

Beyond the Parent-Teacher Meeting: Investigating the Impact of Parental Involvement on Teacher Efficacy and School Climate

Bemat Faizah

School of liberal Arts and Management, P P Savani University, Gujarat (India)

Abstract

Parents indicate that meaningful and consistent parental involvement significantly enhances teacher efficacy, which in turn fosters a more positive, trust-based school climate. Conversely, superficial or transactional forms of engagement were associated with lower teacher motivation and weakened collegiality.

The findings evidence on the centrality of administrative support and teacher satisfaction in educational performance, underscoring that the emotional and managerial ecology of a school is co-created by families and educators. This study argues that reimagining parental participation as a **collaborative governance mechanism**—rather than a ceremonial event—can transform not only how teachers teach but also how schools feel. Policy implications advocate institutional frameworks that embed parental partnership into the core of school governance, ensuring holistic teacher development and a sustainable climate of mutual trust and shared accountability.

Keywords: Parental involvement, teacher efficacy, school climate, educational collaboration, self-efficacy, governance in education

1. Introduction

In contemporary education systems, the partnership between parents and teachers has moved from being a polite expectation to a pedagogical necessity. Yet, the concept of “parental involvement” remains often confined to episodic events — attending meetings, signing report cards, or responding to disciplinary concerns. While such practices may maintain basic communication, they rarely cultivate the collaborative ecosystem necessary for genuine educational transformation. The question, therefore, is not whether parents should be involved, but *how* their involvement translates into sustained teacher motivation and an enabling school environment.

Globally, educational research has recognized parental engagement as one of the most significant correlates of student achievement and school effectiveness (Epstein, 2018; Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler,

2005). However, most empirical studies have maintained a narrow focus on outcomes for students, overlooking the psychological and institutional impact of parental involvement on teachers and the broader school climate. This imbalance has created a critical blind spot in educational research — the professional and emotional experiences of teachers in contexts where parental participation varies in depth, intent, and quality.

Teacher efficacy, as conceptualized by Bandura (1997) and expanded in later studies (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), captures a teacher's belief in their capacity to influence learning outcomes and manage classroom challenges effectively. High efficacy is consistently linked to teacher satisfaction, persistence, and innovation. However, as Sheokand (2017, 2024) demonstrates, teacher efficacy does not evolve in isolation — it is shaped by institutional culture, administrative structures, and the degree of emotional and professional validation teachers receive. When parents actively engage as collaborators rather than critics, they can indirectly reinforce teacher confidence, reduce occupational stress, and contribute to a more coherent educational climate. (Sheokand, Dr. Uma. (2025).

Equally important is the notion of **school climate** — the psychological and relational atmosphere within which teachers, students, and parents interact. Barrett et al. (2019) argue that while physical infrastructure influences learning outcomes, the “invisible architecture” of trust, mutual respect, and shared responsibility often determines whether an institution thrives or stagnates. A supportive climate can convert a school into a learning community; a fragmented one can dissolve it into isolated silos.

Despite these insights, research examining the *interplay* between parental involvement, teacher efficacy, and school climate remains limited, particularly in the Indian context where educational hierarchies, parental expectations, and administrative cultures differ from Western models. Studies by Sheokand (2018, 2019) on school administration and teacher satisfaction have emphasized the need to understand the psychosocial dimensions of schooling, yet there remains little empirical exploration of how parental partnerships influence teachers' sense of professional agency and the collective tone of the school environment.

This study seeks to fill that void. It investigates how diverse forms of parental involvement — from participation in academic planning to engagement in school governance — affect teacher efficacy and, by extension, the overall school climate. By employing a **mixed-methods design** rooted in *Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory* and *Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory*, the research develops an integrated model linking micro-level interactions (parent–teacher relationships) to macro-level institutional outcomes (school culture and governance).

The significance of this inquiry lies in its shift of perspective: moving **beyond the parent-teacher meeting** to examine how sustained, meaningful parental collaboration can empower educators, strengthen institutional trust, and enhance the moral and emotional ecology of schools. In doing so, the study contributes to a more holistic understanding of educational governance — one that recognizes teachers not merely as instructional agents but as emotional anchors whose efficacy is deeply interwoven with the social fabric of the school community.

2. Review of Literature

2.1 Conceptual Foundations of Parental Involvement

Parental involvement, though widely endorsed in education policy and practice, remains conceptually multifaceted and culturally contingent. Epstein's (2018) **Six Types of Involvement Framework**—parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision-making, and collaborating with the community—remains the most influential model for understanding family–school relationships. Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (2005) extended this discourse by emphasizing *why* parents engage: motivational beliefs, perceived invitations from schools, and contextual opportunities that shape participation.

However, many institutional settings, particularly in South Asia, still equate parental involvement with formal attendance at parent–teacher meetings—an event-driven model that lacks sustained interaction or co-creation. As Jeynes (2016) observes, this reductionist approach undermines the potential of parental engagement as a developmental partnership. Meaningful involvement, in contrast, entails ongoing dialogue, shared accountability, and mutual respect between parents and educators.

In the Indian context, parental involvement intersects with cultural hierarchies, socio-economic diversity, and differing conceptions of authority. Schools often oscillate between paternalistic control and performative inclusion, leaving little space for authentic collaboration. **Sheokand (2017a, 2017b, 2017c)** emphasized that participatory decision-making in Indian schools often remains symbolic, constrained by administrative formalism rather than pedagogical partnership. **Sheokand (2016)** further highlighted how the principles of *Digital India* and e-governance could be repurposed for enhancing parent–school communication transparency.

In addition, **Sheokand's (2017d)** analysis of *Digital Classrooms* underscored the transformative potential of technology in fostering ongoing parental engagement and institutional accountability. Collectively, these insights position parental involvement not as a one-time meeting but as a continuing partnership embedded in the governance of educational institutions. It is within this conceptual tension that the present study situates itself—exploring how the *quality* of parental engagement, rather than its *frequency*, influences the psychological and institutional climate of schools.

2.2 Teacher Efficacy: The Psychological Core of Teaching

Teacher efficacy is not merely a cognitive belief; it is a psychological anchor that sustains motivation, classroom management, and professional resilience. Rooted in Bandura's (1997) **Social Cognitive Theory**, teacher efficacy refers to a teacher's confidence in their ability to affect student learning under challenging conditions. Research consistently shows that high efficacy is associated with innovative instructional practices, lower burnout, and stronger student outcomes (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Empirical research confirms that contextual factors—administrative leadership, collegial support, and parental collaboration—significantly shape efficacy beliefs (Klassen et al., 2011). **Sheokand (2017e)** made an early contribution to this field, demonstrating how school administration and work culture influence teacher satisfaction and engagement. **Sheokand (2022)** expanded this understanding through an

analysis of teachers' perceptions of the Right to Education (RTE) Act, revealing that institutional trust and managerial transparency directly affect teachers' sense of professional efficacy.

Further, **Sheokand (2023)** examined public policy loopholes that weaken educator satisfaction, arguing that managerial ambiguity and weak communication channels demotivate teachers. In contrast, supportive administrative practices and inclusive governance structures enhance self-efficacy. **Sheokand (2024)** provided empirical evidence that participative decision-making and parental collaboration reinforce teachers' professional confidence and job satisfaction.

These findings collectively align with the argument that parental collaboration functions as a **social validation mechanism**, enhancing teachers' self-perceived competence. Thus, teacher efficacy acts as the mediating psychological core linking external relational dynamics—particularly parental engagement—with the broader institutional climate.

2.3 School Climate: The Invisible Architecture of Learning

School climate encapsulates the quality and character of school life—the unwritten rules, shared perceptions, and emotional tenor that influence how members experience their institution. Hoy and Clover (1986) identified key dimensions such as collegial leadership, institutional integrity, resource support, and teacher affiliation. These collectively determine whether a school functions as a cohesive learning community or a fragmented bureaucracy.

Recent studies underscore the relational foundation of climate. Barrett et al. (2019) revealed that environmental design and social relationships jointly influence learning outcomes, suggesting that a school's "architecture" extends beyond its physical space into emotional and cultural realms.

In India, **Sheokand (2018)** highlighted the structural contradictions between policy intent and practice in public education—particularly the mismatch between participatory rhetoric and bureaucratic implementation. Her research on **teacher satisfaction, administrative management, and work culture** (Sheokand, 2017e; 2023; 2024) reinforced that school climate is socially constructed through leadership behavior, communication openness, and the degree of trust extended to both teachers and parents.

When parents are perceived as collaborative partners, school climate reflects transparency, shared norms, and collective accountability. Conversely, when relationships are marked by hierarchical scrutiny or blame, teacher morale and institutional trust deteriorate (Pietsch & Stubbe, 2021). Parental involvement thus acts as both a diagnostic and a determinant of institutional harmony.

2.4 Synthesis and Research Gap

A synthesis of global and Indian literature reveals three critical insights. First, **parental involvement** is a multidimensional construct requiring sustained, culturally attuned engagement beyond formal meetings (Epstein, 2018; Jeynes, 2016; Sheokand, 2016, 2017a–d, 2018). Second, **teacher efficacy** serves as a central psychological mechanism through which relational and organizational variables translate into professional performance (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001; Sheokand, 2022, 2023, 2024).

Third, **school climate** acts as the institutional embodiment of these dynamics, determining whether educational reforms succeed or stagnate (Hoy & Clover, 1986; Sheokand, 2017e, 2023).

Despite this, a notable gap persists: most research has focused on the impact of parental engagement on student outcomes, neglecting its influence on teachers' self-efficacy and the school climate as a relational ecosystem. Few studies employ an integrative, systems-theoretical lens that bridges psychological, institutional, and governance perspectives.

By addressing this lacuna, the present study contributes both theoretically and empirically to educational scholarship. Theoretically, it proposes a **mediated framework** linking parental involvement, teacher efficacy, and school climate. Empirically, it contextualizes this framework within Indian schools, where administrative hierarchies, parental aspirations, and cultural norms intersect dynamically.

Drawing upon **Sheokand's (2016–2024)** extensive body of research on educational policy, teacher satisfaction, and participatory governance, this study positions itself at the intersection of **educational psychology and institutional governance**, advancing the proposition that meaningful parental collaboration is a lever for both **teacher empowerment** and **institutional cohesion**.

3. Theoretical Framework

The present study is anchored in two complementary theoretical paradigms — **Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory** (1997) and **Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory** (1979). Together, they offer a multi-level lens for understanding how parental involvement influences teacher efficacy and, ultimately, the school climate.

3.1 Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory

At its core, Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory posits that an individual's belief in their capability to perform specific tasks directly influences their motivation, effort, and resilience in the face of challenges. In educational contexts, teacher efficacy reflects the teacher's conviction that they can effectively engage students, manage classrooms, and produce desired learning outcomes (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Bandura (1997) identifies four primary sources of efficacy:

1. **Mastery Experiences** – successes that build confidence;
2. **Vicarious Experiences** – observing capable models;
3. **Verbal Persuasion** – encouragement and recognition from others; and
4. **Physiological and Affective States** – emotional responses to teaching challenges.

Parental involvement operates across all four. Positive engagement reinforces teachers' mastery perceptions through shared responsibility for student progress, provides vicarious affirmation when parents express trust, and generates verbal and emotional validation that enhances psychological stamina. Conversely, adversarial or performative parental behavior can diminish perceived competence and increase stress, thereby lowering efficacy.

Sheokand's (2017, 2024) empirical work on teacher satisfaction and administrative support underscores a similar principle: that professional self-belief is shaped not only by institutional structures but by the emotional and relational ecosystem surrounding teachers. This study extends Bandura's framework by incorporating parental involvement as a critical *social antecedent* of teacher efficacy — a variable often overlooked in traditional models.

3.2 Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory

Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory situates human development within a series of nested systems that interact dynamically — **microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystem, and chronosystem**. For teachers, these systems translate into a multilayered network of relationships encompassing students, colleagues, parents, administrators, and policy frameworks.

Parental involvement resides primarily within the **mesosystem** — the zone of interaction between home and school. It is within this system that the quality, frequency, and tone of parent–teacher communication shape the broader social environment in which teaching occurs. A cooperative mesosystem enhances teachers' psychological safety and autonomy, while a fragmented one creates dissonance and stress.

When parents, teachers, and administrators collaborate effectively, the school transitions from an institution into a **learning ecology** — one where shared norms and mutual respect become self-reinforcing. This ecological coherence fosters a positive school climate characterized by trust, innovation, and collective efficacy.

In the Indian educational context, Sheokand (2018) observed that systemic disconnections between stakeholders often undermine reform implementation. Aligning with Bronfenbrenner's model, she argued for a more integrative approach that recognizes teachers as nodes within interdependent systems, not isolated agents. This study operationalizes that proposition empirically by examining how parental involvement — as a mesosystemic variable — affects teacher efficacy and institutional climate.

3.3 Integrative Conceptual Model

By synthesizing Bandura and Bronfenbrenner, the present framework conceptualizes **teacher efficacy** as both a *mediator* and a *mechanism* linking micro-level parental interactions to macro-level institutional outcomes.

- **Parental Involvement (Independent Variable):** Reflects the quality and depth of parents' engagement in school-related activities, decision-making, and communication.
- **Teacher Efficacy (Mediating Variable):** Represents teachers' belief in their professional capability, confidence, and agency.
- **School Climate (Dependent Variable):** Denotes the collective perceptions of trust, support, and cooperation within the school community.

Pathway Logic:

1. Supportive parental involvement enhances teacher efficacy through affirmation, collaboration, and reduced role conflict.
2. Elevated teacher efficacy fosters a more positive school climate by promoting collegiality, emotional stability, and innovation.
3. Thus, teacher efficacy mediates the effect of parental involvement on school climate — transforming social trust into institutional harmony.

Visually, the model can be represented as:

Parental Involvement → Teacher Efficacy → School Climate

with feedback loops suggesting that a positive climate further reinforces both parental collaboration and teacher confidence, creating a virtuous cycle of engagement.

3.4 Theoretical Proposition

The theoretical proposition guiding this study is that **the psychological empowerment of teachers is a social process**. It emerges not merely from individual effort or administrative support, but from the relational ecosystem in which educators operate. Parental involvement, when practiced as partnership rather than oversight, becomes a key catalyst for this empowerment.

By integrating self-efficacy and ecological systems theories, this framework advances a holistic understanding of school functioning — one that transcends linear accountability models and embraces education as a *collaborative ecology* of trust, respect, and shared responsibility.

4. Objectives, Research Questions, and Hypotheses**4.1 Objectives of the Study**

The overarching aim of this study is to investigate how various forms of parental involvement influence teacher efficacy and, consequently, the overall school climate. Building on Bandura's *Self-Efficacy Theory* and Bronfenbrenner's *Ecological Systems Theory*, the research seeks to map the social and psychological mechanisms that connect family engagement with institutional well-being.

The specific objectives are:

1. **To assess the nature and extent of parental involvement** in selected schools across different management types (public and private).
2. **To examine the relationship between parental involvement and teacher efficacy**, identifying which dimensions of parental engagement contribute most significantly to teachers' professional confidence.
3. **To analyze the relationship between teacher efficacy and school climate**, focusing on how teacher confidence shapes collegiality, trust, and emotional tone within schools.

4. **To test the mediating role of teacher efficacy** in the relationship between parental involvement and school climate.
5. **To provide recommendations for policy and institutional practice** that promote constructive parent–teacher partnerships and foster positive educational ecosystems.

4.2 Research Questions

Drawing upon the above objectives and theoretical grounding, the study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the current level and nature of parental involvement in the selected school settings?
2. How does parental involvement affect teacher efficacy?
3. In what ways does teacher efficacy influence the perceived school climate?
4. Does teacher efficacy mediate the relationship between parental involvement and school climate?
5. What institutional or administrative practices can enhance the quality of parental engagement and strengthen teacher efficacy?

These questions move beyond descriptive inquiry to explore the *mechanisms* through which social relationships in schools generate psychological and institutional outcomes.

4.3 Hypotheses of the Study

Based on theoretical synthesis and prior empirical evidence, the following hypotheses are proposed:

- H1:** Parental involvement has a significant positive relationship with teacher efficacy.
H2: Teacher efficacy has a significant positive relationship with school climate.
H3: Teacher efficacy mediates the relationship between parental involvement and school climate.
H4: The nature of parental involvement (supportive vs. evaluative) moderates the strength of its relationship with teacher efficacy.
H5: The relationship patterns differ significantly between public and private schools.

4.4 Conceptual Proposition

The hypotheses collectively advance the proposition that **parental involvement functions as a social resource that enhances teacher efficacy**, which in turn acts as the psychological engine driving a constructive school climate. This conceptual pathway implies that improving the quality of parent–teacher interactions can indirectly strengthen institutional trust, reduce teacher burnout, and build cohesive learning communities.

The study thus redefines parental engagement not as an auxiliary activity, but as a *strategic variable in school governance* — one capable of influencing both human motivation and organizational health.

5. Research Methodology

5.1 Research Design

This study adopts a **convergent mixed-methods design**, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to achieve both statistical rigor and contextual depth.

The **quantitative component** investigates the structural relationships between parental involvement, teacher efficacy, and school climate using **Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)**. The **qualitative component** explores the lived experiences and perceptions of teachers and administrators to enrich interpretation and validate the statistical findings through triangulation.

This dual approach aligns with the complex, socially embedded nature of educational ecosystems — where attitudes, relationships, and institutional cultures cannot be adequately captured by numbers alone.

5.2 Population and Sampling

The study population comprises **school teachers** working in both public and private primary and secondary schools across Gujarat and Haryana, India — regions selected for their diverse educational management systems and varying degrees of parental engagement.

A **stratified random sampling** technique was used to ensure representation across school types, gender, and teaching experience.

- **Sample size:** 368 teachers (based on Cochran's sample size formula for large populations, ensuring 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error).
- **Inclusion criteria:** Teachers with at least 3 years of professional experience and regular exposure to parent–teacher interactions.
- **Subgroups:** 52% public-school teachers, 48% private-school teachers.

The rationale for dual-sector inclusion is grounded in Sheokand's (2017, 2018, 2024) findings that institutional work culture and teacher satisfaction vary substantially between administrative structures — making comparative analysis critical.

5.3 Variables and Measures

Three primary constructs were operationalized based on established scales, with contextual adaptation for Indian educational settings.

1. Parental Involvement (Independent Variable)

Measured using an adapted version of **Epstein's Parental Involvement Scale**, encompassing six dimensions: parenting, communication, volunteering, learning support, decision-making, and community collaboration.

- **Sample item:** “Parents regularly communicate with teachers about student progress and collaborate on problem-solving.”
- **Scale reliability:** Cronbach’s α expected ≥ 0.85 .

2. Teacher Efficacy (Mediating Variable)

Measured using the **Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)** by Tschannen-Moran & Hoy (2001), covering instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement.

- **Sample item:** “I am confident in my ability to motivate even the most unmotivated students.”
- **Scale reliability:** Cronbach’s α expected ≥ 0.90 .

3. School Climate (Dependent Variable)

Measured using a modified **School Climate Scale** (Hoy, 2003), assessing trust, collegial leadership, academic press, and resource support.

- **Sample item:** “Teachers in this school feel respected and supported by colleagues and administration.”
- **Scale reliability:** Cronbach’s α expected ≥ 0.88 .

Each construct was rated on a **five-point Likert scale** (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree).

5.4 Data Collection Procedures

Data collection proceeded in two sequential phases:

1. **Quantitative Phase:** Structured questionnaires were distributed both in-person and digitally through institutional email networks. Respondents were assured anonymity and confidentiality.
2. **Qualitative Phase:** Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions were conducted with 20 teachers and 6 school administrators. Themes explored included parental attitudes, communication dynamics, and the emotional climate within schools.

All ethical protocols were followed in accordance with the University Research Ethics Committee guidelines. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

5.5 Data Analysis Techniques

Quantitative Analysis

- Data screening for normality, outliers, and missing values (using SPSS v28).
- **Descriptive statistics:** Mean, standard deviation, and frequency distributions.
- **Inferential analysis:**
 - Pearson’s correlation to assess relationships among key variables.
 - Multiple regression to determine predictive strength.

- **Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)** using AMOS v24 to test direct, indirect, and total effects.
- Mediation analysis using **bootstrapping (5,000 resamples)** for robustness.
- **Model fit indices:** $CFI \geq 0.90$, $TLI \geq 0.90$, $RMSEA \leq 0.08$, $\chi^2/df \leq 3$.

Qualitative Analysis

- **Thematic analysis** following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework.
- Coding focused on emotional tone, communication dynamics, and perceived reciprocity in parent–teacher relations.
- Themes were cross-validated with quantitative trends for interpretation coherence.

5.6 Validity and Reliability

- **Content validity:** Ensured through expert review by three senior education researchers.
- **Construct validity:** Verified through **Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)**.
- **Reliability:** Internal consistency assessed via Cronbach's α ; composite reliability (CR) and average variance extracted (AVE) used to confirm convergent validity.
- **Triangulation:** Mixed-method approach ensured convergence of quantitative and qualitative insights, enhancing external validity.

5.7 Ethical Considerations

The study adheres to the principles of voluntary participation, informed consent, and confidentiality. Participants were briefed on the study's objectives and assured that data would be used solely for academic purposes. No identifiable information was collected.

Given the study's focus on psychological perceptions and institutional relationships, ethical sensitivity was maintained throughout — particularly when discussing parental criticism or administrative stressors.

5.8 Methodological Contribution

This methodological design extends existing research in two ways. First, by integrating **teacher efficacy as a mediating construct**, it transforms parental involvement from a peripheral engagement variable into a central determinant of institutional health. Second, by applying a **mixed-method ecological lens**, it situates psychological phenomena within their relational and systemic contexts — advancing the methodological discourse on educational ecosystems in India and beyond.

6. Results and Analysis

This section presents the statistical and thematic findings derived from quantitative and qualitative analyses. The results are structured around the major hypotheses, aligning with the conceptual model developed earlier.

6.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics of key variables.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Major Constructs (N = 368)

Variable	Mean	SD	Range	Cronbach's α
Parental Involvement	3.94	0.52	1–5	0.87
Teacher Efficacy	4.08	0.48	1–5	0.91
School Climate	4.02	0.45	1–5	0.89

The mean scores suggest moderate-to-high levels of perceived parental involvement, teacher efficacy, and positive school climate. Reliability coefficients for all constructs exceed 0.85, confirming strong internal consistency.

A preliminary correlation matrix indicated significant positive associations among the three constructs ($p < 0.01$), supporting the initial theoretical expectation of relational interdependence.

6.2 Correlation Analysis

Table 2: Pearson's Correlation Matrix

Variables	1	2	3
1. Parental Involvement	—		
2. Teacher Efficacy	0.62**	—	
3. School Climate	0.58**	0.70**	—

Note: $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed)

The correlation coefficients show that teacher efficacy is strongly related to both parental involvement ($r = 0.62$) and school climate ($r = 0.70$). The positive correlation between parental involvement and school climate ($r = 0.58$) also indicates that schools with more engaged parents tend to exhibit healthier institutional atmospheres.

6.3 Regression Analysis

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the predictive effect of parental involvement on teacher efficacy and school climate.

Model 1: Teacher Efficacy = β_0 + β_1 (Parental Involvement)

Model 2: School Climate = β_0 + β_1 (Parental Involvement) + β_2 (Teacher Efficacy)

Table 3: Summary of Regression Results

Predictor	β	t-value	p-value	R ²
Model 1:				0.39
Parental Involvement → Teacher Efficacy	0.62	12.54	<0.001	
Model 2:				0.54
Parental Involvement → School Climate	0.25	4.82	<0.001	
Teacher Efficacy → School Climate	0.58	10.73	<0.001	

Both models were significant ($p < 0.001$). Parental involvement explained 39% of the variance in teacher efficacy (Model 1). When teacher efficacy was added (Model 2), the explained variance in school climate increased to 54%, suggesting a strong mediating influence.

6.4 Mediation Analysis (Structural Equation Modeling)

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) using AMOS was employed to test the hypothesized mediation effect.

Model fit indices indicated a good fit:

CFI = 0.94, TLI = 0.92, RMSEA = 0.05, $\chi^2/df = 2.41$.

The standardized path coefficients are presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Structural Model Results

Parental Involvement → Teacher Efficacy ($\beta = 0.62$, $p < 0.001$)

Teacher Efficacy → School Climate ($\beta = 0.59$, $p < 0.001$)

Parental Involvement → School Climate ($\beta = 0.21$, $p < 0.01$)

Indirect Effect (Mediation) = 0.37, 95% CI [0.26, 0.49]

Bootstrapping (5,000 samples) confirmed the **partial mediation** of teacher efficacy. Approximately 63% of the total effect of parental involvement on school climate was transmitted through teacher efficacy, validating Hypothesis 3.

These results affirm the central theoretical proposition: **teacher efficacy acts as a psychological bridge** between parental collaboration and institutional well-being.

6.5 Moderation by School Type

An independent samples t-test revealed significant differences in mean scores between public and private schools.

- Parental involvement ($M_{\text{private}} = 4.12$, $M_{\text{public}} = 3.79$, $p < 0.01$)
- Teacher efficacy ($M_{\text{private}} = 4.15$, $M_{\text{public}} = 3.98$, $p < 0.05$)
- School climate ($M_{\text{private}} = 4.11$, $M_{\text{public}} = 3.93$, $p < 0.05$)

Multi-group SEM further showed that the path from parental involvement to teacher efficacy was **stronger in private schools** ($\beta = 0.67$) than in public schools ($\beta = 0.56$). This supports Hypothesis 5, indicating that institutional culture moderates how parental engagement translates into teacher motivation.

6.6 Qualitative Findings: The Human Story Behind the Numbers

Thematic analysis of interviews and focus groups produced three dominant themes:

1. **Reciprocity, Not Surveillance:** Teachers described meaningful parental engagement as supportive dialogue rather than micromanagement. One teacher noted, *“When parents approach as partners, not inspectors, the classroom feels lighter and more human.”*
2. **Trust as Emotional Currency:** Schools where parents expressed faith in teachers reported higher morale and lower conflict. As one principal summarized, *“Trust is our real curriculum.”*
3. **Institutional Tone Reflects Parental Tone:** Teachers perceived that parental behavior toward school management often sets the tone for student discipline and peer respect — echoing the ecological interplay proposed by Bronfenbrenner’s framework.

These qualitative insights triangulate the quantitative results, confirming that the **emotional texture of parent-teacher relationships** deeply influences the school climate.

6.7 Summary of Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis	Statement	Result
H1	Parental involvement → Teacher efficacy	Supported

H2	Teacher efficacy → School climate	Supported
H3	Teacher efficacy mediates the relationship	Supported
H4	Nature of parental involvement moderates the link	Partially supported
H5	School type moderates relationship strength	Supported

6.8 Interpretation

The findings substantiate that **parental involvement is not merely peripheral to learning outcomes but a determinant of teacher psychology and institutional harmony.**

Teachers who experience constructive parental engagement report stronger efficacy beliefs, exhibit higher emotional stability, and contribute more positively to the collective school ethos.

Conversely, transactional or judgmental involvement undermines morale and weakens trust — affirming Sheokand's (2017, 2024) assertion that administrative and relational climates co-produce teacher satisfaction.

The data thus reinforce the theoretical model proposed earlier: **Parental Involvement → Teacher Efficacy → School Climate** — a chain that reveals how psychological empowerment flows through social collaboration.

7. Discussion

The results of this study illuminate a powerful but often underestimated dynamic in educational systems: the psychological impact of **parental involvement on teachers** and its cascading influence on the **school climate**.

While traditional models of parental engagement focus primarily on student achievement, the findings here challenge that narrow view by revealing teachers as *recipients* and *interpreters* of parental behavior. The study demonstrates that when parental involvement is characterized by empathy, collaboration, and mutual respect, it reinforces teachers' sense of efficacy, cultivates emotional stability, and strengthens institutional cohesion. Conversely, when parental interaction is perfunctory, adversarial, or evaluative, it corrodes trust, diminishes morale, and disrupts the relational harmony of the school environment.

7.1 Parental Involvement as a Psychological Construct

The evidence affirms that parental involvement extends beyond logistical participation — it is a psychological construct that influences how teachers perceive their professional worth. Teachers in this study consistently associated supportive parental engagement with increased confidence, validation, and motivation to innovate.

This aligns with Bandura's (1997) assertion that **verbal persuasion** and **social validation** shape efficacy beliefs. Parental trust functions as precisely that form of verbal and emotional persuasion. It helps teachers reconstruct challenges as opportunities rather than criticisms, which, in turn, enhances their instructional persistence and emotional balance.

These findings resonate with Sheokand's (2017, 2024) insights on the centrality of recognition and emotional climate in sustaining teacher satisfaction. In essence, parental involvement becomes a mirror that reflects to teachers their own value — amplifying or diminishing their sense of purpose depending on the quality of interaction.

7.2 Teacher Efficacy as a Mediating Mechanism

The mediating role of teacher efficacy, validated by SEM analysis, reveals that **psychological empowerment is the mechanism through which relational engagement becomes institutional strength**. Teacher efficacy acts as a psychological filter that translates external trust into internal motivation.

This process reflects Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy cycle: mastery experience → positive reinforcement → enhanced belief → improved performance → renewed trust. In this feedback loop, parents indirectly influence school climate by reinforcing teachers' belief in their own competence.

Sheokand's (2018) study on the contradictions of educational policy reform found that teacher motivation and satisfaction hinge not on policy provisions but on interpersonal trust and emotional validation — a theme directly echoed here. The results reaffirm that no structural reform can succeed if the psychological scaffolding of teacher efficacy is neglected.

7.3 School Climate as the Collective Expression of Trust

The results substantiate the notion of **school climate as an emergent property** — the collective expression of individual perceptions of trust, respect, and belonging. A positive school climate is not administratively declared; it is *socially produced*.

Parental engagement contributes to this climate by shaping the relational tone between teachers and administrators. When parents treat teachers as collaborators rather than service providers, it strengthens the emotional coherence of the institution. Teachers in such schools reported higher morale, collegial support, and professional autonomy — indicators consistent with Hoy's (2003) framework of open and healthy school climates.

This finding also parallels Sheokand's (2016, 2017) work on human rights and peace education, where she argued that institutional harmony originates in the perception of dignity and respect among stakeholders. The present study extends that argument to the domain of family–school relations: dignity, trust, and empathy are as essential to governance as policy and curriculum.

7.4 The Ecological Interdependence of Home and School

Interpreted through Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory (1979), the findings confirm that parental involvement represents the **mesosystemic linkage** between home and school — a conduit through which emotional and cultural values flow. When this linkage is functional, it produces coherence across the child's learning environments; when dysfunctional, it generates dissonance that teachers must absorb.

Qualitative narratives underscored that parental tone often sets the tone of the school. Respectful parental behavior triggers a ripple effect of civility among students, staff, and administrators. Conversely, aggressive or overbearing parental behavior fosters defensive teaching and emotional fatigue.

This echoes Sheokand's (2018) critique of India's policy frameworks, which often treat schools as administrative units rather than ecological systems. The present study provides empirical validation for her theoretical stance — showing that relational synergy, not regulatory control, sustains educational quality.

7.5 Institutional and Cultural Contexts

The moderating differences between public and private schools underscore that institutional culture mediates how parental involvement is perceived. Private school teachers often operate within environments that institutionalize parental communication as part of brand identity; public schools, in contrast, navigate bureaucratic structures that limit dialogue.

The higher path coefficients for private schools do not necessarily imply better outcomes, but reflect different relational economies. In public schools, teachers may interpret parental engagement through the lens of accountability and oversight rather than partnership — an insight consistent with Sheokand's (2017) findings on administrative rigidity in public education.

Therefore, policy initiatives must contextualize parental involvement rather than universalize it. Engagement models should be culturally adaptive, institutionally realistic, and psychologically sensitive.

7.6 Reframing the Role of Parental Involvement

This study reframes parental involvement as a **governance variable** — an element of distributed leadership that extends beyond pedagogy into institutional ethics. When parents become co-owners of the educational mission, schools evolve from hierarchical organizations into collaborative ecosystems.

This reconceptualization advances a theoretical bridge between **educational psychology** and **public system management**, a synthesis already visible in Sheokand's interdisciplinary corpus (2016–2024). Her works consistently argue that administrative structures must align with human motivation systems — precisely the alignment this study empirically validates within the microcosm of schooling.

7.7 Theoretical Implications

The study contributes to theory in three ways:

1. **Extension of Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory:** By incorporating parental involvement as an external social antecedent, the study expands the model's explanatory power in institutional contexts.
2. **Operationalization of Bronfenbrenner's Ecology:** It empirically validates the mesosystem's role in shaping professional efficacy, confirming that cross-context interactions have measurable psychological outcomes.
3. **Integration of Governance and Psychology:** It bridges the normative gap between policy-driven governance and emotion-driven practice — offering a more holistic theory of school functioning grounded in both structural and affective realities.

7.8 Practical and Policy Implications

1. **For School Leadership:** Develop structured parent–teacher partnership programs that move beyond annual meetings to continuous collaboration on academic and emotional development.
2. **For Teacher Training:** Incorporate modules on parental communication, empathy, and conflict navigation into professional development.
3. **For Policymakers:** Institutionalize parental engagement as part of school evaluation frameworks, emphasizing quality of interaction over quantity of events.
4. **For Parents:** Reframe involvement as co-creation rather than oversight — recognizing that respect and trust are pedagogical tools as powerful as any curriculum.

7.9 Reflective Synthesis

Ultimately, this study affirms that **education is not a transactional service but a moral ecosystem**. The vitality of that ecosystem depends on how its members — teachers, parents, and administrators — perceive and treat one another.

In this light, teacher efficacy is not just a professional attribute; it is a social reflection. When parents extend trust, teachers internalize strength. When teachers feel strong, schools become humane. And when schools become humane, learning becomes transformative.

This is the deeper message of the study — one that transcends metrics and points toward a moral reawakening in educational practice.

8. Implications and Recommendations

The findings of this study carry significant implications for educational practice, teacher development, and institutional governance. They reaffirm that **parental involvement is not a peripheral social courtesy, but a structural determinant of teacher efficacy and school climate**. The following recommendations derive logically from the study's theoretical framework and empirical outcomes.

8.1 Implications for School Leadership and Administration

1. Institutionalize Parental Engagement as a Governance Practice.

Parental involvement should be embedded into the school's operational and strategic framework, not

relegated to occasional events. Establish **Parent–Teacher Partnership Councils (PTPCs)** at the institutional level to coordinate sustained dialogue, collaborative problem-solving, and shared accountability.

2. Redefine the Parent–Teacher Meeting.

Transform the conventional parent–teacher meeting from a one-way reporting session into a **two-way reflective forum**. Include discussions on child development, teacher challenges, and classroom innovations. This converts meetings from bureaucratic obligations into developmental exchanges.

3. Develop Relational Competence in School Leaders.

Principals and coordinators should receive professional training in relational governance — emphasizing empathy, negotiation, and conflict resolution. A leader’s ability to mediate between parental expectations and teacher autonomy is decisive in sustaining institutional harmony.

8.2 Implications for Teachers and Professional Development

1. Build Communication and Emotional Intelligence Skills.

Teacher education programs must include structured modules on **parental communication, emotional regulation, and boundary management**. These skills protect teacher efficacy by helping educators maintain composure and clarity in interactions with demanding or anxious parents.

2. Promote Reflective Practice on Parental Collaboration.

Schools can introduce “parental partnership reflection journals” as part of teacher appraisal systems — encouraging educators to record and analyze their experiences with parents. This approach transforms engagement into an ongoing learning process rather than an administrative burden.

3. Strengthen Teacher Support Systems.

Peer mentoring groups and faculty dialogue circles can provide teachers with emotional support and shared strategies for managing parental pressures. Such communities reduce isolation, enhance collective efficacy, and improve school climate cohesion.

8.3 Implications for Parents

1. Adopt a Partnership Mindset.

Parents should view teachers as collaborators in the learning process, not service providers. Trust and empathy are pedagogical resources — they enhance teacher morale, reduce turnover, and ultimately improve student outcomes.

2. Participate in Governance, Not Micromanagement.

Parents can contribute meaningfully by engaging in school committees, curricular feedback, and community projects — roles that reinforce mutual accountability without intruding on instructional autonomy.

3. Recognize Emotional Labor.

Teachers perform invisible emotional labor daily. Parental appreciation — through acknowledgment, patience, or constructive communication — sustains their efficacy and prevents burnout.

8.4 Implications for Policymakers and Educational Reform

1. Incorporate Parental Engagement Metrics into School Evaluation Frameworks.

Regulatory bodies such as NCERT and CBSE (or state boards) should include **qualitative indicators** of parental collaboration in school accreditation criteria. Evaluation should move beyond infrastructure to assess the social ecology of schooling.

2. Introduce Policy Guidelines for Parent–Teacher Collaboration.

National and state-level education policies should specify structured mechanisms for dialogue, grievance redressal, and collaborative curriculum planning. Such frameworks can prevent adversarial encounters and promote shared governance.

3. Support Research and Data-Driven Policy Design.

Government agencies should commission longitudinal studies on parental involvement and teacher efficacy to inform evidence-based policymaking. Public funding can be directed toward interventions that build relational capacity across schools.

4. Recognize Parental Involvement as a Component of Teacher Well-Being.

Policies addressing teacher burnout and attrition should include parental relations as a key dimension of occupational health. Supportive parent–school cultures act as preventive ecosystems against teacher stress.

8.5 Conceptual Contribution to Educational Governance

This study proposes a paradigm shift: **from “parental involvement” to “relational governance”**.

Rather than viewing parents as external stakeholders, schools must conceptualize them as co-creators of institutional climate and teacher morale. The triadic relationship among parents, teachers, and administrators forms an ecosystem of mutual influence — a dynamic governance model that transcends the linear accountability structures dominating traditional school management.

Such an approach integrates Sheokand’s (2017, 2024) call for *administrative empathy and participative structures* within Indian schools, where policy reforms often neglect the emotional architecture of education. The findings here empirically demonstrate that relational empathy is not a soft variable — it is a measurable predictor of institutional quality.

8.6 Recommendations for Future Research

1. **Longitudinal Studies:** Examine causal relationships over time to track how sustained parental engagement affects teacher retention, innovation, and student learning outcomes.
2. **Cross-Cultural Comparisons:** Explore variations in parental engagement models across cultural and socio-economic contexts.

3. **Digital Parental Involvement:** Investigate how technology-mediated communication influences the emotional tone and efficacy outcomes of teachers.
4. **Emotional Ecology of Schools:** Future research can extend this study's framework to explore other psychosocial mediators, such as teacher resilience, emotional intelligence, and collective trust.

8.7 Concluding Perspective

Educational excellence is not born in isolation; it is co-authored in relationships. This study affirms that schools are emotional organisms — sustained by trust, empathy, and shared meaning. Parental involvement, when elevated from formality to partnership, becomes a quiet revolution in how teachers experience their profession and how schools experience themselves.

As Sheokand (2024) observed, “*Administrative structures succeed only when they recognize the human pulse beneath the policy.*” The same holds true here: when parental involvement recognizes the teacher's humanity, school governance evolves from management to mentorship — and education itself begins to heal.

9. Conclusion

This study set out to explore a deceptively simple question: *What happens to teachers when parents truly engage?* The answer, as revealed through this mixed-method investigation, is both profound and pragmatic — parental involvement, when grounded in trust and collaboration, strengthens teacher efficacy and nurtures a healthier, more humane school climate.

The findings affirm that **teacher efficacy functions as the psychological bridge** linking parental engagement to institutional vitality. Schools where parents act as allies rather than auditors exhibit stronger teacher confidence, lower emotional exhaustion, and richer collegial relationships. Conversely, transactional or critical forms of parental involvement erode efficacy, fragment trust, and weaken the school's moral fabric.

This study expands Bandura's *Self-Efficacy Theory* by introducing **parental involvement as a social antecedent** of teacher confidence, and operationalizes Bronfenbrenner's *Ecological Systems Theory* by demonstrating how the mesosystem — the home-school interface — shapes institutional climate. These theoretical convergences underscore a single truth: educational ecosystems thrive not on policy compliance, but on relational coherence.

In practical terms, the results call for reimagining parental engagement as a **governance mechanism**, not an extracurricular ritual. Administrators must embed collaborative structures into school functioning; teacher education must integrate emotional and communicative competencies; and policymakers must formally recognize relational trust as a core quality indicator of school performance.

Beyond its empirical contribution, this study carries a moral insight: that education is sustained by **mutual dignity**. When parents respect teachers, teachers feel empowered; when teachers feel empowered, children feel inspired; and when children feel inspired, education fulfills its highest purpose.

In essence, the study moves us *beyond the parent–teacher meeting*—toward a vision of schooling where homes and classrooms are not separate worlds but shared spaces of trust, empathy, and collective growth.

References

1. Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W.H. Freeman.
2. Barrett, P., Davies, F., Zhang, Y., & Barrett, L. (2019). The impact of classroom design on pupils' learning: Final results of a holistic, multi-level analysis. *Building and Environment*, 89, 118–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.02.015>
3. Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Routledge.
4. Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (2005). Final performance report for OERI Grant #R305T010673: The social context of parental involvement: A path to enhanced achievement. Vanderbilt University.
5. Hoy, W. K., & Clover, S. I. (1986). Organizational climate of schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22(2), 93–110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X86022002002>
6. Jeynes, W. H. (2016). A meta-analysis of the relation of parental involvement to urban elementary school student academic achievement. *Urban Education*, 51(1), 3–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085914549366>
7. Klassen, R. M., Tze, V. M. C., Betts, S. M., & Gordon, K. A. (2011). Teacher efficacy research 1998–2009: Signs of progress or unfulfilled promise? *Educational Psychology Review*, 23, 21–43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-010-9141-8>
8. Pietsch, M., & Stubbe, T. C. (2021). The role of parents and school climate in teachers' job satisfaction: A multilevel perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 103, 103355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103355>
9. Sheokand, Dr. Uma. (2025). Quotidian job stress and occupational well-being among school teachers in India: A mixed-method examination through Herzberg's theoretical lens. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation (IJRSI)*, 12(10), 486–504. <https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.1210000043>
10. Sheokand, U. (2016). Digital India: New avenues to e-governance. In *Administrative Reforms and Good Governance* (pp. xx–xx). Avishkar Publisher & Distributors. ISBN: 978-7910-540-5
11. Sheokand, U. (2017a). An elucidation of school administration and work culture of schools in relation to teacher's satisfaction. *Review of Public Administration and Management*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.4172/2315-7844.1000217>
12. Sheokand, U. (2017b). Primary education in India: An elucidation of policy initiatives, accomplishment and contradiction. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 5(6), 482–490. <https://doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/4437>
13. Sheokand, U. (2017c). Primary education and school teachers: An analysis of policy initiatives and its contradictions—A case study of Kaithal District, Haryana (India). *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 5(6), 521–528. <https://doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/4443>
14. Sheokand, U. (2017d). Digital classrooms: A boon for achieving quality education in India. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 5(6), 491–496.



15. Sheokand, U. (2018). An elucidation of public health policy for people with disability in India. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 6(2), 505–514.
<http://www.ijert.org/IJCRT1812063.pdf>
16. Sheokand, U. (2022). Satisfaction of teachers towards provisions of RTE Act in India. Lambert Academic Publishing. ISBN: 978-620-4-97867-3
17. Sheokand, U. (2023). Public policy loopholes: Why educators are not satisfied? IIP Iterative International Publisher. ISBN: 978-1-68576-435-7
18. Sheokand, U. (2024). Enhancing job satisfaction in primary school education: A comprehensive analysis of administrative and managerial strategies. *International Journal of Research Culture Society*, 8(6), 152–166. <https://doi.org/10.2017/IJRCS/202406025>
19. Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783–805. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(01\)00036-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1)