THE ROLE OF TEACHER AUTONOMY AND SCHOOL CLIMATE ON GOAL ORIENTATIONS FOR TEACHING

Abstract: Goal orientations of teachers for teaching are significant in shaping educational settings such that they are linked to some school concepts. The curriculum and teaching autonomy of teachers is related to the teachers' goal orientation. Further, school climate that is shaped by behaviors of teachers, students, and administrators affects the goal orientations for teaching. The aim of this study is to reveal the role of teachers' autonomy behavior and perceptions of school climate on their goal orientations for teaching. The study was designed as correlational study. The participants consisted of 284 teachers in public and private schools. Instruments were "goal orientation scale for teaching", "school climate scale", and "teacher autonomy scale". Multiple Hierarchical Regression Analysis method was used to analyze data. The results indicated that school climate was more powerful of and significant predictor of goal orientation than teacher autonomy. Further, teacher autonomy and school climate predicted dimensions of goal orientation for teaching, which were mastery, performance-approach, work-avoidance, and student relations. The study made a contribution to teacher education and school effectiveness literature by revealing factors related to teachers' goal orientations for teaching.

Keywords: Goal orientation, teacher autonomy, school climate, school effectiveness, teacher education

Ertem, Hasan Yücel, PhD
Assist. Prof. Dr.
Department of Educational Sciences
Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University
Turkey
Contact: +905363170381
E-mail: ertem@beun.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0001-9058-641X

Arslan, Ali, PhD
Prof. Dr.
Department of Educational Sciences
Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University
Turkey
Contact:+905305677646
E-mail: ali.arslan@beun.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0002-3707-0892

Özenir Üren, Esra
MS student
Curriculum and Instructıon
Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University
Turkey
Contact: +905333005984
Email: esraurenn@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-0514-5466

INTRODUCTION

The curricula of primary and middle schools have been frequently changing in Turkey due to educational reforms, and so schools are addressing updating approaches, methods, and techniques. To name a few, student-centered methods, consideration of student differences, focus on nature of the course, meaningful learning, integration of content with daily life, connection of new knowledge to preexisting knowledge, and usage of information and communication technologies are core points of new approaches (Ministry of National Education, 2017).

Üzüm and Karslı (2013) stated the current situation and desired situation of teachers. The current situation is based on implementation of instruction by curriculum and course books. However, the desired situation should be based on constructivist approaches which necessitate extra motivation, resource allocation, appropriate knowledge and skills, and power for teachers. All of these underlines the importance of teacher autonomy. Teacher autonomy consists of freedom of teachers in their decision-making process related to class activities. In addition to law providing autonomy for teachers, there could also be climate supporting this autonomy (Çolak, 2016). For this reason, climate in schools and autonomy for teachers are interrelated concepts in a healthy school environment.

Educational settings are influenced by teachers' goal orientation such that teachers organize classroom environment by achieving their goals. Leonardi and Giamalas (2002) related motivation of teachers to their goal orientation. Further, why the individuals determine a goal, how they reach to that, and how the performance is evaluated are key factors in goal orientation (Yıldız, Saban, & Baştuğ, 2006). In a classroom, both students and teachers may have goal orientation. Students perform goal orientation for learning while the teachers perform goal orientation for teaching. Throndsen and Turma (2013) declared that success-based goal orientations of students may trigger teachers' goal orientation for teaching. In conclusion, goal orientations for teaching gain significance for healthy learning environments. In this respect, the current study focused on the relationship of goal orientations for teaching with autonomy and school climate.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teacher autonomy may be defined basically as perception about whether teachers may control themselves and their educational activities (Pearson & Hall, 1993). In other words, teacher autonomy is a phenomenon related to teachers' own selections and decisions in teaching and related education activities such that it depends on structure of learning environment. Great amount of educational activities is organized in classroom in which teachers are the only authorized person for the whole class time with some exceptions. Although the class has strict and autocratic rules, there is a freedom in the class for teachers (Öztürk, 2011) since the teachers are the primary decision-makers on teaching activities, classroom management, and design of the class. According to Anderson (1987), the studies conducted in all over the world showed that the teachers have a factual or informal autonomy due to class environment which has self-enclosed structure. This situation means most of teacher autonomy is based on in-class activities.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) gives a special emphasis on teacher autonomy. By the way, it is evaluated in Program for International Student Achievement (PISA) as an indicator for educational quality. PISA results showed that level of autonomy was positively correlated to student achievement (Ayral et al., 2014; Salhberg, 2013). Further, Öztürk (2011) analyzed the studies related to teacher autonomy and concluded that countries having teacher autonomy for curriculum implementation and student assessment showed more achievement than other countries. On the other hand, Çolak, Altınkurt, and Yılmaz (2017) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and teacher autonomy and found a positive relationship. As a result, teacher autonomy is linked to positive school outcomes.

Like the people represent, the organizations have also specific characteristics, which represents organizational climate. Organizational climate is a kind of perception of subordinates about work atmosphere (Hoy & Miskel, 1991). Schools as organizations have also a special atmosphere which is called as school climate. Basically, school climate is related to school environment's quality (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2011). Halpin and Croft (1963) developed Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) to assess climate of schools. Hoy and Tarter (1997) revised OCDQ and named it as OCDQ-RS

which included disengaged, collegial, and intimate teacher behaviors and restrictive, directive, and supportive principal behaviors.

School climate influences behaviors of educators and environment in school through leadership style of school principal (Şentürk & Sığınak, 2012). School principals make contribution to job satisfaction and motivation of teachers in order to form healthy school climate and school culture (Çelik, 2000). According to Bursalı (2005), two important figures on formation of an open climate are school teachers and principals. Organizational commitment (Tsiu & Cheng, 1999) and job satisfaction (Taylar & Tashakkori, 1995) are frequently studied topics for teachers while school effectiveness is the frequently studied topic for principals. On the other hand, school climate is investigated in terms of perceptions of parents (Ertem & Gökalp, 2020) and students (Bektaş & Nalçacı, 2013). To summarize, school climate is related to quality of schools and is affected by many stakeholders.

Goal orientation is frequently discussed in the literature. Historical development of goal orientation is based on educational and pedagogical psychology (VandeWalle, Cron, & Slocum Jr., 2001). Atkinson's theory of achievement motivation (1964) and Eison's learning orientation conceptualization (1979) were classroom perspectives of goal orientation (as cited in Payne, Youngcourt, & Beaubien, 2007). Further, roots of goal orientation could be felt in the study of Dweck (1986) who considered individuals' personality and preferences on achievement in order to conceptualize goal orientation. Therefore, goal orientation can be defined as situated orientations for action in an achievement task (Dweck, 1986). According to Anderman and Maehr (1994), goal orientation seeks an answer for why and how people have a desire to achieve rather than what people attempt to achieve.

There are different constructs related to goal orientation in the literature. Dweck (1986) constructed learning goal orientation and performance goal orientation. Further, VandeWalle et al. (2001) also proposed a model based on learning goal orientation, proving goal orientation, avoiding goal orientation, and ability. Butler (2007) revealed out dimensions of mastery, ability-approach, ability-avoidance, and work-avoidance. Also, Butler (2012) revised goal orientation model that showed five-factor construct by adding relational goal. Yıldızlı, Saban, and Baştuğ adapted Butler's (2012) construct into Turkish context and concluded that four-factor of the construct was validated in Turkish. Further, the authors called dimensions as mastery, performance-approach, work-avoidance, and student relations.

Goal orientation assessments put forward important results. Butler (2007) found that teachers having more ability-approach goal orientation perceived help-seeking positive while teachers having more work-avoidance goal orientation perceived help-seeking negative. Nitche, Dickhauser, Fasching, and Dresel (2011) conducted a study to investigate self-efficacy beliefs of teachers and found that learning goal orientations and performance approach goals positively predicted self-efficacy beliefs on teaching whereas performance avoidance goals negatively predicted self-efficacy. Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2013) concluded that goal orientations were effective in the improvement of job satisfaction of the teachers. To summarize, goal orientations for teaching are closely related to positive educational outcomes.

SIGNIFICANCE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The current study is significant in terms of research, theory, and practice. Considering research, factors related to goal orientation were revealed out so that it made a contribution to literature. Theoretical significance of the study is based on validation of goal orientation theories in the context of Turkey. In this aspect, the current study examined valuable knowledge on goal orientation for teaching. Finally, educational practitioners, administrators, and policy-makers could determine strategies and action plans to make school climate positive and to provide teacher autonomy. In return, teachers' goal orientations for teaching could be improved.

The purpose of this study is to examine the effect of school climate, teacher autonomy on goal orientation for teaching. As a result, research questions of the study are as follows:

Main RQ: How well do perceptions of school climate and teacher autonomy predict teachers' goal orientations for teaching after controlling for gender, school type, school level, and professional seniority?

RQ1: How well do dimensions of school climate and teacher autonomy predict mastery orientation after controlling for gender, school type, school level, and professional seniority?

RQ2: How well do dimensions of school climate and teacher autonomy predict performance-approach after controlling for gender, school type, school level, and professional seniority?

RQ3: How well do dimensions of school climate and teacher autonomy predict work-avoidance after controlling for gender, school type, school level, and professional seniority?

RQ4: How well do dimensions of school climate and teacher autonomy predict student relations after controlling for gender, school type, school level, and professional seniority?

METHOD

RESEARCH DESIGN

The current study was performed as a correlational study which examines relationships between variables (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). Predictor variables of the study are dimensions of teacher autonomy and dimensions of school climate while criterion variable is dimensions of goal orientation. Dimensions of teacher autonomy are teaching, professional development, curriculum, and communication. School climate dimensions are disengaged, collegial, and intimate teacher behaviors and restrictive, directive, and supportive principal behaviors. Lastly, goal orientation has dimensions of mastery, performance-approach, work-avoidance, and student relations.

SAMPLE

Participants were selected from the schools in urban side of an Anatolian city in Turkey and consisted of teachers from 14 schools with different levels in year 2019. This district had 87 schools, which means about 16% of the schools were included in the current study. Sample was selected within clustered sampling. After 14 schools were chosen randomly, all teachers in those schools were invited to be participated in the study. However, 284 of them involved in the study voluntarily. Table 1 represented the demographics of the participants in terms of gender, school type, school level, and seniority.

Table 1. Demographics of Participants

Variable		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Female	181	63.7
	Male	103	36.3
	Total	284	100
School type	Public	278	97.9
	Private	6	2.1
	Total	284	100
School level	Primary school	101	35.6
	Middle school	87	30.6
	High school	96	33.8
	Total	284	100
Seniority	≤ 5 years	63	22.2
	6-15 years	74	26.0
	16-20 years	73	25.7
	≥21 years	74	26.1
	Total	284	100

DATA COLLECTION

The current study had mainly four instruments. The first one is descriptive part including demographic questions. The second one is teacher autonomy scale assessing autonomy behaviors of teachers. The third one is school climate scale assessing perceptions about teacher and principal behaviors. Lastly, goal orientation scale assessed teachers' goal orientations for teaching. Within institutional approvals and individual willingness, instrument including questionnaires below were administered to participants. For each implementation, informed consent form was read in order to inform participants.

DESCRIPTIVE PART

Questions related to gender, professional seniority, school level, and school types were asked. All of the questions are categorical with alternatives. Impact of these variables was cut off in the analysis.

TEACHER AUTONOMY SCALE

Çolak (2016) developed this scale in Master's thesis. The original scale had 17 items with 5-Likert type. There are four dimensions which are teaching, professional development, curriculum, and communication. Factor loadings changed between .51 and .77 while item-total correlations were between .52 and .88. Cronbach's Alfa coefficients changed between .78 and .85. For the current study, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of applied scale was found .79. "I can choose teaching methods and techniques in myself", "I can do supplementation to teaching curriculum", and "I can give homework to students what ever I want" are some examples to items.

SCHOOL CLIMATE SCALE

Hoy and Tarter (1997) developed the scale which was adapted to Turkish by Yılmaz and Altınkurt (2013). The adapted scale had 39 items with 4-Likert type in six dimensions which are disengaged, collegial, and intimate teacher behaviors and restrictive, directive, and supportive principal behaviors. Factor loadings of the items were between .46 and .82 while item-total correlations changed between .35 and .77. Cronbach's Alfa coefficients changed between .70 and .89. For the current study, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of applied scale was found .71. "The school principal always wants to help teachers", "The teachers take pride in school", and "Understanding school principal is easy" are some examples to items.

GOAL ORIENTATION SCALE

Butler (2012) and Butler and Shibaz (2008) developed the scale. That was adapted to Turkish by Yıldız et al. (2016). Turkish version of the scale had 15 items with 5-Likert type in four dimensions which are mastery, performance-approach, work-avoidance, and student relations. Factor loadings changed between .54 and .86 while item-total correlations were between .38 and .82. Cronbach's Alfa coefficients changed between .60 and .78. For the current study, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of applied scale was found .69. "As a teacher, my main purpose is to set rapport with each student", "When I learnt a new thing related to me as a teacher, I feel that my day is fine", and "If some lectures are cancelled, then I feel fine" are some examples to items.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data gathered from 284 teachers were firstly presented descriptively. Descriptive statistics were given with mean and standard deviation values. Afterward, assumptions of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis were controlled in a licensed software. The reason why Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis was performed was cutting off impacts of gender, school type, school level, and seniority on the criterion variables. These demographics or personal attributes are confounding variables since participants can not determine these issues. In these analyses, significance level of alpha was adjusted as .05.

FINDINGS/RESULTS

Perceptions of teacher autonomy (M = 3.64 SD = .75) were seen higher respectively than goal orientation perceptions (M = 3.49, SD = .86) and school climate perceptions (M = 2.61, SD = .62). Assumptions of type of variable through dummy-coding categorical variables, independent observations through preventing interaction in data collection procedures, normality of residuals through histograms and PP plots, homoscedasticity through scatter plots, independence of errors through Durbin-Watson coefficients, absence of multi-collinearity through Tolerance and VIF values, and influential observations through Cook's distance were checked and confirmed. Within the meeting of all assumptions, main analysis was conducted.

MAIN RESEARCH QUESTION

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis was performed in order to response main research question. The model was fit on goal orientation. In the first model, independent variables were gender, school type, school level, and seniority while goal orientation was dependent variable. Result was significant $F_{(9, 274)} = 3.70$, $p < .05$; $R^2 = .11$. The model explained 11% of the variance in goal orientation. The first dummy of school level (β = -.16, $p < .05$) and the third dummy of school level (β = -.18, $p < .05$) significantly predicted goal orientation. Independent variables were teacher autonomy and school climate in the second model. Result

was significant, $F(2, 272) = 22.90$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .24$. Twenty-four percent of the variance in goal orientation was explained by teacher autonomy and school climate. An additional 13% of the variance in goal orientation was explained by teacher autonomy and school climate after controlling of gender, school type, school level, and seniority. School climate ($\beta = .35$, $p < .05$) was more strong predictor of goal orientation than teacher autonomy ($\beta = .25$, $p < .05$). Table 2 presents the results of goal orientation for teaching.

Table 2. Results of Goal Orientation for Teaching in Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Model	B	SE	β	t	R	R²	ΔR²	ΔF
Model 1					.33	11	.11	3.70*
Gender dummy	.03	.07	.02	.39				
School type dummy	.16	.15	.06	1.04				
School level dummy 1	-.32	.13	-.16	-2.49*				
School level dummy 2	.17	.09	.14	1.97				
School level dummy 3	-.20	.09	-.18	-2.32*				
Seniority dummy 1	-.05	.10	-.04	-.53				
Seniority dummy 2	.03	.10	.02	.28				
Seniority dummy 3	-.18	.11	-.11	-1.56				
Seniority dummy 4	-.06	.08	-.05	-.68				
Model 2					.49	24	.13	22.90*
Teacher autonomy	.34	.08	.25	4.10*				
School climate	.46	.08	.35	6.29*				

*p<.05

THE FIRST RESEARCH QUESTION

In order to response the first sub research question, model was fit on mastery. In the first model, independent variables were gender, school type, school level, and seniority while mastery was the dependent variable. Result was significant $F(9, 274) = 2.69$, $p < .05$; $R^2 = .08$. The model explained 8% of the variance in mastery goal orientation. The second dummy of school level ($\beta = .26$, $p < .05$) and the third dummy of professional seniority ($\beta = -.14$, $p < .05$) significantly predicted mastery. In the second model, teacher autonomy and school climate were independent variables. Result was significant, $F(10, 264) = 8.10$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .30$. Thirty percent of the variance in mastery was explained by dimensions of teacher autonomy and school climate. An additional 22% of the variance in mastery was explained by sub-dimensions of teacher autonomy and school climate after controlling of gender, school type, school level, and seniority. Teaching autonomy ($\beta = .37$, $p < .05$) was more significant predictor of mastery than curriculum autonomy ($\beta = .18$, $p < .05$), collegial teacher behavior ($\beta = .17$, $p < .05$), and directive principal behavior ($\beta = -.16$, $p < .05$).

THE SECOND RESEARCH QUESTION

In order to response the second sub research question, model was fit on performance-approach. In the first model, independent variables were gender, school type, school level, and seniority while the dependent variable was performance approach. Result was significant $F(9, 274) = 7.50$, $p < .05$; $R^2 = .20$. Seventeen percent of the variance in performance-approach was explained by model. The first dummy of school level ($\beta = -.39$, $p < .05$) significantly predicted performance-approach. In the second model, dimensions of teacher autonomy and school climate were independent variables. Result was significant, $F(10, 264) = 4.68$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .32$. Dimensions of teacher autonomy and school climate explained 32% of the variance in performance-approach. An additional 12% of the variance in performance-approach was explained nu sub-dimensions of teacher autonomy and school climate after controlling of gender, school type, school level, and seniority. Communication autonomy ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .05$) was more strong predictor of performance-approach than directive principal behavior ($\beta = .17$, $p < .05$).

THE THIRD RESEARCH QUESTION

In order to response the third sub research question, model was fit on work-avoidance. In the first model, independent variables were gender, school type, school level, and seniority while dependent variable was work-avoidance. Result was significant $F(9, 274) = 8.51$, $p < .05$; $R^2 = .22$. Twenty-two percent variance

in work-avoidance was explained by the model. The first dummy of school level ($\beta = -.36$, $p < .05$) and the third dummy of professional seniority ($\beta = -.35$, $p < .05$) significantly predicted work-avoidance in. In the second model, dimensions of teacher autonomy and school climate were independent variables. Result was significant, $F (10, 264) = 10.43$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .44$. Dimensions of teacher autonomy and school climate explained 44% of the variance in work-avoidance. An additional 22% of the variance in work-avoidance was explained by sub-dimensions of teacher autonomy and school climate after controlling of gender, school type, school level, and seniority. Intimate teacher behaviors ($\beta = .30$, $p < .05$) was more strong predictor of work-avoidance than disengaged teacher behavior ($\beta = .25$, $p < .05$) and directive principal behavior ($\beta = .16$, $p < .05$).

THE FOURTH RESEARCH QUESTION

In order to response the fourth sub research question, model was fit on student relations. In the first model, independent variables were gender, school type, school level, and seniority while student relation was dependent variable. Result was significant $F (9, 274) = 5.04$, $p < .05$; $R^2 = .14$. Fourteen percent of the variance in student relation was explained by model. The first dummy of school level ($\beta = .30$, $p < .05$), the second dummy of school level ($\beta = .29$, $p < .05$), and the third dummy of professional seniority ($\beta = -.15$, $p < .05$) significantly predicted student relations. In the second model, independent variables were dimensions of teacher autonomy and school climate. Result was significant, $F (10, 264) = 4.77$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .27$. Dimensions of teacher autonomy and school climate explained 27% of the variance in student relations. An additional 13% of the variance in student relations was explained by sub-dimensions of teacher autonomy and school climate after controlling of gender, school type, school level, and seniority. Teaching autonomy ($\beta = .30$, $p < .05$) was more strong predictor of student relations than communication autonomy ($\beta = -.19$, $p < .05$), collegial teacher behavior ($\beta = .18$, $p < .05$), and supportive principal behavior ($\beta = .16$, $p < .05$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The current study showed that teachers' goal orientation for teaching was closely related to their perceptions of autonomy and school climate. School climate was found more related with goal orientation than teacher autonomy was. Further, mastery was predicted by teaching autonomy, curriculum autonomy, collegial teacher behavior, and directive principal behavior. Moreover, performance-approach was predicted by communication autonomy and directive principal behavior. In addition, disengaged teacher behavior, intimate teacher behavior, and directive principal behavior predicted work-avoidance. Finally, student relations were found related to teaching autonomy, communication autonomy, collegial teacher behavior, and supportive principal behavior.

The positive relationship found between teacher autonomy, school climate, and goal orientation in the current study is consistent with results of other studies in the literature. Çolak and Altınkurt (2017) examined the relationship between school climate and teacher autonomy behaviors and found that 8%variance in school climate explained by differences in teacher autonomy behaviors. Similarly, study by Garvin (2007) showed that teacher had more autonomy in the schools where the school principals provided environment promoting professional development and corporation of the teachers. Further, supportive principal behaviors were found effective in improving teacher autonomy behaviors of teachers (Sparks, 2012). On the other hand, Buluş (2011) examined goal orientation and found that academic achievement as a part of school climate and focus of control related to teacher autonomy predicted goal orientations.

In the current study, mastery goal orientation was predicted by teaching autonomy, curriculum autonomy, collegial teacher behavior, and directive principal behavior. Teachers having more teaching autonomy, program autonomy, collegial behaviors showed more mastery goal orientation. These findings were parallel to the literature. Arslan (2011) conducted a study on teacher candidates and found there was a significant relationship between mastery goal orientation and constructivist approaches including teaching autonomy and collegial teacher behaviors.

The current study showed that performance-approach was related to directive principal behaviors and communication autonomy. More specifically, increase in directive behaviors of principals and decrease in communication autonomy increased performance-approach. Even if this finding appears to modern ideas, this situation is consistent with the culture in the context. The people show more performance when they meet with commands rather than flexibility. To illustrate, Ayık and Sayir (2014) found significant and positive relationship between directive principal behaviors and supporting teachers, improving teaching process, and evaluating students. Similarly, Diş and Ayık (2016) studied the relationship between power resources of school administrators and school climate and found out the most relevant factor to directive principal behavior was legitimate power. These findings may be evaluated as a reflection of the fact that both school principals and teacher perceive chain of command as a legitimate responsibility or duty. In the current study, those perceptions may have shown directive behaviors as a motivator by limiting communication channels.

Work-avoidance was found positively related to disengaged and intimate teacher behaviors and directive principal behaviors. Finding of positive relationship between work-avoidance and disengaged teacher behavior and directive principal behavior was consistent with the literature since the literature is based on the positive relationships of work avoidance with negative educational outcomes. Study by Özer and Altun (2011) revealed out work-avoidance was positively related to fear of failure, laziness, and procrastination behaviors like dissenting to control and risk-taking such that these relations appeared moderate to high level. On the other hand, finding on positive relationship between work-avoidance and intimate teacher behavior differentiated from the common idea in the literature. The reason of this differentiation may be related to participants. To illustrate, misusage of positive behaviors may be related to work-avoidance. In other words, intimate atmosphere among teachers may have caused work-avoidance by promoting leisure and entertainment. On the other side, work-avoidance may be apparent by ignoring each other's avoidance of work because of close relations among each other.

There was positive relationship between student relations and collegial teacher behavior, supportive principal behavior, and teaching autonomy. Even though the literature has lack of studies focusing on student relations as goal orientation, the literature has studies showing relation between teacher autonomy, school climate, and student relations (Araşkal & Kılınç, 2019; Karababa, Oral ve Dilmaç, 2014; Sökmen, 2018). In this respect, the current study has similar results with the literature. On the other side, negative relationship between student relations and communication autonomy was emerged. This situation may be related to classroom management preferences. Some teachers set a rapport with students through non-authoritarian strategies while others trust more in the rules through authoritarian strategies (Rydell & Henricson, 2004). For the context of the study, authoritarian strategies for classroom management may have limited communication channels between students and teachers and the negative relationship between student relations and communication autonomy may have emerged through this preference.

Considering results of the current study, it can be concluded teachers' goal orientation for teaching was closely related to their perceptions of autonomy and school climate. Improving school climate and autonomy of the teachers would lead to increase in goal orientation of teachers for teaching. In these respects, not only characteristics of teachers but also educational policies and school dynamics determine goal orientations of teachers for teaching. Teacher efforts on autonomy in addition to educational policies based on autonomy and teachers choice for professional development in addition to school support may promote together goal orientations of teachers.

The study has implications by considering the results. In terms of research, the study made a contribution to literature since it attempted to fill a gap in the literature by investigating teachers' goal orientation with teacher autonomy and school climate. In terms of theory, results of the study enriched the theoretical discussion in the field over the relationship of goal orientations, school climate, and teacher autonomy. In terms of practice, since improvement of school climate and teacher autonomy would reinforce teachers' goal orientations for teaching, Ministry of National Education and policy-makers might develop policies to support teachers' autonomy in many dimensions. School administrators may organize academic and social activities to make school climate positive.

The researchers have recommendation to researchers and practitioners. First of all, since the study was conducted with smaller sample and quantitative method, the researchers recommend similar studies with larger samples and qualitative or mixed methods to gather detailed information about the phenomenon. Even though the results of the current study are able to be generalized to population due to random sampling, the study is lack of external and ecological generalizability such that the results are not generalizable for other contexts. Therefore, it is recommended that further researches could conduct studies in different contexts like regions, cities, and school types. Further, researchers could focus on other antecedents of goal orientations with large-scaled contexts. The last recommendations are for policy-makers and practitioners. Policy-makers could carry out legitimate implementations to improve teacher autonomy and school climate. School administrators could both organize school activities for positive school climate and take precautions to provide teacher autonomy in school scale. Further, teachers could canalize professional loyalty, positive attitudes towards teaching, and goal orientation to school effectiveness and school improvement.

REFERENCES

Aksu, Ali. "Okul müdürlerinin etkililiği ve okul iklimi". Unpublished Doctoral Disseration, İnönü University, Malatya. (1994).

Anderman, Eric M., & Maehr, Martin L. "Motivation and schooling in the middle grades". *Review of Educational Research, 64* (1994): 287– 309.

Araşkal, Seçil, & Kılınç, Ali Çağatay. "Öğretmen liderliğini etkileyen faktörlerin incelenmesi: nitel bir araştırma". *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 25(3) (2019): 419-468.

Arslan, Ali. "Öğretmen adaylarının amaç yönelimleri ile yapılandırmacılığa yönelik görüşlerinin incelenmesi". *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30(1), (2011): 107-122.

Ayık, Ahmet., & Şayir, Gönül. "Okul müdürlerin öğretimsel liderlik davranışları ile örgüt iklimi arasındaki ilişki". *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 13(49) (2014): 253-279.

Ayral, Mustafa., etl. al. "Öğretmen özkerliği ile öğrenci başarısı arasındaki ilişki: PISA örneği". *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırma Dergisi*, 4(1) (2014): 207-218.

Anderson, Lorin W. "The decline of teacher autonomy: Tears or cheers?". *International Review of Education*, 33(3) (1987).:357-373.

Bektaş, Fatih, & Nalçacı, Ahmet. "Okul iklimi ve öğrenci başarısı arasındaki ilişki". *Uluslararası Avrasya Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 4*(13) (2013): 1-13.

Bursalıoğlu, Ziya. *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık, (2012).

Butler, Ruth. "Teachers' achievement goal orientations and associations with teachers' help seeking: Examination of a novel approach to teacher motivation". *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2) (2007): 241-252.

Butler, Ruth. "Striving to connect: Extending an achievement goal approach to teacher motivation to include relational goals for teaching". *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(3) (2012): 726–742

Butler, Ruth, & Shibaz, Limor. "Achievement goals for teaching as predictors of students' perceptions of instructional practices and students' help seeking and cheating". *Learning and Instruction, 18*(5) (2008): 453–467.

Buluş, Mustafa. "Öğretmen adaylarında bireysel farklılıklar perspektifinden amaç yönelimleri, denetim odağı ve akademik başarı". *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 11(2) (2011): 529-546.

Cohen, Jacob. "A power primer". *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1) (1992): 155.-159.

Çelik, Vehbi. *Okul kültürü ve yönetim*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık, (2012).

Çolak, İbrahim. "Okul iklimi ile öğretmenlerin özkerlik davranışları arasındaki ilişki (Muğla ili örneği)". Unpublished Masters Thesis, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla. (2016).

Çolak, İbrahim.. "Öğretmenlerin özkerlik davranışları ile iş doyumları arasındaki ilişki". *Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(2) (2017): 189-208.

Çolak, İbrahim., & Altınkurt, Yahya. "Okul iklimi ile öğretmenlerin özkerlik davranışları arasındaki ilişki". *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 23(1) (2017): 33-71.

Diş, Okan., & Ayık, Ahmet. "Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç kaynakları ile örgüt iklimi arasındaki ilişki". *Akademik Bakış Dergisi, 58*(2016) (2016): 499-518.

Dweck, Carol S. "Motivational processes affecting learning". *American Psychologist*, 41(10) (1986): 1040-1048.

Ertem, Hasan Yücel, & Gökalp, Gökçe. "Parents' perceptions of school climate and parent involvement in terms of educational levels of parents and grade of their children". *Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 35*(1) (2020) 78-91.

Gall, Meredith Damien et. al. *Educational research: An introduction* (*7th ed.)*. Boston, USA: Pearson, (2003).

Garvin, Nadine M. "Teacher autonomy: distinguishing perceptions by school cultural characteristics". Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No. AAI3255863). (2007).

Hoy, Wayne K. et al. *Open schools, healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, (1991).

Hoy, Wayne K., & Miskel, Cecil G. *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice.* New York: McGraw-Hill, (1991).

Hoy, Wayne K. & Tarter C. John. *The road to open and healthy schools*: *The handbook for change.* CA: Corwin Press, (1997).

Halpin, Andrew W., & Croft, David B. *The organizational climate of schools* (Vol. 11). Chicago, IL: Midewest Administration Center. (1963).

Karababa, Ali, et. al. "Ergenlerin başarı amaç yönelimlerini yordayan değişkenlerden biri olarak: İnsani değerler". *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, *12*(27) (2014): 165-186.

Karasar, Niyazi. *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: kavramlar ilkeler teknikler.* Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık, (2016).

Leondari, Angeliki, & Gialamas, Vasilios. "Implicit theories, goal orientations, and perceived competence: Impact on students' achievement behavior". *Psychology in the Schools*, *39*(3) (2002): 279-291.

Lunenburg, Fred C., & Ornstein, Allan C. *Educational administration: Concepts and practices.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, (2011).

Ministry of National Education. "Müfredatta yenileme ve değişiklik çalışmalarımız üzerine". Retrieved from https://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2017_07/18160003_basin_aciklamasi-program.pdf. (2017).

Nitsche, Sebastian, et. al. "Rethinking teachers' goal orientations: Conceptual and methodological enhancements". *Learning and Instruction*, *21*(4) (2011): 574-586.

Özer, Arif., & Altun, Esin. "Üniversite öğrencilerinin akademik erteleme nedenleri". *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *1*(21) (2011): 45-72.

Öztürk, İbrahim Hakkı. "Öğretmen özerkliği üzerine kuramsal bir inceleme". *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *10*(35) (2011). 82-99.

Payne, Stephanie C, et. al.. "A meta-analytic examination of the goal orientation nomological net". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(1) (2007). 128-150.

Pearson, Carolyn. & Hall, Bruce W. "Initial construct validation of the teaching autonomy scale. *Journal of Educational Research, 86*(3) (1993): 172-177.

Rydell, Ann Margret., & Henricsson, Lisbeth. "Elementary school teachers' strategies to handle externalizing classroom behavior: A study of relations between perceived control, teacher orientation and strategy preferences". *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *45*(2) (2004): 93-102.

Sahlberg, Pasi. "The PISA 2012 scores show the failure of "market based" education reform". Guardian News and Media, (2013).

Skaalvik, Einar M., & Skaalvik, Sidsel. "Teachers' perceptions of the school goal structure: Relations with teachers' goal orientations, work engagement, and job satisfaction". *International Journal of Educational Research, 62*(2013) (2013). 199–209.

Sparks, Dinah., & Malkus, Nat. *Public school teacher autonomy in the classroom across school years 2003–04, 2007–08, and 2011–12* (NCES 2015-089). Statistics in Brief. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, (2015).

Sökmen, Yeliz. "Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öz-yeterlik, özerklik, iş memnuniyeti, öğretmen katılımı ve tükenmişliği arasındaki ilişki: Bir model geliştirme çalışması". Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum. Retrieved from tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi.(2018).

Şentürk, Cihad, & Sağnak, Mesut. "İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin liderlik davranışları ile okul iklimi arasındaki ilişki". *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi,* 10(1) (2012): 29-43

Tabachnick, Barbara G., & Fidell, Linda S. *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, (2007).

Taylor, Dianne L., & Tashakkori, Abbas. "Decision participation and school climate as predictors of job satisfaction and teacher's sense of efficacy". *Journal of Experimental Education, 63*(3) (1995). 217-227.

Throndsen, Inger, & Turmo, Are. "Primary mathematics teachers' goal orientations and student achievement". *Instructional Science*, *41*(2), (2013): 307-322.

Tsui, Kwok Tung, & Cheng, Yin Cheong. "School organizational health and teacher commitment: A contingency study with multi-level analysis". *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *5*(3) (1999): 249-268.

Üzüm, Püren, & Karslı Mehmet Durdu. "Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğretmen özerkliğine ilişkin farkındalık düzeyleri". *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 14*(3) (2013):79-94.

VandeWalle, Don, et. al. The role of goal orientation following performance feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(4) (2001): 629-640.

Yıldızlı, Hülya, et. al. "Öğretmeye yönelik hedef yönelimi ölçeği'nin Türkçe'yeuyarlanması". *Elementary Education Online, 15*(4) (2016): 1254-1267.

Yılmaz, Kürşad, & Altınkurt, Yahya. "Örgütsel iklim ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması". *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(1) (2013): 1-11.