Eurasian Journal of Educational Research 74 (2018) 81-98

Eurasian Journal of Educational Research
www.ejer.com.tr

A Qualitative Study of School Climate According to Teachers' Perceptions *

Hamit OZEN[1]

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received: 25 Aug. 2017
Received in revised form: 08 Jan. 2018
Accepted: 24 Feb. 2018
DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2018.74.5

Keywords
school, school principal, vision-mission, justice for punishment and reward, aim

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Academic researchers have reported that the climate of a school deeply affects students and other partners. A safe and caring school environment is one in which school attendees feel respected, feel that their work is meaningful, and feel that they are good at what they do. The purpose of this paper was to determine how teachers perceived the school climate that shaped learning processes and personal development in Kutahya and how principals and other dimensions affect the teachers' perceptions.

Research Methods: This study employed a qualitative methodology to measure the school climate. A semi-structured interview technique was used, asking open-ended questions to obtain clear data from participants. The data were analyzed using data codes applied to the text. **Findings**: The study found the school climate to be gloomy in Kutahya. Teachers were dealing with excessive paperwork and supererogatory regulations in their schools. They were unable to produce new ideas, even though they were experienced in their profession. Some principals were favoritist and applied their patronage according to their personal relationship with the teachers. Some teachers were closed to new creative ideas at school and did not want to exert any extra effort for their school.

Implications for Research and Practice: The results emphasized that a positive school climate is crucial for the school to attain their ontological existence, which is raising competent, capable students. A positive school climate requires an open, healthy school ethos that fosters a sense of responsibility and efficacy between teachers and school administrators. Future studies could elaborate social studies with other disciplines to improve the learning climate in schools.

* This study was partially presented at the 4th International Eurasian Educational Research Congress in Denizli, 11–14 May 2017.

[1] Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Faculty of Education, TURKEY, hamitozen@hotmail.com, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7604-5967

Introduction

Schools are accepted as unique sociological organizations where people are educated. They can exercise their mission by the labor of their teachers who aspire to meet the challenge with the support of dynamics like the school climate which is a cluster of phenomena that reflect the school community's norms, goals, and values (Waters, Roach, & Batlis, 1974). Academic researchers have mentioned that the school climate deeply affects students and other partners (Hunter, Bedell, & Mumford, 2007). Moreover, a caring school environment is one in which students feel respected and believe that their work is meaningful (Guillaume, Jagers, & Rivas-drake, 2015). If the teachers are proud, develop social and personal relationships with their students and colleagues, and aim to increase the school's success, we can say that the school has a positive climate (Romero & Gabriela, 2018). What is expected mainly from a school is student learning, and school effectivity must be attained in a progressive way (Miskel & Cosgrove, 1985). In this study, I examine the quality of the school climate in Kutahya to explain the problems faced by teachers there. The analyses were intended to extend our current knowledge about how the school climate can protect against maladjustment in teachers and students.

Theoretical Background

As more studies of the background to the educational process are conducted, new approaches to the concept of the school climate have been formulated in scrutinizing the functions of school dynamics. Halpin and Croft (1963) originally defined school climate as the organizational personality of a school; allegorically, personality is to the individual what climate represents to the organization. The school climate is the multidimensional social place observed through a complex network of social and psychological interactions among school stakeholders (Kelley, 1980). The space in which a teacher works is closely associated with the school climate, which is strongly related to the amount of control over teachers directly wielded by the school principal's administrative style. Teachers see schools as dynamic organizations when there is more professionalism and when decision making is more participative and less centralized (Hoy & Hannum, 1997). The school climate defines the quality of a school that engenders a healthy learning environment, initiates students' and parents' dreams and aspirations, stimulates teachers' creativeness and enthusiasm, and develops all of its stakeholders (Freiberg, 1999). Halpin and Croft (1963) defined the school climate as that which distinguishes schools substantially in their feel. It is an intangible concept that the notion of morale does not provide an index for. Ideal principals who are the educational leaders in schools where development is needed can be paralyzed by the teaching staff, and the topic of organizational climate can generate personal interests.

Considerable research exists on the topic of school climate. Hoy and Miskel (2001) point out that school climate is measured by the interactions between teachers and the principal. They propose six dimensions of school climate. Three of them belong to principals and the others belong to teachers. As for principals, the first one is supportive behavior where the principal listens and is open to teacher suggestions. Praise is given genuinely, and criticism is given constructively by the principal. The

second behavior is directive behavior that involves rigid, close supervision. Principals maintain close and constant control over all teachers and school activities, down to the smallest details. The last dimension is restrictive behavior that hinders rather than facilitates teacher work. Teacher behaviors comprise three sorts: **c**ollegial, intimate and disengaged behavior. Collegial behavior supports open and professional interactions among teachers. Intimate behavior reflects a cohesive and strong network of social support among the faculty. Disengaged behavior refers to a lack of meaning and focus on professional activities. Teachers have no common goal orientation; often their behavior is negative and they are critical of their colleagues and the organization.

Another international study found that students reporting a negative climate in their schools were more likely to attend schools with higher chronic absence rates than students reporting that their school had a positive climate (Eck, Johnson, Bettencourt, & Johnson, 2017). Other research studied the principals' behavior, explaining how their mistreatment created a negative school climate (Huffman, 2015). A study on the organizational health of high schools and subsets of faculty trust found a positive relationship between the overall school climate and student achievement (Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2003). In Turkey, various studies have dealt with the school climate. Sisman (2011) clarified the properties of productive school climates by surveying and measuring their effectiveness. Another study mentioned that a school's commitment referred to a perception that the learning needs of students and the personalities of the students were valued by schools (Ozdemir, Sezgin, Sirin, Karip, & Erkan, 2010). In other words, if the school respected students' learning needs, there was a healthy school climate and high academic achievement. The aim of this research was to reveal the issues on school climate because successful teachers are crucial to the development of excellent schools. That is why understanding the school ethos is a must to explore why teachers and students are unsuccessful and unhappy. The current study has been one out of just a few implemented in Kutahya using the qualitative method.

Research Objectives and Questions

This study was developed to address questions regarding the school climate from the perspective of teachers. The objectives were an understanding of the managerial and educational skills of principals, teacher interactions and empowerment, and the school ethos. These research questions emerged from the objectives:

1. How do you perceive the school principal's managerial behaviors?
2. How do you perceive teacher interactions?
3. How do you perceive the principal's educational behaviors?
4. How do you perceive teacher empowerment?
5. How do you perceive justice in the school?
6. How do you perceive the working ethos?

Method

Research Design

This study was designed as a qualitative evaluation of school teachers' perceptions on issues stemming from the relationships among principals, teachers, students and other stakeholders. Qualitative research design employs methods that are distinct from those used in quantitative research and which emphasize gathering data on naturally occurring phenomena. The research design chosen in this study was phenomenology, which focuses on collecting individual participant experiences (Creswell, 1998). The aim of phenomenology is to transform lived experience into a description of its essence (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001).

Research Sample

Eighteen volunteers were interviewed over a 45-day period. Of the 18 participants (10 females and 8 males), there were 3 English teachers, 2 class teachers, 2 science and technology teachers, 1 physical training teacher, 1 mathematics teacher, 1 preschool teacher, 1 technical teacher, 2 literature teachers, 1 psychological counselor, 2 arts/music teachers, 1 biology teacher, and 1 philosophy teacher. The participants had between 3 and 29 years teaching experience and had worked in their school at least 3 semesters so as to be acquainted with the principal. Their ages ranged from 29 to 55 (M=39, 72). The research sample was employed using maximum variation and criterion sampling. The selection criteria were teachers who had served enough to obtain a perception of the school climate and were willing to participate in the study.

Data Collection

An interview technique was used, employing open-ended questions. To prepare the interview form, the literature was reviewed, and a draft including 17 questions was developed. Later, two experts were consulted, one academic who researched the school climate and another academic who worked on the qualitative research. Finally, the number of questions was reduced to 6. The research data were collected between September 2016 and March 2017. The participants were interviewed in more than 30 meetings, lasting from 35 to 60 minutes.

Validity, Reliability and Reflexivity of the Study

Validity refers to the degree of congruence between explanations of phenomena and the realities of the world (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). To enhance the validity, interim data analysis and corroboration were applied to ensure a match between findings and participant reality. Multimethod strategies allowing triangulation in data collection and data analysis were employed. The study obtained quotations from the participants. Reflexivity is a broad concept that includes a rigorous examination of one's personal and theoretical commitments to see how they serve as resources for selecting approaches (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). Audibility was used for coding, categorizing and preparing themes for the study to enhance the reflexivity. Besides, participants were assured of the secrecy of their records as data gathering complied

with ethical considerations. The reliability calculated using the formula was found to be 91% (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Data Analysis

The descriptive analysis technique was used because the aim of the study was to explore the teachers' perceptions about the school climate based on their opinions and expressions (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). After finishing the interviews, the researcher analyzed the voice-recordings and then transcribed the data verbatim. The researcher and the two academics confirmed the accuracy of the data. Discrepancies between the recordings and the written documents were eliminated. After the data collection, the researcher and the academics worked independently to determine the themes and subthemes. Together they agreed upon five themes and thirteen subthemes with 656 coded references.

Findings and Results

The analysis of the findings resulted in these predominant themes: regulatory procedures, rational responsible self, future centeredness, principal fairness, and work life at school.

Regulatory Procedures

The teachers were asked about the general behaviors of the principal at their school. Questions requested their view on how the school principal administered the school and exercised his or her functions. Two subthemes were reached. Table 1 shows the teachers' perceptions of the regulatory procedures at their school.

Table 1

General Principal Approaches

	Reference Codes	
	f	%
Theme/subtheme	122	100
Trivial bureaucratic & tight rules	63	51
Cronyist & Favoritist	59	49

Several teachers expressed dislike for trivial bureaucratic regulations and tight rules at school (f=63, 51%). Also, school principals' behaviors (f=59, 49%) can be explained as cronyism. Here are examples of the participants' comments:

> *He exaggerates his power to control and make us respect using bureaucratic regulations, which break the spirit.* (G.E. 35 M–Science & Tech. Teacher)

> *Principal does not behave equally at school. He is a cronyist. If you have a close relationship or if you support the same political power, you are a person to prioritize first.* (S.A. 32 F–English Teacher)

If there is a rule, the rule should be for everyone. There shouldn't be certain teachers that get around the rule because of their close relationship with the principal and upper level bureaucrats. (T.G. 43 M–Philosophy Teacher)

It is seen that principals can play with the rules issuing some arbitrary provisions and using them to maintain managerial power. Principals highlight bureaucracy because they want to shun taking risks and to keep teachers under control. Besides, it was found that objectivity is very important for teachers. Teachers expressed their sentiment that principals sometimes prioritized such favoritist behavior.

Rational Responsible Self

Interviewers were asked questions about what they thought about responsibility and collaboration at school. This theme was aimed at learning the perceptions of teachers on whether everybody strived to exert extra effort for the school. Three subthemes were extracted. Table 2 shows the teachers' perceptions.

Table 2

Rational Responsible Self

	Reference Codes	
	f	%
Theme/subtheme	78	100
Teachers do not assume responsibility	41	50
Teachers lack engagement	3	1
Supportive managerial behavior	38	49

As for sharing responsibility at school, teachers (f=41, 50%) expressed the opinion that there was no feeling of responsibility and only a minimal amount of collaboration existed at their school. These were some of the comments given by participants:

As we classroom teachers, we do not want to take responsibility at school collectively and personally. If I do that, I will be overloaded by trivial. (K.K. 51 M–Class Teacher)

Only a couple of teachers share their knowledge before lessons… In addition to this, we speak our daily routines. (N.C. 30 F–Literature Teacher)

When the teachers were asked about assuming responsibility, it was found that teachers understood it as a load and constituting grunt work. Some teachers expressed the view that collaboration was not satisfying and was reduced only to asking questions about daily lessons just before going to class and daily speeches.

A few teachers (f=3, 1%) expressed the perception that the teachers did not feel engaged in the educational settings. Here is one such comment:

KPSS killed me for years. I have just spent all my energy. From now on I will relax. (S.S. 35 F–Pre-School Teacher)

It may be concluded that teachers were not dedicated to their profession. The first reason for this was burnout caused by the Public Personnel Selection Examination (KPSS) that causes the teachers to be alienated from their school, students, and profession. Thus, teachers closed themselves to educational activities and to the students. It is a fact that a dedicated teacher who shows compassion to a student is beneficial to the said aforementioned burnout teacher.

On the other hand, participants suggested that some supportive principals' behaviors (f=38, 49%) were evident, even though most teachers mentioned that restrictive principals were seen in the schools. Teachers mostly agreed that while principals were ready to help, their managerial powers were not enough, but some principals showed their pragmatic self. Here are two excerpts on this subject:

> *He is a well-intentioned person, and he spends effort to promote success, but he falls short. He does not have enough managerial power to use.* (T.S. 31 F–Psychological Counselor)

> *A teacher prepared a female student for Math Olympiad. The principal declined in the beginning in case of possible gossiping between the girl and the teacher… The teacher did not let the principal know that he had prepared the girl… Finally, she won a medal. The principal went to the capital to get it.* (K.D. 46 M–Math Teacher)

The principal involves teachers in fulfilling the goals of the school. Principals want to do their best for the school, but sometimes they fail because the Turkish educational system is fairly centralized. Besides, principals have a pragmatic approach if there is a reward at the end. Being treated in a civilized fashion by the principal is a key to the teacher engagement. Yet principals fail to apply managerial decency which becomes potent when used together with managerial power and teacher engagement.

Future Orientation

In the third dimension, teachers were asked about the aim, innovation, vision, and mission at their school. Two subthemes evolved. Table 3 shows these subdimensions.

Table 3

Future Orientation

	Reference Codes	
	f	%
Theme/subtheme	93	100
Empowerment of teacher and student	49	53
Ineffective vision and strategical plan	44	47

Some participants made it clear that principals were aware of the dynamics of the future of the school and education, especially with the need of teacher and student empowerment. However, a lack of leadership power of the principals was a great concern (f=49, 53%). Here is an excerpt on this subtheme:

> *Principal says…innovative culture and creativity need continuous learning and planning. He puts students in the first place, but mostly he falls short.* (S.U. 38 F–Biology Teacher)

It can be understood that some of the principals stress the main core of the future dynamics. They highlight the theme of lifelong learning of innovative cultures, placing the students at the forefront. Teachers allowed that principals were willing to reinforce the benefits of innovation by opening a space to allow students and teachers to bypass bureaucratic barriers, but their efforts failed due to hierarchies that sap creativity.

Nearly half of the teachers declared that they experienced fear of the effects of future centeredness and expressed anxiety about it (f=44, 47%). This was one of their comments:

> *There is no aim, mission, vision and strategical plans at school. They are empty and just for showing off.* (N.S. 43 M–Math Teacher)

According to this teacher's perceptions, his school did not have an aim, a mission, and a strategic plan which projected the school into the future. It was also declared that teachers perceived such plans as useless, and these principals employed the strategical plans just to show off without implementing them.

Principal Fairness

Some questions were asked of the teachers about justice that predicted the fairness of principals under established rules and laws. Two themes were found. Table 4 shows the dimensions.

Table 4

Distributive Justice

	Reference Codes	
	f	%
Theme/subtheme	71	100
Unfair distribution	49	69
Egalitarianism practiced	22	31

Some teachers asserted that their principals mostly fostered distributive justice. However, other participants (f=49, 69%) felt that in their schools an unfair distribution system prevailed. Here is a sample of the teachers' responses:

> *As for carrots and sticks, the principal does not value my performance. He gives the carrots to his close friends.* (G.F. 31 F–Arts Teacher)

In fact, the majority of teachers found that they faced an unfair distribution of justice. It was understood that principals did not apply procedures appropriately and outcomes were not distributed fairly. The reason for such a system might be that

principals looked for favoritism or same unionship. Conversely, fewer principals (f=22, 31%) demonstrated an egalitarian system. Here is an excerpt on this subject:

> *Carrots and sticks are fair. I trust that the principal distinguishes failure and success.* (T.S 31 F–Psychological Counselor)

Few teachers perceived justice practices at their schools as fair. It could be understood that few principals called for equity when allocating equal materials to all members in the school. However, most of the principals did not offer every person the same level of material goods, including burdens and services.

Teachers also expressed their perceptions of principals' interactional justice. Two subthemes emerged and Table 5 shows them.

Table 5

Interactional Justice

	Reference Codes	
	f	%
Theme/subtheme	51	100
Quality of treatment	26	51
Effective communication	25	49

The teachers indicated that the quality of their treatment at the hands of principals was typified by neglect (f=26, 51%). Conversely, nearly half of them (f=25, 49%) found that principals employ effective communication means. Two examples are given below:

> *Whatever I do isn't important. He neglects my work. He is always formal to me.* (S.S. 35 F–Pre-School Teacher)

> *He wants me to focus on students. He gives me a blank check for my master and uses it to support and communicate.* (R.D. 26 M–Math Teacher)

School principals did not treat teachers well and the social side of the principals did not focus on the informal interactions. It was understood that from the perspective of quality of treatment, principals were not open, consistent, or fair to teachers. Besides, they did not promote teachers based on experience, merit, and performance. However, nearly half of the teachers had the perception that communication existed but not enough for interactional justice. However, it took into account the variables of emotions, self-respect, desire, attitude, and ambitions. In summary, these are the factors that affect the personal agenda of teachers dealing with the external factors of motivation.

School Ethos

The final questions sought information regarding the working ethos at schools. These questions searched for the team spirit in the school environment. Two subthemes were reached and Table 6 shows them.

Table 6

School Ethos

	Reference Codes	
	f	%
Theme/subtheme	45	100
No team spirit	20	44
Good team spirit	25	56

The teachers pointed out that (f=20, 44%) they believed that there was no team spirit at their school. On the contrary, more teachers (f=25, 56%) expressed having a good team spirit in their working ethos. Here are examples of the answers:

> *We don't have common goals. How can we improve team spirit in this case?* (K.B. 38 F–Literature Teacher)

> *There is a good team spirit at school. The principal says players who are friends off the playing area will work better on the court together.* (G.B. 33 M–Physical Trainer)

The teachers who said that there was no team spirit at school probably based their belief on the school culture failing to meet around a common goal. If the school culture encouraged the teachers to foster interaction, they would be in a better position to have good teamwork. Some of the interviewees mentioned positive team spirit because of their principals. Some of the teachers pinpointed the importance of principals who promoted collaboration at school. In some cases, it can also be understood that the teachers were receptive to having a work collaboration, but the right team culture was not instilled at their school.

Discussion and Conclusion

The research demonstrated that bureaucratic regulations were trivial, and that many principals showed a favoritist and cronyist approach. It was found that the bureaucratic hierarchy exerted a negative impact on teachers' behavior and autonomy at the highest level of bureaucratic schools. In the Turkish context, Demirtas, Ozdemir and Kucuk (2016) found that the bureaucratic structure of schools was at a moderate level. Buluc (2009) reported that the bureaucratic structure of schools and the behavior of principals hindered the schools' effectiveness. It was stated that teachers in primary and secondary schools were resigned to the existence of favoritism in the appointment of central administrators, school administrators, and teachers, and in the distribution

of materials to schools by administrators who shared their political views regardless of their success and abilities. It was seen that being a favorite person at school was bound to mean a close relation with the principal, a bureaucrat and a politician. Besides, Ozen (2017) found that teacher trainees found their school principal employing harsh discipline and establishing strict formal communication with school teachers but informal, intimate communication with the teachers who had close ideological relationships. These studies overlapped this study determining that favoritism existed in the Turkish school context. Some schools have a pronounced "them and us" culture based on favoritism, thus causing even more staff disgruntlement (Griff, 2013). This is called cheap leadership. Cheap leaders create a "them" by first creating an "us" and rallying their followers. But the followers of cheap leaders are rallying against a created enemy, rather than working in the pursuit of school improvement (Knuth, 2004). Schools can attain excellence only by having a total approach to managing human resources, decreasing the bureaucratic structure, and building the leadership capacity of teachers (Walker & Hallinger, 2015).

This study confirmed that judging from their perceptions, many teachers are not satisfied with how school administrators handle their responsibilities and feel that their own labor is viewed as grunt work. Another finding was that teachers were not dedicated to their profession because of heavy burnout caused by the Public Personnel Selection Examinations (KPSS). This study further revealed that few principals support their own teachers; instead their managerial power is centralized and never strong enough for them. In fact, instead of facilitating their teachers' work, many principals hindered the teachers. A review of previous studies in the Turkish educational system context implied similar findings. For example, Turan, Yıldırım and Aydogdu (2012) also reported that teachers were not willing to dedicate themselves to their profession. Karakelle (2005) researched the effective teacher qualities and found that teachers did not prioritize their teaching skills and collaborative work desire. Both studies overlapped my study.

The current study indicates that vision, mission, and strategy were not prioritized in schools and instead were deemed to be useless, and thus schools and their partners were far from being future oriented. Principals were aware of the fact that students and teachers should be brought to the forefront and that they must be empowered, but they did not have managerial or legal power to succeed. The two phenomena could be seen as paradoxical. Yet, because the educational system is so centralized, principals lack the practice of their realities such as the teacher and student empowerment that they challenge. Tahaoglu and Gedikoglu (2009) contradicted my study. They found that school principals showed visionary leadership best at schools. However, Balyer (2014) agreed with my research that most school principals did not have the time and opportunity to shape the vision of the school. Principals carry out basic duties like a heavy paperwork load instead. Although change is vital for educational institutions in the 21st century, most schools do not have clear strategies to manage change successfully. Schools in Turkey should prepare students to learn eagerly and contribute to and succeed in a rapidly changing society. Educational leaders admit that students develop both the skills and the competencies essential for success and

leadership in the emerging creative economy. Blase and Blase (1997) identified such empowering principals' behaviors and characteristics as demonstrating trust in teachers, encouraging individual input and teacher autonomy and providing educational and intellectual support. It is a fact that the traditional managerial roles of school leaders have evolved from mainly technical and tactical functions, such as planning teachers' timetables and duties and introducing new curricula. The new leading roles of principals require increased leadership competence in shared vision building, relationship building and change management.

The study investigated the two types of justice practiced by school principals: distributive and interactional justice. It found principals misused both methods of justice. While distributive justice ideally should result in equal distributions of benefits and burdens across members of the school, the principals were not egalitarian and instead gave benefits to their favorites. Similarly, interactional justice, which should mean that school principals treat teachers and students with respect and sensitivity and explain the rationale for decisions, is often replaced by bluntness and a reliance on dogma. Teachers did not perceive the fairness as a suitable outcome because principals did not exercise leadership power gracefully. Moreover, interactional justice was expressed mostly as social recognition which stemmed from the teachers' success. Half of the participants pointed out that their successes were neglected, but the rest of them stated that their successes were recognized. Tekin and Akyol (2017) found that administrators were not fair in the evaluation process. It has been observed that organizational justice in schools is not totally fair. Unfair behaviors perceived by teachers could stem from the evaluation process of principals. Moreover, principals are supposed to provide justice by being objective without prejudice, staying away from politics and religion. It was also expected that principals differentiate between effective and ineffective teachers in a positive way. Furthermore, the state should assign principals according to transparent criteria that are based fairly on merit.

This study researched team spirit. As a result, teachers stated that team spirit mostly did not exist. Few of the teachers expressed a positive team spirit in which the principals were the main actors. These findings could be based on the school culture, meeting around a common goal. If the school culture encouraged the teachers to foster interaction, they would be in a better position to have good teamwork at school. It can also be understood that teachers were eager to work collaboratively, but they were not instilled with the right team culture. Team spirit means aiming for synergy that pulls people together, fosters a sense of collective responsibility, and helps teachers and students overcome any challenges. It is a well-known reality that team spirit comes from the top management of organizations (Troen & Boles, 2010). Principals must take everybody on board to establish effective working teams.

References

Balyer, A. (2014). School principals' role priorities. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, *10*(1), 24-40.

Blase, J. & Blase, J. (1997) The micro political orientation of facilitative school principals and its effects on teachers' sense of empowerment. *Journal of Educational Administration, 35*(2), 138–164.

Buluc, B. (2009). The relationship between bureaucratic school structure and leadership styles of school principals in primary schools. *Education and Science, 34*(132), 71- 86.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Demirtas, Z., Ozdemir, T. Y., & Kucuk, O. (2016). Okullarin burokratik yapisi, orgutsel sessizlik ve orgutsel sinizm arasındaki iliski [Relationships between bureaucratic structure of schools, organizational silence and organizational cynicism]. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 22*(2), 193-216.

Eck, K. V., Johnson, S. R., Bettencourt, A., & Johnson, S. L. (2017). How school climate relates to chronic absence: A multi–level latent profile analysis. *Journal of School Psychology*, *61*, 89-102.

Freiberg, H. J. (1999). *School climate: Measuring, improving and sustaining healthy learning environments.* Philadelphia: Falmer.

Huffman, D. B. (2015). *Support and mistreatment by public school principals as experienced by teachers: A statewide survey* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from American Doctoral Dissertations, EBSCO*host*, viewed 9 March 2018.

Griff, T. (2013). Be friendly, but don't be friends. *Times Educational Supplement*, (5045), 40-41.

Guillaume, C., Jagers, R., & Rivas-drake, D. (2015). Middle school as a developmental niche for civic engagement. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 56*(3-4), 321-331.

Halpin, A. W. & Croft, D. B. (1963). *The organization climate of schools*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center of the University of Chicago.

Hoy, W. K. & Hannum, J. W. (1997). Middle school climate: An empirical assessment of organizational health and student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 33,* 290-311.

Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. W. (2001). *Educational administration: Theory into practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hunter, S. T., Bedell, K. E., & Mumford, M. D. (2007). Climate for creativity. *Creativity Research Journal, 19*(1), 69-90.

Karakelle, S. (2005). Ogretmenlerin etkili ogretmen tanimlarinin etkili ogretmenlik boyutlarina gore incelenmesi [Analyzing teachers' definitions of effective teachers according to effective teaching dimensions]. *Education and Science, 30*(135), 1-10.

Kelley, E. (1980). *Improving school climate*. Reston: NASSP.

Knuth, R. (2004). The negative uses of power: Principal leadership. *High School Edition, 5*(3), 44-49.

McMillan, J. H. & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry. A Conceptual Introduction*. New York: Pearson.

Miles, M. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. London: Sage.

Miskel, C. & Cosgrove, D. (1985). Leader succession in school settings. *Review of Educational Research, 55*, 87-105.

Ozdemir, S., Sezgin, F., Sirin, H., Karip, E., & Erkan, S. (2010). Examining the variables predicting primary school students' perceptions of school climate. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 38,* 213-224.

Ozen, H. (2017). Stajyer ogretmenlerin mesleki ve teknik anadolu lisesi okul mudurleri, ogretmen ve ogrencileri hakkindaki algilarinin incelenmesi: fenomenolojik yaklasim [A research of the perceptions of trainee teachers on vocational school principals, teachers and students: A phenomenologic approach]. *YYU Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi, 14*(1), 1050-1094.

Romero, C. & Gabriela, K. (2018). Interactive leadership in turbulent school climates: an exploratory study of high school principals from the city of Buenos Aires. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 46*(2), 339-354.

Smith, P. A., Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2003). Organizational health of high schools and subsets of faculty trust. *Journal of School Leadership, 11*, 135-150.

Sisman, M. (2011). *Egitimde mukemmellik arayisi: Etkili okullar*. Ankara: Pegem A.

Tahaoglu, F. & Gedikoğlu, T. (2009). Ilkogretim okulu mudurlerinin liderlik rolleri [leadership roles of primary school principals]. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 15*(2), 274-298.

Tekin, Y. F. & Akyol, B. (2017). A qualitative investigation on the views of school principals and teachers about organizational justice in evaluation process. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 23*(1), 165-193.

Troen, V. & Boles, K. C. (2010). Team spirit: Teachers work together to establish and achieve key goals. *Journal of Staff Development, 31*(1), 59-62.

Turan, S., Yıldırım, N., & Aydogdu, E. (2012). Okul mudurlerinin kendi gorevlerine iliskin bakis acıları [Perspectives of school principals on their own task]. *Pegem Egitim ve Ogretim Dergisi, 2*(3), 63-76.

Walker, A. & Hallinger, P. (2015). A synthesis of reviews of research on principal leadership in East Asia. *Journal of Educational Administration, 53*(4), 554-570.

Waters, J. K., Roach, D., & Batlis, N. (1974). Organizational climate dimensions and job related attitudes. *Personnel Psychology,* 27(3), 465-476.

Öğretmen Algılarına Göre Okul İklimi: Nitel Bir Çalışma

Atıf:

Ozen, H. (2018). A qualitative study of school climate according to teachers' perceptions. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research,* 74, 81-98, DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2018.74.5

Özet

Problem Durumu: Öğretmenler okuldaki görevlerini toplum normlarını ve değerlerini yansıtan çeşitli dinamikler ile etkileşerek gerçekleştirmektedirler. Bu dinamiklerden birisi de okul yaşantısının kalitesi olarak ifade edilen okul iklimidir. Halphin ve Croft, okul iklimini okulun organizasyonel kimliği olarak tanımlamıştır. Okul iklimi kalitesinin liderin yönetim stiline bağlı olduğuna değinen Hoy ve Hannum, okulu öğretmenlerin karar süreçlerine daha çok katıldığı, daha az merkezi yapıya sahip olması gereken yerler olarak ifade etmektedir. Olumlu okul ikliminin öğretmen-müdür arasındaki etkileşimin kalitesine bağlı olduğunu söyleyen Hoy ve Miskel, okul müdürlerinin süreçte destekleyici, kısıtlayıcı ve emir verici davranış örüntülerine sahip olduğu, öğretmenlerin de okul içi etkileşimde işbirlikçi, bağlantısız ve samimi davranışlara sahip olduğunu belirtmektedir. Alan yazınında yapılan çalışmalar doğrultusunda Eck, Johnson, Bettlecourt ve Johnson, okul ikliminin okul terklerindeki önemine vurgu yapmaktadır. Öğretmen açısından bakıldığında test odaklı başarı beklentisinin öğretmenler üzerinde olumsuz etkilere yol açtığı ve bununda okul iklimini olumsuz etkilediği söylenmektedir. Türkiye'de Şişman, sağlıklı okul ikliminin okul etkililiği üzerindeki olumlu etkiler yarattığını açıklamıştır. Ayrıca Özdemir, Sezgin, Şirin, Karip ve Erkan, öğrencilerin önemsendiği okullarda okul ikliminin paydaşlar tarafından olumlu olarak algılandığını söylemiştir. Okul; içinde çeşitli karmaşık dinamiklerin olduğu, etkileşimleri etkileyen bu dinamiklerin durağan olmadığı gerçeğiyle insan doğasının biçimlendirildiği yerlerdir. Dolayısıyla okulların organizasyonel ve psikolojik kimliğini etkileyen her bir etkenin belirlenmesi için daha çok çalışmanın yapılmasına ihtiyaç bulunmaktadır. Türkiye'de okul iklimi konusunda birçok çalışma yapılmaktadır. Bu alanda nitel çalışmalara rastlansa da yapılan çalışmaların çoğu nicel yöntemlerle gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bu araştırma Kütahya il merkezindeki okullarda gerçekleştirilmiş ilk nitel çalışmalardan birisidir. Dolayısıyla çalışmanın amacı öğretmen algılarına

dayalı olarak okul müdürü ve öğretmen etkileşimlerinden doğan ve okul iklimini olumsuz etkileyen dinamikleri ortaya çıkarmaktır.

Yöntem: Bu araştırma nitel bir araştırmadır ve olgubilim (fenomenoloji) deseni kullanılarak gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırmanın örneklemini Kütahya il merkezinde görev yapan 18 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Katılımcıların 10'u kadın 8'i ise erkek olup yaş aralığı 29-55 (M=39,72) arasında değişmektedir. Çalışmanın örneklemi maksimum çeşitlilik ve kriter örnekleme yöntemiyle belirlenmiştir. Araştırmanın verileri planlama, veri toplamaya başlama, temel verinin toplanması, veri toplamanın bitirilmesi ve kod ve temaların oluşturulması şeklinde elde edilmiştir. 11 sorudan oluşan veri toplama formuna iki uzman görüşüne başvurulduktan ve iki katılımcıyla pilot görüşmeler yapıldıktan sonra nihai şekli verilmiştir. Araştırmanın verileri Ekim 2016 ile Mart 2017 tarihleri arasında 35-60 dakika süren görüşmelerle elde edilmiştir. Çalışmada kullanılan verilerin geçerliği için katılımcı teyidi, uzman incelemesi aktarılabilirlik için ayrıntılı betimlemeye başvurulmuştur. Güvenirlik için Miles ve Huberman formülü kullanılmış ve %91 uyum gözlenmiştir. Elde edilen verilerin incelenmesi için betimleyici analiz tekniğine başvurulmuştur. Görüşmeler kayıt altına alındıktan sonra çözümleme işlemi yapılmıştır. Kod ve temalara ayırma işlemi iki akademisyen tarafından yapılmıştır. Bunun sonucunda elde edilen bulgulara göre 656 kodlama referansı ile 5 tema, 13 alt temaya ulaşılmıştır.

Bulgular, Yorum ve Tartışma: Katılımcı öğretmenlerin okul müdürünün yönetimsel becerileri konusundaki algılarına göre, müdürlerinin zaman zaman öğretmenler üzerindeki baskısını hissettirmek için bürokratik kuralları sıkılaştırdığı fakat kendi siyasi düşüncesine yakın olan kişilere yönelik böyle bir davranış içinde olmadıklarını ifade etmektedirler. Ayrıca öğretmenler okulda çok fazla angarya işlere maruz kaldıklarını ifade etmişlerdir. Buluç'un okuldaki aşırı bürokratik yapının okulun etkililiğini düşüren bir faktör olarak bulması çalışmamızla örtüşmektedir. Okul müdürünün ve öğretmenlerin sergilediği rasyonel sorumlulukları hakkında öğretmen algılarına göre, okulda öğretmenlerin sorumluluklarını yerine getirirken engelleyici ya da işbirlikçi davranışlar sergilediği bunun yanında okul müdürlerinin de destekleyici ve kısıtlayıcı davranışlar gösterdiği görülmüştür. Karakelle'nin öğretmenlerin mesleki yaşamlarında işbirlikçi davranışlar göstermediği ve öğretmenlik becerilerini geliştirmeye istekli olmadığın bulguları çalışmamla örtüşmektedir. Okul müdürünün vizyon, misyon ve stratejik plan belirleme konusundaki öğretmen algılarına göre; okul müdürlerinin bir kısmının yeniliğe açık olduğu, öğretmen ve öğrenciyi güçlendirme konusunda çabalar gösterdiği belirlenmişken bazı öğretmenlerin okullarında vizyon, misyon ve stratejik planlarla ilgili herhangi bir bilgiye sahip olmadığı bunun yerine müdürün günlük rutin işlere zaman harcadığı görülmüştür. Tahaoğlu ve Gedikoğlu okul müdürlerinin en çok dönüşümcü liderlik becerilerini gösterdiğini ifade ettiği çalışmasıyla çalışmamızın bulguları örtüşmemektedir. Öğretmen algılarına göre okul müdürünün adaletli bir yönetim sergileyip sergilemediği belirlenmeye çalışılmıştır. Bu doğrultuda öğretmenler okuldaki adaleti etkileşimsel adalet ve edimde adalet olarak algılamışlardır. Etkileşimsel adalet konusunda öğretmenlerin çoğunluğu okul müdürünün kayırmacı bir tutum içinde olduğunu tekrar ifade ederek özellikle sicil

verme ve performans değerlendirme konusunda adil olmadıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Edinimde adalet alan yazınında maaş artışı, terfi gibi konuları da içerdiği gibi övme, yüceltme gibi davranışları da kapsamaktadır. Yapılan çalışmada öğretmenler maaş artışı, terfi gibi somut dönütler yaratacak adalet davranışını algılayamamışlar ve edinim adaletini sadece öğretmen başarılarını fark edebilen/etmeyen müdür davranışı olarak nitelemişlerdir. Bu durum yine okul müdürünün merkeziyetçi yapıdan kaynaklanan yöneticilik fonksiyonlarının kısıtlı olmasına dayandırılmaktadır. Akyol'un yaptığı çalışmada elde ettiği öğretmenlerin okul müdürü tarafından adil bir şekilde değerlendirilmediği sonucu çalışmamızla örtüşen bir bulgudur. Okul müdürünün iş ortamına yönelik tutumlarının belirlenmeye çalışıldığı bu bölümde öğretmen algılarına göre okulda takım ruhu ve adanmışlığa yönelik davranış örüntülerinin azlığı dikkate çarpmaktadır. Takım ruhunun bulunmamasının sebebi olarak okul müdürünün ortak hedefler yaratamaması gösterilirken adanmışlık önündeki en büyük engelin öğretmen adaylarının atanma sürecindeki Kamu Personeli Seçme Sınavı (KPSS) gibi sınavların yarattığı tükenmişlik duygusu olduğu ifade edilebilir. Troen ve Boles'un etkili grupların oluşturulmasındaki en büyük faktörün lider olduğu bulgusu çalışmamızın bulgularını desteklemektedir.

Sonuç ve Öneri: Araştırmanın bulgularına göre Kütahya ilinde okul ikliminin pek de olumlu olmadığı söylenebilir. Türk eğitim sisteminin bürokratik yapısının okul müdürünün liderlik becerilerini olumsuz etkilediği ve okul etkililiğini azaltan bir faktör olduğu sonucuna ulaşılabilir. Katı bürokratik yapının yerine daha gevşek, birbiriyle etkileşime daha açık bir sistemin konması okul ve paydaşlarının daha özgün bir kimliğe kavuşması açısından gerekli görülmektedir. Böylece merkezi yönetimin yetkilerini hem öğretmen hem de okul müdürleri ile paylaşması yüksek performans gösteren okullara yol açabilecektir. Eğitim örgütlerinin değişime en açık kurumlar olmaları için geleceğe odaklı bir yönetim anlayışı ile etkin hedef, vizyon, misyon belirlemeleri ve stratejik planlamalar yapmaları gerekmektedir. Örgütsel adalet açısından okul müdürlerinin öğretmen değerlendirmelerini önyargı ve politik görüşlerden uzak bir şekilde yapması önerilmektedir. Bunun yanında yönetici atamaları mutlak kriterlere ve liyakate göre yapılmalıdır. Son olarak okul ortamını olumsuz etkileyen sebeplerden birisi de öğretmen tükenmişliğidir. Bu güne kadar yapılan çalışmalarda öğretmenlerin belli bir süre çalıştıktan sonra tükenmişlik sendromu yaşadığı ifade edilmekteyken bizim çalışmamızda daha mesleğe başlamadan yaşaması çözülmesi gereken önemli bir sorundur. Bu bağlamda indirgeyici KPSS sınavlarının kaldırılması ve eğitim fakültelerinin cazibelerinin arttırılması önerilebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Okul, okul müdürü, vizyon-misyon, ödül ve cezada adalet, hedef