sciendo

Acta Educationis Generalis
Volume 10, 2020, Issue 3

DOI: 10.2478/atd-2020-0019

Investigation of School Administrators' Humour Styles and School Climate according to Teacher Perceptions

Fatih Şahin - Hasan Tabak*

Received: April 9, 2020; received in revised form: June 2, 2020;
accepted: June 5, 2020

Abstract:
Introduction: This research aims to determine the humour behaviours of school administrators according to teacher perception and to reveal the relationship between humour behaviours and school climate.
Methods: The research was carried out in a survey model. The data of the study were obtained from 221 primary school teachers working in Ankara and Aksaray provinces via a questionnaire created online. Regression analysis technique was used to determine the relationship between variables.
Results: According to the results of the research, school administrators showed relatively more positive humour (producer-social humour and affirmative humour) behaviours. In terms of climate, it is seen that the perception of a positive school climate (supportive and intimacy based school climate) is higher than the negative ones. When the relationships between the variables were examined, it was seen that there was a definite increase in the school climate with the school administrator using humour positively. With the rise in the use of refusing or sarcastic humour, there was an adverse increase in school climate.
Discussion: According to these results, it can be argued that humour behaviours of school administrators are an essential determinant in the context of creating a positive school climate in schools.
Limitations: Data from the sample of the study were collected through online questionnaires. Therefore, this research has no claim of generalisability.
Conclusions: Therefore, it is necessary to increase the knowledge and sensitivity of school administrators on how to use and manage humour.

Key words: humour, school climate, school administrator, primary school.

* Fatih Şahin, Gazi University, Faculty of Education, Ankara, Turkey; sahinfatih@gazi.edu.tr
Hasan Tabak, Aksaray University, Department of Educational Sciences, Aksaray, Turkey; hasantabak@aksaray.edu.tr

Introduction

It can be claimed that humour has an essential role in making working environments more joyful and fun. Although humour may evoke an entertaining or enjoyable state for the person who produces or exhibits it, the humour might be perceived as annoying, disrespectful and disruptive beyond being funny for the person to whom it is directed (Malone, 1980). Therefore, it can be considered that humour plays an essential role in organisational life, both in a positive and negative sense. It is possible to address humour, which is often encountered in organisations, as a characteristic of human nature. Collinson (2002) stated that organisations have a feature characterised by humour and laughter as well as rationality and bureaucracy, and organisational research shows an increasing interest in the humorous aspect of organisations.

In organisations where the administrator constructively uses humour, organisational citizenship level is higher, and employees' confidence in their administrator increases (Tremblay, 2017). Especially in organisations where routine work is performed, it can be claimed that humour has a positive effect in making work more exciting and increasing solidarity among employees (Holmes & Marra, 2002). Organisational commitment (Romero & Arendt, 2011) and motivation (Recepoğlu, Kılınç, & Çepni, 2011) appear at high levels in organisations to which positive humour behaviours are liable. There is a tendency to spend more time at work due to positive humour (Meyer, 1999). When humour is used healthily, it contributes to the employee's feeling of belonging to his/her profession (Goriup, Stričević, & Sruk, 2017). Besides, there is an increase in the job satisfaction of the employees depending on the frequency of humour usage of the administrators (Hurren, 2006; Recepoğlu, 2010; Robert, Dunne, & Iun, 2016). It can be argued that humour used in organisations has a vital function in coping with stress (Özdemir, Sezgin, Kaya & Recepoğlu, 2011; Romero & Arendt, 2011). Humour also plays a crucial role in ensuring communication effectiveness (Pierson & Bredeson, 1993).

The literature on humour emphasises the positive effects of humour on organisational life as well as its adverse effects. According to Collinson (2002), humour, which is far from being a source of social integration, has adverse effects such as reflecting, empowering and highlighting workplace divisions, tensions, conflicts, power asymmetries and inequalities (such as gender, ethnicity, class and disability). Romero and Arendt (2011) associated this use of humour with the superiority theory. For instance, humour can be used as a method to gain superiority over others. Tremblay's (2017) study found that humour behaviours in an aggressive manner adversely affected bilateral relations in organisations, and the humorous attitude had a negative relationship with social inclusion. Özdemir et al. (2011) also found a negative relationship between aggressive humour style and coping with stress. Another study found that aggressive or self-destructive humour positively associated with stress (Romero & Arendt, 2011). Mobbing behaviours and cynicism can be

experienced more especially in organisations where humour has a sarcastic or rejecting characteristic (Cemaloğlu, Recepoğlu, Şahin & Daşcı, 2014; Çetinkaya & Şener, 2016; Yılmaz & Altınkurt, 2016).

The effect of humour on organisational life also makes it essential in the context of administration and leadership (Collinson, 2002; Romero & Arendt, 2011; Zeigler, Boardman & Thomas, 1985). Leaders can use humour as a tactic to influence their followers, mainly when they have limited resources (Avolio, Howell & Sosik, 1999; Kong, Cooper & Sosik, 2019). Associating humour with a fun work environment creates an expectation that administrators will make the work environment more enjoyable. Accordingly, it can be argued that the different styles of humour used in organisations create different relationships (Holmes & Marra, 2002), which are reflected in the organisational climate differently. In addition, Matthias (2014) stated that humour could be used as a tool to improve school climate by reducing school tension felt by students, teachers, parents and community members. Şahin (2017) claimed that in an environment where school administrators and teachers support each other, the usage of humour by school administrators is perceived as more constructive. In studies dealing with humour and school climate, it is seen that teacher-student interaction or classroom processes are frequently examined (e.g. Çelik & Gündoğru, 2016; Darling & Civikly, 1986; Stuart & Rosenfeld, 1994). This study provides a novel approach to the phenomenon of humour in the context of school administration and its relation with the school climate.

1 Humour

Having a sense of humour is a feature that many people want to have, but few people see themselves as sufficient (Hurren, 2006). In particular, humour is seen as an essential tool to make interpersonal relations and social interactions more positive (Nezleks & Derks, 2001; Zeigler et al., 1985). Humour has critical effects in organisational life as well as in individual and community life. Humour is often seen as a way to cope with difficulties in jobs that require intense labour and are high in stress (Collinson, 2002). Thorson and Powell (1993) also described humour as a useful tool for coping with daily life challenges.

Although there are several studies in the literature dealing with different aspects of humour and measuring humour in different dimensions (e.g. Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larsen, Gray, & Weir, 2003), the scope of this study was limited to the dimensions in the Humour Behaviour Scale (Cemaloğlu, Recepoğlu, Şahin, Daşcı, & Köktürk, 2012): producer-social humour, affirmative humour, non-humorous style, sarcastic humour and rejective humour. In developing this scale, especially Babad's (1974) and Martin's (2007) studies were taken as a significant reference.

Producer-social humour shows the individual's ability to produce humour and use it in a social environment. To create humour, an individual needs to go through a mental process and express himself/herself in a funny language to entertain others (Martin, 2007). Producer-social humour is a humorous style that has a constructive effect on the organisation. Humour-producing people can reveal humorous situations, make subtle jokes, and tell amazing stories (Babad, 1974). In the affirmative humour style, although a person is not the one who jokes or tells funny stories, he/she shows that he/she is ready to laugh at the humour and enjoys humour and looks for humorous situations (Babad, 1974). The person who affirms humour appreciates funny discourses or behaviours, loves jokes and reacts with laughter (Cemaloğlu et al., 2014). According to Babad (1974), the individual in the non-humorous style does not laugh, joke or humour. Administrators' inactivity, as well as their actions, affect the workplace environment (Collinson, 2002). Therefore, it can be argued that an administrator's positive or negative humorous behaviours or actions, as well as indifference towards humour or non-humorous style, have an impact on organisational life. In choosing a non-humorous style by administrators, the risks associated with using humour in organisations are effective. According to Recepoğlu (2010), administrators were not trained as comedians, so using humour could be risky. For example, making a joke where no one laughs can put the person who wants to use humour in a difficult situation. The person can stay away from humour in order not to harm his/her self. Humour in organisations does not always have a positive character and can be used as an asymmetric force or conflict tool (Collinson, 2002). Romero and Arendt (2011) explained this attitude with the theory of superiority and stated that humour could be used to gain an advantage on others. In the sarcastic humour style, a derogatory manner is put forward, and the person who is exposed to humour is mocked, and his/her self is attacked. (Cemaloğlu et al., 2014). The sarcastic humour seen in organisations has an aggressive character, and that can lead to exclude employees from social interactions and cause poor performance (Tremblay, 2017). In the rejective humour style, the individual reacts negatively to humorous behaviours and does not like humour (Cemaloğlu et al., 2017).

2 School climate

The concept of organisational climate was developed in the late 1950s when scientists in the field of education tried to conceptualise the diversity of the work environment. After the study of industrial and social psychologists on the organisational climate, this concept was studied in educational organisations like a school climate (Hoy, 1990). While the first studies on school climate are mostly conducted as a literature review, an increase in the number of experimental studies is observed in the following years. Although there is no international consensus to define the school climate or dimensions of school climate (Thapa, Cohen, Guffey, & Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2013), it is still

possible to make some explanations dealing with this concept in different aspects. Halpin and Croft (1963), who put forward one of the first studies on school climate, described school climate as similar to personality. Hoy (1991) described the school climate as a set of internal characteristics that differentiate one school from another and affect the behaviour of its members. In a more specific way, they defined it as the relatively permanent quality of the school environment that participants experienced influenced their behaviour and based on perceptions of collective behaviour. This climate is based on their perception of collective behaviour and influences their behaviour. The school climate is based on people's experiences in school life and reflects norms, goals, values, interpersonal relationships, teaching and learning practices, and organisational structures (Cohen, McCabe, Michelli, & Pickeral, 2009). Besides, the school climate reflects the school life experiences of students, school staff and parents socially, emotionally, ethically and academically (Thapa et al., 2013).

This climate has an impact on the behaviour of individuals as well as giving identity to the organisation. A positive, healthy organisational climate is needed for the high level of employee well-being, finding the work meaningful, fostering students' resilience, and sustainable development (Di Fabio, 2017a, 2017b; Tamášová & Barnová, 2011). Considering this issue in the context of educational organisations, it can be said that the school climate is an essential predictor of teachers' job satisfaction (Taylor & Tashakkori, 1995) and also has a meaningful relationship with teacher leadership. For example, teacher leadership behaviours are less visible in a restrictive school climate (Kılınç, 2014). Sustainable positive school climate is associated with positive childhood and youth development, effective risk prevention and health promotion efforts, student learning and academic achievement, increased student graduation rates, and teacher retention (Cohen et al., 2009; Thapa et al., 2013). It can be claimed that the school climate is also related to personality traits (Şahin, Yavuz Tabak, & Sönmez, 2019).

Although there are many studies aimed at defining and measuring school climate (Anderson, 1982), this study was initially based on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) developed by Halpin and Croft (1963). This tool has been used frequently in many studies about school climate since its production (Anderson, 1982). Thomas (1976) states that this tool is a practical tool for determining school climate and is widely used in many countries. However, it is crucial to examine the factor structure before applying it to other cultures. The re-developed version of the scale (OCDQ-RE) for primary schools (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991) was used in the research, which was adapted to Turkish by Kavgacı (2010), and the scope of the study was limited to the dimensions of this scale. In this study, the school climate is considered as supportive, intimacy, directive and restrictive climates.

In a supportive school climate, school administrators support teachers' professional and personal development. In such a school climate, the visibility of the school administrator is high, and the teachers do not have difficulty in interacting with him/her, and can easily talk to him/her (Thomas, 1976). In such an environment, it can be said that the school administrator values teachers, is open to criticism from them and is tolerant. It can be claimed that a supportive school climate is also an open school climate where participation is encouraged. In an open school climate, the school administrator supports teachers' actions and suggestions; he/she provides teachers with space for action and does not disturb them with close supervision. Moreover, in a supportive climate, the school administrator does not tire the teachers with trivial bureaucratic tasks and does not force or block the teachers because he/she knows the intensity of their work (Hoy, Hoffman, Sabo, & Bliss, 1996).

In a restrictive school climate, the school administrator tries to make it difficult for teachers instead of facilitating their work. In such an environment, teachers' workloads are high, and they have routine work to do. In this intensity, teachers have difficulty in focusing on education and training activities (Thomas, 1976). It is possible to see a restrictive school climate as opposed to a supportive school climate. In a directive school climate, teachers are continuously monitored closely by the administrator. It can be argued that such an environment is a closed climate. It is essential to control behaviour in a closed climate (Hoy et al., 1996). An intimate school climate means that teachers have friendly social relationships with each other (Halpin & Croft, 1991). In such a climate, strong ties and close friendships are established between school members and teachers support each other (Hoy & Clover, 1986; Kavgacı, 2010; Kılınç, 2014; Kottkamp et al., 1987). It can be argued that there is an open climate that encourages participation in an intimacy school climate.

The correct use of humour can provide flexibility in the organisation, facilitate communication, provide alternative perspectives, and create a sense of goodwill. All these factors affect leadership and school climate (Zeigler et al., 1985). In this research, it is tried to determine the level of humour in schools and how it is related to school climate. For this purpose, the following questions were sought in the context of teacher perceptions:

1. To what extent do humour styles of school administrators emerge?
2. What are the perceptions of teachers about the school climate?
3. What is the relationship between school administrators' humour styles and school climate?
4. Are the humour styles of school administrators a significant predictor of school climate?

3 Methods

This research, which aims to determine the relationship between school administrator's humour styles and school climate, is a correlational survey model. Correlational studies are designed to determine the relationships between two or more variables. It tries to find out to what extent some relationship types exist. In general terms, the researcher conducts the study without any intervention to find and identify the possible relationships between the phenomena occurring in the natural environment (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2012, pp. 15-16).

3.1 Sample

The sample of the study consists of teachers working in primary schools in the central districts of Ankara and Aksaray. Two hundred twenty-one teachers were reached on the online questionnaire by taking the appropriate sampling method from the population. The majority of the teachers included in the research sample consisted of male teachers. It is seen that the teachers do not exceed the age of 30, and their professional seniority does not exceed 20 years. Demographic data of the sample is given in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic information statistics

Demographic Variables	*Category*	*f*	*%*
Gender	Female	62	28.1
	Male	159	71.9
Marital status	Married	100	45.2
	Single	121	54.8
Age	22-30 years	105	47.5
	31-38 years	85	38.5
	39-47 years	21	9.5
	48-56 years	10	4.5
Seniority	1-9 years	108	48.9
	10-19 years	86	38.9
	20-29 years	27	12.2
Graduation	College	12	5.0
	Undergraduate	171	67.0
	Graduate	40	28.0
Branch	Pre-school teacher	14	6.3
	Class teacher	64	29.0
	Branch teacher	143	64.7

3.2 Data collection tools

In the study, "Humour Behaviour Scale" developed by Cemaloğlu et al. (2012) was used to determine humour behaviours of school administrators. The revised form of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ-RE) was used to determine the school climate for elementary schools. The OCDR-RE developed by Hoy et al. (1991) and adapted to Turkish by Kavgacı (2010).

3.2.1 Humour Behaviour Scale

The scale has 30 items in 5 sub-dimensions: eight items in sarcastic humour style, nine items in producer-social humour style, five items in affirmative humour style, five items in rejective humour style, and three items in non-humorous style. The items were scored on a rating scale from 1 (I do not agree at all) to 5 (I agree). The Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) results of the five sub-dimensions of the Humour Behaviour Scale, and the fit index reference values (Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller, 2003) confirm the five sub-dimensions of the scale (χ^2 / sd = 2.45; RMSEA = .07; CFI = .93; GFI = .96), and goodness of fit indices of the model was found to be acceptable.

3.2.2 The revised form of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ-RE) for elementary schools

The original form of the OCDQ-RE consists of 42 items in six sub-dimensions. The Turkish form of the OCDQ-RE consists of 25 items in four subscales: supportiveness (8 items), restrictiveness (4 items), directive (5 items), and intimacy (8 items). The items were scored on a rating scale from 1 (never) to 4 (always). The Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) results of the five sub-dimensions of the scale, and the fit index reference values (Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003) confirm the four sub-dimensions of the scale (χ^2 /sd = 2.34; RMSEA = .06; CFI = .91; GFI = .94), and goodness of fit indices of the model was found to be acceptable. For the factors of the scale, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients were calculated as .92 for the supportive dimension, .80 for the restrictiveness dimension, .88 for the directive dimension, and .89 for the intimacy dimension. In total, this value was found to be .92.

3.3 Data analysis

Before starting the analysis of the data, missing or incorrect values and outliers were analysed. Each scale item taken from 221 teacher opinions in the data set was subjected to z-score testing $|\pm 3.29|$ and outliers were tried to be determined. It was determined that the data was within the desired value range, and no data extraction was performed. Demographic data of the participants were determined by percentage (%) and frequency (f) analysis. Within the scope of the research sub-problems, arithmetic mean values of the items in each subscale were determined, and a score was calculated for that factor. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was used to calculate the

relationships between variables. Besides, Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was performed to determine the predictive level of independent variables. Data analysis was performed at .05 significance level.

4 Results

In this section, the analysis and interpretation of the data obtained within the scope of sub-problems are given. In this context, the arithmetic means, standard deviation and correlation values calculated for school administrators' humour behaviour and school climate sub-factors are given in Table 2.

Table 2

Means, standard deviations and correlation values of variables

Variables	*M*	*SD*	*1.*	*2.*	*3.*	*4.*	*5.*	*6.*	*7.*	*8.*	*9.*
1. Sarcastic	2.01	1.09	-								
2. Producer-Social	2.99	.95	-.13*	-							
3. Affirmative	3.27	.97	-.33**	.74**	-						
4. Rejective	2.24	1.05	.67**	-.35**	-.52**	-					
5. Non-humorous	2.69	1.08	.43**	-.41**	-.55**	.72**	-				
6. Supportive	2.82	.72	-.31**	.52**	.55**	-.45**	-.35**	-			
7. Restrictive	2.41	.74	.49**	.08	-.04	.24**	.17*	.02	-		
8. Directive	2.71	.77	-.17*	.29**	.30**	-.31**	-.24**	.56**	.07	-	
9. Intimacy	2.90	.64	-.08	.33**	.35**	-.22**	-.15*	.57**	.07	.54**	-

** p < .01; * p < .05

When the data in Table 2 is examined, it is seen that the teachers' perceptions of the humour style used by the school principals are high in the affirmative and producer-social sub-factors. In addition, non-humorous (M = 2.69), rejection (M = 2.24), and sarcastic (M = 2.01) humour scores are relatively low or less preferred. When teachers' perceptions about school climate were examined, it was found that the values of restrictive (M=2.41), directive (M = 2.71), supportive (M = 2.82) and intimacy (M = 2.90) school climate dimensions were above the average value.

There are significant positive or negative relationships between school principals' humour behaviour and school climate sub-factors. The highest correlation was found with affirmative humour (r = .55), and the lowest correlation was with rejective humour (r = .45). The highest correlation with restrictive school climate was obtained in sarcastic style (r = .49), and the lowest correlation was in affirmative humour style (r = - .04). The highest correlation was found in the affirmative humour style (r = .30), and the lowest correlation was found in rejective humour style (r = - .31). The highest correlation with the intimacy school climate was in the affirmative humour style (r = .35) and the lowest in the rejective humour style (r = - .22). In general, it is seen that the

relationships between the variables are generally low, but both positive and negative medium level relationships are also determined.

In Table 3, there are findings related to regression analysis. When the data in Table 3 is examined, it is seen that there is a moderate and significant relationship between the humour styles sub-dimensions (predictive variables) and school climate sub-dimensions (predicted variables). The school principals' humour style explains 15% of the variance in the supportive school climate, 27% of the variance in the restrictive school climate, 14% of the variance in the directive school climate, and 15% of the variance in the intimacy school climate. When standardised regression coefficients (β) are considered, rejective humour predicts school climate more than the other humour styles. On the other hand, t-tests regarding the significance of regression coefficients indicate that the sarcastic humour style is a significant predictor of the restrictive school climate, the producer-social humour style is a significant predictor of the supportive school climate, the affirmative humour style is a significant predictor of the supportive and intimacy school climate, and the rejective humour style is a significant predictor of the supportive and directive school climate. However, there is no significant predictor of non-humorous style.

Table 3

The results of regression analysis on the level of school principals' humour behaviour which predicts school climate

	Predicted Variable											
	Supportive[a]			*Restrictive*[b]			*Directive*[c]			*Intimacy*[d]		
Predictive Variable	*β*	*t*	*p*	*β*	*t*	*p*	*β*	*t*	*p*	*β*	*t*	*p*
Constant	-	7.22	.00		4.69	.00	-	7.65	.00	-	7.67	.00
1. Sarcastic	-.08	-1.03	.31	.58	7.23	.00	.04	.48	.63	.10	1.19	.24
2. Producer-Social	.28	3.47	.00	.11	1.28	.20	.17	1.80	.07	.16	1.62	.11
3. Affirmative	.25	2.79	.01	.04	.38	.71	.06	.59	.56	.24	2.24	.03
4. Rejective	-.25	-2.60	.01	-.16	-1.54	.13	-.30	-2.59	.01	-.23	-2.05	.04
5. Non-Humorous	.12	1.43	.15	.10	1.12	.26	.06	.66	.51	.16	1.71	.09

[a] $R = .39$, $R^2 = .15$; $F = 26.44$, $p \leq .00$ [b] $R = .52$, $R^2 = .27$; $F = 15.78$, $p \leq .00$
[c] $R = .37$, $R^2 = .14$; $F = 6.91$, $p \leq .00$ [d] $R = .40$, $R^2 = .15$; $F = 7.65$, $p \leq .00$

5 Discussion and suggestions

In this section, the data obtained for each sub-objective of the research are discussed in the context of school principals' humour styles, school climate, the relationship between humour styles and school climate and the level of humour styles predicting school climate. First of all, when school administrators' humour styles are examined in general, they have high scores in their affirmative and producer-social humour styles and low scores in sarcastic and rejective humour styles. On the other hand, it is seen that they have average scores

regarding the non-humorous style. These findings are similar to some related studies (Cemaloğlu et al., 2014). Özdemir et al. (2011) and Yılmaz and Altınkurt (2016) found that positive humour (self-enhancing humour and participatory humour) scores were higher than cynical humour (aggressive humour and self-destructive humour) scores. This situation, which emerges in the perceptions of teachers, shows that positive humour styles occur at high levels and negative humour styles occur at low levels in school administrators. In the research of Şahin (2017), it is seen that constructive humour is emphasised more about school administrators. Because negative humour behaviours are associated with the theory of superiority (Romero & Arendt, 2011), low school administrator scores in this direction can be considered as a favourable situation for the school, especially teachers. Otherwise, it could be interpreted that the administrator misused the hierarchical power of being on top and preferred humour as a tool for this. School administrators are expected to use humour as a healthy communication and interaction tool. When school administrators realise this, humour becomes a useful tool (Zeigler et al., 1985).

Regarding the school climate, teachers think that there is a more intimate climate in their schools, followed by supportive and directive school climates. The scores obtained in these three dimensions are at a high level. On the other hand, teachers' perception of the restrictive climate was low. Çolak and Altınkurt (2017) observed that school administrators exhibit more supportive behaviours than restrictive behaviours, and teachers exhibit more collaborative and sincere behaviours than unconcerned behaviours. Based on these results, teachers' perceptions of school climate tend to be more prone to positive. Supportive school principal behaviours and sincerity-based relationships among teachers indicate that the school has an open and encouraging climate (Hoy et al., 1996). In this context, the results of the research indicate a healthy school climate.

Based on the relations between school administrators' humour styles and school climate, a moderately significant relationship was found between sarcastic humour style and restrictive school climate. On the other hand, a moderately significant, but the negative relationship was found between sarcastic humour style and supportive school climate. It can be argued that sarcastic humour behaviour has aggressive, hostile characteristics. Stuart and Rosenfeld's (1994) study shows that there is no healthy classroom climate in classrooms where humour is used in a hostile manner by teachers. It is possible to make a similar assessment when we take this situation to the school level. It is difficult to establish a healthy school climate in schools where humour is used sarcastically by school administrators. This claim is consistent with the research results. Similar results were obtained in the context of the school climate regarding the rejective humour style. When using humour, risks such as the emergence of an undesirable situation, and someone being uncomfortable with this situation can always arise (Recepoğlu, 2010). Therefore, to make the school climate healthier, it is necessary to consider the possible effects before using humour. Positive and

moderate significant relationships were found between affirmative humour style and supportive and intimate school climates.

Regarding the producer-social style of humour, similar results have been obtained, although there are relatively lower relationships in all dimensions of school climate. The non-humorous style was negatively, moderately and significantly related to the supportive school climate. Based on these results, it can be argued that as teachers' perception of positive humour towards school administrators increase, perceptions about school climate increase positively.

When the relationships between school principals' humour styles and school climate were analysed according to the regression analysis, it was found that the sarcastic humour style was a positive predictor of the restrictive school climate; that rejective humour is a negative predictor of a supportive and directive school climate; producer-social and affirmative humour styles are a positive predictor of the supportive school climate. Similar results were obtained in a study that tried to determine how and to what extent teachers used humour according to student views (Stuart & Rosenfeld, 1994). In this study, it is seen that if the humour is used too much or hostile, the perception of supportive school climate perceived by the students' decreases. When these results are taken into consideration, even if a positive humour behaviour is used more than necessary, that can lead to the formation of an adverse climate.

When the research results are evaluated in general, it can be argued that school administrators should develop a positive attitude towards humour in order to create a positive climate in schools. For this, school administrators need to know how to manage humour (Collinson, 2002). Managers who use humour aggressively cannot be expected to benefit from the power of humour effectively (Tremblay, 2017). According to Collinson (2002), administrators who are mainly focused on control try to suppress and censor humour and laughter in the work environment. In other words, it can be argued that these people have a non-humorous attitude or posture. Therefore, it is shown that making workplaces more enjoyable with a reassuring understanding rather than control-oriented management in organisations, especially in schools where social relations are highly regarded, will have positive effects on the school climate. Tremblay's (2017) study found that the effect of humour was more favourable in organisations with a high level of confidence in support of this claim. In this context, however, simple management initiatives to produce humour to create a fun workplace are unlikely to succeed and can have a negative impact. According to Collinson (2002), these simple initiatives can lead to even a reverse gap in the long run, which can lead to the resumption of humour pressure in organisations. Romero and Arendt (2011) argued that the effective use of humour in organisations could be achieved through a proper analysis of the value judgments and understandings of their target kits. The fact that the administrators who apply humour in schools are aware of this situation and the use of humour without harming their self, especially considering the value

judgments and beliefs of teachers, may contribute to the formation of a healthier school climate.

Conclusion

Although this study shows that there is a significant relationship between humour and school climate, further studies are needed to explain the results in terms of causality. Because in the relevant literature, there are also results that can be perceived as discrete. For example, in organisations with negative superior-subordinate relationships, job satisfaction may be low even if leaders show positive humour behaviours (Robert et al., 2016). Therefore, explaining all organisational variables within the chaotic network by associating them with humour may constitute a lack of perspective. Aware of this limitation, this research was carried out.

References

Avolio, B. J., Howell, J. M., & Sosik, J. J. (1999). A funny thing happened on the way to the bottom line: Humor as a moderator of leadership style. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*(2), 219-227.

Çolak, İ., & Altınkurt, Y. (2017). The relationship between school climate and teacher autonomy behaviors. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 23*(1), 33-71.

Anderson, C. S. (1982). The search for school climate: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 52*(3), 368-420.

Babad, E. Y. (1974). A multi-method approach to the assessment of humor: A critical look at humor tests. *Journal of Personality, 42*(4), 618-631.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2012). *Scientific Research Methods*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Cemaloğlu, N., Recepoğlu, E., Şahin, F., & Daşcı, E. (2014). Examining relationships between school administrators' humor behaviors and teachers' mobbing experiences according to teacher perceptions. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 6*(3), 570-580.

Cemaloğlu, N., Recepoğlu, E., Şahin, F., Daşçı, E., & Köktürk, O. (2012). Developing humor behavior scale: The study of validity and reliability. *The Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*, *10*(4), 693-716.

Cohen, J., McCabe, L., Michelli, N. M., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. *Teachers College Record, 111*(1), 180-213.

Collinson, D. L. (2002). Managing humour. *Journal of Management Studies, 39*(3), 269-288.

Çelik, B., & Gündoğdu, K. (2016). The effect of using humor and concept cartoons in high school ICT lesson on students' achievement, retention, attitude and anxiety. *Computers & Education, 103*, 144-157.

Çetinkaya, F. F., & Şener, E. (2016). The effects of manager's humor styles on organisational cynicism perception of employees. *Journal of Business Research-Turk, 8*(3), 207-221.

Darling, A. L., & Civikly, J. M. (1986). The effect of teacher humor on student perceptions of classroom communicative climate. *The Journal of Classroom Interaction, 22*(1), 24-30.

Di Fabio, A. (2017a). Positive Healthy Organisations: Promoting well-being, meaningfulness, and sustainability in organisations. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 1938.

Di Fabio, A. (2017b). The psychology of sustainability and sustainable development for well-being in organisations. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 1534.

Goriup, J., Stričević, J., & Sruk, V. (2017). Is education for using humour in nursing needed? (Slovenian case study on sociological and ergonomic aspects of the impact of humour on nursing professionals). *Acta Educationis Generalis, 7*(3), 45-62. https://doi.org/10.1515/atd-2017-0023

Halpin, A. W., & Croft, D. B. (1963). *The Organisational Climate of Schools.* Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago.

Holmes, J., & Marra, M. (2002). Having a laugh at work: How humour contributes to workplace culture. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*(12), 1683-1710.

Hoy, W. K. (1990). Organisational climate and culture: A conceptual analysis of the school workplace. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 1*(2), 149-168.

Hoy, W. K., & Clover, S. I. R. (1986). Elementary school climate. A revision of the OCDQ. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 22*(1), 93-110.

Hoy, W. K., & Hannum, J. W. (1997). Middle school climate: An empirical assessment of organisational health and student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 33*(3), 290-311.

Hoy, W. K., Hoffman, J., Sabo, D., & Bliss, J. (1996). The organisational climate of middle schools: The development and test of the OCDQ-RM. *Journal of Educational Administration, 34*(1), 41-59.

Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). *Open Schools, Healthy Schools: Measuring Organisational Climate*. Corwin Press.

Hurren, B. L. (2006). The effects of principals' humor on teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Studies, 32*(4), 373-385.

Kavgacı, H. (2010). *Organisational Climate and School-Family Relations in Primary Schools* (unpublished Master's thesis). Ankara: Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences.

Kılınç, A. Ç. (2014). Examining the relationship between teacher leadership and school climate. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 14*(5), 1729-1742.

Kong, D. T., Cooper, C. D., & Sosik, J. J. (2019). The state of research on leader humor. *Organisational Psychology Review, 9*(1), 3-40.

Kottkamp, R. B., Mulhern, J. A., & Hoy, W. K. (1987). Secondary school climate: A revision of OCDQ. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 23*(3), 31-48.

Malone, P. B. (1980). Humor: a double-edged tool for today's managers? *Academy of Management Review, 5*(3), 357-360.

Martin, R. A. (2007). *The Psychology of Humor: An Integrative Approach*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic.

Martin, R. A., Puhlik-Doris, P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, K. (2003). Individual differences in uses of humor and their relation to psychological well-being: Development of the Humor Styles Questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37*(1), 48-75.

Matthias, G. R. (2014). *The Relationship between Principals' Humor Style and School Climate in Wisconsin's Public Middle Schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Milwaukee: The University of Wisconsin.

Nezlek, J. B., & Derks, P. (2001). Use of humor as a coping mechanism, psychological adjustment, and social interaction. *Humor, 14*(4), 395-414.

Özdemir, S., Sezgin, F., Kaya, Z., & Recepoğlu, E. (2011). The relationship between primary school teachers' coping styles with stress and humor styles. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 3*(3), 405-428.

Recepoğlu, E. (2010). The effects of principals' humor on teachers' job satisfaction. *Education and Science, 33*(150), 74-86.

Recepoğlu, E., Kilinç, A. Ç., & Çepni, O. (2011). Examining teachers' motivation level according to school principals' humor styles. *Educational Research and Reviews, 6*(17), 928-934.

Pierson, P. R., & Bredeson, P. V. (1993). It is Not Just a Laughing Matter: School Principals' Use of Humor in Interpersonal Communications with Teachers. *Journal of school leadership, 3*(5), 522-533.

Robert, C., Dunne, T. C., & Iun, J. (2016). The impact of leader humor on subordinate job satisfaction: the crucial role of leader–subordinate relationship quality. *Group & Organization Management, 41*(3), 375-406.

Romero, E. J., & Arendt, L. A. (2011). Variable effects of humor styles on organisational outcomes. *Psychological Reports, 108*(2), 649-659.

Şahin, A. (2017). The use of humor by primary school administrators and its organisational effect on schools. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research, 12*(2), 6-23.

Şahin, F., Sönmez, E., & Tabak, B. Y. (2019). A variable predicting school climate: The personality traits of school principals. *Başkent University Journal of Education, 6*(2), 202-212.

Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive

goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, *8*(2), 23-74.

Stuart, W. D., & Rosenfeld, L. B. (1994). Student perceptions of teacher humor and classroom climate. *Communication Research Reports, 11*(1), 87-97.

Tamášová, V., & Barnová, S. (2011). School climate as the determinant of the relationship between the level of students' resilience and school satisfaction. *Acta Educationis Generalis, 1*(1), 19-37. https://doi.org/10.1515/atd-2015-0037

Taylor, D. L., & Tashakkori, A. (1995). Decision participation and school climate as predictors of job satisfaction and teachers' sense of efficacy. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 63*(3), 217-230.

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.

Thomas, A. R. (1976). The organisational climate of schools. *International Review of Education, 22*(4), 441-463.

Thorson, J. A., & Powell, F. C. (1993). Development and validation of a multidimensional sense of humor scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 49*(1), 13-23.

Tremblay, M. (2017). Humor in teams: Multilevel relationships between humor climate, inclusion, trust, and citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 32*(4), 363-378.

Ziegler, V., Boardman, G., & Thomas, M. D. (1985). Humor, leadership, and school climate. *The Clearing House, 58*(8), 346-348.