

A SURVEY RESEARCH OF LEADERSHIP STYLES OF ELEMENTARY  
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION  
OF

MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

MAHÇE DERELİ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF SCIENCE

IN

EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

SEPTEMBER, 2003

Approval of the Graduate School of Education Faculty

---

Prof.Dr. Sencer Ayata  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the Master of Science.

---

Prof. Dr. Hasan Şimşek  
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Prof. Dr. Hasan Şimşek  
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr.Hasan Şimşek

---

Prof.Dr Yaşar Özden

---

Assist. Prof.Dr. Ercan Kiraz

---

## **ABSTRACT**

### **A SURVEY RESEARCH OF LEADERSHIP STYLES OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS**

Dereli. Mahce

Master of Science Department of Education

Supervisor :Prof.Dr Hasan Simsek

September 2003 , 86 pages

The purpose of this survey research is to explore the leadership styles of public elementary school principals in Turkey as perceived by principals themselves and teachers. The subjects of this study include 350 public elementary school principals and 700 public elementary school teachers. The questionnaire has two parallel forms, one for the principals to rate themselves and another in which teachers can rate the principals. According to Section I and Section II , the principals rated themselves the highest on the human resource frame. In addition to this, the majority of the principals consider themselves as being effective leaders and managers. As to teacher ratings of the principals in relation to leadership frames, the principals were rated the highest on the human resource frame in Section I and Section II . Moreover, the majority of the teachers think that the principals that they work with are effective managers and leaders.

Keywords: Leadership, Leadership Styles

## ÖZ

### İLKÖĞRETİM OKULU MÜDÜRLERİNİN LİDERLİK DAVRANIŞLARI

Dereli, Mahçe

Yüksel Lisans, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Hasan Şimşek

Eylül 2003, 86 sayfa

Bu araştırmanın amacı Türkiye'deki ilköğretim okulu müdürlerinin liderlik davranışlarının hem kendileri hem de onlarla çalışan öğretmenler tarafından değerlendirilerek belirlenmesidir. Araştırmanın verileri Liderlik Davranışları Tanımlama Anketi aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Anket hem müdürlerin kendi liderlik davranışlarını hem de öğretmenlerin müdürlerin liderlik davranışlarını değerlendirmeleri için birbirine paralel iki formdan oluşmaktadır. Anketin birinci ve ikinci bölümlerinden elde edilen sonuçlara göre müdürler en çok insancıl liderlik davranışını sergilediklerini düşünmektedirler. Buna ek olarak müdürlerin büyük bir çoğunluğu kendilerini etkili bir lider ve yönetici olarak değerlendirmektedirler. Öğretmenlerin müdürleri değerlendirmeleri ile ilgili sonuçlara göre de müdürler en çok insancıl liderlik davranışını sergilemektedirler. Öğretmenlerin büyük çoğunluğu müdürleri etkili bir lider ve yönetici olarak değerlendirmişlerdir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Liderlik, Liderlik Davranışları

To My Parents and In Memory of My Cousin Meriç Morca

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I express sincere appreciation to Prof. Dr. Hasan ŐimŐek for his guidance and insight throughout the research. Thanks go to another faculty member Assist. Prof. Dr. Ercan Kiraz for his suggestions and invaluable comments and to Dr. Atilla Yardımcı without whose guidance this thesis could not have been completed. The technical assistance of Murat Kultufan and theoretical assistance of Figen Kanik is gratefully acknowledged. I offer my sincere thanks to EARGED, without their support it would be impossible for me to carry out this research. To my family, Nalan and Őefik Dereli, for their unconditional love and understanding. I also thank to my dear husband Devrim Dural and precious friend Perihan ayırezmez for always being there for me.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	i
ÖZ.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER	
1.INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background to the study .....	1
1.2 Purpose of the study .....	6
1.3 Significance of the study .....	7
2.REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	8
2.1 Introduction .....	8
2.2 Leadership Theories .....	9
2.2.1 Trait Theories of Leadership .....	9
2.2.2 Behavioral Theories of Leadership .....	10
2.2.2.1 The Hawthorne Studies .....	11
2.2.2.2 The Iowa Studies .....	11
2.2.2.3 The Ohio State Studies .....	12

2.2.2.4 University of Michigan Studies .....	13
2.2.2.5 The Managerial Grid .....	13
2.2.3 Contingency Theories of Leadership .....	14
2.2.3.1 Fiedler's Contingency Model .....	14
2.2.3.2 Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Theory .....	15
2.2.3.3 Leader Member Exchange Model .....	16
2.2.3.4 House's Path Goal Theory .....	16
2.2.3.5 Leader Participation Model .....	17
2.2.4 Recent Approaches to Leadership .....	18
2.2.4.1 Attribution Theory of Leadership .....	18
2.2.4.2 Charismatic Leadership Theory .....	18
2.2.4.3 Transactional and Transformational Approaches.....	20
2.2.4.4 Visionary Leadership .....	22
2.2.4.5 Educational Leadership Theory.....	22
2.2.5 Leadership Frames .....	27
2.2.5.1 Structural Leadership.....	29
2.2.5.2 Human Resource Leadership.....	30
2.2.5.3 Political Leadership.....	31
2.2.5.4 Symbolic Leadership.....	31
2.2.6 Research on Educational Leadership in Turkey.....	33
2.2.7 Summary .....	38
3.METHOD .....	39
3.1 Overall Design of the Study .....	39
3.2 Research Questions .....	40
3.3 Context and Sample Selection.....	40
3.5 Data Collection Instruments.....	42
3.6 Piloting of the Data Collection Instrument.....	44
3.7 Data Collection Procedures .....	44
3.8 Data Analysis Procedures .....	44
3.9 Definition of Terms .....	45
3.10 Limitations of The Study .....	45
4.RESULTS.....	46
4.1 An Overview of the Participants in the Study.....	47
4.2 Principal Ratings in Relation to Leadership Frames.....	48



4.3 Teacher Ratings in Relation to Leadership Frames.....	57
5.CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....	66
5.1 Implications for Practice.....	70
5.2 Implications for Research.....	71
REFERENCES .....	72
APPENDICES .....	79
Leadership Orientations Questionnaire (Self) .....	79
Leadership Orientations Questionnaire(Other).....	83

## LIST OF TABLES

### TABLE

1.1.1	Saliency of frames .....	4
3.4.1	Number of Teachers and Principals .....	41
4.1.1	The Distribution of the Participants in Terms of Gender.....	46
4.1.2	The Distribution of Principals in Relation to Their Work Experience.....	47
4.1.3	The Distribution of Teachers in Relation to Their Work Experience.....	47
4.1.4	The Distribution of Teachers in Relation to Their Work Experience with Principals.....	48
4.2.1	Leadership Orientations of the Principals Section I.....	49
4.2.2	The Relationship of Principals' Work Experience Related to Leadership Frames.....	51
4.2.3	Leadership Orientations of the Principals Section II.....	53
4.2.4	The Relationship of Principals' Work Experience Related to Leadership Frames .....	54
4.2.5	Principals' Ratings on Effectiveness as a Leader and Manager.....	56
4.3.1	Teacher Ratings of the Principals' Leadership Orientations Section I.....	57
4.3.2	The Relationship of Teachers' Work Experience Related to Leadership Frames .....	58

4.3.3	The Relationship of Teachers' Work Experience with the Principals Related to Leadership Frames .....	60
4.3.4	Teacher Ratings of the Principals' Leadership Orientations Section II.....	61
4.3.5	The Relationship of Teachers' Work Experience Related to Leadership Frames .....	62
4.3.6	The Relationship of Teachers' Work Experience with the Principals Related to the Structural Frame (Section I) .....	63
4.3.7	The Relationship of Teachers' Work Experience with the Principals Related to the Structural Frame (Section II).....	64
4.3.8	Teacher Ratings of the Principals' Effectiveness as a Leader and Manager.....	65
5.1	A Summary of the Existing Situation .....	67

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Background to the study**

Leadership is a complex phenomenon. A great number of definitions have been offered over the years. The literature suggests that there is an important distinction between the two terms: ‘leader’ and ‘manager’. According to Squires (2001), leaders are concerned with the spiritual aspect of their work, that is, they have followers who deeply believe in them and they possess a latent power in organizations.

However, managers deal with mundane tasks such as allocation of roles, tasks and resources needed to achieve organizational goals, coordination of the allocated activities and processes and monitoring the everyday operation of the organization. Managers are associated with periods of stability; leaders with periods of turbulence (Bryman, 1993). When people are at peace, happy and satisfied there is hardly any need for leadership. On the other hand, when the human condition is at stake and the situation urges someone to step forward and initiate change, the need for leadership is high (English, 1992). In addition to this, leaders have a vision of the future and they develop strategies that are necessary to bring about changes needed to achieve that vision. However, managers take incremental steps and create timetables to achieve those results (Carlson, 1996).

Day (2000) also states that leadership is creating and maintaining a sense of vision, culture, and interpersonal relationships. However, management is coordinating, supporting, and monitoring the activities of an organization. Hersey and Blanchard (1969) claim that leadership is a broader concept than management. Management is a subskill of leadership in which achieving organizational goals is of paramount importance. Leadership involves working with and through people so as to accomplish goals but not necessarily organizational goals.

Throughout history theoretical explanations for leadership have been proffered. The Trait Approach up to the late 1940s claimed that leadership ability is inborn (Bryman, 1993). People become leaders for the traits that they own such as intelligence, appearance, language ability, etc. (Bolman, Crow, Goldring, Slater, & Thurston, 1994). In the late 1940s to the late 1960s, the Behavioral Approach became dominant advocating that effectiveness in leadership has to do with how a leader behaves. The Contingency Approach, on the other hand, suggests that effective leadership is dependent upon the situation, and became popular in the late 1960s to the early 1980s.

It proposes that a particular style is appropriate in some situations whereas others are not. However, recent approaches to leadership focus on vision and charisma, a term used by sociologist Max Weber to describe leaders who can lead, but who do not hold “a sanctioned office” (English, 1992). In the late 1970’s the concepts of transactional and transformational leadership emerged.

Transactional leadership claims that the relationship between managers and employees is based on bargaining whereas transformational leadership supposes that the relationship between the manager and the employee is of mutual trust and

characterized by four factors: charisma, inspiration, individual consideration and intellectual stimulation.

Bolman and Deal (1991) categorized leadership into four frames: the structural, human resource, political and symbolic frames. Firstly, the structural frame focuses on the importance of formal roles and relationships.

The main issue is how to divide the work, and how to assign people to different works and units. Secondly, the human resource frame suggests that organizations are made up of people who have different needs, feelings and interests. The main issue is to make the organization fit its people. Thirdly, the political frame views organizations as political arenas in which resources are scarce and people compete for power.

The main issue is to form coalitions and build negotiation. Lastly, the symbolic frame treats organizations as unique cultures which have rituals, ceremonies, stories, heroes, and myths. The main issue is to focus on meaning, belief, and faith.

Bolman and Deal (1991) suggest that the essence of effective leadership lies in knowing which frame to apply in a particular situation. A structural frame will be helpful in organizations with clear goals, strong technologies and stable authority whereas a human resource frame will work in an organization where employee morale and motivation is low. A political frame will be prominent where resources are scarce, conflict and diversity are high. A symbolic frame will be of particular importance where goals are unclear and ambiguity is high. Bolman and Deal (1991) suggest that there are conditions for salience of each frame as follows:

Table 1.1.1 **Salience of frames**

<u>Frame</u>	<u>Conditions for Salience</u>
Structural	<p>Goals and information clear</p> <p>Cause-effect relations well understood, strong technologies and information systems</p> <p>Low ambiguity, and low uncertainty; Stable legitimate authority.</p>
Human Resource	<p>Employee leverage high or increasing, employee morale and motivation low or declining</p> <p>Resources relatively abundant or increasing, low or moderate conflict and uncertainty, diversity low or moderate.</p>
Political	<p>Resources scarce or declining</p> <p>Goal and value conflict</p> <p>Diversity high or increasing</p> <p>Distribution of power diffuse or unstable.</p>
Symbolic	<p>Goals and information unclear or ambiguous, cause-effect relations poorly understood, weak technologies and information systems, cultural diversity.</p>

Bolman,L., & Deal, T.E. (1991) Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership. San Francisco: Josey Bass Publishers, p. 315.

When referring to the tasks and functions of the principals, educators prefer the term administration rather than management on the basis that management is associated with business and industry while *administration* is better applied to educational enterprise (Rebore, 1985).

Principals who are regarded as effective by both staff and school board members focus on both organizational goals and staff members' needs (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996). The first characteristics can be labelled as "initiating structure" which endeavours to create a well-defined organization with clear tasks. At the other end of the continuum, there is "consideration" which entails sustaining a friendly relationship between the leader and the group, building mutual trust, respect and teamwork. For school administrators both types of leadership are essential. They should have the initiative and consideration for others at the same time (Halpin, 1966).

Davis (1998) states that two important elements of effective school leadership are establishing a school vision and fostering positive interpersonal relationships. He also acknowledges that developing a school vision takes time and the principal should have the ability to determine the status of the school, identify important aspects of improvement and have a contingency plan to solve problems.

In addition to this, they should be knowledgeable about theory and especially those focusing on organizational behavior and leadership. They should possess



technical skills needed for managerial responsibilities and the ability to reflect upon their practices in which they skilfully integrate knowledge and skills with experience (Kowalski, 1995).

According to Cruz (1995), effective principals should communicate with parents, teachers and students and be team builders by building coalitions between these stakeholders. Furthermore, effective principals are well aware that there is a turbulent environment and they should address the needs of the outside groups that are too numerous. They should also encourage a risk taking environment by urging their employees to assume responsibility for a task. Besides, effective principals should possess certain skills in conflict management, active listening, problem solving and consensus building.

They should consult teachers and parents in case of conflict. Moreover, they should adopt norms and attitudes that are in harmony with the school's culture. Most importantly they should establish credibility and prove that they are people of integrity.

A review of literature has revealed that a small number of studies have compared the leadership styles of school administrators changing in scope and focus. Therefore, leadership styles of public elementary school principals by using Bolman and Deal's "four" frames were explored through this survey research.

## **1.2 Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to unveil the leadership styles of public elementary school principals based on the frames developed by Bolman and Deal (1991).

The specific research questions of the study are as follows:

1. What kind of leadership styles are adopted by the principals of public elementary schools?
2. Do leadership styles differ in relation to the principals' experience in the field?

3. Do leadership styles differ in relation to the teachers' experience in the field?
4. Do leadership styles differ in relation to the teachers' work experience with their current principals?
5. Do principals consider themselves as effective managers and leaders?
6. Do teachers consider their principals as effective managers and leaders?
7. Is there a significant difference between the leadership styles of female and male principals?

### **1.3 Significance of the Study**

The importance of this study lies in its exploratory nature as it attempts to unveil the leadership styles employed in public elementary schools in Turkey. This study is innovative in the sense that it will be the first study to utilize Bolman and Deal's four leadership frames in Turkey. This research will provide an additional evidence to educational authorities in choosing or training their leaders.

Furthermore, it is believed to induce self awareness and reflection in principals concerning their principalship practices. Lastly, it will provide, at least, a basis for further studies related to leadership styles of the Turkish elementary school principals.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

Bass (1990) declares that the appearance of the word “leader” in the English language goes back as early as the year 1300 and the word “leadership” did not

appear until the first half of the nineteenth century. Furthermore, he claims that it did not reveal itself in the most other modern languages until recent times.

Leadership has been a complex phenomenon about which many theories have been developed. There are numerous definitions about what it is and under what conditions it reveals itself. As Tead (1935) describes, it is an “... activity of influencing people to cooperate towards same goal which they come to find desirable.” As it can be understood from that statement it necessitates an interaction between the two constituents: those who lead and those who follow. Leaders can not exist without followers and vice versa (Slater, 1995).

For ages people have been looking for direction, purpose and meaning to guide their collective activities. Leadership is needed to foster purpose, direction, imagination, and passion, especially in times of crisis or rapid change. At such times people look to leaders for hope, inspiration, and a pathway which will lead them to somewhere more desirable (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

As leadership has had a great impact on the culture, history, and civilization of humankind, theoretical explanations for it have been proffered throughout history. Although the term leadership is mostly associated with industry and business, it is of great importance to education as well. Firstly, this section will provide a historical background to theories of leadership as rooted in business and industry.

Secondly, it will focus on the recent approaches to leadership one of which is the primary concern of this study, namely leadership frames. Finally, it will end by elaborating on educational leadership, some criticisms and researches conducted in the field in Turkey and worldwide.

## **2.2 Leadership Theories**

As mentioned before, especially within the past century influential theories for leadership have been developed. The Trait Approach that endured up to the late 1940s claimed that leadership ability is inborn. In the late 1940s to late 1960s Behavioral Approach became dominant advocating that effectiveness in leadership has to do with how the leader behaves. In the late 1960s to the early 1980s the Contingency Approach became popular suggesting that effective leadership is dependent upon the situation (Bryman, 1993). Recent approaches to leadership focus on vision and charisma, the term used by sociologist Max Weber to describe leaders who can lead but who do not hold a “sanctioned office” (English, 1992). Later, Burns (cited in Deluga, 1995) introduced the concepts of transactional and transformational leadership. In 1991, Bolman and Deal categorized leadership into four frames : the structural, human resource, political and symbolic frame which constitute the background for this particular survey research.

### **2.2.1 Trait Theories of Leadership**

The study of special traits of leaders emerged from the belief that leadership and abilities such as intelligence were inherited. In addition to intelligence other factors such as birth order, status and liberal parents highly correlate with leadership abilities (Carlson, 1996).

This approach dominated the study of leadership up to the 1950s. It tried to define any distinguishing physical or psychological characteristics of the individual that explains the behavior of leaders (Hoy & Miskel , 1991). It claims that leadership ability is inborn. As the distinguished philosopher Aristotle (cited in Hoy & Miskel, 1991) enunciates that “from the hour of birth, some are marked out for subjection, others for rule.”

However, some shortcomings of this approach were identified. Firstly, it is not clarified which of the traits are most important and which are not. Secondly, some traits overlap. For example, tact, judgement, and common sense are listed as separate traits but the last one covers the preceding ones. Thirdly, trait studies do not distinguish

between traits helping to become a leader and those enabling it to be maintained. Fourthly, most trait studies are descriptive. There is an assumption that the leader's traits existed prior to leadership and most of them have failed to approach the study of personality as an organized whole (Gouldner, 1965). Several studies were conducted to identify leader traits. Mann's later reviews suggested 750 findings about the personality traits of the leaders. However, many of the traits found in one study undermined or were found to be unimportant in others. Gibb (cited in Campell, Corbally & Ramseyer, 1966) argues that failure to outline leadership traits should not be accounted for their absence, but for lack of measurement and comparability of data from different kinds of research. Recent trait studies utilized measurement procedures focusing on managers and administrators. Gary Yukl emphasized leader effectiveness rather than leader traits based on the assumption that becoming a leader and becoming an effective leader are different tasks (Hoy and Miskel, 1991).

## **2.2.2 Behavioral Theories of Leadership**

The failure of tracing "gold" in the trait "mines" urged researchers to examine the behaviors that specific leaders exhibited. Behavioral studies of leadership aim to identify behaviors that differentiate leaders from non-leaders (Robbins, 1998). Behavioral theories of leadership support that a set of particular behaviors can be named as a style of leadership. Leadership style refers to a distinctive behavior adopted by persons in formal positions of leadership (Campell, et al., 1966) and several studies were conducted to identify those.

### **2.2.2.1 The Hawthorne Studies**

The Hawthorne studies were carried out between 1927 and 1932 at the Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Plant in the United States. In one of these studies a group of women workers who were assembling relay switches for telephones was moved to a special room and a series of changes were introduced whose impact on productivity was investigated. The researchers concluded that every change increased production. Employees inferred that management cared about them and responded by working more productively. The "Hawthorne effect" is named

after this phenomenon of working harder because of feelings of participation in something important (Roberts & Hunt, 1991).

#### **2.2.2.2 The Iowa Studies**

An attempt to identify different styles of leader behavior on the group was conducted at the University of Iowa by a group of scientists. The researchers came up with three leadership styles to determine their effect on the attitudes and productivity of the subordinates.

*Authoritarian leaders* were very directive and did not allow any participation in the decision-making process. They assume full authority and responsibility from initiation to task completion. *Democratic leaders* promoted group discussion and decision-making. They encouraged subordinates to express their ideas and make suggestions. *Laissez-faire* leaders let the group decide on their own and gave them complete freedom. In other words, they do not provide any leadership at all. Some of the implications of the research were that of the three styles of leadership, subordinates preferred democratic style the best. They also preferred laissez-faire leadership style over the authoritarian one. Authoritarian leaders receive aggressive or apathetic behavior from their subordinates. Productivity was slightly higher under the authoritarian leader than under the democratic one. However, it turned out to be the lowest under the laissez-faire leader's supervision (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996).

#### **2.2.2.3 The Ohio State Studies**

The Ohio State Leadership studies represents an interdisciplinary undertaking. Psychologists, sociologists and economists were the major contributors. Not all projects used the same methods to measure leadership behavior, but The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

This questionnaire has been used in order to study the leadership behaviors of commanders, and crew members of bomber crews in the Department of the Air Force, commissioned officers, non-commissioned personnel and civilian administrators in the Department of the Navy, foremen in a manufacturing plant, executives in regional cooperative associations, college administrators, school superintendents, principals and teachers, leaders in a wide variety of student and civilian groups and organizations (Stodgill & Coons, 1957).

The question of how a leader behaves was an important motive which urged the researchers to develop a method. The way a leader carries out activities had become the major core of interest common to all individual research activities of the staff members. Therefore, it was decided to make the development of a leader description instrument which aimed at identifying the methods and strategies of a leader (Hemphill & Coons, 1957).

After an extensive factor analyses of all the items in The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, two scores were obtained: *Consideration* refers to behavior on the part of a leader which is characterized by warm and friendly relations with the group members and concern for the welfare of the group. *Initiating structure* also refers to activities on the part of a leader that introduce new ways of doing things, and new procedures for solving group problems (Hemphill, 1957).

Halpin (cited in Hoy & Miskel, 1991) contends that initiating structure represents any leader behavior that clearly outlines the relationship between the leader and the subordinates establishing defined patterns of the organization, channels of communication, and procedures at the same time. However, consideration reflects leader behavior that shows friendship, trust, warmth, interest, and respect.

#### **2.2.2.4 University of Michigan Studies**

Katz and Kahn (1966) consider leadership to be over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directiveness of the organization as an organization



consists of human beings in positions of authority and power rather than computers. In terms of the differences between the cognitive orientation and affective style of the leader, there are two basic dimensions of the leader follower relationship which are task direction and socio-economic supportiveness.

There are two distinct styles of leadership: *Production-oriented* and *Employee-centered* which are at opposite ends of the same continuum. Production-oriented leaders valued mission or task accomplishment and the technical aspects of the job. Employee-centered leaders delegated decision-making and assist followers in satisfying their needs in a supportive work environment. (Hoy & Miskel, 1991).

In terms of effectiveness, a leader who successfully integrates primary and secondary relationships within the organization is the best. Primary relationships refer to face to face interaction and tend to be person specific such as relationships in the families or among friends whereas secondary relations refer to interpersonal relationships required by organizational role such as in the case of division of labor. Thus, a successful leader integrates organizational requirements with the needs of persons and he does this in ways which are not damaging to the organization, but enhancing it. The leader achieves this through promoting group loyalty and showing care for persons as persons (Katz & Kahn, 1966).

#### **2.2.2.5 The Managerial Grid**

The Managerial Grid or recently called as The Leadership Grid is a framework to classify leadership styles that focus on a leader's concern for task accomplishment and people at the same time. *Concern for production* involves results, the bottom line, performance, mission, and profits. *Concern for people* involves group members and co-workers.

Each of these concerns are in varying degrees along a continuum from 1 to 9. Leaders can integrate their concerns for people with production to be *opportunistic* or *paternalistic/maternalistic*.

The opportunistic leader moves to any Grid style needed to achieve personal gain and self-promotion, but the paternalistic/maternalistic adopts the high 9 level of concern from 9,1 and 1,9 in order to create a combined style of monitoring parent-like behavior. On the Grid, a 9,9 style (team management) is desirable in that it results in high productivity, satisfaction, and creativity (DuBrin, 1997).

### **2.2.3 Contingency Theories of Leadership**

The contingency view of leadership emerged from systems theory and its impact on organizational and administrative theory. According to this model, specific leader behaviors relate to group performance and satisfaction. In order to achieve this, certain variables interact with each other such as the leader himself, the position he holds, group members, internal, and external environment of the organization. A successful match between the leader and the group's performance and satisfaction is "contingent" upon these variables. Three situational variables intervene between the leader's style and effectiveness which are leader-member relations, task structure, and power position. Groups are classified as either favorable or unfavorable based on this criteria (Monahan & Hengst, 1982).

#### **2.2.3.1 Fiedler's Contingency Model**

Fiedler (1967) claims that if organizational performance is to be improved, we must cope not only with the leader's style but also with the situational factors which influence him/her. Organizational performance can be improved either by the leader's fit to the situation or the situation's fit to the leader. Fiedler (1961) also states that leadership traits, if exist at all, would be exposed to many outside effects.

Therefore, they are difficult to identify. He argues that a variety of causes may force a man to become a leader, many of which are totally unrelated to personality attributes one of which is inheritance of leadership.

He suggests that dealing with leadership effectiveness would be more logical and beneficial on the grounds that the ability to motivate other people may well be dependent upon one or more personality traits. A leader is effective to the extent to which he renders his group more productive.

Thus, a leadership effectiveness trait can be termed as a consistent and measurable personality attribute which separates effective leaders from ineffective ones. However, the behavior related with these traits will reveal itself only under appropriate conditions.

Fiedler also developed a semantic differentiating instrument through which the leader rated the co-worker with whom he worked least well called *Least Preferred Co-worker Questionnaire* (LPC). Leaders who rated their least preferred co-worker positively and favorably were classified as “relationship motivated” and those who rated their least preferred co-worker negatively and unfavorably were defined as “task motivated” ( Monahan & Hengst, 1982).

*Cognitive Resource Theory is an updated version of Fiedler’s contingency theory. According to this theory, cognitive resources are abilities and a leader’s directive or non-directive behavior. Directiveness is most helpful when the leader is competent, relaxed, and supported. When the leader is under stress, experience is more important than ability. There is less leader impact when the group support is low. When the leader is non-directive, group member ability becomes the most important component and there is strong support from the group members (Schermerhorn, Hunt & Osborn, 1994).*

### **2.2.3.2 Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Theory**

According to this approach, leadership is the process of influencing an individual’s or a groups activities in their efforts to goal achievement in a given situation. From this definition of leadership, it can be understood that the leadership process is a function of the leader, the follower, and the situation which can be formulated as follows:  $L = f(l, f, s)$ .

The focus of the situational approach to leadership is on observed behavior, not on any hypothetical inborn or acquired ability or potential for leadership. Utmost importance is attached to the behavior of leaders, their group members (followers) and various situations. Thus, training individuals in adapting styles of leader behavior to varying situations is of prime importance. Therefore, through education, training and development most people can increase their effectiveness in leadership roles. By observing frequency or infrequency of certain leader behavior in numerous types of situations, theoretical models can be developed so as to aid a leader to adopt the most appropriate leader behavior for the present situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969).

This model claims that the most effective leadership style is contingent upon the readiness level of the group members. It has two components: Ability refers to the skill, knowledge and experience an individual or group brings to a particular task and willingness refers to confidence, motivation, and commitment an individual or group has in order to achieve a specific task.

The crucial aspect of situational leadership theory is that a leader should depend more on relationship behavior and less on task behavior as readiness level of the group members increases. Minimum of task and relationship behavior is required when a group member is very ready (DuBrin, 1995).

### **2.2.3.3 Leader Member Exchange Model (Vertical Dyad Exchange Model)**

This model developed by George Graen and his followers challenges the well-established assumption that leadership behavior is consistent. It proposes that a leader might be caring and considerate toward a team member yet uncaring and strict toward another (DuBrin, 1997).

Each of these pairs of relationships or dyads must be evaluated in terms of whether the group member is “in” or “out” with the leader. The leader’s first impression of a group member’s competency has a strong impact of the group member’s belonging to the in-group or the out-group. In-group members have similar values and attitudes with the leader. However, out-group members do not have much in

common with the leader and act somewhat detached from him. In-group members can become a part of a smooth functioning team whereas out-group members are unlikely to achieve good teamwork (DuBrin, 1997).

#### **2.2.3.4 House's Path-Goal Theory**

Path-goal theory focuses on how leaders influence followers' expectations. Robert House, the originator of the theory, proposes a model in which leader behavior is acceptable when employees regard it as a source of satisfaction (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1995). In addition to this, leader behavior is motivational when it eliminates factors that hinder goal accomplishment; provides guidance and support to the employees, and grants meaningful rewards in return for success. House claims that the leader should stay on the right path to achieve challenging goals. In contrast to Fiedler, who supports that leaders have one dominant leadership style, House believes that leaders can display more than one.

Directive leadership is providing guidance to employees about the task to be accomplished and ways to do it. Supportive leadership is being friendly, approachable, and concerned for the well-being and needs of the employees. Participative leadership is collaborating with the employees and taking their ideas into consideration during the decision-making process. Achievement-oriented leadership is setting high standards and challenging goals for the employees by encouraging them to perform at their highest level (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1995).

#### **2.2.3.5 Leader Participation Model**

Leader Participation Model is based on five modes of decision-making, which ranged from highly autocratic to fully consultative. The effectiveness of a mode depended upon several contingent factors which can be summed up as information sufficiency, structure of the problem, and subordinate attitudes and relationship with the leader (Sinha, 1995).

This theory is normative in nature as it prescribes a set of rules to determine the form and amount of participative decision making in different situations. The model was composed of a complex decision making tree involving seven contingencies whose

relevance can be assessed by answering “Yes” or “No” questions and five alternative leadership styles. The model was revised by expanding the contingency variables to twelve, ten of which are answered along a five-point scale.

This model indicates that leadership studies should be geared towards the situation not the leader. It is probably more sensible to talk about participative and autocratic situations than leaders who possess these characteristics as leader behavior alters depending on the situation and a leader can adjust his or her style to different situations ( Robbins, 1998).

#### **2.2.4 Recent Approaches to Leadership**

In this section, the theories developed to understand leadership put aside all the complex and sophisticated explanations about leadership behavior and attempted to examine leadership from the point of view of ordinary and simple people (Robbins, 1998).

##### **2.2.4.1 Attribution Theory of Leadership**

According to this theory, people have hidden leadership theories in their minds about what makes a good leader or, in another words, they have a leadership prototype; an image of a model leader. These implicit theories or prototypes refer to a mix of specific and more general characteristics. The leader is favorable provided that he or she appeals to the implicit theories of the followers.

Leadership is regarded as something to be largely symbolic and in “the eye of the beholder” (Schermerhorn et. al., 1994). One of the most interesting aspects of this theory is that effective leaders are associated with consistency in the decision making phase (Robbins, 1998).

### 2.2.4.2 Charismatic Leadership Theory

Sinha (1995) defines charisma as a “magical aura” which only a few leader may be granted. Max Weber (cited in Sinha, 1995) maintains that there are three bases of authority which are traditions, rights and privileges and charisma which is synonymous with heroism and an exemplary character of a person.

Owing to his character, strength and skill, super human qualities are attributed to a leader who saves his followers from a crisis or a catastrophic event and becomes an idol providing direction and inspiration to his followers.

The charismatic leader attaches utmost importance to his vision, speech, capacity to take risks and above all the emotions of his subordinates (Sinha, 1995). Robert J. House (as cited in DuBrin, 1995) identified nine effects which charismatic leaders have on their followers such as group member’s trust in the correctness of the leader’s beliefs, congruence between the leader’s and the group’s beliefs, acceptance of the leader, affection for the leader, willing obedience to the leader, identification with and admiration for the leader, emotional involvement of the group member in the mission, challenging goals of the group member and belief in the accomplishment of the mission.

Later, these nine effects were statistically clustered into three dimensions: *referent power* refers to the ability of the leader to influence others with the help of his desirable traits and characteristics; *expert power* refers to the ability of the leader to influence others through his specialized knowledge and skills; *job involvement* refers to the ability of the leader to encourage group members toward the accomplishment of the job (DuBrin, 1995).

Bass (1990) categorized charismatic leaders into five types:

*Socialized charismatics*: a leader who is in pursuit of fulfilling the needs of the group members and providing intellectual stimulation to them

*Personalized charismatics*: a leader who offers consideration, help, and support to group members only when it helps to achieve their own goals

*Office holder charismatics*: a leader who owns respect and recognition through the office or status he holds not because of his personal characteristics

*Personal charismatics*: a leader who exerts influence on others owing to his personal traits and skills not his high status or position

*Divine charismatics*: a leader who is believed to be endowed with a gift or divine grace

#### **2.2.4.3 Transactional and Transformational Approaches**

If one attempts to examine transformational leadership theory, it can be clearly seen that it is epistemologically based on positivist/empiricist foundation on which traditional conceptualizations of leadership have been formulated (Allix, 2000).

Burns (cited in Deluga, 1995) holds that leadership can not be separated from followers' needs and goals. Its essence lies in the interaction between the follower and the leader. This interaction takes fundamentally two different forms: transactional and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership occurs when there is an exchange between people which can be economic, political or psychological in nature. The relationship between the leader and the follower is purely based on bargaining and it does not go beyond this.

However, transformational leadership occurs when the leader and the follower elevates one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Carlson (1996) points out that Burns felt that leadership theories developed up to the mid-seventies were lacking ethical/moral dimensions so he elaborated on his exchange theory which maintains that followers play a crucial role in the definition of leadership. This theory is made up of power relations and entails bargaining, trading and compromise among leaders and followers.



This transactional model has a political basis and emphasizes the need to look closely at sociocultural aspects that have an impact on the leader-follower relationships. According to Stodgill (1997) these can be external factors such as the availability or scarcity of resources, changes in the society, and a competitive environment that influences an organization which also in return affects the leadership of the group as well. Transactional leaders encourage subordinates by appealing to their self interest and offering rewards in exchange of work effort which are contingent reward and management by exception.

The former urges the leader to tell the followers what to do in order to achieve a desired reward for their efforts, whereas the latter one allows the leader to interfere with the subordinates' work only when specifications or standards are not met (Hunt, 1991).

Bass (1961) also maintains that individuals form a group for getting reward or avoiding punishment. They are more attracted to the group if they expect more reward or reinforcement from grouping together. Some members will try to change the behavior of others if there are hindrances to rewards or avoidance of punishments. Transformational leaders urge followers to go beyond their self-interests and be concerned about their organization. They help followers to realize and develop their potential. These leaders identify the needs of their followers and then consider those needs to enhance development. They gather their followers around a common purpose, mission or vision and provide a sense of purpose and future direction. Furthermore, they act as role models for their followers and encourage them to question problems that underlie basic assumptions from different perspectives. They want their followers to regard challenges as opportunities and they cooperate with them to elevate expectations, needs, abilities, and moral character (Bass & Avolio, 1997).

In the 1990s Bass and Avolio developed the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) so as to identify four distinct characteristics of transformational leaders, which are called as “4Is”:

*Idealized influence or charisma:* Based on follower reactions and leader behavior. Followers identify with and admire these leaders. Such leaders are deeply respected, have referent power, set high standards and challenging goals for their followers

*Inspirational motivation:* Depends on how much followers wish to identify with the leader. The leader makes use of symbols and images to raise awareness of shared and desired goals

*Intellectual stimulation:* Followers let go of their past. They are encouraged to question their own beliefs, values, and expectations, as well as those of the leader and the organization itself

*Individualized consideration:* Different but equal treatment of the followers. The leader delegates assignments to followers to provide learning opportunities and coaches them if they need it (Bass & Avolio, 1997).

Leithwood (1994) suggests that transformational school leaders adopt a widely shared vision for the school and clarify its meaning in terms of its practical implications and instruction. In addition to this, they make use of all available resources and opportunities to communicate the school’s vision to staff, students, parents and others. They also focus on teachers’ professional goals and if possible align these goals with those of the school.

Moreover, they make use of the school goals in the decision making process. They encourage their staff to be innovative, hardworking and professional and they also search for these qualities when they recruit staff. In terms of administrative processes, they delegate responsibility and power for leadership widely throughout the school by providing teachers with autonomy in their decisions.

DuBrin (1995) states that charismatic and transformational leadership are closely related with each other in literature, but reminds the reader that not all leaders are transformational until they bring about a change in their organizations.

#### **2.2.4.4 Visionary Leadership**

Visionary leadership is the ability to create and express a realistic, attainable, and attractive vision of the future for organizations which grow continuously. Visionary leaders should create inspiring and innovative visions for their organizations rendering them credible in the eyes of the people in the organization at the same time.

Visionary leaders have three qualities, which are related to their effectiveness. First, is the ability to explain and articulate the vision to the others. Second, is to express the vision not just verbally but through the leader's behavior. Third, is to communicate the vision to different leadership contexts. For example, the vision of the organization should appeal to employees in different departments (Robbins, 1998).

#### **2.2.4.5. Educational Leadership Theory**

Sergiovanni (1994) claims that educational administration borrows its fundamental concepts for thinking about the structure and coordination of schools; rules and regulations within a school; leadership and how it works from organizational theory which itself derived from management theory. It adopted such terms as quality, productivity and efficiency and its strategies to achieve them.

Moreover, it has borrowed its theories of human nature and motivation from economics which asserts that human beings rely on self interest and seek to maximize their gains and minimize their losses.

Furthermore, he declares that the ways in which we understand schools and view leadership depends upon whether we regard them as communities (*gemeinschaft*) or societies (*gesellschaft*). In a community individuals relate to each other by intrinsic meaning and significance. There is no expectation of a reward or benefit. However, in a society individuals relate to each other in order to reach some goal or gain benefit. By adopting community as a theory, schools should be restructured not by brick and mortar but by ideas and relationships.

On the other hand Slater, (1995) declares that leadership is rooted in sociology and it has four social paradigms, which are a) structural functionalist, b) political conflict, c) constructivist, and d) critical humanist perspective. From the structural-functionalist perspective leadership comprises a set of measurable skills. Science can aid us to explore leadership and improve our understanding of how it works and how it can be used to promote group performance (Bolman et.al., 1994).

From the political-conflict perspective, leadership is seen as a power relationship between those who are dominant and those who are subordinate. Some people always have more power than others do. Moreover, subordinates think that their superior's power is legitimate. The study of leadership those who adopt the political-conflict perspective is not simply interpreting power structures in society but also studying how educational administration and the organization of schooling relate to these power structures (Bolman et. al., 1994).

From the constructivist perspective, prescriptions about leader behavior are nonsense as any behavior can qualify as a leadership behavior if it meets certain conditions and conveys meaning (Slater, 1995). As opposed to structural functionalist which holds that there is a single reality, a nature which can be discovered and

analyzed in terms of its parts, and working relationships, constructivists claim that realities are multiple, constructed, and holistic (Bolman et. al., 1994).

From the critical humanist perspective, leadership is symbolic and values shape the decision making process (Slater, 1995). Critical humanists are committed to social change. They do not support, like structural-functionalists do, that educational administration research is exempt from values (Bolman et.al., 1994).

Moreover, there are other subcategories of the aforementioned theories. Reductionist leadership theory can be examined under structural functionalism. It holds that there are substitutes for leadership, some of which are outcomes of the socialization process such as experience, education, professional orientation, and incentives. Others have to do with group task and organizational structure such as rules and regulations, division of labor, centralization and decentralization, and spatial arrangements (Slater, 1995).

Attribution theory which is a subcategory of constructivism maintains that leadership, in essence, is not effective but people need to believe in it anyway because they need to believe in something (Bolman et.al., 1994). Actually, it is an anti-leadership theory in that leaders do not actually have so much to do with solving problems for they are themselves surrounded by history, politics, protocol, and their environment. However, people need to feel secure and create meaning in their lives. That is when leaders come in for they provide an explanation for why things happen or fail to happen (Slater, 1995).

Duke (1998) develops a normative perspective about leadership which supports that leadership can not be fully understood unless it is studied within the immediate context in which it is perceived to exist. Furthermore, he asserts that growing interest in how leaders and leadership are perceived urged him to develop an aesthetic theory of leadership which holds that leadership should be thought of as a perception. It has no existence until an observer perceives it.

Therefore, a leader's declaration of leadership by itself is of little value. Meaning should be attached to what a leader does or does not do, who a leader is or not, or what a leader does or does not symbolize.

Ethical leadership, similar to aesthetic leadership theory, also has a normative content and it forms a subcategory of critical-humanism (Bolman et.al., 1994). Calabrese (cited in Slater, 1995) states that effective schools are synonymous with ethical leadership which is concerned with fairness, equity, commitment, responsibility, and obligation.

He maintains that the principals' actions should be regulated by traditional ethical guidelines and integrated with the values of a democratic society. Starrat (cited in Slater, 1994) asserts that school leaders should commit themselves to three ethics: the ethic of critique, caring, and justice.

Feminist theory of leadership can be considered as a sub-category of political conflict theory for it is concerned with power relationships and social change. Advocates of this theory argue that gender is the single criterion for determining superiority and subordination. They claim that women are recruited to lower positions and relegated to lower echelons than men simply because they are women. They suffer gender oppression as leader-follower relationship has always been patriarchal (Slater, 1995).

To some critical-humanists, leadership plays a unique and crucial symbolic role in democracy. That is why democracies are more dependent upon symbolic leadership than are other types of sociopolitical systems (Bolman et. al., 1994). A democracy necessitates citizens with tastes, sentiments, and values, that is why schools should provide the children with a set of experiences that they can both practice and observe democracy (Maxcy, 1995).

Maxcy (1995) contends that contemporary leadership theory is deteriorating and that even experts can not tell the difference between leadership and pure luck. People are undergoing a societal and cultural change so newer metaphors, words, problem solving techniques are needed as the old ones have become futile.

Furthermore, Maxcy criticizes such efforts to frame and label leadership by urging framework thinkers to question the validity of frameworking itself. There are difficulties with the framework thinking and one is the assumption that leadership can be described objectively. Next, is the belief that leadership is a single real phenomenon about which there are different and contradictory views.

Gronn and Ribbins (1996) support Maxcy's criticism against framework thinkers and they suggest that leadership should be studied with the help of a holistic approach. They put forward three types of leadership contexts which are categorical, interpretive and relational.

Categorical conceptions of contexts view leadership phenomena as singular and plural entities like "leader" and "followers", "superordinate" and "subordinate". By the effect of the leader followers change their behaviors and this is expressed in numerical measures as increased level of worker satisfaction, enhanced performance, and the like. Similar to the normative and instrumental approaches of which transformational leadership is a representative of.

By contrast, the interpretive or constructivist approach to context focuses on the lived experience of a situationally real world actors. This perspective regard organization members as dynamic and active entities who interact with time and space through meaningful negotiation. This is reflected in follower centered approaches and attributions of leadership.

A relational conception of context tries to dwell on the particular institutional forms or patterns of leadership dominant in any one culture. It endeavors to provide an explanation for why those forms persist or change through time.

Bolman and Deal (1994) suggest that leadership is inevitably political as the power to get things done is very significant. When various individuals struggle for power to realize special interests, conflict is inescapable. However, political leaders view conflict as a means of acquiring cohesion and unity. Moreover, when public school sector is concerned, Cronin (cited in Bolman and Deal, 1994) states that the public school leader has to be political and creative by building coalitions, negotiating with forces and constituencies of greater power.

Furthermore, Bolman and Deal (1994) claim that leadership is inherently symbolic for leadership is contextual and leaders should have a deep understanding of the cultures with which they are integrated. Effective leaders value symbols and recognize the importance of articulating a vision that provides purpose, direction and meaning to an organization.

Slater (1994) also supports symbolic leadership and develops a counter argument to Maxcy's democracy. Slater thinks that symbolic leadership can remedy two weaknesses of democracy which are bearing a tendency to favor conformity of thought; discouraging critical thinking, and underestimating the power of symbols. He states that symbolic leadership is necessary to articulate values and choices that most people find convenient.

Hallinger and Murphy (1985) also acknowledge the importance of a school's vision. They introduced the concept of instructional leadership which contends that instructional leaders have a vision of a school's desired goals. They articulate this vision through creating a sense of a shared school mission which they communicate to teachers and students. They should emphasize the important aspects of the school's mission when they meet with students, teachers and parents and strive towards building an ownership of it. Furthermore, they should periodically go over and discuss the rationale behind it during the meetings with the school board and other members of the school.

Blase and Blase (1999) inquired the key themes in effective instructional leadership and they had 17 professors from a variety of disciplines in education interview 809 full-time public school teachers through The Inventory of strategies used by principals to Influence Classroom teaching (ISUPICT). Two major themes were identified: talking with teachers to promote reflection and promoting professional growth.

Principals who valued dialog above all encouraged teachers to become aware of and reflect on their learning and professional practice. This theme involves principals' making suggestions, giving feedback, modelling, using inquiry and soliciting advice and opinions from teachers and giving praise.

According to teachers, effective instructional leaders employed six teacher development strategies: 1. Emphasizing the study of teaching and learning 2.



Encouraging collaboration 3. Developing coaching among educators 4. Promoting and supporting redesign of programs

5. Making use of the principals of adult learning, growth and development in every phase of staff development programs 6. Utilizing action research to encourage instructional decision making (Blase & Blase, 1999).

### **2.2.5 Leadership Frames**

Bolman and Deal (1995) attributes human qualities to organizations when attempting to define them as “having huge appetites” and almost consuming unlimited resources but often producing unsatisfying results. Several theories have emerged so as to analyze organizations.

Rational system theorists focus on organizational goals, roles and technology. The fit between the organizational structure and environment is of prime importance. Human resource theorists emphasized the relationship between the people and organizations. Their main focus is to develop the best fit between people’s skills, needs, and values and the organization. Political theorists regard power, conflict, and the distribution of scarce resources as the central issues in organizations. Symbolic theorists, on the other hand, focus on meaning and manager’s abilities to bring about organizational unity through power and rationality (Bolman & Deal, 1995).

One can infer that Burrell and Morgan’s (1988) four paradigms constituted the basis of Bolman and Deal’s leadership frames as Burrell and Morgan (1988) regard those paradigms as ways of seeing the world in a particular way so do Bolman and Deal with the framework thinking.

The functionalist paradigm is concerned with providing explanations of the status quo, social order, consensus, social integration, solidarity, need satisfaction and actuality. It focuses on the effective regulation, maintaining order and equilibrium and the control of social affairs (Burrell & Morgan, 1988). In that respect it reflects the basic assumptions of the political frame which purports that conflict is

inherent in organizations and the main issue is to build negotiation and form coalitions to preserve the status quo (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

The interpretive paradigm tries to explain the nature of the social world through individual consciousness and subjectivity. Social reality exists within the consciousness of a single individual. It is formed by a network of assumptions and intersubjectively shared meanings (Burrell & Morgan, 1988). Similarly, the symbolic frame focuses on meaning, belief, and faith (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

The radical humanist paradigm claims that a human being should be exempt from all the constraints which are inherent in social arrangements and hinder human development. For the radical humanists, human beings can be released from all the spiritual bonds and responsibilities which tie them into existing social patterns and thus realize their full potential (Burrell & Morgan, 1988). Likewise, the human resource frame attaches utmost importance to human needs and interests and tries to make the organization fit its people (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

The radical structuralist paradigm concentrates upon structural relationships within a realist social world. It tries to provide explanations for the basic interrelationships within the context of total social formations (Burrell & Morgan, 1988). Similarly, the structural frame focuses upon rules, policies and standard operating procedures. Organizational problems occur as organizations can not strike a delicate balance between differentiation and integration (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

Bolman and Deal (1991) justify their choice of the label “frames” by saying that frames are windows of the world and they act as filters by letting things in easily while leaving out some others. Also, they report that frames aid us order the world and decide what action to take. They conclude that only when managers can look at organizations through multiple frames they are likely to understand the depth and complexity of organizational life. The following sections will elaborate on each leadership frame in detail.

### **2.5.1 Structural Leadership**

Structural Leadership is based on a variety of core assumptions. Firstly, organizations exist primarily to achieve established goals. For any organization a structural form can be designed and utilized to fit its particular set of circumstances such as goals, strategies, environment, technology and people. Secondly, organizations work most effectively when organizational choices and individual preferences are restricted by norms of rationality. Structure stipulates that people focus on getting the job done rather than doing what they please. Thirdly, specialization entails higher levels of individual expertise and performance. Fourthly, coordination and control are of prime importance for organizational effectiveness. Based on the task and environment, coordination may be achieved through authority, rules, policies, standard operating procedures, information systems, meetings or a variety of informal techniques.

Lastly, organizational problems typically stem from inappropriate structures or inadequate systems and can be solved through restructuring or devising new systems. There are two main issues in structural design : 1) How to divide the work (differentiation), 2) how to coordinate the work of different people and units after it has been divided (integration).

Organizations try to achieve formal coordination and control in two primary ways: 1) vertically, by means of commands, supervision, policies, rules, planning or control systems, 2) laterally, through meetings, task forces, committees, special coordinating roles or matrix structures. Vertical coordination occurs when people at higher levels control and coordinate the work of their subordinates. It is more likely to be important when the environment is relatively unchanging, the task is predictable

and well understood and uniformity is crucial. However, lateral coordination is more informal. It occurs when people at similar levels respond to one another face-to-face. It is more likely to be important when the environment becomes more turbulent, the task is differentiated and the technology becomes more sophisticated.

Structural leaders value analysis and data, focus on the lower levels, set clear directions, hold people responsible for results, and attempt to solve organizational problems with new policies and rules or through restructuring (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

### **2.2.5.2 Human Resource Leadership**

Human Resource Leadership maintains that an organization's most critical resources are people's skills, insights, ideas, energy, and commitment. The human resource frame is based on the following set of assumptions:

Firstly, organizations serve human needs such as physiological, social, self-esteem and self-actualization. Secondly, organizations and people need each other; organizations need skill, energy, and ideas. Similarly, people need work opportunities, salaries and careers. Thirdly, either the organization or the people will suffer when the fit between the people and the organization is poor. As a result, organizations will exploit people or people will find ways to exploit the organizations. Fourthly, both parties will benefit from a good fit between people and the organization, people will find meaningful and satisfying work, and organizations get the human skill and energy that they need. Human resource leaders value relationships, feelings of individuals and try to lead through facilitation and empowerment (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

### **2.2.5.3 Political Leadership**

Political Leadership views organizations as political arenas that accommodate a complex variety of individual and group interests. The political frame is based on the following set of assumptions: Firstly, organizations are coalitions made up of different individuals and interest groups, for example, hierarchical levels,

departments, professional groups, gender and ethnic subgroups. Secondly, there are deeply rooted differences among individuals and groups in their values, preferences, beliefs, information and perceptions of reality. Such differences change slowly, if at all. Thirdly, allocation of scarce resources, which constitute decisions about who gets what, are vital decisions in organizations. Fourthly, power is the most important resource and conflict is inevitable for resources are scarce and there are enduring differences between people.

Lastly, organizational goals and decisions emerge from bargaining, negotiation, and competition for position among members of different coalitions. Different interests and conflict over scarce resources are an indispensable fact of organizational life.

The question is how does each group show its own preferences and use power to get what it wants? Politically, conflict is not necessarily a bad component. The focus here is not on the resolution of it as is often the case in both structural and human resource frames but on their strategy and tactics used to resolve it. Political leaders are advocates and negotiators who focus on processes such as networking, building coalitions and power bases and negotiating compromises (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

#### **2.2.5.4 Symbolic Leadership**

Symbolic Leadership aims to interpret and elaborate on the basic issue of meaning and faith that make symbols very powerful in every aspect of the human experience, including organizations. It is based on the following set of assumptions. Firstly, the importance of any event lies in its meaning. The same events can be interpreted differently by different people for they have a variety of schemas and point of views that they use so as to give meaning to their experiences.

Secondly, many of the most significant events and processes in organizations are difficult to interpret. Thirdly, it makes it harder to use rational approaches to analysis, problem solving, and decision making when the ambiguity and uncertainty is greater. Fourthly, human beings create symbols to overcome confusion, predict events, and provide direction when attempting to cope with uncertainty and ambiguity. Lastly, many organizational events are processes which are more important for what they represent than for what they cause: they are myths, rituals, ceremonies that aid people find meaning and order in their experiences.

Rituals and ceremonies serve four major roles: to socialize, to stabilize, to reduce worries and uncertainties, and to communicate messages to external and internal constituencies (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Deal and Petersen (1994) states that school leaders adopt eight major symbolic roles:

*Historian*: tries to understand the past of the school

*Anthropological sleuth*: seeks to understand the existing set of norms, value and beliefs that define the current culture.

*Visionary*: collaborates with other leaders and the community to define a highly value focused picture of the future for the school which constantly evolves

*Symbol*: conveys values through clothing, behavior, attention, and routines

*Potter*: shapes and is also shaped by the school's heroes, rituals, traditions, ceremonies, and symbols

*Poets*: communicate with powerful words and images invoked from the heart which reflect influential sentiments

*Actors*: act in social dramas, the various stages of activity in the school in the form of a theatre play. School leader may seize such dramas as an opportunity to solve problems and

redirect the school

*Healers*: recognize the difficulty of transitions and plan events

that make the transition a collective experience which brings

people together.

### **2.2.6 Research on Educational Leadership in Turkey**

Previous research about leadership investigated the leadership styles of Turkish educational and industrial administrators (Bircan, 1993). A total of 132 public high school teachers and 100 subordinates who have been working with the same administrators for at least one year participated in the study. To determine the leadership styles, Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was administered to teachers and subordinates. The data obtained from the LBDQ were classified according to the mean scores of administrators on initiating structure and consideration dimensions.

The possible differences between the initiating structure and consideration dimensions of the LBDQ scores of the educational and industrial administrators were also investigated by employing separate t-tests to the mean initiating structure and consideration subscales' scores of the subjects.

The results showed that there was not a significant difference between the initiating structure scores of the educational and industrial administrators. But there was a significant difference between the consideration dimension scores of the two groups. This result indicated that educational administrators emphasized consideration more than industrial administrators did. Finally, it was found that there was not a significant difference between the mean total scores of the two groups in terms of the effectiveness criteria (Bircan, 1993).

Another study attempted to examine the relationship between public and private high school principals' leadership styles and their Type A/ Type B Behavior Pattern (Ergene, 1990). A total of 117 public high school administrators and 117 teachers and 39 private high school administrators and 39 teachers who have been working with the same administrators for at least one year participated in the study. In order to determine the leadership style, Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire was administered to the teachers.

The data obtained from the LBDQ were classified according to the mean scores of the administrators on initiating structure and consideration dimensions. Two way ANOVA and t-tests were used to analyze the data. The results showed no significant difference between the percentage distributions of public and private high school administrators' leadership styles. However, the private high school administrators scored significantly higher in initiating structure dimension than the public high school administrators did, but no significant difference was found between the mean consideration dimension scores of private and public high school administrators (Ergene, 1990).

Another study which made use of the LBDQ investigated the leadership behaviors of the primary school principals and the differences between Level I and Level II primary school teachers' perceptions through assessing their principals. The study was carried out at 17 primary schools in Ankara. 17 primary school principals and 269 teachers of which 129 were Level I and 160 were Level II participated in the study. The results indicated that out of 17, nine primary school principals perceive themselves as belonging to Initiating structure and eight of them perceive themselves as belonging to the Consideration group. All Level I teachers (male-female) have agreed with the perceptions of those principals who regard themselves as representing



Initiating structure. Only Level I female teachers have agreed with the perceptions of principals who regard themselves as representatives of Consideration. This was due to Level I female teachers having spent more time in the school and having had a better relationship with their principals. However, Level I male teachers and Level II female/male teachers haven't agreed with the perceptions of the principals who see themselves as representatives of consideration behavior (Erkuş, 1997).

Çağan (1998) carried out a study so as to determine the perceptions and expectations of primary school teachers towards the leadership and supervision skills of their principals. The study was conducted in 17 primary schools which differ in terms of socio-economic level. The researcher used the cluster sampling technique so as to form the sample out of the population. 124 male and 212 female Level I teachers; 162 male and 245 female Level II teachers participated in the study.

In order to collect data, the researcher used The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and Administrators Supervisory Assessment Questionnaire which was prepared by the researcher. Alpha level for overall questionnaire was between .9128 and .9858 which render the questionnaire a highly reliable measure.

The results indicated that the expectation levels of the primary school teachers related to their principals' supervisory skills are higher than their perception levels. Furthermore, the expectation levels of primary school teachers related to their principals' leadership skills have been found higher than their perception levels. Thirdly, the perception levels of primary school teachers related to their principals' leadership skills are higher than their perceptions towards supervisory skills. Fourthly, the expectation levels of primary school teachers related to their principals' supervisory skills are higher than their expectations towards leadership skills.

Sakin (2000) conducted a study on the symbolic leadership attitudes of the school administrators in Eskişehir. 88 principals and 138 teachers participated in the study in which 30 of whom represent Adalet Primary school and 58 of whom represent Pilot Binbaşı Ali Tekin Primary School. The aforementioned schools differ in their characteristics as this was thought enhance the validity of the results. The Symbolic Leadership Attitudes of the Descriptive Scale (SLADC) was used as a measure and the data were analyzed with frequencies and chi-square test.

The results of the study indicated that both administrators of the two schools have used the same metaphors like *success/victory*, *perfect/complete*, *quality/respect* and *task*. It can be stated that both administrators have shown the same attitudes while explaining the aims of the school. As of the structure of the school, the metaphors they used are like *family*, and one for all, all for one. It can be stated that both school administrators have shown the same attitudes while explaining the structure of the school.

In the communication process inside the school, the metaphors that are used are stated as *friends*, *colleagues*, *daisy flower*, *I have confidence in you* and *Oh! I see*. While explaining the metaphors about relationship between the school and environment, both school administrators used, *our land*, *country/district*. It can be said that both administrators emphasized the importance of the environment on schools. As a result, it can be stated that both school administrators have shown the symbolic attitudes while explaining the school and environment relationship.

Bayrak (2001) attempted to determine the leadership characteristics of elementary school administrators as perceived by principals themselves, classroom and subject teachers. 49 school administrators, 341 classroom teachers and 241

branch teachers in Eskişehir participated in the study. The researcher used The Leadership Characteristics of the School Administrators Questionnaire which comprises of two forms as personal information and leadership characteristics on a 4 point Likert scale. The questionnaire involves items on ethical, visionary, instructional and transformational leadership styles and was prepared and revised with the help of the school administrators, teacher and experts in the field of educational administration.

The results indicated that classroom teachers and subject teachers perceive their school administrators as displaying instructional leadership. However, classroom teachers have higher perceptions than subject teachers on this dimension. Classroom teachers and subject teachers perceive their school administrators as utilizing ethical leadership.

However, classroom teachers have higher perceptions than subject teachers on this dimension as well. Furthermore, classroom teachers and subject teachers perceive their school administrators as representing visionary leadership characteristics.

Lastly, classroom teachers and subject teachers perceive their school administrators as displaying transformational leadership characteristics. However, classroom teachers have higher perceptions than subject teachers on this dimension.

Çalhan (1999) inquired about the instructional leadership of primary school principals as well. The research focused on the primary school principals' instructional leadership behavior in three dimensions: 1) stating the school's mission 2) administering instruction and educational programs and 3) developing a positive learning climate.

In addition to this, the teachers who took part in the survey were grouped according to different variables such as age, gender, their participation in educational seminars and the primary school sectors they work in. Moreover, the noticeable

differences in teachers' views on the principals' performance levels in instructional leadership tasks were studied.

The survey was constructed by the researcher and its Cronbach alpha level is .98. 21 schools were chosen as a sample and the data were collected from 240 teachers working in both level I and Level II sections of those schools. The findings of this research from the point of view of teachers were that the primary school principals have usually conducted the tasks of developing the aims of the school, explaining the aims to the staff, supervising the instruction, coordinating the educational programs, maintaining the instruction time, presence in school, and encouraging students to learn whereas they have sometimes conducted the tasks of monitoring student success, encouraging teachers to work, supporting teachers' professional development, developing and implementing academic standards.

From the point of view of the teachers, the age variable did not cause a remarkable difference in the performance of the primary school principals' instructional leadership tasks. Gender and sector variables had no effect, in their opinion, except on the task of maintaining instruction time, and the variable of the number of seminars participated in by the teachers made no remarkable difference to the principals' performance of instructional leadership tasks, except in the task of developing the aims of the school.

Another study which investigated the instructional leadership behaviors of primary school principals also examined the perceptions of teachers and principals themselves (Akgün, 2001). Data were collected through interviews held with 10 primary school principals and 10 primary school teachers. During the study the snowball and criterion sampling techniques were used. In order to analyze the data, the content analysis method was used.

When the perceptions of primary school principals and primary school teachers were concerned, it was found out that the primary school principals generally fulfill

their duties in relation to their instructional leadership behaviors. However, differences were found between the primary school principal and primary school teachers' perceptions in the following areas: feeling his existence, providing opportunities and means for teachers to develop themselves professionally and developing and enforcing academic standards (Akgün, 2001).

### **2.2.7 Summary**

Researchers have attempted to define leadership throughout history. The trait theorists claimed that leadership ability is inborn. People become leaders for the traits that they own such as intelligence, appearance, language ability, etc.

Behavioral theorists maintained that effectiveness in leadership is directly related to the behavior of a leader. On the other hand, contingency theorists supported that effective leadership is dependent upon the situation and a particular style of leadership is appropriate in some situations but not necessarily all. Recent theories about leadership has dealt with vision and charisma.

Among these recent approaches, transactional leadership suggests that the relationship between managers and employees is based on bargaining whereas transformational leadership supposes that the relationship between the manager and the employee is of mutual trust and characterized by four factors: charisma, inspiration, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation.

In 1991, Bolman and Deal developed frames for leadership. Firstly, the structural frame focuses on the importance of formal roles and relationships. Secondly, the human resource frame aims to make the organization fit its people's needs, feelings and interests. Thirdly, the political frame views organizations as political arenas in which resources are scarce and people compete for power. Lastly, the symbolic frame treats organizations as unique cultures which have rituals, ceremonies, heroes, and myths and it focuses on meaning, belief, and faith. The crucial aspect of the framework thinking is that leaders should know which frame to apply in a particular situation.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **METHOD**

This chapter describes the overall design of the study, research questions, population and sample collection, data collection instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures, and limitations of the study.

#### **3.1 Overall Design of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to identify the leadership styles of public elementary school principals. This study bears the characteristics of a “survey research” as it attempts to unveil the leadership styles of public elementary school principals based on Bolman and Deal’s theory of leadership frames. As in a survey research the researcher is usually interested in how and how much of the responses differ –their variability, how closely some responses are related to others and how responses vary within certain demographic variables or with measures of social, political or psychological variables (Krathwohl, 1998).

Quantitative research methods were employed to carry out the study. They were used to collect information regarding the principals’ self-ratings and the teacher’s ratings through Leadership Orientations Questionnaire. The subjects of this study involve 350 public elementary school principals (1-8<sup>th</sup> grade) and 700 public elementary school teachers. Leadership Orientations Questionnaire, which was developed by Bolman and Deal (1991) was administered as the quantitative measure.

Data regarding the survey were collected at one point in time. The instrument was mailed to randomly selected public elementary schools in Turkey with the assistance and sponsorship of EARGED, Research and Development Unit of The Ministry of National Education.

### **3.2 Research Questions**

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What kind of leadership styles are adopted by the principals of public and elementary schools?
2. Do leadership styles differ in relation to the principals' experience in the field?
3. Do leadership styles differ in relation to the teachers' experience in the field?
4. Do leadership styles differ in relation to the teachers' work experience with their current principals?
5. Do principals consider themselves as effective managers and leaders?
6. Do teachers consider their principals as effective managers and leaders?
7. Is there a significant difference between the leadership styles of female and male principals?

### **3.3 Context and Sample Selection**

This study was carried out in two randomly sampled provinces from seven administrative sections in Turkey which adds up to 14 cities. The subjects of this study included 350 public elementary school (1-8<sup>th</sup> grade) principals and 700 public elementary school teachers.

The number of principals and teachers who participated in the study are as follows:

**Table 3.4.1** Number of Principals and Teachers

Name of the cities	Number of principals	Number of teachers
Ordu	25	50
Samsun	25	50
Niğde	25	50
Çankırı	25	50
Denizli	25	50
Aydın	25	50
İçel	25	50
Adana	25	50
Çanakkale	25	50
Kocaeli	25	50
Elazığ	25	50
Erzincan	25	50
Diyarbakır	25	50
Şanlıurfa	25	50



Total	350	700
-------	-----	-----

### 3.5 Data Collection Instruments

In this study Leadership Orientations Questionnaire developed by Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal (1990) was used to gather information related to the leadership styles of public elementary (1-8<sup>th</sup> grade) school principals.

The instrument was acquired through internet by urging Lee.G. Bolman to send it to the researcher provided that the researcher will send the results and data of the study in return if requested. It has two parallel forms. One for the principals to rate themselves and another in which teachers can rate the principals.

In both versions there are three sections designed for measuring the Bolman and Deal frames. The first used 5 –point rating scales, organized around eight separate dimensions of leadership, two for each frame:

1. Human resource dimensions:

- a)Supportive: concerned about the feelings of others; supportive and responsive
- b)Participative: encourages participation and involvement; listens and wellcomes new ideas.

2. Structural dimensions:

- a)Analytic: thinks clearly and logically; approaches problems with facts and gives attention to detail
- b)Organized: developes clear goals and holds people accountable for results

3. Political dimensions:

- a)Powerful: persuasive; high level of ability to mobilize people and resources; effective at building alliances and support
- b)Adroit: politically sensitive and skillful; a skillful negotiator in face of conflict and opposition

4. Symbolic dimensions:

- a)Inspirational: inspires others to be loyal and enthusiastic; communicates a strong sense of vision

b)Charismatic: imaginative, creative, emphasizes culture and values; models organizational aspirations (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

This section contains rating scales and the items are in a consistent frame sequence: structural (items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29), human resource (items 2,6,10,14,18,22,26,30), political (items 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31), symbolic (items 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32).

Subscales are also organized in a consistent sequence: analytic (items 1, 9,17, 25), supportive (items 2, 10, 18, 26), powerful (items 3, 11, 19, 27), inspirational (items 4, 12, 20, 28), organized (items 5, 13, 21, 29), participative (6, 14, 22, 30), adroit (items 7, 15, 23, 31), charismatic (items 8, 16, 24, 32).

The second section contains a series of forced-choice items. Each item gives four options, and participants must rank them from 1 (most like this individual) to 4 (least like this individual). The third section has two-one item measures: effectiveness as a manager and effectiveness as a leader. This section assesses whether the principals themselves and teachers regard their principals as effective managers and leaders.

Reliability statistics for the English version of the Leadership Orientations was based on 1309 colleague ratings for a multi sector sample of managers in business and education. For section one split-half correlation for structural frame was: .875, for human resource frame: .867, for political frame: .837, and symbolic frame: .882. For section two forced choice items split-half correlation for the structural frame was .644, for human resource frame .755, for political frame .708, and symbolic frame .825 (Bolman & Deal, 1990).

Bolman and Deal (1994) also conducted a cross-cultural study to identify which frames principals use in the United States and Singapore and they used Leadership Orientations Questionnaire to gather information. The results showed that Singapore principals were highest on the structural frame, whereas the dominant frame for the Americans was the human resource. Both groups were rated lowest on the political

frame, but administrators in Singapore were rated much higher on symbols than on politics, whereas the Americans were almost equally low on both.

As in relation to gender differences, which is one of the concerns of this study, in the Singapore sample, there are no significant differences between men and women in their self-ratings. In the American sample women did rate themselves significantly lower on the political frame. Among the American school administrators, women were, on average, rated higher than men on every frame although the magnitude of differences was not large except for the human resource.

In the Singapore sample, women were rated lower than men on structure and higher on every other frame, the differences were small and not statistically reliable. Bolman and Deal (1994) states that the results of their study is a manifestation that two concepts: leadership and management for the school principalship are harder to distinguish as qualities of effective managers and effective leaders overlap.

### **3.6 Piloting of the Data Collection Instrument**

The questionnaire was translated to Turkish by the researcher. In order to assure its validity and reliability, two expert translators and two experts in the field of educational administration reviewed the questionnaire. Then, it was translated back to Turkish by a professional translator and the necessary changes were made.

### **3.7 Data Collection Procedures**

The data for the study were gathered from 350 public elementary school (1-8<sup>th</sup> grade) principals and 700 public elementary school teachers in Turkey. The study was carried out in 2002/2003 academic year.

First, the researcher sent a proposal explaining the aim of the study to the Department of Educational Sciences at The Middle East Technical University which in return was sent to the Ministry of National Education for permission and approval. Then, the researcher also sent the proposal of the study to EARGED so as to request

their assistance in contacting the schools, mailing the questionnaires, ensuring their return. The aforementioned correspondences took place in June 2002 and July 2002.

The data collection was conducted in September 2002 and October 2002 and the results were analyzed in November 2002 and December 2002.

### **3.8 Data Analysis Procedures**

So as to assess the differences concerning the leadership frames that public elementary school principals employ, descriptive statistics and cross-tabulation analysis techniques were used.

### **3.9 Definition of Terms**

**Leadership:** It is an act of having influence on the activities of an organized group in its attempts to set and achieve its goals (Stodgill, 1997).

**Leadership Frames:** Bolman and Deal's (1991) categorization of leaders' views and actions into four frames concerning their leadership styles:

*The structural frame:* it emphasizes rationality, efficiency, structure, and policies.

*The human resource frame:* It focuses on the interaction between individual and organizational needs.

*The political frame:* It deals with conflict among different groups and interests for scarce resources

*The symbolic frame:* It pays diligent attention to myth, stories, ceremony, ritual, meaning, and other symbolic forms (Bolman and Deal, 1994).

**Elementary Schools:** Level of education including the 1<sup>st</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade.

**Public School:** Schools which are under financial and administrative control of the Ministry of National Education.

**School Principals:** Individuals who hold administrative positions in schools.

### **3.9 Limitations of the Study**

The sample of this study is limited to 350 principals and 700 teachers in Turkey. Therefore, the results of this study are limited with the perceptions and experiences of the sampled group.

The forced-choice measure produces sharper differentiation among the frames since it does not permit rating someone higher on everything and this may lead to some differences concerning the scores in Section I and II of the questionnaire.

During the analysis stage the researcher had to perform each statistical analysis technique to three different sections of the questionnaire as each section has different ways of measuring the leadership frames.

Despite these limitations, it should be noted that an educational study of this nature would hopefully contribute to the generation of new ideas and perspectives about educational administration and leadership practices.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **RESULTS**

This chapter is devoted to a presentation of the results of the study which were obtained by analyzing the data in the way described in the preceding chapter. The findings concerning the leadership styles of elementary school principals are presented in two sections. The first section deals with the results related to principals' rating themselves on the Leadership Orientations Questionnaire and the second section presents the results concerning teachers' ratings of principals on the same questionnaire.

#### 4.1 An Overview of the Participants in the Study

350 principals and 700 teachers were asked to participate in this study. No problems were encountered concerning the principals' questionnaires return. However, out of 700 teacher questionnaires, 656 were returned as valid. The distribution of the participants in relevance to their gender is presented below :

**Table 4.1.1 The Distribution of the Participants in Terms of Gender**

	Male	Female	Total
Principal	299(92)	26(8)	325
Teacher	622(93)	34(7)	656
Total	921(94)	60(6)	981

Note: The numbers in parentheses indicate the percentages.

As can be seen from Table 4.1.1, %92 of the principals are male and this renders a comparison between male and female principals futile since a vast majority of the participants are male and an evaluation relying solely on %8 would not be valid and reliable statistically. The distribution of the principals in relation to their work experience is given below :

**Table 4.1.2 : The Distribution of Principals in Relation to Their Work Experience**

Years	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20 -	Total
Male	63	66	59	48	41	277
Female	6	5	2	1	2	16
Total	69(24)	71(24)	61(21)	49(17)	43 (15)	293

Note: The numbers in parentheses indicate the percentages.

As it can be seen from Table 4.1.2 , out of 325 only 287 principals answered questions about their work experience. % 24 of the principals have 1-4 years of work experience. In addition to this, %25 of the principals have 5-9 years of work experience. As a result % 49 of the principals have 1-9 years of work experience.

Table 4.1.3 : The Distribution of Teachers in Relation to Their Work Experience

Years	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-	Total
Male	52	114	80	68	295	609
Female	2	5	2	5	19	33
Total	54(8)	119(19)	82(13)	73(11)	314(49)	642

Note: The numbers in parentheses indicate the percentages.

As can be seen from Table 4.1.3, out of 656 only 642 teachers answered the questions about their work experience. % 49 of the teachers have a work experience of 20 years and above. It can be inferred that these teachers provided valuable data since they had the chance to work with different principals and observed their leadership behaviors for a long time.

**Table 4.1.4** : The Distribution of Teachers in Relation to Their Work Experience with Principals

Years	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-	Total

Male	369	167	33	12	6	587
Female	21	7	2	1	0	31
Total	390(63)	174(28)	35(6)	13(2)	6(1)	618

Note: The numbers in parentheses indicate the percentages.

As indicated in Table 4.1.4, out of 656 only 618 teachers answered the questions about their experience with the principals. %63 of the teachers have 1-4 years of work experience with their principals. Furthermore, %28 of the teachers have 5-9 years of work experience with their principals so it can be said that %91 of the teachers have 1-9 years of work experience with their principals.

## 4.2 Principal Ratings in Relation to Leadership Frames

### Section I

Section I of the questionnaire consists of 32 statements corresponding to four leadership frames each. The principals rate themselves on a 5 point Likert scale. Therefore, the highest point that the principals could get from this section is 40. The scores are classified into four levels as 0-10, 11-20, 21-30, 31-40. With the help of this



classification one can observe which frames the principals rated themselves the highest , the lowest and in between.

Table 4.2.1 presents the distribution of the principals in relevance to leadership frames adopted:

**Table 4.2.1** : Leadership Orientations of the Principals

Level of Scores					
LeadershipStyles	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	Total
Structural	0	11	32	292	325
HumanResource	0	0	9	316	325
Political	1	0	70	254	325
Symbolic	0	3	83	239	325

As it can be seen from Table 4.2.1 , the majority of the principals scored relatively high on the four leadership frames. It can be inferred that the principals employ the four leadership frames according to self-ratings.

It is also noteworthy that the majority of the principals use the human resource frame in their leadership practices. Moreover, %10, %22, %26 of the principals scored between 21-30 on the structural, political and symbolic frame, respectively which shows that the principals do not utilize these aforementioned leadership frames as much as they do the human resource frame.

Principals' use of the human resource frame dominantly shows that they think that the schools must fit teachers' needs as organizations and people need each other

otherwise organizations will exploit people or people will find ways to exploit organizations (Bolman & Deal, 1994). The principals think that they value relationships, feelings of the teachers and they try to lead through facilitation and empowerment. Previous research have also presented similar results about principals' attaching more importance to teachers' needs and skills than the school's goals and achievements (Erkuş, 1997).

It is also arguable whether the principals really do what they think or not. However, they must be aware of the fact that if school leaders are not skilled in human relations, they will perish (Azzara, 2001). Moreover, they may have also wanted to show that they care and consider the needs of others. Furthermore, the principals think that they utilize the structural frame which stipulates that people should focus on getting the job done rather than doing what they please.

Based on the task and environment coordination may be achieved through authority, rules, policies, and standard operating procedures, information systems, meetings or a variety of informal techniques (Bolman & Deal, 1994). This shows that although principals value the human side of the school, they still give a lot of importance to rules, authority and structure which are dominant concepts in eastern and conventional cultures. As in the Singapore example, the frame that the principals use most was the structural one in the study conducted by Bolman and Deal in 1991.

Principals scored relatively low on the political and symbolic frames since they work in public schools which are under the supervision of The Ministry of Education, a highly centralized institution. It is really difficult for the principals to exercise networking, building coalitions and power bases and negotiating compromises (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

Moreover, in a centralized education system the principals do not really exercise visionary leadership which may be an indication of symbolic leadership. Furthermore, it is not feasible to expect them to focus on abstract issues such as meaning, symbols and faith as there is a scarcity of resources and recession in the country which are more serious and crucial problems surrounding every organization and particularly schools in the country.

**Table 4.2.2** : The Relationship of Principals' Work Experience Related to Leadership Frames

Leadership Frames	Experience					
	Level of scores	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-
<b>Structural</b>	0-10	0	0	0	0	0
	11-20	0	0	0	0	0
	21-30	7	12	5	3	1
	<b>31-40</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>42</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Human Resource</b>	0-10	0	0	0	0	0
	11-20	0	0	0	0	0
	21-30	1	2	1	1	1
	<b>31-40</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>42</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Political</b>	0-10	0	0	0	0	0
	11-20	0	0	0	0	0
	21-30	22	11	11	6	7
	<b>31-40</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>36</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Symbolic</b>	0-10	0	0	0	0	0
	11-20	0	0	0	0	0
	21-30	28	20	14	7	4
	<b>31-40</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>39</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>43</b>

Note: The following explain what level of scores represent:

0-10= a low score 11-20= an average score

21-30= a high score 31-40= a very high score

As Table 4.2.2 shows, the more the principals gain experience the less they use the structural frame. Similarly, the more the principals gain experience, the less they use the human resource frame. However, there is a sharper decline in the number of scores obtained when compared with the structural frame. Moreover, principals who have work experience between 1-14 years scored relatively high on the human resource frame. Furthermore, the principals with a work experience of 5-14 years scored high on the symbolic frame as well.

As a result when all the tables in this section are taken into consideration, the principals with a work experience between 5-14 years scored high on the four frames. The decline in the number of scores obtained as the principals gain work experience can be attributed to the phenomenon of being burn-out, in other words, demotivation due to the number of years spent in a particular job. However, it is worth considering the sharp decline in the scores concerning the human resource frame in relation to an increase in the number of years spent in a particular job.

This result can be attributed to the highly centralized Turkish education system which leaves principals with no autonomy in local schools. Principals can not deal with the human side of the school and can not appeal to the needs of the teachers. Moreover, the principals are faced with serious recession and budget cuts in education so they can not find ways to create new work opportunities and enhance teachers' salaries and careers (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

## Section II

The second section of the questionnaire asks the principals to rate themselves from 1(given to the item that defines them the least) to 4 (given to the item that defines them the most). The highest point that a principal can obtain from this section is 24 (See Appendix A. The following are the level of scores : 0-6, 7-12, 13-18, 19-24. An overall representation of the scores obtained from this section are displayed below:

**Table 4.2.3:** Leadership Orientations of the Principals

Level of Scores					
Leadership Styles	0-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	Total
Structural	20	31	166	108	325
Human Resource	9	26	87	203	325
Political	35	183	72	35	325
Symbolic	24	84	140	77	325

As Table 4.2.3 indicates, the principals mostly use the human resource frame followed by the structural, symbolic and political frame. However, it is worth mentioning that the principals scored high on the symbolic frame and very low on the political frame which shows that they do not think that they are being political. This is due to the fact that being political has negative connotations echoing concepts such as power, networking and coalitions when compared with more humane counterparts such as needs, skills and compromise. However, the public school leader has to be political and creative by building coalitions, negotiating with forces and constituencies of greater power (Cronin cited in Bolman & Deal, 1994). This result also shows the inhibiting influence of centralization on principals' political skills.

**Table 4.2.4:** The Relationship of Principals' Work Experience Related to Leadership Frames

<b>Leadership Frames</b>	<b>Experience</b>					
	<b>Level of scores</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<b>5-9</b>	<b>10-14</b>	<b>15-19</b>	<b>20-</b>
<b>Structural</b>	0-6	4	4	4	2	3
	7-12	8	7	3	8	3
	13-18	38	33	34	21	21
	<b>19-24</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>43</b>
	<b>Human Resource</b>	0-6	2	0	1	2
7-12		7	6	5	3	2
13-18		17	20	13	14	13
<b>19-24</b>		<b>43</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>69</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Political</b>		0-6	4	6	10	6
	7-12	45	41	29	31	23
	13-18	16	12	15	9	10
	<b>19-24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>43</b>
	<b>Symbolic</b>	0-6	5	4	4	4
7-12		26	16	6	8	13
13-18		27	32	24	23	16

	<b>19-24</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>10</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>43</b>

Note: The following explain what level of scores represent:

0-6= a low score 7-12= an average score

13-18= a high score 19-24= a very high score

As it can be seen from Table 4.2.4, the structural frame is mostly exercised by the principals who have 1-14 years of work experience. Moreover, principals who have a work experience of 1-14 years obtained the highest level of scores from the human resource frame. Within the first years of their tenure, principals are more energetic and willing to contribute to the empowerment of the school. As the structural frame stipulates, they dwell on establishing a clear organizational structure and setting goals for the school. They tend to coordinate and control the work environment. Furthermore, they are more idealistic and they value the relationships and feelings of individuals (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

The principals with a work experience of 1-14 years obtained scores between 7-12, which is the half of the highest scores that can be obtained from this section. Therefore, one can infer that the more the principals gain experience, the less they use the political frame. In addition to this, principals with a work experience of 1-14 years scored between 13-18 which is relatively high when compared with the political frame (See Table 4.2.9). Therefore, one can infer that principals with a work experience of 1-14 years consider themselves as being more symbolic rather than political leaders. As symbolic leadership is associated with such terms as charisma, being a role model to others and inspiration, principals within their first years of work experience want to impose such concepts on their teachers because effective leaders value symbols and recognize the importance of articulating a vision that provides purpose, direction and meaning to an organization (Bolman & Deal, 1994).



It is also noteworthy that principals who have a work experience of 15 years and above scored low on all frames . This is due to the long period that principals spend in a particular job with no hope for further promotion and change feeling ready for retirement and getting fossilized day by day both individually and institutionally as well. However, Goldman (1998) states succinctly that the values that a leader has in his heart, whether they are stated or not, will be reflected in institutional practice unchecked.

### Section III

**Table 4.2.5:** Principals’ Ratings on Effectiveness as a Leader and Manager

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Leaders	22(7)	1(.3)	1(.3)	41(13)	109(34)	151(46)	325
Managers	23(7)	1(.3)	1(.3)	39(13)	105(32)	156(48)	325

Note: The numbers in parentheses indicate the percentages.

Table 18 indicates principals’ self-ratings about their effectiveness as a manager and leader. The following explain what the numbers in cells represent:

0=no answer                      1-2=ineffectiveness  
 3=average effectiveness        4-5=effectiveness

As Table 4.2.5 shows, 22(%7) principals didn’t provide any data about themselves, 2(% .6) principals think that they are ineffective as leaders, 41(%13) principals think that they are average as a leader, and 260(%80) principals consider themselves as being effective leaders. On the other hand, 23(%7) principals didn’t

provide any data about themselves, 2(% .6) principals think that they are ineffective as managers, 39(%12) principals think that they are average managers, and 261(%80) principals consider themselves as being effective managers. 45(%14) principals' unwillingness to provide data proves that evaluating oneself on effectiveness criteria is still a sensible and delicate issue for some. Only a minority of the principals regard themselves as being ineffective as a leader and a manager. As expected it is hard to downgrade oneself in a profession.

On the other hand, 80(%25) principals think that they need further improvement and professional development in order to become better leaders and managers. Nevertheless, if examined closely the scores concerning principals' effectiveness as a manager and leader are very close to each other , only differing slightly. This may be due to the fact that principals can not distinguish between the concepts of leadership and management so they assign similar values to the items which represent them.

As Bolman and Deal (1994) state that the results of their study is a manifestation of two concepts: leadership and management for the school principalship are hard to distinguish as qualities of effective managers and leaders overlap.

### 4.3 Teacher Ratings of the Principals in Relation to Leadership Frames

#### Section I

**Table 4.3.1:** Teacher Ratings of the Principals' Leadership Orientations

Level of Scores					
Leadership Styles	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	Total
Structural	1	7	93	555	656
Human Resource	1	10	56	589	656

Political	3	12	150	491	656
Symbolic	3	26	165	462	656

As Table 4.3.1 shows, teachers rated principals on the human resource frame the highest which is surprisingly parallel to the principals' self-ratings (See Table 4.2.1). Moreover, teachers rated principals on the structural frame the second highest followed by the political and symbolic frames. It is interesting to note that the teachers rated the principals on the symbolic frame the lowest. This shows that the principals undermine the value of symbols. However, effective leaders value symbols and recognize the importance of articulating a vision that provides purpose, direction and meaning to an organization (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

**Table 4.3.2:** The Relationship of Teachers' Work Experience Related to Leadership Frames

Leadership Frames	Experience					
	Level of scores	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-
<b>Structural</b>	0-10	0	0	0	0	1
	11-20	0	1	0	2	4
	21-30	9	20	16	8	37
	<b>31-40</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>272</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>314</b>
<b>Human Resource</b>	0-10	0	0	0	0	1
	11-20	0	2	1	2	5
	21-30	6	16	8	7	19
	<b>31-40</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>289</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>314</b>

<b>Political</b>	0-10	0	2	0	0	1
	11-20	1	2	4	1	4
	21-30	17	35	21	16	59
	<b>31-40</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>250</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>314</b>
<b>Symbolic</b>	0-10	0	2	0	0	1
	11-20	2	6	6	3	9
	21-30	15	41	19	17	70
	<b>31-40</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>234</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>314</b>

Note: The following explain what level of scores represent:

0-10= a low score 11-20= an average score

21-30= a high score 31-40= a very high score

As Table 4.3.2 displays, teachers with a work experience of 20 years and above think that principals use the structural frame the most as 272 principals scored between 31-40 which is the highest level of score that can be obtained. However, it is also noteworthy that teachers with a work experience of 5-9 years rated principals relatively higher on the structural frame when compared with other periods of teacher work experience. Furthermore, teachers with a work experience of 5-9 and 20 years and above rated principals relatively high on the human resource, political and symbolic frames. This may be due to the fact that more experienced teachers have spent much more time with the principals and have had the chance to observe their leadership styles more than novice teachers have. Moreover, teachers rated principals the lowest on the symbolic frame when compared with the other three leadership frames. However, symbolic leadership is necessary to articulate values and choices that most people find too difficult or uncomfortable (Slater, 1994).

**Table 4.3.3:** The Relationship of Teachers’ Work Experience with the Principals Related to Leadership Frames

<b>Leadership Frames</b>	<b>Experience</b>					
	Level of scores	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-
<b>Structural</b>	0-10	0	1	0	0	0
	11-20	3	3	0	0	0
	21-30	55	27	4	0	1
	<b>31-40</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>

<b>Human Resource</b>	0-10	0	1	0	0	0
	11-20	4	4	0	0	0
	21-30	31	19	1	0	1
	<b>31-40</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Political</b>	0-10	2	1	0	0	0
	11-20	8	3	0	0	0
	21-30	96	34	7	1	1
	<b>31-40</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Symbolic</b>	0-10	2	1	0	0	0
	11-20	15	9	0	0	0
	21-30	104	43	7	1	1
	<b>31-40</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>

Note: The following explain what level of scores represent:

0-10= a low score 11-20= an average score

21-30= a high score 31-40= a very high score

Teachers who have 1-4 years of work experience with the principals rated them the highest on the structural frame. However, the more the teachers work with the principals the less they rated them on the structural frame. The same pattern applies to the relationship of teachers' work experience with the principals with the human resource, political and symbolic frames. Teachers with a work experience between 1-4 years with their principals rated them higher on all three frames when compared with other periods of work experience with the human resource frame being the highest

among all other leadership frames (355 in the level of grades 31-40) and the symbolic frame being the lowest among all leadership frames ( 269 in the level of grades 31-40).

The decline in the teachers' ratings who have a work experience with the principals 10 years and above may be explained by the length of time spent working with a particular principal. The more teachers work with the same principal, the easier they get burn-out. In addition to this, there is a higher chance of observing failures and mistakes in principals' practices. On the other hand, novice teachers are more energetic, idealistic and optimistic when compared with their older counterparts.

The fact that principals do not exercise symbolic leadership as much as they do others proves that they fail to act as a role model conveying values through clothing, behavior, attention and routines (Deal & Petersen, 1994).

## Section II

**Table 4.3.4:** Teacher Ratings of the Principals' Leadership Orientations

Level of Scores
-----------------

Leadership Styles	0-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	Total
Structural	24	74	312	232	642
Human Resource	16	47	180	399	642
Political	53	295	166	128	642
Symbolic	49	226	238	129	642

As Table 4.3.4 shows, teachers rated principals the highest on the human resource frame in this section of the questionnaire followed by the structural frame, the symbolic and the political frame, although differing slightly. This result shows that principals are aware of the fact that leadership is not a matter of getting people to do things. It is rather a matter of getting them to want to do what they should do (Slater, 1995).

**Table 4.3.5:** The Relationship of Teachers' Work Experience Related to Leadership Frames

Leadership Frames	Experience
----------------------	------------



	Level of scores	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-
<b>Structural</b>	0-6	0	3	3	1	17
	7-12	7	7	10	9	40
	13-18	29	55	49	34	144
	<b>19-24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>113</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>314</b>
<b>Human Resource</b>	0-6	1	3	1	2	9
	7-12	4	15	6	11	16
	13-18	15	40	30	19	76
	<b>19-24</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>213</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>314</b>
<b>Political</b>	0-6	2	7	4	9	31
	7-12	26	48	41	26	154
	13-18	16	39	20	18	72
	<b>19-24</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>57</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>314</b>
<b>Symbolic</b>	0-6	1	6	7	8	27
	7-12	22	44	32	23	105
	13-18	23	51	27	23	114
	<b>19-24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>68</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>314</b>

Note: The following explain what level of scores represent:

0-6= a low score 7-12= an average score

13-18= a high score 19-24= a very high score

As Table 4.3.5 indicates, as teachers gain more experience they assign higher grades to the principals on the structural frame particularly the teachers who have a work experience of 15 years and above. Furthermore, as teachers gain more experience they assign higher values to the principals on the human resource frame particularly the teachers who have a work experience of 20 years and above. As teachers gain more experience they assign higher grades to the principals on the political and symbolic frames particularly teachers with a work experience of 20 years and above. As mentioned before, as teachers have more experience they have had the chance to observe various principals thus various leadership styles in return. However, one may say that as teachers gain more experience they think that principals utilize the political and symbolic frames less. Therefore, teachers think that principals ignore one of the basic facts about organizations that conflict is inevitable for resources are scarce and there are enduring differences between people (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

The Relationship of Teachers’ Work Experience with the Principals with Leadership Frames Section I and Section II Combined

**Table 4.3.6:** The Relationship of Teachers’ Work Experience with the Principals with the Structural Frame ( Section I)

Level of Scores					
Experience	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	Total
1-4	0	3	55	332	390
5-9	1	3	27	143	174
10-14	0	0	4	31	35
15-19	0	0	0	13	13
20-	0	0	1	5	6

As Table 4.3.6 shows, the more teachers have work experience with the principals the less they rate the principals on the structural frame. Only teachers who have a work experience of 1-4 years with the principals rate them high on the structural frame.

**Table 4.3.7:** The Relationship of Teachers' Work Experience with the Principals with the Structural Frame ( Section II )

Level of Scores					
Experience	0-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	Total
1-4	11	43	190	146	390
5-9	8	18	87	61	174
10-14	2	3	17	13	35
15-19	0	2	7	4	13
20-	2	1	2	1	6

As shown in Table 4.3.7, the more work experience teachers have with the principals the less they rate them on the structural frame so the same pattern in Table 4.3.6 applies here as well. Moreover, the same thing is true for teachers' ratings of the principals on the human resource, political and symbolic frames. Similarly, the more work experience teachers gain with the principals the less they rate them on the aforementioned frames. Therefore, it is thought that it would be wise not to display those tables due to the need for conciseness and space limitations.

As teachers work more with the same principals and vice versa, both parties may be influenced by each others' attitudes and behaviors. The practices may become routinized and no innovations introduced because of working with the same people, probably in the same environment for a long time. Toward retirement, hopes for further promotion and better payment and fringe benefits are likely to fade as well.

### Section III

**Table 4.3.8:** Teachers' Ratings of the Principals' Effectiveness as a Leader and Manager

	0	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Leaders	29(.4)	8(.1)	4(.1)	72(11)	163(25)	380(57)	656
Managers	30(.5)	4(.1)	5(.1)	54(.8)	129(20)	434(66)	656

Note: The numbers in parentheses indicate the percentages.

The following explain what the numbers in cells represent:

0=no answer

1-2=ineffectiveness

3=average effectiveness

4-5=effectiveness

29(%4) teachers didn't provide any data about principals' effectiveness as a leader, 12(%2) teachers think that principals are ineffective as leaders, 72(%11) teachers think that they are average as a leader, and 543(%82) teachers consider principals as being effective leaders. On the other hand, 30(%5) teachers didn't provide any data about principals' effectiveness as a manager. 9(%2) teachers think that principals are ineffective as managers, 54(%8) teachers think that they are average managers, and 563(%86) teachers consider principals as being effective managers. 59(%9) teachers did not provide any data about their principals' effectiveness as a manager and leader due to the fact that evaluating ones' superiors is a delicate issue and the ratings may be exposed to the principals' eyes. Only 21(%3) teachers' rating principals as ineffective as a manager and leader may be explained by the same fear of the results' being made public. 126(%19) teachers' rating the principals as average leaders and managers shows that there is a need for further development and training.

Teachers' ratings of the principals higher on effectiveness as a manager criteria shows that principals focus on mundane tasks such as allocation of roles, tasks and resources needed to achieve organizational goals rather than more abstract concepts such as vision, culture and interpersonal relationships (Day, 2000).

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter presents the conclusions reached from the results of this study and its implications for practice and research.

Out of 325 principals who participated in this study 299 are male and only 26 are female. Out of 656 teachers who took part in this study 622 teachers are male and only 34 of them are female. %49 of the principals have 1-9 years of work experience and %49 of the teachers have a work experience of 20 years and above. In addition to this, %91 of the teachers have 1-9 years of work experience with their principals.

According to Section I of the questionnaire, principals use the human resource frame dominantly. Principals' use of the human resource frame dominantly shows that they think that the schools must fit teachers' needs as organizations and people need each other otherwise organizations will exploit people or people will find ways to exploit organizations (Bolman & Deal, 1994). The principals think that they value relationships, feelings of the teachers and they try to lead through facilitation and empowerment. Previous research have also presented similar results about principals' attaching more importance to teachers' needs and skills than the school's goals and achievements (Erkuş, 1997). As there is a difference between an espoused theory and theory in-use.

It is also arguable whether the principals really do what they think or not. However, they must be aware of the fact that if school leaders are not skilled in human relations, they will perish (Azzara, 2001). Moreover, they may have also wanted to show that they care and consider the needs of others.

The following table summarizes the existing situation in Turkey about the leadership frames that public elementary school principals employ and the possible reasons for their usage.

**Table 5.1:** A Summary of the Existing Situation in Turkey

<b>Leadership Frames</b>	<b>Existing Situation</b>	<b>Possible Reasons</b>
Structural	High scores obtained from principals self-ratings	Emphasis on rules. Authority and structure in eastern and conventional societies
Human Resource	A sharp decline in the scores in relation to an increase in the number of years spent in principals self -ratings	Higly centralized Turkish educational system
Political	Low scores obtained from principals self-ratings	Negative connotations of being political
Symbolic	High scores obtained from principals self-ratings  Low scores obtained from teachers ratings of the principals	Positive connotations such as being charismatic and a role model  Principals undermining the value of symbols

Furthermore, the principals think that they utilize the structural frame which stipulates that people should focus on getting the job done rather than doing what they

please. Based on the task and environment coordination may be achieved through authority, rules, policies, and standard operating procedures, information systems, meetings or a variety of informal techniques (Bolman & Deal, 1994)

As in the Singapore example, the frame that the principals use most was the structural one in the study conducted by Bolman and Deal in 1991. As in the United states example, the frame that the principals use most was the human resource in the study conducted by Bolman and Deal in 1991.

According to another study which investigates the leadership styles of Turkish educational and industrial administrators through using Leadership Behavior and Description Questionnaire(LBDQ), educational administrators emphasized consideration, which comprises of similar principals with the human resource frame, more than industrial administrators did (Bircan, 1993). Another study examined the relationship between public and private high school principals' leadership styles through Leadership Behavior and Description Questionnaire(LBDQ). The results showed that the private high school administrators scored significantly higher in initiating structure, which comprises of similar principals with the structural frame, than the public high school administrators did (Ergene, 1990).

It is also noteworthy that principals who have a work experience of 15 years and above scored low on all frames . This is due to the long period that principals spend in a particular job with no hope for futher promotion and change feeling ready for retirement and getting fossilized day by day both individually and institutionally as well. However, Goldman (1998) states succintly that the values that a leader has in his heart, whether they are stated or not, will be reflected in institutional practice unchecked.

As to Section III of the questionnaire, the majority of the principals consider themselves as being effective leaders and principals as well expected. Nevertheless, if examined closely the scores concerning principals' effectiveness as a manager and leader are very close to each other , only differing slightly. This may be due to the fact that principals can not distinguish between the concepts of leadership and management so they assign similar values to the items which represent them. As Bolman and Deal (1994) state that the results of their study is a manifestation of two concepts: leadership

and management for the school principalship are hard to distinguish as qualities of effective managers and leaders overlap.

As to Section II, teachers rated principals the highest on the human resource frame followed by the structural frame, the symbolic and the political frame differing slightly. This result shows that principals are aware of the fact that leadership is not a matter of getting people to do things. It is rather a matter of getting them to want to do what they should do (Slater, 1995).

As teachers gain more experience, they assign higher grades to the principals on all four frames. However, the decline in the scores assigned to the principals on the political and symbolic frames is much more remarkable than the scores assigned to the principals on the structural and human resource frames. Therefore, teachers think that principals ignore one of the basic facts about organizations that conflict is inevitable for resources are scarce and there are enduring differences between people (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

The results of Section I and Section II concerning the relationship of teachers' work experience with the principals and the leadership frames that they employ are combined since the results display the same pattern that is the more work experience teachers gain with the principals the less they rate them on all four frames. As teachers work more with the same principals and vice versa, both parties may be influenced by each others' attitudes and behaviors. The practices may become routinized and no innovations introduced because of working with the same people, probably in the same environment for a long time. Toward retirement, hopes for further promotion and better payment and fringe benefits are likely to fade as well.

As to Section III, the majority of the teachers consider their principals as being effective managers and leaders but assigning higher scores to the principals on the



management criteria. Teachers' ratings of the principals higher on effectiveness as a manager criteria shows that principals focus on mundane tasks such as allocation of roles, tasks and resources needed to achieve organizational goals rather than more abstract concepts such as vision, culture and interpersonal relationships (Day, 2000).

## **IMPLICATIONS**

In the light of this study several implications may be mentioned for the field of educational administration.

### **5.1 Implications for Practice**

1. Principals should be encouraged and trained to use not only the human resource and the structural frames but also the political and the symbolic frames as well. As recent research supports that effective leaders and effective organizations rely on multiple frames and perspectives. It can be enormously liberating for administrators to see that there is always more than one way to respond to any organizational problem or dilemma (Bolman & Deal, 1991).
2. Knowing the importance of leadership behavior, by means of this study, would provide an additional evidence to educational authorities in choosing or training their administrators. In-service training and development programs may be prepared in order to improve the leadership qualities of the administrators.

3. Workshops and seminars about the recent trends in management strategies such as TQM (Total Quality Management) and Strategic Planning can be conducted with the aid of the university staff and experts.
4. Principals can be informed about the difference between management and leadership with the help of the aforementioned seminars.
5. The highly centralized Turkish educational system can be moved toward decentralization allowing the principals with more autonomy and freedom in their leadership practices.
6. The length of tenure spent in a particular school may be limited to 10 years as people and practices may easily become routinized and ineffective.

## **5.2 Implications for Research**

1. Additional investigations can be conducted through purposeful sampling which renders a comparison in terms of gender possible.
2. Further studies can be made by including variables such as educational background of the principals, their teaching experience, educational background of the teachers and geographical location of the schools.
3. A similar study may be carried out to investigate the differences between the leadership styles of educational and industrial administrators in terms of leadership frames.
4. This study can be replicated by a larger sample from educational organizations abroad in order to be able to conduct a cross-cultural comparison.

5. A similar study may be done with a larger sample which would enhance the validity and reliability of the conclusions reached.
6. A study which focuses on the number of in-service training programs that the principals participated and their relationship with leadership styles may be carried out.
7. This study can be replicated by administering the Leadership Orientations Questionnaire not only to teachers and principals but to support staff in the school as well.

## **REFERENCES**

Akgün, N. (2001). The Instructional Leadership of Primary School Principals. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.

Allix, N, M. (2000). Transformational Leadership: Democratic or Despotic? *Educational Management and Administration*, 28(1), pp. 7+, Retrieved September 28, 2002 from EBSCO database on the World Wide Web: <http://www.ebsco.com>.

- Azzara, J.R. (2001). The Heart of School Leadership. Educational Leadership, 58(4), p.62
- Bass, B.M. (1961). Some observations about a general theory of leadership and interpersonal behavior. In L. Petrulla & B.M. Bass (Eds.) Leadership and interpersonal behavior. (5-6). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- . (1990). Bass & Stodgill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications. (3<sup>rd</sup>.ed.) New York: The Free Press.
- ., & Avolio, B.J. (1997). Shatter the glass ceiling : Women may make better managers. In K. Grint (Ed.), Leadership: Classical, contemporary, and critical approaches. (203-204). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bayrak, N. (2001). Leadership Characteristics of Elementary Schools Administrators. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Anadolu University, Eskişehir.
- Bircan, B. (1993). A study to compare the leadership styles of Turkish educational and industrial administrators. Unpublished Master's Thesis. METU, Ankara.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1999). Principals' Instructional Leadership and Teacher development: Teachers' Perspectives. Educational Administration Quarterly, 35(3), pp. 349+. Retrieved September 28, 2002 from EBSCO database on the World Wide Web: <http://www.ebsco.com>.
- Bolman, L.G., Crow, G.M., Goldring, E., Slater, R.O., & Thurston, P.W. (1994). Taxonomy and overview. In W.K.Hoy (Ed.), Educational administration: The UCEA document base (p.9). USA: McGraw Hill.

- ., & Deal, T.E. (1990). Leadership Orientations. Retrieved March 18, 2002 from the World Wide Web:  
<http://www.bolmanl@umkc.edu>
- ., & Deal, T.E. (1991). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership. San Francisco: Josey-Bass Publishers.
- . (1994). Looking for leadership: Another search party's report. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(1), pp.77+. Retrieved March 22, 2002 from EBSCO database on the World Wide Web:  
<http://www.ebsco.com>.
- . (1995). Common views of organizations. In J.T. Wren (Ed.), The leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages (390-394). New York: The Free Press.
- Bryman, A. (1993) Charisma and leadership in organizations. London: Sage Publications.
- Burrell,G., & Morgan,G. (1988). Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis. New Hampshire: Heinemann
- Campell, R.F., Corbally, J.E., & Ramseyer, J.A. (1966). Introduction to educational administration. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Carlson, R.V. (1996). Reframing and reform. New York: Longman.
- Cruz, J. (1995). Effective Principals: A Superintendent's Perspective. *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, 15(7), pp. 15 +. Retrieved march, 2002 from EBSCO database form the World Wide Web. <http://www.ebsco.com>.
- Çağan, V. (1998). The Perceptions and Expectations of Primary

School Teachers toward the Leadership and Supervisory Skills of Their Principals. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Osmangazi University, Eskişehir.

Çalhan, G. (1999). Instructional Leadership of Elementary School Principals. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Yıldız Teknik University, İstanbul.

Deal, T.E., & Petersen, K.D. (1994). Shaping school culture. San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Davis, S.H. (1998). The Truth about Visionary Leadership. *Thrust for Educational leadership*, 10(2), pp.9+. Retrieved September 28, 2002 from EBSCO database on the World Wide Web: <http://www.ebsco.com>.

Day, C. (2000). Beyond Transformational Leadership. Educational Leadership, 57(7), pp. 56-59.

Deluga, R.J. (1995). Relationship of transformational and transactional leadership with employee influencing strategies. Leaders and the leadership process: Readings, self-assessments and applications. IL: Austin Press.

DuBrin, A.J. (1995). Leadership: Research findings, practice, and skills. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

---. (1997). Fundamentals of organizational behavior. Ohio: Southwestern College Publishing.

Duke, D.L. (1998). The Normative Context of Organizational Leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(2), pp.165+. Retrieved September 28, 2002 from EBSCO database on the World Wide Web: <http://www.ebsco.com>.

Eagly, A.H., & Johnson, B.T. (1995). Gender and leadership style: A meta analysis. Leaders and the leadership process: Readings, self-assessments, applications. IL: Austin Press.

English, F.W. (1992). Educational administration: The human science. New York: Harper Collins.

- Ergene, T. (1990). The leadership styles of the high school administrators and their relations with their Type A/Type B behavior patterns. Unpublished master's thesis. METU, Ankara.
- Erkuş, R. (1997). The Leadership Behaviors of the Primary School Principals. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1961). Leadership and leadership effectiveness traits: A reconceptualization of the leadership trait problem. In L. Petruzzo & B.M. Bass (Eds.), Leadership and interpersonal behavior. (180-181). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- . (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Goldman, E. (1998). The Significance of Leadership Style. Educational Leadership, 55(7), p.22
- Gronn, P., & Ribbins, P. (1996). Leaders in Context: Post Positivist Approaches to understanding Educational Leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32(3), pp. 452+. Retrieved September 28, 2002 from EBSCO database on the World Wide Web: <http://www.ebsco.com>.
- Gouldner, A.W. (1965). Studies in leadership. New York: Russell & Russell.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J.F. (1985). Assessing the Instructional Management Behavior of Principals. The Elementary School Journal. 86(2), pp. 217-247.
- Halpin, A.W. (1966). Theory and research in administration. New York: MacMillan.
- Hemphill, J.K., & Coons, A.E. (1957). Development of the leader

Behavior Description Questionnaire. In R.M. Stodgill and A.E. Coons (Eds.) Leader Behavior : Its Description and Measurement. Ohio: The Ohio State University.

---. J.K. (1957). Leader Behavior Associated with the Administrative reputations of College Departments. In R.M. Stodgill and A.E. Coons (Eds.) Leader Behavior : Its Description and Measurement. Ohio: The Ohio State University.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1969). Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (1991). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) New York: McGraw Hill.

Hunt, J.G. (1991). Leadership: A new synthesis. California: Sage Publications.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). The Social psychology of organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Kearns, D.T., & Harvey, J. (2001). Redefining public schools: Educational Leadership, 58(4), p. 55.

Kowalski, T.J. (1995). Case studies on educational administration. New York: Longman.

Kratwohl, D.R. (1998). Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Kreitner, R., & Knicki, A. (1995). Organizational behavior. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) Chicago: Irwin.

---. (1994). Leadership for School Restructuring: Educational Administration Quarterly, 30(4), pp.498+. Retrieved March 22, 2002 from EBSCO database on the World Wide Web:



<http://www.ebsco.com>.

Lunenburg, F.C., & Ornstein, A.C. (1996). Educational administration: Concepts and practices (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Maxcy, S.J. (1995). Beyond leadership frameworks. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31(3), pp.473+. Retrieved March 22, 2002 from EBSCO database on the World Wide Web:  
<http://www.ebsco.com>.

Monahan, W.G., & Hengst, H.R. (1982). Contemporary educational administration. New York: MacMillan.

Rebore, R.W. (1985). Educational administration. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Robbins, S.P. (1998). Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies, applications. (8<sup>th</sup> ed.) New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Roberts, H.K., & Hunt, D.M. (1991). Organizational behavior. Boston: PWS Kent Publishing.

Sakin, A. (2000). The Symbolic leadership Attitudes of the School Administrators. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Osmangazi University, Eskişehir.

Schermerhorn, J.R., Hunt, J.G., & Osborn, R.H. (1994). Managing organizational behavior. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). Organizations or Communities? Changing the Metaphor Changes the Theory. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(2), pp. 214. Retrieved September 28, 2002 from EBSCO database on the World Wide Web:

<http://www.ebsco.com>.

Sinha, J.B.P. (1995). The cultural context of leadership and power. California: Sage Publications.

Slater, R.O. (1994). Symbolic educational leadership and democracy in America. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(1), pp.97+. Retrieved March 22, 2002 from EBSCO database on the World Wide Web: <http://www.ebsco.com>.

---. (1995). The sociology of leadership and educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31(3), pp,449+. Retrieved March 22, 2002 from EBSCO database on the World Wide Web: <http://www.ebsco.com>.

Squires, G. (2001). Management as a professional discipline. Journal of Management Studies,34(4), p. 11.

Stodgill, R.M., & Coons, A.E. (1957). Leader Behavior : Its Description and Measurement. Ohio: The Ohio State University.

---. (1997). Leadership, membership, organization. In K. Grint (Ed.), Leadership: Classical, contemporary, and critical approaches (114-115). New York: Oxford University Press.

Tead, O. (1935). The art of leadership. New York: McGraw Hill.

**APPENDICES**  
**Appendix A**

Bu anket sizin liderlik ve yönetim biçiminizi tanımlamanız için tasarlanmıştır. Anket sonuçları kurumunuzdaki diğer bireylere hiçbir şekilde bildirilmeyecektir. Yanıtsız soru bırakmayınız. Herhangi bir sorunuz olduğunda iletişim kurmakta sakınca görmeyiniz. Teşekkür ederim.

Mahçe Dereli Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Tel: 234 10 10/1348 E-mail: [mahce23121976@yahoo.com](mailto:mahce23121976@yahoo.com)

**I. Kişisel Bilgiler**

1. Cinsiyetiniz: Bay  Bayan

2. Mesleki Deneyiminiz: Öğretmenlik: 1-4 yıl  5-9 yıl  10-14 yıl  15-19 yıl  20 ve üstü

Müdürlük: 1-4 yıl  5-9 yıl  10-14 yıl  15-19 yıl  20 ve üstü

**I. Aşağıdaki her ifade için size uygun seçeneği (X) işareti ile işaretleyiniz.**

	Hiçbir zaman	Nadiren	Bazen	Sık Sık	Her zaman
1. Net ve mantıklı bir biçimde düşünürüm.					
2. Diğer insanları büyük ölçüde destekler ve onların sorunlarına karşı ilgi gösteririm					
3. İşlerin yerine getirilmesi amacıyla insanları harekete geçirme ve kaynakları etkili kullanma gibi bir yeteneğim vardır.					
4. Ellerinden gelenin en iyisini yapmaları konusunda diğer insanlara ilham veririm.					
5. Dikkatli planlamanın ve planlanan işlerin zamanında bitirilmesinin önemini vurgularım.					
6. Açık ve işbirliğine dayalı ilişkiler yoluyla güven yaratırım.					
7. Karşıt görüşlere sahip kişileri ikna etmede başarılı ve yetenekliyimdir.					
8. Karizmatik bir insanımdır					
9. Problemlerin mantıklı çözümlenme ve dikkatli düşünmeyle çözülebileceğine inanırım.					
10. Diğer insanların ihtiyaç ve duygularına karşı duyarlılık gösteririm.					
11. İkna kabiliyetim iyi ve etkileyiciğim.					
12. Diğer insanlar için ilham kaynağıyım.					
13. Net, akılcı politikalar ve süreçler geliştirir ve uygularım.					
14. Kararlarda insanların aktif rol almasını ve katılımlarını desteklerim.					
15. Kurum içi anlaşmazlık ve çatışmaları önceden görür ve çözme konusunda yılmadan çalışırım.					
16. Hayalgücüm kuvvetli ve yaratıcıyım.					
17. Problemlere gerçekçi ve mantıklı bir biçimde yaklaşırım.					

	Hiçbir zaman	<b>Nadiren</b>	Bazen	Sık Sık	Her zaman
18.Tutarlı bir biçimde başkalarına karşı açığım ve yardım ederim.					
19. Etki ve güc sahibi baska insanların desteğini kazanmada etkiliyim.					
20.Güçlü ve iddialı bir vizyon ve misyon duygusu aşılarım.					
21.Açık ve ölçülebilir hedefler ortaya koyarım ve kişileri sonuçlardan sorumlu tutarım.					
22. İyi bir dinleyiciyim; diğer insanların fikirlerine ve katkılarına genellikle açığım.					
23. Politik davranma konusunda duyarlı ve yetenekliyimdir.					
24.Mevcut gerçeklerin ötesini görerek yeni ve heyecan verici fırsatlar yaratırım.					
25.Detaya önem veririm.					
26.İyi yapılan işler konusunda insanları takdir ederim.					
27.Yeterli desteği sağlamak için kurum içi ve dışı ilgi grupları (paydaşlar) ile koalisyonlar geliştiririm.					
28.Sadakat ve şevk aşılarım.					
29.Net bir kurumsal yapı ve kurumsal yapıda ast-üst hiyerarşisinin gerekliliğine inanırım.					
30.Katılımı destekleyen bir yöneticiyim.					
31.Çatışma ve muhalafete rağmen başarıya ulaşıyorum.					
32.Çevremdeki insanlar için kurumsal değer ve amaçları kişiliğimde yansıtan model/örnek bir yöneticiyim.					

## II. Liderlik Biçimi

Bu bölümdeki soruları yanıtlarken kendinizi :en iyi tanımlayan maddeye: 4 iyi tanımlayan maddeye: 3 az tanımlayan maddeye: 2 en az tanımlayan

maddeye 1 rakamını vererek her bir maddenin yanındaki boşluğa yazınız.

1. En güçlü yeteneğim:

\_\_\_\_\_ a. problem çözme ve analitik yeteneğim

\_\_\_\_\_ b. insanlar arası ilişki ve iletişim kurma yeteneğim

\_\_\_\_\_ c. politik davranma yeteneğim

\_\_\_\_\_ d. heyecan ve istek uyandırma yeteneğim

2. Beni tanımlamanın en iyi yolu:

\_\_\_\_\_ a. teknik uzman

\_\_\_\_\_ b. iyi bir dinleyici

\_\_\_\_\_ c. becerikli bir politikacı

\_\_\_\_\_ d. ilham veren bir lider

3. Başarılı olmamda bana yardımcı olan en önemli becerim:

\_\_\_\_\_ a. iyi kararlar verebilme

\_\_\_\_\_ b. insanlara yardımcı olma ve onları geliştirme

\_\_\_\_\_ c. güçlü ittifaklar geliştirme ve güç/etki alanımı genişletme

\_\_\_\_\_ d. başkalarını harekete geçirme ve onlara ilham verme

4. İnsanların bende fark ettikleri en önemli özelliğim:

\_\_\_\_\_ a. detaya verdiğim önem

\_\_\_\_\_ b. insanlara gösterdiğim ilgi ve verdiğim değer

\_\_\_\_\_ c. çatışma ve muhalafete rağmen başarıya yeteneğim

\_\_\_\_\_ d. karizmam

5. En önemli liderlik özelliğim:

\_\_\_\_\_ a. net ve akılcı düşünme

\_\_\_\_\_ b. başkalarına karşı ilgili olma ve onları destekleme

\_\_\_\_\_ c. sert ve mücadeleci olma

\_\_\_\_\_ d. hayalgücü ve yaratıcılık

6. En iyi şu şekilde tanımlanabilirim:

\_\_\_\_\_ a. çözümlemeci/analitik

\_\_\_\_\_ b. insancıl

\_\_\_\_\_ c. politikacı

\_\_\_\_\_ d. vizyoner

## II. Genel Deęerlendirme

Kendinizle aynı tecrübe ve sorumluluęa sahip tanıdığımız dięer bireylerle karşılaştırıldığınızda, ařağıdaki cetvele göre deęerlendiriniz ve uygun rakamı daire içine alınız.

1. Bir yönetici olarak yeterlilięiniz:

1 2 3 4 5  
Alt % 20 Orta % 20 Üst % 20

2. Bir lider olarak yeterlilięiniz:

1 2 3 4 5  
Alt % 20 Orta % 20 Üst % 20

## Appendix B

Bu anket yöneticinizin liderlik ve yönetim biçimini tanımlamanız için tasarlanmıştır. Anket sonuçları kurumunuzdaki diğer bireylere hiçbir şekilde bildirilmeyecektir.

Yanıtız soru bırakmayınız. Herhangi bir sorunuz olduğunda iletişim kurmakta sakınca görmeyiniz. Teşekkür ederim.

Mahçe Dereli Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Tel: (0312) 234 10 10/1348 E-mail: [mahce23121976@yahoo.com](mailto:mahce23121976@yahoo.com)

### I. Kişisel Bilgiler

1. Cinsiyetiniz: Bay  Bayan
2. Okul Müdürlüğünüzün Cinsiyeti: Bay  Bayan
3. Öğretmenlik Deneyiminiz: 1-4 yıl  5-9 yıl  10-14 yıl  15-19 yıl  20 ve üstü
4. Değerlendirdiğiniz yöneticinizle ne kadar süredir beraber çalışıyorsunuz: 1-4 yıl  5-9 yıl  10-14 yıl  15-19 yıl  20 ve üstü

### I. Aşağıdaki her ifade için yöneticinize uygun seçeneği (X) işareti ile işaretleyiniz.

	Her zaman	Sık Sık	Bazen	Nadiren	Hiçbir zaman
1. Net ve mantıklı bir biçimde düşünür.					
2. Diğer insanları destekler ve onların sorunlarına karşı ilgi gösterir.					
3. İşlerin yerine getirilmesi amacıyla insanları harekete geçirme ve kaynakları etkili kullanma gibi bir yeteneği vardır.					
4. Ellerinden gelenin en iyisini yapmaları konusunda diğer insanlara ilham verir.					
5. Dikkatli planlamanın ve planlanan işlerin zamanında bitirilmesinin önemini vurgular.					
6. Açık ve işbirliğine dayalı ilişkiler yoluyla güven yaratır.					
7. Karşıt görüşlere sahip kişileri ikna etmede başarılı ve yeteneklidir.					
8. Karizmatik bir insandır.					
9. Problemlerin mantıklı çözümlene ve dikkatli düşünmeyle çözülebileceğine inanır.					
10. Diğer insanların ihtiyaç ve duygularına karşı duyarlılık gösterir.					
11. Olağan dışı bir biçimde ikna edici ve etkileyicidir.					
12. Diğer insanlar için ilham kaynağıdır.					
13. Net, akılcı politikalar ve süreçler geliştirir ve uygular.					
14. Kararlarda insanların aktif rol almasını ve katılımlarını destekler.					
15. Kurum içi anlaşmazlık ve çatışmaları önceden görür ve çözüme konusunda yılmadan çalışır.					
16. Hayalgücü kuvvetli ve yaratıcıdır.					
17. Problemlere gerçekçi ve mantıklı bir biçimde yaklaşır.					
18. Tutarlı bir biçimde başkalarına karşı açıktır ve yardım eder.					



	Her zaman	Sık Sık	Bazen	Nadiren	Hiçbir zaman
19.Etki ve güç sahibi başka insanların desteğini kazanmada etkilidir.					
20.Güçlü ve iddialı bir vizyon ve misyon duygusu aşılar.					
21.Açık ve ölçülebilir hedefler ortaya koyar ve kişileri sonuçlardan sorumlu tutar.					
22. İyi bir dinleyicidir; diğer insanların fikirlerine ve katkılarına genellikle açıktır.					
23.Politik davranma konusunda duyarlı ve yeteneklidir.					
24.Mevcut gerçeklerin ötesini görerek yeni ve heyecan verici fırsatlar yaratır.					
25.Detaya önem verir.					
26.İyi yapılan işler konusunda insanları takdir eder.					
27.Yeterli desteği sağlamak için kurum içi ve dışı ilgi grupları (paydaşlar) ile koalisyonlar geliştirir.					
28.Sadakat ve şevk aşılar.					
29.Net bir kurumsal yapı ve kurumsal yapıda ast-üst hiyerarşisinin gerekliliğine inanır.					
30.Katılımı destekleyen bir yöneticidir.					
31.Çatışma ve muhalafete rağmen başarıya ulaşır.					
32.Çevresindeki insanlar için kurumsal değer ve amaçları kişiliğinde yansıtan model/örnek bir yöneticidir.					

## II. Liderlik Biçimi

Bu bölümdeki soruları yanıtlarken yöneticinizi : en iyi tanımlayan maddeye: 4 iyi tanımlayan maddeye: 3 az tanımlayan maddeye: 2

en az tanımlayan maddeye 1 rakamını vererek her bir maddenin yanındaki boşluğa yazınız. **Her rakamı sadece bir kez kullanınız.**

Yanıtsız soru bırakmayınız.

1.Bu kişinin en güçlü yeteneği:

\_\_\_\_\_ a. problem çözme ve analitik yeteneği

\_\_\_\_\_ b. insanlar arası ilişki ve iletişim kurma yeteneği

\_\_\_\_\_ c. politik davranma yeteneği

\_\_\_\_\_ d. heyecan ve istek uyandırma yeteneği

2.Bu kişiyi tanımlamanın en iyi yolu:

\_\_\_\_\_ a. teknik uzman

\_\_\_\_\_ b. iyi bir dinleyici

\_\_\_\_\_ c. becerikli bir politikacı

\_\_\_\_\_ d. ilham veren bir lider

3.Bu bireyin yaptığı en iyi şey:

\_\_\_\_\_ a. iyi kararlar verebilmesi

\_\_\_\_\_ b. insanlara yardımcı olması ve onları geliştirmesi

\_\_\_\_\_ c. güçlü ittifaklar geliştirmesi ve güç/etki alanını genişletmesi

\_\_\_\_\_ d. başkalarını harekete geçirmesi ve onlara ilham vermesi

\_\_\_\_\_ c. politikacı

4. İnsanların bu kişiyle ilgili fark ettikleri en önemli şey:

\_\_\_\_\_ a. detaya verdiği önem

\_\_\_\_\_ d. vizyoner

\_\_\_\_\_ b. insanlara gösterdiği ilgi ve verdiği değer

\_\_\_\_\_ c. çatışma ve muhalafete rağmen başarıya yeteneği

\_\_\_\_\_ d. karizması

5.. Bu kişinin en önemli liderlik özelliği

\_\_\_\_\_ a. net ve akılcı düşünmesi

\_\_\_\_\_ b. başkalarına karşı ilgili olması ve onları desteklemesi

\_\_\_\_\_ c. sert ve mücadeleci olması

\_\_\_\_\_ d. hayalgücü geniş ve yaratıcı olması

6. Bu kişi en iyi şu şekilde tanımlanabilir:

\_\_\_\_\_ a. çözümleneci/analitik

\_\_\_\_\_ b. insancıl

## II. Genel Deęerlendirme

Yöneticinizi dięer yöneticilerle karşılaştırdığımızda, aşağıdaki cetvele göre deęerlendiriniz ve uygun rakamı daire içine alınız.

1. Bir yönetici olarak yeterlilięi:

1	2	3	4	5
Alt % 20		Orta % 20	Üst % 20	

2. Bir lider olarak yeterlilięi:

1	2	3	4	5
Alt % 20		Orta % 20	Üst % 20	



