



# Teacher Perceptions on Managerial Role Behaviors of School Principals

Nurhayat Çelebi <sup>a \*</sup>, Huriye Sevinç Peker <sup>b</sup>, Gülenaz Selçuk <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Karabük University, Karabük, Turkey*

<sup>b</sup> *İstanbul Arel University, İstanbul, Turkey*

<sup>c</sup> *Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey*

---

## Abstract

Duties and responsibilities of managers in a school to increase the quality of education are often discussed among the trainers. The aim of this research was to reveal the perceptions of the teachers at public high schools on the managerial role and behaviors of school administrators. The research was a descriptive study in the screening model. The study group of the research had 276 teachers working in the official high schools in the districts of Bakırköy and Avcılar in İstanbul. The measuring instrument used in the research was a 30-item Likert-type measuring instrument developed by the researchers. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the scale was .914. T-test and one-way ANOVA were administered to the independent groups. According to the results of these factor analyses, teachers' perceptions about administrators' managerial role behaviors were gathered under four sub-dimensions as "administrator's role and strategies, education-training programs, assessment of teaching and supporting teacher". The findings revealed that the item 'school principals encourage their participation in professional meetings for the training of teachers' had the highest ( $\bar{X}=3.13$ ), and the item "efforts to contribute to improving the quality of education in teaching" had the lowest average scores ( $\bar{X}=2.15$ ). The results of the research also showed that managerial leadership role in education curricula was emphasized but leadership qualities such as rewarding, motivation, cooperation, quality, success related to learning teaching process were weak.

**Keywords:** Role and Behavior; Quality; Leadership; Assessment

---

© 2016 IJCI & the Authors. Published by *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction (IJCI)*. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Organizations should keep up with technological and environmental changes to continue their existence. It is possible to achieve this process effectively and efficiently with the administrators who have the leadership ability. Gaining confidence lies at the

---

\* Corresponding author: Nurhayat Çelebi  
E-mail address: [nurcelebi@marmara.edu.tr](mailto:nurcelebi@marmara.edu.tr)

bottom of leadership (Maxwell, 2010). In addition, altruism and humility are the hallmarks of leadership (Sertoğlu, 2010). Lead administrators can lead their teams by establishing positive relationships with them. Leaders should have the knowledge and vision to look at the activity area, structural and environmental problems of the organizations they are in from different perspectives when fulfilling their duties. In addition, with the belief in self-sufficiency required to cope with possible situations (Selçuk, Aydın & Çakmak, 2018), leaders should have competencies that can influence and drive the team.

Administrators' personal characteristics play managerial roles in organizational success by influencing, directing, motivating people, these roles are crucial for organizations. The developments in administration science have also changed the role of school principals (Peker & Selçuk, 2011). Administrators have managerial roles under three categories: interpersonal roles, informational roles and decisional roles. The interpersonal roles including relations with members of the organization and others are classified as "presidentship", "leadership" and "communication establisher". The roles that administrators are responsible for taking effective decisions and providing the necessary information to their workmates, are informational roles. Informational roles are also categorized as "followership", "informership" and "spokesmanship". Decisional roles are the roles that distinguish administrators from other employees by the selection of the most suitable alternative among the alternatives. Decisional roles are categorized under four categories: entrepreneurship, correctorship, resource allocatorship and arbitratorship roles (Mintzberg, 1973).

The school principal is the leader of the school, who fulfill the goals of the school, maintain the constitution and provide a positive atmosphere. School principal shave important roles in meeting the educational needs of learners in the globalizing world. Administrators are individuals who try to establish and operate schools' policies, procedures, activities, resources, programs, rules and standards to ensure the function of schools without any problem (Buluç, 2013). Administrators have to communicate with all stakeholders inside and outside of the school and respond to their expectations. Since the school is an organization, it is the duty of the administrator to ensure that the organization achieves its goals, to make teachers' working environments suitable for them and to ensure effectiveness in the school (Çetin & Güven, 2015). The school administrator should be a leader who applies what they learn, is able to provide a confident and sincere working environment, pioneers in learning, makes shared decisions, is able to sees the need for innovation and reflects it in the school. In addition to these, the school principal should be a leader who seeks new vision for the school, attempts to present the latest technological innovations to the school, exhibits sufficient flexibility in every subject, accepts the school as a whole and attempts to realize change initiatives (Beycioğlu & Aslan, 2004: 153-173).

Influential school principals have leadership roles such as modeling and exemplifying, creating a shared vision, getting through the process, enabling and encouraging others to act (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). (Sergiovanni, 1984). In addition, the leadership roles of school principals have been categorized as educational, supervisory, organizational and administrative roles (Sergiovanni, 1984). In addition, school principals have educational leadership roles such as defining and sharing school objectives, managing the curriculum and teaching process, assessing the teaching process and students, supporting and developing teachers, creating a regular educational environment and climate (Sullivan & Glanz, 2005). The school principal plays an important role in the formation of the school culture by enabling teachers and students to be connected to the school (Busher & Barker, 2003). In recent studies, there are similar results that school principals should have responsibilities such as the development, planning and evaluation of school education programs as an educational leader (Korkmaz, Çelebi, Yücel, Şahbudak, Karta & Şen, 2015: 246). Litchka and Babaoğlu (2018) found that gender is the determining factor in the perception of male and female administrators' leadership; administrators' leadership differs according to gender. It is stated that female administrators encounter more difficulties than male administrators in recruitment and supervision. It also causes that women leaders show the role of masculine leadership because of the thoughts such as women leaders are not necessary, women leaders can not be strong and decisive.

In the literature, there are studies that show the school administrators' critical role in the improvement of schools and achievement. It is expected that the educational administrator is a person who can carry onward the organization as a leader besides his/her role of planning, coordinating and supervising the managerial processes. Çelebi and Bayhan (2008) stated that are not enough role models, they can not follow innovations and do not develop creativity. School principals as educational leaders, should have an adequate power to perform the best coordinatorship. They should always be the leader with participatory management practices as well as being the initiator of changes towards student and teacher expectations in their schools.

School principals who have leadership qualities, are individuals who act as role models and encourage teachers. The school principal takes force from formal authorities. The legal leader of the school is the sole owner of authority and power. However, as a leader, he has the responsibility to ensure the success of the school and make it permanent (Bursalıoğlu, 2011). For inexperienced teachers who have just started their career, the presence of a working environment, difficulties in conveying theoretical information, etc., causes stress in people. Mentorship is one of the applications that administrators take into consideration in their education organizations, which help newcomers to adapt to the profession more easily and to facilitate their career advancement by their more experienced colleagues (Bakıoğlu, 2013; Topçuoğlu, 2010; Yıldırım & Şerefhanıoğlu, 2014). Schools are not only oriented towards education now, they should also be open to

the collective and emotional side of the student, accept social diversity, have a high awareness of technology, protect own sentimental value according to the society by improving this value, cooperate with their workers, teach democracy, be democratic in education, be ready for the competitive environment of today's world, resist the harmful effects of the external environment without detaching itself from the concrete side of life and question its own structure while performing all these activities (Beycioğlu & Aslan, 2010: 153-173).

School principals should find ways to maximize teachers' efficiency by using motivation tools while respecting individual differences among teachers. Fair and reliable criteria should be developed for the analysis of teachers' performance; better opportunities should be created for their professional progress (Korkmaz, Çelebi, Yücel et al., 2015). In addition, the policies applied by administrators should cover the expectations and be encouraging. These control policies and practices such as "job forms, legislations and rules, job description and expectations", "individual leadership forms, motivational information and human relations skill", "professionalism, experiences, teaching art knowledge, research and personal expertise", "ethics, necessity because of sharing of values in a wide range of ways, forms of opinions and ideals", are essential resources in which administrators meet on a common ground (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007).

Teddle and Reynolds (2000) summarized the effective leadership characteristics of school administrators as follows: (1) A focus upon learning that involved: Focusing on academic outcomes and maximized learning time. (2) A positive school culture that involved: Shared vision, an orderly climate, and positive reinforcement. (3) High expectations of students and staff. (4) Monitoring progress at school, classroom, and student levels. (5) Involving parents through: Buffering negative influences and promoting positive interactions. (6) Generating effective teaching through: Maximizing learning time, grouping strategies, benchmarking against best practice, and adapting practice to student needs. (7) Professional development of staff that was: Site located, and Integrated with school initiatives. (8) Involving students in the educational process through. The studies have showed that school principals' leadership as well as teachers' competence are effective factors on student success. A highly qualified school principal effectively manages the activities in the school and improve the performances of teachers and students. For this reason, school principals' administrative role behaviors and competencies are considered important in terms of the effectiveness of education (Peker & Selçuk, 2011).

Depending on the purpose of the study, the research problems can be stated as follows:

1. What factors were managerial role behaviours of the participated principals concentrated?
2. What was the perception level of the participated teachers on the managerial role behaviours of their principals?

3. Were statistically significant differences between the perception of the teachers on the school principals' managerial role behaviours according to gender, graduation status, professional experience and branch variables?

## **2. Method**

### *2.1. Model of Research*

This research is a descriptive study in the screening model. The screening model, which is a research approach aimed at describing the situation as it exist in the past or present, the event that is the subject of the research is defined as the individual or object, as if it were within its own conditions (Karasar, 2009).

### *2.2. Participant*

The study group of the research is the teachers working in the formal high schools in the districts of Bakırköy and Avcılar. In the 2015-2016 school year, there are 450 teachers working in 8 high schools in Bakırköy district of Istanbul, and 683 teachers working in 16 high schools in Avcılar district. The progressive sampling method was used in the selection of the sample. In the first stage, the counties were selected. In the second stage, the schools were selected according to availability. In the third stage, the number of teachers in the schools was taken into consideration. The questionnaires were applied by the teachers working in those schools and the trainees. The sample consisted of 276 teachers who answered the questions. The sample was 40% of the total. 54% (n = 149) of the participated teachers were male while 46% (n = 127) of them were female. 48.9% (n = 135) of them graduated from a faculty of education, 38.8% (N = 107) of them graduated from a faculty of science and literature, 14.1% (n = 34) of them graduated from other faculties or had a master degree. (n = 139) of the teachers had a professional experience less than 10 years; 19.6% (n = 63 persons) of them had a professional experience between 11-15 years. 12.7% (n = 35) of them had a professional experience between 16-20 years; 14.1% (n = 39) of them had a professional experience of 21 years. 59.1% (n = 163) of them graduated from a department of social sciences, 27.2% (n = 75) of them graduated from a department of life or physical sciences and 13.8 % (n = 38) of them graduated from a department of fine arts, religion and other fields.

### *2.3. Data Collection Tool*

The data of the study were collected by the scale developed by the researchers. The scale items were first organized as 5-point Likert type scale with 45 items. The scale items were scored by a rating from (5) i totally agree to (1) i totally disagree. The

reliability of the study was tested by performing item analysis. When the 7th, 8th and 13th items were excluded in the first stage, the reliability coefficient was found as .867. In the second stage, the total and item discrimination indices were analyzed; the number of items was reduced to 30; the reliability coefficient of the scale was increased to 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,14,15,22,29,33,35. and 37. items were excluded.

Exploratory factor analysis was performed to determine in which subscales the scale used in the study was concentrated. Kaiser Mayer Olkin KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy value was found as .883, Barlett sphericity test was found as significant ( $X^2 = 4.128E$ , df: 630,  $p = .000$ ), as a result of that factor analysis was performed. The number of the factors was determined to be four by performing double conversion; the analysis was carried out. These four factors explained 43.298 % of the total variance. High scores from all subdimensions of the scale indicates a high level participation to the opinions about the administrator in all subdimensions. The Cronbach Alpha coefficients were determined as .919, .758, .627 and .617 for first, second, third and fourth sub-dimensions. In Table 1, the factors' explanatory percentages, factor loadings and the factors' Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients are given.

#### 2.4. Data Analysis

In this section, the factor analysis was conducted to determine the managerial role behaviors of the school principals. The frequency and percentage values were calculated to determine the demographic characteristics of the teachers who constituted the research group. The mean and standard deviation scores for all subscale scores of the scales were also found. And the changes in the teachers' perception levels for the managerial role behaviors of the principals according to the gender, graduation status, job experience and branch variables were analyzed. In addition the Kolmogorov-Simirnov Test for each variable distribution normality yielded normal distributions ( $p > .05$ ). Later independent samples t-test and one-way ANOVA test and Tukey HSD were used to determine the differences between the opinions of the groups. The results obtained after statistical procedures are tabulated and interpreted in order for the purposes of the study.

### 3. Findings

**Table 1.** Exploratory factor analysis results for the principals' managerial role behaviors

<b>Factor 1</b> Administrator's Role and Strategies	<b>Factor 2</b> Education and Training Programs	<b>Factor 3</b> Assessment of Education	<b>Factor 4</b> Supporting Teachers
---	---	--	--

Item	Factor1 Loading	Item	Factor 2 Loading	Item	Factor 3 Loading	Item	Factor 4 Loading
31	.731	26	.640	43	.723	12	.657
30	.697	18	.624	39	.635	11	.577
36	.694	17	.623	27	.531	10	.460
45	.673	21	.504	23	.523	14	.418
40	.661	16	.480	20	.496		
32	.657	19	.467				
13	.657						
38	.652						
25	.622						
28	.616						
44	.597						
41	.585						
42	.567						
24	.519						
34	.496						
$\alpha$ =	.919	$\alpha$ =	.758	$\alpha$ =	.627	$\alpha$ =	.617
Eigenvalue	7.78	Eigenvalue	3.28	Eigenvalue	2.40	Eigenvalue	2.33
Variance	21.63	Variance	9.12	Variance	6.68	Variance	6.48

According to Table 1, factor loadings of the items related to the first factor "principal's role and strategies" varied between .731 to .496; factor loadings of the items related to the second factor "education and training programs" varied between .640 to .467, factor loadings of the items related to the third factor "assessment of education" varied between .723 and .496, factor loadings of the items related to the fourth factor "supporting teachers" varied between .657 to .418.

**Table 2.** Mean and standard deviations of the teachers' factor subscales related to managerial role behaviors of the principals

Factor Subscales			
Items	Subscale- 1 "Administrator's role and strategies"	$\bar{X}$	<i>Sd</i>
24	Guiding teachers in their efforts for improvement of teaching	3.02	1.12
31	Ability to discuss problems in the profession	2.96	1.27
34	Informing about related laws and regulations	2.93	1.14
45	Using tangible and intangible incentives for teachers	2.91	1.31
25	Valuing teachers' opinions on student problems.	2.89	1.16
30	Taking measures to increase the success of students.	2.88	1.29
32	Conveying new developments in the professional field to teachers	2.86	1.25
42	Flexibility in students' disciplinary issues	2.84	1.25
28	Making an effort to protect school culture and values	2.84	1.22
44	Providing required conditions to teachers to improve themselves	2.79	1.09
38	Ensuring that education is carried out in accordance with democratic principles	2.78	1.09
41	Encouraging teachers to improve school success	2.76	1.12
13	Behaving in accordance with ethical principles	2.75	1.30
40	Being a role model in terms of attitudes and behaviors	2.72	1.08

36	Opening communication channels to reach the administrator	2.71	1.43
<b>Total</b>		<b>2.85</b>	<b>1.20</b>
<b>Items Subscale - 2 “Education and training programs”</b>			
18	Supporting the participation of teachers in professional meetings for on-the-job training	3.13	1.18
21	Appreciating the programs that improve the creativity of the students	2.97	1.21
26	Presenting solution proposals for imperfections in education.	2.93	1.16
17	Considering the dimension of guidance in disciplinary proceedings	2.93	1.19
16	Contributing to the development of the teacher's classroom management skills	2.82	1.71
19	Encouraging teachers to cooperate for quality education	2.66	1.23
<b>Total</b>		<b>2.91</b>	<b>1.28</b>
<b>Items Subscale- 3 “Assessment of education”</b>			
27	Cooperating with the parents on the education of unsuccessful students	3.01	1.23
43	Asking teachers to behave objectively in student evaluation	2.88	.997
23	Being successful in evaluating environmental opportunities	2.85	1.19
20	Following a clear and transparent policy	2.84	1.13
39	Being neutral to teachers in the supervision process	2.80	1.14
<b>Total</b>		<b>2.88</b>	<b>1.12</b>
<b>Items Subscale- 4 “Supporting teachers ”</b>			
12	Using reward systems in the evaluation of achievements	2.41	1.14
11	Seeing coworkers as a colleague rather than as an opponent	2.18	1.14
10	Helping to promote and to use new technological tools	2.15	1.20
14	Trusting own subordinates	2.65	1.21
<b>Total</b>		<b>2.34</b>	<b>1.17</b>

In Table 2, the means of the items constituting the first factor varied between  $\bar{X} = 3.02$  and  $\bar{X} = 2.71$ . the means of the items constituting the second factor varied between  $\bar{X} = 3.13$  and  $\bar{X} = 2.66$ . The means of the items constituting the third factor varied between  $\bar{X} = 3.01$  and 2.80. The means of the items constituting the fourth factor varied between  $\bar{X} = 2.41$  and  $\bar{X} = 2.65$ . When the means of factor sub-dimensions are examined, the highest mean "education and training programs" ( $\bar{X} = 2.91$ ) is correlated with the lowest mean "supporting teacher" ( $\bar{X} = 2.34$ ).

**Table 3.** t-test results by gender variable of teacher's perceptions of principals

Subscales	Gender	n	$\bar{X}$	Sd	t	P
<b>Administrator's Role and Strategies</b>	Male	149	2.94	.87	-2.19	.022*
	Female	127	3.18	.85		
<b>Education and Training Programs</b>	Male	149	2.41	.77	-1.70	.090
	Female	127	2.57	.67		
<b>Assessment of Education</b>	Male	149	2.40	.66	-.601	.548



	Female	127	2.45	.59		
<b>Supporting Teachers</b>	Male	149	2.03	.70	-1.182	.238
	Female	127	2.37	.67		

p&lt;.05\*

In Table 3, t-test results by gender variable of teacher's perceptions of principals was conducted to determine the changes in the gender variable according to the factor subscale, but the significant difference was observed only in the first factor sub-dimension [ $t(274) = -2.19, p < .05$ ]. This result shows that the female teachers were more expectant than the male teachers in terms of managerial role behaviors.

**Table 4.** One-way ANOVA test results by graduation status variable of teacher's perceptions of principals

Subscales	Graduation Status	<i>n</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>Sd.</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	
<b>Administrator's Role and Strategies</b>	Faculty of Education	135	2.95	.84	2,35	.097	
	Faculty of Science and Literature	107	3.19	.86			
	Other	34	3.02	.81			
<b>Total</b>		276	3.05	.85			
<b>Education and Training Programs</b>	Faculty of Education	135	2.35	.70	6,06	.003*	
	Faculty of Science and Literature	107	2.66	.72			Tukey HSD
	Other	34	2.58	.74			
<b>Total</b>		276	2.64	.73			
<b>Assessment of Education</b>	Faculty of Education	135	2.46	.64	.567	.568	
	Faculty of Science and Literature	107	2.40	.63			
	Other	34	2.34	.57			
<b>Total</b>		276	2.42	.63			
<b>Supporting Teachers</b>	Faculty of Education	135	2.34	.70	.074	.929	
	Faculty of Science and Literature	107	2.33	.64			
	Other	34	3.38	.71			
<b>Total</b>		276	2.35	.68			

In Table 4, as a result One-Way ANOVA test was found that there was a statistically significant difference between the "education and training programs" sub-dimension of the teachers according to the "graduation status" variable [ $F(2, 273) = 6.06, p < .05$ ]. When we evaluate the means of these sub-dimensions, there is a significant difference between the teachers who graduated from a Faculty of Education and the teachers who graduated from others such as faculty of theology, education institute and who had a master degree ( $p < .05$ ), there is also a significant difference between the teachers graduated from a Faculty of Education and the teachers who graduated from a Faculty of science and literature ( $p < .05$ ). According to this, it was found that the perceptions of the teachers who graduated from a faculty of education on the administrators' managerial role behaviors were lower than the other faculty graduates. For this reason, it has been thought that the fact that the graduates of the Faculty of Education took professional

formation courses for four years, this situation probably gave them more confidence in terms of their profession, so their expectations for supervision were probably lower than others.

**Table 5.** One-way ANOVA test results by professional experience variable of teachers' perceptions of principals

Subscales	Professional Experience	<i>n</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>Sd.</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
<b>Administrator's Role and Strategies</b>	<10 years	139	3.02	.94	.214	.887
	11-15	63	3.10	.77		
	16-20	35	3.11	.87		
	21+	39	3.05	.57		
	<b>Total</b>		276	3.06		
<b>Education and Training Programs</b>	<10 years	139	2.46	.76	1,24	.293
	11-15	63	2.48	.75		
	16-20	35	2.75	.75		
	21+	39	2.45	.53		
	<b>Total</b>		276	2.50		
<b>Assessment of Education</b>	<10 years	139	2.41	.72	2.01	.390
	11-15	63	2.44	.53		
	16-20	35	2.52	.63		
	21+	39	2.34	.64		
	<b>Total</b>		276	2.42		
<b>Supporting Teachers</b>	<10 years	139	2.38	.73	.292	.831
	11-15	63	2.28	.68		
	16-20	35	2.32	.63		
	21+	39	2.33	.54		
	<b>Total</b>		276	2.35		

In Table 5, According to the one-way ANOVA results, there was no significant difference between the teachers' professional experience and factor dimensions of administrators' role behaviors ( $p > .05$ ).

**Table 6.** One way ANOVA results by branch variable of teachers' perceptions of principals

Subscales	Branch	<i>n</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>Sd.</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
<b>Administrator's Role and Strategies</b>	Social Sciences	163	3.07	3,00	1,09	.579
	Physical and Life Sciences	75	3.08	4,29		
	Fine Arts-language and Religious Education	38	2.93	7,98		
	<b>Total</b>		276	3.05		
<b>Education and Training Programs</b>	Social Sciences	163	2.51	4,62	.342	.711
	Physical and Life Sciences	75	2.51	4,86		
	Fine Arts-language and Religious Education	38	2.41	3,36		
	<b>Total</b>		276	2.50		
<b>Assessment of Education</b>	Social Sciences	163	2.07	3,42	1.57	.455
	Physical and Life Sciences	75	1.98	2,78		
	Fine Arts-language And Religious Education	38	1.86	2,28		

<b>Total</b>		276	2.02	3,15		
<b>Supporting Teachers</b>	Social Sciences	163	2.32	2,81	.974	.379
	Physical and Life Sciences	75	2.43	2,73		
	Fine Arts-language and Religious Education	38	2.26	2,35		
<b>Total</b>		276	2.34	2,73		

Table 6, According to the One way ANOVA test results, there was no significant difference in the the subscales of factors ( $p > .05$ ).

#### 4. Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations

According to the results of the assessment of the teachers 'perceptions on the school principals' managerial roles and behaviors, the teachers' perceptions were grouped under four factors. These factors were grouped under the name of "administrator's rol and strategies, education and training programs, assessment of education and supporting teachers". In this study, teachers generally perceived the administrator's fulfillment of managerial duties moderately. According to these dimensions, the items with the lowest means were in the fourth subscale "supporting teachers" ( $\bar{x} = 2.34$ ). The subscale with the highest mean is "education and training programs" ( $\bar{x} = 2.91$ ).

The manager roles of school administrators are changing. The principal is expected to be a good leader in making the desired changes in schools (Fullan, 1992). In the study conducted by Hallinger and Muphy (1986), they found that school principals had a positive effect on school effectiveness and school success in establishing effective communication in school environment, in school climate, in disciplinary policies, in organizing teaching in school, and in school performance. Again, Balci's (1993) study concluded that according to teachers, the principal work of the school head should be the educational leader and that the managerial leadership should support the educational leadership. There was no difference between the administrators' perceptions and independent variables (age, professional experience, branch). The study of Şişman (1996) also found that the most effective dimension of school in primary schools is the executive dimension. It was found that managers' leadership in the creation of a good working environment at school was highly effective, and rewarding of the achievement behavior at school has been identified as a low-impact dimension. In the studies of Çelik (2003) and Yalçınkaya (2002), the role of school administrators in teaching and learning in a high quality education has gained importance. The findings of this study are supported by these studies in order to highlight the managerial and instructional roles of managers.

Sağır (2005) stated that the administrators did not provide adequate guidance to teachers in their educational activities. In the research study of Babaoğlu (2017), the teachers stated that the leadership of the school administrators, the organization the

activities and the function of the school by the school principals are the most important factors affecting the success in the school. Çelebi (2010) stated that teachers should help the school principals to use new technologies and methods, criticize constructively during the inspection, contribute to the improvement of teaching skills and have certain abilities to create a positive atmosphere in the school.

In the study, there was a significant relation between the gender variable and the administrator's role behavior subscale. The female teachers approved the administrators' role behaviors more than the male teachers. There was only a significant relation between the "graduation status variable" and the "education and training programs" sub-dimension, there was no significant relation between the other independent variables and subscale. The differences are between the teachers who graduated from the Faculty of Education and the teachers who graduated from the Faculty of Science and Literature and between the teachers who graduated from the Faculty of Education and the teachers who graduated from other faculties (theology, foreign languages and fine arts).

As it can be understood from the results of the study, a school principal is more prominent in instructional leadership. For this reason, the transformational leadership process in educational organizations at school level is sometimes difficult or even sometimes prevented by the influence of various internal and external variables. These variables are the variables such as the legislation that constitutes the legal framework of the education system and administrators' limited authority in spite of their responsibilities. This situation causes the practices that should be implemented urgently in the National Education system can not to be implemented on time. In addition, educational organizations have a vertical hierarchical structure. Teachers and other personnel working at school do not believed to change and transform; they resist to change; these factors negatively affect the education process. Moreover, differences between the physical, social, and psychological characteristics of school principals and their inexplicit leadership characteristics according to the literature are difficulties in the application of these theories. Social gender and leadership aspects should be addressed within the framework of legislation at all levels of professional development and the process of leader training. In order to increase the quality of schools and create a qualified society, education managers have vital responsibilities. In this context, educational managers should be allowed to develop themselves through in-service trainings.

## Acknowledgements

This study was presented as an oral presentation at the 4th International Conference on Lifelong Education and Leadership for all ICLEL 2018/July 3-5 2018/ Lower Silesia University Wroclaw-POLAND.

## References

- Babaoğlu, E. (2017). Okul başarısına okul yöneticisinin etkisine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 43, 93-109.
- Bakioğlu, A. (2013). *Eğitimde mentorluk*. 2. Basım. Ankara: Nobel.
- Beycioğlu, K., & Aslan, M. (2010). Okul gelişiminde temel dinamik olarak değişim ve yenileşme: okul yöneticileri ve öğretmenlerin rolleri. *Yüzyüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(1), 153-173.
- Balcı, A. (1993). *Etkili okul, kuram, uygulama ve araştırma*. Ankara: Erek Ofset.
- Buluç, B. (2013). Örgüt kültürü ve iklimi. S. Özdemir (Ed.), F. Sezgin, S. Koşar (Ed. Yrd.), *Eğitim yönetiminde kuram ve uygulama* (s. 101-130) içinde. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Bursalhoğlu, Z. (2011). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış*. (16. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem A.
- Busher, H., & Barker, B. (2003). The crux of leadership: Shaping school culture by contesting the policy contexts and practices of teaching and learning. *Educational Management Administration Leadership*, 31(1), 51-65.
- Çelebi, N., Güner, H., & Yıldız, V. (2015). Developing toxic leadership scale (Toksik liderlik ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi). *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(1), 249-268.
- Çelebi, N. (2010). Public high school teachers opinions on school principals supervision duty in Turkey. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5(3), 212–231.
- Çelebi, N., & Bayhan, G. (2008). İlköğretimde çalışan öğretmenlerin algılarına göre okul yöneticilerinin yaratıcılık potansiyellerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 27, 79-97.
- Çelik, V. (2003). *Eğitimsel liderlik*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Çetin, M., & Güven, Y. (2015). Lider öğretmenlerin okul kültürüne etkisi. *Uluslararası Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(3), 1-5.
- Fullan, M. (1992). *Successful school improvement*. Philadelphia, Open University Publication.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education*, 94 (5), 328-355.

- Korkmaz, M., Çelebi, N., Yücel, A.S., Şahbudak, E., & Karta, N. (2015). *Eğitim kurumlarında yönetim ve liderlik*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Litchka, P.L., & Babaoğlu, E. (2018). The leadership perceptions of female and male school principals' in Turkey and USA. *Kastamonu Education Journal March 2018, 26(2)*, 296-307.
- Maxwell, J. C. (2010). *Liderlik nitelikleri*. İstanbul: Beyaz Yayınları.
- MEB. (2016). *Okul sayıları*. Retrieved from <http://www.meb.gov.tr/baglanti/okullar/index.asp?ILKODU=34>
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.
- Peker, H.S., & Selçuk, G. (2011). Okul müdürlerinin yeterliklerinin eğitim öğretim sürecine etkisi. *CBÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 9(2)*, 472-480.
- Şişman, M. (2004). *Öğretim liderliği*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Sağır, M. (2005). *İlköğretim kurumlarında görevli öğretmenlerin işbaşında yetişmelerinde müfettişlerin denetim rolüne ilişkin öğretmen, yönetici ve müfettiş algıları*. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans tezi). Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Selçuk, G., Aydın, S., & Çakmak, A. (2018). Examining beliefs of preservice teachers about self-competency andlifelong learning competency via canonical correlation analysis. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science, 13(2)*, 474–486.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. *Educational Leadership, 41(5)*, 4–13.
- Sergiovanni, T.J., & Starratt, R. J. (2007). *Supervision. A redefinition. Eight edition*. McGraw Hill Companies, Inc. Newyork.
- Sertoğlu, R. (2010). *Stratejik Liderlik*. İstanbul: Etap Yayınevi.
- Sullivan,S., & Glanz, J. (2005). *Supervision that improves teaching: Strategies and techniques*. California: Corwin Press Inc.
- Teddlie, C., & Reynolds, D. (2000). *The international handbook of school effectiveness research*. London: Falmer Press.
- Topçuoğlu, Z. (2010). *İlköğretim devlet okullarında okul yönetiminin öğretmen başarısına etkisi*.(Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Beykent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. İstanbul.
- Yalçınkaya, M., & Akyüz, M. (2002). Çağdaş okulda etkili liderlik. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi, 1(2)*, 109-119.

Yıldırım, B., & Şerefhanođlu, O. (2014).Okul müdürlerinin rehberlik fonksiyonları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel uyarı düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *NWSA. Educational Sciences*, 9(4), 419-432.

---

### Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (**CC BY-NC-ND**) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).