Osmangazi Journal of Educational Research **Volume 10 (Special Issue) 2023**

100ᵗʰ Anniversary of the Republic of Türkiye

Evaluation of the Effect of Educational Bureaucracy on School Administration: A Blunting School Climate for Teachers

*Güler Shaikh 🆔, **İlknur Şentürk 🆔

Abstract. This study aims to determine the relationship between school climate, organizational commitment and educational bureaucracy (coercive and enabling) to examine it according to some variables. In the study, relational research model, which is one of the quantitative research methods was used. The data were collected from a total of 280 teachers working in public primary and secondary schools in Gebze during the 2022-2023 academic year. Statistical analysis of the data was carried out with SPSS 26.0. Annova and t-tests were applied to the items to test the effect of dependent variables. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistic were applied and it was found that the answers given by the participants showed homogeneous distribution (p>0.05). Skewness and Kurtosis values were evaluated to obtain normal distribution values. Based on the results it was concluded that there is a negative, low significant relationship between school climate organizational commitment and coercive bureaucracy. It was seen that there is a positive, moderate and significant relationship between school climate, organizational commitment and enabling bureaucracy. In addition, significant differences were found between the answers given to scale items according to teachers' gender, age, institution and field.

Keywords. School climate, organizational commitment, educational bureaucracy, teachers' views.

* PhD student, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Eskisehir, Türkiye

e-mail: gulershaikh@gmail.com

** **(Responsible Author)** Assoc. Prof. Dr., Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Eskişehir, Türkiye

e-mail: lknurkokcu@gmail.com

The history of bureaucracy dates back to the emergence of societies. As human communities began to form, the concept of democracy has deepened and its impact on the functioning of daily life has increased. On the other hand, the complex bureaucratic structure has been a recent phenomenon that was popularized by Max Weber (Schott, 2000; Darren, 2021). Bureaucracy is a structure based on rules and order (Beetham, 1997). Therefore, it has become a preferred method in organizational management (Lennon, 2010). Even though bureaucracy emerged from government and public organizations, it has been implemented in educational and private organizations to maintain hierarchy and order. Thus, it has led to different ideas and theories regarding bureaucracy. Researchers have begun to investigate the effect of bureaucratic structure on the functioning of organizations (Mcneil, 2000; Dutta, 2006).

A phenomenon affected by the bureaucratic structure is its effect on the organizational culture and climate. Bureaucratic structure has been implemented in educational institutions as it enables schools to run effectively. School's organizational culture and climate consist of beliefs, assumptions and values shared by a group of people (Schein, 1992). Therefore, the effect of bureaucratic structure on organizational culture and climate caught the attention of educational scientists, and it has led to a significant amount of research on functionality and performance of bureaucratic structure (Bjork, 2005; Firestone & Wilson, 1985; Franks, 1989; Harber & Davies, 2005; Hightower, 2002; Hunter, 2020). Some studies have emphasized the hierarchical power of bureaucratic structure that prevents a positive and democratic atmosphere in educational institutions that hinder the school culture and climate (Díaz de Rada, 2007; Thompson, 2004). On the other hand, some suggest that bureaucracy has enabled the schools function better (Gay, 2009; Hightower, 2001).

School culture and climate are multidimensional phenomena that affects the school stakeholders' behaviors and opinions. Research indicates that the factors affecting school culture and climate affect teachers' perceptions of the school. In addition, a positive school climate and culture should lead to a shared sense of purpose and value, continuous learning between teachers and school administration. It is argued that a positive school culture and climate provide an opportunity for development, collaborations, problem solving, experience sharing, and strong school commitment (Cherubini, 2009; Lee & Louis, 2019; Page, 1987; Reaves & Cozzens, 2018). This study intends to explore the differences in perception between primary and secondary school teachers concerning the implementation of educational bureaucracy. Moreover, it will investigate the influence of educational bureaucracy on variables related to school climate and organizational commitment. Additionally, it will explore the enabling and coercive effects of educational bureaucracy and the relationship

between these two distinct concepts, as perceived by teachers and school administrators. The findings will furnish insights to the education sector on how educational bureaucracy influences teachers' perceptions and organizational allegiance toward the school administration. Such insights will also help comprehend how these perceptions overarch the overall school climate and organizational commitment. Therefore, the following hypotheses were sought to be answered within the scope of the research.

H^1: Coercive bureaucracy has a significant effect on school climate & organizational commitment

H^{1a}: Coercive bureaucracy affects school climate in a negative & significant way.

H^{1b}: Coercive bureaucracy affects organizational commitment in a negative & significant way.

H^{1c}.Coercive bureaucracy has no significant effect on school climate & organizational commitment

H^2: Enabling bureaucracy has a significant effect on organizational commitment & school climate

H^{2a}: Enabling bureaucracy affects school climate in a positive & significant way.

H^{2b}: Enabling bureaucracy affects organizational commitment in a positive & significant way.

H^{2c}: Enabling bureaucracy has no significant effect on school climate & organizational commitment.

H^3: There is a significant difference between the opinions of teachers according to the teachers' demographic characteristics.

H^{3a}: There is no a significant difference between the opinions of teachers according to the teachers' demographic characteristics.

The Evolution of Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy continues to be an indispensable phenomenon in every aspect of our life including schools, hospitals, courts etc. Although, the origin of bureaucracy, which became a more popular phenomenon after Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy, goes back to ancient times. The phenomenon of bureaucracy began to take its place in history with the registration activity that gained momentum after the invention of writing. Sumerians had used it to administer records of agricultural activities. Later on the term "bureaucracy" was coined by the French word "bureau" – office – and the Greek

word "kratos" – rule or political power. Therefore, since then the word has been used to operate officialdom properly by implementing certain procedures (Riggs, 1979).

This phenomenon has attracted the attention of theorists such as Karl Marx, John Stuart Mill and Max Weber who are among the most influential theorists in recent history. Even though Karl Marx did not use the term bureaucracy, his theory stated the roles and functions of bureaucracy. Marx was against the idea of bureaucracy, on the other hand, he supported the specialization brought by bureaucracy (Chattopadhyay, 1993). As a political theorist, John Stuart Mill advocated that bureaucracy is a common phenomenon used by successful administrations. According to Mill, a successful management involves dedication, skills and professionalism, which leads to the role of bureaucracy. (Warner, 2001).

Marx Weber has been certainly the first theorist that comes to mind when bureaucracy is mentioned (Drechsler, 2020). While the society's perception of bureaucracy has been characterized as paperload, approvals, signatures, waiting in line and pressure from civil servants and authorities, Weber theorized a bureaucratic model which is known as the "Weberian Bureaucracy Model" (Miewald, 1970; Sager & Rosser, 2021; Wong, 2013). The "Weberian Bureaucracy Model", on the other hand, has been considered different from the aforementioned concept of general bureaucracy. The tasks are arranged in a way to form a hierarchical system. Officialdom at every level of the hierarchy has been formally carried out in accordance with certain rules and standards (Langer, 2022; Meyer, 2013). Moreover, duties are divided into sections by experts. Transactions and correspondences are implemented in written form, and officialdom comply with the legal orders. Besides, Weber emphasized that the legal system of the modern state is based on laws. According to the Weberian Bureaucracy Model, it is essential to observe the coercive legitimate power of the administrative organization (Bozeman, 2000; Gualmini, 2008). A country's development is based on how the bureaucracy is implemented in that country. It is considered that the countries where bureaucracy is stronger have less development. (Cheng, Haggard & Kang, 2020; Lee, 2019; Monteiro & Adler, 2022; Obamuyi & Olayiwola, 2019; Suzuki & Hur, 2020). On the other hand, the Weberian Bureaucracy Model indicates the necessity of keeping a balance in the bureaucratic procedures implemented by the authorities (Cornell, Knutsen & Teorell, 2020; Hashmi & Shuja, 2020; Ferreira & Serpa, 2019; Saputra, Mahardika & Izharsyah, 2021; Serpa & Ferreira, 2019).

Educational Bureaucracy

Since bureaucracy facilitates order and functioning in institutions, it continues to be used in a dominant way in all institutions. Although the function of the educational system is to prepare young generations academically for the future, to achieve successful educational outcomes and to raise self-actualized individuals by implementing creative options and freedom of choice, bureaucratic functioning has been applied to maintain order and regulate social On the other hand, there are opinions that a balanced implementation of educational bureaucracy will prevent conflicts that may arise between teachers and administrators over the legitimization of authority. Some studies emphasized that educational bureaucracy plays an important role in pursuing multiple targets to maintain positive outcomes on school dropout rates, attendance and test performance. (Hanson, 1975; Smith & Larimer, 2004). Moreover, it is stated that educational bureaucracy functioning effectively can create an innovative and more productive environment through collaboration and interaction (Tjosvold & McNeely, 1988).

Enabling Bureaucracy

Enabling bureaucracy is an approach that aims to make the administrative processes of a country or organization more effective, efficient and user-friendly. This type of bureaucracy aims to make things easier for citizens, businesses and other stakeholders by speeding up processes and reducing unnecessary complexity. For example, moving transactions to online platforms and providing electronic services can speed up processes. Simplifying complex procedures and reducing unnecessary forms can help to speed up the processing of applications. Better communication and cooperation between relevant institutions and stakeholders can contribute to more efficient processes. Responding to requests and making decisions quickly can reduce processing times. Providing guidance and support to citizens and businesses to help them understand processes promotes facilitative bureaucracy. The aim of facilitative bureaucracy is to improve the quality of life in society by making public services more accessible and user-friendly mobility (Katz, 1971; Mehta, 2013).

Enabling bureaucracy in education may include regulations that aim to make educational institutions and systems work more effectively and efficiently. Such regulations are implemented to improve student achievement, support better teacher performance, and make educational processes more accessible (Oldac & Kondakci, 2020). Simplifying complex and overly detailed curricula can help students and teachers to better understand and apply them. Reducing the excessive number of examinations or excessive assessment practices can reduce student stress and teacher workload.

Arrangements can be made to reduce the complexity of school administration and speed up decision-making. (Hoy, 2003; Tsang, Wang, & Bai, 2022). Establish a more effective and fair evaluation system to support teachers' professional development. Arrangements can be made for better management of education budgets, better distribution of resources and faster access to schools. Facilitating the use of technology and making it easier for students to access digital resources and support services to help them overcome the challenges of learning. Streamlining bureaucracy aims to make education more efficient and student-centered. As a result, students learn better, teachers teach better, and the education system works better (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001; Kotnis, 2004; McGuigan, 2005; Schechter, Da'as & Qadach, 2022; Sinden Hoy & Sweetland, 2004).

Coercive Bureaucracy

Coercive bureaucracy denotes a bureaucratic system or process that impedes progress or complicates matters due to the complexity of multiple procedures, protocols, or regulations. Excessive regulations, lengthy application processes, inordinate demands for documentation or multiple approval requirements frequently add to the troubles of a burdensome bureaucracy. Such bureaucracy can adversely affect business, public services, or the everyday lives of citizens. The impact of such coercive bureaucracy may result in elevated business costs, reduced innovation, and inefficient resource allocation. Reforms aimed at reducing or simplifying such bureaucracy can boost economic growth and make doing business easier, especially for businesses. These reforms intend to expedite business processes, minimize unnecessary regulations and boost the business environment (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000; Kissell, 2023; Myksvoll, Tatham & Fimreite, 2022).

Coercive bureaucracy within the education sector may lead to numerous issues. Research indicates that the dominant bureaucratic structure applied in educational institutions alienates teachers, restricts their creativity and blunt teachers' commitment to the institution. An abundance of regulations and intricate procedures can impede the ability of educational institutions to create pioneering approaches and respond promptly. Ultimately, this can adversely impact the excellence of education. Coercive bureaucracy can also result in teachers and school administrators allocating their efforts towards administrative tasks, resulting in less focus on students. (Boz & Saylik, 2021; Churcher & Talbot, 2020; Kasikci, Kurtay, & Kondakci, 2023). Burdensome regulations can impede the ability of schools to respond flexibly to students' needs. This can lead to the standardization of the education system and limit its ability to provide individualized learning opportunities for students. Additionally, excessive bureaucracy can result in additional costs for educational institutions, leading

to the inefficient allocation of resources and preventing resources from being spent directly on education activities. Lengthy application processes, convoluted admission procedures, and bureaucratic obstacles have the potential to generate discontent among students and parents. Stricter regulations and inspections may propel educators towards implementing an "exam-driven" pedagogical approach, which could potentially impede students' capacity to grasp reality and foster innovative thinking (Darling-Hammond, 1998; Frymier, 1987; Hedges, 2002).

Culture of Education

Culture has a complex terminology that is notorious to define. Although culture has many different definitions, the commonly accepted definition is that it is considered to be a phenomenon that includes the values, norms, beliefs, customs, habits, assumptions, knowledge, behaviors, language, arts and laws that are shared by the individuals in a particular setting (Eagleton, 2016; Hofstede, 2003; Johnson, 2013; Spencer & Franklin, Schein, 1991; 2012). Apart from being a phenomenon shared by individuals in society, culture continues to be a terminology that we encounter in other areas of life such as educational institutions, organizations, companies, etc. (Whiten & et al., 2011). The culture of education encompasses the attitudes, behaviors, and expectations of students, teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders involved in the education system to shape the way the education is approached and delivered. Furthermore, the culture of education can influence the curriculum, teaching methods, assessment practices, and overall goals of the education system (Entwistle, 2011; Lam, 2006; Miguel del Río, 2007; Tan, 2012).

In particular, many studies have focused on how school culture affects teachers-student's relations, students' achievements, teachers' efficacy and the relations between school stakeholders. Studies have shown that a constructive and collaborative school culture positively affects students' achievements, teachers' devotions, efficacy, productivity and relations between teachers, students and administrations (Bruner, 1996; Erickson, 1987; Goldring, 2002; Jerald, 2006; MacNeil, Prater, & Busch, 2009). Moreover, some school cultures place a greater emphasis on rote learning and memorization, while others prioritize critical thinking and problem-solving. Additionally, some school cultures have a more hierarchical approach to education, with a strong emphasis on teacher-led instruction, while others place a greater emphasis on student-centered learning, autonomous learning and collaboration (Masemann, 2003; McDermott,& Varenne, 2012; Peterson & Deal, 2009; Singh & Chaudhary, 2022).

School Climate

School climate is often referred to as a learning atmosphere in which students, teachers, parents, administrators and school staff share different experiences in numerous dimensions including feelings, attitudes and behaviors (Block, 2011; Loukas, 2007). It can also include the physical and emotional safety of the school, the level of engagement and sense of belonging among students, and the quality of relationships between students and staff. The school climate can have a significant impact on student learning and well-being, and is considered an important factor in the overall success of a school. School climate is directly related to education policies and practices. Studies examine the impact of these policies and practices on school climate. Research on teachers' behavior, attitudes, and teaching experiences in schools help us understand school climate. Furthermore, school climate is shaped by teachers' working conditions, teaching methods and collaboration (Bickel & Qualls, 1980; Zullig & Matthews, 2014).

School principals' leadership styles and management approaches can significantly affect the school climate as well. Studies have focused on understanding the relationship between leadership and school management and school climate. Moreover, diversity and equity issues in schools are important factors that affect school climate. Research in these areas can address inequalities and analyze the experiences of various student groups. Research examines the effects of family involvement in school climate on student achievement and school experiences. The physical environment and atmosphere of the school are part of the school climate. Studies on this subject are among the research topics of how the physical conditions of the school affect the student and staff experiences. School climate is shaped by the values, beliefs and norms in the school. Research can examine how these values are created and shared. These topics represent general areas of research on school climate, but research focuses can vary widely (Gilmore, 2022; Kutsyuruba, Klinger & Hussain, 2015).

Bureaucracy is one of the important phenomenon that plays a significant role in school climate. It encompasses procedures related to budgeting, personnel management, compliance with laws and regulations which can shape the way that schools operate the resources that are available to students and teachers. It impacts the level of trust and collaboration among staff members, and the level of engagement and motivation among students (Kean, Kannan & Piaw, 2018; McVey, 2009). On the other hand, if the bureaucracy is streamlined and efficient, it can boost a positive school climate by providing necessary resources and support, fostering collaboration and trust among staff, and

promoting student engagement and achievements (Jacob, 2004; Teoh, 2017). Additionally, if the bureaucracy is too dominant, it prevents schools from responding to the needs of students and teachers quickly and effectively, which can also negatively affect the overall climate of a school (Chen, 2008; Cotton, 1996; Freiberg, 2005; Volk, 2014).

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment refers to the emotional attachment and loyalty of an employee or organizational member to his or her organization. This commitment reflects the employee's attitudes, values and commitment level towards the organization. Organizational commitment is an important concept in business life and is associated with a number of positive outcomes for both employees and organizations (Meyer & Allen, 2001; Pudjowati et al., 2021). There are some factors that are the basic components of organizational commitment. For example, Affective Commitment refers to an employee's feeling of emotional attachment and attachment to the organization. This commitment may lead the employee to view the workplace as a family or community and feel committed to the organization. Continuing commitment refers to an employee's desire to stay in the organization or continue to contribute to the organization. This means that the employee prefers to stay in the current organization rather than changing jobs. Normative commitment refers to the feeling that an employee has a responsibility to be committed to the organization for social or ethical reasons. This type of commitment may be based on personal values and norms. Organizational commitment is important to the success of an organization because committed employees are generally more motivated, more loyal and more productive. Additionally, the organization can retain loyal employees more easily and be more successful in attracting talented employees. Therefore, organizations often develop strategies to increase organizational commitment, as this is an important factor for long-term success (Al-Jabari & Ghazzawi, 2019; Mowday, 1998; Reichers, 1985; Ridwan, et al., 2020).

Research suggests that there are many different factors that increase organizational commitment. For example, an open communication helps employees understand what is going on in their organization. Transparent communication contributes to employees feeling more committed to the organization. It is stated that a good leadership increases the commitment of the employees to the organization. It is important for leaders to play a fair, supportive and guiding role. Opportunities for employees to develop their careers can increase commitment to the organization. Training, promotion opportunities and personal development programs can help. The participation of employees in organizational decisions and the evaluation of their views can increase the sense of commitment. It

is important for employees to have a voice in the organization. Employees' satisfaction with their jobs can increase organizational commitment. Employees with high job satisfaction may be more loyal to the organization. Rewarding employees for their work and recognizing their achievements can increase engagement. Financial rewards, incentives and praise can be effective in this regard. Making employees feel valued and respected can increase organizational commitment (Purwanto, 2020; Redondo et al, 2021). Good human resources policies and a positive working environment are important in this regard. If employees are committed to the values and culture of the organization, their organizational commitment may increase. Therefore, it is important for organizations to clearly communicate their values and culture to their employees. Establishing good relationships with co-workers and team members can increase employee organizational commitment. Social support and solidarity can strengthen the sense of commitment. These factors form the basis of strategies to increase organizational commitment. Every organization is different, so engagement enhancement strategies must be customized. A successful commitment strategy can increase employee motivation, job satisfaction, and loyalty to their organization (Albalawi et al., 2019; Headley, Wright, & Meier, 2021; Luna-Arocas & Lara, 2020; Rahawarin, 2020).

There are a number of factors that reduce organizational commitment. These factors can weaken the emotional commitment of employees to the organization and negatively affect job satisfaction. There are some factors that can reduce organizational commitment. Lack of job satisfaction can reduce employees' organizational commitment. Dissatisfaction with their jobs negatively affects employees' commitment to their jobs and the organization. Unfair behavior can reduce employees' organizational commitment. If these injustices are felt, especially in matters such as wages, promotion opportunities and work distribution, commitment may weaken. Excessive workload and constant stress can reduce employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Aranki et al., 2019; Hoff, 2021; Syakur et al., 2020). In this case, employees may not want to continue their work under more stress. Incomplete or ineffective communication can reduce employees' organizational commitment. Communication problems may prevent employees from understanding the organization's goals, values, or changes. Poor leadership or poor management can negatively impact employees' organizational commitment. Good leadership can encourage employees to trust and feel committed to the organization. Job insecurity can reduce employees' organizational commitment (Baugh & Roberts, 1994; Loan, 2020). Employees who are worried about losing their jobs may tend to lose their commitment to the organization. Conflicts, mobbing and bullying in the workplace can negatively affect employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Intense working

conditions and workload can cause employees to experience emotional exhaustion. Emotional exhaustion can weaken organizational commitment. Moreover, research emphasizes that overly rigid bureaucracy slows down the functioning of business and reduces employee motivation (Chegini et al, 2019; Marta et al., 2021; Sarhan et al., 2020; Suzuki & Hur, 2020). These are factors that can reduce employees' organizational commitment, but each organization and employee group is different.

Method

Research Design

In this study, a relational research design, which is one of the quantitative research methods, was used to determine to what extent teachers' perceptions of bureaucracy predict their school climate and school commitment levels. The relational research design is a method used to examine the relationships between variables during a research study. This design allows the researcher to analyze data to understand the relationships between independent and dependent variables. The relational research design uses statistical analysis to determine the relationship between two or more variables (Creswell & et al., 2007). This design is different from experimental or non-experimental research designs, which are usually used to determine causal relationships. Correlational research uses statistical techniques to measure, predict or explain relationships between variables. The correlational research design is also frequently used in survey studies and social sciences. Researchers collect data by asking respondents to complete questionnaires containing information about specific variables. This data is then analyzed statistically to determine the relationships between variables (Anastas, 2000; Galletta, 2013; Maxwell, 2012). The correlational research design is popular because it reduces complexity, can be applied to large sample groups and reflects real-world situations. The relational research design is basically considered within the scope of an analysis in which relational statistical analyses are performed. Correlational statistical analyses are statistical techniques used to identify and analyze the relationship between variables. It is used to determine the nature and strength of the relationship between two or more variables. The correlation coefficient indicates the direction (positive or negative) and strength of the relationship between the variables. It examines the effect of one or more independent variables on the dependent variable. This analysis involves the use of independent variables to predict or explain the value of a dependent variable. It is used to determine the differences of a dependent variable between groups or categories and to understand the relationships between a large numbers of variables in a data set and to reduce the variables into

smaller groups or factors. These analysis techniques are common statistical tools used to evaluate data obtained in a correlational research design and to understand the relationship between variables. This design provides a framework for researchers to meaningfully interpret data and find answers to research questions (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2016; Leavy, 2022; Rovai & et al., 2013).

Study Group

The research was conducted with a group of 280 teachers and administrators working at primary and secondary state schools in Gebze, Kocaeli. The data were collected during the 2022-2023 academic year. The demographic characteristics of the participants in the study are given in Table 1.

Table 1.

Demographic Characteristics of the Teachers

Variables	Categories	f	%
Institution	Primary	90	32.14
	Secondary	190	67.85
Gender	Female	148	52.85
	Male	132	47.14
Age	24-29	25	8.92
	30-34	43	15.35
	35-39	68	24.28
	40-44	58	20.71
	45 & above	86	30.71
Seniority	1-5	23	8.21
	6-10	65	23.21
	11-15	49	17.49
	16 & above	143	51.07
Education	Bachelor's	223	79.64
	Master's	53	18.92
	Doctorates	4	1.42
Total		280	100

Design and Procedure

In this research quantitative data were obtained with the relational survey model since the research aimed to determine the effect of educational bureaucracy on school management, how this affects school teachers' commitment to school and their views on school climate. The survey method is generally used to study the characteristics of a group of people (Christensen, Johnson & Turner, 2014; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). The survey method is conducted using questionnaires or interview protocols to answer research questions or test hypotheses. It provides necessary conditions for the collection and analysis of data in accordance with the purpose of the research objectively. The relational survey method includes the processes such as interpretations, evaluations and generalizations to be applied to new situations as a result of the analysis and explanation of the data

obtained (Fowler, 2013; Karasar, 2016; Rossi, Wright & Anderson, 2013; Seeram, 2019; Visser & et al. 2000). In addition, this method is used to determine whether there is a relationship between two or more variables related to various fields of interest (Karasar, 1995; Şen, 2005).

Data collection tools

Within the scope of the research, three different scales applied to the administrators and teachers working in official primary and secondary schools in Gebze, Kocaeli. To measure the effect of bureaucracy, the Enabling School Structure Scale consisting of 12 items, which was adapted into Turkish by Özer and Dönmez (2013), was used. The Organizational Commitment Scale for Teachers consisting of 17 items, which was developed by Üstüner (2009) as a result of data obtained from teachers working in primary and secondary schools, was used to measure teachers' commitment to school. The School Climate Scale consisting of 23 items developed by Canlı, Demirtaş and Özer (2018) was used to measure the effect of bureaucracy on school climate. The survey consists of two parts including scale items and demographic characteristics. The survey was prepared in google documents and sent to teachers and administrators online. The survey was prepared in the form of a five-point Likert scale including "strongly agree", "agree", "undecided", "disagree", "strongly disagree" and sent to teachers and administrators using the online platforms.

Table 2.

Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient Statistics of the Scales

	Scales	Cronbach's Alpha	N
Cronbach's Alpha	The Enabling School Structure Scale		
	The School Climate Scale	0.72	3
	Teachers' Organizational Commitment Scale		

As a result of the reliability analysis of the scales, Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients were examined to determine its internal consistency. When the values of the scales were analyzed, it was seen that the scales complied with the reliability criteria since they were above 0.70 (Daud et al., 2018; Hajjar, 2018).

Data Analysis

According to the answers given by the teachers participating in the research, which statistical analysis would be performed was determined. As a result of the analysis, normality test was performed. Moreover, ANOVA and t-tests were applied to the items to test the effect of dependent variables (Baştürk, 2010). In addition to these, Multiple Linear Analysis was performed to see whether there is correlation between the dependent variables. Considering the number of participants in the study, Kolmogorov-Smirnova test statistics were applied and as a result, it was seen that the answers given by the students showed homogeneous distribution. On the other hand, Skewness and Kurtosis values were taken into consideration since the data distribution of the Research-Inquiry was p< 0.05. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results are shown in Table 3 (p>0.05).

Table 3.

Normality Analysis Statistics of the items

Total Mean	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	P	Statistic	df	P
School Climate Scale	.144	280	.000	.910	280	.000
Organizational Commitment Scale	.082	280	.000	.967	280	.000
Educational Bureaucracy Scale	.089	280	.000	.974	280	.000

Skewness and Kurtosis values were asymmetry and kurtosis values between -2 and +2 are considered acceptable to prove normal univariate distribution (George & Mallery, 2010). It has been argued that if the skewness is between -2 and +2 and kurtosis is between -7 and +7, the data will be considered normal (Bai & Ng, 2005; Bryne, 2010; Curran et al., 1996; Hair et al., 2010). Therefore, parametric tests were conducted in the research. Then, the data were turned into tables and whether there was a significant difference between the variables analyzed taking α = .05 as a reference value. Skewness & Kurtosis results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4.

Normality Analysis Descriptions of Items

Variables	Skewness	Kurtosis	Std. Error
School Climate Scale	1.208	1.875	.146-.290
Organizational Commitment Scale	.633	.476	.146-.290
Educational Bureaucracy Scale	-.298	.602	.146-.290

Results

In this section, the answers given by the teachers about educational bureaucracy, school climate and organizational commitment are presented. In addition, the findings obtained as a result of parametric statistical analyzes and the interpretations of these findings are given.

Table 5.

t-Test Results of Students' Responses to the Scale Items According to Gender

Variables	Gender	N	X̄	SS	t	F	p
School climate	Female	148	2.1	.65	-1.3		.18
	Male	132	2.2	.75			
Organizational commitment	Female	148	2.3	.51	-1.3		.18
	Male	132	2.4	.55		278	
Coercive bureaucracy	Female	148	3.4	.92	2.7		.00
	Male	132	3.1	1.0			
Enabling bureaucracy	Female	148	1.9	.67	-3.1		.00
	Male	132	2.2	.82			

When Table 5 is examined, according to gender, the mean arithmetic score of the teachers' views on School climate is X̄=(2.10) for female teachers and X̄=(2.21) for male teachers. Therefore, there is no significant difference between female and male (p=0.18, p<0.05). In addition, according to gender, the mean arithmetic score of teachers' views on Organizational commitment is X̄=(2.63)

for female teachers and X̄=(2.57) for male teachers. Therefore, there is no significant difference between female and male (p=0.18, p>0.05). On the other hand, the means of the answers given by female teachers to the Coercive bureaucracy items is X̄=(3.46) while the average of male teachers is X̄=(3.14). Therefore, there is a significant difference between the answers of female and male teachers (p=0.006, p<0.05). Moreover, the means of the answers given by female teachers to the Enabling bureaucracy items is X̄=(1.96) while the average of male teachers is X̄=(2.24). Therefore, there is a significant difference between the answers of female and male teachers (p=0.006, p<0.05).

Table 6.

t-Test Results of Teachers' Responses to the Scale Items According to Institution

Variables	Institution	N	X̄	SS	t	df	p
School climate	Primary	148	2.0	.67	-2.23		.02
	Secondary	132	2.2	.70			
Organisational commitment	Primary	148	2.4	.46	-.74		.45
	Secondary	132	2.3	.56			
						278	
Coercive bureaucracy	Primary	148	3.3	1.0	.67		.49
	Secondary	132	3.2	.94			
Enabling bureaucracy	Primary	148	2.0	.75	-.14		.88
	Secondary	132	2.1	.76			

When Table 6 is examined, according to institution, the mean arithmetic score of the teachers' views on School Climate is X̄=(2.00) for primary school teachers and X̄=(2.21) for secondary school teachers. Therefore, there is a significant difference between primary and secondary school teachers (p=0.026, p<0.05). In addition, according to institution, the mean arithmetic score of teachers' views on Organizational Commitment is X̄=(2.42) for primary school teachers and X̄=(2.37) for secondary school teachers. Therefore, there is no significant difference between primary and secondary school teachers (p=0.45, p>0.05). In addition, the means of the answers given by primary school teachers to the Coercive bureaucracy items is X̄=(3.37) while the average of secondary school teachers is X̄=(3.28). Therefore, there is no significant difference between the answers of primary and secondary school teachers (p=0.49, p>0.05). Moreover, the means of the answers given by primary school

teachers to the Enabling bureaucracy items is X̄=(2.08) while the average of secondary school teachers is X̄=(2.10). Therefore, there is no significant difference between the answers of primary and secondary school teachers (p=0.88, p>0.05).

Table 7.

Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Responses to Scale Items by Age

Variables	Age	N	X̄	SD
School climate	24-29	25	2.1	.76
	30-34	43	2.3	.77
	35-39	68	2.1	.70
	40-44	58	2.1	.67
	45 & above	86	2.0	.64
	Total	280	2.1	.70
Organisational commitment	24-29	25	2.4	.50
	30-34	43	2.4	.50
	35-39	68	2.3	.49
	40-44	58	2.3	.61
	45 & above	86	2.4	.53
	Total	280	2.3	.53
Coercive bureaucracy	24-29	25	3.5	.93
	30-34	43	3.3	.96
	35-39	68	3.5	.83
	40-44	58	3.1	1.04
	45 & above	86	3.1	1.01
	Total	280	3.3	.97

	24-29	25	2.1	.80
	30-34	43	2.2	.77
	35-39	68	2.0	.65
Enabling bureaucracy	40-44	58	2.0	.79
	45 & above	86	2.0	.78
	Total	280	2.0	.75

Table 7 shows the means of the teachers' responses to the scale items according to age. ANOVA test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the averages of the teachers' responses to the scale items according to age. The results are given in Table 8.

Table 8.

ANOVA Results Regarding Teachers' Responses to "Educational Bureaucracy, School Climate and Organizational Commitment" in Terms of Age

Variables		Sum of Squares	DF	$\bar{X}$	F	P
School climate	Between Groups	2.1	4	.73	2.7	.35
	Within Groups	135.0	275	.26		
	Total	137.1	279			
Organizational commitment	Between Groups	1.0	4	.54	1.1	.46
	Within Groups	79.5	275	.49		
	Total	80.5	279			
Coercive bureaucracy	Between Groups	9.9	4	.25	.8	.03
	Within Groups	255.3	275	.28		
	Total	265.3	279			
	Between Groups	1.4	4	2.4	2.6	.63

Enabling bureaucracy	Within Groups	159.3	275	.92
	Total	160.8	279	

There is no significant difference (p=0.351, p>0.05) between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses to "school climate" according to age when analyzing Table 8. Furthermore, there is no significant difference between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses related to "Organizational Commitment" according to age (p=0.467, p>0.05). In addition, there is no significant difference between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses related to "Enabling bureaucracy" according to age (p=0.634, p>0.05). However, there is a significant difference between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses regarding "Coercive bureaucracy" by age (p=0.033, p<0.05). The Games-Howell post hoc test was used to analyze the difference between the ages, as the sample groups were different.

Table 9.

One-Way Post Hoc Results Regarding the Difference between Teachers' "Educational Bureaucracy" in Terms of Age

	Age	X̄	Std. Erı	P
35-39	45 & above	.42*	.14	.039

When the Table 9 is examined, the arithmetic mean difference of the 35-39-year-old teachers and 45 & above -year-old teachers is X̄=(.42*). Therefore, there is a significant difference between 35-39 year-old teachers' views on "Coercive Bureaucracy" of 45 & above year-old teachers. (p=0.039, p<0.05)

Table 10.

Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Responses to Scale Items by Seniority

Variables	Seniority	N	X̄	SD
School climate	1-5	23	2.3	.79
	6-10	65	2.2	.75
	11-15	49	2.1	.70
	16 & above	143	2.1	.66

	Total	280	2.1	.70
	1-5	23	2.3	.60
	6-10	65	2.4	.48
Organizational commitment	11-15	49	2.3	.56
	16 & above	143	2.3	.54
	Total	280	2.3	.53
	1-5	23	3.3	.93
	6-10	65	3.4	.95
Coercive bureaucracy	11-15	49	3.4	.87
	16 & above	143	3.1	1.01
	Total	280	3.3	.97
	1-5	23	2.1	.82
	6-10	65	2.1	.77
Enabling bureaucracy	11-15	49	1.9	.61
	16 & above	143	2.1	.79
	Total	280	2.0	.75

Table 10 shows the means of the teachers' responses to the scale items according to seniority. ANOVA test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the averages of the teachers' responses to the scale items according to seniority. The results are given in Table 11.

Table 11.

 ANOVA Results Regarding Teachers' Responses to "Educational Bureaucracy, School Climate and Organizational Commitment" in Terms of Seniority

Variables		Sum of Squares	DF	X̄	F	p
School climate	Between Groups	1.1	3	.37	.76	.51
	Within Groups	136.0	276	.49		
	Total	137.1	279			
Organizational commitment	Between Groups	.3	3	.11	.39	.75
	Within Groups	80.2	276	.29		
	Total	80.5	279			
Coercive bureaucracy	Between Groups	5.7	3	1.9	2.0	.11
	Within Groups	259.5	276	.94		
	Total	265.3	279			
Enabling bureaucracy	Between Groups	1.0	3	.35	.61	.60
	Within Groups	159.7	276	.57		
	Total	160.8	279			

There is no significant difference (p=0.515, p>0.05) between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses to "school climate" according to seniority when analyzing Table 11. Furthermore, there is no significant difference between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses related to "Organizational Commitment" according to seniority (p=0.755, p>0.05). Moreover, there is no significant difference between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses regarding "Coercive bureaucracy" by seniority (p=0.110, p>0.05). In addition, there is no significant difference between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses related to "Enabling bureaucracy" according to seniority (p=0.609, p>0.05).

Table 12.

Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Responses to Scale Items by Education

Variables	Education	N	X̄	SD
School climate	Bachelor's	223	2.1	.66
	Masters	53	2.0	.79
	Doctorates	4	2.4	1.1
	Total	280	2.1	.70
Organizational commitment	Bachelor's	223	2.4	.50
	Masters	53	2.2	.59
	Doctorates	4	2.6	1.1
	Total	280	2.3	.53
Coercive bureaucracy	Bachelor's	223	3.3	.91
	Masters	53	3.1	1.1
	Doctorates	4	3.0	1.4
	Total	280	3.3	.97
Enabling bureaucracy	Bachelor's	223	2.1	.73
	Masters	53	2.0	.82
	Doctorates	4	2.2	1.2
	Total	280	2.0	.75

Table 12 shows the means of the teachers' responses to the scale items according to education. ANOVA test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the averages of the teachers' responses to the scale items according to education. The results are given in Table 13.

Table 13.

ANOVA Results Regarding Teachers' Responses to "Educational Bureaucracy (Coercive & Enabling), School Climate and Organizational Commitment" in Terms of Education

Variables		Sum of Squares	DF	X̄	F	p
School climate	Between Groups	1.6	2	.84	1.73	.17
	Within Groups	135.4	277	.48		
	Total	137.1	279			
Organizational commitment	Between Groups	1.7	2	.86	3.03	.05
	Within Groups	78.8	277	.28		
	Total	80.5	279			
Coercive bureaucracy	Between Groups	1.8	2	.92	.97	.37
	Within Groups	263.4	277	.95		
	Total	265.3	279			
Enabling bureaucracy	Between Groups	.47	2	.23	.41	.66
	Within Groups	160.3	277	.57		
	Total	160.8	279			

There is no significant difference (p=0.179, p>0.05) between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses to "school climate" according to education when analyzing Table 13. Furthermore, there is no significant difference between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses related to "Organizational Commitment" according to education (p=0.050, p>0.05). Moreover, there is no significant difference between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses regarding "Coercive bureaucracy" by education (p=0.379, p>0.05). In addition, there is no significant difference between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses related to "Enabling bureaucracy" according to education (p=0.664, p>0.05).

Table 14.

Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Responses to Scale Items by Field

Variables	Field	N	X̄	SD
School climate	Principal	20	1.6	.34
	Vice-Principal	27	1.9	.52
	Counsellor	8	2.1	.96
	Class Teacher	59	2.0	.72
	Subject Teacher	166	2.2	.69
	Total	280	2.1	.70
Organizational commitment	Principal	20	2.1	.38
	Vice-Principal	27	2.3	.38
	Counsellor	8	2.4	.53
	Class Teacher	59	2.4	.51
	Subject Teacher	166	2.3	.57
	Total	280	2.3	.53
Coercive bureaucracy	Principal	20	3.8	.99
	Vice-Principal	27	3.6	.94
	Counsellor	8	3.6	1.1
	Class Teacher	59	3.2	1.0
	Subject Teacher	166	3.2	.92
	Total	280	3.3	.97
Enabling bureaucracy	Principal	20	1.7	.72
	Vice-Principal	27	1.7	.53
	Counsellor	8	2.0	.83
	Class Teacher	59	2.1	.75
	Subject Teacher	166	2.1	.77
	Total	280	2.0	.75

Table 14 shows the means of the teachers' responses to the scale items according to field at school. ANOVA test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the averages of the teachers' responses to the scale items according to field. The results are given in Table 15.

Table 15.

ANOVA Results Regarding Teachers' Responses to "Educational Bureaucracy (Coercive & Enabling), School Climate and Organizational Commitment" in Terms of Field

Variables		Sum of Squ	DF	X̄	F	P
School climate	Between Groups	10.4	4	2.6	5.6	.00
	Within Groups	126.7	275	.4		
	Total	137.1	279			
Organizational commitment	Between Groups	1.6	4	.4	1.4	.22
	Within Groups	78.9	275	.2		
	Total	80.5	279			
Coercive bureaucracy	Between Groups	12.2	4	3.0	3.3	.01
	Within Groups	253.0	275	.9		
	Total	265.3	279			
Enabling bureaucracy	Between Groups	6.3	4	1.5	2.8	.02
	Within Groups	154.4	275	.5		
	Total	160.8	279			

There is a significant difference (p=0.000, p>0.05) between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses to "school climate" according to field when analyzing Table 15. However, there is no significant difference between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses related to "Organizational Commitment" according to field (p=0.227, p>0.05). On the other hand, there is a significant difference between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses regarding

"Coercive bureaucracy" by field (p=0.011, p>0.05). In addition, there is a significant difference between the general arithmetic means of teachers' responses related to "Enabling bureaucracy" according to field (p=0.025, p>0.05). The Games-Howell post hoc test was used to analyze the difference between the answers, as the sample groups were different. The results are given in table 16.

Table 16.

One-Way Post Hoc Results Regarding the Difference between Teachers' Views on "School Climate & Educational Bureaucracy (Coercive & Enabling)" in Terms of Field

Variables	Fields		X̄	Std. Error	p
School Climate	Principal	Class Teacher	-.45*	.12	,003
		Subject Teacher	-.66*	.09	,000
	Vice Principal	Subject Teacher	-.35*	.11	,027
Coercive Bureaucracy	Principal	Subject Teacher	.66*	.22	,012
Enabling Bureaucracy	Vice Principal	Subject Teacher	-.40*	.15	,046

As a result of the post-hoc Gabriel test after one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine which subgroups differed according to the field of field variable, a statistically significant difference at the level of (p<.05) in favour of the principal was found in between the principal and classroom teachers and subject teachers. In addition, it is seen that principals and vice principals have different perceptions than branch teachers as a result of the test of the coercive bureaucracy and enabling bureaucracy variables.

Table 17.

The Relation between School Climate, Organizational Commitment & Educational Bureaucracy (Coercive & Enabling)

Variables		SC	OC	CB	EB
School Climate (SC)	Pearson r	1	.574	-.273	.615
	P		.000	.000	.000
Organizational Commitment(OC)	Pearson r		1	-.040	.457
	P			.507	.000
Coercive Bureaucracy (CB)	Pearson r			1	-.305
	P				.000
Enabling Bureaucracy (EB)	Pearson r				1

Pearson Correlation Analysis was used to determine the relationship between educational bureaucracy (coercive & enabling), school climate and organizational commitment. The findings obtained are shown in Table 17. According to the table, there is a positive, moderate (r=0.574) and statistically significant (P<0.05) relationship between school climate and coercive bureaucracy. In addition, there is a negative, low level (r=-.273) and statistically significant P<0.05) relationship between school climate and coercive bureaucracy. On the other hand, there is a positive, moderate r=0.615) and statistically significant (P<0.05) relationship between school climate and enabling bureaucracy. Furthermore, there is a negative, low level (r=-.040) and significant (P<0.05) relationship between organizational commitment and coercive bureaucracy. In other words, as organizational commitment increases, coercive bureaucracy decreases. Moreover, there is a positive, moderate (r=.457) and statistically significant relationship between organizational commitment and enabling bureaucracy.

Discussion and Conclusion

Since the beginning of the formation of societies, school climate, organizational commitment and educational bureaucracy have become some of the main phenomena in educational research. States have developed different strategies to provide better educational opportunities and have tried

to find answers to the problems that arise in schools. Today, educational research has continued to attract the interest of researchers (Dhillon & Meier, 2022; Maassen & Stensaker, 2019; Robinson, 2019). Therefore, in the study, teachers' and administrators' perceptions of school climate, organizational commitment and educational bureaucracy (coercive & enabling) were examined. In the research, first of all, scale reliability studies were conducted and the reliability coefficient of the scales was found as 0.72. (Daud et al., 2018; Hajjar, 2018). Kolmogorov-Smirnov test statistics were applied and as a result, it was seen that the answers given by the students showed homogeneous distribution. On the other hand, Skewness and Kurtosis values were taken into consideration since the data distribution of the Research-Inquiry was $p < 0.05$. In the study, it was seen that the answers given by the teachers to the items of school climate, organizational commitment and enabling bureaucracy did not differ in terms of gender variable, but showed a significant difference for the items of coercive bureaucracy ($p=0.006$, $p<0.05$). Statistically, the difference is significant and this difference is in favor of women. Studies conducted in the field have reached similar results (Rosenfeld 2017). Moreover, it was found that the teachers' views on School Climate differs significantly between primary and secondary school teachers and this difference is in favor of secondary school ($p=0.026$, $p<0.05$). This difference may be due to the fact that subject teachers spend more time in the teacher's room, enter different classes, and have less class competition. Research on school climate has reached similar results (Aldridge & Fraser, 2016; Pashiardis, 2000; Rafferty, 2003; Tajasom & Ahmad, 2011).

It was seen that there was a significant difference ($p>0.05$) between the views of subject teachers, principals and vice principals' responses to "school climate, coercive bureaucracy, enabling bureaucracy. When the school climate and enabling democracy variables are taken into consideration, it is seen that the averages of the answers of the subject teachers are higher than the other participants. Moreover, it is seen that the averages of the answers given by the principals are higher than the other participants on coercive democracy. On the other hand, no difference was found between teachers' views in terms of organizational culture. Research shows that there are differences between teachers' views on school climate, bureaucracy and organizational commitment (Gülşen & Gülenay, 2014; Lacks, 2016; Rudasill, 2018; Thapa, et al., 2013). Çeltek (2021) stated that preschool teachers perceive the bureaucratic culture in their schools more than subject teachers. Moreover, Karaoğlan (2019) indicated that classroom teachers perceived school structure to be higher than subject teachers.

Taking into account the variable of age, it was observed that there was a significant difference between the views of teachers aged 35-39 on "Coercive Bureaucracy" and the views of teachers aged

45 and above, and this difference was in favor of teachers aged 35-39 (p=0.039, p<0.05). The opinions of teachers aged 35-39 about coercive democracy were found to be at a higher level than those of teachers aged 40 and above. Similar results have been obtained in the relevant literature (Cox & Wood, 1980; Deniz & Erdener, 2020; Özgenel & Ankaralioglu, 2020; Theobald et al., 2009).

Within the study's scope, hypotheses were presented regarding the potential positive or negative effects of educational bureaucracy on both school climate and organizational commitment. Furthermore, it was hypothesized that teachers would have different perspectives on the research variables based on their demographic characteristics. To verify the validity of these hypotheses, relevant analyses were conducted. Therefore, regression analysis was used to find out whether there was any relationship between the research variables.

The first step was to examine the relationship between school climate and organizational commitment. The findings from the analysis indicate that there is a positive, moderate and statistically significant relationship between school climate and organizational commitment. Studies show that better school climate is associated with greater organizational commitment. Teachers' commitment to the school can be increased by a favorable school climate (Burak, 2022; Collie et al., 2011; John, 1999; Khan, 2019; Lai Eng Fei, & Han, 2020; Odoh, 2020; Yusof, 2012). The study also analyzed the relationship between school climate and enabling bureaucracy and concluded that there is a positive, moderate and significant relationship between the two variables. The findings suggest that the dominance of enabling bureaucracy in schools allows for a positive increase in school climate and the orderly progress of work (Avşar, 2019; Smith et al., 2020; Toprak et al., 2022; Yiğit & Ağalday, 2022). Furthermore, the study analyzed the level of relationship between school climate and coercive bureaucracy.

The findings indicate a negative, low-level and significant relationship between school climate and coercive bureaucracy. The coercive nature of bureaucracy is seen as one of the most important factors affecting the school climate. The school climate is negatively affected by coercive bureaucracy, which is an obstacle to the activities that teachers want to do. Research suggests that excessive bureaucracy has a negative impact on school climate, alienates teachers from the school administration, and causes teachers to be burdened with meaningless paperwork rather than focusing on students (Bellibaş et al., 2022; Besley et al., 2022; Bodur & Argon, 2019; Sarı, 2019; Waruwu et al., 2020). Additionally, the study examined the relationship between organizational commitment and enabling bureaucracy and coercive bureaucracy. The results of the study indicate that a positive, low

level and significant relationship exists between organizational commitment and enabling bureaucracy, while a negative, low level and significant relationship exists between organizational commitment and coercive bureaucracy. As the level of enabling bureaucracy increases, so does the level of organizational commitment. Organizational commitment, like the school climate, is also adversely affected by excessive bureaucracy. An effective and efficient bureaucracy creates a positive environment by increasing the commitment of teachers to the school (Aranki, Suifan, & Sweis, 2019; Sarhan et al., 2020; Suzuki & Hur, 2020).

As a result, the data obtained from the study show that teachers have different opinions about how the educational bureaucracy works. Bureaucracy in the school environment has been shown to have a positive or negative impact on the school climate and teacher commitment.

Recommendations

To improve the functionality of the educational bureaucracy, it is imperative to review its operations and streamline procedures by eliminating unnecessary complexities, which will have a positive impact on the school climate and organizational commitment.

Utilizing technology effectively in educational institutions can lead to expeditious and efficient completion of tasks. Digital tools and automation systems can further facilitate the functioning of educational bureaucracy. Provision of regular training and development to enhance the capabilities and knowledge of educational issues. Keeping staff up to date can increase the functionality of the educational bureaucracy.

Consideration should be given to collaborating with other educational institutions to share resources and gain insight into best practice. By implementing these methodologies, one can enhance the functionality of the educational bureaucracy and ensure that educational institutions are more efficient, flexible and have a positive school climate and increased organizational commitment on the part of teachers.

About Authors

First Author: Güler Shaikh obtained her bachelor's degree from the Department of English Language Teaching at Dokuz Eylül University. She later completed her master's degree in Educational Management, Inspection, Planning and Economics at Artuklu University. Currently, she is pursuing her doctoral degree in Educational Sciences at Eskişehir University.

Second Author: Ilknur Şentürk earned her Bachelor's degree in Biology from Anadolu University's Faculty of Science, where she studied from 1993-1997. She obtained a Master's degree from Eskisehir Osmangazi University in 2000, after studying Educational Management, Supervision, Planning, and Economics at the Institute of Social Sciences between 1997 and 2000. Subsequently, Senturk obtained her Doctorate from Hacettepe University's Institute of Social Sciences in Turkey, between 2001 and 2007, Currently, she holds the position of associate professor at Eskişehir Osmangazi University.

Conflict of Interest

It has been reported by the authors that there is no conflict of interest

Funding

No funding was received.

Ethical Standards

This research was unanimously approved by the Ethics Committee of Social and Human Sciences of Eskişehir Osmangazi University on 01.04.23, with the committee's decision numbered 2023-1.

ORCID

Güler Shaikh https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1094-6110

İlknur Şentürk https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2096-614X

References

Albalawi, A. S., Naughton, S., Elayan, M. B., & Sleimi, M. T. (2019). Perceived organizational support, alternative job opportunity, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intention: A moderated-mediated model. *Organizacija*, *52*(4).

Aldridge, J. M., & Fraser, B. J. (2016). Teachers' views of their school climate and its relationship with teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Learning Environments Research*, *19*, 291-307.

Al-Jabari, B., & Ghazzawi, I. (2019). Organizational commitment: A review of the conceptual and empirical literature and a research agenda. *International Leadership Journal*, *11*(1).

Aranki, D. H., Suifan, T. S., & Sweis, R. J. (2019). The relationship between organizational culture and organizational commitment. *Modern Applied Science*, *13*(4), 137-154.

Avşar, D. (2019). *Okul ikliminin işe yabancılaşma düzeyine etkisi.* [Unpublished Master's Thesis], Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Baugh, S. G., & Roberts, R. M. (1994). Professional and organizational commitment among engineers: Conflicting or complementing? *IEEE transactions on engineering management*, *41*(2), 108-114.

Bellibaş, M. Ş., Polatcan, M., & Kılınç, A. Ç. (2022). Linking instructional leadership to teacher practices: The mediating effect of shared practice and agency in learning effectiveness. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *50*(5), 812-831.

Besley, T., Burgess, R., Khan, A., & Xu, G. (2022). Bureaucracy and development. *Annual Review of Economics*, *14*, 397-424.

Bjork, C. (2005). Indonesian Education: Teachers, schools, and central bureaucracy (1st ed.). Routledge.

Block, M. (2011). School climate. In Goldstein, S., Naglieri, J.A. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of child behavior and development.* Springer, Boston, MA.

Bodur, E., & Argon, T. (2019). Yenilikçi okul ve örgüt iklimine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Uluslararası Liderlik Eğitimi Dergisi*, *1*(1), 75-88.

Boz, A., & Saylik, A. (2021). The impact of enabling school structure on academic optimism: Mediating role of altruistic behaviors. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, *7*(1), 137-154.

Bozeman, B. (2000). *Bureaucracy and red tape*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Harvard University Press.

Burak, İ. (2022). *Öğretmen algılarına göre bürokratik okul yapısı ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi.* Unpublished Master's thesis, Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Chattopadhyay, P. (1993). Bureaucracy and class in Marxism. In Garston, N. (Ed.), Bureaucracy: Three paradigms. Recent Economic Thought Series, vol 34. Springer, Dordrecht.

Chegini, Z., Janati, A., Asghari-Jafarabadi, M., & Khosravizadeh, O. (2019). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, organizational justice and self-efficacy among nurses. *Nursing Practice Today*, *6*(2), 86-93.

Cheng, T. J., Haggard, S., & Kang, D. (2020). Institutions and growth in Korea and Taiwan: the bureaucracy. *East Asian Development: New Perspectives* (pp. 87-111). Routledge.

Cherubini, L. (2009). Reconciling the tensions of new teachers' socialization into school culture: A review of the research. *Issues in Educational Research, 19,* 83-99.

Christensen, L., Johnson, R. B., & Turner, L. A. (2014). Research methods: Design and analysis. (Trans. Ed. A. Aypay). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Churcher, M., & Talbot, D. (2020). The corporatization of education: Bureaucracy, boredom, and transformative possibilities. *New Formations*, *100*(100-101), 28-42.

Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2011). Predicting teacher commitment: The impact of school climate and social–emotional learning. *Psychology in the Schools*, *48*(10), 1034-1048.

Cornell, A., Knutsen, C. H., & Teorell, J. (2020). Bureaucracy and growth. *Comparative Political Studies*, *53*(14), 2246-2282.

Cox, H., & Wood, J. R. (1980). Organizational structure and professional alienation: The case of public school teachers. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *58*(1), 1-6.

Çeltek, F. M. (2021). *Temel eğitim kademesindeki öğretmenlerin okul kültürü algıları ile iş doyumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi.

Daud, K. A. M., Khidzir, N. Z., Ismail, A. R., & Abdullah, F. A. (2018). Validity and reliability of instrument to measure social media skills among small and medium entrepreneurs at Pengkalan Datu River. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 7(3), 1026-1037.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1999). Shaping school culture: The heart of leadership. *Adolescence*, *34*(136), 802.

Deniz, Ü., & Erdener, M. A. (2020). Levels of school administrators exhibiting instructional supervision behaviors: Teachers' perspectives. *Research in Educational Administration and Leadership*, *5*(4), 1038-1081.

Dhillon, A., & Meier, K. J. (2022). Representative bureaucracy in challenging environments: Gender representation, education, and India. *International Public Management Journal*, *25*(1), 43-64.

Díaz de Rada, Á. (2007). School bureaucracy, ethnography and culture, *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie sociale*, *15*(2), 205-222.

Drechsler, W. (2020). Good bureaucracy: Max Weber and public administration today. *Max Weber Studies*, *20*(2), 219-224.

Dutta, A. (2006). *The bureaucracy of beauty: Design in the age of its global reproducibility*. Routledge.

Eagleton, T. (2016). *Culture*. Yale University Press.

Erickson, F. (1987). Conceptions of school culture: An overview. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *23*(4), 11-24

Ferreira, C. M., & Serpa, S. (2019). Rationalization and bureaucracy: Ideal-type bureaucracy by Max Weber. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, *7*(2), 187-195.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage.

Firestone, W. A., & Wilson, B. L. (1985). Using bureaucratic and cultural linkages to improve instruction: The principal's contribution. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *21*(2), 7-30.

Fowler, J. F. J. (2013). *Survey research methods*. Sage Publications.

Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2006). How to design and evaluate research in education. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Franks, T. (1989). Bureaucracy, organization culture and development. *Public Administration and Development*, *9*(4), 357-368.

Frymier, J. (1987). Bureaucracy and the Neutering of Teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *69*(1), 9-14

Gay, P. D. (2009). *The values of bureaucracy*. Oxford University Press.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2019). *IBM SPSS statistics 26 step by step: A simple guide and reference*. Routledge.

Goldring, L. (2002). The power of school culture. *Leadership, 32*(2), 32-35

Gruenert, S. (2005). Correlations of collaborative school cultures with student achievement. *NASSP bulletin*, *89*(645), 43-55.

Gualmini, E. (2008). Restructuring Weberian bureaucracy: Comparing managerial reforms in Europe and the United States. *Public Administration*, *86*(1), 75-94.

Gülşen, C., & Gülenay, G. B. (2014). The principal and healthy school climate. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, *42*(1), 93-100.

Hajjar, S. T. (2018). Statistical analysis: Internal-consistency reliability and construct validity. *International Journal of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*, *6*(1), 27-38.

Hanson, E. M. (1975). The modern educational bureaucracy and the process of change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *11*(3), 21–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X7501100303

Harber, C., & Davies, L. (2005). *School management and effectiveness in developing countries: The post-bureaucratic school*. A&C Black.

Hargreaves, D. H. (1995). School culture, school effectiveness and school improvement. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, *6*(1), 23-46.

Hashmi, M. U., & Shuja, S. (2020). The bureaucracy of Pakistan: from the perspective of Max Weber's 'Iron Cage' Philosophy. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, *36*(1), 30-39.

Haşim, I. (2017). Ortaokullarda okul kültürünün incelenmesi. *İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Dergisi*, *9*(3), 61-71.

Headley, A. M., Wright, J. E., & Meier, K. J. (2021). Bureaucracy, democracy, and race: The limits of symbolic representation. *Public Administration Review*, *81*(6), 1033-1043.

Hedges, J. (2002). The importance of posting and interaction with the education bureaucracy in becoming a teacher in Ghana. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *22*(3-4), 353-366.

Hightower, A. M. (2001). *San Diego's big boom: District bureaucracy meets culture of learning*. Stanford University.

Hightower, A. M. (2002). San Diego's big boom: District bureaucracy supports culture of learning. A research report. Document R-02-2. *Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy*.

Hinton, P., McMurray, I., & Brownlow, C. (2014). *SPSS explained*. Routledge.

Hoff, T., Lee, D. R., & Prout, K. (2021). Organizational commitment among physicians: A systematic literature review. *Health Services Management Research*, *34*(2), 99-112.

Hofstede, G. (2003). What is culture? A reply to Baskerville. *Accounting, organizations and society*, *28*(7-8), 811-813.

Hoy, W. K. (2003). An analysis of enabling and mindful school structures: Some theoretical, research and practical considerations. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *41*(1), 87-109.

Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2000). School bureaucracies that work: Enabling, not coercive. *Journal of school Leadership*, *10*(6), 525-541.

Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Designing better schools: The meaning and measure of enabling school structures. *Educational administration quarterly*, *37*(3), 296-321.

Hunter, I. (2020). *Rethinking the school: Subjectivity, bureaucracy, criticism*. Routledge.

Jerald, C. D. (2006). School culture. *Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement*.

John, M. C. (1999, April). Leadership style, school climate, and the institutional commitment of teachers. *International Forum Journal*, *2*(1), 25-57.

Johnson, M. T., & Johnson, M. T. (2013). What is culture? What does it do? What should it do?. *Evaluating culture: Well-being, institutions and circumstance*, 97-119.

Karaoğlan, Ö. (2019). *Okulların bürokratik yapısı, örgütsel sessizlik ve örgütsel sinizm arasındaki ilişki* [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Pamukkale University, Denizli.

Kasikci, S., Kurtay, M., & Kondakci, Y. (2023). The role of leadership in developing a climate of technology integration in public schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *132*, 104234.

Katz, M. B. (1971). *Class, bureaucracy, and schools: The illusion of educational change in America*. New York: Praeger

Khan, N. (2019). The impact of organizational climate on teacher's commitment. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, *6*(2), 327-342.

Kissell, R. E. (2023). Coercion and consent for the US education market: community engagement policy under racialized fiscal surveillance. *Journal of Education Policy*, *38*(5), 738-760.

Kotnis, B. (2004). *Enabling bureaucracies in education: A case study of formalization in an urban district and schools*. State University of New York at Buffalo.

Lacks, P. (2016). The relationships between school climate, teacher self-efficacy, and teacher beliefs. [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. The Institutional Repository of Liberty University, Virginia.

Lai Eng Fei, E., & K Han, C. G. (2020). The influence of school climate, teachers' commitment, teachers' motivation on teachers' work performance through teachers' job satisfaction. *International journal of advanced research in education and society, 1*(3), 23-35.

Landau, S., & Everitt, B. S. (2003). *A handbook of statistical analyses using SPSS*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.

Langer, J. (2022). Bureaucracy and the imaginal realm: Max Weber, rationality and the substantive Basis of Public Administration. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, *5*(2), 122-134.

Lee, H. Y. (2019). China's new bureaucracy? *State and society in China* (pp. 55-75). Routledge.

Lee, M., & Louis, K. S. (2019). Mapping a strong school culture and linking it to sustainable school improvement. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *81*, 84-96.

Lennon, P. A. (2010). *The Relationship of Bureaucratic Structure to School Climate: An Exploratory Factor Analysis of Construct Validity*. ProQuest LLC. 789 East Eisenhower Parkway, PO Box 1346, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

Levesque, R. (2007). SPSS programming and data management. *A guide for SPSS and SAS Users*.

Loan, L. J. M. S. L. (2020). The influence of organizational commitment on employees' job performance: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *Management Science Letters*, *10*(14), 3307-3312.

Loukas, A. (2007). What is school climate?. *Leadership Compass*, *5*(1), 1-3.

Luna-Arocas, R., & Lara, F. J. (2020). Talent management, affective organizational commitment and service performance in local government. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *17*(13), 4827.

Maassen, P., & Stensaker, B. (2019). From organised anarchy to de-coupled bureaucracy: The transformation of university organisation. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *73*(4), 456-468.

MacNeil, A. J., Prater, D. L., & Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *12*(1), 73-84.

Marta, I. A., Supartha, I., Dewi, I. G. A. M., & Wibawa, I. (2021). Job enrichment, empowerment, and organizational commitment: The mediating role of work motivation and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, *8*(1), 1031-1040.

Masemann, V. L. (2003). Culture and education. *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local*, *2*, 115-132.

McGuigan, L. (2005). *The role of enabling bureaucracy and academic optimism in academic achievement growth*. The Ohio State University.

Mcneil, L. M. (2000). Sameness, bureaucracy, and the myth of educational equity: The TAAS System of Testing in Texas public schools. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *22*(4), 508–523. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986300224008

Mehta, J. (2013). From bureaucracy to profession: Remaking the educational sector for the twenty-first century. *Harvard Educational Review*, *83*(3), 463-488.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (2001). Organizational commitment. *Personnel psychology and human resource management: A reader for students and practitioners*, 289-342.

Meyer, M. W. (2013). Limits to bureaucratic growth. *In Limits to Bureaucratic Growth*. de Gruyter.

Miewald, R. D. (1970). Weberian bureaucracy and the military model. *Public Administration Review*, 129-133.

Monteiro, P., & Adler, P. S. (2022). Bureaucracy for the 21st century: Clarifying and expanding our view of bureaucratic organization. *Academy of Management Annals*, *16*(2), 427-475.

Mowday, R. T. (1998). Reflections on the study and relevance of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, *8*(4), 387-401.

Myksvoll, T., Tatham, M., & Fimreite, A. L. (2022). Understanding bureaucratic support for coerced institutional change. *Governance*, *35*(4), 1119-1138.

Nah, D. (2021). Hegel, Weber, and bureaucracy. *Critical Review, 33*, 1-21. Doi.10.1080/08913811.2021.2006900.

Obamuyi, T. M., & Olayiwola, S. O. (2019). Corruption and economic growth in India and Nigeria. *Journal of Economics & Management*, *35*, 80-105.

Odoh, J. N. (2020). Comparative analysis of school climate and teachers' commitment in public and private secondary schools in Ebonyi State. *National Journal of Educational Leadership*, *5*(1).

Oldac, Y. I., & Kondakci, Y. (2020). Multilevel analysis of the relationship between school-level variables and student achievement. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *48*(4), 762-780.

Özgenel, M., & Ankaralioglu, S. (2020). The effect of school administrators' spiritual leadership style on school culture. *Spiritual Psychology and Counseling*, *5*(2), 137-165.

Page, R. (1987). Teachers' perceptions of students: A link between classrooms, school cultures, and the social order. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 77-99.

Pashiardis, G. (2000). School climate in elementary and secondary schools: Views of Cypriot principals and teachers. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *14*(5), 224-237.

Peterson, K. D., & Deal, T. E. (2009). *The shaping school culture fieldbook*. John Wiley & Sons.

Pudjiwati, J., Cakranegara, P. A., Pesik, I. M., Yusuf, M., & Sutaguna, I. N. T. (2021). The influence of employee competence and leadership on the organizational commitment of Perumda Pasar Juara employees. *Jurnal Darma Agung*, *30*(2), 606-613.

Purwanto, A. (2020). The relationship of transformational leadership, organizational justice and organizational commitment: a mediation effect of job satisfaction. *Journal of Critical Reviews*.

Rafferty, T. J. (2003). School climate and teacher attitudes toward upward communication in secondary schools. *American Secondary Education*, 49-70.

Rahawarin, M. A., Zacharias, T., Yusriadi, Y., & Rianti, M. (2020). Dimension of organizational citizenship behavior and its effect toward employees' performance at capital investment and licensing service office South Buru District. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews, 8*(2), 681-689.

Reaves, S. J., & Cozzens, J. A. (2018). Teacher perceptions of climate, motivation, and self-efficacy: is there really a connection. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, *6*(12), 48-67.

Redondo, R., Sparrow, P., & Hernández-Lechuga, G. (2021). The effect of protean careers on talent retention: examining the relationship between protean career orientation, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and intention to quit for talented workers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *32*(9), 2046-2069.

Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of management review*, *10*(3), 465-476.

Ridwan, M., Mulyani, S. R., & Ali, H. (2020). Improving employee performance through perceived organizational support, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, *11*(12).

Robinson, S. (2019). Decentralization, managerialism and accountability: Professional loss in an Australian education bureaucracy. *Policy Actors*, (pp. 2-16). Routledge.

Rosenfeld J. (2017). Don't ask or tell: pay secrecy policies in U.S. workplaces. *Social Science Research, 65,* 1-16. Doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2017.01.009

Rossi, P. H., Wright, J. D., & Anderson, A. B. (Eds.). (2013). *Handbook of survey research*. Academic press.

Rudasill, K. M., Snyder, K. E., Levinson, H., & L Adelson, J. (2018). Systems view of school climate: A theoretical framework for research. *Educational psychology review*, *30*, 35-60.

Sager, F., & Rosser, C. (2021). Weberian bureaucracy. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of politics*.

Sager, Fritz & Rosser, Christian. (2009). Weber, Wilson, and Hegel: Theories of modern bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review*. 69. 1136 - 1147. 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2009.02071.x.

Saputra, A., Mahardika, A., & Izharsyah, J. R. (2021). The rationality of the Max Weber Bureaucracy Model in the modernization of the public services bureaucracy of the industrial era 4.0 (Case Study of Medan City E-KTP Services). *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, *4*(3), 6677-6687.

Sarhan, N., Harb, A., Shrafat, F., & Alhusban, M. (2020). The effect of organizational culture on the organizational commitment: Evidence from hotel industry. *Management Science Letters*, *10*(1), 183-196.

Sarı, T. (2019). *Okul yöneticilerinin algı yönetimi taktikleri, örgüt iklimi ve öğretmen motivasyonu arasındaki ilişkiler* [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Denizli.

Schechter, C., Da'as, R. A., & Qadach, M. (2022). Crisis leadership: Leading schools in a global pandemic. *Management in Education*, Doi: 10.1177/08920206221084050

Schein, E. H. (1991). What is culture?. *Newbury Park, CA: Sage*, 243-253.

Schott, R. L. (2000). The origins of bureaucracy: An anthropological perspective. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *23*(1), 53–78.

Seeram, E. (2019). An overview of correlational research. *Radiologic technology*, *91*(2), 176-179.

Serpa, S., & Ferreira, C. M. (2019). The concept of bureaucracy in a depraved Nigerian Economy: Challenges and prospects. *Int'l J. Soc. Sci. Stud.*, *7*, 12.

Sinden, J. E., Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2004). An analysis of enabling school structure: Theoretical, empirical, and research considerations. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *42*(4), 462-478.

Smith, K. B., & Larimer, C. W. (2004). A mixed relationship: Bureaucracy and school performance. *Public Administration Review*, *64*(6), 728-736.

Smith, P. A., Escobedo, P., & Kearney, W. S. (2020). Principal influence: A catalyst for positive school climate. *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership*, *16*(5).

Spencer-Oatey, H., & Franklin, P. (2012). What is culture? *A compilation of quotations. GlobalPAD Core Concepts*, *1*, 22.

Suzuki, K., & Hur, H. (2020). Bureaucratic structures and organizational commitment: Findings from a comparative study of 20 European countries. *Public Management Review*, *22*(6), 877-907.

Syakur, A., Susilo, T. A. B., Wike, W., & Ahmadi, R. (2020). Sustainability of communication, organizational culture, cooperation, trust and leadership style for lecturer commitments in higher education. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, *3*(2), 1325-1335.

Tajasom, A., & Ahmad, Z. A. (2011). Principals' leadership style and school climate: teachers' perspectives from Malaysia. *International Journal of Leadership in Public Services*, *7*(4), 314-333.

Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of educational research*, *83*(3), 357-385.

Theobald, Nick A., and Donald P. Haider-Markel. (2009). "Race, bureaucracy, and symbolic representation: Interactions between citizens and police." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 19(2), 409-426.

Thompson, D. (2004). Bureaucracy and democracy. In *Restoring Responsibility: Ethics in Government, Business, and Healthcare* (pp. 50-70). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511617423.005

Tjosvold, D., & McNeely, L. T. (1988). Innovation through communication in an educational bureaucracy. *Communication Research*, *15*(5), 568-581.

Toprak, M., Saylik, A., & Törün, M. K. (2022). Türkiye'deki kamu okullarında bürokrasi: Mevcut ampirik çalışmaların tematik bir analizi. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *58*, 245-257.

Tsang, K. K., Wang, G., & Bai, H. (2022). Enabling school bureaucracy, psychological empowerment, and teacher burnout: a mediation analysis. *Sustainability*, *14*(4), 2047.

Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Lavrakas, P. J. (2000). Survey research. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology* (pp. 223–252). Cambridge University Press.

Warner, B. E. (2001). John Stuart Mill's Theory of Bureaucracy within representative government: Balancing competence and participation. *Public Administration Review*, *61*(4), 403–413. http://www.jstor.org/stable/977502

Waruwu, H., Asbari, M., Purwanto, A., Nugroho, Y. A., Fikri, M. A. A., Fauji, A.,& Dewi, W. R. (2020). The role of transformational leadership, organizational learning and structure on innovation capacity: Evidence from Indonesia private schools. *EduPsyCouns: Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling*, *2*(1), 378-397.

Weber, M. (2016). Bureaucracy. In *Social Theory Re-Wired* (pp. 287-292). Routledge.

Whiten, A., Hinde, R. A., Laland, K. N., & Stringer, C. B. (2011). Culture evolves. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *366*(1567), 938-948.

Wong, W. (2013). The search for a model of public administration reform in Hong Kong: Weberian bureaucracy, new public management or something else?. *Public Administration and Development*, *33*(4), 297-310.

Yiğit, M., & Ağalday, B. (2022). Unutulmuş bir okul yöneticisi: Okul müdür yardımcılarının yönetim tarzları okul iklimini nasıl etkiler?. *Yaşadıkça Eğitim*, *36*(3), 732-750.

Yusof, N. (2012). School climate and teachers' commitment: A case study of Malaysia. *International Journal of Economics Business and Management Studies*, *1*(2), 65-75.

Zahedipour, M., & Haghighi, M. (2015). Investigating the correlation between the organizational participative and bureaucratic culture white teachers job burnout. *International Journal of Biology, Pharmacy and Allied Sciences*, *4*(8), 117-125.

Zullig, K., Matthews, M.R. (2014). School climate. in: Michalos, A.C. (eds) Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_2597