



Evaluation of the Relationship Between School Governance and School Climate *

Berna Yüner ¹, Berrin Burgaz ²

Abstract

In this study, the relationship between school governance and school climate was examined based on teachers' views. This research carried out with the participation of 375 teachers in Kayseri (Melikgazi, Kocasinan and Talas) in 2016-2017 academic year, was a quantitative study. As a data collection tool "School Governance Scale" developed within the scope of this study was used to determine the realized and the targeted level of governance in the schools. For the school climate "School Climate Scale" developed by Hoy, Smith and Sweetland (2002) and adapted to Turkish within the scope of this study was used. For the reliability of the scales, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was examined. The data were analyzed using t-test, ANOVA and LSD test in post hoc tests, Pearson's correlation coefficient and multivariate regression analysis. As a result of the research, it was determined that school governance is realized at *medium* level in schools and it is targeted at a *very high* level. Also, a significant difference between the realized and the targeted level of school governance was observed. A positive moderate relationship was found between school governance and school climate dimensions. School governance's *Rule of Law* and *Participation* dimensions were found as significant predictors of school climate while *Transparency* dimension was not found to be a significant predictor.

Keywords

School Governance
School Climate
Rule of Law
Participation
Transparency

Article Info

Received: 06.05.2018
Accepted: 04.03.2019
Online Published: 07.12.2019

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2019.7961

* This article is derived from Berna Yüner's PhD dissertation entitled "Evaluation of the relationship between school governance and school climate based on teachers' views", conducted under the supervision of Berrin Burgaz.

¹ Yozgat Bozok University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, bernayuner@gmail.com

² Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, burgazberrin@gmail.com

Introduction

The social expectation for school effectiveness is increasing steadily. Moreover, the increasing demands of teachers, parents and students on participation, transparency, justice and accountability necessitate reconsideration of the processes in schools. In this respect, it is seen as important to examine governance in terms of schools. It is believed that school governance, which expresses the conduct of the teaching process in a transparent and lawful manner with the participation of the relevant school actors, has considerable influence on the organizational attitudes, behaviors, and school climate which ultimately affects school effectiveness. For this reason, the realized and targeted levels of governance practices in schools and the relationship between school governance and school climate are examined.

School Governance

Governance, different from "administration", refers to the unity of the public institutions, private sector and non-governmental organizations. The notion of governance was used in legal texts for the first time in 1989 in "Sub-Saharan Africa: Sustainable Growth from the Crisis", a report prepared by the World Bank, and it has been used to demonstrate the need for institutional reforms toward economic development and a better, more effective public sector (World Bank, 1989). Governance, which emerged as a model of economic development in the first place, has created content that advocates social and administrative innovations over time.

In the 1980s, neo-liberalism was adopted as a means of solving the economic crisis and government intervention was attempted to reduce. The new public administration (NPM), which is based on the principle of implementing a productive management approach in public services, has begun to take effect. NPM has replaced traditional, vertically organized administration with a multi-actor, responsible, transparent and accountable governance. In addition to the structural changes, governance with its principles refers to a different process (Uçkan, 2003). There is considerable work of international organizations on governance principles (World Bank, 1994; UNDP, 1997; European Commission, 2001). Despite the difference in terminology, there is a consensus on the governance principles that are targeted both at the macro level in public services and at micro level in organizations. These principles can be listed as the rule of law, participation, transparency, accountability, effectiveness, equality, responsiveness, and strategic vision.

Governance is an element of the NPM that depends on the idea that, as a response to the increased transparency, quality and accountability demands, public institutions can be re-evaluated as enterprises. Governance suggests building a multi-stakeholder and horizontal partnership rather than government-controlled administration (Tekeli, 1999). What is expected from the government is to grant authority to and strengthen both the non-governmental organizations and the private sector. One of the tools governance uses to ensure effectiveness is privatization. The aim of privatization is to ensure productivity in result-oriented market conditions. However, it is not possible to implement privatization in all public institutions (Özdemir, 2008). Especially, for the services in which human rights and national interests are concerned like education, transfer of the state's role of directing and supervising is not considered possible or reasonable. At this point, school governance can be considered as an effective process in which participatory, democratic, transparent, accountable, law-based policies are followed.

When evaluated in terms of the Turkish education system, it can be said that the National Education Development Project (NEDP), which was realized with the support of the World Bank in 1990, is the first governance practice in education. The NEDP emphasized the importance of quality in education and aimed to reach success close to OECD countries by increasing qualifications of teachers, improving teaching materials, textbooks, measurement and evaluation activities, and transferring "management skills" for the efficient use of resources (MEB, 1990). Within the scope of NEDP, Curriculum Laboratory Schools (CLO) which were planned as the pilot schools for new teaching

programs, methods, techniques and materials, were established and disseminated (MEB, 1999b). Total Quality Management (TQM), which follows “plan-do-check-act” cycle, was taken as the basis of these educational institutions. School Development Management Team (SDMT) was established to ensure planned development, and increase both the quality of education and rate of student success. Furthermore, the establishment of Educational Zones and Education Boards aimed to integrate schools with their environments in order to increase the quality of education, ensure continuity, and encourage academia and school cooperation, which can be considered educational governance (MEB, 1999a).

School governance includes the participation of school community, including school administrators, teachers, students, parents, school staff, representatives of local government, private sector and non-governmental organizations in the school district in decision making, actively operated accountability, multidirectional communication channels, financial and administrative transparency, and the initiative towards the demands of the school community.

It is essential to adopt governance in schools which forms the basis for social development. Because the school, which is defined as the education-teaching place, has an important function in transferring the social values to the younger generations with the educational function and in acquisition of the information and skills required by the age with the teaching function. In order to gain the democratic values of the 21st century, young generations have to be educated with these values from the earliest ages. Backmen and Trafford (2007) explained the need for school governance in relation to three factors: ethical reason, political reason and needs of the changing community. They advocated that in order to embrace democratic rights and freedom of people, to place democracy in the country's values, to teach critical and self-management thinking to students in today's dynamic information flow, and to adopt a perspective which accepts diversity and change as opportunity, governance is needed even from the first grade.

Bekkers Dijkstra, Edwards, and Fenger (2007) and Meral Şahin (2016) discussed governance through *Self-Regulation*, *Collective Decision Making* and *Collaboration*. On the other hand Arslan (2016) examined school governance with *Participation*, *Accountability*, *Rule of Law* and *Equality* sub-dimensions. Governance requires legal commitment, active participation of relevant actors and a transparent process within the framework of law, equality and accountability. Therefore, in the present study school governance was examined with dimensions of *Rule of Law*, *Participation* and *Transparency*. The dimension of *Rule of Law* is related to the school's accountability, compliance with laws, equality and justice. Non-distinction between teachers' gender, branch or trade union membership and, the equal approach to each student and their parents are considered within this dimension. The *Participation* dimension describes the role and responsibility of the school community. The *Transparency* dimension describes the open communication channels, display of academic performance reports, budget revenues and expenditures and school plans. In this study, the realized and targeted levels of school governance dimensions are examined regarding these dimensions. The realized governance is aimed to determine the current situation of the governance practices in schools while targeted governance aimed to determine the governance demands of the teachers.

Although the concept of governance has been dealt with in different disciplines, it is not a long time to consider it in terms of educational organizations. When the studies in the literature are examined, it can be stated that the studies focused on governance principles rather than governance in educational organizations (Arslan, 2016; Meral Şahin, 2016; Terzi, 2011; Töremen & Kılıç, 2015). The ones that focus on the principles have revealed that accountability (Arslan Durmuş, 2016; Bülbül, 2011; Chiang, 2009; Doğan, 2015; Elmore, 2005; Erdağ, 2013; Himmetoğlu, Ayduğ, & Bayrak, 2017; Kalman & Gedikoğlu, 2014; Özen, 2011; Reback, 2008; Salduz, 2013), transparency (Demirkıran, Eser, & Keklik, 2011), participation (Başyigit, 2009; Ertem, 2015; Karataş, 2012; Tanrıverdi, 2007), equality and justice (Babaoğlu & Ertürk, 2013) organizational democracy (Drucker, 1999; Geçkil & Tikici, 2015) and

freedom of expression (Yılmaz & Sarpkaya, 2009) contribute to school effectiveness by increasing the teacher and student commitment in the schools and creating a positive school climate.

School Climate

Although its structure and purpose are the same, each school has its own characteristics. What is felt in the classrooms, corridors, and gardens of a school and differs it from other locations is climate (John & Taylor, 1999). The personality that distinguishes individuals from each other responds to climate in schools. Hoy (2003) defined school climate as an organizational characteristic that differentiates one school from the other and influences the behavior of its members. School climate is the character and quality of the school life, interpersonal relationships, teaching, learning and leadership practices and organizational structure (Cohen, McCabe, Michelli, & Pickeral, 2009).

Balachandran and Thomas (2007) explained the perception of climate with the metaphor of "cognitive maps". In organizations, events and procedures have a routine. A newly joined member creates a "cognitive map" to make sense of the new process around him. This map makes it more meaningful to see what he experiences, hears and sees in the organization. With every new experience and feedback that the member has in the organization, their "cognitive maps" are reorganized. Consequently, the individual is affected by the organizational climate. In addition to that, as a member of the organization, he also affects the climate. Therefore, it can be concluded that the climate works in a cycle within the organization (Sweetland & Hoy, 2000).

Schools are complex organizations which focus on student learning and needs cooperation of managers, teachers, students, parents and other stakeholders. Within this structure, many factors influence the school climate. In the literature, there have been studies examining school climate in relation with manager attitudes and behaviors (Ayık & Şayir, 2014; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Hoy & Clover, 1986; Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939; Litwin & Stringer, 1968; Koene, Vogelaar, & Soeters, 2002; Sergiovanni, 1991), teacher attitudes and behaviors (Doğan, 2011; Halpin & Croft, 1963), student attitudes and behaviors (Freiberg, 1999; Scales & Taccogna, 2001) and institutional attitude of the school (DeWitt & Slade, 2014; Hernandez & Seem, 2004; Vail, 2005).

Studies have explained school climate with personality and health metaphors (Halpin & Croft, 1963; Hoy & Feldman, 1987; Hoy & Tarter, 1997; Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991; Hoy & Sabo, 1998; Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989; Stern, 1970). Although personality and health metaphors are different notions, there are some overlapping points in their content and measurements. Moreover, schools with an open school climate tend to be healthy and healthy schools tend to have open climate (Hoy et al., 2002). For this reason, Hoy et al. (2002) explained the school climate within a frame which encompasses both personality and health, in four dimensions: *Institutional Vulnerability*, *Collegial Leadership*, *Professional Teacher Behavior*, and *Achievement Press*. This study was also conducted through the same dimensions.

The school climate was explained with four dimensions: *Institutional Vulnerability*, *Collegial Leadership*, *Professional Teacher Behavior*, and *Achievement Press*. The *Collegial Leadership* dimension frames the leadership that focuses both on the realization of school goals and on meeting the social needs of the school. It examines the manager's accessibility, openness to different ideas and innovations, and effort to maintain established standards. The dimension of *Professional Teacher Behavior* examines teachers' respect for their colleagues' competencies, their mutual relations, devotions to students, and self-assessment skills. The *Achievement Press* dimension examines the perspective of the school community including the manager, teachers, students and parents about academic achievement. It comprises the goals set at the school and the effort required to achieve these goals. The *Institutional Vulnerability* dimension describes the relationship of the school with society, and the attitude of school as it relates to the pressure from parents and citizens.

School climate is a fundamental component of Edmonds' (1979) effective school model. Only schools that have positive climate can enhance their effectiveness. Plans and reforms to improve the school cannot be successful if the school climate is not taken into account (Dellar, 1998; MacNeil, Prater, & Busch, 2009). Positive school climate has a positive effect on all school members and it supports not only students' academic development, but also their social and psychological development. Studies have revealed that students who perceive school climate as positive, show less risky and violent behaviors (Resnick et al., 1997), receive less discipline penalties (Nelson, Martella, & Marchhand-Martella, 2002; Welsh, 2000), have a strong sense of trust (Syvertsen, Flanagan, & Stout, 2009; Welsh, 2000) and have higher life satisfaction (Suldo, McMahan, Chappel, & Loker, 2012).

Healthy and open school climate has remarkable results for both organizational goals and psychological satisfaction of the members. In schools with a positive climate, members of the organization feel that they are valuable (Gonder & Hymes, 1994) and work in cooperation by devoting themselves to their work (Ellis, 1988). In these schools, change is accomplished in a shorter period of time without resistance (Bulach & Malone, 1994). Schools with high morale and motivation also have high academic performance (Kelley, Thornton, & Daugherty, 2005). Positive school climate perceptions of teachers are associated with higher student achievement in reading and mathematics (Brand, Felner, Seitsinger, Burns, & Bolton, 2008; Uline, Tschannene-Moran, & Wolsey 2009). In addition, it has been found that positive school climate has a positive relationship with organizational motivation, job satisfaction and commitment (Gediköglü & Tahaoğlu, 2010).

Management policies have significant influence on the organization climate. Leadership behaviors affect the perceptions of organization members (Ekvall & Ryhammar, 1998; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Koene et al., 2002). Regarding schools, Sergiovanni (1991) has found that the greatest factor in determining climate is the leadership style adopted by the manager. This finding is in line with many studies that indicate the school principal has greater influence than other individuals at school and that the positive school climate can only initiate with a principal desiring a positive school climate (Ayık & Şayir, 2014; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Hoy & Clover, 1986; Sybouts & Wendel, 1994).

The structure of communication between student-teacher-principal, transparency and accountability and involvement of stakeholders differ according to the leadership style of the principal. Therefore, the transition from administration to governance is thought have a considerable effect on the school climate. There are national (Ayık & Şayir, 2014; Tahaoğlu, 2007; Varlı, 2015) and international studies (Fultz, 2011; Tajasom & Ahmad, 2011) on the effects of different leadership behaviors on school climate. These studies suggest that the democratic attitudes of the school administration will positively affect the school climate. Similarly, Hughes and Pickeral (2013) stated that within the scope of shared leadership, sharing responsibility with managers, teachers, students, staff and parents can create a positive climate that could overcome the encountered problems.

Governance advocates the active participation of the relevant actors throughout the whole process from planning to evaluation. Within the scope of school governance, participation of teachers, students, parents and related institutions in decisions and evaluation of the process is aimed. Consequently, it is desired to create a school that is aware of local needs and can respond to these needs more quickly and on the spot. Similarly, the study conducted by Boadua, Milondzo, and Adjei (2009) found that in the schools where family participation and social participation were provided, teachers were highly influential and this situation contributed to the students' positive behaviors and academic success. It was also stated that participation is effective in providing discipline, in terms of students coming to school on time, taking responsibility of homework and making teachers feel safe about getting support whenever they need. Similarly, Sarafidou and Chatziioannidis (2013) found a positive relationship between the participation of teachers in the decision and their perception of positive school

climate. For this reason, it is believed to be important to examine the relationship between school governance practices and school climate.

It is observed that in literature many of the studies focused on the principles of governance. However, the principles of governance are in a mutual interaction, and it is not enough to implement a single principle to achieve governance. Therefore, it is considered important to consider governance as a whole in schools. Furthermore, a study examining the relationship between school governance and school climate was not found in national and international literature. Therefore, the purpose of the present study is to examine the relationship between school governance and school climate based on teachers' opinions. In the study it is also questioned whether the realized and targeted school governance differ. The research questions are as follows;

1. How are teachers' opinions towards the realized and targeted governance and school climate?
2. Is there a significant difference between teachers' views on realized and targeted governance?
3. Is there a significant correlation among research variables?
4. Is school governance a significant predictor of school climate?

Method

The present study which aims to measure the realized and targeted level of school governance practices and to describe the relationship between school governance and school climate based on teacher views in public and private secondary schools, is a correlational survey. The data were analyzed with quantitative statistical technique.

Population and Sampling

The study's population constitutes 1890 teachers, including 1316 teachers in 32 public secondary schools in the central districts of Kayseri (Melikgazi, Kocasinan, Talas) and 574 teachers in 27 private secondary schools in 2016-2017 academic year. In the selection of the sample, "stratified sampling technique" was used considering the number of teachers working in public and private schools in districts. For this purpose, the research population was stratified firstly according to district level then to the number of teachers working in school types,

It was calculated that 328 teachers could represent the target population of 1890 teachers at the level of $\alpha = .05$ significance and 5% tolerance (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Erkan, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2008, p.96). Among 400 data collection tools, 375 were found to be appropriate for analysis.

It was observed that 46.9% of the 375 teachers who participated in the survey were female and 53.1% were male. 66% of teachers are in public schools and 34% are in private schools. It was seen that 30.9% of the teachers had 1-10 years, 32% of them had 11-20 years and 37.1% had 21 years or more of seniority. In addition, 40.5% of the teachers in the survey are members of a trade union, while 59.5% are not trade union members. Regarding of the socioeconomic status of schools, 4.8% of teachers noted their school's SES as low, 76.8% as moderate, 18.4% as high.

Data Collection Tools

The "School Governance Scale" developed within the scope of this study was used to determine the current and the targeted level of school governance based on teacher opinions in public and private secondary schools. "School Climate Scale", developed by Hoy et al. (2002) and adapted to the Turkish within the scope of this study was used to examine teachers' perception of school climate.

School Governance Scale (SGS): The scale was developed to determine the current level of governance and the level of governance in schools within the scope of this study. In the development process of SGS, firstly, literature was reviewed to examine the governance concept (World Bank, 1994;

UNDP, 1997; European Commission, 2001). Scale items were formed considering the governance principles such as participation, consensus tendency, transparency, accountability, responsiveness, strategic vision, rule of law, equality and openness. Items were given to 8 field experts for validity. Regarding the opinions of the experts, the scale items were shortened in number and 28-item 5-point Likert scale was prepared for pilot study.

The results obtained from the pilot study which was conducted with 178 teachers, were found to appropriate for Explicit Factor Analysis (EFA) (KMO = .93; Barlett Sphericity = $p < .05$). Results of the EFA, showed three factor structures of the scale with factor load from .53 to .82. The dimensions were named according to the items related to governance principles accepted in the literature. The first dimension, which includes items related to the principles of law, equality and accountability was called *Rule of Law*, the second dimension that includee the items related to the participation of the relevant actors was called *Participation* and the third dimension including the items related to the transparency of the process was called the *Transparency*. The scale explained 59.31% of the total variance. *Rule of Law* dimension explained 47.9%, *Participation* dimension explained 9.82% and *Transparency* dimension explained 6.31% of the total variance. In the substance discrimination analysis, the mean of the 27% lower and upper groups were examined and it was determined that the groups showed statistically significant differences. The item-total correlation coefficient values of the scale items were found to be between .47 and .75. The Cronbach alpha coefficients of the scale and its subscales were calculated in order to test the reliability of the scale. The Cronbach alpha value of the scale was calculated .93. for *Rule of Law* dimension, .90, for *Participation* dimension, .85 for *Transparency* dimension and .95 for the scale. The construct validity of the three-factor scale, which was formed after EFA, was tested with Confirmatory Factor Analysis and the goodness of fit values were found within the acceptance limits [$\chi^2 = 384.00$; Sd = 296; $\chi^2 / Sd = 1.29$; AGFI = 0.97; GFI = 0.83; NFI = 0.97; CFI = 0.99; IFI = 0.99; RMSEA = 0.04]. Furthermore, the CFA was repeated after the main practice with 375 people. The goodness of fit values obtained from the analysis [$\chi^2 = 778.26$; Sd = 347.43; $\chi / Sd = 2.24$; AGFI = 0.97; GFI = 0.97; NFI = 0.95; CFI = 0.97; IFI = 0.98; RMSEA = 0.05] were found within the acceptance limits. Based on these results, it was assumed that the scale is a valid and reliable scale (Kline, 2005). Each item in the scale is rated from the lowest, 1 to the highest, 5, respectively for the realized and targeted governance. The realized governance reveals to what degree governance principles are followed at schools, and the targeted governance reveals teachers' demands for governance practices. The mean score can be taken from the scale and there are no items scored reversely.

School Climate Scale (SCS): Hoy et al. (2002) developed the original scale to examine teachers' school climate perceptions. It comprises four factors; *Institutional Vulnerability*, *Collegial Leadership*, *Professional Teacher Behavior*, and *Achievement Press*. The scale explains 69.8% of the total variance. The variance explained by the dimensions were found 33.2%, 18.8%, 9.5%, and 8.3%, respectively. As a result of the reliability analysis, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the scale dimensions were reported as .87, .94, .88, .92 for the dimensions, respectively. (Hoy et al., 2002).

For this study, during the adaptation of the scale, expert opinions were asked for language reliability. The original scale was developed as a four-point Likert. However, the scale of the toher varibale, the scale of school governance, is a five-point Likert-type scale. In order to facilitate the comparison and understanding of variable data, the School Climate Scale was adopted as a five-point Likert by obtaining permission from the responsible author. In the literature, it was reported that the validity and reliability of the scale were independent of the Likert degree (Finn, 1972; Jacoby & Matell, 1971). The items were valued from 1 to 5, with "Never", "Rarely", "Occasional", "Mostly" and "Always" ratings. Within the scope of the pilot study, the Turkish version was applied to 224 teachers. For scale validation, CFA was conducted, and the goodness of fit values were calculated as [$\chi^2 = 729.72$; sd = 357; $\chi^2 / sd = 2.04$; AGFI = 0.92; GFI = 0.93; NFI = 0.86; CFI = 0.92; IFI = 0.95; RMR = 0.041; RMSEA = 0.08].

For the reliability analysis, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was re-calculated. The Cronbach alpha value of the scale was calculated.89. for *Collegial Leadership* dimension, .88, for *Professional Teacher Behavior* dimension, .79 for *Achievement Press* dimension and .60 for *Institutional Vulnerability* dimension and .88 for the scale. Based on the goodness of fit and reliability coefficient results, the Turkish version of the Scale for School Climate Index was accepted as a valid and reliable scale. (Kline, 2005). 2nd, 5th, 11th and 24th items under the *Institutional Vulnerability* dimension were coded reversely. The total scores of the scale can be taken. The high score from the school climate scale is interpreted as open and healthy school climate. In schools where school climate is highly perceived, the school principal is seen as a leader who expresses his expectation from teachers, tries to meet the school goals and social needs of the school, and approaches everyone equally and friendly. In addition, their management protects teachers from unjustified pressures. In these schools, high but achievable targets are determined for their students and the learning environment is organized and serious. Teachers are committed to teaching and learning, trust their colleagues and describe their school positively. The low score of the School Climate Scale is interpreted as closed and unhealthy climate. In these schools, it is possible to think that the administrator has low ability to guide, structure and support teachers, and that teachers have negative attitude towards their colleagues and their duties. Teachers who perceive low school climate are in a skeptical and self-defensive manner and cannot rely on their colleagues and management. The motivation for academic achievement is very low.

Processes and Data Analysis

Data were collected through visiting the schools by the researcher between April-June in 2016-2017 academic year. Before the collection of the data, the approval from the ethics committee and the required permission from the Kayseri Provincial Directorate of National Education was also received. Teachers participated the study voluntarily. Before analyzing the data set, frequency values and Mahalonobis distances were examined for the detection of outliers and it was determined that there were no outliers. Normal distribution of the data was checked and distribution graphs revealed that the skewness and kurtosis coefficients of the groups were within ± 1 the acceptable limits and the points on the Q-Q graph concentrated on the curve. The scatter plots were analyzed and the assumption of multivariate normality was met. Correlation coefficients between the variables were examined and the coefficients were found to be less than .80 and it was found that the data did not show a multi-connection problem Therefore, it was determined that the data are normally distributed and parametric analysis could be used (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013; George & Mallery, 2010).

Arithmetical mean scores and standard deviation scores were used for the analysis of teachers' opinions on the realized and expected governance, and school climate. The difference between the realized and targeted governance mean scores was tested by *t*-test. Pearson Correlation Coefficients are used to determine the correlation between school governance and school climate. The mean scores for the variables were interpreted as *very low* between 1.00 and 1.79, as *low* between 1.80 - 2.59, as *medium* between 2.60 - 3.39, as *high* between 3.40 - 4.19 and *very high* 4.20 - 5.00. The absolute value of correlation coefficient was interpreted as *low* if it was lower than 0.30, as *medium* if it was between 0.30 and 0.70, and as *high* if it was higher than 0.70 (Büyüköztürk, Çokluk, & Köklü, 2012). In the comparisons, significance tests were conducted at $p = .05$ level. Multiple regression analysis was used for the analysis of school governance's predictive impact on school climate.

Results

In the study, firstly, realized and targeted school governance and school climate were examined based on the teachers' opinions. In addition, the difference between realized and expected levels of school governance and the relations among variables were investigated. Descriptive statistics of the realized and expected school governance and school climate based on teacher's opinions were presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Variables

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Realized School Governance	375	3.34	.70	.24	-.22
Rule of Law	375	3.74	.84	.55	.24
Participation	375	3.14	.73	.29	-.18
Transparency	375	2.90	.91	.32	-.44
Targeted School Governance	375	4.13	.61	-.74	-.04
Rule of Law	375	4.39	.62	-.98	.59
Participation	375	3.96	.66	-.77	.46
Transparency	375	3.88	.84	-.59	-.19
School Climate	375	3.63	.45	-.26	-.16
Collegial Leadership	375	3.83	.62	-.55	-.06
Professional Teacher Behaviour	375	3.85	.56	-.43	.07
Achievement Press	375	3.52	.56	-.06	-.01
Institutional Vulnerability	375	3.58	.65	-.69	.85

As seen from Table 1, school governance is realized at *moderate* level (\bar{X} = 3.34) and expected at *high* level (\bar{X} = 4.13). Realized school governance values have revealed that *Rule of Law* dimension has the highest mean score (\bar{X} = 3.74) while *Transparency* dimension has the lowest (\bar{X} = 2.90). It is the same for the expected school governance. The *Rule of Law* dimension has the highest average (\bar{X} = 4.39) and *Transparency* dimension has the lowest mean score (\bar{X} = 3.63). According to teachers' perceptions, school climate is high (\bar{X} = 3.63). It can be observed that all dimensions of school climate have *high* means while the *Professional Teacher Behavior* dimension has the highest (\bar{X} = 3.85) and the *Achievement Press* dimension has the lowest (\bar{X} = 3.52) mean score. The *t*-test was conducted to test the significance of difference between realized and expected school governance. Table 2 presents the *t*-test results of teachers' opinions on realized and expected school governance.

Table 2. Results of The T-Test on Realized and Expected School Governance

School Governance	N	\bar{X}	Ss	sd	t	p
Realized	375	3.34	.70	374	92.245	.000*
Targeted	375	4.21	.61	374		

As seen from Table 2, according to the teachers' opinions, school governance is expected at very *high* level (\bar{X} = 4.21) while it is realized at *moderate* level (\bar{X} = 3.34). The result of the *t*-test showed that the difference in favor of expected school governance is statistically significant [*t* (375) = 92.245, *p* < .01]. In other words, teachers indicate that the existing governance practices in their schools are at a moderate level while they demand these practices at very high level.

In this study, it is aimed to examine the relationship between the existing governance practices in schools and the school climate. Therefore, in this section targeted governance is not analyzed. Correlation between school governance and school climate was examined with Pearson Correlation coefficient. Results were presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Pearson Correlation Matrix

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Realized School Governance	1.00								
2. School Climate	.606**								
3. Rule of Law	.883**	.546**							
4. Participation	.872**	.534**	.609**						
5. Transparency	.667**	.444**	.631**	.654**					
6. Collegial Leadership	.667**	.861**	.631**	.575**	.453**				
7. Professional Teacher Behaviour	.496**	.855**	.463**	.421**	.355**	.667**			
8. Achievement Press	.530**	.894**	.439**	.495**	.421**	.724**	.667**		
9. Institutional Vulnerability	.561**	.816**	.517**	.497**	.387**	.665**	.612**	.665**	1.00

** $p < .01$

As it can be followed in Table 3, there is a positive moderate relationship between school governance and school climate ($r_{GOY \times OI} = .60$; $p < .001$). among the dimensions, the *Rule of Law* dimension ($r_{RL \times CL} = .631$; $p < .001$; $r_{RL \times PTB} = .463$; $p < .001$; $r_{RL \times AP} = .439$; $p < .001$; $r_{RL \times IV} = .497$; $p < .001$), *Participation* dimension ($r_P \times CL = .575$, $p < .001$, $r_P \times PTB = .421$, $p < .001$, $r_P \times AP = .495$, $p < .001$; $r_P \times IV = .497$; $p < .001$) and *Transparency* dimension ($r_T \times CL = .453$; $p < .001$; $r_T \times PTB = .355$; $p < .001$; $r_T \times AP = .421$; $p < .001$; $r_T \times IV = .387$; $p < .001$) were found to have moderate positive relationship with all dimensions of school climate. To test whether school governance is a significant predictor of school climate or not, multiple regression analysis was conducted. Results of the analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Results of Multiple Regression Analysis

Dependent Variable= School climate					
Variables	B	Standart Error _B	β	t	p
Constant	2.388	.112		21.227	.000
Rule of Law	.170	.036	.322	4.773	.000**
Participation	.134	.050	.221	2.691	.008**
Transparency	.060	.036	.123	1.656	.099

$R = .579$; $R^2 = .335$; $F(40.873)$; $p = .000$

** $p < .010$

As seen from Table 4, school governance is a significant predictor of school climate ($R = .579$, $R^2 = .335$, $p < .01$). According to these findings, 33% of the school climate is explained by the dimensions of school governance. The standardized regression coefficients (β) show the order of importance in explaining school climate as *Rule of Law* ($R^2 = .322$, $p < .001$), *Participation* ($R^2 = .221$, $p < .001$) and *Transparency* ($R^2 = .123$, $p < .0001$). When p values results for the significance of the regression coefficients were examined, *Rule of Law* ($p < .01$) and *Participation* dimension ($p < .01$) were significant predictors of the school climate whereas *Transparency* dimension was not a significant predictor ($p > .05$).

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

The present study examined the relationship between school governance and school climate based on the teachers' opinions. Primarily, the difference between the realized and targeted school governance was questioned. For these purposes, the data were analyzed with descriptive statistics, correlation and regression analysis.

The data showed that school governance is realized at moderate level but targeted at high level. Teachers think that realized governance practices are not sufficient. They demand their schools follow a more participative policy in which teachers, parents and related stakeholders have right to speak in decision process. The finding revealing participation is not realized sufficiently is parallel to the findings of studies that show teachers do not *always* participate in educational and management decisions (Yılmaz, 2006; Karaevli & Levent, 2014; Başığit, 2009). *Rule of Law* dimension has the highest mean score for the expected school governance. In the *Rule of Law* dimension, there are items which include sharing of the school evaluation results, explaining the reasons for the decisions taken and the reasons that can not be applied, equal treatment to each student and parents, not making distinctions according to gender, branch and being a trade union membership, and adoption of a fair approach in rewarding and in the distribution of duties. In this direction, it can be stated that the highest demands of the teachers are related to equality, justice and accountability. This finding is consistent with the study of Erdağ and Karadağ (2017) which found that principals and teachers regard accountability as the most effective way to improve academic performance in schools. Accountability and transparency are two principles that work together. For this reason, it can be stated that teachers and principals who have taken responsibility for accountability will act on the principle of transparency at the same time.

Professional Teacher Behavior comprises respect for colleague competence, teachers' commitment to the student, self-assessment, working in collaboration and support. *Colleagial Leadership* refers to the school managers who consider teachers as professional colleagues, reveal their expectations and performance criteria clearly, try to realize their school goals and also pay attention to social needs. In this study, the dimensions of *Professional Teacher Behavior* and *Colleagial Leadership* have a relatively high average which can be interpreted as teachers' relationship with their colleagues, their beliefs about their competencies, the attitude of the principle, and the communication method have priority in perception of positive school climate. This finding is consistent with the similar studies revealing relationships within the school as the main factor of school climate (Çağlayan, 2014, Sezgin & Kılınc, 2011, Kavgacı, 2010, Süpçin, 2000). Moreover, the high levels of these dimensions can also be interpreted as that teachers work with their colleagues in co-operation with pleasure, strive to increase student achievement, and think that school principals are accessible and open to different ideas.

Another finding of the present study is that there are significant positive, *moderate* correlations between school governance and all dimensions of school climate. Based on these results, it can be declared that as the participation of stakeholders, equality, justice, accountability and transparency in schools increases, the climate of schools becomes more positive. As the climate is perceived more positive, teachers find managers more accessible and open-minded and work harder to increase the success of their students. Freiberg (1999) found that positive school climate increased school efficiency and student achievement. In the same vein, Akbaba and Erdoğan (2014) found that a positive school climate increased the motivation of the employees and had a positive effect on the increase of academic achievement. In schools with positive school climate tend to have higher success rate because in these schools, teachers have high level of confidence that their students will be able to succeed. While the students are working diligently to improve their success, parents are the followers of the students. Moreover, both students and teachers feel social support. It can be inferred from the findings that as participation, transparency and accountability are ensured in school, teachers, students and parents give more intensive effort to achieve the school goals. The transparency of school practices and the

presence of accountability enhances confidence in the school. In addition, teachers feel that they are guarded against unjustified pressures from the outside.

Management policies and form of leadership behaviors have decisive influence on school climate (Hoy & Clover, 1986). The leadership that school principals exhibit have great influence on the organizational climate of schools.. In this direction, the attitude of the school principals is very important for the realization of school governance. In the studies of Littrell, Billingsley, & Cross (1994) and Tahaoğlu (2007), it was determined that school administrators had a significant effect on teachers' perceptions of school climate; teachers who defined their principals as supportive, found their job more meaningful and school environment more efficient and motivating. Fultz (2011) found that the principal's co-operation and support for participation influence teachers' school climate perception. Similarly, Johnson and Johnson (1993) stated that with a school governance sharing responsibility with parents, students and teachers, school climate would be positive. Spicer (2016) stated that ensuring the participation of parents and school community will affect the school climate positively. In a similar way, Ertem (2015) found a positive relationship between families' participation and their school climate perception.

The study showed that school governance is a significant predictor of school climate. Nearly one-third of the school climate is explained by the dimensions of school governance. *Rule of Law* and *Participation* dimensions are significant predictors. *Rule to Law* represents principles of accountability, equity and justice. What teachers desire primarily in their schools is found *justice* (Yılmaz, 2006). School principals' fairness in the distribution of tasks and practices, evaluation and reward affect the perception of school climate positively (Ayık, Savaş, & Çelikel, 2014). Ertan-Kantos and Balcı (2011) stated that principal has primarily responsibility to create positive school climate which is considered as one of the most important factors in student success. Similarly, Spicer's (2016) study examining the influence of school principals in determining school climate, drew attention to the role of ensuring participation of school community in positive school climate.

Transparency dimension was not found to be a meaningful predictor in the school climate ($t = 1.656, p > .05$). This finding contradicts with the literature. Karaevli and Levent (2014) examining the effects of transparency on teachers in different career stages, stated that transparency in school governance contribute to the professional development of teachers, effective communication and sustainable trust environment. In this direction, it is an unexpected finding of the present study that the *Transparency* dimension does not predict the school climate.

In conclusion, the findings of this study clarified the role of school governance on teachers' perceptions of school climate. The implementation of the principles of school governance, in other words ensuring participation, the non-discrimination between teachers and students, the clarification of the practices with reasons, evaluation of the process and possible solutions for unattained targets, will make each teacher, student and parent feel valuable and important for the school. Thus, each actor will want to take more responsibility for achieving the goals of education. Teachers' confidence in their self-efficacy and collective competence will positively impact their school commitment, motivation and performance. The ultimate goal of the education system is to increase the effectiveness of the school and to ensure that students' learning at the highest level. In this respect, the importance of the positive school climate and the effect of governance on climate can be clearly understood.

Based on the results of the study, following suggestions can be made for practitioners. Organizing the board meetings in the educational districts seriously and sharing authority with the provincial organization might improve cooperation between school and the environment. School principals can encourage the involvement of related stakeholders to detect deficiencies of realized governance and to take their suggestions to improve it. They can also encourage teachers for in-service training and postgraduate studies and implement incentives for increasing the quality of the teachers

For researchers, the following suggestions might be beneficial: Carrying out the similar study based on the opinions of principals, students and parents might provide extensive information about the relationship between school governance and school climate. Conducting the study at other school levels and school types can help to uncover different variables, especially in vocational high schools which have the mission of educating intermediate staff may be useful to examine the relationship between the sector and the school. The role of school governance and school climate on educational outcomes can be investigated by examining variables such as academic performance of students, private sector satisfaction, and views of graduate students.

References

- Akbaba, A., & Erdoğan, H. (2014). Okul yöneticileri ve öğretmen görüşlerine göre okul ikliminin oluşması. *The Journal of Academic Social Science*, 5, 211-227.
- Arslan Durmuş, S. (2016). *İlk ve ortaokul öğretmenlerinin idareye karşı hak arama durumlarına ve hesap verebilirlik düzeylerine ilişkin algıları* (Unpublished master's thesis). Abant İzzet Baysal University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Bolu.
- Arslan, M. S. (2016). *Özel ve devlet okullarının yönetim özelliklerine sahip olma düzeyleri* (Unpublished master's thesis). Harran University, Social Science Institute, Şanlıurfa.
- Ayık, A., Savaş, M., & Çelikel, G. (2014). Ortaöğretim kurumlarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin okul iklimi ve örgütsel güven algıları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11(27), 203-220.
- Ayık, A., & Şayir, G. (2014). İlköğretim kurumlarında görevli okul müdürlerinin öğretimsel liderlik davranışlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, 18(60), 15-30.
- Babaoğlan, E., & Ertürk, E. (2013). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet algısı ile örgütsel adanmışlıkları arasındaki ilişki. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28(2), 87-101.
- Backmen, E., & Trafford, B. (2007). *Okulların demokratik yönetişimi*. Strasbourg Cedex: Avrupa Konseyi Yayınları.
- Balachandran, M., & Thomas, I. (2007). Dimensions of organizational climate. *The Psychospace*, 1(1), 27-36.
- Başığit, F. (2009). *Öğretmenlerin karar alma sürecine katılım düzeylerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri ile ilişkisi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Bekkers, V., Dijkstra, G., Edwards, A., & Fenger, M. (2007). *Governance and the democratic deficit: assessing the democratic legitimacy of governance practices*. London: Routledge.
- Boadua, N., Milondzo, K., & Adjei, A. (2009). Parent community involvement in school governance and its effects on teacher effectiveness and improvement of learner performance. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 4(3), 96-105.
- Brand, S., Felner, R. D., Seitsinger, A., Burns, A., & Bolton, N. (2008). A large scale study of the assessment of the social environment of middle and secondary schools: The validity and utility of teachers' ratings of school climate, cultural pluralism, and safety problems for understanding school effects and school improvement. *Journal of School Psychology*, 46, 507-535.
- Bulach, C., & Malone, B. (1994). The relationship of school climate to the implementation of school reform. *ERS Spectrum*, 12(4), 3-8.
- Bülbül, M. (2011). *Türk milli eğitim sisteminde hesap verebilirlik* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çokluk, Ö., & Köklü, N. (2012). *Sosyal Bilimler İçin İstatistik* (10th ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2008). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: PEGEM Yayıncılık.
- Chiang, H. (2009). How accountability pressure on failing schools affects student achievement. *Journal of Public Economics*, 93, 1045-1057.
- Cohen, J., McCabe, L., Michelli, N. M., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 111(1), 180-213.
- Çağlayan, E. (2014). *Okul binaları ve örgüt iklimi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İzmir.
- Dellar, G. B. (1998). School climate, school improvement and site-based management. *Learning Environments Research*, 1(3), 353-367.

- Demirkıran, Ö., Eser, H. M. & Keklik, B. (2011). Demokrasinin tabana yayılması, yönetimde şeffaflık ve hesap verebilirlik bağlamında bilgi edinme hakkı kanunu. *Akdeniz Üniversitesi Uluslararası Alanya İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(2), 169-192.
- DeWitt, P., & Slade, S. (2014). *School climate change: How do i build a positive environment for learning?*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Doğan, D. (2015). *Türkiye'deki yüksek öğretim kurumlarında hesap verebilirlik ve akademik özgürlük* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Institute of Education, Eskisehir.
- Doğan, S. (2011). *Genel lise öğrencilerinin algılarına göre okul tahripçiliği ile okul iklimi arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Drucker, P. F. (1999). *Management challenges for the 21st century*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-18.
- Ekvall, G., & Ryhammar, L. (1998). Leadership style, social climate and organizational outcomes: A study of a Swedish university college. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 7, 126-30.
- Ellis, T. I. (1988). *School climate*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED291154.pdf>
- Elmore, R. F. (2005). Accountable leadership. *The Educational Forum*, 69(2), 134-142.
- Erdağ, C. (2013). *Okullarda hesapverebilirlik politikaları: Bir yapısal eşitlik modelleme çalışması* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Institute of Education, Eskisehir.
- Erdağ, C., & Karadağ, E. (2017). Öğretmenler ve okul müdürleri perspektifinden okul hesap verebilirliği politikaları. *Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(13), 459-496.
- Ertan-Kantos, Z., & Balcı, A. (2011). İlköğretim okulu yönetici ve öğretmenlerinin görüşlerine göre kamu ve özel ilköğretim okulları için bir hesap verebilirlik modeli. *Eğitim Bilimleri ve Uygulama*, 10(20), 107-138.
- Ertem, H. Y. (2015). *The relationship between parents' perceptions of school climate and their involvement in school / Velilerin okul iklimi algısı ve onların okulda katılımı arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- European Commision. (2001). *European governance a white paper*. Brussels: European Commision.
- Finn, R.H. (1972). Effects of some variations in rating scale characteristics on the means and reliabilities of ratings. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 32(2), 255-265.
- Freiberg, H. J. (1999). Introduction. In H. J. Freiberg (Ed.), *School climate: Measuring, improving and sustaining healthy learning environments* (pp. 1-10). Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis.
- Fultz, D. M. (2011). *Principal influence on school climate: A networked leadership approach* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Ohio State University, USA.
- Geçkil, T., & Tikici, M., (2015). Örgütsel demokrasi ölçeği geliştirme çalışması. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 48(4), 41-78.
- Gedikoğlu, T., & Tahaoğlu, F. (2010). İlköğretim okullarının örgüt iklimi: Gaziantep ili Şahinbey ve Şehitkamil ilçeleri örneği. *Milli Eğitim*, 186, 38-55.
- George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: a simple guide and reference, 17.0 update* (10th ed.) Boston: Pearson.
- Gonder, P. O., & Hymes, D. (1994). *Improving school climate and culture*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9, 157-191. doi:10.1080/0924345980090203
- Halpin, A. W., & Croft, D. B. (1963). *The organizational climate of schools*. Chicago, IL: Midwest Administration Center of the University of Chicago.

- Hernandez, T. J. & Seem, S. R. (2004). A safe school climate: A systemic approach and the school counselor. *Professional School Counseling*, 7(4), 256-262.
- Himmetoğlu, B., Ayduğ, D., & Bayrak C. (2017). Eğitim örgütlerinde hesap verebilirliğe ilişkin okul yöneticilerinin görüşleri. *Turkish Online Journal Of Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 39-68. doi:10.17569/tojqi.288852
- Hoy, J. K. & Tarter C. J. (1997). *The road to open and healthy schools: The handbook for change*. CA: Corwin.
- Hoy, W. K. (2003). School climate. In J.W. Guhtrie (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of education* (2nd ed.). New York: Thompson Gale.
- Hoy, W. K., & Clover, S. I. (1986). Elementary school climate: A revision of the OCDQ. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22(1), 93-110.
- Hoy, W. K. & Feldman, J. A. (1987). Organizational health: The concept and its measure. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 20, 30-38.
- Hoy, W. K., & Sabo, D. J. (1998). *Quality middle schools: Open and healthy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hoy, W. K., Smith, P., & Sweetland, S. R. (2002). The development of the organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *High School Journal*, 38(12).
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). *Open schools/healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate*. London, UK: Sage.
- Hughes, W., & Pickeral, T. (2013). *School climate and shared leadership*. New York, NY: National School Climate Center.
- Jacoby, J., & Matell, M. S. (1971). Three-point likert scales are good enough. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8(4), 495-500.
- John, M. C., & Taylor, W. T (1999). Leadership style, school climate and the institutional commitment of teachers. *International Forum*, 2(1), 25-57.
- Johnson, W. L., & Johnson, M. (1993). Validity of the quality of school life scale: A primary and secondorder factor analysis. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 53(1), 145-153.
- Kalman, M., & Gedikoğlu, T. (2014). Okul yöneticilerinin hesap verebilirliği ile örgütsel adalet arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 29(2), 115-128.
- Karaevli, Ö., & Levent, F. (2014). Okul yönetiminde şeffaflığın farklı kariyer evrelerinde bulunan öğretmenler üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi. *Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 40, 89-108. doi:10.15285/EBD.2014409744
- Karataş, İ. H. (2012). Türk eğitim sisteminde toplumsal katılımı sağlamak için bir model önerisi: Yerel eğitim şûrâları. *Amasya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(2), 151-166.
- Kavgacı, H. (2010). *İlköğretimde örgütsel iklim ve okul-aile ilişkileri* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Kelley, R. G., Thornton, B., & Daugherty, R. (2005). Relationships between measures of leadership and school climate. *Education*, 126, 17-24.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Koene, B. A. S., Vogelaar, A. L. W., & Soeters, J. M. M. L. (2002). Leadership effects on organizational climate and financial performance: Local leadership effect in chain organizations. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 193-215
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behaviour in experimentally created 'social climate'. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271-290.
- Littrell, P. C., Billingsley, B. S., & Cross, L. H. (1994). The effects of principal support on special and general educators' stress, job satisfaction, school commitment, health, and intent to stay in teaching. *Remedial and Special Education*, 15(5), 297-310.

- Litwin, G. H., & Stringer, R. A. (1968). *Motivation and organizational climate*. Boston: Haward Business Press.
- MacNeil, A. J., Prater, D. L., & Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 12, 73-84. doi:10.1080/13603120701576241.
- MEB. (1990). Milli eğitimi geliştirme projesi. Retrieved from http://www.meb.gov.tr/earged/earged/Milli_Egitimi_Gelistirme.pdf
- MEB. (1999a). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Eğitim Bölgeleri ve Eğitim Kurulları Yönergesi. Retrieved from <http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/49.html>
- MEB. (1999b). *Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı müfredat laboratuvar okulu uygulamalarının yaygınlaştırılmasına ilişkin yönerge*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.
- Meral Şahin, B. (2016). *Eğitimde yönetim: Okul çalışanlarının yönetim algısı* (Unpublished master's thesis). Aksaray University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Aksaray.
- Nelson, J. R., Martella, R. M., & Marchand-Martella, N. (2002). Maximizing student learning: The effects of a comprehensive school-based program for preventing problem behaviors. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 10(3), 136-148.
- Özdemir, M. (2008). Eğitim yönetiminde yerleşme siyasetleri. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 41(3), 153-168.
- Özen, F. (2011). *İlköğretim okulu yönetici ve öğretmenlerinin görüşlerine göre okul geliştirme aracı olarak hesap verebilirlik* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Reback, R. (2008). Teaching to the rating: School accountability and the distribution of student achievement. *Journal of Public Economics*, 92, 1394-1415
- Resnick, M. D., Bearman, P. S., Blum, R. W., Bauman, K. E., Harris, K. M., Jones, J., ... Udry, J. R. (1997). Protecting adolescents from harm: Findings from the national longitudinal study on adolescent health. *JAMA*, 278(10), 823-832. doi:10.1001/jama.1997.03550100049038
- Salduz, E. (2013). *Öğretmenlerin hesap verebilirliklerini öğrencilerin akademik başarısı açısından değerlendirmeleri* (Unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University, Istanbul.
- Sarafidou, J. O., & Chatziioannidis, G. (2013). Teacher participation in decision making and its impact on school and teachers. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(2), 170-183.
- Scales, P. C., & Taccogna, J. (2001). Developmental assets for school and life. *The Education Digest*, 66(6), 34-39.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacpon.
- Sezgin, F., & Kılınç, A. Ç. (2011). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgüt iklimine ilişkin algılarının incelenmesi. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31(3), 743-757.
- Spicer, F. V. (2016). *School culture, school climate and the role of the principal* (Unpublihed doctoral dissertation). Georgia State University, Educational Policy Studies, Atlanta, US.
- Stern, G. G. (1970). *People in context: Measuring person-environment congruence in education and industry*. New York: Wiley.
- Suldo, S. M., McMahan, M., Chappel, A., & Loker, T. (2012). Relationships between perceived school climate and adolescent mental health across genders. *School Mental Health*, 4(2), 69-80. doi:10.1007/s12310-012-9073-1
- Süpcin, E. (2000). *İlköğretim okullarında örgüt iklimi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Pamukkale University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Pamukkale.
- Sweetland, S. R., & Hoy, W. K. (2000) School characteristics and educational outcomes: Toward an organizational model of student achievement in middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(5), 703-729.

- Sybouts, W., & Wendel, F. C. (1994). *The training and development of school principals: A handbook*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Syvertsen, A. K., Flanagan C. A., & Stout, M. D. (2009). Code of silence: students' perceptions of school climate and willingness to intervene in a peer's dangerous plan. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*, 2019-232.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). United States: Pearson Education
- Tahaoglu, F. (2007). *İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin liderlik rollerinin örgüt iklimi üzerine etkisi (Gaziantep ili örneği)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gaziantep University, Gaziantep.
- Tajasom, A., & Ahmad, Z. A. (2011). Principals leadership style and school climate: teachers perspectives from Malaysia. *International Journal of Leadership in Public Services, 7*(4), 314-333.
- Tanrıverdi, S. (2007). *Katılımcı okul kültürünün yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin iş motivasyonu ile ilişkisine yönelik örnek bir çalışma* (Unpublished master's thesis). Yeditepe University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Tarter, C. J., Bliss, J. R., & Hoy, W. K. (1989). School characteristics and faculty trust in secondary schools. *Education Administration Quarterly, 25*(3), 294-308.
- Tekeli, İ. (1999). *Modernite aşılırken siyaset*. İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi.
- Terzi, Ç. (2011). Türk eğitim sistemi'nde okulların örgüt ve yönetim yapısı ile yapılandırmacı eğitim yaklaşımı arasındaki ilişkinin çözümlenmesi. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International, 1*(1), 75-82.
- Töremen, F., & Kılıç, M. (2015). Okullarda yönetim: hesap verebilirlik ve şeffaflık önündeki engeller. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 2*(4), 271-281.
- Uçkan, Ö. (2003). *E-devlet, e-demokrasi ve Türkiye*. İstanbul: Literatür Yayıncılık.
- Uline, C. L., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Wolsey, T. D. (2009). The walls still speak: The stories occupants tell. *Journal of Educational Administration, 47*, 400-426. doi:10.1108/09578230910955818
- UNDP. (1997). *Governance for sustainable human development (Policy Paper)*. New York: UNDP.
- Vail, K. (2005). Create great school climate. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review, 71*(4), 4-11.
- Varlı, S. (2015). *İlkokul müdürlerinin liderlik davranışları ile okul iklimi ilişkisi: Sakarya ili örneği* (Unpublished master's thesis). Sakarya University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Sakarya.
- Welsh, W. N. (2000). The effects of school climate on school disorder. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 567*(1), 88-107.
- World Bank. (1989). *Sub-Saharan Africa: from crisis to sustainable development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. (1994). *Governance: The World Bank experience*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Yılmaz, E. (2006). Okullardaki örgütsel güven düzeyinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 16*, 739-756.
- Yılmaz, S., & Sarpkaya, P. (2009). Eğitim örgütlerinde yabancılaşma ve yönetimi. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, 6*(2), 314-333.