching practice in front of them
-

Table 4.54*Description of Contributing Professional Capital Dimensions of Low Performing Schools*

Professional Capital in Low Performing Schools		
Dimensions	Contributing	Non-contributing
Dimension-1		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human capital 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My school provides me with career opportunities that improve my professional growth and practice. 2. I can readily access and consult with specialists who can support my teaching practice. 3. I am assigned to the class(es) that are best suited to my talent and expertise. 4. Our school places a high priority on attracting highly effective teachers. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is only so much that I can do as a teacher; if a student doesn't put in the effort, it is not always my fault. 2. I am offered the professional development needed to improve my teaching practice. 3. I am provided with feedback I need to improve my professional practice by administrators in my school. 4. In my school, teachers with little teaching experience are often placed in classrooms with the greatest needs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social capital 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My colleagues and I have high expectations for the learning of all students. 2. I have time built into my regular school schedule to examine and improve my instructional practice with 	

other teachers

3. I **regularly examine student work** in collaboration with other teachers.

4. I **work with other teachers** to look into the reasons for differences in student achievement across classes.

5. I am **provided with opportunities** to observe other colleagues' teaching.

6. I provide **feedback to my colleagues** about their classroom practice.

7. I **share and try out new teaching methods** with my colleagues to enhance student learning.

8. I **rely on the teachers** I work within this school for professional guidance and support.

9. I regularly participate in teacher **collaboration meetings** where our principal is involved.

10. I have improved the way I **teach as a result of collaborating with other teachers** at my school.

11. I have **positively influenced student learning** by working together with other teachers at my school.

	<p>12. I collaborate with teachers from other schools to improve teaching and learning in my and their classrooms.</p>	
<p>• Decisional capital</p>	<p>1. Most decisions that guide my professional practice are based on a set of moral values that are shared with the other teachers at my school.</p> <p>2. I have developed an extensive set of teaching strategies to adapt my instruction to the learning needs of each student.</p> <p>3. I am confident that when a lesson isn't going as planned, I can change the plan immediately without losing the intended objectives of the lesson.</p> <p>4. On any given day, I would be able to provide evidence of what worked and what didn't in my lesson.</p> <p>5. It has become second nature to me to reflect on how well my lessons are going while I am teaching.</p> <p>6. I regularly take time to reflect on what didn't work in my teaching and figure out how to do things better next time.</p> <p>7. I am confident in my ability to mentor or coach other teachers.</p>	<p>1. If other teachers visited my classroom, I would be uncomfortable displaying my teaching practice in front of them</p>

	<p>8. Most decisions in my teaching are based on a combination of research evidence and practical experience.</p> <p>9. I regularly analyze and act on data related to student performance with colleagues.</p> <p>10. The passion I have for my work improves the judgments I make in the classroom.</p> <p>11. My teaching is up to date with current educational research about effective practice.</p>	
<p>Dimension -4</p> <p>• Upliftment: opportunities and desires</p>	<p>1. I am able to advance the learning of the most disadvantaged students.</p> <p>2. When students from my class move on to the next grade they are prepared for their class work in my subject area(s).</p> <p>3. I regularly search for professional learning opportunities to improve my teaching.</p> <p>4. I feel that I have little influence when it comes to making school-wide decisions related to student learning.</p>	

4.3 Discussion of the results

Objective-1

To identify the leadership practices prevailing in the high and low performing schools

Result

The results for this objective have shown that dimension (component) one is the main contributing dimension of the leadership practices in high performing schools because maximum variation caused in the leadership practices in these schools is explained by dimension one. It reveals that 23.29 % of the variance in leadership practices of these schools is explained by dimension one. Dimension one includes instructional support, collaboration, and cooperation, professional development, leader acting as a role model and vision for the school.

Looking for the low performing school's, it has been found that the maximum variation in leadership practices is explained by the dimension one and two. The results have shown that 22.58 % of the variance in leadership practices is explained by dimension one and 5.77 % by dimension two. Therefore, the leadership practices in low performing schools are mostly represented by dimension one and dimension two. Dimension one includes collaboration and cooperation, professional development, involvement of the staff, and leader acting as a role model. Dimension two is represented by supervision of school activities and providing autonomy to the teachers.

It was seen that in high performance schools dimension one is the major contributing factor while dimension one and dimension two are the major contributing factors in low performing schools. It has been found that in high performing schools instructional support is provided to the teachers while in low performing schools the instructional

support was completely absent. Dimension two in low performing schools is represented by supervision of school activities and providing autonomy to the teachers while in high performing schools dimension two is not a major defining factor of leadership practices.

Objective -2

To identify the school culture of the high and low performing schools

Result

Based on the data, it was found that dimension (component) one is the major contributing dimension of school culture in high performing schools. A variance of 30.41 % in school culture is explained by dimension one. This shows that the variation caused in the school culture of high performing schools is mostly explained by dimension one. The dimension one in high performing schools includes collaboration, cooperation, following a single path, commitment, and involvement.

Looking for the low performing schools the results have shown that dimension (component) one is the major contributing dimension of school culture. About 29 % of the variance in school culture is explained by dimension one. This shows that the variation caused in the school culture of low performing schools is mostly explained by dimension one. The dimension one includes collaboration, cooperation, working in a single direction, commitment and involvement. In both types of schools, the features of school culture such as collaboration, cooperation, working in a single direction, commitment and involvement are common.

Objective -3

To identify the professional capital of the high and low performing schools

Result

From the result, it has been found that dimension (component) one and dimension two represents the effective dimension of professional capital in high performing schools. The result shows that 25.72 % of the variance in professional capital is explained by dimension one and 12.85 % of the variation is caused by dimension two. This shows that the variation caused in the professional capital in high performing schools is mostly explained by dimension one and dimension two. Dimension one is represented by talent and expertise, way of working, way of taking decisions, and dimension two is represented by professional development and providing opportunities.

The results further bring to light that dimension (component) one and dimension four are the effective dimensions of professional capital in low performing schools. The result shows that 28.34 % of the variance in professional capital in low performing schools is explained by dimension one and 5.20 % variance in professional capital of low performing schools is explained by dimension four. This shows that the variation caused in the professional capital of high performing schools is mostly explained by dimension one and dimension four. Dimension one includes support and talent, working together, and ways of taking decisions. Dimension four in low performing schools is represented by professional learning opportunities.

In high performing schools, it has been found that dimension one and dimension two are the major contributing factor while in low performing, dimension one and dimension two are the major contributing factors. Dimension one in high performing

schools is represented by talent and expertise, way of working, way of taking decisions. Dimension two in high performing schools is represented by professional development and providing opportunities. The dimension one in low performing schools is represented by support and talent, working together, way of taking decisions. Dimension four in low performing schools is represented by professional learning opportunities.

Objective-4

To find out the relationship between the leadership practices and school culture of high and low performing schools.

Result

The leadership practices and the school culture of high and low performing schools are related to each other.

A significant relationship between the leadership practices and school culture of low and high performing schools was observed. The data obtained from teachers reveals a high degree of correlation between the leadership practices and school culture of high performing schools ($r = .613$). However, a moderate correlation was found between the leadership practice and school culture of low performing schools ($r = .57$). Based on the data of principals a very high degree of correlation between the leadership practices and school culture of high and low performing schools was observed ($r = .87$ & $r = .86$). These results are in conformity with the results of previous studies. The studies supporting the result of the present study are Tarun and Bektas (2013), Niemann and Kotze (2006) & Quin, Deris, Bischoff, and Johnson (2015). The study of Tarun and Bektas (2013) shows a strong and positive relationship between leadership practices

and school culture in lower level schools and 20% variance in school culture is explained by the dimensions of leadership practices. Similar results were found by Nieman and Kotze (2006) and Quin, et. al. (2015).

While observing the association between the dimensions of leadership practices and dimensions of school culture in high performing schools, it has been found that there is low correlation between monitoring instructional support dimension of leadership practices and teacher collaboration, unity of purpose, and collaborative leadership dimensions of school culture. However moderate correlation has been found between monitoring and instructional support dimension of leadership practices and learning partnership dimension of school culture and there is no correlation between monitoring instructional support dimension of leadership practices and collegial support dimension of school culture in high performance schools. Looking for the next dimension of leadership practices i.e. interpersonal relationship, it has been found that there is a low correlation between the interpersonal relationship dimension of leadership practices and all the dimensions of school culture. From the results, it has been observed that there is a moderate correlation between the professional development dimension of leadership practices and teacher collaboration, collaborative leadership, and learning partnership dimensions of school culture. Further the results also depicted that there is low correlation between professional development dimension of leadership practices and unity of purpose and collegial support dimensions of school culture. The dimension of leadership responsibilities distribution of leadership practices shows moderate correlation with teacher collaboration, collegial support, and learning partnership dimensions of school culture and low correlation with collaborative leadership and unity of purpose dimensions of school culture. From the findings, it has been observed

that there is a moderate correlation between modeling the way dimension of leadership practices and teacher collaboration, collaborative leadership and collegial support dimensions of school culture and low correlation with unity of purpose and learning partnership dimensions of school culture in low performing schools. The dimension of shared vision of school of leadership practices shows moderate correlation with teacher collaboration and learning partnership dimension of school culture and low correlation with collaborative leadership, collegial support and unity of purpose dimensions of school culture. In low performing schools, there is a weak correlation between monitoring instructional support dimensions of leadership practices and collegial support, unity of purpose, and learning partnership dimensions of school culture. There is a low correlation between monitoring and instructional support dimension of leadership practices and the collaborative leadership dimension of school culture and no correlation has been found between monitoring and instructional support dimension of leadership practices and the teacher collaboration dimension of school culture. The dimension of the interpersonal relationship of leadership practices shows a high correlation with collaborative leadership dimension of school culture, moderate correlation with teacher collaboration, collegial support and unity of purpose dimensions of school culture and no correlation with learning partnership dimension of school culture. The dimension of professional development of leadership practices shows moderate correlation with collaborative leadership and teacher collaboration dimensions of school culture, low correlation between unity of purpose and collegial support dimensions of school culture, and no correlation with learning partnership dimension of school culture. From the findings, it has also been observed that there is a low correlation between the dimension of leadership responsibilities distribution, modeling the way, dimensions of leadership practices and all the dimensions of school

culture. However, a moderate correlation has been found between shared vision of school dimension of leadership practices and collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration dimensions of school culture, low correlation with unity of purpose and no correlation with collegial support and learning partnership dimensions of school culture.

Objective -5

To find out the relationship between the leadership practices and professional capital of high and low performing schools.

Result

The leadership practices and school culture of high and low performing schools are related to each other.

Based on the data, a significant association between the leadership practices and professional capital of high and low performing schools. However, the data obtained from teachers reveals a low but significant correlation between the leadership practices and professional capital of these categories of schools ($r = .32$ & $r = .26$). However, based on the data of principals a high correlation has been found between leadership practices and the professional capital of high and low performing schools ($r = .75$ & $r = .79$).

Looking at the results, a significant correlation between the leadership practices and professional capital of high performing schools was observed. The dimension of monitoring instructional support of leadership practices has a low but significant correlation with the dimensions of professional capital. The dimension of interpersonal relationship has a low but significant correlation with the social capital dimension of leadership practices and no correlation with human and decisional capital dimensions

of professional capital. The dimension of professional development of leadership practices has a low but significant correlation with the human and social capital dimension of professional capital. The dimension of leadership responsibility distribution has a low but significant correlation with human and social capital dimensions of professional capital and no correlation with the decisional capital dimension of professional capital. The modeling the way dimension has a low but significant correlation with the human and social capital dimension of professional capital. However, the dimension of shared vision of school has a low but significant correlation with all the dimensions of professional capital. While observing the results of low performing schools it has been found that monitoring the instructional support dimension of leadership practices has no correlation with all the dimensions of professional capital. The dimension of the interpersonal relationship of leadership practices has a low but significant relationship with all the dimensions of professional capital. However, the dimension of professional development of leadership practices has no correlation with all the dimensions of professional capital. Another dimension, leadership responsibility distribution of leadership practices has no correlation with human capital dimension of professional capital, low but significant correlation with social and decisional capital dimensions of professional capital. The dimension of modeling the way of leadership practices has no correlation with all the dimensions of professional capital. The last dimension of leadership practices, shared vision of school has a low but significant correlation with human and decisional capital dimensions of professional capital and no correlation with the social capital dimension of professional capital.

Objective-6

To find out the relationship between the school culture and professional capital of high and low performing schools.

Result

The school culture and professional capital of high and low performing schools are related to each other.

Based on the data of the teachers, a low but a significant correlation between the school culture and professional capital of high performing school was seen ($r=.35$). Similarly, in low performing schools a moderate relationship between school culture and professional capital was seen ($r= .44$). As per the data of the principals, it has been found that a very high degree correlation between school culture and professional capital of high and low performing schools was observed ($r= .93$ & $r=.95$).

From these results, it was seen that a low but significant correlation between collaborative leadership dimension of school culture and human and social capital dimensions of professional capital, and no correlation with the decisional capital dimension of professional capital was observed. The dimension of teacher collaboration dimension of school culture has a low but significant correlation with the human and social capital dimension of professional capital and no correlation with the decisional capital dimension of professional capital. The dimension of unity of purpose has a low but significant correlation with the human and social capital dimension of professional capital and no correlation with the decisional capital dimension of professional capital. Similarly, the dimension of collegial support of school culture has a low but significant correlation with the human and social capital dimension of professional capital and no

correlation with the decisional capital dimension of professional capital. The dimension of learning partnership of school culture has a low but significant correlation with human and decisional capital dimensions of professional capital and moderate correlation with the social capital dimension of professional capital.

Objective-7

To study the difference between the leadership practices of high and low performing schools

Result

The leadership practices of high and low performing schools are different.

Based on the results a significant difference in leadership practices between the high and low performance schools was observed. The difference in leadership practices based on the data of teachers were seen in the dimensions of monitoring instructional support, interpersonal relationship, professional development, leadership responsibilities distribution and modeling the way. However, in the data obtained from teachers, no difference in the dimension of the shared vision of school between the high and low performing schools was seen. The same results were shown by the studies conducted by Abu-Tineh, Khasawneh, Omary (2009), Salfi (2010), Quin et. al. (2015), Sing & Allison (2016), Quin, Deris, Bishop & Johnson (2016). The study of Quin, et.al.(2015) showed that major differences were seen in the dimensions of inspiring the vision sharing and process challenging. The results of inspiring the vision sharing of school dimension are in contradiction with the result of this study. The results of the study of Abu-Tineh, Khasawneh, Omary (2009) showed no significant difference in challenging the process dimension of leadership practice but there is a significant

difference in inspiring the vision sharing, modeling the way, making others to behave, and praising the heart between the teachers in basic and high schools. The results of the study by Salfi (2010) revealed that most of the headmasters of successful schools have developed a shared and common school vision and developed a collaborative culture, trust, and support. They encouraged others to lead by distributing the responsibilities in the school. They involved stakeholders in the decision-making process. They established good ties with other members of the school. They stressed the professional development of other teachers as well as their own.

Objective-8

To study the difference between the school culture of high and low performing schools.

Result

The school culture of high and low performing schools is different.

Based on the data obtained from teachers, a significant difference between the school culture of low and high performing schools was seen. These differences were seen in dimensions of collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration, collegial support and partnership learning. However, no difference was seen in the dimension of unity of purpose between the high and low performance schools based on the data of the teachers. These results were consistent with the results of Deliowska, Dernowska & Gruenert (2017). The results of Deliowska, Dernowska & Gruenert (2017) have seen a significant difference in the four dimensions of school culture. The study of Singh and Allison considered a collegial environment as the key to the success of the schools.

Objective-9

To study the difference between the professional capital of high and low performing schools.

Result

The professional capital of high and low performing schools is not different.

Based on the results, no significant difference between the professional capital of high and low schools was seen from the data obtained from teachers. The results were supported by the study of Carie Leana as cited in the book of professional capital by Hargreaves and Fullan (2012). However, there is no difference in all the dimensions of professional capital in high and low performing schools.

Objective -10

To study the effect of leadership practices on the school culture and professional capital of high performing schools.

Result

There is a significant effect of leadership practices on school culture but there is no effect of leadership practices on professional capital of high performing schools.

Based on the results it has been found that a significant effect of leadership practices on school culture in high performing schools was seen. This highlights that practices of leadership play a crucial role in the betterment of culture of schools in high performing schools. This result is supported by the studies conducted by Tarun & Bektas (2013), Quin, et. al. (2015). The study of Tarun & Bektas showed that 20 % variance in school culture scores is explained by the sub-dimensions of leadership practices. The study of Quin, et. al. (2015) showed that leadership practices caused 36% of the variance in

collaborative leadership, 29% in unity of purpose, 27% in professional development, 24% in collegial support, 22% in teacher collaboration, and 15% in learning partnership.

However, while observing the results it has been found that leadership practices doesn't have any significant effect on the professional capital of high performing schools.

Objective-11

To study the effect of leadership practices on the school culture and professional capital of low performing schools

Result

There is a significant effect of leadership practices on school culture but there is no effect of leadership practices on the professional capital of low performing schools.

From the results, it can be seen that leadership practices does have a significant effect on culture of schools in low performing schools. This highlights that practices of leadership play a vital role for the upliftment of culture in schools in low performing schools. The result is supported by the studies conducted by Tarun & Bektas (2013), Quin, et. al. (2015). The study of Tarun & Bektas showed that 20 % variance in school culture scores is explained by the sub-dimensions of leadership practices. The study of Quin, et. al. (2015) showed that leadership practices caused 36% of the variance in collaborative leadership, 29% of the unity of purpose, 27% of professional development, 24% of collegial support, 22% of teacher collaboration and 15% of learning partnership.

However, while observing the results it has been found that leadership practices does not have any significant effect on the professional capital of low performing schools.