

# Relationship Between Implicit Leadership and Proactive Behaviors of School Principals

Sultan Bilge Keskinilic-Kara\* Demet Zafer-Gunes

Faculty of Education, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Küçükçekmece, Istanbul, Turkey

## Abstract

The aim of this research is to define the school principals' implicit leadership theory and to reveal its relationship with the proactive behavior. The study is conducted in Bağcılar and Basaksehir districts in Istanbul and the target population of the research is 153 school principals working in state elementary schools, middle schools and high schools in these districts. Samples not used in the research and the research is conducted on the population. 137 school principals participated in the study. Implicit Leadership Scale is used to determine the theories of implicit leadership of school principals and Proactive Personality Scale is used to determine their proactive personality traits. The study concluded that school principals perceive individuals as leaders who have high moral values, are skillful, sensitive, strong and powerful and who can influence his/her colleagues. Another conclusion of the study is that a low level of significant relationship was found between the personal morals, sensitivity, power and impressiveness factors of school principals' implicit leadership theories and their proactive personalities; and a medium level of significant relationship was found between the skillfulness factor of implicit leadership theories and their proactive personalities.

**Keywords:** school principal, leadership, implicit leadership, proactive behavior

## 1. Introduction

Leadership is one of the prominent concepts in organizations and plays a key role in adapting to the changing environment and becoming the source of change. For this reason, when identifying the definitions of leadership, their different and strong features are sorted. For example, Steingraber (1999) defines leadership as the process of turning the unknown into known and states that leaders are people who are risk takers and who lead the way through rough seas and foggy nights. However, Eren (2001) defines leadership as "the whole of knowledge and abilities that can gather a group of people around specific objectives and mobilize them to achieve these objectives." Definitions of leadership can be diversified, increased but the important point is that in order to mention the existence of leadership some things should be initiated, audience should be influenced by an objective and directed towards that objective.

The statements on leadership are being made for a long time and the scientists' efforts to define and understand it still remains. When it is examined in terms of society, we may encounter different leadership perceptions and expectations. While some cultures look for leaders who patronize the society and expect to be respected, some others want modest leaders who are part of the society (Steers, Sanchez & Nardon, 2012; Bass & Bass, 2008). While leadership differs from culture to culture and from time to time, it also differs from one individual to another. When the differences of individuals and correspondingly of the audiences from each other are taken into consideration, the expectations from the leaders and the leader perceptions differentiate and diversify. For this reason, the recent topic studied on leadership is about what leadership is, how it is improved, how followers perceive leadership and the leader and how they make sense of them, instead of what traits the leader possesses. This approach that looks at leadership from its followers' point of view is called implicit leadership. According to Judge, Bono, Ilies and Gerhardt (2002) who approached leadership in this context, the perception of an individual as a leader in a group is whether or not the individual is regarded as a leader by the others or not or to what extent the person is regarded as a leader. Implicit leadership is figurations that are unwittingly formed by followers and that distinguish leaders from non-leaders (Shondrick & Lord, 2010). According to the implicit leadership theory, a potential leader will only be able to emerge when followers perceive and accept him or her as a leader. This perception-based process will work as long as the potential leader's characteristics and behaviors coincide with the leader image in the followers' minds. The leader prototype or model that followers form in their minds should be understood from the statement of leader image in followers' minds. This model takes form by the individual's experiences gained since childhood and inputs of several other factors (Kenney, Blascovich & Shaver, 1994; Tabak, Kiziloglu & Polat, 2010).

Considering the differences of each individual from each other among the followers, their perceptions towards the leader differ. With the differing perceptions of leadership, people have some thoughts on how leadership should be. These thoughts form the leader model in the individual's mind after which the individual compares the opponent with this model and classifies the opponent as leader or non-leader. (Judge et al., 2002; Offermann, Kennedy & Wirtz, 1994). As the harmony between individuals' implicit leadership theories and the leader's traits increases, leader follower relationships will be established on trust, the motivation level and performance (Lord & Maher, 1991) and the quality of interaction between the follower and the leader will

increase (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005).

When the literature is examined, some studies on implicit leadership theory in Turkey are found. The first study that comes to mind when the subject is implicit leadership is the GLOBE study in which Kabasakal and Bodur (2007), who conducted the Turkey leg of the project, observed in their studies to determine the ideal leader traits that being visionary, being good at human affairs, fairness and determination are among the leadership traits. They expressed the leader that is described as ideal leader in the Middle Eastern countries which Turkey is part of, communicates with subordinates, listens to them, shares information with them, gives the opportunity in order for the employees to express themselves, shows empathy, having good relations. In addition to this, there are also expectations for the leaders to attend to their subordinates' personal problems, participate in social events and create a family environment in the organization, concisely to act as a father and be authoritarian. In a study he conducted, Pasa (2000) came to the similar conclusions. In their study on implicit leadership theory related with administrator and political leadership, Ozalp-Turetgen and Cesur (2010) sorted the most common traits for both leadership types such as being fair, hardworking, honest, trustable, having strong declamation, farsighted, persuasive, cultured, intelligent.

It is possible for the implicit leadership to have antecedent or there may be different organizational behavior variables affected by implicit leadership theory. One of the variables studied frequently in implicit leadership studies has been personality and the relationship between personality traits with leader perception has been revealed in many studies (Erogluer, 2014; Balli, 2013; Campbell, Simpson, Stewart, Manning, 2003; Kickul & Neuman, 2000). Concurrently, studies aimed to explore the variables that affect implicit leadership theory, which are generations (Goktas and Carikci, 2015; Gergen, Green & Ceballos, 2014, Akdemir et al, 2013), individual differences (Burnette, Pollack & Hoyt, 2010), gender (Dural & Bayazit, 2015, Gergen et al, 2014), aggression (Ozturk & Tavas, 2016) and socio-economic level (Kiziloglu, 2011). Assuming that individuals differ by their power to mobilize and influence their environment (Crant & Bateman, 2000) and considering the possibility of relationship between this power and leadership perception, it may be suggested that proactive personality is one of the variables relating to implicit leadership.

Bindl & Parker (2010) defines proactive behavior as the individuals' independent and future-focused acts in an organization that involve changing their environments, situations and themselves. However, Crant (2000) defines it as to taking initiative and changing the status quo to improve the current situation or to create new ones. Bateman and Crant (1993) define proactive people as people with such personality traits that mobilize to make an impact in their environment which will bring change, and refer to people who behave exactly the opposite the proactive people as inactive. Individuals with proactive personality seek opportunities for themselves and attempt based on these opportunities. One of their paramount personality traits in achieving this is being patient. Proactive people seek opportunities to improve the existing situation and what they have and do not wait for the knowledge and opportunity to come (Crant, 2000; Crant & Bateman, 2000). Proactive personality refers to taking an active role such as initiating a change and influencing the environment. The key feature that differentiates the behaviors of individuals possessing this personality trait is their being active and taking the first step, instead of being inactive, in other words, being reactive towards the task.

While proactive personality is one of the important concepts for individuals holding managerial positions, there is a limited number of studies on levels of proactive personality of school principals in Turkey and antecedents or subsequents of proactive personality. Another study in this area that might be considered similar was conducted by Akin (2014) about the relationship between school principals' levels of taking initiative and their self-sufficiency perceptions and reveals the relationship between the proactivity, which is a factor of taking initiative with self-sufficiency perception. Although studies on implicit leadership stated in the previous paragraphs and researches on proactive behaviors reveal some data on leadership perception in Turkey and on levels of proactive personality, no research was found in the literature directly focusing on determining the implicit leadership theory of school principals and on revealing the relationship between implicit leadership and levels of proactive personality. This study is expected to contribute to the gap in the field from this aspect. The implicit leadership theory of school principals may also affect their leadership roles. This study is expected to determine the implicit leadership perceptions of school principals and to enlighten the personal traits of the prospective principals in the National Education organization.

The aim of this research is to define the implicit leadership theory school principals have and to reveal its relationship with their proactive personalities. For this purpose, answers to the following sub problems were sought

1. What are the implicit leadership theories of school principals?
2. Do implicit leadership theories of school principals vary significantly based on age, organization, educational background, number of books read, their self-description as a leader or as an principal and their opinions on leadership?
3. What are the proactive personality levels of school principals?
4. Is there a significant relationship between school principals' implicit leadership theories and

proactive personality levels?

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Research Design

This study is designed using relational survey model which is one of the descriptive methods. Survey model strives to describe the individual or the object that is the subject of the study by its existence in its own conditions. A relational survey design aims to describe the degree of relationship between two or more variables (Karasar, 2004; McMillan & Schumacher, 2010).

### 2.2. Population and Sample

The study is conducted in Bagcilar and Basaksehir districts in Istanbul. The population comprises of 153 school principals working in Basaksehir ve Bagcilar districts, including 56 from elementary schools, 54 from middle schools and 43 from high schools. The research is conducted on the population. All school principals in the target population were delivered the scales by hand, 9 of which were not returned, 7 of which were not analyzed as they were filled out incorrectly or were incomplete. Thus, 137 school principals participated in the study. Accordingly, participants represents %89.5 of the population.

**Table 1.** Demographic Information of School Principals Participated the Study

		f	%		F	%	
<b>Gender</b>	Female	5	3	<b>Organization worked</b>	Primary School	48	36
	Male	131	97		Elementary School	46	33.5
<b>Age</b>	30 and younger	40	29.4		High School	42	30.5
	31-40	65	47.8	<b>Seniority (Year)</b>	1-5	80	58.8
	41 and older	28	20.6		6-10	35	25.7
11-15					11	8.1	
<b>Educational background</b>	Graduate	103	75.7	16 years and older	10	7.4	
	Postgraduate	33	24.3				
	None	9	6.6	<b>One cannot become a leader, one is born as a leader</b>	Agree	70	51.5
<b>The Number of Books Read In One Year</b>	1-5	41	30.1		Disagree	66	48.5
	6-10	21	15.4		Leader	90	66.2
	10 books and more	65	47.8	Principal			
				<b>principals defined themselves</b>			

Demographic features of school principals participated the study provided in Table 1. Accordingly, 36% of the school principals (48) are working at elementary schools, %33.5 (46) at middle schools and %30.5 (42) at high schools. % 6.6 (9) of the participants stated that they haven't read a book in the previous year, %30.1 (41) stated that they read one to five books in the previous year, %15.4 (21) stated that they read six to ten books in the previous year and %47.8 (65) stated that they read ten and more books in the previous year While %51.5 (70) of the participants stated that one cannot become a leader, one is born as a leader, %48.5 (66) of them stated that they do not agree with this statement. While %66.2 (90) of the school principals defined themselves as leaders, %33.8 (46) defined themselves as principals. Other demographic information of participants is provided in Table 1.

### 2.3. Data Collection Tools

Two scales were used to collect data. These are Implicit Leadership Scale and Proactive Personality Scale. Implicit Leadership Scale is developed by Tabak, Kiziloglu and Turkoz (2013). This scale is developed from a study based on data gathered from three different sample groups of participants from various demographic groups and various regions of Turkey and measures the implicit leadership perception. Scale is prepared as a Likert-type scale with scores ranging from 1 to 10. The scale comprises five factors (27 items) as personal morals, skillfulness, impressiveness, sensitivity and power. The Alpha reliability coefficient for these factors were found to be .91 for personal morals, .87 for skillfulness, .79 for sensitivity, .66 for power and .71 for impressiveness. The scale explains 61% of the total variance. Load values of items vary between .47 and .78, and the items related with this scale explain %40 of total variance and Alpha reliability level is .93.

Proactive personality scale is a unidimensional scale designed by Bateman and Crant (1993). It is stated that original version of the scale has been formed as a result of the studies conducted on three different

sample groups for more than three months. Adaptation of the scale into Turkish was conducted by Tosun (2012). It is a 5-point Likert-type scale comprising 17 items. Load values of items vary between .32 and .72, and the items related with this scale explain %59 of total variance and Alpha reliability level is .87.

### 2.3. Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, Mann-Whitney U, Kruskal-Wallis and correlation tests were used in the analysis of the research data. Data was analyzed with the help of the statistics program developed for social sciences (SPSS). The results were tested at  $p < .01$  and  $p < .05$  level. Scores obtained from five-point Likert-type scale. (1.00-1.80) "None". (1.81-2.60) "Low". (2.61- 3.40) "Medium" (3.41-4.20) "High" and (4.21-5.00) "Very High" were considered. Correlation coefficient as an absolute value; 0.00 - 0.29 exhibits "low", 0.30 - 0.69 exhibits "medium" and 1.00 - 0.70 exhibits "high" level of relationship with one another. An absolute value of correlation coefficient suggests a low level of relation if between 0.00 - 0.29, a medium level of relationship if between 0.30 - 0.69 and a high level of relationship if between 1.00 - 0.70 (Buyukozturk, 2009).

### 3. Findings

Implicit leadership perceptions of the participants and values of proactive personality levels are listed in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Descriptive statistics of implicit leadership and proactive personality levels of school principals

	N	$\bar{x}$	SS
Personal morals	136	9.24	1.18
Skillfulness	136	9.10	1.21
Sensitivity	136	8.65	1.34
Power	136	7.90	2.12
Impressiveness	136	7.50	1.87
Proactive Personality	136	3.86	0.48

When Table 2 is examined, participating principals' implicit leadership personal morals factor  $\bar{x} = 9.24$  is found to be at very high level, in skillfulness factor  $\bar{x} = 9.10$  at very high level, in sensitivity factor  $\bar{x} = 8.65$  at very high level, in power factor  $\bar{x} = 7.90$  at high level and in impressiveness factor  $\bar{x} = 7.50$  at high level. Proactive personality levels are seen to be  $\bar{x} = 3.86$  "high" level. When the highest and lowest scores are examined in each sub-segment, the trait school principals expect most from the leader to possess in personal morals factor is trustability and the least expected trait is to gain subordinates' trust. In skillfulness factor, it is seen that the trait school principals expect most from the leader to possess is to take initiative, and the least is being a motivator. When sensitivity sub-factor is examined, it is seen that school principals place emphasis on tolerance most, and the least is amiability. In power factor, the school principals expect most from the leader to be authoritative, and the least is to be knowledgeable in the last sub-factor of implicit leadership that is impressiveness, it is seen that the trait school principals place most emphasis on is strong declamation, and the least is instructiveness.

The results of Mann-Whitney U test related with the implicit leadership perceptions of participating principals and their proactive personality levels with educational background, their opinions on the one cannot become a leader, one is born to be a leader statement and their own self-description types variable are exhibited in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Mann-Whitney U test results on school principals' opinions about sub-factors of implicit leadership based on educational background variable

Factor	Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	U	p
Personal morals	Graduate	103	68.50	7055	1699	.998
	Postgraduate	33	68.52	2261		
Skillfulness	Graduate	103	70.83	7296	1459	.213
	Postgraduate	33	61.21	2020		
Sensitivity	Graduate	103	71.33	7347	1408	.136
	Postgraduate	33	59.67	1969		
Power	Graduate	103	69.14	7121	1633	.736
	Postgraduate	33	66.50	2194		
Impressiveness	Graduate	103	70.30	7241	1514	.345
	Postgraduate	33	62.88	2075		

When Mann-Whitney U test results on Table 3 related with educational background variable are examined, there are no statistically significant variances in the graduate and postgraduate school principals' implicit leadership personal morals factor ( $U=1699$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), skillfulness factor ( $U=1459$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), sensitivity factor ( $U=1408$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), power factor ( $U=1633$ ,  $p>0.05$ ) and impressiveness factor ( $U=1514$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). This finding suggests that educational background variable is not a significant determinant in all the factors of school principals' implicit leadership.

The results of Mann-Whitney U test related with the participants' implicit leadership sub-factors, and one cannot become a leader, one is born to be a leader variable are exhibited in Table 4.

**Table 4.** Mann-Whitney U test results on school principals' opinions about sub-factors of implicit leadership based on one cannot become a leader, one is born to be a leader variable

Factor	Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	U	p
Personal morals	Agree	70	66.01	4621	2136	.435
	Disagree	66	71.14	4695		
Skillfulness	Agree	103	68.88	4821	2283	.906
	Disagree	33	68.10	4494		
Sensitivity	Agree	103	71.40	4998	2107	.373
	Disagree	33	65.42	4318		
Power	Agree	103	68.70	4809	2296	.951
	Disagree	33	68.29	4507		
Impressiveness	Agree	103	77.06	5394	1711	.009
	Disagree	33	59.42	3922		

When Mann-Whitney U test results on Table 4 related with the one cannot become a leader, one is born as a leader variable are examined, there are no statistically significant variances in the school principals' implicit leadership personal morals factor ( $U=2136$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), skillfulness factor ( $U=2283$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), sensitivity factor ( $U=2107$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), and power factor ( $U=2296$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). In the impressiveness factor ( $U=1711$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), there is statistically significant variance between the school principals agreeing the statement of one cannot become a leader, one is born as a leader and principals not agreeing this statement. This finding suggests that one cannot become a leader, one is born to be a leader variable is not a significant determinant in personal morals, skillfulness, sensitivity and power factors of school principals' implicit leadership. In the impressiveness factor of implicit leadership, it is seen that one cannot become a leader, one is born to be a leader variable is a significant determinant.

The results of Mann-Whitney U test related with the participants' implicit leadership sub-factors, and their self-description as a leader or a principal variable are exhibited in Table 5.

**Table 5.** Mann-Whitney U test results on school principals' opinions about sub-factors of implicit leadership based on self-description as a leader or as a principal variable

Factor	Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	U	p
Personal morals	Leader	90	72,64	6537,50	1697	.078
	Principal	46	60,40	2778,50		
Skillfulness	Leader	90	68,49	6164,50	2069	.998
	Principal	46	68,51	3151,50		
Sensitivity	Leader	90	73,78	6640,00	1595	.028
	Principal	46	58,17	2676,00		
Power	Leader	90	75,37	6783,00	1452	.004
	Principal	46	55,07	2533,00		
Impressiveness	Leader	90	70,64	6358,00	1877	.373
	Principal	46	64,30	2958,00		

When Mann-Whitney U test results on Table 5 related with the self-description as a leader or as an principal variable are examined, there are no statistically significant variances in the school principals' implicit leadership personal morals factor ( $U=1697$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), skillfulness factor ( $U=2069$ ,  $p>0.05$ ) and impressiveness factor ( $U=1877$ ,  $p>0.05$ ) In the sensitivity factor ( $U=1595$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) and in the power factor ( $U=1452$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), there is statistically significant variance between school principals' self-description as a leader or as an principal. This finding suggests that self-description as a leader or as a principal variable is not a significant determinant in personal morals, skillfulness and impressiveness factors of school principals' implicit leadership. In the sensitivity and power factors of implicit leadership, it is seen that self-description as a leader or as a principal variable is a significant determinant.

The results of Kruskal-Wallis test related with the participants' implicit leadership sub-factors and age variable are exhibited in Table 6.

**Table 6.** Kruskal-Wallis test results on school principals' opinions about sub-factors of age variable

Factor	Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X <sup>2</sup>	p
Personal morals	30 and younger	40	59.14	2	3.44	.178
	31-40	65	73.03			
	41 and older	31	71.01			
Skillfulness	30 and younger	40	63.95	2	2.69	.270
	31-40	65	74.08			
	41 and older	31	62.68			
Sensitivity	30 and younger	40	59.89	2	3.05	.217
	31-40	65	73.62			
	41 and older	31	68.89			
Power	30 and younger	40	64.03	2	1.60	.447
	31-40	65	72.93			
	41 and older	31	64.98			
Impressiveness	30 and younger	40	67.55	2	1.03	.596
	31-40	65	71.67			
	41 and older	31	63.08			

When Kruskal-Wallis test results on Table 6 related with the age variable are examined, there are no statistically significant variances in the school principals' implicit leadership personal morals factor of all factors. This finding suggests that age variable is not a significant determinant in all the factors of school principals' implicit leadership. The results of Kruskal-Wallis test related with the participants' implicit leadership sub-factors and organization worked variable are exhibited in Table 7.

**Table 7.** Kruskal-Wallis test results on school principals' opinions about sub-factors of organization worked variable

Factor	Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X <sup>2</sup>	p	Significant Difference
Personal morals	Primary	48	70.36	2	2.25	.324	
	Elementary	46	73.10				
	High	42	61.33				
Skillfulness	Primary	48	68.71	2	0.20	.990	
	Elementary	46	68.91				
	High	42	67.81				
Sensitivity	Primary	48	71.06	2	2.59	.273	
	Elementary	46	73.11				
	High	42	60.52				
Power	Primary	48	68.67	2	4.90	.086	2-3
	Elementary	46	77.23				
	High	42	58.75				
Impressiveness	Primary	48	65.84	2	0.84	.654	
	Elementary	46	72.80				
	High	42	66.82				

When Kruskal-Wallis test results on Table 7 related with the organization worked variable are examined, there are no statistically significant variances in the school principals' implicit leadership personal morals, skillfulness, sensitivity and impressiveness factors. In the power factor, there is statistically significant variance between the school principals organizations worked variable. This finding suggests that organization worked variable is not a significant determinant in personal morals, skillfulness, sensitivity and impressiveness factors of school principals' implicit leadership. In the power factor of implicit leadership, it is seen that organization worked variable is a significant determinant. Mann-Whitney U test was conducted on two probable sets of all groups in order to find among which groups the variance occurred, and the analysis result exhibits the variance between middle school and high school principals' opinions. The results of Kruskal-Wallis test related with the participants' implicit leadership sub-factors and seniority variable are exhibited in Table 8.

**Table 8.** Kruskal-Wallis test results on school principals' opinions about sub-factors of seniority variable

Factor	Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X <sup>2</sup>	p	Significant Difference
Personal morals	1-5	80	63,26	3	12.47	.000	1-4
	6-10	35	71,46				2-4
	11-15	11	61,68				3-4
	16 years and older	10	107,55				
Skillfulness	1-5	80	64,96	3	5.74	.125	
	6-10	35	67,93				
	11-15	11	71,27				
	16 years and older	10	95,80				
Sensitivity	1-5	80	62,68	3	11.76	.008	1-4
	6-10	35	70,63				2-4
	11-15	11	68,77				3-4
	16 years and older	10	107,35				
Power	1-5	80	63,21	3	9.24	.026	1-4
	6-10	35	72,49				2-4
	11-15	11	63,95				3-4
	16 years and older	10	101,85				
Impressiveness	1-5	80	66,68	3	3.33	.342	
	6-10	35	68,94				
	11-15	11	61,41				
	16 years and older	10	89,30				

When Kruskal-Wallis test results on Table 8 related with the seniority variable are examined, there are no statistically significant variances in the school principals' implicit leadership skillfulness and impressiveness factors. In the personal morals factor, power factor and sensitivity factor, there are statistically significant variances between the school principals' seniority variable. This finding suggests that seniority variable is not a significant determinant in skillfulness and impressiveness factors of school principals' implicit leadership. In the personal morals, sensitivity and power factors of implicit leadership, it is seen that age variable is a significant determinant. Mann-Whitney U test was conducted on two probable sets of all groups in order to find among which groups the variance occurred, and the analysis result exhibits the variance between the opinions of principals with 1-5 years of seniority, principals with 6-10 years of seniority, principals with 11-15 years of seniority and principals with 16 and more years of seniority.

The results of Kruskal-Wallis test related with the participants' implicit leadership sub-factors and the number of books read in one-year variable are exhibited in Table 9.

**Table 9.** Kruskal-Wallis test results on school principals' opinions about sub-factors of the number of books read in one-year variable

Factor	Groups	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X <sup>2</sup>	p	Significant Difference
Personal morals	None	9	58,11	3	8.68	.034	2-4
	1-5	41	56,43				
	6-10	21	67,43				
	10 books and more	65	77,90				
Skillfulness	None	9	76,61	3	8.35	.039	3-4
	1-5	41	61,84				
	6-10	21	52,26				
	10 books and more	65	76,82				
Sensitivity	None	9	81,11	3	6.45	.092	
	1-5	41	60,54				
	6-10	21	57,17				
	10 books and more	65	75,44				
Power	None	9	78,22	3	2.33	.507	
	1-5	41	61,54				
	6-10	21	67,69				
	10 books and more	65	71,81				
Impressiveness	None	9	63,89	3	2.50	.474	
	1-5	41	64,71				
	6-10	21	61,05				
	10 books and more	65	73,94				

When Kruskal-Wallis test results on Table 9 related with the number of books read in one-year variable are examined, there are no statistically significant variances in the school principals' implicit leadership sensitivity, factor, power factor and impressiveness factor. In the personal morals factor and skillfulness factor, there are statistically significant variances between the school principals' number of books read in one-year variable. This finding suggests that the number of books read in one-year variable is not a significant determinant in sensitivity factor, power factor and impressiveness factor of school principals' implicit leadership. In the personal morals factor and skillfulness factor of implicit leadership, it is seen that number of books read in one-year variable is a significant determinant. Mann-Whitney U test was conducted on two probable sets of all groups in order to find among which groups the variance occurred, and the analysis result exhibits the variance in personal morals factor between the opinions of principals who read 1-5 books in one year and principals who read 10 and more books. In the skillfulness factor, opinions of school principals who read 6-10 books in one year differ from the opinions of school principals who read 10 and more books.



**Table 10.** The Relationship Between School Principals' Implicit Leadership Sub-Factor and Proactive Personality Levels

		Personal morals	Skillfulness	Sensitivity	Power	Impressiveness	Proactive Personalities
Personal morals	Sperman Correlation	.538	.687	.610	.330		.185
	P N	.000	.000	.000	.000		.032
Skillfulness	Sperman Correlation		.644	.484	.349		.310
	P N		.000	.000	.000		.001
Sensitivity	Sperman Correlation			.826	.572		.182
	P N			.000	.000		.034
Power	Sperman Correlation				.590		.148
	P N				.000		.005
Impressiveness	Sperman Correlation						.011
	P N						.897

Spearman's Rank Order Correlation was conducted in order to find as to whether a relationship between school principals' implicit leadership and proactive personality traits exists, and a low level of significant positive relationship was found between personal morals ( $r=0.18$ ,  $p<.05$ ), sensitivity ( $r=0.18$ ,  $p<.05$ ) and power ( $r=0.15$ ,  $p<.01$ ) factors and their proactive personalities; and a medium level of significant positive relationship was found between skillfulness ( $r=0.31$ ,  $p<.01$ ) factor of implicit leadership theories and their proactive personalities. A significant relationship between impressiveness and proactive personality was not found.

#### 4. Conclusion and Discussion

This research is conducted to reveal the relationship between school principals' implicit leadership theories with their proactive personalities. The opinions of principals participating in the research have been found to be at very high level in implicit leadership personal morals factor, skillfulness factor and sensitivity factor; and at high level in power factor and impressiveness factor. In summary, the study concluded that school principals perceive individuals as leaders who have high moral values, are skillful, sensitive, powerful and who can influence his/her colleagues. While the trait school principals expect most from the leader to possess is trustability in personal morals factor, the least they expect is gaining subordinates' trust. In skillfulness factor, it is seen that the trait school principals expect most from the leader to possess is to take initiative, and the least is being a motivator. When sensitivity sub-factor is examined, it is seen that school principals place emphasis on tolerance most, and the least is amiability. In power factor, the school principals expect most from the leader to be authoritative, and the least is to be knowledgeable in the last sub-factor of implicit leadership that is impressiveness, it is seen that the trait school principals place most emphasis is strong declamation, and the trait that is placed least emphasis on is instructiveness. According to the results of GLOBE research, in countries, among which Turkey is part of, power distance and sociability have rather high values based on implicit leadership theories of individuals. In societies with power distance, a leader or a principal is seen as authority figure and in this context authority is promoted. In his study on leadership perception in Turkey, Pasa (2000), similarly determined that the leader is expected to also be authoritative in addition to having strong communication skills, being sincere, being agreeable and compassionate. Likewise, Ozalp-Turetgen and Cesur (2010) identified that a leader is perceived as an individual who is fair, hardworking, trustable, courageous and has strong declamation ability. Generally, this result of the research is an alignment with the other researches in the literature.

Another result of the research is that proactive personality levels of school principals are at "high" level. A research supporting this finding of the present research has been conducted by Akin (2012). Proactivity is examined as the sub-factor of taking initiative in the present study that determines the school principals' initiation and the levels of proactivity of the school principals are found to be high.

Another result of the research is that the implicit leadership factors do not differ based on the educational background variance. According to the result of present research, the research conducted by Kiziloglu (2011) causes a significant variance in educational background of the school principals' implicit

leadership theory. The variance of research results may be based on different participant groups, as well as the fact that the educational backgrounds of present research participants were graduate and postgraduate and the participant group of the aforementioned research comprised individuals from all educational backgrounds.

Similarly, this finding suggests that age variable is not a significant determinant in all factors of school principals' implicit leadership. Although a research directly on age variable and the implicit leadership is not encountered in the literature, it is possible to encounter studies on generations and senses of leadership. In the present studies, implicit leadership theories of baby boomers, generation X and generation Y were determined and various results were obtained from the results of the present study. Based on the researches conducted by Gergen et al (2010), Kiziloglu (2011), Akdemir et al (2013) and Goktas and Carikci (2015), it is determined that individuals' implicit leadership theories differ with respect to generations. The variance between present research findings and findings of studies in the literature may be based on the fact that the majority of the research participants were between 31 and 40 years of age and could be included roundly in the same generation.

Another finding of the research suggests that seniority variable is not a significant determinant in personal morals and impressiveness factors of school principals' implicit leadership. In the personal morals, sensitivity and power factors of implicit leadership, it is seen that seniority variable is a significant determinant.

The school principals were asked whether or not they agree the statement one cannot become a leader, one is born to be a leader and this variable is found not to be a significant determinant in personal morals, skillfulness, sensitivity and power factors of school principals' implicit leadership. In the impressiveness factor of implicit leadership, it is seen that one cannot become a leader, one is born to be a leader variable has a significant determinant. Self-description as a leader or as a principal variable is not a significant determinant in personal morals, skillfulness and impressiveness factors of school principals' implicit leadership. This variable is a significant determinant of the sensitivity and power factors of implicit leadership. The number of books read in one-year variable is not a significant determinant in sensitivity factor, power factor and impressiveness factor of school principals' implicit leadership. In the personal morals factor and skillfulness factor of implicit leadership, it is seen that the number of books read in one-year variable is a significant determinant.

When innovations and different practices are planned in organizations, another way to easily succeed in this is the leaders. It may get easier for the employees to focus on the goal with the leader's initiation and guidance. Based on the researches conducted on implicit leadership theories, Ministry of National Education and Provincial Directorates for National Education must develop executive selection policies in order for individuals who could be perceived and accepted as leaders to take up executive positions.

This study is conducted in Bagcilar and Basaksehir and comprised a limited number of school principals. Further researches may be conducted in a larger population. Proactive personality that may have a relationship with the implicit leadership theories of school principals was considered as the variable; however, different variables relating to implicit leadership theory may be studied.

Detailed information may be gathered through researches designed differently in order to determine the implicit leadership theories of school principals, principals and teachers.

## References

- Akdemir, A., K., Demirkaya, G., Noyan, H., Demir, A., Ağ, B., Pehlivan, C., Özdemir, Ç., Akduman, E., Eregez, G., Öztürk, H., İlksen, E. & Balcı, O. (2013). The investigation of relationship between organizational an investigation of expectations of career perception and change, and leadership style of generation y. *Journal of Economics and Management Research*, 2(3), 11-41
- Akın, U. (2012). Public elementary school principals' taking personal initiative and its relation with their self-efficacy. Ankara University Social Science Institute, Unpublished Doctorate Thesis.
- Akın, U. (2014). The relationship between principals' initiative taking levels and self-efficacy. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 20(2), 125-149.
- Ballı, E. (2013). The effects of personality traits on being perceived as a leader: an empirical study in a private security officer sample. *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(3), 85-94.
- Bass, M., & Bass, R. (2008). *The bass handbook of leadership, theory, research & managerial applications*. 4th Ed. Free Press. New York.
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 14(2), 103-118.
- Burnette, J. L., Pollack, J. M., & Hoyt, C. L. (2010). Individual differences in implicit theories of leadership ability and self - efficacy: Predicting responses to stereotype threat. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(4), 46-56.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2009). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı: İstatistik, araştırma deseni, SPSS uygulamaları ve yorum*. Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.
- Campbell, L., Simpson, J. A., Stewart, M., & Manning, J. (2003). Putting personality in social context: Extraversion, emergent leadership, and the availability of rewards. *Personality and Social Psychology*

- Bulletin, 29(12), 1547-1559.
- Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 435-462.
- Crant, J. M., & Bateman, T. S. (2000). Charismatic leadership viewed from above: The impact of proactive personality. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 21(1), 63-75.
- Dural, U., & Bayazıt, M. (2015). Kadın liderliğine karşı örtük kalıp düşünceler ve örtük önyargılar: Türkiye’de kadın belediye başkanlığı bağlamında karşılaştırmalı çalışma. 23. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı, 656-666.
- Eren, E. (2001). *Yönetim ve Organizasyon Çağdaş ve Küresel Yaklaşımlar*, İstanbul: Beta Basım.
- Eroğluer, K. (2014). An analysis on implicit leadership: the effects of manufacturing sector employees’ personality characteristics on leadership perception. *Ege Strategic Research Journal*, 5(2), 105-147.
- Gergen, E., Green, M., & Ceballos, S. (2014). Generational and gender differences in implicit leadership prototypes. *Business Management Dynamics*, 3(9), 44-54.
- Göktaş, P. & Çarıkçı, İ. H. (2015). The evaluation of generation in terms of political communication culture and leadership. *MAKU İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(3), 7-33.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Iliès, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: a qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(4), 765.
- Kabasakal, H. & Bodur, M. (2007). Leadership and culture in turkey: a multi-faceted phenomenon. J.Chhokar, F.Brodbeck, & R. House (Ed.), *Managerial Cultures of the World: A GLOBE Report of In-depth Studies of the Cultures of 25 Countries*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Karasar, N. (2004). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık
- Kenney, R. A., Blascovich, J., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: Prototypes for new leaders. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 15(4), 409-437.
- Kızıloğlu, A. (2011). Leadership perception among socioeconomic status groups, in the context of implicit leadership theories (Unpublished Master Thesis). Ankara Military Academy Defense Science Institute. Ankara University Social.
- McMillan, J.H. & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry (7th Edition)*. London: Pearson.
- Offermann, L. R., Kennedy, J. K., & Wirtz, P. W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: Content, structure, and generalizability. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 5(1), 43-58.
- Özalp-Türetgen, İ., & Cesur, S. (2010). The comparison of business and political implicit leadership theories. *Journal of Management*, 21(67), 52-66.
- Öztürk, C & Tavas, B. (2016). Examining relationship between aggression levels and perceived leadership of workers in homeland security services, *The Journal of International Social Research*, 9(43), 2092-2097.
- Paşa, S. F. (2000). Türkiye ortamında liderlik özellikleri. Z. Aycan (Ed.), *Türkiye’de Yönetim, Liderlik ve İnsan Kaynakları Uygulamaları*, 225-241.
- Pasa, S. F., Kabasakal, H., & Bodur, M. (2001). Society, organizations, and leadership in Turkey. *Applied Psychology*, 50(4), 559-589.
- Shondrick, S. J., & Lord, R. G. (2010). Implicit leadership and followership theories: Dynamic structures for leadership perceptions, memory, and leader–follower processes. In G. P. Hodgkinson & J.K. Ford (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1–33.
- Steers, R. M., Sanchez-Runde, C. J., & Nardon, L. (2012). Culture, cognition, and managerial leadership. *Asia Pacific business review*, 18(3), 425-439.
- Steingraber, L. (1999). *How to Succeed in the Global Marketplace*. Conn: Duskin/McGraw-Hill.
- Tabak, A., Kızıloğlu, A., & Polat, M. (2010). The concept of implicit leadership in Turkey: content and framework. *Cag University Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(2), 72-86.