

## Relationship between Instructional Leadership and Organizational Health in Primary Schools

Bekir Buluc

*Gazi University, Faculty of Education, Department of Primary Education, Ankara, Turkey*  
*E-mail: <buluc@gazi.edu.tr>*

**KEYWORDS** Instructional Leadership. Organizational Health. Primary Schools

**ABSTRACT** The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between school administrators' instructional leadership behavior and organizational health in primary schools based on the views of some teachers. The participants of the study were 409 classroom teachers working in 21 different primary schools in Ankara. The participants were identified through the use of maximum variance sampling used as purposeful sampling techniques. The data of the study were collected through the administration of the Instructional Leadership Questionnaire and Organizational Health Inventory. The data collected were analyzed using such statistical techniques as arithmetical mean, frequency, percentage, Pearson two-way correlation analysis and multi regression analysis. The findings obtained indicate that there are significant correlations between instructional leadership and organizational health. The results of regression analysis also show that instructional leadership is a significant predictor of organizational health.

### INTRODUCTION

Innovations and developments witnessed in the twenty-first century have significant effects on schools and educational institutions. Therefore, the roles of school administrators have changed and their leadership endeavor has become much more apparent. Instructional leadership focuses on teaching process and educational programs. On the other hand, schools should be useful for the community they serve and also become a motivator for change and innovation. In this context, organizational health of schools is significant in that those schools with a healthy structure could achieve their goals.

Numerous studies spanning from the past three decades link high-quality leadership with positive school outcomes. Recognition of the importance of school leadership has led to increased attention to recruiting and preparing school leaders. In addition, teacher training and development programs have begun to emphasize the instructional leadership roles of school administrators (Hornig and Loeb 2010). Organizational health is an important concept referring to the achievement of goals, adaptation and change for schools. Healthy individuals grow in healthy settings. And schools are among the settings where individuals grow (Altun 2001). Organizational health was first studied by Miles, who argued that organizational health is the ability of the school system to realize its development in an effective manner. Organizational health

is not only about the survival of schools in the related community, but also the improvement of their ability to cope with problems in long-run (Hoy et al. 1990; Klingele et al. 2001).

It is seen that there are limited number of studies dealing with the relationship between instructional leadership and organizational health. Some of these studies analyzed these variables in isolation, while others studied the relationships between these variables and other factors.

In Turkey instructional leadership has been studied by different scholars from different angles. For instance, Gumuseli (1996), Sisman (1997), Aksoy and Isik (2008) and Gokyer (2010), attempted to determine the level of the realization of instructional leadership roles displayed by school administrators. Yoruk and Akdag (2010) developed a scale in order to measure the effectiveness of school principals' instructional leadership. Tanriogen (2000) analyzed the teacher expectations with regard to the instructional leadership roles played by primary school principals. Kesan and Kaya (2011) identified the university graduates' views about instructional leadership. There are also other studies examining the relationship between instructional leadership and school culture (Sahin 2011), organizational loyalty (Serin and Buluc 2012), organizational climate (Ayik and Sair 2014; Kis and Konan 2014) studied the views of classroom and branch teachers on levels of school principals' instructional leadership behaviours doing a meta-analysis. Instructional leadership has been also studied

by international researchers. Hallinger and Murphy (1985) analyzed the school principals' instructional leadership. Hallinger (2005) studied again the school principals' instructional leadership. Tan (2012) developed a model of instructional leadership. Sofu et al. (2012) studied the role of instructional leadership in school reform in Indonesia. Khan et al. (2009) analyzed the effects of instructional leadership on inspection and teacher development. Notwithstanding, Burke (2014) studied evidence-based instructional leadership. Finley (2014) examined the relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership behaviors and transformational leadership behaviors.

Organizational health is also studied by both Turkish and international scholars. In Turkey Altun (2001) studied the concept first. Celep and Mete (2005) analyzed the relationship between organizational health and organizational loyalty. Karaman and Akil (2005) dealt with the relationship between bureaucracy and organizational health. The relationship between organizational health and other variables has also been studied. For instance, Cemaloglu (2006) studied the relationship between organizational health and demographical characteristics; Korkmaz (2007) studied leadership styles with regard to organizational health. Ozdemir (2012) dealt with the correlation between school culture of primary schools and organizational health. Kurgun and Bagiran (2013) analyzed the relationship between organizational health and organizational activities. Recepoglu (2013) investigated the organizational health in primary and secondary schools. Guclu et al. (2014) dealt with the connection between organizational health and motivation. With regard to organization health, Hoy et al. (1990) studied school health, climate and efficiency, also Hoy et al. (1991) developed the scale for organizational health towards primary and secondary schools. Various variables were studied in relation to organizational health: student achievement (Hoy and Hannum 1997; Roney et al. 2007) and personality (Miller et al. 1999). Klingele et al. (2001) measured organizational health in higher education institutions and Smith (2002) in high schools. Meng et al. (2014) analyzed the effects of organizational health on job expectations. Farahani et al. (2014) conducted the survey of organizational health relationship of schools with student's academic achievement in secondary schools of kohkilouie and boierahmad province.

Pour et al. (2014) studied the relationship between organizational health and organizational citizenship behavior among hospitals staff. Talaei and Shahtalebi's (2014) study examined the relationship between organizational health and organizational maturity.

Research suggests that both instructional leadership and organizational health have significant effects on organizational performance and productivity. Given that primary level is an important period for students with regard to their future education and that there are many primary schools where many students are educated using lots of teachers', therefore instructional leadership and organizational health at this level of education are significant. In Turkey there are a total of 28,532 private or state primary schools where 5,574,916 students are being educated by 288,444 teachers in the schools year of 2013-2014 (MEB 2014). Therefore, the aim of this study is to identify the correlation between school administrators' leadership behavior and organizational health in schools based on the views of teachers.

### **Instructional Leadership**

Researches on instructional leadership have focused on the activities of school principals since the mid-1980s. The major finding of these studies indicates that a strong instructional leader is a key to improving the educational quality and in providing a systematic development in schools (Camburn et al. 2003).

Instructional leadership may be defined as the acts of school administrators which include both their obligatory duties and other acts to affect the behavior of school staff to support these duties (Sisman 2004). Instructional leadership is also defined as teacher behaviors which directly influence the education of students. It affects several organizational variables, including organizational culture (Leithwood and Duke 1998). Advances in education make both classrooms and schools significant in improving student achievement. As a result of such changes, leadership roles of school principals have become much more important and so they have begun to be regarded as leaders. Leadership roles of school administrators include very important duties such as the provision of opportunities for teachers to improve their knowledge

base with the aim of increasing student achievement (Graczewski et al. 2009).

Theory of instructional leadership is based on research on effective school functioning. Researches state that school principals as instructional leaders have a strong instructional and program infrastructure which is used for improving classroom activities (Ylimaki 2007). Research on effective schools concludes that school principals should develop a connection between the aims of schools, technology and outcomes. Instructional leadership mostly focuses on the roles of school administrators such as coordination, control, inspection, and development of teaching and learning (Hallinger and Murphy 1985). Instructional leaders are goal-oriented and focus on improving the student achievement (Hallinger 2003).

Schools where efficient and strong principals work have academically developed (Horng and Loeb 2010), instructional leadership may contribute to realize the goals of these schools. The process of teaching and learning may become a much higher quality if instructional leadership is emphasized and leadership roles are given prominence (Ozdemir and Sezgin 2002). In the concept of instructional leadership, teaching and leadership cannot be separated (Sofa et al. 2012). In the process of development of teaching both school conditions and instructional leadership are two important factors. For education, innovations of organizational structure and leader qualities are critical points (Spillane et al. 2004). For instance, future instructional leaders should be learning-oriented and assuming leadership roles (Ozdemir and Sezgin 2002).

There are several models of instructional leadership in which several dimensions are offered. Robinson and colleagues developed five dimensions of instructional leadership as follows: Leading through promoting and participating in teacher learning and development; establishing goals and expectations; planning, coordinating, and evaluating teaching and the curriculum; strategic resourcing and ensuring an orderly and supportive environment (Robinson 2010). On the other hand, Leithwood and Jantzi (1999) state that instructional leadership covers the duties about goals, culture, planning and information gathering concerning structure and organization.

The most commonly used conceptualization model about instructional leadership was developed by Hallinger. This includes three dimen-

sions of instructional leadership: defining the school's mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school learning-climate (Hallinger 2003) as follows: *Defining the school's mission* is concerned with developing and communicating the goals of schools. The related functions deal with the development of clear and measurable goals by school principals to improve student achievement. It is the principal's responsibility to ensure that these goals are widely known and supported throughout the school community. Although school mission cannot be developed by only school principal, it is his responsibility that school must have a clear academic mission and school staff must be informed about it (Hallinger 2003). Vision, mission and goals are three critical points for school principals as instructional leaders (Hallinger 2005). The second dimension, *managing the instructional program*, focuses on the coordination and control of instruction and curriculum. It deals with the coordination and control of teaching process and educational programs. The management of instructional programs includes three leadership functions: supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, monitoring student progress (Hallinger and Murphy 1985). The third dimension of instructional leadership, *promoting a positive school learning climate*, includes several functions: protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, providing incentives for learning (Hallinger 2003).

Another conceptualization about instructional leadership was developed by Sisman (2004). In this conceptualization instructional leadership includes the followings: (1) Defining and sharing school goals, (2) Managing the educational programs and teaching process, (3) Evaluation of teaching process and students, (4) Supporting teacher development and (5) Ensuring systematic teaching-learning setting and climate. In the study this conceptualization is followed.

### Organizational Health

Health as a biological concept refers to the survival of living beings in a healthy manner (Sisman 2007). Organizational health in the context of education refers to schools' psycho-social status. If organizational health is determined before change takes place, the dimensions to be

improved or modified can be identified. The goal of the analysis on the organizational health in schools does not only describe the current situation, but also to develop improvement plans as the situation requires (Altun 2001).

Organizational health was first studied by Miles (1969). Miles (1969) had argued that there are ten basic characteristics of healthy organizations. These characteristics are goal focus, communication adequacy, power equalization, resource utilization, cohesiveness, morale, innovativeness, autonomy, adaptation and effective problem solving. Another leading figure in organizational health is Parsons. Parsons (1967 cited in Hoy and Hannum 1997) states that social systems should control the activities carried out at the levels of institutional, managerial and technical in order to solve the problems. The cohesive functioning of these levels leads to healthy schools with regards to their organizational structure. These three dimensions are explained as follows;

*Institutional Level:* This level is concerned with developing a connection between school and society. *Managerial level:* This level is related to organization's internal managerial functions and coordination. School principals manage the school and are responsible for resource allocation and the coordination of the functioning of school staff. School principals should find ways to improve teachers' trust, loyalty and affiliation and motivation. *Technical level:* This level is closely related to the school's mission and focuses on the process of learning and teaching. One of the basic duties of teachers and school administrators is to solve the problems with regard to this process (Hoy et al. 1991; Hoy et al. 1990; Hoy and Hannum 1997).

Hoy et al. (1991) developed an inventory for organizational health to describe and measure the organizational health in primary schools. This inventory is made up of three levels, namely institutional, managerial and technical, and each level has its own dimension which is given as follows: *institutional level*; institutional integrity; *managerial level*; collegial leadership and resource influence; *technical level*; teacher affiliation and academic emphasis. These five dimensions are explained briefly as follows:

*Institutional Integrity:* Institutional integrity is the degree to which the school can cope with its environment in a way that maintains the educational integrity of its programs. Teachers

are protected from unreasonable community and parental demands.

*Collegial Leadership:* Collegial leadership is principal behavior that is friendly, supportive, open and guided by norms of equality.

*Resource Influence:* Describes the principal's ability to affect the action of superiors to the benefit of teachers. Teachers are given adequate classroom supplies, and extra instructional materials and supplies are easily obtained.

*Academic Emphasis:* Refers to the school's press for achievement. The expectation of high achievement is met by students who work hard, are cooperative, seek extra work, and respect other students who get good grades.

*Teacher Affiliation:* refers to a sense of friendliness and strong affiliation with the school. Teachers feel good about each other and, at the same time, have a sense of accomplishment from their jobs (Hoy et al. 1991). The findings of the study are discussed based on these dimensions and levels.

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify the correlation between school administrators' leadership behavior and organizational health in schools based on the views of teachers. To this end the study tries to answer the following research questions:

1. What are teachers' views about school principals' instructional leadership?
2. What are teachers' views about school's organizational health?
3. How organizational health and instructional leadership are related?
4. Is instructional leadership predictor of organizational health?

## METHODOLOGY

### Sample and Population

The participants were 409 classroom teachers working in 21 different primary schools in Ankara. The participants were identified through the use of maximum variance sampling that is among purposeful sampling techniques. Demographical characteristics of the participants are as follows: 59.9% male, 40.1% female; 79% married, 21% single. With regard to the age groups, the participants' characteristics are as follows: 42.5% 30 years or younger, 35.9% 31-40 years,

21.6% 41 years or older. Of them, 31.3% have teaching experience of 5 years or more, 30.6% 6-10 years, and 15.2% 11-15 years. In addition, 74.3% of the participants have been working at the same school for 1-5 years, 16.4% 6-10 years, and 9.3% 11 years or more.

### Data Collection Tools

The data of the study were collected through two different tools. One of them is the instructional leadership questionnaire developed by Sisman (1997). The other is the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-E) developed by Hoy et al. (1991).

### Instructional Leadership Questionnaire

Instructional leadership questionnaire developed by Sisman (1997) consists of five dimensions, each with ten items. Therefore, it involves a total of fifty items. The dimensions covered in the questionnaire are as follows: (a) defining and sharing school goals, (b) managing the educational programs and teaching process, (c) evaluating teaching process and students, (d) supporting teacher development and (e) ensuring systematic teaching-learning setting and climate. The questionnaire was administered to 176 subjects who were teachers in a pilot study. The study showed that the questionnaire has the KMO value of .941, chi square of 7556.944 and significance level of  $p < .05$ . It was also found that it accounts for 66.712 of the total variance. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient for the questionnaire as a whole is found to be .976. Those for the sub dimensions are found to be between .898 and .947.

### Organizational Health Inventory

Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-E) was developed by Hoy et al. (1991). The OHI-E has

five dimensions, namely institutional integrity, collegial leadership, resource interest, teacher affiliation and academic emphasis. It is made up of thirty-seven items which have Likert type structure. Of these items, eight are negative, while the remaining twenty-nine are positive. The questionnaire was administered to 176 subjects who were teachers in a pilot study. The study revealed that it has the KMO value of .891, chi square of 3510.610 and has the significance level of  $p < .05$ . It is also found that it accounts for 53.969% of the total variance. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient for the questionnaire as a whole is found to be .924. Those for sub dimensions are found to be between .719 and .892.

### Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed using such statistical techniques as arithmetical mean, frequency, percentage, Pearson two-way correlation analysis and multi regression analysis.

## RESULTS

The analysis of the responses of the teachers to the instructional leadership was displayed with mean and standard deviation in Table 1. As can be seen in Table 1, of these five dimensions the one with the highest mean is the defining and sharing of school goals "mostly level" ( $M=3.71$ ). The dimension of supporting teacher development has the lowest mean "sometimes level" ( $M=3.16$ ). For the instructional leadership as a whole the views of participants indicate the option of "mostly" ( $M=3.54$ ).

In the next step of the study, the teachers' responses to Organizational Health Inventory were analyzed and shown in Table 2. Table 2 indicates that of five dimensions, the one with the highest mean is a teacher affiliation ( $M=3.68$ ) referring to the option of "I agree" and the one with the lowest mean is institutional integrity ( $M=$

**Table 1: Means and standard deviations of the teachers' responses to instructional leadership questionnaire**

<i>Sub-dimensions</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean (M)</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>
1. Defining and sharing school goals	409	3.71	.87
2. Managing the educational programs and teaching process	409	3.63	.84
3. Evaluating teaching process and students	409	3.58	.91
4. Supporting teacher development	409	3.16	.96
5. Ensuring systematic teaching-learning setting and climate	409	3.61	.98
Instructional Leadership (General)	409	3.54	.85

**Table 2: Means and standard deviations of the teachers' responses to organizational health inventory**

Sub-dimensions	n	Mean (M)	Standard deviation
1. Institutional integrity	409	3.06	.72
2. Collegial leadership	409	3.57	.81
3. Resource influence	409	3.43	.69
4. Teacher affiliation	409	3.68	.68
5. Academic emphasis	409	3.42	.57
Organizational Health (General)	409	3.47	.57

3.06) referring to the option of “I somewhat agree”. The mean for the organizational health as a whole is found to be M= 3.47, referring to the option of “I agree”.

The relationship between instructional leadership and organizational health was analyzed using Pearson correlation and the results were displayed in Table 3. As can be seen in Table 3, there is a positive and statistically significant correlation between instructional leadership and organizational health (r=.76). In addition, it was also found that the most significant relationship is between defining and sharing of school goals and collegial leadership (r=.82). The lowest corre-

lation is found to be between Supporting teacher development and institutional integrity (r=.06). In addition, all dimensions of instructional leadership have positive and statistically significant correlations with the collegial leadership dimension of the organizational health. On the other hand, all dimensions of instructional leadership have moderate and statistically significant correlations with resource interest and teacher affiliation.

Regression analysis was employed to see whether or not instructional leadership is a predictor of organizational health. The results of this analysis are given in Table 4. Table 4 indicates that there is a statistically significant relation-

**Table 3: Pearson correlation and the results between instructional leadership and organizational health**

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Instructional Leadership	1											
2. Defining and sharing school goals		.92**1										
3. Managing the educational programs and teaching process		.94**	.87** 1									
4. Evaluating teaching process and students		.95**	.85**	.90** 1								
5. Supporting teacher development		.89**	.74**	.76**	.80**1							
6. Ensuring systematic teaching-learning setting and climate		.94**	.84**	.84**	.86**	.83** 1						
7. Organizational Health		.76**	.73**	.74**	.72**	.63**	.73**1					
8. Institutional integrity		.07	.08	.11**	.09	.06	.04	.46**1				
9. Collegial leadership		.86**	.82**	.81**	.80**	.72**	.84**	.90**	.17** 1			
10. Resource influence		.74**	.71**	.71**	.69**	.63**	.72**	.91**	.29**	.85**1		
11. Teacher affiliation		.66**	.65**	.66**	.62**	.55**	.61**	.90**	.27**	.76**	.77**1	
12. Academic emphasis		.38**	.35**	.37**	.36**	.36**	.34**	.64**	.28**	.44**	.50**	.57** 1

\*\* p<.01

**Table 4: The results of the multiple regression analysis related to instructional leadership as the predictor of organizational health**

Variants	B	Standard error	β	t	p
Constant	1.59	.08		19.51	.000
Defining and sharing school goals	.15	.05	.23	3.14	.002
Managing the educational programs and teaching process	.19	.06	.29	3.43	.001
Evaluating teaching process and students	.04	.05	.06	.76	.450
Supporting teacher development	.00	.04	.00	.00	.994
Ensuring systematic teaching-learning setting and climate	.14	.04	.24	3.13	.002

R= .77 R²= .60 Adjusted R² =.59 F<sub>(5-403)</sub> = 119.58 p=.00

ship between instructional leadership and organizational health ( $r=.76$ ). Five dimensions of instructional leadership account for 59% of the total variance. Standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ) shows that these dimensions have differential predictive force on organizational health. The following is the order of these dimensions based on their effect on this prediction: Managing the educational programs and teaching process, ensuring systematic teaching-learning setting and climate, defining and sharing of school goals, evaluating teaching process and students and supporting teacher development. The results of the test for the significance of these dimensions provided the following: Defining and sharing of school goals, managing the educational programs and teaching process, ensuring systematic teaching-learning setting and climate. These three dimensions are significant predictors of the organizational health. The remaining dimensions do not have such a significant predictive effect.

The regression analysis also provided the mathematical model about the prediction of organizational health. This is as follows: organizational health =  $1.59 + .15$  Defining and sharing school goals +  $.19$  Managing the educational programs and teaching process +  $.04$  Evaluating teaching process and students +  $.00$  Supporting teacher development +  $.14$  Ensuring systematic teaching-learning setting and climate.

## DISCUSSION

The findings of the study show that the teachers' participation was most frequently perceived as sufficient for the dimension of defining and sharing of school goals and are least frequently perceived as sufficient for the dimension of supporting teacher development. The general perception about instructional leadership of the participants was found to be on the moderate level. As stated by Serin and Buluc (2012), school principals should inform the teachers and students about the school goals and lead the activities to realize these goals. It is also needed that they should continually revise the school goals together with the teachers based on changing conditions and student achievement. The other finding is that the participants perceived that teachers are not supported in an efficient manner. On this note, Hallinger and Murphy (1986) argue that in order to increase the teacher performance they should be supported and en-

couraged through compliments and other form of reinforcement ways. In a similar way, Korkmaz (2005) concluded that when school principals support the teachers, and teachers are provided with opportunities to develop themselves and to take part in decision-making process their job satisfaction is higher. Finley (2014) findings from his study depicted a strong relationship between instructional and transformational leadership behaviors. The findings of the current study about the realization of instructional leadership are similar to those by Gumuseli (1996), Sisman (1997), Aksoy and Isik (2008), and Serin and Buluc (2012).

With regard to organizational health, the participants most frequently perceived the dimension of teacher affiliation as sufficient. They thought that institutional integration is not sufficient. The participants most frequently perceived teacher affiliation as sufficient and least frequently perceived institutional integrity as sufficient. The general perception about organizational health of the participants was found to be at the moderate level. As Hoy et al. (1991) suggest that teacher affiliation can be explained as positive relationships among teachers and as positive feelings of teachers about their job. Similarly, in the present study teachers' affiliation was found in a higher level. On the other hand, Institutional integrity that is not perceived by the participants as sufficient refers to the integration of schools with educational programs and schools' ability to cope with external negative pressures. Farahani et al. (2014) find a positive and significant relationship between organizational health of schools and academic achievement in their research. In recent research, it was revealed that organizational health affects many variables and have positive contributions to the performance of schools (Hoy and Hannum 1997; Celep and Mete 2005; Roney et al. 2007; Buluc 2008; Korkmaz 2011; Guclu et al. 2014; Meng et al. 2014; Talaee and Shahtalebi 2014).

In the study, the relationships between instructional leadership and organizational health were also investigated. The results of correlation analysis showed a statistically significant relationship between instructional leadership and organizational health. This relationship was found to be the highest for the sub-dimension of defining and sharing of school goals with regard to instructional leadership and collegial leadership regarding the organizational health. The low-

est relationship was found to be between supporting teacher development and institutional integrity. The results also suggest that when the instructional leadership roles of school principals are at a higher level, the organizational health of schools is positively affected. The findings by Sahin (2011), Serin and Buluc (2012) and Ayik and Sair (2014) indicate that organizational health affects many variables. Given these findings, it is possible to argue that it also positively affects the organizational health. Moreover, the regression analysis showed that instructional leadership is a strong predictor of organizational health. More specifically, the sub-dimensions of defining and sharing of school goals, managing the educational programs and teaching process and ensuring systematic teaching-learning setting and climate are significant predictors of organizational health.

### CONCLUSION

The findings of the study indicate that instructional leadership and organizational health are closely and significantly related. The leadership roles of school principals positively affect organizational health as well as other variables. The results also suggest that when the instructional leadership roles of school principals are at a higher level, the organizational health of schools is positively affected. Another finding is that instructional leadership is one of the significant predictors of organizational health. Therefore, the leadership roles of school principals exist to improve the organizational health of schools.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the study suggest that the leadership roles of school principals are significant to improve the organizational health of schools. Therefore school principals can be trained in instructional leadership roles to help them to exhibit such roles in an efficient way. In addition, barriers to these roles and organizational health of schools should be eliminated by higher authorities.

### REFERENCES

- Altun S 2001. *Orgut sagligi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayin Dagitim.
- Aksoy E, Isik H 2008. Ilkogretim okul mudurlerinin ogretim liderligi rolleri. *Kirgizistan Manas Universitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 19: 235-249.
- Ayik A, Sair G 2014. Okul mudurlerinin ogretimsel liderlik davranislari ile orgut iklimi arasindaki iliski. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(49): 253-279.
- Buluc B 2008. Ortaogretim okullarinda orgutsel saglik ile orgutsel vatandaslik davranislari arasindaki iliski. *Turk Egitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(4): 571-602.
- Burke KM 2014. Evidence-based instructional leadership in community colleges: A conceptual approach. *Educational Action Research*, 22(2): 221-234.
- Camburn E, Rowan B, Taylor J 2003. Distributed leadership in schools: The case of elementary schools adopting comprehensive school reform models. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(4): 347-373.
- Celep C, Mete Y 2005. Orgutsel saglik ve orgutsel baglilik arasindaki iliski. *XIV. Ulusal Egitim Bilimleri Kongresi'nde Sunulmus Bildiri*.
- Cemaloglu N 2006. Analysis of the primary schools teachers' perception of organizational health in terms of different variables. *Hacettepe University, Journal of Education*, 30: 63-72.
- Farahani MF, Mirzamohamadi MH, Afsouran NR, Mohammadi SS 2014. The study of the relationship of organizational health of the schools and that of the student's' academic achievement. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 109: 628-633.
- Finley MJ 2014. *An Exploration of the Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of Principals' Instructional Leadership and Transformational Leadership Behaviors*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Georgia: Georgia Southern University
- Gokyer N 2010. Ilkogretim okulu mudurlerinin ogretim liderligi rollerini gerceklestirme duzeyleri ve bu rolleri sinirlayan etkenler. *SU, Ahmet Kelesoglu Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 29:113-129.
- Graczewski C, Knudson J, Holtzman DJ 2009. Instructional leadership in practice: What does it look like, and what influence does it have? *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 14: 72-96.
- Guclu N, Recepoglu E, Kilinc AC 2014. The relationship between organizational health of the primary schools and teachers' motivation. *HU, Journal of Education*, 29(1): 140-156.
- Gumuseli AI 1996. Ilkogretim okulu mudurlerinin ogretim liderligi davranislari. *III. Egitim Bilimleri Kongresi*, 5-7 Eylul, Uludag Universitesi, Bursa.
- Hallinger P 2003. Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3): 329-351.
- Hallinger P 2005. Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4: 221-239.
- Hallinger P, Murphy J 1985. Assessing the instructional leadership behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(2): 217-248.
- Hallinger P, Murphy J 1986. Instructional leadership in effective schools. (Report No. EA 021153), US Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). *Eric Document Reproduction Service* No. ED309535.
- Hornig E, Loeb S 2010. New thinking about instructional leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(11): 66-69.
- Hoy WK, Hannum JW 1997. Middle school climate: An empirical assessment of organizational health



- and student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33(3): 290-311.
- Hoy WK, Tarter CJ, Bliss JR 1990. Organizational climate, school health and effectiveness: A comparative analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(3): 260-279.
- Hoy WK, Tarter CJ, Kottkamp RB 1991. *Open Schools/Healthy Schools: Measuring Organizational Climate*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Karaman MK, Akil UG 2005. Bürokrasi ve ilköğretimde örgütsel sağlık. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(2): 15-38.
- Kesan C, Kaya D 2011. Öğretimsel liderlik boyutu üzerine üniversite mezunlarının bakış açıları. *Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30: 20-37.
- Khan Z, Khan UA, Shah RU, Iqbal J 2009. Instructional leadership, supervision and teacher development. *Dialogue*, 4(4): 580-592.
- Kis A, Konan N 2014. Okul müdürlerinin öğretimsel liderlik davranışlarını gösterme düzeylerine ilişkin sınıf ve branş öğretmen görüşleri: Bir meta analiz. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching*, 3(1): 359-374.
- Klinge WE, Lyden JA, Vaughan BJ 2001. Organizational health and higher education: Concept and measurement scale development. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 43(2): 97-111.
- Korkmaz M 2005. Duyguların ve liderlik stillerinin öğretmenlerin performansı üzerinde etkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 11(43): 401-422.
- Korkmaz M 2007. Örgütsel sağlık üzerinde liderlik stillerinin etkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 13(49): 57-91.
- Korkmaz M 2011. İlköğretim okullarında örgütsel iklim ve örgüt sağlığının örgütsel bağlılık üzerindeki etkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 17(1): 117-139.
- Kurgun A, Bagiran D 2013. Rekabetçi değerler yaklaşımı ile örgütsel etkinliğin belirlenmesinde örgütsel sağlığın rolü: İzmir ili merkezindeki dört ve beş yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 15(3): 477-510.
- Leithwood KA, Duke DL 1998. Mapping the conceptual terrain of leadership: A critical point of departure for cross-cultural studies. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 73(2): 31-50.
- Leithwood K, Jantzi D 1999. The relative effects of principal and teacher sources of leadership on student engagement with school. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35: 679-706.
- MEB 2014. *National Education Statistics, Formal Education (2013-2014)*. Ministry of National Education Strategy Development Presidency, Ankara.
- Meng F, Zhang J, Huang Z 2014. Perceived organizational health as a mediator for job expectations: A multidimensional integrated model. *Public Personnel Management*, 1-16. Published online 14 May 2014 DOI: 10.1177/0091026014535181.
- Miles MB 1969. Planned change and organizational health: Figure and ground. In: FD Carver, TJ Sergiovanni (Eds.): *Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools*. New York: McGraw-Hill, pp. 375-391.
- Miller RE, Griffin MA, Hart P 1999. Personality and organizational health: The role of conscientiousness. *Work and Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health and Organizations*, 13(1): 7-19.
- Ozdemir S, Sezgin F 2002. Etkili okullar ve öğretim liderliği. *Kırgızistan Manas Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(3): 266-282.
- Ozdemir S 2012. İlköğretim okullarında okul kültürü ile örgütsel sağlık arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 4: 599-620.
- Pour AZ, Naraghi V, Haidari S, Kianipour N 2014. Relationship between organizational health and organizational citizenship behavior among hospitals staff of Medical Sciences University in Kermanshah, 2013. *New York Science Journal*, 7(4): 1-7.
- Recepoglu E 2013. Investigating organizational health of Turkish primary and secondary schools in terms of teacher perceptions. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 5(4): 29-34.
- Robinson VMJ 2010. From instructional leadership to leadership capabilities: Empirical findings and methodological challenges. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 9: 1-26.
- Roney K, Coleman H, Schlichting KA 2007. Linking the organizational health of middle grades schools to student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 91(4): 289-321.
- Sahin S 2011. The relationship between instructional leadership style and school culture (Izmir Case). *Educational Sciences: Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 11: 1920-1927.
- Serin MK, Buluc B 2012. İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin öğretim liderliği davranışları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 18(3): 435-459.
- Sisman M 1997. Okul müdürlerinin öğretim liderliği davranışları. *IV. Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresinde Sunulan Sozlu Bildiri*, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.
- Sisman M 2004. *Öğretim liderliği*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Sisman M 2007. *Örgütler ve kültürler* (2. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Smith PA 2002. The organizational health of high schools and student proficiency in mathematics. *The International Journal of Education Management*, 16(2): 98-104.
- Sofo F, Fitzgerald R, Javas U 2012. Instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform: overcoming the problems to move forward. *School Leadership and Management*, 32(5): 503-522.
- Spillane JP, Halverson R, Diamond B 2004. Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(1): 3-34.
- Talae MA, Shahtalebi B 2014. The relationship between organizational health and organizational maturity among educational organizations. *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences*, 4(2): 191-200.
- Tan CY 2012. Instructional leadership: Toward a contextualized knowledge creation model. *School Leadership and Management*, 32(2): 183-194.
- Tanriogen A 2000. Temel eğitim öğretmenlerinin okul müdürlerinden bekledikleri öğretimsel liderlik davranışları. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7: 67-73.
- Ylimaki RM 2007. Instructional leadership in challenging US Schools. *International Studies in Educational Administration (ISEA)*, 35(3): 11-19.
- Yoruk S, Akdag GA 2010. İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin öğretimsel liderlik davranışlarının etkililiği ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim*, 3(1): 66-92.