

How Effective are Schools According to Teachers?¹

Hasan Basri MEMDUHOĐLU² & Erdem KARATAŐ³

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to determine the perceptions of teachers about the effectiveness of the schools they work in based on various variables. The research was designed in the descriptive scanning model. The sample of the study is composed of 316 teachers working at Turkish high school in the Ađrı provincial center and local districts during the 2015-2016 academic years. The “Effective School Scale” developed by Abdurrezzak (2015) was used to collect data in the study. The data of the study were analyzed by descriptive statistics and parametric tests. According to the findings of the study, teachers’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the schools they work in are at a “medium” level. While teachers’ perceptions of effective school administrators, teachers and school atmosphere sub-dimensions are at a “medium” level, their perceptions on effective school students, and parents were determined as at a “low” level. It was determined that teachers’ perceptions of school effectiveness were not significantly different according to gender, marital status, education status and duration of service variables. However, significant differences were found between the perceptions of teachers about the dimensions of effective schools according to the type of school they worked in and the branch variable.

Key Words: Effectiveness, Organizational effectiveness, Effective school, Perception

¹ Part of the data of this study was presented at the “International Congress of Management, Economy and Policy” held in Istanbul on November 26-27, 2016.

² Assoc. Prof. Dr. - Yüzüncü Yıl University, Faculty of Education - hasanmemduhoglu@gmail.com

³ Res. Assist. - Kırıkkale University, Faculty of Education - erdemkaratas068@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

In today's rapidly changing world, the dynamic nature of globalization and information society has led societies to make innovations to meet the needs of the age as much as they are in the economic, social, political and cultural fields, as well as in the field of education (Balay, 2004; Özden, 2013; Stromquist, & Monkman, 2014). These innovations and developments encompass different implementations to improve system-level reforms, the creation of modern institutions, the provision of modern teaching materials, the upgrading of teachers' professional knowledge and skills, and the teaching-learning process through innovations in school management (Karip, & Köksal, 1996, p. 245).

According to Valesky (1993), it is necessary for schools to achieve continuous improvement in order to meet societal expectations. In an environment of technological and social change, the success of students depends on the way in which the content, methodology and values of education are organized to respond to new needs (Everard, Morris, & Wilson, 2004). In this sense, societies determine their educational paradigms according to changing conditions (Özden, 2013; Aydoğan, 2015).

Considering the development levels of countries directly relate to the qualified human resources they possess; schools, as one of the most widespread social institutions of our time (Tatar, 2006; Şişman, 2013), play a vital role in structuring the future of a country by raising the qualified human resource needs of society. Therefore, the effectiveness of schools, that is, the level of achieving the aims of schools and fulfilling the duties expected of them, directly affects the future of the society (Reagle, 2006; Memduhoğlu, 2007).

Determination of the effectiveness of educational institutions and of the investments being made is a requirement for public accountability (Balcı, 2014). As the level of social development increases, the expectation of people for the school also increases. Today, many parents want their children to have good education, to be educated with high level knowledge and skills, and to have a good job. People also believe the future of their countries depends on students who are raised in public schools (Reagle, 2006). Hoy and Miskel (2012) stated that school stakeholders are often questioned and have expectations about the effectiveness of schools. The concept of an effective school has gained considerable importance in recent years in terms of meeting these expectations.

Effective School

The concept of effectiveness, transferred from economics to management sciences, was defined by Barnard in the 1930's as "the degree to which the organization achieves its goals" (Duranay, 2005, p. 7). Organizational effectiveness is expressed as the level of achieving the goals of an organization (Yılmaz, & Taşdan, 2006; Hoy, & Miskel, 2012).

Effective school action is an approach that first emerged in the United States and developed particularly after the 1960's. In the early studies of Coleman and colleagues in 1966 and Jencks et al. in 1972, it was suggested that the school had very little effect on student achievement, and that the actual effect originated from the socio-economic class and origins of the child (Lezotte, 2001; Reynolds et al., 2014). As a result of these studies, it was found that out-of-school inputs are more effective and important than in-school inputs (Balcı, 2014).

Effective school studies have arisen in response to the view of Coleman and Jencks that schools are not going to make a difference in their students' learning. These studies show the

students' past experiences and families are more effective in influencing the academic success of students (Reynolds, Teddlie, Creemers, Scheerens, & Townsend, 2000; Reynolds et al., 2014; Sammons, Hillman, & Mortimore, 1995).

The basis of effective school research is that some schools are more successful than others (Helvacı, & Aydoğan, 2011; Scheerens, 2000). The fact that different schools have similar students but are successful at different levels is accepted by both educators and the public (Hoy, & Miskel, 2012). This creates responsibilities for all stakeholders, principally administrators, at the point of ensuring school effectiveness, and puts accountability issue on the agenda.

Educators need to be able to overcome a series of constantly changing challenges to create effective schools (Hoy, & Miskel, 2012). The ability of schools to be effective depends on their ability to keep up with the pace of the era they are in and to be open to changes and developments (Valesky, 1993; Everard et al., 2004; Ada, & Akan, 2007).

Effective school understanding requires the creation of appropriate physical environments for the success of students, the efficient use of all teaching and school resources, and the provision of both cognitive and emotional development of students (Özdemir, 2000). In line with this understanding, the idea that schools can make a difference in student achievement dominates (Muijs, 2006; Reynolds et al., 2014).

An effective school is defined as a school in which the cognitive, emotional, psychomotor, social and aesthetic developments of the students are optimally provided; a school where an optimal learning environment including the teachers' job satisfaction, effective use of resources and achievement of goals is provided (Özdemir, 2000; Şişman, 2013; Balcı, 2014). When this definition is examined, it is understood that all these factors which constitute an effective school have a multidimensional dynamic characteristic related to each other and interacting with each other (Purkey, & Smith, 1983; Helvacı, & Aydoğan, 2011; Hoy, & Miskel, 2012).

Characteristics of an effective school. The characteristics of effective schools generally can be listed as follows (Edmonds, 1979; Lezotte, 1992; Sammons et al., 1995, p. 12; Zigarelli, 1996; Townsend, 1997; Özdemir, 2000; Reagle, 2006):

1. Positive strong leadership;
2. A safe climate that encourages teaching and learning;
3. Including teachers and students in the planning of school work;
4. Clearly setting and implementing objectives related to education and training;
5. Systematic evaluation in general and specific dimensions;
6. Dynamic and principled education staff;
7. Positive communication at school;
8. Having high expectations from students;
9. Following the development of the students;
10. Ensuring students take an active role in school activities and giving them responsibility;
11. Rewarding achievements of students and encouraging them to be successful;
12. Including parents in school events.

Dimensions of an effective school. According to research on the effectiveness of schools, it is seen that there are many variables affecting school effectiveness (Balcı, 2014).

Reagle (2006) stated that schools should have certain goals for change and that the groups concerned (teachers, students, parents, administrators, and support staff) must have high expectations and common understanding in order to achieve these goals. Şişman (2013) and Balcı (2014) stated that factors that define the effective school are teachers, students, school management, classroom management, parents and school climate, school culture, environment, school physical structure, education technology, flexibility in school programs, success-oriented vision, trust and adaptation. Just as organs come together to form a full body, it is necessary for all school stakeholders to come together and collaborate to form an effective school. The dimensions of effective school in this study are covered under five headings as administrator, teacher, school atmosphere, students and parents.

Administrators in an effective school. The school administrator is the key player who ensures the school achieves its goals (Sammons et al., 1995; Balcı, 2014; Aydoğan, 2015). Therefore, in order to create an effective school, it is first necessary to have effective managerial qualities. Effective school administrators also have effective leadership qualities (Zigarelli, 1996). Features such as giving importance to teaching, clearly and explicitly determining the aims and expectations of teaching, ensuring these aims and expectations are delivered to teachers and administrators, spending most of the time dealing with teaching problems, giving support to the teaching staff, and being staff-centered are evidence that educational administrators are effective leaders (Balcı, 2014).

Just as virtuoso artists of a world-class orchestra need an elite conductor, schools with quality teachers need administrators who have the right leadership qualities (Lezotte, 1992). The qualifications of an effective school administrator are presented below (Balcı, 2014, p. 119):

1. Showing strong leadership in teaching subjects;
2. Clearly expressing expectations from students and teachers;
3. Developing a system for the success of the curriculum;
4. Giving importance to student success;
5. Involving teachers in the decision-making process and communicating intensively with them;
6. Spending half of the time in school corridors and classrooms;
7. Observing and participating in classroom instruction often;
8. Explaining the personnel expectations for the curriculum;
9. Coordinating the curriculum, actively participating in the curriculum planning and evaluation process.

Involvement of employees in the organization reduces conflict within the organization. Collaboration and teamwork constitute the spirit, which ensures the formation of a positive organizational climate. An effective school administrator in this direction has a significant share in reaching the right decisions and providing different ideas in the school by making all the stakeholders of the school participate in decisions affecting the school (Hoy & Miskel, 2012).

Teachers in an effective school. The teacher, the main actor of classroom processes and teaching-learning processes in the school, is very important in terms of the school and the students (Şişman, 2013). Factors such as school climate, culture, the willingness of the student to learn, the willingness of the teacher to teach, and family interest have an impact on the effectiveness of the teacher (Duranay, 2005, p. 53). In effective schools, the characteristics and roles of teachers can be summarized as follows (Şişman, 2013; Balcı, 2014):

1. Having a sense of responsibility at a high level;
2. Having mastery in their field and continuously developing themselves professionally;
3. Having high expectations about student achievement;
4. Managing the class at an effective level;
5. Creating a regular classroom and learning climate;
6. Being a positive role model for students;
7. Planning well-structured lessons, and concentrating on learning and teaching;
8. Giving feedback and guidance to students about course success and learning;
9. Showing consistent behavior among teachers in terms of expectations, behavior and planning;
10. Developing good relationships and cooperation with parents.

Teacher effectiveness or successful teaching is related to teacher self-efficacy (Friedman, & Kass, 2002; Demirtaş, Cömert, & Özer, 2011). Teachers with a low level of competence experience problems in motivating their students and create negative expectations for them. On the other hand, teachers with self-efficacy and positive attitudes toward their profession spend most of their time on class effectiveness, create a safe and supportive atmosphere in the classroom, encourage student entrepreneurship, focus on individual needs, spend less time on classroom control and thus improve student achievement (Balci, 2014, p. 141). It can be said that teachers have a higher level of job satisfaction and self-efficacy when they see their students are successful and that their efforts have not been wasted in the educational process.

Effective school atmosphere. Culture influences people's behavior, thoughts and the way they interact with others (Zhu, Devos, & Li, 2011; Aydoğın, 2015) and gives emotion and intuition about how people should behave (Güçlü, 2003). Each organization has its own culture and climate. Organizational culture is the whole set of norms, beliefs, behaviors, shared values, habits that guide the behaviors of the members of the organization and are symbols and stories that convey them to the members of the organization (Alvesson, & Sveningsson, 2015). In other words, organizational culture is the dominant set of values and beliefs that shape the thoughts and behaviors of an organization's members (Güçlü, 2003, p. 148). The organizational climate is the whole of individual, organizational and environmental qualities that give a certain identity to the organization, is perceived by its members, and affects their behavior (Arslan, 2004, p. 204). Organizational climate is briefly the psychological atmosphere that dominates the organization.

The school climate and culture (Sammons et al., 1995) which plays an important role in ensuring school effectiveness, also affects motivation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment of members of the school (Cheng, 1993; Güçlü, 2003; Şişman, 2007). A strong school culture is related to the manager's effective leadership, participatory organizational structure and positive social interactions among members (Cheng, 1993). According to Ayık and Ada (2009), school culture and the effectiveness of schools cannot be considered separately, and there is a positive relationship between the two. An effective school has a positive culture that is suitable for learning, a respectful communication environment among its people, and a regular, participatory, safe and peaceful educational atmosphere (Baştepe, 2009).

Students in an effective school. The existence and survival of schools depends on the students (Başaran, 2000). In effective schools constructed as *student-centered*, the aim is expressed as the success and happiness of the students (Baştepe, 2009; Şişman, 2013). The success of the students means that the school is also successful and effective at the same time. The characteristics and roles of students in effective schools can be summarized as follows (Şişman, 2013; Balcı, 2014):

1. Being willing to take responsibility and cooperate in school and classroom activities;
2. Participating in decisions about themselves and the school;
3. Having high expectations about being successful;
4. Being in an active learning struggle;
5. Having a habit of critical thinking instead of memorization;
6. Clearly expressing wishes, thoughts and goals;
7. Being aware of rights and responsibilities.

School environment and parents in an effective school. The fact that both the school and the family home is a place of education and learning for students makes it necessary for these two institutions to cooperate in education (Şişman, 2013). Family involvement represents the active involvement of parents in the education process and experiences of students (Jeynes, 2007). Family participation, one of the most important issues in contemporary education, is emphasized by the fact that the parents have made significant contributions to school effectiveness and to the success of their students (Purkey, & Smith, 1983; Zigarelli, 1996; Rosenblatt, & Peled, 2002; Lawson, 2003; Jeynes, 2007; Shaw, 2008; Helvacı, & Aydoğan, 2011).

Family involvement and effective schools are closely related to each other (Balcı, 2014; Hester, 1989, as cited in: Erdoğan, & Demirkasımoğlu, 2010). Families in effective schools are in a strong cooperative and effective communication process with the school in order to support the education of the student (Duranay, 2005). Families, one of the school's key stakeholders, actively participate in school activities within the framework of effective school understanding and play an important role in creating effective solutions for students' problems and taking responsibility together with the school in reaching the school's goals.

In recent years, efforts to create effective schools have gained momentum as the concepts of organizational effectiveness and accountability have come to the fore of educational administration (Balcı, 2014). In this respect, research dealing with effective schools in the literature has increased both domestically (e.g., Girmen, 2001; Duranay, 2005; Oral, 2005; Keleş, 2006; Yılmaz, 2006; Ada, & Akan, 2007; Baştepe, 2009; Gökçe, & Kahraman, 2010; Kuşaksız, 2010; Helvacı, & Aydoğan, 2011; Kaya, 2015; Uğurlu, & Abdurrezzak, 2016) and abroad (e.g., Cheng, 1993; Edmonds, 1979; ; Purkey, & Smith, 1983; Valesky, 1993; Zigarelli, 1996; Scheerens, 2000; Lezotte, 2001; Muijs, 2006; Reagle, 2006). This current study is deemed important in terms of determining the current level of effectiveness of schools, which is the first step in creating an effective school, and shedding light on practitioners in determining the strategic steps to be taken. In addition, it is considered that this research will contribute to the related field studies in the literature in terms of the limited number of studies conducted at the level of high school type in terms of effective schools in Turkey.

Purpose

The purpose of this current research is to determine the perceptions of teachers about the effectiveness of the schools in which they work in terms of certain variables. In accordance with this purpose, answers to the following research questions were sought:

1. What are the effective school perception levels of teachers about the schools they work in regarding the administrator, teachers, school atmosphere, students and school environment-parent sub-dimensions?
2. Do the effective school perceptions of teachers related to the schools they work in show a statistically meaningful difference according to gender, marital status, education status, period of service, branch and school type variables?

METHOD

Research Design

This research study was designed in a descriptive scanning model in order to determine the extent to which teachers in high schools have the effective school characteristics of their own schools in terms of determined variables and dimensions and present the current situation in the eyes of teachers. The scanning model is a research approach in which the participants' views, interests, abilities, attitudes, etc. are presented as they exist in the past or within a current situation, topic or event (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2015; Karasar, 2008).

Population and Sample

The population of the research is composed of teachers working in Turkish high schools in the Ağrı provincial center and local districts during the 2015-2016 academic years. The sample of the research consists of 316 teachers working in different high school types (Anatolian High School, Vocational-Technical High School, and Imam Hatip High School) in the province of Ağrı and the districts of Patnos and Eleşkirt. Appropriate / accidental sampling method was used in the selection of the sample. Appropriate sampling, which is also referred to as convenience sampling, refers to a method that has the primary purpose of preventing time, money and labor loss (Büyüköztürk et al., 2015). Personal variables related to the teachers participating in the study are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. *Personal variables of the sample group*

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Gender</i>	Female	169	53.5
	Male	147	46.5
<i>Marital Status</i>	Married	146	46.2
	Single	170	53.8
<i>State of Education</i>	Bachelor's Degree	266	84.2
	Postgraduate	50	15.8
<i>Period of Service</i>	1-2 Year	170	53.8
	3-4 Years	71	22.5
	5 Years and over	75	23.7
<i>Branch</i>	Social Domain	131	41.5
	Science - Math	72	22.8
	Talent - Informatics	23	7.3
	Foreign Language	49	15.5
	Vocational Field	41	13.0
<i>Type of School</i>	Anatolian High School	162	51.3
	Vocational Technical High School	87	27.5
	Imam Hatip High School	67	21.2
<i>Total</i>		316	100

As can be seen in Table 1, the numbers of female and male teachers participating in the research are similar. Likewise, the distribution of teachers in terms of marital status is also similar. It is observed that more than half of the participants (53.8%) have a 1-2 year service period and that the vast majority (84.2%) have an undergraduate level education. According to the branch variable, social field teachers including branches such as History, Literature, Geography and Philosophy are in the majority (41.5%), while the number of teachers in the field of talent and information, which includes courses in Painting, Music, Physical Education, and Information and Technology is in the minority (7.3%). Just over half of the teachers who participated in the study (51.3%) work in Anatolian high schools.

Data Collection Tool

The research data were collected by using the “Effective School Scale” (ESS) developed by Abdurrezzak (2015). The scale consists of 31 items and five dimensions of administrators, teachers, school atmosphere, students, and school environment-parents. The Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficient, which is used frequently when the responses are obtained on a rating scale and indicates the extent to which the measure of the item scores are consistent (Büyüköztürk et al., 2015, p. 111) , was found to be .95 for the ESS scale. This value indicates that the scale is highly reliable. Reliability scores for the subscales were found to be .77 for the administrator dimension, .90 for teachers, .88 for school atmosphere, .92 for students, and .91 for the school environment-parents dimension. Reliability analysis of the scale was repeated in this study and the values were found to be .94 for the whole scale, .78 for the administrator dimension, .92 for teachers, .89 for school atmosphere, .92 for students, and .89 for the school environment-parents dimension. Factor analysis on the items of the scale showed that the common variance load values ranged from .55 to .85.

Data Analysis

Statistical analysis of the data was made using the IBM SPSS 23 program. Descriptive statistics (percent, frequency, arithmetic mean, standard deviation) were used in the study to determine the perception levels of teachers about effective schools and its sub-dimensions. Parametric tests (*t*-test and one-way analysis of variance [ANOVA]) were used to determine whether or not there were any differences in the research variables (gender, marital status, education status, period of service, branch, and school type). Tukey test was utilized in order to discover sub-dimensions which held significant differences. The arithmetic mean ranges in interpretation are 1.00-1.79 (“quite low”), 1.80-2.59 (“low”), 2.60-3.39 (“medium”), 3.40-4.19 (“quite high”), and 4.20-5.00 (“high”).

FINDINGS

Findings related to effective school perceptions of high school teachers were included in this section. The arithmetic mean of the opinions of the teachers participating in the study on the scale general and sub-dimensions are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Arithmetic mean of participants' views on the whole scale and sub-dimensions

Dimensions	N	\bar{X}	SS
Effective School (whole scale)	316	2.96	.68
Administrators	316	3.15	.85
Teachers	316	3.41	.87
School Atmosphere	316	3.12	.95
Students	316	2.62	.94
School Environment-Parents	316	2.61	.87

According to Table 2, teachers think that the schools they work in are effective at the “medium” ($\bar{x} = 2.96$) level. According to the teachers, their schools have effective school characteristics at the “medium” level for the sub-dimensions of school environment-parents ($\bar{x} = 2.61$), students ($\bar{x} = 2.62$), school atmosphere ($\bar{x} = 3.12$), and administrators ($\bar{x} = 3.15$) sub-dimensions, whereas the teachers sub-dimension was “quite high” ($\bar{x} = 3.41$).

On the basis of these findings, the teachers surveyed think that the most effective factor in terms of effective school factors is teacher, followed respectively by administrators, school atmosphere, students, and school environment-parents.

Findings Related to Personal Variables

Descriptive statistics and *t*-test results showing differentiation in teachers' perceptions of an effective school and its sub-dimensions according to the gender, marital status, and educational status variables are presented in Tables 3, 4 and 5, respectively.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics and *t*-test results - Teachers' perceptions: effective schools according to gender

Dimensions	Gender	N	\bar{X}	S	df	t	p
Effective School (whole scale)	Female	169	2.99	.64	314	-0.68	.492
	Male	147	2.93	.72			
Administrators	Female	169	3.15	.78	314	0.00	.994
	Male	147	3.15	.93			
Teachers	Female	169	3.46	.79	314	-1.13	.258
	Male	147	3.35	.95			
School Atmosphere	Female	169	3.12	.89	314	0.01	.986
	Male	147	3.12	1.03			
Students	Female	169	2.59	.96	314	0.50	.617
	Male	147	2.65	.92			
School Environment-Parents	Female	169	2.70	.87	314	-1.81	.071
	Male	147	2.52	.86			

When Table 3 is examined, no statistically significant difference is seen in the perceptions of teachers about school effectiveness ($t_{(314)} = -0.68$, $p > .05$) and the related sub-dimensions according to gender variable. By considering the averages, it can be said that the perceptions of the male and female teachers regarding the effective school and its sub-dimensions are similar.

Table 4. *Descriptive statistics and t-test results - Teachers' perceptions: effective schools according to marital status*

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Marital Status</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>X̄</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Effective School (whole scale)	Married	146	3.00	.66	314	0.97	.332
	Single	170	2.93	.69			
Administrators	Married	146	3.18	.89	314	0.71	.478
	Single	170	3.11	.82			
Teachers	Married	146	3.45	.87	314	0.79	.426
	Single	170	3.37	.87			
School Atmosphere	Married	146	3.18	.91	314	1.14	.255
	Single	170	3.06	.99			
Students	Married	146	2.67	.92	314	0.93	.352
	Single	170	2.57	.96			
School Environment- Parents	Married	146	2.62	.86	314	0.15	.877
	Single	170	2.61	.88			

As can be seen in Table 4, there is no significant difference in the *t*-test of the teachers' effective school perceptions ($t_{(314)}=0.97, p>.05$) and the related sub-dimensions according to the variable of marital status. When the averages are examined, it can be said that the perceptions of married and single teachers regarding the effective school and its sub-dimensions are similar.

Table 5. *Descriptive statistics and t-test results - Teachers' perceptions: effective schools according to educational status*

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>State of Education</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>X̄</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Effective School (whole scale)	Bachelor's Degree	266	2.96	.67	314	-0.28	.775
	Master's Degree	50	2.99	.71			
Administrators	Bachelor's Degree	266	3.12	.85	314	-1.01	.309
	Master's Degree	50	3.26	.86			
Teachers	Bachelor's Degree	266	3.42	.86	314	0.30	.762
	Master's Degree	50	3.38	.95			
School Atmosphere	Bachelor's Degree	266	3.10	.94	314	-0.97	.330
	Master's Degree	50	3.24	1.03			
Students	Bachelor's Degree	266	2.63	.97	314	0.46	.645
	Master's Degree	50	2.56	.81			
School Environment- Parents	Bachelor's Degree	266	2.61	.88	314	-0,32	.749
	Master's Degree	50	2.65	.83			

According to Table 5, there is no significant difference in the teachers' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of schools ($t_{(314)}=-0.28, p>.05$) and the sub-dimensions in the *t*-test according to the variable of educational status. Based on this finding, it can be said that the effective school perceptions of teachers who received education at undergraduate and graduate level are similar.

Table 6 shows the results of the ANOVA test, which indicates whether or not the perceptions of teachers' about effective school and its' sub-dimensions differ according to the period of service.

Table 6. ANOVA test results for teachers' effective school perceptions according to period of service variable

Dimensions	Period of Service	N	\bar{X}	S	Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean of squares	F	p	Diff.
Effective School (whole scale)	1-2 Years	170	2.97	.68	Inter group	1.605	2	.803	1.735	.178	
	3-4 Years	71	2.84	.63	Within group	144.842	313	.463			
	5 Years/+	75	3.05	.71	Total	146.448	315				
Administrators	1-2 Years	170	3.14	.85	Inter group	.399	2	.199	.270	.764	
	3-4 Years	71	3.10	.78	Within group	231.231	313	.739			
	5 Years /+	75	3.20	.93	Total	231.630	315				
Teachers	1-2 Years	170	3.44	.85	Inter group	.741	2	.371	.482	.618	
	3-4 Years	71	3.32	.90	Within group	240.850	313	.769			
	5 Years /+	75	3.41	.89	Total	241.591	315				
School Atmosphere	1-2 Years	170	3.15	.96	Inter group	5.003	2	2.502	2.755	.065	
	3-4 Years	71	2.90	.85	Within group	284.233	313	.908			
	5 Years /+	75	3.25	1.01	Total	289.236	315				
Students	1-2 Years	170	2.60	.96	Inter group	3.669	2	1.835	2.057	.129	
	3-4 Years	71	2.48	.82	Within group	279.078	313	.892			
	5 Years /+	75	2.79	.99	Total	282.747	315				
School Environment -Parents	1-2 Years	170	2.62	.89	Inter group	1.605	2	.669	.876	.418	
	3-4 Years	71	2.51	.88	Within group	144.842	313	.764			
	5 Years /+	75	2.70	.81	Total	146.448	315				

As can be seen in Table 6, there is no meaningful difference in the teachers' perceptions of an effective school based on the period of service variable ($F_{(2-313)}=1.735$; $p>.05$). According to this finding, it can be concluded that the effective school perception of a teacher does not depend on whether their length of service in school is short or long.

The results of the ANOVA test, which indicates whether or not the effective school perceptions of teachers differ according to the branch variable, are shown in Table 7.

When Table 7 is examined, a meaningful difference can only be seen for the sub-dimensions of administrators ($F_{(4-311)}=2.925$; $p<.05$) and students ($F_{(4-311)}=3.176$; $p<.05$) for teachers' effective school perceptions according to the variable of branch, and no significant difference was seen for the other dimensions. In the administrators sub-dimension, teachers of foreign languages have a more negative view of school effectiveness than teachers in the social and talent-informatics field. In the students sub-dimension, it can be said that teachers in the field of science-mathematics have a negative opinion about school effectiveness compared to teachers in the talent-informatics field.

Table 7. ANOVA test results for teachers' effective school perceptions according to branch variable

Dimension	Branch	N	\bar{X}	S	Source of variance	Sum of sq.	df	Mean of sq.	F	p	Diff.
Effective School (whole scale)	Social Domain	131	2.99	.71	Inter group	3.918	4	.980	2.137	.076	
	Science - Math	72	2.93	.61	Within group	142.53	311	.458			
	Talent - Informatics	23	3.24	.80	Total	0	315				
	Foreign Language	49	2.77	.57		146.44					
	Vocational Field	41	3.01	.70		8					
Administrators	Social Domain	131	3.20	.88	Inter group	8.397	4	2.099	2.925	.021	1-4
	Science - Math	72	3.15	.82	Within group	223.23	311	.718			
	Talent - Informatics	23	3.40	1.01	Total	3	315				
	Foreign Language	49	2.80	.71		231.63					
	Vocational Field	41	3.26	.78		0					
Teachers	Social Domain	131	3.35	.93	Inter group	2.230	4	.557	.724	.576	
	Science - Math	72	3.50	.70	Within group	239.36	311	.770			
	Talent - Informatics	23	3.60	1.03	Total	1	315				
	Foreign Language	49	3.33	.88		241.59					
	Vocational Field	41	3.43	.85		1					
School Atmosphere	Social Domain	131	3.14	.97	Inter group	5.746	4	1.436	1.576	.181	
	Science - Math	72	3.10	.91	Within group	283.49	311	.912			
	Talent - Informatics	23	3.47	1.03	Total	0	315				
	Foreign Language	49	2.88	.91		289.23					
	Vocational Field	41	3.17	.93		6					
Students	Social Domain	131	2.74	.94	Inter group	11.096	4	2.774	3.176	.014	2-3
	Science - Math	72	2.39	.81	Within group	271.65	311	.873			
	Talent - Informatics	23	3.02	.98	Total	1	315				
	Foreign Language	49	2.43	.84		282.74					
	Vocational Field	41	2.62	1.14		7					
School Environment-Parents	Social Domain	131	2.62	.89	Inter group	2.940	4	.735	.962	.429	
	Science - Math	72	2.62	.71	Within group	237.66	311	.764			
	Talent - Informatics	23	2.81	1.06	Total	0	315				
	Foreign Language	49	2.42	.84		240.60					
	Vocational Field	41	2.69	.97		1					

The results of the ANOVA test, which indicates whether or not the teachers' effective school perceptions differ according to the variable of school type, are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. ANOVA test results for teachers' effective school perceptions according to school type variable

Dimension	School Type	N	\bar{X}	S	Source of variance	Sum of sq.	df	Mean of squares	F	p	Diff
Effective School (whole scale)	Anatolian	162	3.01	.63	Inter group	10.185	2	5.093	12.14	.00	1-3
	Vocational	87	3.08	.65	Within group	127.025	303	.419	8	0	2-3
	Imam Hatip	67	2.60	.66	Total	137.210	305				
Administrators	Anatolian	162	3.10	.85	Inter group	4.086	2	2.043	2.860	.05	
	Vocational	87	3.29	.79	Within group	216.474	303	.714		9	
	Imam Hatip	67	2.97	.87	Total	220.560	305				
Teachers	Anatolian	162	3.42	.87	Inter group	8.959	2	4.480	6.089	.00	1-3
	Vocational	87	3.59	.82	Within group	222.928	303	.736		3	2-3
	Imam Hatip	67	3.10	.85	Total	231.887	305				
School Atmosphere	Anatolian	162	3.17	.87	Inter group	17.478	2	8.739	10.14	.00	1-3
	Vocational	87	3.32	.98	Within group	261.000	303	.861	5	0	2-3
	Imam Hatip	67	2.67	.95	Total	278.478	305				
Students	Anatolian	162	2.73	.81	Inter group	25.255	2	12.627	16.01	.00	1-3
	Vocational	87	2.73	.97	Within group	238.969	303	.789	1	0	2-3
	Imam Hatip	67	2.04	.92	Total	264.224	305				
School Environment-Parents	Anatolian	162	2.68	.86	Inter group	5.290	2	2.645	3.594	.02	1-3
	Vocational	87	2.61	.88	Within group	223.003	303	.736		9	
	Imam Hatip	67	2.34	.80	Total	228.294	305				

As can be seen in Table 8, there is a significant difference in the total of school teachers' effective school perceptions ($F_{(2-303)}=12.148$; $p<.05$) according to the variable of school type. Accordingly, effective school perceptions of teachers show significant differences in all of the dimensions except for the dimension of administrator. In all other dimensions except for the whole scale and the administrator sub-dimension, the teachers have the opinion that Imam Hatip High Schools have less effective school characteristics than the other high school types.

RESULT, DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS

One of the most important issues that decision-makers and practitioners must deal with in education in the twenty-first century can be expressed as the ability to meet the expectations of today's modern society by schools that have many dimensions, players and an open system. At this point, steps are taken to ensure school effectiveness and efforts to create effective schools have increased in recent years. In order to ensure the effectiveness of schools, it is important to first determine the current levels of effectiveness of the schools and to take the necessary strategic steps from this point of view. The purpose of this current research was to determine to what extent schools have effective school characteristics according to high school teachers' views in terms of certain variables and dimensions.

According to the findings of this study, it is determined the teachers have a "medium" level of effective school perception about their schools in the overall scale. This result can be interpreted as, according to the teachers, the schools they work in do not have characteristics of an effective school at the expected level. This finding is similar to that of studies conducted by Duranay (2005) and Oral (2005). In various other studies found in the literature, it has been reported that the effective school perceptions of teachers are of a high level (e.g., Keleş, 2006; Akan, 2007; Ayık & Ada, 2009; Kuşaksız, 2010; Abdurrezzak, 2015). The difference in teachers'

effective school perceptions can be related to the variability of the environment, organizational culture and climate of schools.

According to the views of the participants, teachers think their schools have a “medium” level of effectiveness in administrator, teacher and school atmosphere sub-dimensions and a “low” level of effectiveness in student and school environment-parent sub-dimensions. Teachers think the most effective factor among effective school factors is teacher, and their perceptions are more negative in the students and school environment-parent sub-dimensions. This finding is similar to that of research conducted by Abdurrezzak (2015). In many research studies conducted in the literature, the most effective dimension according to the teachers was determined as the administrator dimension (e.g., Balcı, 1993; Şişman, 1996; Girmen, 2001; Yılmaz, 2006; Akan, 2007; Kuşaksız, 2010; Türker, 2010; Kaya, 2015). In the research conducted by Keleş (2006), the most effective dimensions in effective school according to the teachers were identified as administrator and teacher dimension.

The fact that teacher perceptions related to school administrator, which is one of the most critical factors in ensuring an effective school, is at a “medium” level in the current research, can be interpreted that school administrators do not have effective managerial qualities and competencies at the expected level. This result may be due to school administrators giving more importance to their managerial duties than their teaching duties and that they take the leadership of teaching as secondary. In addition, this situation can be related to school administration in Turkey not being considered as a field of specialization and that many school administrators are appointed to the duties without having adequate managerial training (Yılmaz, & Taşdan, 2006; Memduhoğlu, 2007). The fact that school administrators, who are practitioners in educational administration in Turkey, are not educated in the field of educational administration is a continuing problem (Yılmaz, 2016). According to Çelik (2002), no remarkable policies could be seen for the selection and placement of school principals in Turkey. Aydoğan (2015, p. 173) states that there is no standard principle in the selection and appointment of school administrators in Turkey, and that effective management practices of school administrators, who are appointed by frequently changing methods, emerge as a personal trait. In research on the selection and placement of school administrators in Turkey (e.g., Akın, 2012; Pelit, 2013), it has been determined that practices of selecting and training school administrators have differed over time, but that this difference does not reflect a development and there is no mention of an existing policy in this respect.

In the research conducted by Akın (2012), it was found that graduate conditions were introduced to become school administrators in countries that provided important contributions to the field of education management such as the United States, Japan and the United Kingdom; however, the graduate and doctoral degrees of the related fields of universities in Turkey were not sufficiently taken into consideration by the Ministry of National Education (MoNE). According to Özdemir (2013) and Balcı (2014), school principals need to first have sufficient information and qualifications in the field of educational administration in order to be effective administrators. From this point of view, it would be appropriate for the school principals in Turkey to attend post-graduate education in the field of educational administration as a prerequisite for their appointment.

According to the findings of this current study, it was seen that teachers had the most negative opinions about the school environment and parents dimension among the effective school dimensions. This finding overlaps with the findings of other researches in the literature

(e.g., Balcı, 1993; Şişman, 1996; Girmen, 2001; Akan, 2007; Keleş, 2006; Gökçe & Kahraman, 2010; Türker, 2010; Abdurrezzak, 2015; Kaya, 2015). In research conducted by Kuşaksız (2010) and Yılmaz (2006), it was seen that besides the school environment and parent dimension, the least effective dimension was the student dimension according to the teachers. These findings indicate that school-family cooperation is not being achieved at the required level.

In a study conducted by Uğurlu and Abdurrezzak (2016), it was determined that according to the teachers, the society and families do not provide sufficient support and contribution to the school. Erdoğan and Demirkasımoğlu (2010) point out that most of the families are reluctant and passive in their participation in the education process and that participation is mainly limited to activities such as visiting the school and exchanging information, taking the advice of teachers and participating in school meetings. In the study conducted by Aydoğan (2007), the reasons for preventing family involvement are stated as lack of time, lack of sufficient knowledge about the scope of school activities, lack of sufficient knowledge in course-subject areas, and economic problems.

In the current study, it was revealed that the perception level of the teachers about the effectiveness of the school they work in do not show any significant difference according to the variables of gender, marital status, education status or duration of service. These findings are similar to that of the research conducted by Abdurrezzak (2015). In the literature, according to the gender variable, besides the research showing significant differences in effective school perceptions of the teachers (e.g., Yılmaz, 2006; Akan, 2007; Kuşaksız, 2010), there are also studies that found no significant difference (e.g., Duranay, 2005; Keleş, 2006; Türker, 2010; Kaya, 2015). According to the educational status variable, significant differences were found in effective school perceptions of teachers in the research conducted by Akan (2007), Kaya (2015), Kuşaksız (2010), and Yılmaz (2006).

According to branch variable, it was seen in the current research that teachers in the field of foreign language have a negative view about the school effectiveness for the administrator sub-dimension compared to teachers in the social and talent-informatics branches. In the sub-dimension of students, it was determined that teachers in the field of science-mathematics have a negative opinion about the effective school in comparison with teachers in the field of talent-informatics. The fact that teachers in the field of talent and informatics, including courses such as Technology Design, Painting, Visual Arts, Music, Physical Education, and Information Technology have higher effective school perceptions than teachers of other fields can be related to today's students being more interested in these courses. In addition, these courses contain less theoretical knowledge and more practices and so students have more activities compared to courses in the fields of foreign language or science-mathematics; which may increase student motivation. Therefore, teacher motivation and effective school perception are likely to be higher when the students have high motivation for the lesson.

According to the variable of school type, teachers have the opinion that Imam Hatip High Schools have less effective school characteristics than Anatolian and Vocational-Technical High Schools. In a study conducted by Duranay (2005) examining the levels of effective school characteristics of secondary education institutions, the most effective school types in the İzmir province of Turkey were Science High Schools and Anatolian High Schools; while the least effective school types were identified as General High Schools and Vocational High Schools, according to teacher perceptions. These differences may be due to student

profiles formed by the placement of students in high school according to their academic achievement.

It is thought that the narrow and specific suggestions for schools to become effective schools are not very meaningful. This is because the development of school effectiveness is directly related to macro-scale education policies and structural-administrative arrangements, as well as to the social, cultural, political and economic structure of society. In this context, important responsibilities fall to all social sectors, especially policy makers, decision-makers and local education officials.

REFERENCES

- Abdurrezzak, S. (2015). *Etkili okul ve okul liderliğine ilişkin öğretmen algılarının incelenmesi* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Sivas.
- Ada, Ş., & Akan, D. (2007). Değişim sürecinde etkili okullar. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Kazım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16, 343-373.
- Akan, D. (2007). *Değişim sürecinde ilköğretim okullarının etkili okul özelliklerine sahip olma düzeyleri* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Atatürk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erzurum.
- Akın, U. (2012). Okul yöneticilerinin seçimi ve yetiştirilmesi: Türkiye ve seçilmiş ülkelerden farklı uygulamalar, karşılaştırmalar. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12(2), 1-30.
- Alvesson, M., & Sveningsson, S. (2015). *Changing organizational culture: Cultural change work in progress*. London / New York: Routledge.
- Arslan, N. T. (2004). Örgütsel performansı belirleyici bir etmen olarak örgüt kültürü ve örgüt iklimi hakkında bir değerlendirme. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi*, 9(1), 203-228.
- Aydoğan, İ. (2007). Okul faaliyetlerine aile katılımını engelleyen faktörler. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(23), 259-273.
- Aydoğan, İ. (2015). *Eğitim ve paradigma*. Ankara: Harf Yayıncılık.
- Ayık, A., & Ada, Ş. (2009). İlköğretim okullarında oluşturulan okul kültürü ile okulların etkililiği arasındaki ilişki. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(2), 429-446.
- Balay, R. (2004). Küreselleşme, bilgi toplumu ve eğitim. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 37(2), 61-82.
- Balcı, A. (1993). *Etkili okul kuram, uygulama ve araştırma*. Ankara: Erek Ofset Matbaası Yayınları.
- Balcı, A. (2014). *Etkili okul, okul geliştirme kuram uygulama ve araştırma* (7th ed.). Ankara: Pegem A. Yayıncılık.
- Başaran, İ. E. (2000). *Eğitim yönetimi: Nitelikli okul*. Ankara: Feryal Matbaası.
- Baştepe, İ. (2009). Etkili okulun eğitim-öğretim süreci ve ortamı boyutlarının nitelikleri. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(29), 76-83.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2015). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (19th ed.). Ankara: Pegem A. Yayıncılık.
- Cheng, Y. C. (1993). Profiles of organizational culture and effective schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 4(2), 85-110. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0924345930040201>.

- Çelik, V. (2002, May). *Eğitim yöneticisi yetiştirme politikasına yön veren temel eğilimler*. Paper presented at 21. Yüzyıl Eğitim Yöneticilerinin Yetiştirilmesi Sempozyumu. Ankara.
- Demirtaş, H., Cömert, M., & Özer, N. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının özyeterlik inançları ve öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin tutumları. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 36(159), 96-111.
- Duranay, P. Y., (2005). *Ortaöğretim kurumlarının etkili okul özelliklerini karşılama düzeyleri* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Denizli.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-24.
- Erdoğan, Ç., & Demirkasımoğlu, N. (2010). Ailelerin eğitim sürecine katılımına ilişkin öğretmen ve yönetici görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 16(3), 399-431.
- Everard, K. B., Morris, G., & Wilson, I. (2004). *Effective school management*. London: Sage Publications.
- Friedman, I. A., & Kass, E. (2002). Teacher self-efficacy: a classroom-organization conceptualization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(6), 675-686. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(02\)00027-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(02)00027-6).
- Girmen, P. (2001). *Ortaöğretim kurumlarının etkili okul özelliklerini karşılama düzeyleri* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Gökçe, F., & Kahraman, P. B. (2010). Etkili okulun bileşenleri: Bursa İli Örneği. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, XXIII(1), 173-206.
- Güçlü, N. (2003). Örgüt kültürü. *Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(6), 58-63.
- Helvacı, M. A., & Aydoğan, İ. (2011). Etkili okul ve etkili okul müdürüne ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8, 41-60.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2012). *Eğitim yönetimi teori, araştırma ve uygulama* (S. Turan, Trans., Ed.). Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2007). The relationship between parental involvement and urban secondary school student academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Urban Education*, 42(1), 82-110.
- Karasar, N. (2008). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Karip, E., & Köksal, K. (1996). Etkili eğitim sistemlerinin geliştirilmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 2(2), 245-257.
- Kaya, Y. (2015). *Okul paydaşlarının görüşlerine göre etkili okul geliştirme (Şahinbey ilçesi örneği)* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Gaziantep.
- Keleş, B. (2006). *İlköğretim okullarının etkili okul özelliklerine sahip olma dereceleri hakkında öğretmen görüşleri (Çorum ili örneği)* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Kuşaksız, N. (2010). *Öğretmen görüşlerine göre ilköğretim okullarının etkili okul özelliklerine sahip olma düzeyleri (Üsküdar ilçesi örneği)* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Selçuk Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Lawson, M. A. (2003). School-family relations in context: parent and teacher perceptions of parent involvement. *Urban Education*, 38(1), 77-133.
- Lezotte, L. W. (1992). 'Principal' insights from effective schools. *The Education Digest*, 58(3), 14-17. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/218170540?accountid=16369>.
- Lezotte, L. W. (2001). *Revolutionary and evolutionary: The effective schools movement*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.

- Memduhoğlu, H. B. (2007). Türk eğitim sisteminde okulların yönetimi ve okul yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi sorunsalı. *Milli Eğitim*, 176, 86-96.
- Muijs, D. (2006). New directions for school effectiveness research: Towards school effectiveness without schools. *Journal of Educational Change*, 7(3), 141-160. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10833-006-0002-7>.
- Oral, Ş. (2005). *İlköğretim okullarının etkili okul kavramı açısından değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Dicle Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Diyarbakır.
- Özdemir, S. (2000). *Eğitimde örgütsel yenileşme*. Ankara: Pegem A. Yayıncılık.
- Özdemir, S. (2013). *Eğitim yönetiminde kuram ve uygulama*. Ankara: Pegem A. Yayıncılık.
- Özden, Y. (2013). *Eğitimde yeni değerler*. Ankara: Pegem A. Yayıncılık.
- Pelit, A. (2013). *Okul yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesine ve atanmasına ilişkin benimsenen modellerin karşılaştırılması (Türkiye, Fransa, Danimarka ve İngiltere Örneği)* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Purkey, S., & Smith, M. (1983). Effective Schools: A Review. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83(4), 427-452. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1001168>.
- Reagle, C. (2006). Creating effective schools where all students can learn. *Rural Educator*, 27(3), 24-33.
- Reynolds, D., Sammons, P., De Fraine, B., Van Damme, J., Townsend, T., Teddlie, C., & Stringfield, S. (2014). Educational effectiveness research (EER): A state-of-the-art review. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 25(2), 197-230.
- Reynolds, D., Teddlie, C., Creemers, B., Scheerens, J., & Townsend, T. (2000). An introduction to school effectiveness research. In C. Teddlie & D. Reynolds (Eds.), *The international handbook of school effectiveness research* (pp. 3-25). Oxon: Routledge.
- Rosenblatt, Z., & Peled, D. (2002). School ethical climate and parental involvement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(4), 349-367. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230210433427>.
- Sammons, P., Hillman, J., & Mortimore, P. (1995). *Key characteristics of effective schools: A review of school effectiveness research*. International School Effectiveness and Improvement Centre. London: Institute of Education, University of London.
- Scheerens, J. (2000). *Improving school effectiveness*. Fundamentals of educational planning, 68. UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning. Paris: UNESCO.
- Shaw, C. A. (2008). *A study of the relationship of parental involvement to student achievement in a Pennsylvania career and technology center* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation) Pennsylvania State University. Pennsylvania, USA.
- Stromquist, N. P., & Monkman, K. (2014). Defining globalization and assessing its implications for knowledge and education, revisited. In N. P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures*. (pp. 1-20). Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Şişman, M. (1996). *Etkili okul yönetimi* (Unpublished research report). Eskişehir.
- Şişman, M. (2007). *Örgütler ve kültürler*. Ankara: Pegem A. Yayıncılık.
- Şişman, M. (2013). *Eğitimde mükemmellik arayışı etkili okullar* (4th ed.). Ankara: Pegem A. Yayıncılık.
- Tatar, M. (2006). Okul ve öğretmenin öğrenci başarısı üzerindeki etkisi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 171, 156-166.
- Townsend, T. (1997). What makes school effective? A comparison between school communities in Australia and the USA. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 8(3), 311-326.

- Türker, Y. (2010). *İlköğretim okullarının etkililik düzeyleri ile örgüt sağlığı arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya.
- Uğurlu, C. T., & Abdurrezzak, S. (2016). Etkili okul ve okul liderliğine ilişkin öğretmen görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 22(3), 401-428.
- Valesky, T. C. (1993, November). *Total quality management as a philosophical and organizational framework to achieve outcomes-based education and effective schools*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the MidSouth Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Yılmaz, K. (2016). Türkiye’de eğitim yönetimi alanındaki batı etkisi üzerine bir değerlendirme. In K. Yılmaz (Ed.), *Eleştirel eğitim yönetimi yazıları* (pp. 65-114). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Yılmaz, K., & Taşdan, M. (2006). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin okul yönetiminde etkililik hakkındaki görüşleri. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 39(2), 125-150.
- Yılmaz, V. (2006). *İlköğretim okullarının etkili okul özelliklerine sahip olma düzeyleri (Düzce İli Örneği)* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bolu.
- Zhu, C., Devos, G., & Li, Y. (2011). Teacher perceptions of school culture and their organizational commitment and well-being in a Chinese school. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 12(2), 319-328.
- Zigarelli, M. A. (1996). An empirical test of conclusions from effective schools. *Journal of Educational Research*, 90(2), 103-111.

Please cite as:

Memduhoğlu, H. B., & Karataş, E. (2017). How effective are schools according to teachers? *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi - Journal of Educational Sciences Research*, 7(2), 207-225. <http://ebad-jesr.com/>