



## ÜNİVERSİTEPARK Bülten | Bulletin

ISSN: 2147-351X | e-ISSN: 2564-8039 | [www.unibulletin.com](http://www.unibulletin.com)

### ÜNİVERSİTEPARK Bülten | Bulletin • Volume 7 • Issue 1 • 2018

#### Investigation of Students' Commitment to Schools in terms of some Variables

Tuncay Yavuz Ozdemir

**To cite this article:** Ozdemir, T. Y. (2018). Investigation of Students' Commitment to Schools in terms of some Variables. *Üniversitepark Bülten*, 7(1), 51-65.

**To link to this article:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2018.71.5>

Tuncay Yavuz Ozdemir, Firat University, Turkey. (e-mail: tyozdemir@gmail.com)

## Investigation of Students' Commitment to Schools in terms of some Variables

TUNCAY YAVUZ OZDEMIR

### Abstract

The aim of this study is to determine the predictive level of variables such as school climate, school life quality and classroom teacher behaviors on students' commitment to the school. For this purpose, 422 students attending secondary and high school education in the central province of Elazığ, Turkey, were included in the research sample by random sampling method. It was determined that the dataset displayed a normal distribution and statistical analyses was applied. Firstly, it was determined that there was a positive and medium-level relationship between the level of students' commitment to the school and the school climate, school life quality and classroom teacher behavior. It was found that school climate, school life quality and classroom teacher attitudes explain 39.6% of the variance in the level of students' commitment to school. It was also determined that the level of students' commitment to school had a significant difference in favor of students attending junior high schools according to the school type variable and in favor of female students according to the gender variable.

**Keywords:** school climate, school life quality, classroom teacher behaviors.



DOI: 10.22521/unibulletin.2018.71.5

UNIBULLETIN • ISSN 2147-351X • e-ISSN 2564-8039

Copyright © 2018 by ÜNİVERSİTEPARK

unibulletin.com

## Introduction

Climate as a concept is defined as the average of long-term averages of the effects of weather events anywhere on earth (TDK, 2011). From a chronological point of view, the concept of climate was first considered as organizational climate in management science (Calik & Kurt, 2010), and then used within schools and other organizations (Hoy, 2003). It is seen that conceptual definitions in school climate studies are mostly evaluated in the context of human relations in school. For example, Bursalioglu (2015) defined organizational climate as the relationship between individuals and groups in the organization, and Loukas, Suzuki, and Horton (2006) as the quality of relations in the school. Similarly, Hoy (2003) noted that climate is a concept that affects organization members and is influenced by the behavior of those members, and also can vary depending on the collective perceptions of the people at the school. School climate examines how students, teachers and other employees perceive the school environment and the psychological consequences of this perception (Cohen, McCabe, Michelli, & Pickeral, 2009), and the norms, values, and attitudes existing at school and the interaction that these concepts created between school stakeholders (Welsh 2000, p. 89). From a holistic perspective, Hernandez and Seem (2004) define school climate as a concept that includes the attitudes, feelings and behavior of school stakeholders. The school climate indicates the satisfaction level with the school of the school's internal and external stakeholders. In order to increase this level of satisfaction, it is stated that it is important for students to feel safe in school and to be supported by their friends and teachers when necessary (Libbey, 2004, p. 274). Schools are expected to contribute to the academic, emotional and behavioral development of students. In a sense, if the actualization of organizational goals is related to the attitudes and behaviors of the students in the school, the importance of school climate will be better understood. If the school has a positive climate, the students will focus on academic achievement (Sweetland & Hoy, 2000, p. 704), develop positive relationships within the school environment (Johnson & Grayson, 2005, p. 501), and adopt and follow school rules (Basaran, 2008, p. 313). Additionally, the participation of families in the schools will be positively affected (Ozdemir, Sezgin, Sirin, Karip, & Erkan, 2010), and will have an effect on reducing the teacher's injustice behavior (Gottfredson, Gottfredson, Ann Payne, & Gottfredson, 2005, p. 412), and will increase the students' commitment to the school, thereby helping to reduce problematic behaviors such as confronting their teachers, fighting with their friends and running away from school (Hopson & Lee, 2011, p. 2227). If the school has a negative climate, the frequency of risky group behavior will also increase (Astor, Benbenishty, Vinokur, & Zeira, 2006, p. 95), students will increase their violent behavior (Blum, 2005, p. 13), incidences of bullying behavior at school will increase (Orpinas & Horne, 2010, p. 50), and students' creative thinking will be prevented (Welsh, 2000, p. 92). In summary, school climate is one of the most important factors in the effectiveness of schools and in reaching the aims of schools.

The origin of the concept of school life quality is rooted in the notion of quality of life (Linnakylä & Brunell, 1996). While the concept of life quality is described as being in a state of constant goodness, it is evaluated by the happiness, pleasure and satisfaction of the individual (Linnakylä & Brunell, 1996). WHO (2001) describes the concept of quality of life as a way of perceiving one's own situation in one's own culture and values. The life quality of the individual is evaluated together with factors such as social environment, family,

education and work life. School life quality can be considered as the quality of school life. The level of satisfaction of school students involves their commitment to the school or their reactions to the teachers (Jimmieson, Hannam, & Yeo, 2010, p. 453). High school life quality of students in educational environments will reduce the dropout rate of students and contribute to the participation of students' learning experience in the school environment and the socialization process with their friends (Sari, 2007). Similarly, Dos (2013) stated that students with high school life quality have high motivation and decreases student absenteeism, resulting in students working harder and thereby increasing their chances of success. Depending on the quality of school life, encouraging students to learn during classes increases their school performance (Perry, Liu, & Pabian, 2010, pp. 286-287), and provides a positive contribution to their commitment to school and decreases the risk of dropping out (Orthner et al., 2010). As Mok and Flynn (2002) cited the study of Williams and Batten (1981), the subscales of school life quality are valued as positive emotion, negative emotion, status, identity, teachers, opportunities and success. According to Karatzias, Power, and Swanson (2001), the criteria for school life quality are valued as attendance, curriculum, teaching methods, learning, learning styles, personal needs, evaluation, value system of individuals, support, career, value system of schools, relationships, and objective and subjective environmental determinants.

Teacher behaviors are especially important in early age groups. Teachers are considered as role models for students, even above the parents. The behaviors of teachers, who have such an important role in the construction of the next generation, is also becoming more and more important. The dominant factor of education systems in fulfilling the national and universal objectives are teachers. The effectiveness of teachers in the classroom is a decisive criterion for education in order for schools to reach their specified goals. In other words, the quality of education is largely determined by the behaviors of the teachers (Senemoglu, 2016). The role of internal and external stakeholders in formal education institutions has been determined. In this context, education systems will meet their expectations through the expected performance of each stakeholder. Greenwood and Carta (1987) described this in the sense that student achievement directly relates to teacher behavior, no matter how different the students' individual characteristics are. Feldman (2007) states that this is an important effect of teacher behaviors on student behaviors. The teacher, who is primarily responsible for the regulation of the learning environment (Tsang, 2017), provides the academic development of the students with their knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Calik & Kurt, 2010; Hoy & Tarter, 1997; Yilmaz & Altinkurt, 2013) and influences students through their own behaviors (Atteberry, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2017). Classroom teacher behaviors are shaped by the school climate (Calik & Kurt, 2010; Hoy & Tarter, 1997; Yilmaz & Altinkurt, 2013), personal and professional development of teachers (Leigh, 2010; Seferoglu, 2001) and their personalities. Classroom teacher behaviors increase students' academic achievement (Frydaki, 2009; Halstead & Taylor, 2000), school attachment (Bakir Aygar & Kaya, 2017; Colak, Altinkurt, & Yilmaz, 2014, p. 48; Hunt-Sartori, 2007; Semlak & Pearson, 2008), as well as supporting positive attitudes. In addition, in-class teacher behaviors contribute positively to the elimination of undesired student behaviors (Bekiari, Heropoulou, & Sakellariou, 2005; Guclu, 2000; Lewis & Riley, 2009).

Another important parameter in the ability of the education systems to achieve the intended objectives is the level of students' commitment to their school. Educational and

instructional objectives will only be realized if the students continue to attend classes. The positive approach of students to their friends and teachers is defined as (Cueto, Gabriela, Claudia, & Alvaro, 2010, p. 277) their level of motivation to comply with school rules, their interest towards the lesson (Cueto et al., 2010), regular attendance, and presence at extracurricular social activities (Silins & Mulford, 2004). Silins and Mulford (2004, p. 51) describe students' commitment to the school as regular attendance, engaging in extracurricular social activities, participating in classroom and school-wide decisions, expressing their own ideas, and the level of interpreting the relationship of students with their friends and teachers. Although students' commitment to the school is classified in different ways, it can be examined in four different dimensions, namely, behavioral, academic, cognitive, and psychological commitment (Appleton, Christenson, Kim, & Reschly, 2006). Behavioral commitment can be defined as the level of a student's desire to be prepared for school activities (Appleton et al., 2006). It has been reported that students with high levels of behavioral commitment showed less tendency to drop out of school (Archambault, Janosz, Fallu, & Pagani, 2009). Academic commitment is related to the time they spend fulfilling their duties and responsibilities. Korterling and Christenson (2009) emphasized the importance of the relationship between the time a student spends on their school work and their success while explaining academic commitment. Cognitive commitment can be expressed as the value that students place on learning, and the meaning they place on the concept of learning (Appleton et al., 2006). Psychological commitment includes a student's involvement with their teachers and peers and the support the student perceives from them (Sharkey, You, & Schnoebelen, 2008). Scientific studies have shown that students with high levels of commitment to the school also have high levels of academic achievement (Furlong & Christenson, 2008; Klem & Connell, 2004; Skinner, Furrer, Marchand, & Kindermann, 2008). In cases where the students' loyalty to the school is insufficient, it has been reported that students have tendencies towards antisocial behaviors (Hambleton, 2011; Wahome, 2003), resulting in school drop out if the necessary precautions are not taken (Korterling & Christenson, 2009). Students' loyalty to the school, which is a very important concept, can be influenced by the school environment, school management, and peer group factors (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris 2004, p. 77).

The aim of this current study is to determine the predictive level of variables such as school climate, school life quality and classroom teacher behaviors on students' commitment to the school. Several studies have been carried out to date on students' commitment to the school and the current literature shows a theoretical relationship between school climate, school life quality and classroom teacher behavior, and that these variables have an important place in explaining the students' commitment to the school (Demir, Kaya, & Metin, 2012; Durmaz, 2008; Erdem, 2010; Shernoff et al., 2016; Zendarski, Sciberras, Mensah, & Hiscock, 2017). For example, Ozdemir et al. (2010) reported that school climate is an element supporting student achievement and that their commitment to the school increases as student achievement increases. Similarly, many studies have found a significant relationship between school climate and student commitment to the school (Lubienski, Lubienski, & Crane, 2008; MacNeil, Prater, & Busch, 2009). It has been stated in different studies that students' commitment to the school is related to school life quality (Mok & Flynn, 2002; Orthner et al., 2010) and classroom teacher behavior (Ozdemir, 2012). The aim of this current study is to determine the predictive level of school climate, school

life quality and classroom teacher behavior variables on students' commitment to the school. With this aim in mind, answers to the following questions have been sought:

- Is the level of perceived school climate of students a meaningful predictor of their level of commitment to the school?
- Are the levels of perceived school climate of students, school life quality and classroom teacher behavior meaningful predictors of students' level of commitment to the school?
- Are the demographic characteristics of students (gender, academic achievement, school type) meaningful predictors of students' level of commitment to the school?

## Methodology

In this research, relational screening model, which is one of the general screening models, was used because the current situation was depicted as it existed and it was tested if there was a meaningful relationship between the variables.

To arrive at a conclusion about the population in the relational screening model, the existence of a change between two or more variables and the sample taken from the population is searched. If there is a relationship between the variables, it is tried to determine the level of this relationship (Karasar, 2014).

The research population includes secondary and high school students who continue their education at the central district of Elazig province, Turkey, during the 2015-2016 academic year. A total of 450 secondary school students were identified by random sampling method for the research sample. The random sampling method provides a way to generalize a population by selecting a sample that represents the population (Creswell, 2014; Punch, 2014). Of the 450 students in the research sample, 422 returned forms that were found to be usable. 172 of the participants are male (40.76%) and 250 of them are female (59.24%); also, 270 were secondary school students (64%) and 152 were from high schools (36%).

### *Data Collection Tools*

Four data collection tools were used in the study; School Climate Student Scale (SCSS) (Calik & Kurt, 2010), School Life Quality Scale (SLQS) (Turkoglu, 2012), Classroom Teacher Behavior Scale (CTBS) (Buyukozturk, Kilic, Karadeniz, & Karatas, 2004) and the Commitment to School Scale (CSS) (Akin et al., 2013). Information about each of the scales used is given below.

### *School Climate Student Scale (SCSS)*

Developed by Calik and Kurt (2010, p. 177), this scale consists of 22 items in a five-point, Likert-type grading format. The grading scale is formed as "Never" (1) through to "Always" (5). There are three factors in the scale: (Factor 1) supportive teacher behaviors (eight items), (Factor 2) success orientation (four items), and (Factor 3) secure learning environment and positive peer interaction (10 items). The internal consistency coefficients calculated to determine the reliability of the scores obtained from the factors ranged from .77 to .85. Eight negative expressions (Items 9, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22) in the scale are scored by reverse coding. The internal consistency coefficient of the scale was calculated as .88 in the analyses performed on collected data in this study.

### *School Life Quality Scale (SLQS)*

Developed by Turkoglu (2012), the School Life Quality Scale consists of 35 items in a five-point, Likert-type grading format. The grading scale is formed as “Definitely Disagree” (1) through to and “Definitely Agree” (5). The scale consists five sub-dimensions; “Emotions towards the School,” “School Management,” “Teacher-Student Communication,” “Student-Student Communication,” and “Status”. The 15 negative expressions (Items 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 14, 16, 18, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, 32, 35) in the scale are scored by reverse coding. In this study, the internal consistency coefficient of your scale is calculated as .83 for the whole scale.

### *Classroom Teacher Behavior Scale (CTBS)*

Developed by Buyukozturk et al. (2004) in order to determine teachers’ classroom behaviors, the Classroom Teacher Behavior Scale (CTBS) consists of 27 items in a five-point, Likert-type grading format. The scale was formed as “Almost always” (5), “Usually” (4), “Sometimes” (3), “Rarely” (2), “Almost never” (1). All of the items in the scale consist of positive expressions. The scale has a single factor structure consisting of 27 items. In this study, the internal consistency coefficient of the scale is calculated as .94 for the whole scale.

### *Commitment to School Scale (CSS)*

One of the data collection tools used in the research was the Commitment to School Scale (CSS) which was developed by Fredricks, Blumenfeld, Friedel, and Paris (2003, 2005). The validity and reliability of the Turkish form of the scale was conducted by Akin et al. (2013). It is a 15-item scale developed in a five-point, Likert-type format, with a grading scale of “Never” (1), “Rarely” (2), “Sometimes” (3), “Often” (4), and “Always” (5) in order to determine the levels of cognitive, behavioral and emotional attachment of students to the school. The three negative expressions (Items 2, 4, 6) in the scale are scored by reverse coding. In this study, the internal consistency coefficient of the scale is calculated as .84 for the whole scale.

## **Results**

The SPSS 22.0 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) program was used in the analysis of the collected data. The necessary examinations were carried out to determine whether or not the data was appropriate for the analyses to be performed. First of all, it was examined whether or not the data of the School Climate Student Scale, School Life Quality Scale, Classroom Teacher Behavior Scale, and Commitment to School Scale variables were within normal range. A premise that is required for the application of parametric tests is that the observations are selected from a normally distributed universe, that is, the normal distribution of the obtained data. Skewness and Kurtosis values were examined with central tendency measures (mean and median) for the distribution of total scores obtained from all scales applied to teachers to test whether this premise was met. The obtained values are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Values Related to Average Scores Obtained from School Climate Student Scale (SCSS), School Life Quality Scale (SLQS), Classroom Teacher Behavior Scale (CTBS) and Commitment to School Scale (CSS)

<i>Scale</i>	<i>N</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>Skewness</i>	<i>Kurtosis</i>
SCSS	422	3.518	.471	-.189	-.315
SLQS	422	3.395	.513	.095	.544
CTBS	422	3.593	.812	-.484	.460
CSS	422	3.620	.683	-.348	-.424

Table 1 shows the Kurtosis and Skewness values along with the central tendency measures of the scores obtained for all the variables used in the analysis of the data within the scope of the research. When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that the central tendency measures for each variable are close to each other. Moreover, when Kurtosis and Skewness coefficients obtained from all scales are examined, it is seen that all values are between -1.5 and +1.5 values accepted for social sciences (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) according to the level of 5% significance. In this case, it was decided that multiple regression analysis could be performed from the parametric tests, assuming that all the values obtained from the measurements of the scales of SCSS, SLQS, CTBS and CSS showed a normal distribution. One of the important premises in the multi-regression analysis is to identify and remove multivariable extreme values from the dataset (Pallant, 2015). In this study, Mahalanobis distances were calculated and examined and one extreme value which threatened the strength of the study was identified and deleted from the dataset and the reanalyzed. Table 2 shows the distribution of the relationship of student views between the scales of SCSS, SLQS, CTBS and CSS.

**Table 2.** Relationship between students and SCSS, SLQS, CTBS, CSS scales

	CSS (Mean)	CTBS (Mean)	SCSS (Mean)	SLQS (Mean)
CSS (Mean)	-			
CTBS (Mean)	.476	-		
SCSS (Mean)	.523	.438	-	
SLQS (Mean)	.538	.563	.511	-

P<.05

When the distribution of the relationship of students between SCSS, SLQS, CTBS and CSS in Table 2 is analyzed, it is seen that there is a positive and medium-level relationship between the scores of SCSS, SLQS, CTBS and CSS scales. According to this, it can be said that as the students' school life quality, classroom teacher behaviors and school climate scores increase, the commitment of the students to the schools will also increase. The multiple regression analysis of students' commitment to the school is given in Table 3.



**Table 3.** Multiple regression analysis for prediction of Commitment to School Scale

Variable	B	Standard error <sub>B</sub>	$\beta$	T	P	Tailed r	Partial r
	.260	.214	-	1.215	.225	-	-
CTBS	.157	.040	.187	3.983	.000	.191	.151
SCSS	.431	.065	.298	6.583	.000	.306	.706
SLQS	.376	.066	.280	5.689	.000	.268	.596

R=.629, R<sup>2</sup>=.396, F (3-421)=91.260, p=.000

When the results of the regression analysis on the predictability of students' attachment to the school are examined in Table 3, it is observed that there is a significant relationship between the scales of classroom teacher behaviors, school climate student and school life quality scores and commitment to school scale scores ( $R = .629, R^2 = .396, p < .05$ ). The three scales mentioned account for 39.6% of the variance in the students' commitment to the school. According to the standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ), the relative importance of the predictive variables on the commitment to school is school climate, school life quality, and classroom teacher behavior. When the results of variance analysis on the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that school climate, school life quality, and classroom teacher behavior are important predictors of students' commitment to the school. According to the results of the regression analysis, the regression equation for the predictability of commitment to school is as follows:

$$\text{Commitment to School} = .260 + .157 \times \text{classroom teacher behaviour} + .431 \times \text{school climate} + .376 \times \text{school life quality}$$

The commitment of the students to the school is examined in Table 4 according to their demographic characteristics. When the independent groups t-test results, which were performed in order to compare the level of commitment of male and female students to the school, were examined, a significant difference was found in favor of the female students ( $t_{0.05; 420} = -4.05$ ). Accordingly, the level of female students' attachment to the school ( $\bar{X} = 3.73$ ) is higher than that of the male students ( $\bar{X} = 3.47$ ).

**Table 4.** Independent Group t-Test: Does CSS Differentiate According to Gender?

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	t	df	p
Male	172	3.47	.68	-4.05	420	.001
Female	250	3.73	.66			

Independent groups t-test results carried out for the comparison of secondary school and high school students' commitment levels are presented in Table 5. When examined, Table 5 shows a significant difference in favor of secondary school students ( $t_{0.05; 420} = 8.24$ ). According to this, the level of commitment to the school of the secondary school students ( $\bar{X} = 3.82$ ) is higher than that of the high school students ( $\bar{X} = 3.29$ ).

**Table 5.** Independent Group t-Test: Does CSS Differentiate According to School Type?

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	t	df	P
Secondary school	270	3.82	.60	8.24	420	.001
High School	152	3.29	.6*			

When the correlation between the academic achievement levels of the students and the students' commitment to the school levels were examined, it was determined that  $r=.131$ ,  $n=422$ ,  $p<.001$ . It has been determined that the level of academic achievement of students and the level of students' commitment to the schools only share a variance of 1.7% ( $r^2 = .017$ ) and that this value is very small (Pallant, 2015).

### Conclusion and Discussion

In this current study, it was aimed to determine whether or not the variables of school climate, school life quality, and classroom teacher behaviors were significant predictors of students' commitment to the school. For this purpose, 450 students attending secondary and high school education in the central province of Elazig, Turkey, during in the 2015-2016 academic year were included in the research sample by random sampling method. Four data collection tools were employed in the study; School Climate Student Scale (SCSS) (Calik & Kurt, 2010), School Life Quality Scale (SLQS) (Turkoglu, 2012), Classroom Teacher Behavior Scale (CTBS) (Buyukozturk et al., 2004) and Commitment to School Scale (CSS) (Akin et al., 2013).

In light of the obtained findings, it was concluded that there was a moderate (medium-level) correlation between commitment to school and school life quality ( $r=.538$ ), school climate ( $r=.523$ ) and classroom teacher behavior ( $r=.476$ ). According to the results of regression analysis, it was concluded that school life quality, school climate, and classroom teacher behavior were important predictors of students' commitment to the school. The school climate is the most important predictor variable of student commitment. It can be said that as the scores of the students' school climate increase, their commitment to the school will increase. The related literature also supports the results of this research (Crosnoe, 2006; Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002; Payne, Gottfredson, & Gottfredson, 2003; Ring & Svensson, 2007; Ozdemir et al., 2010; Xin, 2003).

Among others, school life quality is the second most important predictor of student commitment to the school. This result shows that school life quality and students' commitment to the school interact with each other. It can be said that as school life quality increases, the commitment of the students to the school will also increase. This result has been expressed in the related literature that as the school life quality increases, their performance, moral values, and success will also increase and thus it is expected that students' commitment to schools will also increase (Blum, 2005; Sari, 2013; Wolf, Chandler, & Spies, 2001; Xin, 2003). Gordon (2010) attributed the realization of this expected effect to the teachers' support of students, while Maele and Houtte (2010) attributed it to the trust relationship between students and their teachers. By improving the quality of schools as a living space, it is thought that commitment to school can reach the desired level.

Classroom teacher behaviors, another variable in the study, was also found to predict student commitment to the school at a medium-level. This was explained by Brewster and Bowen (2004), that teachers increased student success by supporting their students, and the

students' commitment to the school was positively affected by the positive change in their success. The result found in the current research is similar to many study results to be found in the related literature (e.g., Hallinger, 2010; Mulford & Silins, 2003; Valentine & Prater, 2011).

According to the gender variable, it was determined that there was a significant difference in the level of student commitment to the school in favor of female students. While Chughtai and Zafar (2006) found no evidence of any relationship between gender variation and commitment to school, many research findings show parallelism with the finding of the current study (e.g., Bruce & Crump, 2003; Lopez & Emmer, 2002; Upadyaya & Salmela-Aro, 2013; Wang, Willett, & Eccles, 2011).

When the commitment to school levels of the students were examined according to the variable of school type, it was seen that there was a significant difference in favor of secondary school students. It was determined that secondary school students expressed their level of commitment to the school with a higher arithmetic average than those of high school students. This is consistent with the findings of McNeely, Nonnemaker, and Blum (2002) that students who are older and whose class levels are higher have lower levels of commitment to the school. However, in the research of Bellici (2015) and Simons-Morton, Crump, Haynie, and Saylor (1999), it was stated that students' commitment to school increases as the class levels increase. Hill (2006), on the other hand, concluded that no relationship exists between students' commitment to their schools and their age.

## References

- Akin, A., Saricam, H., Demirci, I, Usta, F., Yalniz, A., Yildiz, B., & Akin, U. (2013, September). *The Validity And Reliability Of The Turkish Version Of The School Engagement Scale*. Paper presented at the 2013 World Congress of Psychological Counselling and Guidance, Istanbul.
- Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., Kim, D., & Reschly, A. L. (2006). Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the Student Engagement Instrument. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*(5), 427-445.
- Archambault, I., Janosz, M., Fallu, J. S., & Pagani, L. S. (2009). Student engagement and its relationship with early high school dropout. *Journal of Adolescence, 32*(3), 651-670.
- Astor, R. A., Benbenishty, R., Vinokur, A. D., & Zeira, A. (2006). Arab and Jewish Elementary School Students' Perceptions of Fear and School Violence: Understanding The Influence of School Context. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(1), 91-118.
- Atteberry, A., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2017). Teacher churning: reassignment rates and implications for student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 39*(1), 3-30.
- Bakir Aygar, B., & Kaya, A. (2017). The Mediator Role of School Climate on the Relationship between Middle School Students' Sense of School Membership and Their School Loneliness. *E-Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 8*, (1), 14-27.
- Basaran, E. İ. (2008). *Orgütsel davranış insanın üretimi gücü*. Ankara: Ekinoks Yayınları.
- Bekiari, A., Heropoulou, H., & Sakellariou, K. (2005) Perceived Aggressive Physical Education Teacher Communication, Student State Satisfaction and Reasons for Discipline. *Italian Journal of Sport Sciences, 12*(1), 73-78.

- Bellici, N. (2015). Analyzing secondary school students' school attendance With regards to various variables. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(1), 48-65.
- Blum, R. (2005). *School Connectedness: Improving the Lives of Students*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health.
- Brewster, A. B., & Bowen, G. L. (2004). Teacher support and the school engagement of Latino middle and high school students at risk of school failure. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 21(1), 47-67.
- Bruce, G., & Crump, D. A. (2003). Association of parental involvement and social competence with school adjustment and engagement among six graders. *Journal of School Health*, 73(3), 121-126.
- Bursalioğlu, Z. (2015). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranışlar*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Buyukoztürk, S., Kilic, A. G. E., Karadeniz, O. G. S., & Karatas, O. G. S. (2004). Development of Teacher Behaviors within Classroom Scale: Validity and Reliability Analysis. *Educational Administration in Theory & Practice*, 38(38), 212-239.
- Chughtai, A. A., & Zafar, S. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment among Pakistani university teachers. *Applied H.R.M. Research*, 11(1), 39-64.
- 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.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Arastirma deseni: Nitel, nicel ve karma yontem yaklasimlari*. Ankara: Egiten.
- Crosnoe, R. (2006). The connection between academic failure and adolescent drinking in secondary school. *Sociology of Education*, 79(1), 44-60.
- Cueto S., Gabriela G., Claudia S., & Alvaro M. Z. (2010). Sense of belonging and transition to high schools in Peru. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 30(3), 277-287
- Calik, T., & Kurt, T. (2010). Development of the School Climate Scale (SCS). *Education and Science*, 35(157), 167-180.
- Colak, İ., Altinkurt, Y., & Yilmaz, K. (2014). The relationship between teachers' teacher leadership roles and organizational commitment levels. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 3(1-2), 35-51.
- Demir, O., Kaya, H. İ., & Metin, M. (2012). An Investigation of High School Students' School Quality of Life Perceptions as an Element of School Culture. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 2(4), 9-28.
- Dos, İ. (2013). Happy School. *Education and Science*, 38(170), 266-280.
- Durmaz, A. (2008). *Quality of School Life in High Schools (The Case of Kırklareli Province)* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Trakya University, Edirne.
- Erdem, M. (2010). Quality of work life and its relation to organizational commitment according to teachers in secondary schools. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 16(4), 511- 536.
- Feldman, A. (2007). Teachers, responsibility and action research. *Educational Action Research*, 15(2), 239-252.
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of educational research*, 74(1), 59-109.

- Frydaki, E. (2009). Values in teaching and teaching values: A review of theory and research, including the case of Greece. *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies*, 14(1), 109-128.
- Furlong, M. J., & Christenson, S. L. (2008). Engaging students at school and with learning: A relevant constructs for all students. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45(5), 365-368.
- Gordon, C. F. (2010). *School belonging: An exploration of secondary students' perceptions of life at school* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Washington. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/openview/8d6b99fbf58b2a73a3cec93fd4604b28/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>.
- Gottfredson, G., Gottfredson, D., Ann Payne, A., & Gottfredson, N. (2005). School Climate Predictors of School Disorder: Results From A National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42(4), 412-443.
- Greenwood, C. R., & Carta, J. J. (1987). An ecobehavioral interaction analysis of instruction within special education. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 19(9), 1-12.
- Guclu, N. (2000). Ogretmen Davranislari. *Millî Egitim*, 147, 21-23.
- Hallinger, P. (2010). Leadership for learning: lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125-142.
- Halstead, J. M., & Taylor, M. J. (2000). Learning and teaching about values: A review of recent research. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30(2), 169-202.
- Hambleton, K. (2011). *The cognitive and psychological school engagement of young offenders* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). University College London, London.
- Hernandez, T. J., & S. R. Seem. (2004). A safe school climate: A systemic approach and the school counselor. *Professional School Counseling* 7(4), 256-262.
- Hill, L. G., & Werner, N. E. (2006). Affiliative Motivation, School Attachment, And Aggression In School. *Psychology in the Schools*, 43(2), 231-246.
- Hopson, L. M., & Lee, E. (2011). Mitigating the Effect of Family Poverty on Academic and Behavioral Outcomes: The Role of School Climate in Middle and High School. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33(11), 2221-2229.
- Hoy, W. K. (2003). School Climate. In J. W. Guhtrie (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of education* (2nd ed.) (pp. 2121-2124). New York: Thompson Gale.
- Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., & Sweetland, S. R. (2002). The development of the organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *High School Journal*, 86(2), 38-49.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). *Open Schools / Healthy Schools: Measuring organizational climate*. Retrieved from [http://www.waynehoy.com/pdfs/open\\_schools\\_healthy\\_schools\\_book.pdf](http://www.waynehoy.com/pdfs/open_schools_healthy_schools_book.pdf).
- Hunt-Sartori, M. A. (2007). *The Relationships Among Student Membership in Groups Quality of School Life, Sense of Belongingness and Selected Performance Factors* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.
- Jimmieson, N., Hannam, R., & Yeo, G. (2010). Teacher Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Job Efficacy: Implications for Student Quality of School Life. *British Journal of Psychology*, 101(3), 453-479.
- Johnson, D., & Grayson, K. (2005). Cognitive and affective trust in service relationships. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(4), 500-507.
- Karasar, N. (2014). *Bilimsel arastirma yontemleri*. Ankara: Nobel Yayin Dagitim.

- Karatzias, A., Power, K., & Swanson, V. (2001). Quality of school life. Development and preliminary standardization of an instrument based on performance indicators in Scottish secondary schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 12*(3), 265-284.
- Klem, A. M., & Connell, J. P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 262-273.
- Kortering, L. J., & Christenson, S. L. (2009). Engaging students in school and learning: The real deal for school completion. *Exceptionality: A Special Education Journal, 17*(1), 5-15.
- Leigh, A. (2010). Estimating teacher effectiveness from two-year changes in students' test scores. *Economics of Education Review, 29*(3): 480-488.
- Lewis, R., & Riley, P. (2009). Teacher misbehavior. In L. J. Saha & A. G. Dworkin (Eds.), *The international handbook of research on teachers and teaching* (pp. 417-431). Norwell, MA: Springer.
- Libbey, H. P. (2004). Measuring Student Relationships to School: Attachment, Bonding, Connectedness, and Engagement. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 274-247.
- Linnakylä, P., & Brunell, V. (1996). Quality of school life in the Finnish and Swedish speaking schools in Finland. In M. Binkley, K. Rust, & T. Williams (Eds.), *Reading literacy in an international perspective* (pp. 203-217). U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement NCES 97-875.
- Lopez, V. A., & Emmer, E. T. (2002). Influences of beliefs and values on male adolescents' decision to commit violent offenses. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 3*(1), 28.
- Loukas, A., Suzuki, R., & Horton, K. D. (2006) Examining School Connectedness as a mediator of school climate effects. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 16*(3), 491-502.
- Lubienski, S. T., Lubienski, C & Crane, C. C. (2008). Achievement differences and school type: The role of school climate, teacher certification and instruction. *American Journal of Education, 115*(1), 97-138
- 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*(1), 73-84.
- Maele, D. V., & Houtte, M. V. (2010). The quality of school life: Teacher-student trust relationships and the organizational school context. *Social Indicators Research, 100*(1), 85-100.
- Mok, M. M. C., & Flynn, M., (1997). Does School Size Affect Quality of School Life? *Issues in Educational Research, 7*(1), 69-86.
- Mulford, B., & Silins, H. (2003). Leadership for organizational learning and improved student outcomes – what do we know? *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(2), 175-195.
- Orpinas, P., & Horne, A. M. (2010). Creating a positive school climate and developing social competence. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 49-59). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Orthner, D., Akos, P., Rose, R., Jones-Sanpei, H., Mercado, M., & Woolley, M. (2010). CareerStart: A Middle School Student Engagement and Academic Achievement Program. *Children Schools, 32*(4), 223-234.
- 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.

- Pallant, J. (2015). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS* (5th ed.). NY, USA: McGraw Hill.
- Payne, A. A., Gottfredson, D. C., & Gottfredson, G. R. (2003). School as communities: The relationship among communal school organization, student bonding, and school disorder. *Criminology*, 41(3), 749-777.
- Perry, J. C., Liu, X., & Pabian, Y. (2010). School Engagement as a Mediator of Academic Performance Among Urban Youth: The Role of Career Preparation, Parental Career Support, and Teacher Support. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 38(2), 269-295.
- Punch, K. F. (2014). *Sosyal arastirmalara giris: Nicel ve nitel yaklasimlar*. Ankara: Siyasal.
- Ring, J., & Svensson, R. (2007). Social class and criminality among young people: A study considering the effects of school achievement as a mediating factor on the basis of Swedish register and self-report data. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 8(2), 210-233.
- Sari, M. (2007). *The effect of hidden curriculum on gaining democratic values: a qualitative study in two elementary schools having low and high quality of school life* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Cukurova Universitesi, Adana.
- Seferoglu, S. S. (2001). Sinif Ogretmenlerinin Kendi Mesleki Gelisimleriyle İlgili Gorusleri, Beklentileri ve Onerileri. *Milli Egitim Dergisi*, 149, 12-18.
- Semlak, J. L., & Pearson, J. C. (2008). Through the years: An examination of instructor age and misbehavior on perceived teacher credibility. *Communication Research Reports*, 25(1), 76-85.
- Sharkey, J. D., You, S., & Schnoebelen, K. (2008). Relations among school assets, individual resilience, and student engagement for youth grouped by level of family functioning. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45(5), 402-418.
- Shernoff, D. J., Kelly, S., Tonks, S. M., Anderson, B., Cavanagh, R. F., Sinha, S., & Abdi, B. (2016). Student engagement as a function of environmental complexity in high school classrooms. *Learning and Instruction*, 43, 52-60.
- Silins, H., & Mulford, B. (2004). Schools as learning organisations: Effects on Teacher Leadership and Student Outcomes. *School effectiveness and School improvement*, 15(3-4), 443-466.
- Simons-Morton, B. G., Crump, A. D., Haynie, D. L., & Saylor, K. E. (1999). Student-school bonding and adolescent problem behavior. *Health Education Research*, 14(1), 99-107.
- Skinner, E., Furrer, C., Marchand, G., & Kindermann, T. (2008). Engagement and disaffection in the classroom: Part of a larger motivational dynamic? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100(4), 765-781.
- 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.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- TDK. (2011). *Turkce Sozluk*. Ankara: Turk Dil Kurumu Yayinlari.
- Tsang, E. W. (2017). How the concept of organizational unlearning contributes to studies of learning organizations: a personal reflection. *The Learning Organization*, 24(1), 39-48.
- Turkoglu, G. (2012). *İlkogretim okulu ogrencilerinin okul yasam kalitesine iliskin algilari (Bursa ili Yildirim ilcesi ornegi)* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Akdeniz Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu, Antalya.

- Upadyaya, K., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2013). Development of school engagement in association with academic success and well-being in varying social contexts. *European Psychologist, 18*(2), 136-147.
- Valentine, J. W., & Prater, M. (2011). Instructional, transformational, and managerial leadership and student achievement: high school principals make a difference. *NASSP Bulletin, 95*(1), 5-30.
- Wahome, T.J. (2003). Student perceptions of factors that promote resiliency in high schools. Unpublished doctorate thesis, University of California.
- Wang, M. T., Willett, J. B., & Eccles, J. S. (2011). The assessment of school engagement: Examining dimensionality and measurement invariance by gender and race/ethnicity. *Journal of School Psychology, 49*(4), 465-480.
- Welsh, W. N. (2000). The Effects of School Climate on School Disorder. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 567*(88), 86-107.
- Wolf, F. M., Chandler, T. A., & Spies, C. J. (2001). A Cross Legged Panel Analysis Of Quality Of School Life And Achievement Responsibility. *Journal of Educational Research, 74*(5), 363-368.
- Xin, M. (2003). Sense of Belonging to School: Can Schools Make a Difference? *The Journal of Educational Research, 96*(6), 340-349.
- Yilmaz, K., & Altinkurt, Y. (2013). Adaptation of Organizational Climate Scale into Turkish: The Validity and Reliability Study. *Trakya University Journal of Education, 3*(1), 1-11.
- Zendarski, N., Sciberras, E., Mensah, F., & Hiscock, H. (2017). Early high school engagement in students with attention/deficit hyperactivity disorder. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 87*(2), 127-145.