

Faculty's Academic Intellectual Leadership: Predictive Relations with Several Organizational Characteristics of Universities*

Öğretim Üyelerinin Akademik Entelektüel Liderliği: Üniversitelerin Bazı Örgütsel Özellikleri ile Yordayıcı İlişkileri*

Bariş USLU, Hasan ARSLAN

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to examine the predictive relations between faculty's academic intellectual leadership, and communication, climate and managerial flexibility regarding scholarly practices in universities. For this purpose, the research was designed in correlational research pattern, and, to collect data, an online questionnaire composed of Organizational Communication, Organizational Climate, Managerial Flexibility Regarding Scholarly Practices and Academic Intellectual Leadership scales was sent via e-mail to faculty who work in different disciplines in Turkish public universities. The questionnaires responded to by 504 faculties were included in the data analysis, and then descriptive, correlation and regression analyses were performed. According to the findings, Managerial Flexibility Regarding Service Practices is a significant predictor for all dimensions of academic intellectual leadership; Managerial Flexibility Regarding Teaching Practices for only the Guardian dimension; Supported Structurally, a dimension of the organizational climate, for Ambassador and Acquisitor dimensions. This result shows that faculty's perceptions about climate in universities and the managerial support for scholarly duties strongly affect their academic intellectual leadership. Therefore, to enhance faculty's academic intellectual leadership behaviors, university managers can initiate different mechanisms such as learning-teaching centers, media advisory units and sporting-social event bureaus besides research-based facilities. University managers should also generate a more positive work environment by encouraging academics to follow their scholarly interests and recognizing academics' various achievements with material and moral rewards within the institution.

Keywords: Academic intellectual leadership, Organizational communication, Organizational climate, Managerial flexibility, Scholarly practices

ÖZ

Bu araştırmanın amacı öğretim üyelerinin akademik entelektüel liderlikleri ile üniversitelerdeki iletişim, iklim ve bilimsel-sosyal uygulamalara ilişkin yönetsel esneklik arasındaki yordayıcı ilişkileri incelemektir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, araştırma ilişkisel tarama modelinde tasarlanmış ve veri toplamak amacıyla Örgütsel İletişim, Örgüt İklimi, Bilimsel-Sosyal Uygulamalara İlişkin Yönetsel Esneklik ve Akademik Entelektüel Liderlik ölçeklerinden oluşan çevrimiçi anket e-posta yoluyla Türkiye'deki farklı devlet üniversitelerinde görev yapan öğretim üyelerine gönderilmiştir. 504 öğretim üyesinden gelen yanıtlar veri analizine dahil edilmiş ve ardından betimsel, korelasyon ve regresyon analizleri gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırmanın bulgularına göre; Toplum Hizmeti Uygulamalarına İlişkin Yönetsel Esneklik öğretim üyelerinin akademik entelektüel liderlik davranışlarının tümü için anlamlı bir yordayıcı iken, Öğretim Uygulamalarına İlişkin Yönetsel Esneklik ise yalnızca Gözetici Olma boyutu için anlamlı yordayıcıdır. Ayrıca, Örgüt İklimi boyutlarından Yapısal Destek öğretim üyelerinin Temsilci Olma ve Kazandırıcı Olma davranışları için anlamlı yordayıcı olarak bulunmuştur. Bu sonuç, üniversitelerdeki iklimin

*This article was generated by using data set in the first author's PhD dissertation which has been performed under the guidance of the second author.

*Bu makale, ikinci yazarın danışmanlığında tamamlanan ilk yazarın doktora tezindeki veriler kullanılarak üretilmiştir.

Bariş USLU (✉)

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Çanakkale, Türkiye
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Çanakkale, Turkey
barisuslu@gmail.com

Hasan ARSLAN

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Çanakkale, Türkiye
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Çanakkale, Turkey

Geliş Tarihi/Received : 20.01.2015

Kabul Tarihi/Accepted : 16.05.2015

ve akademik etkinliklere ilişkin yönetsel desteğin öğretim üyelerinin entelektüel liderliklerini güçlü şekilde etkilediğini göstermektedir. Bu anlamda, öğretim üyelerinin akademik entelektüel liderlik davranışlarını arttırmak için üniversite yöneticileri araştırmaya yönelik uygulamaların yanı sıra öğrenme-öğretme merkezi, medya danışma birimi ve sportif-sanatsal etkinlikler bürosu gibi farklı mekanizmaları oluşturabilirler. Ayrıca, üniversite yönetimleri, akademisyenleri kendi bilimsel ilgilerini takip etmeleri noktasında destekleyerek ve akademisyenlerin farklı türdeki başarılarını maddi ve manevi olarak ödüllendirerek daha pozitif bir çalışma ortamı yaratabilirler.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Akademik entelektüel liderlik, Örgütsel iletişim, Örgüt iklimi, Yönetmelik, Bilimsel-Sosyal uygulamalar

INTRODUCTION

People graduating from higher education institutions with various qualifications are accepted as a major capital of countries during the Information Age in which there has been rapid development into science and technology. In this regard, one of main missions of higher education institutions is to ensure education that provides these people with the qualities and skills to become persons of sophisticated creativity, and to realize their own learning, to produce new knowledge and to transmute this knowledge into products. Universities as main higher education provider institutions have other missions to produce new knowledge as outcomes of their research and development activities and to contribute to social life with activities of community engagement (Sandmann, Saltmarsh, & O'Meara, 2008; Welch, 2005).

Academics are the essential human resource in universities to achieve these missions effectively (Coates, Dobson, Edwards, Friedman, Goedegebuure, & Meek, 2009). Hence, academics are expected to carry out many duties and responsibilities such as leading research, producing income, preserving scientific and professional standards, helping their colleagues' career advancement, being a role model, influencing public debates, influencing the university's direction and representing their department and university (Bolden, Gosling & O'Brien, 2014). These behaviors and activities exhibited by academics while they fulfill their duties and responsibilities are termed as Intellectual Leadership by Macfarlane (2011).

However, many serious questions about discharge of academics' duties and responsibilities within intellectual leadership have been raised in some news articles in the Turkish media such as *Time-Serving Professor Just for Salary*, *Insufficient Academics for their Students* and *Plagiarism Suicide* (<http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/>, 30.06.2013, 06.02.2012; <http://www.haber7.com/>, 03.01.2012). Although it is acknowledged that not all academics can accomplish the duties and responsibilities expected of them, this situation is not only the responsibility of academics themselves but also higher education system and university management in Turkey (Atila, 2009). After a rapid increase in the number of universities during last three decades, there are 71 foundation and 108 public universities in Turkey. In 1992, 24 public universities (22.22%) were established and 50 public universities (46.30%) were established after 2005 (Günay & Günay, 2011). Many of these young public universities do not have adequate physical infrastructure and convenient institutional systems, and need more academic and administrative staff (Çetinsaya, 2014). Therefore, as in many

higher education institutions of other developing countries, academics in these young Turkish public universities do not have enough time to carry out research, service activities and collaborative projects with their colleagues because of their huge teaching loads.

Additionally, Turkish public universities have meager governmental funds, mainly for basic expenses such as staff salaries and maintenance of physical structures, and do not have strong resources from external sources (Kavak, 2011). Thus, managers in Turkish universities can only operate limited practices to develop institutional services for academic activities. Turkish universities also are affiliated to nation-wide central management structure, The Council of Higher Education, Turkey (YÖK), and academics have to follow heavy bureaucratic processes because of strong hierarchical system in their institutions. Thus, interactions between staff and management and the participation of academics in decision-making are very constricted (Arabacı, 2011; Günay, 2011). Furthermore, YÖK provides universities in each year with a restricted number of positions to appoint new staff and promote existing ones, so academics' perceptions towards their institutions can be affected positively or negatively by their managements' preferences related to academic appointments or promotions (Özer, 2011). In this regard, many public universities in Turkey cannot provide suitable work conditions for academics to display intellectual leadership behaviors. This reality is confirmed by academics' recent criticisms about the decreasing quality in higher education, students' complaints related to managerial issues and many judicial disputes increasing day by day between academics and higher education institutions (Ekinci & Burgaz, 2007; Erkutlu & Chafra, 2014).

The most important feature of universities, conducive to this unfortunate situation, is the compliance level of work environments provided for academics. Providing individual autonomy in work place is necessary to fulfil the duties of academics; this is provided by flexible structures in universities (Welch, 2005). Therefore, university managements should create flexibility by means of alternative practices to support academics regarding research and development activities, teaching and learning issues, and involvement in communal and social progress.

Flexibility in administrative approaches and implementations is influenced by the organizational climate, which is formed as a result of the interactions among the stakeholders of the organization and is one of the important determinants for the completion level of responsibilities expected from personnel. Academics' perception of the organizational climate affects

their commitment, job satisfaction and devotion to fulfilling their duties (Schulz, 2013). In this sense, a positive organizational climate in universities can be seen as an important factor for providing the environment to display intellectual leadership behaviors by academics.

Moreover, the quality of organizational communication is a key ingredient in providing flexibility and the appropriate climate in organizations (Skorstad & Ramsdal, 2009). Like all organizations, the usage of formal and informal communication channels in universities effectively contributes to forming the flexible structure for conveying academics' expectations and demands in the process of performing their duties to relevant units in a convenient way (Beytekin & Arslan, 2013). Besides, the efficient use of organizational communication channels helps to actualize positive interactions among academics and administrators, so it expedites the creation of a more positive atmosphere for employees in the organization (McMurray & Scott, 2013).

Given the above, the investigation of the academics' intellectual leadership behaviors based on academics' own perceptions can be a suitable way to reply to the negative assessments about academics in different parts of the community. Moreover, specifying the relationship between the factors affecting the academics' accomplishment level of their duties and responsibilities, such as managerial practice flexibility, climate and communication in universities, and faculty's academic leadership may identify many important practices to assist academics' rising productivity. Accordingly, the research subject is the examination of the predictive relations among organizational communication, organizational climate and managerial flexibility regarding scholarly practices in universities, and faculty's academic intellectual leadership.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Academic Intellectual Leadership

Intellectual means being a wise and critical person who attends to the ideational and mental activities to lead social development and community welfare by their ability to use ideas and knowledge from their own field and to influence debates from inside and outside the field (H. Yılmaz, 2007). In ancient times, philosophers had been mostly accepted as intellectuals who produced knowledge, developed thinking ways, trained students and enlightened the public. After major religions arose, the clergy both in eastern and western cultures became influential as intellectuals who educated children and guided people according to religion-based approaches. Many madrasahs as pioneer higher education institutions were then established by former Islamic civilizations during 10th century such as Daru'l-Hikme (1004) by Abbasids and Nizamiye Madrasah (1067) by Great Seljuks, and education in these institutions provided by the teachers called Müderris, equally professor in modern days (Günay, 2014). After the impact of madrasahs on western culture, Bologna University as the oldest university in the world was established in 1088, and then other medieval universities like Oxford, Modena, Paris Sorbonne and Cambridge were established (Makdisi, 1981). After the establishment of these universities, scientists, artists and other intellectuals found op-

portunities to continue their studies in universities and to use academic products for raising people's awareness and educating new generations (Conroy, 2000; Macfarlane, 2012).

During the age of enlightenment, academics, as being knowledge producers in universities, continued to use scientific knowledge to inform people about the universe, the world, art, education, economics, etc. despite heavy pressures from religious institutions (Conroy, 2000). Besides producing new knowledge, academics as public intellectuals have used their scholarly products frequently to contribute to many social and economic events like human rights, children's well-being, educational policies, equality issues, racism, climate change, food quality, standardization of ICT, higher education finance, microcredits, worker rights, etc. since early 1900s (Macfarlane, 2012). Furthermore, contemporary changes in higher education have brought new duties and responsibilities for academics in 'generating alternative resources, becoming more cosmopolitan, creating new networks with government and industry, expanding their research and teaching agendas with interdisciplinary activities, representing their disciplines and institutions internally and externally', besides being knowledge producers and public intellectuals in their traditional roles (H. Yılmaz, 2007).

Macfarlane (2011) identified these behaviors, actions and activities expected to be performed by academics as Intellectual Leadership. Also, Macfarlane (2012) emphasized that Academic Freedom (being a critic and an advocate) and Duties of Professorial Leadership (mentor, guardian, enabler and ambassador) are two sides of the same coin, and they are the roots of Academic Intellectual Leadership (AIL). In this aspect, AIL is composed of academics' behaviors such as being a role model and mentor for less experienced colleagues, protecting standards in their scientific fields and representing their institutions, and activities like producing knowledge, expanding their disciplines, transferring their expertise to the public and influencing social debates (Macfarlane & Chan, 2014; H. Yılmaz, 2007). Furthermore, Macfarlane (2011) categorized AIL behaviors into six dimensions: *Role Model*, *Mentor*, *Advocate*, *Guardian*, *Acquistor* and *Ambassador*.

Role model. *Role Model* covers some personal characteristics (Served, Helping, Patient, etc.) and virtues (Strategic Thinker, Innovative, Honest, etc.), and scholarly attributes (Authority, Expert, Pioneering, etc.) which have several associations with other dimensions (Macfarlane & Chan, 2014, p. 6-9). However, this dimension primarily emphasizes scholarly achievements and building a reputation based on research productivity and its impacts on disciplinary context (Macfarlane, 2011). Besides effective publications with intellectually provoking ideas, *Role Model's* scope covers challenging to create a transformation on others' understandings towards the discipline and society broadly, influencing others with personal virtues and leading them for success, committing the service to contribute the development of students, colleagues, research fields, higher education institutions and society, and coping with difficulties in academic and personal life like economical, racial, sexual, religious or ideological obstacles (Macfarlane, 2012).

Mentor. *Mentor* dimension indicates contributing to the development of less experienced colleagues by guiding and facilitating their scholarly activities, and nurturing their potential by collaborative studies (Macfarlane, 2011). According to Macfarlane (2012, p. 93), “good mentorship involves helping people realize their own potential and putting their personal interests above those of the organization they are currently working for”. On the other side, supervising or advising post-graduate students formally and informally while considering them as the next generation in academia and preserving them from internal and external pressures in academic institutions are the main parts in mentoring activities of senior academics (Macfarlane & Chan, 2014).

Advocate. *Advocate* designates two aspects: i) emphasizing the importance of a discipline and contributing its value by benefiting from disciplinary expertise in an institutional services, ii) applying theoretical information and practical experiences based on their scholarly activities to the solution of social problems (Macfarlane, 2012). Academics, in the first aspect, can explain main ideas related to their subjects, promote key points of their scholarly products, discuss topics within their expertise in the disciplinary and interdisciplinary context, and lobby inside and outside of their institutions on behalf of their field (Macfarlane, 2011). In the other aspect, academics as *Advocate* should influence public debates by transferring their knowledge, ideas and suggestions to people via local, national and even international publications, radio and television programs or internet broadcast facilities, and should participate in social campaigns related to their scholarly interests by adapting theoretical understandings of their disciplines to eliminate conflicts in communities (Macfarlane & Chan, 2014).

Guardian. Being a *Guardian* means to keep up academic values and standards in scholarly platforms and contribute to the development of scientific fields in new directions by unprejudiced peer review activities (Macfarlane, 2011). Academics carry out their *Guardian* roles mostly by gatekeeping duties such as editing or peer-reviewing in books and journals, assessing research grant proposals as panelists and chairing sessions in academic events, and pro bono activities like examining doctoral candidates in the dissertation period, reviewing colleagues’ studies, taking responsibilities in disciplinary committees and contributing to the university-wide research assessment commissions (Macfarlane & Chan, 2014). As a natural process, when academics become more experienced and well-known in their field, their guardianship roles start to increase with new roles in different editorial boards, scientific committees and research councils besides promoting academic titles (Macfarlane, 2012).

Acquistor. *Acquistor* implies that senior academics have to acquire research grants, research and development contracts, patents and copyrights, alternative resources and other commercial opportunities, as an indispensable part of the reality of corporatized business-oriented contemporary universities (Macfarlane, 2012). Furthermore, being an *Acquistor* covers supporting young researchers and junior colleagues and their research initiatives financially by coordinating and leading project teams to obtain research funds (Macfarlane & Chan,

2014). Senior academics are also important figures in establishing communication channels between younger researchers, effective faculty and academic leaders in their discipline from inside and outside of their institutions using with their personal connections, and introducing students and less experienced colleagues to academic platforms and networks like research collaborations, journals, conferences, colloquiums, seminars or lectures as co-investigator, -author, -presenter or guest speakers (Macfarlane, 2011).

Ambassador. This dimension emphasizes the representation of higher education institutions and their interests by academics in local, national and even international platforms (Macfarlane & Chan, 2014). When academics become more well-known figures in academia nationally and internationally, they can contribute more fully to the reputation of their institutions (Macfarlane, 2011). Examples of activities which promote the academics’ own reputation while they represent their disciplines and institutions can be: participating in international foundations related to their expertise and interests, joining research collaborations with foreign universities, undertaking duties on national and international disciplinary boards and commissions, attending conferences as keynote speakers, writing about social issues in the popular press like journals, magazines and newspapers and taking a seat in radio or television programs to inform the public according to their expertise (Macfarlane, 2012).

Organizational Communication and Academic Intellectual Leadership

People have to communicate, sometimes as a sender or a receiver, in organizations to reach their common goals. This mutual communication between people in organizations is called Organizational Communication, and is defined as sharing information, emotions, savviness and approaches within messages among units and employees in organizations by using all kind tools and equipment as channels (E. Yılmaz, 2007). Some organizations, especially universities as the largest educational institutions, cover many interactions among people, so they must have effective communication structures to continue to accomplish their missions effectively (Beytekin & Arslan, 2013).

Effective communication systems in universities can provide to share vision and common goals among units, to inform stakeholders about ongoing processes and operations, to exchange opinions between senior and junior members, to establish collegial discussion platforms and to form interdisciplinary cooperation (Şimşek, 2011). These types of communication mediums motivate academics to carry out their duties and responsibilities, as part of AIL, more efficiently in helping the development of colleagues, transferring their expertise into solution of social problems, keeping up disciplinary standards, obtaining alternative resources for team-based projects, being a role model for others about organizational values, traditions and expectations and representing their institutions in external platforms (Aypay, 2001; Bolden et al., 2014; Macfarlane, 2012). In addition, by assisting institutional support practices to become functional, organizational communication contributes to

displaying academics' intellectual leadership behaviors such as exchanging ideas about teaching-learning initiatives, establishing wider research networks, contributing professional development of junior academics, transferring disciplinary knowledge into different fields and informing the community about public issues related to their expertise (Macfarlane, 2012; Sandmann et al., 2008; H. Yılmaz, 2007).

Organizational Climate and Academic Intellectual Leadership

Organizational Climate is defined as the general atmosphere surrounding an organization consists of the power of employees' belonging, interest and goodwill feelings, and morale level (Schulz, 2013). Such perceptions of employees are influenced by factors like organizational structure, management support, rewards, taking risks, participation in decision-making, communications, conflicts, a sense of belonging, acceptance team work and organizational image (Arabacı, 2011). All these organizational or personal factors behind the climate affect organizational performance and employees' individual efforts. In higher education institutions, for instance, "the organisational climate may either facilitate staff participation and effectiveness in teaching, research and scholarly activities or create barriers to this participation" (McMurray & Scott, 2013, p. 962).

In this respect, mutual and open communication with management, involvement in decision-making processes, fair access to resources, social networks between different disciplines and disciplinary cooperation practices at universities create a collegial and positive climate perception among academics (Akman, Kelecioğlu & Bilge, 2006; Schulz, 2013). This type of climate in universities can contribute to producing intellectual leadership behaviors, such as helping the development of colleagues, transferring their expertise into solution of social problems, keeping up disciplinary standards and obtaining alternative resources for team-based projects, by academics more desirously and efficiently (Aypay, 2001; Macfarlane, 2012; Evans, Homer & Rayner, 2013). Also, positive climate perceptions enable academics to embrace their universities in all aspects and features, so that they try to act as a model for others in regard to organizational values, traditions and expectations, and represent their institutions in internal and external platforms with great attention (Bolden et al., 2014; Macfarlane, 2012).

Managerial Flexibility Regarding Scholarly Practices and Academic Intellectual Leadership

Organizational Flexibility refers, in improving their adaptation capacity, to the ability of organizations to give proper responses at the right times to the changes in their environments owing to employees and managers who develop by learning continuously (Skorstad & Ramsdal, 2009). As one dimension of flexibility in organization, management should institute *Managerial Flexibility* which can be defined as the ability of managers to shift plans and processes at proper times for giving the right directions to organizations by modifying their management styles according to the changes in internal and external environments (Ceylan, 2001). In this regard, modern universities should have a much more flexible managerial structure at *Operating Core* to become more innovative and entrepreneurial organizations as in *Adhocracy*, besides keeping the professional

specifications of *Professional Bureaucracy* (Mintzberg, 2014), so modern universities can be called *Professional Adhocracy*.

The production in *Operating Core* of universities is generally performed by academics, so managers, especially academic leaders, should provide a flexible organizational structure to enable academics to accomplish the knowledge mission of universities (Coates et al., 2009; Welch, 2005). On the other hand, the managerial flexibility towards work environments in universities can be created by management with alternative support practices for academics' teaching, research and service responsibilities (Bentley, Coates, Dobson, Goedegebuure & Meek, 2013; Campbell, & O'Meara, 2014). These scholarly practices executed by management in universities are called Managerial Flexibility Regarding Scholarly Practices (MFRSP) in the research, and defined as the variety of managerial practices within the scope of teaching, research and service activities to ease the duties and responsibilities expected to be fulfilled by academics, and to provide competitive advantages for higher education institutions.

MFRSP, such as ensuring the compatibility of physical-technological structures for teaching and research grounds, forming pedagogical development opportunities, supporting academics' research initiatives in formal procedures, facilitating their access to external funds, contributing their social projects by institutional resources and leading their connections with public and community actors, aim generally to support academics' teaching, research and service activities as the parts of their intellectual leadership behaviors (Akman et al., 2006; Campbell & O'Meara, 2014). Therefore, managerial practice flexibility can assist academics to establish institutional and international research networks, to acquire alternative funds with their research teams and to contribute professional development of junior academics by collaborative studies (Bentley et al., 2013; Macfarlane, 2012). Furthermore, MFRSP might contribute to the transfer of academics' disciplinary knowledge in different fields, informing the community about public issues related to academics' expertise and their participation in national and international social responsibility projects (Macfarlane, 2011; H. Yılmaz, 2007).

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research is to examine the predictive relations between faculty's academic intellectual leadership, and communication, climate and managerial flexibility regarding scholarly practices in universities. According to this purpose, the research was designed in correlational research pattern. This pattern can be used in both relational and prediction studies, and prediction studies are explained by Mertens: "the researcher is interested in using one or more variables (the predictor variables) to project performance on one or more variables (the criterion variables)" (2010, p. 161). The following questions then guided the research:

1. What are the levels of faculty's academic intellectual leadership, and their perceptions about organizational communication, organizational climate and managerial flexibility regarding scholarly practices in universities?

2. Are there any significant relations among faculty's academic intellectual leadership, and organizational communication, organizational climate and managerial flexibility regarding scholarly practices in universities?
3. Are there any significant predictors for faculty's academic intellectual leadership among organizational communication, organizational climate and managerial flexibility regarding scholarly practices in universities?

Population and Sample

The targeted population of the research was limited to faculty, as academics having teaching, research and service duties together, from public universities in Turkey. The researchers aimed to reach faculty as much as possible, so the online questionnaire was arranged on www.surveey.com. The questionnaire link was then sent via e-mail to faculty who work in different disciplines from Turkish public universities, and the questionnaires filled in by 504 faculty constitute the sample of the research (see in Table 1).

Data Collection Instruments

As a data collection instrument, the questionnaire, composed of the personal & institutional information form, and Organizational Communication, Organizational Climate, Managerial Flexibility Regarding Scholarly Practices and Academic Intellectual Leadership scales, was used in the research. In addition, the researchers used model fit indexes: χ^2/df (*Chi-Square/Degree of Freedom*) <5; GFI (*Goodness of Fit Index*) >.90; AGFI (*Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index*) >.90; CFI (*Comparative Fit Index*) >.90; RMSEA (*Root Mean Square Error of Approximation*) <.10, as criteria for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the scales (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2010).

Organizational communication scale (OCOS). OCOS used in the research was developed by E. Yılmaz (2007). The validity and reliability analyses of the scale were carried out by the researchers. First, structural validity was examined with the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) by using Principal Component

Technique, and 1-factorial structure, which can explain 57.792% of variance for organizational communication, was found with 10 items (having .467-.851 factor loadings). The reliability of the scale was then analyzed by Cronbach Alpha method and found $\alpha=.915$; indicating that the scale has very high reliability. Finally, CFA was proceeded and model fit indexes were found as $\chi^2/df=2.753$; GFI=.962; AGFI=.938; CFI=.979; RMSEA=.059 (highly good fit).

Organizational climate scale (OCLS). OCLS was originally developed by George H. Litwin and Robert A. Stringer, and updated by Stringer (2002). The validity and reliability analyses for the Turkish form of the scale were performed by Kılıç-Ergülen (2011). Kılıç-Ergülen (2011) explored 2-factorial structure (*Recognition of the Organization* with 7 items having .607-.875 factor loadings and $\alpha=.95$, and *Supported Structurally* with 10 items having .530-.798 factor loadings and $\alpha=.91$) which can explain 60.91% of variance for organizational climate. The factorial structure in Kılıç-Ergülen's (2011) study was then tested by CFA, and indexes were found as $\chi^2/df=3.536$; GFI=.909; AGFI=.881; CFI=.935; RMSEA=.071 (moderate fit). Finally, the reliability analysis for OCLS in the research was carried out by using Cronbach Alpha technique, and α was .933, proving a high reliability for the scale.

Managerial flexibility regarding scholarly practices scale (MFRSPS). This scale was originally developed for this research. At first, 32 interviews were conducted with 16 Turkish and 16 Australian faculty to identify the existent support mechanisms instituted by university management and the expectations of faculty related to managerial practices to facilitate their scholarly activities. As the next step, based on the outcomes of these interviews, a *MFRSP Questionnaire* with 36 items was generated, and then this questionnaire as online was sent to Turkish faculty in a pilot application via e-mail. The questionnaires responded to by 399 faculty were then included in the data analysis. As the next step, to explore the structural validity of *MFRSPS Questionnaire*, EFA analysis was performed by using Principle Component and Varimax Rotation techniques, and

Table 1: Distribution of Faculty According to Their Personal & Institutional Characteristics

Variables	Distribution			
	Female	Male		
Gender	179 (35.5%)	324 (64.3%)		
Academic Title	Assist. Professor 178 (35.3%)	Assoc. Professor 141 (28.0%)	Professor 173 (34.3%)	
Discipline	Applied Sciences 229 (45.4%)	Arts & Humanities 47 (9.3%)	Natural Sciences 65 (12.9%)	Social Sciences 151 (30.0%)
Establishment Dates of their Universities	Pre-1992 235 (46.6%)	1992-2005 165 (32.7%)	Post-2005 101 (20.0%)	

a 3-factorial structure with 14 items (explaining 63.669% of variances) was found. According to item distributions, the first factor was named as *Managerial Flexibility Regarding Service Practices* (5 items having .695-.765 factor loadings), the second as *Managerial Flexibility Regarding Research Practices* (4 items having .695-.751 factor loadings) and the third as *Managerial Flexibility Regarding Teaching Practices* (5 items having .481-.862 factor loadings). Finally, the reliability of *MFRSPS* was tested by Cronbach Alpha method, and α was .917; this alpha coefficient indicates that the scale has very high reliability. After exploring the structure, CFA was applied to the scale, and model fit indexes were found as $\chi^2/df=2.386$; GFI=.940; AGFI=.913; CFI=.962; RMSEA=.059 (highly good fit).

Sample items. Academics are supported in leading to establishment and continuity of the formations (NGO, association, club, etc.) which enhance their participation into social life. (*MFRserP*) / Assistance is provided to academics about intellectual property rights, copyright acquisition process, patent application, etc. (*MFRresP*) / The regulations related to outdoor teaching-learning activities (field works, workplace visits, participation in academic events, etc.) are completed in the required time. (*MFRteacP*)

Academic intellectual leadership scale (AILS). The scale was newly developed in this research, based on the framework of professorial intellectual leadership in Macfarlane (2011) as 6 dimensions; *Role Model*, *Mentor*, *Advocate*, *Guardian*, *Acquistor* and *Ambassador*. The online questionnaire with 72 items (12 items for each dimension) for pilot application was then generated, and the link was sent to 8664 Turkish faculty via e-mail. After data purification (*having s.d. $\geq .50$ and no missing data*), 359 valid questionnaires were included in validity and reliability analyses. The structural validity of *AIL Questionnaire* was performed by using Principle Component and Varimax Ro-

tation techniques. As a result of EFA, it was observed that all of 11 items for *Role Model* dimension were scattered into other dimensions, so that 5-dimensional structure within 20 items (having .553-.848 factor loadings as 4 items for each dimension) for *AILS* was discovered. This scale succeeds in explaining 64.83% of variance as a highly reliable scale according to Cronbach Alpha analysis with $\alpha=.906$. After detecting the validity of the scale, CFA was performed for the scale, and fit indexes were found as $\chi^2/df=1.943$; GFI=.919; AGFI=.893; CFI=.949; RMSEA=.051 (highly good fit).

Sample items. To attend voluntarily, as a representative of my university, in local or national ceremonies (celebration, commemoration, rally, etc.) (*Ambassador*) / To give feedback related to the academic development of my less experienced colleagues even if they are unfavorable (*Mentor*) / To provide financial support to my less experienced colleagues as consultant, researcher, trainer, etc. via the projects or activities coordinated by me (*Acquistor*) / To take part voluntarily in different reviewer mechanisms (editor, referee, panelist, counsellor, etc.) regarding publications, projects, activities, etc. within my discipline (*Guardian*) / To take an active role in social formations (NGOs, associations, unions, press-broadcast units, etc.) related to my study areas (*Advocate*)

Data Analysis

For data collection, all scales were arranged in 5-Point Likert Type, and the data set was analyzed using SPSS 21.0. At first, normal distributions of items were checked by Skewness & Kurtosis coefficients, which were found in -2/+2 interval as evidence for normal distribution. Descriptive Analysis (frequency, percentages, etc.) were then used to decide the level of faculty's perceptions about AIL, Organizational Communication, Organizational Climate and MFRPS in universities. The relation-

Table 2: Faculty's AIL, and Their Perceptions about OCO, OCL and MFRSP in Universities

Variables	n	\bar{X} *	s.d.	Skewness		Kurtosis	
				Statistic	s.e.	Statistic	s.e.
AIL	504	3.24	.71	-.32	.11	-.34	.22
<i>Ambassador</i>	504	2.96	.92	-.05	.11	-.49	.22
<i>Mentor</i>	504	3.54	.89	-.71	.11	.14	.22
<i>Acquistor</i>	504	3.10	.98	-.21	.11	-.66	.22
<i>Guardian</i>	504	3.76	.75	-.51	.11	-.23	.22
<i>Advocate</i>	504	2.83	.99	-.10	.11	-.83	.22
OCO	504	2.87	.87	-.10	.11	-.64	.22
OCL	504	2.95	.82	.03	.11	-.71	.22
<i>Recog Org</i>	504	2.61	.89	.20	.11	-.62	.22
<i>Sup Struc</i>	504	3.18	.84	-.09	.11	-.76	.22
MFRSP	504	3.13	.81	-.17	.11	-.69	.22
<i>MFRserP</i>	504	2.83	.89	-.02	.11	-.63	.22
<i>MFRresP</i>	504	3.41	.90	-.31	.11	-.62	.22
<i>MFRteacP</i>	504	3.20	.89	-.19	.11	-.62	.22

* 1.00-1.79 = Very Low; 1.80-2.59 = Low; 2.60-3.39 = Medium; 3.40-4.19 = High; 4.20-5.00 = Very High

ship between these variables was also examined with Bivariate Correlation Analysis. Finally, significant predictors for faculty's AIL were explored by using Multiple Linear Regression Analysis.

FINDINGS

The first research question is 'What are the levels of faculty's AIL, and their perceptions about Organizational Communication (OCO), Organizational Climate (OCL) and MFRSP in universities?', and the results of data analysis related to this question are demonstrated in Table 2.

According to the results in Table 2, faculty display AIL behaviors within *Mentor* ($=3.54$, $s.d.=.89$) and *Guardian* ($=3.76$, $s.d=.75$) dimensions at a high level, but the frequency of their AIL behaviors within other dimensions are at a medium level. In addition, faculty's perceptions about OCO ($=2.87$, $s.d=.87$) and OCL ($=2.95$, $s.d=.82$; $=2.61$, $s.d=.89$ for *Recog. Org.* and $=3.18$, $s.d=.84$ for *Sup. Struc.*) in universities are at a medium level. Moreover, according to faculty's perceptions, MFRSP ($=3.13$, $s.d=.81$) is at a medium level for *MFRserviceP* ($=2.83$, $s.d=.89$) and *MFRteachingP* ($=3.20$, $s.d=.89$) whereas *MFRresearchP* ($=3.41$, $s.d=.90$) is at a high level.

'Are there any significant relations among faculty's AIL, and OCO, OCL and MFRSP in universities?' is the second research question, and Table 3 present the results of Correlation Analysis for the variables in the question.

The findings in Table 3 denote that there are significant correlations between all variables and their dimensions. The significant correlations between variables are $r=.82$ ($p\leq.01$) for OCO and OCL, $r=.75$ ($p\leq.01$) for OCO and MFRSP, $r=.29$ ($p\leq.01$) for OCO and AIL, $r=.71$ ($p\leq.01$) for OCL and MFRSP, $r=.32$ ($p\leq.01$) for OCL and AIL, and $r=.34$ ($p\leq.01$) for MFRSP and AIL. These correlation coefficients ($r=.29-.75$) are also accepted as adequate to test the regression model in the research (Hair et al., 2010).

Regression analysis results related to the third research question, 'Are there any significant predictors for faculty's AIL among OCO, OCL and MFRSP in universities?', are shown in Table 4.

As shown by the data in Table 4, OCO, OCL and MFRSP in universities have significant influences on faculty's AIL; these organizational variables explain 20% of variance for faculty's behaviors within *Ambassador* dimension, 10% of variance for *Advocate* and 9% of variance for *Guardian*, 9% of variance for *Supported Structurally* ($t=2.05 - 4.22$; $p\leq.05$) is a significant predictor for leadership behaviors within *Ambassador* and *Acquistor* dimensions, *MFRserP* ($t=2.09 - 4.13$; $p\leq.05$) in universities is a significant predictor for all dimensions of faculty's AIL and *MFRteacP* ($t=2.03$; $p\leq.05$) is a significant predictor for only *Guardian* behaviors of faculty.

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

The research firstly reported that the demonstration of AIL behaviors by Turkish faculty is not at an expected level, and they display behaviors within *Guardian* and *Mentor* dimensions

more than behaviors within *Acquistor*, *Advocate* and *Ambassador* dimensions. This result affirms that faculty give priority to the intellectual leadership behaviors which contribute to the advancement of their discipline such as producing new knowledge, helping the academic development of younger researcher, introducing values of the profession to junior staff and keeping up the disciplinary standards in their colleagues' publications by gate-keeping activities (Evans et al., 2013; Macfarlane, 2011). It can be claimed that Turkish faculty focus mainly on their scholarly performance within their disciplines because, similar to the general tendency in tenure assessment around the world, tenure criteria in Turkey are based only on academics publication records (Campbell & O'Meara, 2014; Çetinsaya, 2014). They also give importance to supervising students' studies because of its contribution in academic promotions, especially at a professoriate level (H. Yılmaz, 2007). In this regard, to increase faculty's AIL behaviors, higher education policy makers may give space for the behaviors within institutional representations, community engagements and financial contributions in academic promotion and reward systems, and also tenure criteria may be re-arranged to contain participation in projects, contributions to the solution of social issues, attendance at national and international academic events, membership of committees, disciplinary gate-keeping activities besides faculty's scholarly publications.

The research also exposed that faculty's perceptions about organizational communication, organizational climate and MFRSP in universities are not so high, and these variables have strong connections as a result of their mutual effects on each other by means of their common values, conjoint points, associations and similar practices. According to this result, many Turkish universities do not have adequate physical infrastructure and managerial practices to facilitate faculty's scholarly activities, effective communication systems to enhance academics' participation in decision-making and favorable climate to empower collegiality and staff's commitments toward their institutions (Akman et al., 2013; Arabacı, 2011; Şimşek, 2011). It can be asserted that most of public universities in Turkey, especially younger ones, have not developed necessary work environment and organizational structures to motivate academics for higher productivity as well as to support their academic and social projects (Çetinsaya, 2014; Kavak, 2011). Therefore, beyond basic expenses of universities, higher education authorities should plan new investments to improve universities' technological and physical facilities such as intranet platforms, institutional social networks, classrooms, laboratories, libraries, congress centers and sport halls, and establish various communication channels to minimize the effects of highly centralized and bureaucratic structure and to maximize the participation of academics in management.

Finally, the research revealed that there is a moderate level predictive relationship between faculty's AIL, and organizational communication, climate and MFRSP in universities. These organizational characteristics of universities explain 13% of variance in faculty's intellectual leadership behaviors, and *Supported Structurally* dimension of organizational climate and

Managerial Flexibility Regarding Service and Teaching Practices are significant predictors of faculty's intellectual leadership. These results indicate that communication, climate and managerial practice flexibility in universities considerably affect faculty's leadership behaviors (Bentley et al., 2013; Beytekin &

Arslan, 2013; Schulz, 2013). Therefore, the existence of various managerial mechanisms to support scholarly activities in universities and faculty's belief about encouragement and appreciation by university managements are strong determinants for the frequency of faculty's AIL behaviors (Aypay, 2001; Camp-

Table 3: The Correlations between Faculty's AIL, and OCO, OCL and MFRSP in Universities

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1.AIL	1.00													
2.Ambassador	.76*	1.00												
3.Mentor	.78*	.37*	1.00											
4.Acquistor	.79*	.49*	.51*	1.00										
5.Guardian	.80*	.47*	.70*	.56*	1.00									
6.Advocate	.80*	.61*	.50*	.49*	.51*	1.00								
7.OCO	.29*	.35*	.14*	.22*	.19*	.21*	1.00							
8.OCL	.32*	.39*	.15*	.28*	.21*	.21*	.82*	1.00						
9.Recog org	.27*	.33*	.11 [!]	.26*	.17*	.17*	.76*	.94*	1.00					
10.Sup struc	.33*	.41*	.17*	.27*	.22*	.22*	.79*	.97*	.81*	1.00				
11.MFRSP	.34*	.37*	.16*	.28*	.27*	.24*	.75*	.71*	.68*	.68*	1.00			
12.MFRserP	.36*	.40*	.19*	.28*	.26*	.29*	.71*	.67*	.62*	.65*	.91*	1.00		
13.MFRresP	.25*	.28*	.09 [!]	.25*	.21*	.16*	.61*	.59*	.58*	.55*	.88*	.70*	1.00	
14.MFRteacP	.30*	.31*	.15*	.24*	.26*	.21*	.70*	.67*	.65*	.64*	.93*	.76*	.74*	1.00

*p ≤ .01; [!] ≤ .05.

Table 4: The Regression Matrix for Faculty's AIL, and OCO, OCL and MFRSP in Universities

Variables [R=.45; R ² =.20] F=20.62; p=.00		Ambassador	Mentor	Acquistor	Guardian	Advocate
		[R=.22; R ² =.05]	[R=.31; R ² =.10]	[R=.29; R ² =.09]	[R=.30; R ² =.09]	
		F=4.20; p=.00	F=9.05; p=.00	F=7.71; p=.00	F=8.37; p=.00	
OCO	β	-.01	-.01	-.12	-.08	.01
	t	-.18	-.15	-1.45	-1.03	.12
	p	.86	.89	.15	.30	.90
Recog org	β	-.07	-.10	.07	-.10	-.09
	t	-.90	-1.21	.90	-1.28	-1.13
	p	.37	.23	.37	.20	.26
Sup struc	β	.33	.15	.17	.16	.14
	t	4.22	1.77	2.05	1.90	1.64
	p	.00*	.08	.04**	.06	.10
MFRserP	β	.28	.20	.15	.17	.31
	t	3.98	2.59	2.09	2.25	4.13
	p	.00*	.01*	.04**	.03**	.00*
MFRresP	β	-.01	-.11	.09	-.01	-.09
	t	-.16	-1.54	1.28	-.08	-1.25
	p	.87	.12	.20	.94	.21
MFRteacP	β	-.05	.05	-.02	.16	.00
	t	-.68	.68	-.21	2.03	.01
	p	.50	.50	.84	.04**	.99

* p ≤ .01; ** ≤ .05.

bell & O'Meara, 2014, McMurray & Scott, 2013). According to this result, to support academics' teaching and social activities, university managers should initiate different mechanisms such as learning-teaching center, media advisory unit and sporting-social events bureau besides research-based facilities like research office, central laboratories, technology transfer unit and techno city, and encourage academics to follow their scholarly interests and recognize academics' various achievements by celebrating and rewarding these achievements materially and morally within the institution.

In this research, the predictive relations between faculty's ALL behaviors, and organizational communication, organizational climate and MFRSP in universities were examined by collecting data from a limited number of faculty who work in different Turkish public universities. Thus, researchers may carry out similar studies using different data set by collecting data from a whole faculty in selected universities. In addition, researchers might investigate other managerial practices, apart from institutional mechanisms related to teaching, research and service, to understand which types of managerial operations contribute to academics' scholarly productivity. Researchers might also explore the personal and professional characteristics of academics to nurture their intellectual leadership behaviors by using different methods in various study groups.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The overseas part of this research was supported by The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) with Reference No: B.14.2.TBT.0.06.01-214-6041. The authors are grateful to Prof. Anthony Welch, the University of Sydney for his collaboration and guidance, and to Dr. Marie McInnes, the University of Sydney for her contributions, during the overseas part of the research. The authors also would like to thank anonymous reviewers for their valuable feedback on an earlier draft of this article.

REFERENCES

- Akman, Y., Kelecioğlu, H., & Bilge, F. (2006). Öğretim elemanlarının işdoyumlarını etkileyen faktörlere ilişkin görüşleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30, 11-20.
- Arabacı, İ. B. (2011). Organizational climate of Fırat University. *Uluslararası Online Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(1), 161-180.
- Atila, S. (2009). Entelektüeller, üniversiteler ve bilimsel bilginin üretilmesi kapsamında eleştirel bir deneme. *Akademik İncelemeler*, 4(2), 81-94.
- Aypay, A. (2001). *The relationship between organizational structures and faculty roles at colleges and universities* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Vanderbilt University, USA.
- Bentley, P. J., Coates, H., Dobson, I. R., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, V. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Job satisfaction around the academic world*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Beytekin, O. F., & Arslan, H. (2013). The function of communication in faculty management. *Social Change Review*, 11(2), 137-152.
- Bolden, R., Gosling, J., & O'Brien, A. (2014) Citizens of the academic community? A societal perspective on leadership in UK higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(5), 754-770.
- Campbell, C. M., & O'Meara, K. (2014). Faculty agency: Departmental contexts that matter in faculty careers. *Research in Higher Education*, 55(1), 49-74.
- Ceylan, C. (2001). *Örgütler için esneklik performans modeli oluşturulması ve örgütlerin esneklik analizi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). İstanbul Technical University, Turkey.
- Coates, H., Dobson, I., Edwards, D., Friedman, T., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, L. (2009). *The attractiveness of the Australian academic profession: A comparative analysis*. Melbourne: LH Martin Institute.
- Conroy, J. P. (2000). *Intellectual leadership in education*. New York: Springer Science+Business Media.
- Çetinsaya, G. (2014). *Büyüme, kalite, uluslararasılaşma: Türkiye Yükseköğretimi için bir yol haritası* (Yükseköğretim Kurulu Yayın No: 2014/2). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Ekinci, C. E., & Burgaz, B. (2007). Hacettepe Üniversitesi öğrencilerinin bazı akademik hizmetlere ilişkin beklenti ve memnuniyet düzeyleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33, 120-134.
- Erkutlu, H., & Chafra, J. (2014). Ethical leadership and workplace bullying in higher education. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 29(3), 55-67.
- Evans, L., Homer, M., & Rayner, S. (2013). Professors as academic leaders: The perspectives of 'the led'. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(5), 674-689.
- Günay, D. (2011). Türk yükseköğretiminin yeniden yapılandırılması bağlamında sorunlar, eğilimler, ilkeler ve öneriler – I. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 1(3), 113-121.
- Günay, D. (2014). Türkiye'de yükseköğretimin mevcut durumu, sorunları, gelişmeler ve öneriler. *Yeni Türkiye*, 58, 678-695.
- Günay, D., & Günay, A. (2011). 1933'den günümüze Türk yükseköğretiminde niceliksel gelişmeler. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 1(1), 1-22.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th Ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Kavak, Y. (2011). Türkiye'de yükseköğretimin görünümü ve geleceğe bakış. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 1(2), 55-58.
- Kılınç-Ergülen, G. (2011). *Influence of leader-member exchange quality on organizational attachment around the organizational climate perspective in family-owned business* (Unpublished master thesis). Marmara University, Turkey.
- Macfarlane, B. (2011). Professors as intellectual leaders: Formation, identity and role. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(1), 57-73.
- Macfarlane, B. (2012). *Intellectual leadership in higher education: Renewing the role of the university professor*. London: Routledge.
- Macfarlane, B., & Chan, R. Y. (2014). The last judgement: Exploring intellectual leadership in higher education through academic obituaries. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(2), 294-306.
- Makdisi, G. (1981). *The rise of colleges: Institutions of learning Islam and the west*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McMurray, A., & Scott, D. (2013). Determinants of organisational climate for academia. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 32(6), 960-974.

- Mertens, D. M. (2010). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative, and mixed methods* (3th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mintzberg, H. (2014). Örgütler ve yapıları (A. Aypay, Trans. Ed.) Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık. (Original work was published in 1979)
- Özer, M. (2011). Türkiye’de yükseköğretimde büyüme ve öğretim üyesi arzı. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 1(1), 23-26.
- Sandmann, L., Saltmarsh, J., & O’Meara, K. (2008). An integrated model for advancing the scholarship of engagement: Creating academic homes for the engaged scholar. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 12(1), 47-64.
- Schulz, J. (2013). The impact of role conflict, role ambiguity and organizational climate on the job satisfaction of academic staff in research-intensive universities in the UK. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 32(3), 464-478.
- Skorstad, E. J., & Ramsdal, H. (2009). *Flexible organizations and the new working life: A European perspective*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Şimşek, E. (2011). Örgütsel iletişim ve kişilik özelliklerinin yaşam doyumuna etkileri (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Anadolu University, Turkey.
- Welch, A. (2005). *The professoriate: Profile of a profession*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Yılmaz, E. (2007). Kurum içi iletişim ortamı ile kurumsal güven arasındaki ilişki ve bir alan araştırması (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marmara University, Turkey.
- Yılmaz, H. (2007). Akademik yöneticilerin entelektüel düzeylerinin ölçülmesi (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Kocaeli University, Turkey.