

An Exploration of the Relationship between School Happiness and School Effectiveness

¹Muhammet İbrahim Akyürek

²Ahmet Aypay

Abstract

The study investigated the levels of school happiness and school effectiveness, and also examined for the relationship between school happiness and school effectiveness variables as well as the predictive relationships between school happiness and school effectiveness. Data was collected from 432 teachers with a simple random sampling at different schools in 2021 in a provincial city through School Happiness and School Effectiveness scales. Confirmatory Factor Analysis was used to establish validity and Cronbach Alpha was used to check the reliability of the instruments. In addition to means and standard deviations, correlations and regressions used to analyze the data. All significant medium and high positive relationships were found among the study variables. School administration had significant positive effects on all school effectiveness variables. Learning environments, cooperation and activities follow school administration.

Keywords: *School Happiness, School Effectiveness, Administrators, Teachers, Students.*

¹Muhammet İbrahim Akyürek, PhD, Selcuk University Faculty of Education, Turkey

Email: m.ibrahimakyurek@gmail.com

²Ahmet Aypay, PhD, Nazarbaeyev University Graduate School of Education, Kazakhstan

Email: aypaya@gmail.com

Recommended Citation: *Akyürek, M. İ. & Aypay, A. (2023). An exploration of the relationship between school happiness and school effectiveness, Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, 7(1).*

Introduction

School effectiveness research includes effectiveness, efficiency, and quality in general. These concepts all have values, desires and goals for constituents in education under different conditions and systems (Scheerens, 2004). Quality in education indicates reaching or maintaining a set of standards through improving schools (Creemers & Scheerens, 1994). Achieving goals, developing human resources and environmental conditions, and fostering innovation and creativity are all ways to claim quality as an outcome (Brusic, Babarovic, and Velic, 2016).

Models of school effectiveness focus on different aspects of school life. The correlates of effective schools include: a clear and shared mission for principals and teachers, high expectations of teachers, effective instructional leadership, teachers and students have clear expectations, a cooperative school environment, constructive school-family relationship, and following student progress (Lezotte, 1991).

Following the Coleman et al. (1966) study, education researchers engaged in a series of research to indicated the effectiveness of schools. The first wave of school effectiveness research focused on proving that teachers and schools influence student outcomes in the 1980s. The second wave of research focused on determining the factors of school effectiveness and listing the characteristics of effective schools in the 1990s. The third wave focused on creating school effectiveness models including students, teachers, and schools in the 2000s. The fourth wave of research focused on developing dynamic models that may be able to track changes on its variables (Brusic, Babarovic, and Velic, 2016).

School Happiness

According to Aristotle, the goal of the state and its institutions is to provide a good life for its citizens. Happiness was used for eudaimonia, the Greek word for well-being, the purpose of life (Hargreaves, 2001). Happiness includes quality and excellence:

In Aristotle's view, it is eudaimonia, the Greek word usually translated into English as happiness, but perhaps better rendered as well-being, which is the complete end or purpose of life. Eudaimonia is not a state of mind or set of feelings, but a quality of conduct or disposition to act in a certain way. Well-being consists in virtuous activity. Here we meet a second intractable problem of translation: the Greek arete, usually translated as virtue, is perhaps better rendered as excellence.

There are studies that claim that the concept of happiness has both emotional and cognitive aspects (Arslan, 2018). The concept of happiness, when considered cognitively, is defined as the meaning of life and the intensity of positive emotions in a person (Seligman et al., 2009). The intensity of the positive or negative emotion levels on an individual reveals that happiness has an emotional aspect as well (Waterman, 1993).

There are studies that focus on organizational happiness (Öztaş, 2018; Bulut, 2015; Kızılay, 2017; Karahan, 2018). Organizational happiness may be defined as the level of joint effort spent in achieving individual as well as organizational goals (Bulut, 2015). Arslan (2018) indicates that organizational happiness is experiencing more frequent and intense positive emotions than the negative ones by employees. Pryce-Jones (2010), on the other hand, claimed that the cognitive dimension of happiness is a way of thinking that enables employees to take action to reach goals

by maximizing their performance. Another study defined happy organizations; as organizations where customers, employees and administrators are altogether happy (Fidan, 2018).

School happiness is defined as the state of emotional well-being resulting from the harmony of the needs and expectations of both staff and students, based on the relevant environmental dimensions (Engels, Aelterman, Petegem, & Schepens, 2004). The importance of a happy school environment for the achievement of effective learning and the promotion of students' abilities is evident (Talebzadeh & Samkan, 2011). Bird and Markle (2012) emphasized the importance of a happy school environment not only in academic contexts, but also in contributing to students' overall life skills and satisfaction.

Studies have been conducted on education and happiness, and evaluations have been made by taking different factors into account (Mattig, 2011). While for some scholars the aim in education should be only learning, others have seen the main purpose as the individual happiness. Happiness is considered in proportion to the quality of the result at hand in education. Teachers can often question their sense of meaning and value because of the constant communication they have with their students. Striving to be a “good” example to students and colleagues can be a sign of good teaching. In such a case, the teacher's love of teaching can be a start in terms of happiness. However, the dominant administrative structure and strict discipline together with the hierarchical structure in schools, see this caring relationship not important for students (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2009). When teachers are satisfied with the physical conditions, school administration and school discipline, they can do a better job in revealing the talents of the students (Unesco, 2015).

Human resources are the most crucial source of schools. The most important human resource of the school is the teachers (Şişman, 2016). Teacher happiness in the schools, where they spend approximately one third of their time, is important in terms of the well-being of all constituents (Ergün & Sezgin-Nartgün, 2017). Teaching is a profession that requires constant interaction with different individuals. Having the potential to affect all segments of society and given that the most important interactions of teachers are with students, teacher happiness in schools is important in terms of their productivity and performance (Demir & Murat, 2017).

Talebzadeh and Samkan (2011) emphasized to individual, physical, socio-emotional, and instructional factors associated with school happiness. However, Yıldırım (2014) argued that staff cooperation, fair and helpful assessment and feedback, student-centered teaching practices, a positive school environment, and personal development factors contribute to teachers' well-being in the school environment. Aelterman, Engels, Van Petegem, and Verhaeghe (2007) associated teacher well-being with the support of the school principal and colleagues, workload, self-efficacy, parent relationships, and positive attitudes towards innovation.

Bakker (2005) stated that happy teachers in schools raise happy students who are academically successful. Duckworth, Quinn, and Seligman (2009) found that teacher positivity and life satisfaction were predictors of students' academic success; Turner et al. (2002) showed that humor is more prominent in well-organized classrooms with high student participation. Jennings and Greenberg (2009) emphasized that teachers who show high levels of socio-emotional competence develop good teacher-student relationships and a supportive classroom atmosphere. Boehm and Lyubomirsky (2008) also said that students learn better and are more motivated to learn when they are in a happy environment.

School Effectiveness

The concept of the effective school first emerged in the late 1960s as a response to the Coleman report on “Equality of Educational Opportunity” (Coleman et al., 1966). From the 1970s, school supporters engaged in research to demonstrate the impact of schools on student achievement, and this led to the establishment of an effective school movement (Li et al., 2016). Efforts to make schools effective have emerged with the necessity of adapting organizational development studies to educational institutions. Organization development includes interventions that are managed based on a specific plan at organizational level, aiming to make the organization effective and healthy. Effective school is a school where an optimum learning environment is created for cognitive, affective, psychomotor, social and aesthetic development of students (Özdemir, 2000).

The concept of an effective school is based on the belief that teachers can affect the academic achievement levels of students and increase their achievement through the existing collective work culture in these schools. In other words, when teachers work together on a clear and common set of goals, they can have a lasting and significant impact on students' outcomes (Donohoo, 2018; Sharratt, 2018). The concept of effective schools represents educational and administrative features that emerge at a higher level in the school structure. In the structure of the effective school, shaping of established beliefs, values and norms, are important while goal-oriented leadership is emphasized (Modin, Låftman, & Östberg, 2017).

Several approaches that attempt to define effective schools: (a) the output goal approach, which claims that an effective school is a school whose achievements are above what would be expected under defined forecasting conditions; (b) the goal approach in which a school is effective if it achieves the goals it has set for itself within a specified time; (c) the resource approach where a school is considered effective if it can mobilize the resources necessary to fulfill its mission; (d) the internal processes approach, which is thought to be effective if the functioning of a school is smooth and its organizational climate is healthy (Arar & Abu Nasra, 2020). Hallinger and Heck (2011) drew attention to five characteristics of an effective school; strong leadership of the school principal, developing high expectations of students and teachers, order and discipline, emphasis on student-centered activities and monitoring of their work; (e) the stakeholder satisfaction approach, in which an effective school is defined as one that meets the expectations and needs of stakeholders (parents, students and the community); and (f) the combined approach, in which an effective school is an educational institution that strives to systematically and continuously improve itself to achieve its goals by maximizing physical and human resources while protecting the well-being of teachers and students (Hallinger & Heck, 2011).

There are many features that distinguish effective schools from traditional schools. However, none of these features is sufficient on its own to create or maintain an effective school. The components must overlap, interpenetrate and support each other in order to provide the necessary conditions for school engagement and job satisfaction as part of all school community members. Such a system can create an effective school and improve student outcomes (Preston, Goldring, Guthrie, Ramsey, & Huff, 2017). The features that distinguish effective schools from other schools are seen in many different areas, including the education system, school organization, teaching-learning processes, and school culture itself, such as policy and financing (Intxausti, Etxeberria, & Bartau, 2017).

The person who plays a key role in teacher and student effectiveness is the school principal (Balyer, 2013). The school administrator is the person who directs the teacher's work, leads, and coordinates with the goals of the organization (Korumaz & Kocabaş, 2013). The main task of an effective administrator is to make the school successful by dealing with education and training (Binbaşioğlu, 1993). The effectiveness of a teacher in effective schools is the self-confidence and belief in planning and performing the activities necessary to successfully perform a teaching activity (Hoy & Miskel, 2012). Effective teachers create healthy communication with their students and teach in collaboration with their students in the classroom environment (Tatar, 2004). In school effectiveness, the middle element of instruction is the student. The aim of an effective school is to enable students with different academic skills to reach the desired level. In an effective school approach, teachers believe in the success of each student and share this with students. An effective student is one who knows what he is learning and why, and is eager to take responsibility. Thanks to the support of teachers and administrators, students are interested in taking responsibility in their studies (Gündüz, 2015).

The aspects that make schools potentially effective; good leadership, positive teacher-student relationships, a strong academic focus, and a positive school climate. In addition to increasing the effectiveness of the school and the success of the students, these school characteristics can also serve as a protector against students who tend not to fulfill their responsibilities (Ramberg, Låftman, Fransson & Modin, 2019). The central features of effective schools include strong and competent leadership, high expectations of all students, a school environment conducive to learning, a focus on acquiring basic skills, and frequent monitoring of students' progress. These qualities were later adopted as variables of the effective school (Scheerens, 2016; Lezotte, 2001).

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between school happiness and effectiveness based on teacher perceptions. The research questions were as follows:

1. What is the level of school happiness?
2. What is the level of school effectiveness?
3. What is the relationship between school happiness and effectiveness?
4. To what extent school happiness variables (physical equipment, learning environment, cooperation, activities and school management) predict school effectiveness variables (administrators, teachers, school environment and educational process, students and parents)?

Method

Model of the Research

This study is correlational survey. A survey was used to determine the relationship between two or more variables.

Participants

The population of the research comprised teachers working in schools (K-12) in Siirt province of Turkey in the 2021-2022 academic year. The number of teachers working in schools in Siirt is 4566 (Ministry of National Education [MNE], 2021). The lower limit for the sample size of the study is 354 based on the 95% confidence interval (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2014). The sample of the research consists of 432 randomly selected teachers working in schools in Siirt in the 2021-

2022 academic year (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012). Table 1 provides descriptive statistics on demographic variables (gender, professional experience, school level).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics on Demographic Variables

Variables		N	%
Gender	Female	153	35.4
	Male	279	64.6
Professional experience	1-6 years	138	31.9
	7-12 years	120	27.8
	13-18 years	81	18.8
	19 years and above	93	21.5
Grade level	Kindergarten	57	13.2
	Primary school	105	24.3
	Middle school	114	26.4
	High school	156	36.1
Total		432	100

Table 1 demonstrates that there were more male teachers than female teachers in the sample. When teacher experience is considered, the largest group is teachers with 1-6 years of experience (31.9%) while teachers with 13-18 years of experience were the lowest (18.8%). When teachers are divided based on the school level variable, the majority of the teachers were from high school (36.1%) while teachers in the kindergarten were the lowest group with 13.2% in the sample.

Instruments

Two different data collection instruments were used to determine the relationship between school happiness and effectiveness according to teacher perceptions. Both scales coincide with the views put forward by leading experts or authorities who have published and developed theories on these topics (Aelterman, Engels, Van Petegem & Verhaeghe, 2007; Balcı, 1993; Şişman, 1996; Yıldırım, 2014).

School Happiness Scale

The "School Happiness Scale (SHS)" is a five-point Likert-type scale developed by Sezer and Can (2019) was used to determine the level of school happiness in schools. It aims to measure the level of school happiness and includes 26 items with five dimensions. The dimensions of the scale are: physical equipment, learning environment, cooperation, activities and school administration. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used to confirm the factor structure of the instrument. CFA revealed that the t-values of the latent variables explaining the observed

variables were found to be significant at the .01 level. Since significant t- values were obtained for all items in the model, all indicators were included in the model. The CFA results of the SHS are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results of the School Happiness Scale

Fit measurements	Measurement value	The reference range
p	.00	< .01
X ² /sd	4.18	< 5
RMSEA	.08	≤ .08
SRMR	.05	≤ .05
NNFI - CFI	.90 - .92	≥ .90

When Table 2 is examined, we see that the p value is significant at the .01 level. However, in many studies CFA is used, it is very common to find p value to be significant due to large sample sizes. For this reason, alternative fit indices regarding the fit between the two matrices were evaluated.

The findings indicate that the X²/sd ratio indicated a moderate fit, the fit index of the RMSEA, t and finally the NNFI, and CFI have all good fit indices while the SRMR has an excellent fit. The five-factor structure of the SHS consisting of 26 items (4 items for physical equipment, 7 items for learning environment, 8 items for cooperation factor, 3 items for activities factor and 4 items for school administration factor) was confirmed as a model.

For the reliability, item analysis was examined by using item-total correlation. In addition, the reliability of the scale was checked by using Cronbach's Alpha. The results of the reliability analysis of the SHS are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Reliability Analysis Results of the School Happiness Scale

Dimensions	Alpha value	Item-total correlation
Physical equipment	.78	.46-.72
Learning environment	.81	.41-.68
Cooperation	.91	.59-.80
Activities	.80	.59-.76
School administration	.96	.85-.93
Scale (Overall)	.94	.41-.93

The overall internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) of the SHS is quite high with .94. Both the overall and dimensions of the scale have high internal consistency coefficients to claim that the school happiness scale is reliable. The item-total correlations for all items in the scale ranged from .41 to .93.

School Effectiveness Scale

The "School Effectiveness Scale (SES)" has a five-point Likert-type scale developed by Abdurrezzak and Uğurlu (2019) and was used to determine school effectiveness levels. The instrument included 31 items and has five dimensions. These theoretical dimensions are: administrators, teachers, school environment and educational process, students and parents. CFA was used to confirm the factor structure of the instrument. CFA indicated that the t values of the latent variables explaining the observed variables were found to be significant at the .01 level. Since significant t- values were obtained for all items in the model, all indicators were included in the model. The CFA results of the school effectiveness scale are provided in Table 4.

Table 4

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results of the School Effectiveness Scale

Fit measurements	Measurement value	The reference range
p	.00	< .01
X ² /sd	4.02	< 5
RMSEA	.08	≤ .08
SRMR	.05	≤ .05
NNFI - CFI	.90 - .92	≥ .90

CFA results indicated that p value is significant at the .01 level and it is common for the p value to be significant due to the large sample size. For this reason, alternative fit indices regarding the fit between the two matrices were evaluated.

For the first analysis, the X²/sd ratio indicated a moderate fit, the fit index of the RMSEA value, the NNFI, and CFI all have good fit while the SRMR has an excellent fit. Thus, the five-factor structure of the SES consisting of 31 items (5 items for the administrators factor, 7 items for the teachers factor, 5 items for the school environment and education process factor, 7 items for the students factor and 7 items for the parents factor) of the SES can be stated as a model. Item-total correlations were used for item analyses. Finally, the reliability of the scale was checked by using Cronbach's Alpha. The results of the reliability analysis of the SEC are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Reliability Analysis Results of School Effectiveness Scale

Dimensions	Alpha value	Item-total correlation
Administrators	.91	.70-.84

Teachers	.95	.77-.88
School environment and educational process	.92	.77-.84
Students	.93	.65-.82
Parents	.89	.54-.81
Scale (General)	.97	.54-.88

The overall internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) of the SEC is .97. The internal consistency coefficients of the SEC were quite high ranging from .89 to .95. The item-total correlations for all items in the scale vary from .54 to .88.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data collected using the instruments from 432 teachers working in Siirt province of Turkey in October 2021 by the researchers following instructions are provided. Before conducting the analyses, first, the assumption of normality was checked. Kurtosis, skewness, mean, mode and median values were examined. All the values of kurtosis and skewness for both scales were within the acceptable limits. Thus, we may claim that the data has a normal distribution (George & Mallery, 2010; Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011). Parametric tests were used to test the sub-problems of the research.

In addition to means and standard deviations, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) was used in data analysis. Multiple linear regression analysis was performed in order to determine the predictive levels of independent variables for dependent variables. In the interpretation of the regression analyzes, standardized Beta (β) coefficients and their significance t-test results were taken into account.

Results

Teacher perceptions concerning the level of SES were examined. Table 6 presents descriptive statistics on the school happiness levels.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics on Level of School Happiness

Dimensions	N	\bar{X}	SD
Physical equipment	432	3.21	.88
Learning environment	432	3.82	.57
Cooperation	432	3.85	.61
Activities	432	3.08	.91
School administration	432	3.72	1.03
Scale (Overall)	432	3.63	.60

When the table is examined; it is seen that teachers' perceptions of the level of school happiness are at the "mostly" level ($\bar{X} = 3.63$). In addition, teachers' perceptions of school happiness in the dimensions of physical equipment ($\bar{X} = 3.21$) and activities ($\bar{X} = 3.08$) were "sometimes"; in the dimensions of learning environment ($\bar{X} = 3.82$), cooperation ($\bar{X} = 3.85$) and school administration ($\bar{X} = 3.72$), it is seen that teachers' perceptions of school happiness are at the "mostly" level. When the dimensions are examined, teachers perceive the level of cooperation in school happiness is the highest dimension while they perceive the lowest is activities.

Teacher perceptions on the level of school effectiveness were examined. Table 7, presents descriptive statistics on the school effectiveness levels.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics on School Effectiveness Level

Dimensions	N	\bar{X}	SD
Administrator	432	3.28	.97
Teachers	432	3.57	.80
School environment and educational process	432	3.50	.83
Students	432	3.18	.82
Parents	432	3.14	.87
Scale (Overall)	432	3.33	.71

The overall teacher perceptions on the level of school effectiveness are at "moderately agree" ($\bar{X} = 3.33$) level. The administrators ($\bar{X} = 3.28$), students ($\bar{X} = 3.18$), parents ($\bar{X} = 3.14$), and teacher perceptions of school effectiveness were all at a "moderately agree" level. While teacher perception on the dimensions of teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.57$) and school environment and educational process ($\bar{X} = 3.50$), "agree" level. When the dimensions are examined, the dimension in which teachers perceive the level of school effectiveness the highest is teachers while that of the least perceived dimension is parents.

For the third sub-problem of the research, the level of relationship between school happiness and school effectiveness was examined. Table 8 includes the results of correlation analysis among the variables.

Table 8

Correlation Analysis Results Among Variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Physical equipment	1	.63*	.46*	.57*	.40*	.74*	.40*	.35*	.38*	.37*	.43*	.46*
2. Learning environment		1	.69*	.59*	.51*	.86*	.46*	.56*	.61*	.58*	.55*	.66*

3.Cooperation	1	.62*	.63*	.87*	.55*	.66*	.72*	.53*	.54*	.71*
4.Activities	1	.49*	.78*	.53*	.46*	.56*	.51*	.53*	.61*	
5.School administration	1	.77*	.77*	.43*	.74*	.53*	.47*	.69*		
6.School happiness (Overall)			1	.68*	.63*	.76*	.63*	.63*	.78*	
7.Administrator				1	.49*	.74*	.52*	.48*	.75*	
8.Teachers					1	.73*	.61*	.61*	.82*	
9.School environment and educational process						1	.70*	.65*	.89*	
10.Students							1	.77*	.87*	
11.Parents								1	.86*	
12.School effectiveness (Overall)									1	

* $p < .01$

When Table 8 is examined, a high positive relationship between school happiness and school effectiveness ($r = .78, p < .01$) variables was found. In other words, as the level of school happiness increases, the level of school effectiveness also increases. In addition, the largest significant positive relationship between school happiness and school effectiveness was found between school administration and administrators ($r = .77, p < .01$) dimensions while the lowest significant positive relationship was on physical equipment and teachers ($r = .35, p < .01$).

When the correlations among sub-dimensions are examined, there is a high positive relationship between school happiness with school administration and school effectiveness with the administrator the dimensions ($r = .77, p < .01$), cooperation between school happiness and school environment and education process ($r = .72, p < .01$) dimensions of school happiness. Moreover, there were moderate relationships between school happiness and other dimensions of school effectiveness.

When the relationships between the sub-dimensions of school happiness and school effectiveness in the table are examined separately, moderate positive relationships among the sub-dimensions of school happiness were found. There was a high positive relationship among the sub-dimensions of school happiness, a medium level relationship between learning environment and

cooperation ($r = .69, p < .01$) and the low positive relationship between physical equipment and school administration was ($r = .40, p < .01$).

Finally, there are positive relationships between the sub-dimensions of school effectiveness. Among the sub-dimensions of school effectiveness, the largest positive relationship was found between students and parents ($r = .77, p < .01$). A moderate positive relationship between administrator and parents dimensions ($r = .48, p < .05$) was found.

For the fourth sub-problem of the research, whether school happiness significantly predicts school effectiveness dimensions was analyzed. Table 9, presents the results of multiple linear regression analysis regarding the prediction of administrator dimension.

Table 9

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results on the Prediction of Administrators Dimension

Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>Standard Error B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Dual r</i>	<i>Partial R</i>
Constant	.231	.214	---	1.080	.281	---	---
Physical equipment	.027	.045	.024	.590	.556	.395	.029
Learning environment	-.015	.081	-.009	-.186	.853	.460	-.009
Cooperation	.026	.077	.017	.341	.733	.551	.017
Activities	.189	.045	.177	4.195	.000*	.525	.199
School administration	.628	.037	.666	16.954	.000*	.769	.635
<hr/>							
<i>R</i> = .787	<i>R</i> ² = .620	<i>F</i> _(5,426) = 138.826		<i>p</i> = .000			

* $p < .01$

When the bivariate and partial correlations between the predictor variables and the dependent (predicted, criterion) variable were examined, a positive and moderate relationship ($r = .40$) between physical equipment and the administrator was found. However, when other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = .03$. A positive and moderate relationship ($r = .46$) between the learning environment and the administrator was found. However, when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = -.01$. A positive and moderate relationship ($r = .55$) between cooperation and the administrator was found. However, when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables was found as $r = .02$. A positive and moderate relationship ($r = .53$) between the activities and the administrator was observed. But when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = .20$. A high positive correlation ($r = .77$) was found between the school administration and the administrator. However, when other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = .64$.

Physical equipment, learning environment, cooperation, activities and school administration variables together had a high relationship with the administrator ($R = .787$, $R^2 = .62$, $p < .01$). The five variables mentioned together explain 62% of the total variance in administrator scores.

Based on the standardized regression coefficient (β), the relative importance of the predictor variables on the administrator; school administration and activities variables. Physical equipment, learning environment and collaboration variables do not predict the school administration.

Based on the results of the regression analysis, the regression equation (mathematical model) for the prediction of the administrator sub-dimension is as follows: Administrator = $.231 + .027\text{Physical equipment} - .015\text{Learning environment} + .026\text{Collaboration} + .189\text{Activities} + .628\text{School administration}$.

In table 10, the results of multiple linear regression analysis regarding the prediction of the teachers dimension are provided.

Table 10

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results on the Prediction of Teachers Dimension

Variables	B	Standard Error B	β	t	p	Dual r	Partial R
Constant	-.089	.209	---	-.428	.669	---	---
Physical equipment	-.046	.044	-.050	-1.034	.302	.348	-.050
Learning environment	.306	.079	.220	3.854	.000*	.564	.184
Cooperation	.643	.076	.493	8.518	.000*	.659	.381
Activities	.045	.044	.051	1.016	.310	.462	.049
School administration	.006	.036	.007	.153	.878	.434	.007
<hr/>							
$R = .677$	$R^2 = .458$	$F_{(5,426)} = 72.058$	$p = .000$				

* $p < .01$

When the bivariate and partial correlations between the predictor variables and the dependent (predicted, criterion) variable are examined, there was a positive and moderate relationship ($r = .35$) between physical equipment and teachers, but when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables was $r = -.05$. appears to have been calculated. It is seen that there is a positive and moderate relationship ($r = .56$) between the learning environment and teachers, but when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables was found as $r = .18$. A moderate positive relationship ($r = .66$) between collaboration and teachers was found but when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two

variables was calculated as $r = .38$. A moderate positive relationship ($r = .46$) between the activities and the teachers was found. However, when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = .05$. A moderate positive relationship ($r = .43$) between school administration and teachers was found but when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = .01$.

Learning environment and cooperation variables significantly predict teachers ($R = .677$, $R^2 = .46$, $p < .01$). These two variables together explain 46% of the total variance in teacher scores.

Based on the standardized regression coefficient (β), the relative importance of the predictor variables on teachers; cooperation and learning environment on school administration. Activities, physical equipment and school administration variables do not predict teacher behavior.

According to the results of the regression analysis, the regression equation (mathematical model) for the prediction of the teachers sub-dimension is as follows: Teachers = $-.089 - .046\text{Physical equipment} + .306\text{Learning environment} + .643\text{Collaboration} + .045\text{Activities} + .006\text{School administration}$.

Table 11 presents the results of multiple linear regression analysis regarding the prediction of school environment and educational process dimensions.

Table 11

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results on the Prediction of School Environment and Educational Process Dimension

Variables	B	Standard Error B	β	t	p	Dual r	Partial R
Constant	-.368	.168	---	-2.183	.030	---	---
Physical equipment	-.106	.036	-.112	-2.966	.003*	.383	-.142
Learning environment	.273	.064	.188	4.268	.000*	.610	.202
Cooperation	.383	.061	.281	6.288	.000*	.717	.291
Activities	.096	.036	.106	2.705	.007*	.556	.130
School administration	.374	.029	.463	12.789	.000*	.743	.527
<hr/>							
R = .822	R ² = .676	F _(5,426) = 178.151		p = .000			

* $p < .01$

In the table; when the bilateral and partial correlations between the predictor variables and the dependent (predicted, criterion) variable are examined, there is a positive and moderate relationship ($r = .38$) between physical equipment, school environment and education process, but when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables is r . It is seen that it is calculated as $r = -.14$. It is seen that there is a positive and moderate relationship ($r = .61$) between

the learning environment and the school environment and the educational process, but when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r = .20$. It is seen that there is a positive and high level of relationship ($r = .72$) between cooperation, school environment and education process, but when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r = .29$. It is seen that there is a positive and moderate relationship ($r = .56$) between the activities, the school environment and the educational process, but when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r = .13$. It is seen that there is a positive and high level of relationship ($r = .74$) between school administration, school environment and education process, but when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r = .53$.

Physical equipment, learning environment, cooperation, activities and school administration variables together give a high and significant relationship with the school environment and education process ($R = .822$, $R^2 = .68$, $p < .01$). The five variables mentioned together explain 68% of the total variance in school environment and education process scores. According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), the relative importance of the predictor variables on the school environment and education process; school administration, cooperation, learning environment, physical equipment, and activities. When the t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that the physical equipment, learning environment, cooperation, activities and school administration variables are important (significant) predictors on the school environment and the educational process.

According to the results of the regression analysis, the regression equation (mathematical model) for the prediction of the school environment and educational process sub-dimension is as follows: School environment and educational process = $-.368 - .106 \text{Physical equipment} + .273 \text{Learning environment} + .383 \text{Collaboration} + .096 \text{Activities} + .374 \text{School administration}$.

In table 12, the results of multiple linear regression analysis regarding the prediction of the students dimension are given.

Table 12

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results for the Prediction of the Students Dimension

Variables	B	Standard Error B	β	t	p	Dual r	Partial R
Constant	-.007	.220	---	-.033	.973	---	---
Physical equipment	-.092	.046	-.098	-1.970	.049*	.367	-.095
Learning environment	.533	.083	.373	6.387	.000*	.578	.296
Cooperation	.027	.079	.020	.335	.738	.526	.016
Activities	.172	.046	.191	3.705	.000*	.505	.177

School administration	.220	.038	.277	5.773	.000*	.533	.269
--------------------------	------	------	------	-------	-------	------	------

$R = .658$	$R^2 = .434$	$F_{(5,426)} = 65.225$	$p = .000$
------------	--------------	------------------------	------------

* $p < .05$

When the bivariate and partial correlations between the predictor variables and the dependent (predicted, criterion) variable were examined, there was a moderate positive relationship ($r = .37$) between physical equipment and students, but when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables was $r = -.09$. A moderate positive relationship ($r = .58$) between the learning environment and students was found. However, when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = .30$. There was a moderate positive relationship ($r = .53$) between cooperation and students, but when other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = .02$. A moderate positive relationship ($r = .51$) between the activities and the students was found but when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = .18$. A moderate positive relationship ($r = .53$) between the school administration and students was found. However, when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = .27$.

Physical equipment, learning environment, activities and school administration variables together have a significant relationship with students ($R = .658$, $R^2 = .43$, $p < .01$). The four variables mentioned together explain 43% of the total variance in student dimension.

Based on the standardized regression coefficient (β), the relative order of importance of the predictor variables on students; learning environment, school administration, activities, physical equipment variables. When the t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients were analyzed, it is found that the variables of physical equipment, learning environment, activities and school administration are significant predictors on students. The cooperation variable, on the other hand, did not predict significantly.

Based on the results of the regression analysis, the regression equation (mathematical model) for the prediction of the students sub-dimension was as follows: Students = $-.007 - .092 \text{Physical equipment} + .533 \text{Learning environment} + .027 \text{Collaboration} + .172 \text{Activities} + .220 \text{School administration}$.

Table 13 presents the results of multiple linear regression analysis regarding the prediction of the parents dimension.

Table 13

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results for the Prediction of Parents Dimension

Variables	B	Standard Error B	β	t	p	Dual r	Partial R
Constant	-.153	.239	---	-.639	.523	---	---
Physical equipment	.048	.051	.049	.945	.345	.434	.046

Learning environment	.356	.091	.235	3.920	.000*	.554	.187
Cooperation	.185	.086	.131	2.144	.033*	.537	.103
Activities	.193	.051	.203	3.815	.000*	.526	.182
School administration	.127	.041	.152	3.076	.002*	.473	.147
<hr/>							
$R = .632$	$R^2 = .400$	$F_{(5.426)} = 56.802$	$p = .000$				

* $p < .05$

When the bivariate and partial correlations between the predictor variables and the dependent (predicted, criterion) variable were examined, it was found that there was a moderate positive ($r = .43$) between physical equipment and parents. However, when other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = .05$. A moderate positive relationship ($r = .55$) between the learning environment and the parents, but when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = .19$. There is a moderate positive relationship ($r = .54$) between cooperation and parents, but when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables is $r = .10$. A moderate positive and moderate relationship ($r = .53$) between the activities and the parents was found. However, when the other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = .18$. A moderate positive relationship ($r = .47$) between school administration and parents was found, but when other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = .15$.

Physical equipment, learning environment, cooperation, activities and school administration variables together have a moderate relationship with parents ($R = .632$, $R^2 = .40$, $p < .01$). The five variables together explain 40% of the total variance in the parent variable.

The standardized regression coefficient (β) provided the relative importance of the predictor variables on the parents: learning environment, activities, school administration, and collaboration variables. When the t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that the variables of learning environment, cooperation, activities and school administration are significant (significant) predictors on parents. The physical equipment does not have a significant effect on the parent variable.

The results of the regression analysis indicate that the regression equation (mathematical model) for the prediction of the parents sub-dimension is as follows: Parents = $-.153 + .048$ Physical equipment + $.356$ Learning environment + $.185$ Collaboration + $.193$ Activities + $.127$ School administration.

Discussion and Conclusion

The first two research questions were to determine the levels of school happiness and effectiveness. CFA was used on two instruments (SHS and SEC) and the instruments were found valid and Cronbach Alpha analyses found the instruments reliable. Moreover, correlations found

significant relationships among SHS and SEC instruments. Multiple regression analyses indicated predictive relationships among SHS and SEC variables. Moskowitz and Dewaele (2021) claimed that teacher happiness is contagious. They were able to empirically link teacher education to student attitudes.

This study included 8 out of 10 variables outlined in Lezotto's (1991) study. They are: high expectations, effective leaders, teachers providing opportunities, cooperative and orderly learning environment, positive school-family relations. This study did not include two dimensions of Lezotto's (1991): Clear and shared mission and monitoring student progress.

The findings of this study indicated that teachers were happy in their schools. Correlations also indicate that there is a high correlation between overall school effectiveness variable and overall school happiness and cooperation. Thus, the findings of the current study supports Hargreaves (2001) claims. Furthermore, variables in the school environment and the teaching-learning process may promote knowledge transfer and cognitive-moral outcomes, whereas cooperation may generate social capital through trust and networks. Harris (2005) argues that teacher leadership mediates school improvement. Teachers are sources of knowledge and instructional expertise and they develop close relationships with their peers. They learn from one another, They build trust and rapport with their colleagues. Thus, they influence school culture.

The third problem of the research, the level of relationship between school happiness and school effectiveness was examined. A high positive relationship between school happiness and school effectiveness was found. Ben-Sahar (2002) brought Freud's pleasure with Frankl's theory in an equation: "happiness= pleasure + meaning/purpose" (Cited in Moscovitz and Dewaele, 2021, p.119). Interestingly, the relationship between SHS and SES variables were all significant and positive as well as the strength of the relationships are all at a medium level or high. There were no non-significant or negative relationships among the sub-dimensions of the SHS and SES variables. High positive relationships were found among school happiness and learning environment, cooperation, school administration, and school effectiveness. High positive relationships were also found between the school environment and learning process, cooperation, administrator, and school effectiveness. Moreover, high positive relationships were found between school effectiveness and administrator, teachers, school environment and learning process, students, and parents. Finally, a high positive relationship was found between students and parents.

Regression results indicate that the activities and school administration variables significantly predict school administrators. Studies indicate that school administration plays an important role in creating a positive school culture and climate. Price (2012) argued that school climate influences school effectiveness. She found that school administrators' relationships with teachers influence their own and teachers' job satisfaction, cohesion, and commitment. Similarly, the learning environment and cooperation also significantly predict the variable teachers. Duckworth, Quinn, and Seligman (2009) were able to show that positive traits were the predictors of teacher effectiveness. They were able to empirically show that optimistic explanatory style, grit, and life satisfaction were the predictors of teacher effectiveness. Moreover, physical equipment, learning environment, cooperation, activities, and school administration all have a significant influence on school environment, teaching and learning process. Physical equipment, learning environment, activities, and school administration have a significant influence on students. Only cooperation does not have a significant effect on students. Finally, the learning environment,

cooperation, activities, and school administration have a significant influence on parents. The only exception to this was physical equipment.

Schools are essentially based on cooperation rather than competition. This is the assumption of the human resources approach. Modes of schooling include goals (for example, coordination), position structure (management structure and grouping of teachers), structure of procedures (cooperation), culture, environment (buffering), primary processes (instructional arrangements, teaching strategies). The findings of this study are partly consistent with both qualitative and quantitative findings of evidence from developing countries. We claim this partly since we did not take individual teacher background variables into account (Scheerens, 2000).

Limitations

This study is a cross-sectional study and does not establish a causal relationship. This study used self-reported evaluations and thus they may have rated themselves higher. This study does not include teacher background variables. The study did not include any objective measure of school effectiveness.

Recommendations

Principals should establish positive relationships with teachers. All the happiness variables are associated with school effectiveness variables significantly and positively. Although it seems natural, this may not always be the case. Principals who would like to improve the effectiveness of their schools should consider teacher happiness. Happiness not only includes emotions but also includes knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are contagious.

References

- Abdurrezzak, S., & Uğurlu, C. T. (2019). A study of validity and reliability of school effectiveness scale. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 20(1), 69-82.
- Aelterman, A., Engels, N., Van Petegem, K., & Verhaeghe, J. P. (2007). The wellbeing of teachers in Flanders: The importance of a supportive school culture. *Educational Studies*, 3(33), 285-298.
- Arar, K. & Abu Nasra, M. (2020). Linking school-based management and school effectiveness: The influence of self-based management, motivation and effectiveness in the Arab education system in Israel. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(1) 186-204.
- Arslan, Y. (2018). *Öğretmenlerin farklılıkların yönetimi yaklaşımlarına ilişkin algıları ile örgütsel mutluluk algıları arasındaki ilişki* (Doktora Tezi). Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.
- Bakker, A. B. (2005). Flow among music teachers and their students: The crossover of peak experiences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66, 26-44.
- Balcı, A. (1993). *Etkili okul: Türkiye'de ilköğretim okullarının etkililiği araştırması*. In a "A. Balcı (2013). Etkili okul: Okul geliştirme kuram, uygulama ve araştırma (p. 221-244)". Ankara: Pegem A.
- Balyer, A. (2013). Okul müdürlerinin değerlendirilmesi: Bir model önerisi. 8. *Ulusal Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi, Bildiri Özetleri, 07-09 Kasım 2013*. İstanbul Marmara Üniversitesi: 264-266.
- Ben-Sahar, T. (2002). *The question of happiness: On finding meaning, pleasure, and the ultimate currency*. San Jose: Writers Club Press.
- Bird, J. M., & Markle, R. S. (2012). Subjective well-being in school environments: Promoting positive youth development through evidence based assessment and intervention. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 82, 61-66.
- Binbaşıoğlu, C. (1993). Etkili Okul kavramı ve buna etki eden bazı etmenler. *Çağdaş Eğitim*, 18(185), 22-28.
- Boehm, J., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2008). Does happiness promote career success? *Journal of Career Assessment*, 16(1), 101-116.
- Bullough, R. V. Jr. & Pinnegar, S. (2009). The happiness of teaching (as eudaimonia): Disciplinary knowledge and the threat of performativity. *Teachers and Teaching*, 15(2), 241-256.
- Burusic, J., Barbarovic, T., & Velic, M. S. (2016). School Effectiveness: An Overview of Conceptual, Methodological and Empirical Foundations, *In school effectiveness and educational management* (pp/5-26). Springer International Publishing.
- Bulut, A. (2015). *Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel mutluluk algılarının incelenmesi: bir norm çalışması* (Doktora Tezi). Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Gaziantep.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2013). *Veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem A.

- Creemers, B. P. M. & Scheerens, J. (1994). Developments in the educational effectiveness research programme. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 21 (2), 125-140.
- Coleman et al. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington: National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Demir, R. & Murat, M. (2017). Öğretmen adaylarının mutluluk, iyimserlik, yaşam anlamı ve yaşam doyumlarının incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(13), 349-378.
- Donohoo, J. (2018). Collective teacher efficacy research: Productive patterns of behaviour and other positive consequences. *Journal of Educational Change*, 19(3), 323-345.
- Duckworth, A. L., Quinn, P. D. & Seligman, M. E. P. (2009). Positive predictors of teacher effectiveness. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 4, 540-547.
- Engels, N., Aelterman, A., Petegem, K. V. & Schepens, A. (2004). Factors which influence the well-being of pupils in Flemish secondary schools. *Educational Studies*, 30, 127-143.
- Ergün, E. & Nartgün-Sezgin, Ş. (2017). Öğretmen öznel iyi oluş ölçeğinin Türkçeye uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 7(2), 385-397.
- Fidan, M. (2018). Örgüt yazınının kuramsal incelemesi ve metaforik bir tasarım olarak mutlu örgüt. *International Journal of Management and Administration*, 2(3), 17-33.
- George, D. & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference, 17.0 update* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Gündüz, S. (2015). *Okul paydaşlarının görüşlerine göre etkili okul geliştirme* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Gaziantep.
- Gürbüz, S. & Şahin, F. (2014). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri: Felsefe-yöntem-analiz*. Ankara: Seçkin.
- Hair, J., Ringle, C. & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139-151.
- Harris, A. (2005). Teacher Leadership: More than Just a Feel-Good Factor? *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4, 3, 201-219
- Hallinger, P. & Heck, R. (2011). Conceptual and methodological issues in studying school leadership effects as a reciprocal process. *School Effectiveness & School Improvement*, 22(2), 149-173.
- Hargreaves, D. H. (2001). A capital theory of school effectiveness and improvement. *British Educational Research Journal*, 27, 4, 2001.
- Hoy, W. K. & Miskel C. G. (2012). *Educational administration theory, research and practice*. (Edit: S. Turan). Ankara: Nobel.
- Intxausti, N., Etxeberria, F. & Bartau, I. (2017). Effective and inclusive schools? Attention to diversity in highly effective schools in the Autonomous Region of the Basque Country. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 21(1), 14-30.
- Jennings, P. A. & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The pro-social classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 79, 491-525.
- Karasar, N. (2010). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler*. Ankara: Nobel.

- Karahan, G. (2018). *Örgütsel iletişimde işe ilişkin duyuşsal iyilik algısı ile özne mutluluk arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: Türkiye’de havayolu şirketlerinde kabin memurları üzerine bir alan araştırması* (Doktora Tezi). Maltepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Kızılay, A. (2018). *Psikolojik güçlendirmenin mutluluk ve iş tatmini üzerindeki etkisi* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Maltepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Korumaz, M. & Kocabaş, İ. (2013). Öğretmen görüşlerine göre okul müdürlerinin yeterlikleri. 8. *Ulusal Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi, Bildiri Özetleri, 07-09 Kasım 2013*. İstanbul Marmara Üniversitesi: 392-395.
- Lezotte, L. (1991). *Correlates of effective schools: The first and second generation*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.
- Lezotte, L. (2001). *Revolutionary and evolutionary: The effective schools movement*. Accessed from http://www.parentssee.org/_media/sess_1_the_effective_school_movement.pdf.
- Li, L., Hallinger, P. & Walker, A. (2016). Exploring the mediating effects of trust on principal leadership and teacher professional learning in Hong Kong primary schools. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership* 44(1), 20-42.
- Mattig, R. (2011). Happiness in pedagogical institutions: An analysis of outward bound schools in Japan and Germany. *Psychologia*, 54, 4, 190-207.
- MNE (2021). *2019-2020 öğretim yılı eğitim istatistikleri*. Accessed from <https://siirt.meb.gov.tr/>.
- Modin, B., Låftman, S. & Östberg, V. (2017). Teacher rated school ethos and student reported bullying-A multilevel study of upper secondary schools in Stockholm, Sweden. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 14(12), 1565.
- Moskowitz, S. & Dewaele, J-M. (2021). Is teacher happiness contagious? A study of the link between perceptions of language teacher happiness and student attitudes. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 15, 2, 117-130.
- Özdemir, S. (2000). *Eğitimde örgütsel yenileşme*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Öztaş, İ. (2018). *Farklı kurumlarda çalışan memurların serbest zaman doyum ve mutluluk düzeylerinin belirlenmesi (Kırıkkale ili örneği)* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ağrı.
- Preston, C., Goldring, E., Guthrie, J. E., Ramsey, R. & Huff, J. (2017). Conceptualizing essential components of effective high schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 16(4), 525-562.
- Price, H. (2012). Principal-teacher interactions: How affective relationships shape principal and teacher attitudes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48, 1, 39-85.
- Pryce-Jones, J. (2010). Happiness at work. *Maximizing Your Psychological Capital For Success*, 187-188.
- Ramberg, J., Brodin Låftman, S., Fransson, E. & Modin, B. (2019). School effectiveness and truancy: A multilevel study of upper secondary schools in Stockholm. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 24(2), 185-198.
- Scheerens, J. (2000). *Improving School Effectiveness*. Paris: Unesco-IIEP.
- Scheerens, J. (2016). *Educational effectiveness and ineffectiveness: A critical review of the knowledge base*. Accessed from <http://link.springer.com/openurl?genre=book&isbn=978-94-017-7457-4>.

- Seligman, M. E. P., Ernst, R. M., Gillham, J., Reivich, K. & Linkins, M. (2009). Positive education: positive psychology and classroom interventions. *Oxford Review of Education*, 35(3), 293-311.
- Sezer, Ş. & Can, E. (2019). School happiness: A scale development and implementation study. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 79, 167-190.
- Sharratt, L. (2019). *Clarity: What matters most in learning, teaching, and leading*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin.
- Şişman, M. (1996). *Etkili okul ölçeği*. In a “M. Şişman (2013). Eğitimde mükemmellik arayışı etkili okullar (p. 209-212)”. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Şişman, M. (2016). *Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Talebzadeh, F. & Samkan, M. (2011). Happiness for our kids in schools: A conceptual model. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29(2011), 1462-1471.
- Tatar, M. (2004). *Etkili öğretmen*. Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 1(2), 1-12.
- Turner, J. C., Midgley, C., Meyer, D. K., Gheen, M., Anderman, E. M. & Kang, Y. (2002). The classroom environment and students’ reports of avoidance strategies in mathematics: A multimethod study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 88-106.
- UNICEF (2000). Defining Quality in Education. A paper presented at the meeting of The International Working Group on Education Florence, Italy.
- UNESCO (2015). *The right to education and the teaching profession: Overview of the measures supporting the rights, status and working conditions of the teaching profession reported on by member states*. Paris: UNESCO
- Waterman, A. S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(4), 678-691.
- Yıldırım, K. (2014). Main factors of teachers’ professional well-being. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 9(6), 153-163.