European Journal of Education Studies
ISSN: 2501 - 1111
ISSN-L: 2501 - 1111
Available on-line at: www.oapub.org/edu

doi: 10.5281/zenodo.2580545 Volume 5 | Issue 11 | 2019

INVESTIGATION OF SAFETY AND SUPPORTIVE SCHOOL CLIMATE IN SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO VARIOUS VARIABLES

Zeynep Eren[i]
Assist. Prof. Dr.,
Sinop University,
The Education Faculty,
Turkey

Abstract:
In this study, it is aimed to examine the perceptions of pedagogical formation teacher candidates about the safe and supportive school climate according to various variables. The population of the research, which was designed in the descriptive survey model, was composed of the pedagogical formation teacher candidates of the Faculty of Education of Sinop University in 2018 academic year. One hundred fifty-six teacher candidates participated as volunteers. Since six of the completed scales were not correctly filled, the study was carried out with 150 participants. The data of the study was collected by the personal information form of the researcher and the Maryland Safe and Supporting School Climate Scale. Data were analysed by using SPSS package program and descriptive and statistical techniques. The mean and standard deviation examined formation pedagogical formation teacher candidates' demographic characteristics, frequency and percentage, the school's safety and supportive climate. According to the findings of the study, the perceived safety of pedagogical formation teacher candidates high level significant positive and moderate correlations between the other dimensions and sub-dimensions.

Keywords: school climate, safety, engagement, environment, teacher-candidates

1. Introduction

By nature, every person wants to feel peaceful, happy, comfortable, cared and appreciated in the environment where he lives and works. Feeling calm, safe and supported in its surroundings reflects positively to all human activities. The same applies to schools. Studies on students in schools showed that positive relationships between teachers, students and peers in the school and positive perceptions of students about the school have positive effects on the school success of the school's various structural features and school relations (Anderson, 1982; Bektaş and Nalçacı, 2013;

[i] Correspondence: email zugurlu@sinop.edu.tr

Cohen, McCabe, Michelli and Pickeral, 2009; Hendron, 2014; Smith, 2008; Tableman, 2004; Uline and Tschannen-Moran, 2008). School climate refers to all qualifications of the school's internal environment that distinguishes one school from another and affect the behaviour of individuals in the school (Hoy and Miskel, 2015). The school climate is safe and supportive, making it easier for the school to achieve its goals. In this study, it is aimed to examine the perceptions of pedagogical formation students about school climate in terms of various variables.

2. Literature Review

Organisational climate is defined by the different points of view that affect the perceptions of employees about the internal environment of the organisation, the feeling created by the physical environment, and the product of relations between individuals and groups (Bursalıoğlu, 2015; Schein, 1985). The concept of climate, organisation and management are defined as the perceptions of the employees of the organisation about their fields of work in science research (Hoy and Miskel, 2015). Organisational climate includes the positive or negative perceptions of the employees in the organisation and the practices in the organisation and other employees. In a healthy and positive organisational climate, it is assumed that employees are happier, peaceful, satisfied with being in and out of the organisation, and as a result, they have high productivity.

Schools are educational organisations that are explicitly established to achieve educational objectives. Each school is an ecological system in which students' behaviour, attitude and achievement levels reflect the school climate. Therefore, a positive change in the school climate is a sign that the school is developing (Haynes, Emmons and Ben-Avie, 2001, p. 5). The concept of school climate created by adapting the idea of organizational climate to the school reflects the standards, goals, values, interpersonal relations, education, teaching and leadership practices and organizational structure of all individuals related to school, such as students, teachers, school staff, parents, and connected to their current school life and based on experience (Pickeral, Evans, Hughes and Hutchison, 2009, p.3). Nwankwo (1979, p.268, translated Anderson, 1982) is defined as the school climate, the sense that *individuals perceive about the general public, the group subculture, or the interactive life of the school.*

The concept of school climate is directly related to school culture. Like all organisations, schools are also unique places. In this respect, seeing schools as structures with bureaucratic characteristics means ignoring the natural attributes of the school beyond its formal features (Uğurlu, 2015). The organisational culture of the school and its organisation is a system of traditions, beliefs and values that distinguishes an organisation from other organisations (Can, 2007; Mintzberg, 2014). Organisational culture transfers the fundamental values, norms and expectations of the organisation to the employees in the organisation. It provides a road map to the employees who are united within the same organisation and with common goals and values and gives them to reach the objectives of the organisation in a specific plan and

order (Altman, 2000; Robbins and Judge, 2012). School culture and climate are generally considered together, but they are different from each other. School culture is a set of values, beliefs, rules, rituals that facilitate or complicate the functioning of the school and forms the framework for the operation of the organisation. School climate is the perceptions of the individuals in the school. This is due to the difference in organisational culture and organisational climate as an organisational concept (Table 1).

Table 1: Primary Distinctions of Culture and Climate

Organisational Concept	Culture	Climate
Basis of concept	Deeply shared values, assumptions, beliefs, or ideologies of members	Common member perception of attitudes toward and feelings about organisational life
Primary conceptual sources	Anthropology, sociology, linguistics, and organisational behaviour	Cognitive and social psychology and organisational behaviour
Organizational perspective	Holistic primary Emergent patterns	Pervasive, various organizational patterns, often focused on specific arenas
Major purposes of concept	Instrumental (Is): social interpretation, behaviour control, and adaptation metaphor or meaning Interpretive	Extrinsic: member control Intrinsic: member motivation
Primary elements or emphasis	Superordinate meaning	Common views of participants
Primary values or use	Identifies uniqueness about other organisations	Comparison among organisations or over time
Major characteristics	Embedded or enduring	Current patterns or atmosphere
Nature of change	Cataclysmic or long-term and intensive efforts	More malleable, various direct or indirect means

Source: Peterson, M.W. and Melinda G. Spencer, M.G., 1990, Understanding academic culture and climate. *New directions for institutional research*, no:68, Jossey-Bass Inc., p. 7., Table 1.

Climate, as a construct or concept, emanates primarily from cognitive and social psychology and studies of organisational behaviour. Although the terms climate and culture are often used interchangeably, the two can be usefully distinguished. Climate can be defined as the current common patterns of critical dimensions of organisational life or its members' perceptions of and attitudes toward those dimensions. Thus, climate, compared to culture, is more concerned with current opinions and opinions rather than deeply held meanings, beliefs, and values (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974, transferred Peterson and Spencer, 1990, p.7). A wide range of different variables has been included in various researches about the determinants of school climate. Inspired by Tagiuri (1968), who developed a taxonomy to assess the climate of the organisation, Anderson (1987), who suggested that the use of this taxonomy could also evaluate the

school climate. The variables examined in the research were observed in four groups: ecology, environment, social system and culture (Anderson, 1987, p. 388-404):

- Ecological variables are physical properties and material aspects of the school. For example, the characteristics of the school building and the size of the school.
- Environmental variables are characteristics of individuals and groups in the school environment: teacher characteristics, teacher and student satisfaction, morale.
- Variables related to the social system, organizational structure and management of the school, the flexibility of curriculum and curricula, a grouping of students' talents, manager and teacher compliance, the participation of teachers and students in the decision-making process, teacher-student and teacher-teacher relationship, good communication, student participation opportunities, community-school relationship and the development of curricula.
- Cultural variables include belief systems, values, cognitive structures and social dimensions related to meaning. In terms of the school, teachers' commitment to the profession and the school and their academic development, team spirit, expectations, awards and appreciation, consistency, consensus, and openness of the objectives were included.

The researcher found that some of the variables mentioned above contributed to the school's positive learning environment (for example, teacher traits and communication with students, teacher engagement, good conversation), and some (e.g., ecological variables) were more indirect (Anderson, 1987).

When talking about the climate of the school, the leadership of the school principals, the determination of the educational philosophy and school goals, the policies and procedures agreed on, the expectation of high achievement from the students, the regular program, performance and student evaluation, other activities offered by the school outside the academic program, support for the students and the inclusion of parents in school processes. An analysis of these issues gives an idea of the school's climate (Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp, 1991; Uğurlu, 2015). Therefore, studies evaluating the school's climate should include as many dimensions as possible.

Cohen et al. (2009, p. 10) stated that school climate expresses the character and character of school life. The authors argue that the school climate reflects on the experiences of people's school life and reflects norms, goals, values, interpersonal relationships, teaching and learning practices, and organisational structures. Cohen et al. (2009) suggested that school life refers to the level of security provided by a school, the type of relationships that exist within it, and the vision and participation shared by everyone in this vision, as well as larger physical environments. In particular, this definition includes both the social and physical aspects of the school climate and shows the entire school as an appropriate unit of measure. However, Bradshaw, Waasdorp, Debnam and Johnson (2014) have argued that although many scales have been developed to measure school climate, few of them reflect the multidimensional and complex nature of the school climate. According to the researchers, although there is a large number of evidence showing that the school climate is a multifaceted structure,

many studies in literature do not adequately reflect this multidimensional structure of the school climate. Usually, the scales used focus on specific areas of the school environment, such as the participation of teachers or students.

Bradshaw et al. (2014) developed a school climate scale *Maryland Safe and Supportive School Climate Scale (MGDOI),* the school has measured the climate in three dimensions: *Safety, engagement, environment* and 13 sub-dimensions: *Perceived safety, bullying and aggression, general drug use, connection to teachers, whole-school connectedness, student connectedness, culture of equity, academic engagement, parent engagement, rules and consequences, disorder, physical comfort and support.* In a school that is based on respect and trust, supportive and related school staff and peers, the sense of loyalty leads the student to feel belonging to the school. *Engagement* is the strong relationship between students, teachers, the school and the school and the wider community: s*afety*, violence, bullying, maltreatment, and substance-related activities. Safe schools encourage protection from violence, weapons and threats by school, theft, bullying, the use and sale of illegal substances. A safe school is associated with academic performance, especially physical and emotional safety. Those who are physically and emotionally abused in the school or who use illicit substances constitute a risk group in terms of low academic achievement, course failure and dropping out of school. *The school environment* is widely characterized by the school's equipment, classes, disciplinary policies and practices. It regulates the external factors affecting students. The positive school environment is defined as the appropriate equipment, the well-managed classes, and the clear disciplinary policies of a school.

In the study of the dimensions and basic indicators of school climate created by *National School Climate Center* (2017), school climate, safety, teaching and learning, interpersonal relations, institutional environment, social media, and only for employees are organised into six dimensions (Table 2).

Table 2: The 13 dimensions of school climate measured by the CSCI

Dimensions	Major indicators
Safety	
1. Rules and Norms	Communicated rules about physical violence, clearly communicated rules about verbal abuse, harassment, and teasing, clear and consistent norms and enforcement for adult intervention.
2. Physical Security	Students and adults feel safe from physical harm in the school.
3. Social-Emotional Security	Students feel safe from verbal abuse, teasing, and exclusion.
Teaching and Learning	
4. Support for Learning	Use of supportive teaching practices, such as encouragement and constructive feedback, varied opportunities to demonstrate knowledge and skills, support for risk-taking and independent thinking, an atmosphere conducive to dialogue and questioning, academic challenge, and individual attention.
5. Social and Civic Learning	Support for the development of social and civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions including effective listening, conflict resolution, self-reflection, emotional regulation, empathy, personal responsibility, and ethical decision making.

6. Respect for Diversity	Mutual respect for individual differences (e.g. gender, race, culture, etc.) at all levels of the school—student-student, adult-student, adult-adult and overall norms for tolerance.
7. Social Support—Adults	The pattern of supportive and caring adult relationships for students, including high expectations for students' success, willingness to listen to students and to get to know them as individuals, and personal concern for students' problems.
8. Social Support—Students	The pattern of supportive peer relationships for students, including friendships for socialising, for problems, for academic help, and new students.
Institutional Environment	
9. School Connectedness - Engagement	Identification with the school; norms for broad participation in school life for students, staff, and families.
10. Physical Surroundings	Cleanliness, order, the appeal of facilities; adequate resources and materials.
Social Media	
11. Social Media	Students feel safe from physical harm, verbal abuse/teasing, gossip, and exclusion when online or on electronic devices (i.e., Facebook, Twitter, other social media platforms, by an email, text messaging, posting photo/video, etc.).
Staff Only	
12. Leadership	Administration creates and communicates a clear vision and is accessible and supportive of school staff development.
13. Professional Relationships	Positive attitudes and relationships among school staff that support effectively working and learning together.

Source: The 13 dimensions of school climate measured by the CSCI, National School Climate Center, 2017, https://www.schoolclimate.org/services/measuring-school-climate-csci

As seen in Table 2, different dimensions of school climate have been rearranged by including similar dimensions, and social media variable has been added. In the safety dimension, which is the first dimension in the measurement of school climate, rules and norms, physical safety and social-emotional safety; the second dimension of teaching and learning, learning support and social life; the third dimension is respect for differences in the dimension of interpersonal relations, social support to adults and students; the engagement to school and physical environment; fifth and other similar scales not included dimension social media; the sixth and last dimension of the school, which is aimed at school staff, and the professional relations sub-dimensions in school have taken place. Physical damage, verbal abuse / mockery, gossip and exclusion of students, online or electronic devices in the social media dimension, which is not included in previously developed scales (eg: Facebook, Twitter, other social media platforms, via e-mail, text messaging, photography It is defined as primary indicators for a healthy school climate.

When the researches in the literature were examined, the relationships between different variables were considered in many studies about school climate. According to Zullig, Koopman, Patton and Ubbes (2010), safety, discipline, order, academic outcomes, social relations, in-school functioning and school adherence variables were

investigated in the researches on the school climate. These variables are perceived safety, peer and respect to authority, discipline policies based on fair and knowledge, school gangs, school success, academic norms, satisfaction with schools and classes, future and current evaluations of performance, teacher-student relations, interpersonal relations, peer relations, school satisfaction of the students, physical conditions of the school and class (such as temperature, arrangement, decoration, noise, material and materials of the class), motivation of the learners and their belonging to the school were examined (Kuperminc, Leadbeater and Blatt, 2001; Cohen et al, 2009; Uline and Tschannen-Moran, 2008; Worrell and Hale, 2001). Similarly, similar concepts have been explored in more recent studies. The researches show that the relationship of the students with the teachers on the school climate, their relations with their peers, adherence to the school, the acceptance and valuation of the students with different culture and language, the existence of fair, transparent and coherent rules and the attention of the students in the search for help are effective (Aldridge and Ala'I, 2013).

In the researches on school climate, it is seen that the school climate is investigated about both environmental and personal factors and is extremely complex, comprehensive and multi-dimensional (Anderson, 1982; Cohen et al., 2009; Freiberg, 1998; Freiberg and Stein, 1999; Thapa, Cohen, Guffey and Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2013). School climate includes communication models, appropriate behavioural norms, the way things are done, role relationships, role perceptions, sanctions and ideas of being affected (Welsh, 2000). The concept of school climate is a character and quality indicator that the stakeholders feel secure, socially, emotionally and physically (Cohen et al., 2009).

The school can be a risk factor or protective factor for students to develop healthy behaviours according to their qualifications. It is stated in the literature that students who do not like their school generally have academic failures, have unhealthy behaviours, have psychosomatic problems and have a lower quality of life (Epstein, 1981). School climate is an essential variable in the development of positive or negative attitudes towards school, and in increasing or decreasing the academic success and undesired behaviour rates (Furrer and Skinner, 2003). The assessment of school climate is useful for data-based decision-making in determining the measures that can be taken at school and can provide data for school development studies.

From this point of view, it is aimed to examine the perceptions of pedagogical formation teacher candidates about a safe and supportive school climate according to various variables. For this purpose, the following questions were sought:

1) What are the perceptions of pedagogical formation teacher candidates about a safe and supportive school climate?
2) Are there any significant differences to the perceptions of pedagogical formation teacher candidates about a safe and supportive school climate according to;
   - Gender;
   - Age;
   - Whether having a working condition or not.

3. Is there any significant relationship between the perceptions of pedagogical formation teacher candidates about a safe and supportive school climate?

3. Methods

3.1. Participants

The study group involved in the research consists of 156 pedagogical formation teacher candidates who receive pedagogical formation education at the Sinop University during 2018-2019 in the Turkey Republic. However, 150 data collection tools were used. Research participants' demographic characteristics are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Pedagogical Formation Teacher Candidates' Demographics

Variables		n	%
Gender	Female	38	25.3
	Male	112	74.7
	Total	150	100
Age	23 age and <	116	77.3
	24 age and >	34	22.7
	Total	150	100
Working condition	Working	20	13.3
	Not working	130	86.7
	Total	150	100

As shown in Table 3; 25.3% female (n: 38), 74.7% male (n: 112); 77.3%, 23 years and under (n: 116); 22.7% were in the 24 years and over (n: 34) range, 13.3% in a working (n: 20) and 86.7% in non-working (n: 130).

3.2. Research methods

Descriptive statistics with a quantitative method were used in this study. Descriptive statistics are defined as pattern organisation being applied to a sample group or the whole population to reach an overall judgment about the total population when this population involves a lot of subjects (Karasar, 2012).

3.3. Instrument

In this study, *Personal Information Form* and *Maryland Safe and Supportive Schools Climate Scale* were used as data collection tools. Maryland Safe and Supportive Schools Climate Scale which was designed by Bradshaw et al. in 2014 and Ekşi, Türk and Avcu (2017) adapted to Turkish. In this study, the scale adapted to Turkish was used with permission from Ekşi et al (2017).

Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were carried out with randomly generated sub-sample groups obtained from 25000 students and original scale *(Maryland Safe and Supportive Schools Climate Survey)* developed by Bradshaw et al. (2014). For scale safety factor CFI=0.984, TLI=0.964, RMSEA=0.038, ve SRMR=0.023, α=0.81; for scale engagement factor CFI=0.983, TLI=0.971, RMSEA=0.029, and for scale

environment factor CFI=0.969, TLI=0.943, RMSEA=0.045, ve SRMR=0.022, α=0.94 values were found. The internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) is .94 (Bradshaw et al., 2014). The scale adapted to Turkish by Ekşi et al. (2017), exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were $\chi 2$/sd value 1,85 < 2, GFI value 0.92 > 0.90, CFI value 0,97 > 0.90 and RMSEA value 0,48 <0.60 model data compliance was found to be acceptable. The internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) is .89 (Ekşi et al, 2017).

The survey consists of two parts. The first part is the personal information form used to identify teacher candidates' *gender, age* and *working condition.* The second part is a 4 Likert Scale in the form of [Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), Strongly Agree (4)] inclusive. It includes 56 items, three dimensions and 13 sub-dimensions. The first of the dimensions *safety* consists of 3 sub-dimensions (perceived safety, bullying and aggression, general drug use), the second dimension *engagement* consists of 6 sub-dimensions (connection to teachers, student connectedness, academic engagement, whole-school connectedness, culture of equity, parent engagement), the third dimension *environment* consists of 4 sub-dimensions (rules and consequences, physical comfort, support, disorder). The internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) is .85. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient greater than .80 indicates that the scale is highly reliable (Field, 2005).

3.4. Procedure and Data Analysis

The data of this study were collected from the students who received pedagogical formation education at the Faculty of Education of Sinop University in the 2018-2019 academic year. Six of the data collected from 156 people who volunteered to participate in the study were not included in the study for various reasons, and the research was completed with 150 data collection tools. SPSS program was used in data analysis, and descriptive and statistical techniques which are suitable for research were used (Field, 2005; Büyüköztürk et al, 2008). The demographic characteristics of the students were determined by frequency and percentage, and the school's safety and supportive climate were determined by the mean and standard deviation. Whether the data is normally distributed the skewness coefficient was examined. In the study, Mann Whitney U test which is nonparametric equivalent was used instead of the parametric test (t-test) because of the low number of participants in the working condition independent variable (n <30) (Field, 2005).

4. Findings

Research findings; The findings of the teacher candidates in pedagogical formation education were determined according to the level of perception of a safe and supportive school climate and their differences according to various variables.

4.1. Findings Related to Safety and Supporting School Climate Perception Levels of Pedagogical Formation Teacher Candidates

The descriptive statistics of the teacher candidates in pedagogical formation education about perception levels of safety and supportive school climate are given in Table 4.

Table 4: Pedagogical Formation Teacher Candidates' Safety and Supporting School Climate Perception Levels

Dimensions	Sub-Dimensions	n	Ẋ	Ss	
Safety	Perceived safety	150	2.86	.463	1
	Bullying and aggression		2.63	.466	2
	General drug use		2.08	.587	3
General safety			2.57	.361	
Engagement	Academic engagement		3.16	.399	1
	Culture of equity		2.93	.533	2
	Connection to teachers		2.92	.487	3
	Student connectedness		2.66	.542	4
	Whole-school connectedness		2.66	.629	5
	Parent engagement		2.43	.650	6
General engagement			2.78	.376	
Environment	Rules and consequences		2.78	.466	1
	Support		2.69	.605	2
	Physical comfort		2.41	.643	3
	Disorder		2.37	.483	4
General environment			2.56	.353	

As shown that Table 4 in the *general safety* perceptions of the pedagogical formation teacher candidates' was found to highest average size *perceived safety* sub-dimension ($\bar{X}$ = 2.86, ss=.463) and lowest average size *general drug use* sub-dimension ($\bar{X}$ = 2.08, ss=.587). The level of general safety perception was found to be higher than the average ($\bar{X}$ = 2.57, ss=.361). *Engagement* perceptions of the pedagogical formation teacher candidates' was found to highest average size *academic engagement* sub-dimension ($\bar{X}$ = 3.16, ss=.399), and lowest average size *parent engagement* sub-dimension ($\bar{X}$ = 2.43, ss=.650). The level of general engagement perception was found to be higher than the average ($\bar{X}$ = 2.78, ss=.376). *Environment* perceptions of the pedagogical formation teacher candidates' was found to highest average size *rules and consequences* sub-dimension ($\bar{X}$ = 2.78, ss=.466), and lowest average size *disorder* sub-dimension ($\bar{X}$ = 2.37, ss=.483). The level of general environment perception was found to be higher than the average ($\bar{X}$ = 2.56, ss=.353). These findings can be interpreted as positive a perception of school climate.

4.2. Findings Related to Investigation by Various Variables of Pedagogical Formation Teacher Candidates

Independent t-test analysis was used to determine whether or not there is a significant difference between the safety and supportive school climate perceptions according to the pedagogical formation teacher candidates' gender. The results of the comparison of

pedagogical formation teacher candidates' gender in terms of safety and supportive school climate perceptions were presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Results of the Comparison of Pedagogical Formation Teacher Candidates' Gender on Safety and Supporting School Climate Perception (t-test analysis)

Dimensions		**Gender**	**n**	$\acute{X}$	**Ss**	***df***	***t***	***p***
Safety	Perceived safety	Female	38	2.94	.508	148	.276	.234
		Male	112	2.84	.446			
	Bullying and aggression	Female	38	2.61	.580		.402	.688
		Male	112	2.64	.424			
	General drug use	Female	38	1.99	.567		1.078	.283
		Male	112	2.11	.594			
	General safety	Female	38	2.56	.372		.111	.912
		Male	112	2.57	.359			
Engagement	Academic engagement	Female	38	3.14	.379		.389	.698
		Male	112	3.17	.407			
	Culture of equity	Female	38	2.91	.504		.162	.871
		Male	112	2.93	.545			
	Connection to teachers	Female	38	2.94	.463		.271	.787
		Male	112	2.92	.496			
	Student connectedness	Female	38	2.79	.514		1.765	.080
		Male	112	2.62	.546			
	Whole-school connectedness	Female	38	2.69	.561		.386	.700
		Male	112	2.65	.652			
	Parent engagement	Female	38	2.33	.725		1.116	.266
		Male	112	2.46	.622			
	General engagement	Female	38	2.79	.384		.182	.856
		Male	112	2.78	.375			
Environment	Rules and consequences	Female	38	2.80	.513		.285	.776
		Male	112	2.78	.451			
	Support	Female	38	2.73	.628		.408	.684
		Male	112	2.68	.599			
	Physical comfort	Female	38	2.42	.687		.104	.918
		Male	112	2.41	.630			
	Disorder	Female	38	2.27	.562		1.576	.117
		Male	112	2.41	.450			
	General Environment	Female	38	2.54	.379		.350	.727
		Male	112	2.57	.346			

*p< .05

As seen in Table 5, there is no significant difference between perceptions of pedagogical formation teacher candidates' perceptions about a safe and supportive school climate according to their gender. The gender variable of the pedagogical formation teacher candidates by dimensions and sub-dimensions did not make any difference in their perceptions about school safety.

Independent t-test analysis was used to determine whether or not there is a significant difference between the safety and supportive school climate perceptions

according to the pedagogical formation teacher candidates' age. The results of the comparison of pedagogical formation teacher candidates' age in terms of safety and supportive school climate perceptions were presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Results of the Comparison of Pedagogical Formation Teacher Candidates' Age on Safety and Supporting School Climate Perception (t-test analysis)

Dimensions		**Age**	**n**	**X̄**	**Ss**	**df**	**t**	**p**
Safety	Perceived safety	23 age and <	116	2.83	.475	148	1.543	.125
		24 age and >	34	2.97	.407			
	Bullying and aggression	23 age and <	116	2.62	.487		.635	.526
		24 age and >	34	2.68	.392			
	General drug use	23 age and <	116	2.04	.586		1.651	.101
		24 age and >	34	2.23	.579			
	General safety	23 age and <	116	2.54	.368		1.753	.082
		24 age and >	34	2.66	.326			
Engagement	Academic engagement	23 age and <	116	3.17	.382		.458	.648
		24 age and >	34	3.13	.457			
	Culture of equity	23 age and <	116	2.90	.532		1.094	.276
		24 age and >	34	3.01	.536			
	Connection to teachers	23 age and <	116	2.92	.489		.427	.670
		24 age and >	34	2.96	.486			
	Student connectedness	23 age and <	116	2.62	.555		1.852	.066
		24 age and >	34	2.81	.474			
	Whole-school connectedness	23 age and <	116	2.61	.635		1.850	.066
		24 age and >	34	2.83	.586			
	Parent engagement	23 age and <	116	2.41	.665		.493	.623
		24 age and >	34	2.48	.605			
	General engagement	23 age and <	116	2.76	.370		1.339	.183
		24 age and >	34	2.86	.389			
Environment	Rules and consequences	23 age and <	116	2.77	.458		.348	.728
		24 age and >	34	2.81	.500			
	Support	23 age and <	116	2.68	.641		.566	.572
		24 age and >	34	2.75	.464			
	Physical comfort	23 age and <	116	2.35	.649		2.070	.040*
		24 age and >	34	2.61	.587			
	Disorder	23 age and <	116	2.38	.471		.297	.767
		24 age and >	34	2.35	.528			
	General Environment	23 age and <	116	2.54	.348		1.063	.290
		24 age and >	34	2.62	.370			

*p< .05

As seen in Table 6, there is no significant difference except for physical comfort between perceptions of pedagogical formation teacher candidates' perceptions about a safe and supportive school climate according to their age. It is seen that pedagogical formation teacher candidates who are 24 years ($\bar{X}$ = 2.61, ss=.587) of age or older have higher perceptions, about physical comfort sub-dimension than pedagogical formation teacher candidates who are under 23 years ($\bar{X}$ = 2.35, ss=.649) of age or older. [t(148)= 2.070,

p<.05]. According to this, it is understood that the physical comfort of the pedagogical formation teacher candidates aged 24 and over in all dimensions within the physical comfort sub-dimension of all dimensions within the dimensions of the three dimensions and internal sub-dimensions, found the physical comfort of the school to be more adequate than the students aged 23 and below.

Mann Whitney U test analysis was used to determine whether there is a significant difference between the safety and supportive school climate perceptions according to the pedagogical formation teacher candidates' working condition. The results of the comparison of pedagogical formation teacher candidates' working condition in terms of safety and supportive school climate perceptions were presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Results of the Comparison of Pedagogical Formation Teacher Candidates' Working Condition on Safety and Supporting School Climate Perception (Mann Whitney U test)

Dimensions		**Work**	**N**	**Median**	**U**	**p**
Safety	Perceived safety	Working	20	92.75	955.000	.052*
		Not working	130	72.85		
	Bullying and aggression	Working	20	88.73	1035.500	.138
		Not working	130	73.47		
	General drug use	Working	20	76.93	1271.500	.873
		Not working	130	75.28		
	General safety	Working	20	89.03	1029.500	.133
		Not working	130	73.42		
Engagement	Academic engagement	Working	20	86.15	1087.000	.230
		Not working	130	73.86		
	Culture of equity	Working	20	87.10	1068.000	.194
		Not working	130	73.72		
	Connection to teachers	Working	20	81.50	1180.000	.503
		Not working	130	74.58		
	Student connectedness	Working	20	85.38	1102.500	.271
		Not working	130	73.98		
	Whole-school connectedness	Working	20	88.40	1042.000	.150
		Not working	130	73.52		
	Parent engagement	Working	20	80.43	1201.500	.584
		Not working	130	74.74		
	General engagement	Working	20	86.35	1083.000	.230
		Not working	130	73.83		
Environment	Rules and consequences	Working	20	93.08	948.500	.049*
		Not working	130	72.80		
	Support	Working	20	77.78	1254.500	.799
		Not working	130	75.15		
	Physical comfort	Working	20	91.45	981.000	.076
		Not working	130	73.05		
	Disorder	Working	20	68.75	1165.000	.451
		Not working	130	76.54		
	General Environment	Working	20	87.85	1053.000	.171
		Not working	130	73.60		

* p< .05

As seen in Table 7, there is no significant difference except for perceived safety [U= 955; p<.05]. And rules and consequences [U= 948.5; p<.05] between perceptions of pedagogical formation teacher candidates' according to their work condition. As can be seen, it was found that pedagogical formation teacher candidates differed significantly only in perceived safety and rules and consequences sub-dimensions in 3 dimensions and 13 sub-dimensions according to their employment status. Pedagogical formation teacher candidates who are work at a job, perceived safety and rules and consequences according to non-workers perceive the perception of a higher level and significantly different.

4.3. Findings Related to Investigation of Correlation among Safety and Supporting School Climate Perceptions of Pedagogical Formation Teacher Candidates

Table 8 shows the correlation test results of the relationship between the perceptions of pedagogical formation teacher candidates about a safe and supportive school climate. As seen in Table 8, the general safety perceptions of the teacher candidates are high in themselves, and between the other dimensions and sub-dimensions, there were moderate and low positive correlations. The relative highest relationship between their dimensions was the perceived safety dimension (r = .74), and the lowest relationship was found to be between parent engagement dimension (r = .17). The general perceptions of teacher candidate's perceptions in high and medium level, and between other dimensions and sub-dimensions show high, medium and low positive relationships. The relative highest relationship among its dimensions is the size of the whole school connected (r = .80), and the lowest relationship is between the general drug use dimension (r = .19). The perceptions of the general environment have high positive, high and moderate positive correlations between other dimensions and sub-dimensions. The relatively highest relations among their dimensions are the physical comfort and support dimensions (r = .72), while the lowest relationship is the bullying and aggression dimension (r = .35). As can be seen, perceptions of pedagogical formation teacher candidates in all three dimensions related to school climate have high positive, positive relationships. In the safety dimension, the highest relationship is perceived safety, the lowest relationship to the parent engagement; the highest relationship in the dimension of whole-school connected, the lowest relationship to general drug use; the highest relationship in the environmental dimension is physical comfort and support, the lowest relationship is bullying and aggression. While there were highly positive, positive relationships within the dimensions related to school climate, low and medium level relations were found among the sub-dimensions.

Table 8: Correlation Test Results for Relationship Between Teacher Candidates' Perceptions of Safety and Supporting School Climate

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. General safety	-															
2. Perceived safety	.741**	-														
3. Bullying and aggression	.730**	.307**	-													
4. General drug use	.706**	.297**	.265**	-												
5. General engagement	.471**	.566**	.266**	.185*	-											
6. Connection to teachers	.287**	.391**	.190*	.034	.767**	-										
7. Student connectedness	.391**	.450**	.221**	.175*	.722**	.404**	-									
8. Academic engagement	.211**	.319**	.107	.028	.569**	.531**	.265**	-								
9. Whole-school connected	.466**	.529**	.270**	.211**	.796**	.520**	.539**	.398**	-							
10. Parent engagement	.174*	.221**	.044	.113	.615**	.317**	.272**	.132	.375**	-						
11. Culture of equity	.460**	.487**	.307**	.202*	.665**	.410**	.492**	.323**	.480**	.189*	-					
12. General Environment	.497**	.454**	.354**	.269**	.760**	.545**	.605**	.368**	.672**	.445**	.490**	-				
13. Rules and consequences	.258**	.324**	.156	.077	.650**	.493**	.426**	.311**	.489**	.487**	.438**	.720**	-			
14. Physical comfort	.316**	.345**	.151	.192*	.547**	.278**	.499**	.135	.546**	.458**	.240**	.724**	.438**	-		
15. Support	.291**	.366**	.176*	.086	.671**	.580**	.500**	.371**	.506**	.363**	.455**	.724**	.461**	.401**	-	
16. Disorder	.431**	.431**	.439**	.325**	.179*	.150	.187*	.193*	.240**	-.123	.201*	.473**	.015	.012	.201*	-

5. Discussion

The school climate reflects the standards, goals, values, interpersonal relations, education, teaching and leadership practices and organizational structure of all school-related individuals, such as students, teachers, school staff, parents, and is based on their experience of current school life (Pickeral, Evans, Hughes and Hutchison, 2009, p.3). The elements of the school climate are based on both personal perceptions and environmental influences, so this issue is very comprehensive and complex. Accordingly, different researchers have examined the various dimensions of school climate (safety, engagement, environmental factors, interpersonal relations, peer relations, reflections on school success, effects on school behaviour, school management and school staff relationships). From this point, the different age groups (elementary, middle, high school, university) researchers working in different countries (Aldridge and Ala'I, 2013; Bradshaw et al, 2014; Furlong, Greif, Bates, Whipple, Jimenez and Morrison, 2005; Garrity, Jens, Porter, Sager and Short-Camilli, 2000; Halderson, 1990; Haynes, Emmons and Ben-Avie, 2001; National School Climate Center, 2017) and on the need by both quite diverse and different from each other in Turkey (Acarbay, 2006; Arastaman and Balcı, 2013; Bugay, Aşkar, Tuna, Çelik Örücü and Çok, 2015; Çalık and Kurt, 2010; Ekşi et al., 2017; Kapıkıran-Acun and Kapıkıran, 2010; Terzi, 2015) improved measurement tools are adapted and used. In the literature, the point emphasised by both developmental and ecological perspectives, the results of the school climate shaped by adolescents; it is best to explain the interactions between students and their perceptions of school, interpersonal, structural and organisational dimension. In this respect, the critical concepts in the school climate are between students and teachers, students, etc. Interpersonal relationships include structural components such as security, rules and discipline, and student autonomy and interest, such as decision making and student participation (Schotland, 2011, transferred Ekşi et al., 2017).

In this study, the scale developed by Bradshaw et al. (2014) and the scale adapted to Turkish by Ekşi et al., (2017) were used on 150 pedagogical formation teacher candidates. In the study, the perceptions of the pre-service teachers on the three basic dimensions of security, commitment and environment and the school climate in 13 sub-dimensions were examined according to various variables such as age, gender and working status. In the research, it was found that the teacher candidates who received pedagogical formation training were rated above the average in all three dimensions. When these results are evaluated in general, it is seen that the trainees who take the pedagogical formation education of Sinop University, where the research is conducted, perceive the school climate positively. In different studies that examined the relationship of school climate with various variables, there is a negative relationship between positive school climate and positive school climate such as aggression-peer bullying in school, substance abuse, disciplinary behaviours. It was found to reduce (Brookmeyer, Fanti and Henrich, 2006; Goldstein, Young and Boyd, 2008; LaRusso, Romer and Selman, 2008; Meyer-Adams and Conner, 2008; Yoneyama and Rigby, 2006).

This finding is also supported by the low incidence of disciplinary cases and the absence of legal cases.

In the study, the highest score in the dimension of engagement was academic engagement, and the lowest score was found in the dimension of engagement to the parent. Engagement to school, positive attitude towards school can be explained in the form of norms for broad participation in school life for students, staff and families (National School Climate Center, 2017). School engagement is the bond established through teachers, administrators, peers and activities, and a sense of belonging from this bond (Jimerson, Campos and Greif, 2003). In this dimension, there are high expectations for the success of the students in the school, listening to the students and accepting them as individuals, both for the students' wishes and problems and for having a personal concern; features such as improvement of academic programs (National School Climate Center, 2017). In this context, the most effective relations, although accepting the influence of school management and leadership structure, are still the teacher-student relationship and interpersonal relations between peers (Anderson, 1982; Thapa, Cohen, Guffey and Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2013). It has been found that the positive school climate has a positive effect on student achievement in different studies examining the relationship of school climate with various variables (Childers and Fairman, 1986; Çavumirza, 2012, Kıral and Kaçar, 2016). In different studies that examined the relationship between school climate and various variables, it was found that the positive school climate also decreased school dropout (Lee and Burkam, 2003; Worrell and Hale, 2001). According to the findings of the research, the level of academic engagement of teacher candidates was found to be high. This situation can be interpreted that the teacher candidates are generally satisfied with the school success and the school's program and learning-teaching activities. In the study, the low perception of parent engagement should be considered normal for the age group of teacher candidates, who are university students and partly graduates. The fact that this variable, which is natural to be found higher in smaller students such as primary school, secondary school and high school level, is low in this age group of university students and graduates. This situation shows once again the need to use age-sensitive scales. The findings of this study also support the results of other studies.

In the research, the highest score in the dimension of the environment were rules and consequences, and the highest score was found in the dimension of the disorder. Rule and consequences are described in the form of explicitly defined rules on verbal harassment, bullying and ridicule, and explicit and consistent norms and practices for adult intervention (National School Climate Center, 2017). Rules and consequences create trust for students to be interfered by school management and adults when they encounter such behaviour. At the same time, it will be ensured that these behaviours are prohibited in school and that sanctions are imposed in the school environment. Among the characteristics of the school climate identified as positive in various studies, it has been shown that there are applicable rules that operate correctly and function equitably and reduces undesirable behaviours (Anderson, 1982; Brookmeyer, Fanti and Henrich, 2006; Meyer-Adams and Conner, 2008). In such a climate, there are research

findings that confirm that students have a positive effect on their school attachment, positive perception of the school, feeling good in school, and attending school (Goldstein, Young and Boyd, 2008; LaRusso, Romer and Selman, 2008; Thapa et al., 2013). The findings of this study also support the findings of other studies. While there were highly favorable, positive relationships within the dimensions related to school climate, low and medium level relations were found among the sub-dimensions.

In the study, the pedagogical formation teacher candidates' perceptions of school climate were examined according to demographic variables. According to the findings of the research, it was found that teacher candidates' perceptions about school climate did not differ significantly according to the gender variable. Contradictory findings are found in the literature on the effect of gender variable on organisational climate. In some researches on organisational climate, it has been found that the gender variable is not related to the organisational climate in general (Memduhoğlu and Şeker, 2011; Sezgin and Kılınç, 2011). Roberts (2007 translated Eraslan, 2018), Eraslan (2018) found that the gender variable did not cause any difference in the perception of school climate. Doğan (2012) found that school climate perception differs according to gender variable, and female students perceive the school climate more positively than male students. Similarly, Özdemir, Sezgin, Şirin, Karip and Erkan (2010) found that female students perceive the climate of the schools they study more positively than male students.

In this study, there were no differences according to gender variable. According to the findings of the study, it was found that there was a significant difference between the ages of the students aged 24 and over in the physical facilities sub-dimension according to age variables. According to this, it can be seen that students aged 24 and over found that the physical facilities of the school were adequate and evaluated positively than the students aged 23 and under. In the analyses conducted according to the working status of the teacher candidates, only significant differences were observed in the perceived safety, rules and consequences sub-dimensions. The perceptions of teacher candidates in terms of perceived safety and rules consequences compared to non-workers differed significantly. As a result, it was found that, in general, when the perceptions of the pedagogical formation teacher candidates about the school climate were evaluated, it was found to be positive because there were above average scores in all three dimensions. In schools with a favourable climate, individuals feel valued and work cooperatively to achieve the goals of the school. Schools with a pleasant climate seem to have an open climate. In schools with an open climate, school administrators support teachers, respect teachers' professional qualifications, and exhibit leadership behaviour. At the same time, teachers in this type of school are happy; they establish intimate relationships and cooperate (Anderson, 1982; Hoy and Miskel, 2015, İhtiyaroğlu, 2014). It is possible to say that schools with an open climate are healthy schools.

The primary purpose or contribution of the studies to measure school climate, the general harmony in the school and the quality of the relationship between the students and adults at the school to evaluate at different school level students, school staff and all the stakeholders of the school and as a result of this, to make arrangements

to improve the positive school climate in schools (Altman, 2000; Balcı, 2001; Haynes, Emmons, and Ben-Avie, 2001). Research shows that the positive school climate has a substantial impact on learning motivation, decreases the negative effects of socioeconomic context on academic achievement, reduces the incidence of aggression, violence and harassment and acts as a protective factor for young people's learning and positive life developments. In addition to these areas, studies around the world show that the quality of the school environment contributes to academic outcomes and the personal growth and well-being of students (Zulling et al, 2010). In this context, evaluating the school climate from time to time in school development studies may also provide data collection and data-based decisions about the extent of the school's arrangements and improvements. Very different scales are used in the measurement of school climate. Gradual classifications gradually bring dimensions and variables closer to each other. In recent studies on the dimensions of school climate, the dimensions of school climate are summarised as follows. In past years, the social media dimension was added (Bradshaw et al., 2014; Kane, Hoff, Cathcart, Heifner, Palmon, Peterson, 2016; National School Climate Center, 2017; Thapa at al, 2013; Zulling et al, 2010):

1) Safety (for example, rules and norms, physical safety, social-emotional safety),
2) Relations (for example, respect for diversity, engagement to school, social support, social media, leadership and pupils' race/ethnicity and school climate perceptions),
3) Teaching and learning (e.g., social, emotional, ethical, and civic learning; service learning; support for academic learning; support for professional relations, teachers and students' perception of school climate),
4) The corporate environment (e.g. physical environment, resources, materials),
5) School development process.

School climate is a multidimensional concept, and multifaceted evaluations will provide more useful results for the determination of school climate. The school can be a risk factor or protective factor for students to develop healthy behaviours according to their qualifications. It is stated in the literature that students who do not like their school generally have academic failures, have unhealthy behaviours, have psychosomatic problems and have a lower quality of life (Epstein, 1981). According to Owens and Valesky (2014), when the studies of organisational climate are examined, it is stated that these studies are based on revealing the perceptions of the participants. This situation leads to the development and use of measurement tools which are directly asked for their perception. Also, according to the researchers, the first studies on organisational climate in schools were conducted based on data collected from adults (almost all teachers, rarely school administrators). In recent years, school climate studies tend to concentrate on students rather than adults (Owens and Valesky, 2014). The use of multiple evaluations approaches in the measurement of school climate, rather than evaluating only from teachers, managers and students; it is recommended to carry out larger sized school climate measurement and evaluation studies, which include all of the organisation's structural arrangements and practices in a comprehensive manner. Also, it is recommended that these measurements be repeated

from time to time and that measures are taken for the results and that improvements in the school climate are monitored.

References

Acarbay F. Y., 2006. Kapsamlı okul iklimini değerlendirme ölçeğinin (öğrenci formu) Türkçe dilsel eşdeğerlik güvenirlik ve geçerlik çalışması. Master Thesis, University of Yeditepe, İstanbul, TURKEY

Aldridge J., Ala'I K., 2013. Assessing Students' Views of School Climate: Developing and Validating the What's Happening in This School? (WHITS) Questionnaire. Improving Schools 16, 1: 47– 66 doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480212473680

Anderson C. S., 1982. The Search for School Climate: A Review of the Research. Review of Educational Research, 52, 3: 368-420 doi: https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543052003368

Altman R., 2000. Understanding Organizational Climate: Start Minimizing Your Workforce Problems. Water Engineering & Management, 147, 6 https://www.sciencebase.gov/catalog/item/50576e5de4b01ad7e027ac80

Arastaman G., Balcı A., 2013. Investigation of High School Students' Resiliency Perception in Terms of some Variables. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri, 13, 2: 922-928 https://toad.edam.com.tr/sites/default/files/pdf/okul-iklimi-olcegi-toad.pdf

Atik G., Güneri O. Y., 2016. Ortaokul Öğrencileri İçin Okul İklimi Ölçeği: Türkçe Formu'nun Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. İlköğretim Online, 15, 1: 91-103 doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.17051/io.2016.42123

Balcı A., 2001. Etkili okul ve okul geliştirme. Pegem Yayınları. Ankara, TURKEY

Bektaş F, Nalçacı A, 2013. Okul İklimi ile Öğrenci Başarısı Arasındaki İlişki. Uluslararası Avrasya Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 4, 13 http://www.ijoess.com/Makaleler/2127506899_Ahmet%20nal%C3%A7ac%C4%B1.pdf

Brookmeyer K. A., Fanti K. A., Henrich C. C., 2006. Schools Parents and Youth Violence: A Multilevel Ecological Analysis. Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology 35,4: 504-514 doi: 10.1207/s15374424jccp3504_2 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17007596

Bradshaw C. P., Waasdorp T. E., Debnam K. J., Johnson S. L., 2014. Measuring School Climate in High Schools: A Focus on Safety, Engagement, and the Environment. Journal of School Health 84, 9: 593-604 doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.12186

Bugay A., Aşkar P., Tuna M. E., Çelik Örücü M., Çok F., 2015. Okul İklimi Ölçeği Lise Formu'nun Türkçe psikometrik özellikleri. İlköğretim Online, 14, 1: 311- 322, doi: 10.17051/io.2015.46598.

Bursalıoğlu Z., 2015. Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış, PegemA Yayıncılık. Ankara, Turkey

Childers J. H., Fairman M, 1986. The School Counselor as Facilitator of Organizational Health. The School Counselor, 33,5: 332–337 https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1987-23279-001

Cohen J., McCabe L., Michelli N. M., Pickeral T., 2009. School Climate: Research, Policy, Practice, and Teacher Education. The Teachers College Record, 111,1: 180-213 http://ww.ijvs.org/files/Publications/School-Climate.pdf

Çalık, T., Kurt T., 2010. Okul İklimi Ölçeğinin (OİÖ) Geliştirilmesi, Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışmaları. Eğitim ve Bilim, 35, 157: 167-180 http://egitimvebilim.ted.org.tr/index.php/EB/article/view/298/163

Çavumirza E. S., 2012. İlköğretim 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin sahip oldukları bazı değişkenler ve algıladıkları okul iklimi bakımından seviye belirleme sınavında aldıkları puanların değerlendirilmesi. Master Thesis, University of Necmettin Erbakan, Konya, Turkey

Doğan S., 2012. Lise Öğrencilerinin Okul İklimi Algıları. Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler

Enstitüsü Dergisi, 5, 10: 55-92. https://dx.doi.org/10.14520/adyusbd.286

Ekşi H., Türk T., Avcu A., 2017. Maryland Güvenli ve Destekleyici Okul İlkimi Ölçeği (MGDOİ)'nın Türk kültürüne uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 17, 4: 1882-1899 http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/379303

Epstein J. L., 1981. The Quality of School Life. Lexington Books, D.C. Health, Lexington. USA.

Eraslan B., 2018. Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin okul iklimi algıları. Master Thesis, University of Gazi, Ankara, TURKEY

Field A., 2005. Discovering statistics using SPSS. Sage. Newbury Park, CA, USA

Freiberg H. J., 1998. Measuring School Climate: Let Me Count the Ways. Educational Leadership. 56,1: 22-26. http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/sept98/vol56/num01/Measuring-School-Climate@-Let-Me-Count-the-Ways.aspx

Freiberg H. J., Stein T. A., 1999. Measuring, improving and sustaining healthy learning environments. In H. J. Freiberg (Ed.), School climate: measuring, improving and sustaining healthy learning environments (pp. 11-32). Falmer. Philadelphia, PA, USA

Furlong M. J., Greif J. L., Bates M. P., Whipple A. D., Jimenez T. C., Morrison R., 2005. Development of the California School Climate and Safety Survey-Short Form. Psychology in the Schools. 42, 2: 137-149. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pits.20053

Furrer C., Skinner E. A., 2003. The Sense of Relatedness as a Factor in Children's Academic Engagement and Performance. Journal of Educational Psychology. 95, 1: 148–162 doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.95.1.148

Garrity C., Jens K., Porter W., Sager N., Short-Camilli C., 2000. Bully-proofing your school: A comprehensive approach for elementary school. Chapter Three:

Colorado school climate survey, elementary school student report, (pp.55-61) (2nd Edi.). Sopris West. Longmont, CO, USA.

Goldstein S. E., Young A., Boyd C., 2008. Relational Aggression at School: Associations with School Safety and Social Climate. Journal of Youth and Adolescence. 37, 6: 641-654 doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-007-9192-4

Halderson C., 1990. Comprehensive assessment of school environments: Technical manual. National Association of Secondary School Principals, Alexandria, VA, USA.

Haynes N. M., Emmons C. L., Ben-Avie M., 2001. School Climate Surveys: Revised Manual. Yale Child Development Center, School Development Program. New Haven, CT, USA doi: 10.1207/s1532768xjepc0803_4

Hendron M. C., 2014. School climate, absenteeism, and psychopathology among truant youth. PhD Thesis, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, USA

Hoy W. K., Miskel C. G., 2015. Education administration-Theory, research and practice. Radom House. New York, USA

Hoy W. K., Tarter C. J., Kottkamp R. B., 1991. Open schools/healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate. Sage, London, England

İhtiyaroğlu N., 2014. Okul ikliminin öğretmen etkililiği ve öğrenci okul bağlılığı ile ilişkisinin incelenmesi. PhD Thesis, University of Gazi, Turkey

Jimerson S. R., Campos E., Greif J. L., 2003. Toward an Understanding of Definitions and Measures of School Engagement and Related Terms. University of California Santa Barbara The California School Psychologist, 8,1: 7-27 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF03340893

Kane E., Hoff N., Cathcart A., Heifner A., Palmon S., Peterson R. L., 2016. School Climate & Culture, Strategy Brief, February. https://k12engagement.unl.edu/strategy-briefs/School%20Climate%20&%20Culture%202-6-16%20.pdf

Kapıkıran-Acun N., Kapıkıran Ş., 2010. School Climate Inventory: Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Reliability-Validity. Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research. 42: 117-177 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286178339_School_Climate_Inventory_Exploratory_and_Confirmatory_Factor_Analysis_and_Reliability-Validity

Karasar N., 2012. Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi, Nobel Yayıcılık, Ankara, TURKEY.
Korkmaz M, 2007. Örgütsel Sağlık Üzerinde Liderlik Stillerinin Etkisi. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi. 13, 49: 57-91. http://www.kuey.net/index.php/kuey/article/view/911

Kıral E., Kaçar, Ö.,2016. The Relationship between Teachers School Commitment and School Culture. International Education Studies. 9,12: 90-108

Kuperminc G. P., Leadbeater B. J., Emmons C., Blatt S. J., 1997. Perceived School Climate and Difficulties in the Social Adjustment of Middle School Students. Applied Developmental Science, 1, 2: 76-88 doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s1532480xads0102_2

LaRusso M., Romer D., Selman R., 2008. Teachers as Builders of Respectful School Climates: Implications for Adolescent Drug use Norms and Depressive Symptoms in High School. Journal of Youth and Adolescence. 37, 4: 386 doi: 10.1007/s10964-007-9212-4

Lee V. E., Burkam D., 2003. Dropping Out of High School: The Role of School Organisation and Structure. American Educational Research Journal. 2: 353-393

Memduhoğlu H. B., Şeker G., 2011. Organisational Climate of Primary Schools in the View of Teachers. Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education (INUJFE). 12, 1: 1- 26

Meyer-Adams N., Conner B. T., 2008. School Violence: Bullying Behaviours and The Psychosocial School Environment in Middle Schools. Children and Schools. 30,4: 211-221.

Mintzberg H., 2014. Örgütler ve yapıları. Nobel Yayıncılık, Ankara, TURKEY

National School Climate Center, 2017, The 13 dimensions of school climate measured by the CSCI, https://www.schoolclimate.org/services/measuring-school-climate-csci

Owens R. E., Valesky T. C., 2014. Organizational behavior in education: Leadership and school reform. Pearson. NY, USA ISBN 13: 978-0133489033

Özdemir S., Sezgin F., Şirin H., Karip E., Erkan S., 2010. İlköğretim Okulu Öğrencilerinin Okul İklimine İlişkin Algılarını Yordayan Değişkenlerin İncelenmesi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 38,38: 213-224

Peterson M. W., Melinda G., Spencer M. G., 1990. Understanding academic culture and climate. New directions for institutional research, no:68, Jossey-Bass, USA

Pickeral T., Evans L., Hughes W., Hutchison D., 2009. School Climate Guide for District Policymakers and Educational Leaders. Center for Social and Emotional Education. New York, USA http://www.schoolclimate.org/climate/districtguide.php

Pritchard R. D., Karasick B. W., 1973. The Effects of Organizational Climate On Managerial Job Performance and Job Satisfaction. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. 9: 126-146

Robbins S. P., Judge T. A., 2012. Organisational behavior. Pearson. New York, USA

Schein E H., 1985. Organisational culture and leadership. Jossey-Bass. San Francisco, USA

Sezgin F., Kılınç A. Ç., 2011. İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin Örgüt İklimine İlişkin Algılarının İncelenmesi. Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 31,3: 743- 757.

Smith K. M., 2008. The impact of the district and school climate on student achievement. PhD Thesis, The College of William and Mary, Virginia, USA

Tableman B., 2003. School Climate and Learning. Best Practice Briefs. 3,2: 121-134

Terzi A. R., 2015. Üniversite Öğrencilerine Yönelik Okul İklimi Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi. Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi. 4, 4: 111-117 https://toad.edam.com.tr/sites/default/files/pdf/universite-ogrencilerine-yonelik-okul-iklimi-olcegi-toad.pdf

Thapa A., Cohen J., Guffey S., Higgins-D'Alessandro A., 2013. A Review of School Climate Research. Review of Educational Research. 83, 3: 357-385. doi: 10.3102/0034654313483907

Treputtharat S., Tayiam S., 2014. School Climate is Affecting Job Satisfaction of Teachers in Primary Education, Khon Kaen, Thailand. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 116: 996-1000

Uğurlu Z., 2015. Okul örgütü ve yönetimi, Uğur Akın (Eds.) İçinde Türk Eğitim Sistemi ve Okul Yönetimi, Pegem Akademi, Ankara, TURKEY.

Uline C., Tschannen-Moran M., 2008. The Walls Speak the Interplay of Quality Facilities, School Climate, and Student Achievement. Journal of Educational Administration. 46, 1: 55 – 73

Ural A., 2014. Gazi Üniversite'sinde Örgütsel İklim. Amme İdaresi Dergisi. 47, 2: 145-165

Welsh W. N., 2000. The Effects of School Climate On School Disorder. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 567,1: 88-107

Worrell F. C., Hale R. L., 2001. The Relationship of Hope in the Future and Perceived School Climate to School Completion. School Psychology Quarterly. 16, 4: 370-388

Yoneyama S., Rigby K., 2006. Bully/Victim Students and Classroom Climate'. Youth Studies Australia. 25, 3 :34-41

Zullig K. J., Koopman T. M., Patton J. M., Ubbes V. A., 2010. School Climate: Historical Review, Instrument Development, and School Assessment. Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment. 28, 2: 139-152 doi: 10.1177/0734282909344205