Öz, H. (2023). Investigation of school administrator competencies based on teacher perceptions. *Bartın Universitesi Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(2), 110-126.

Bartın University Journal of Educational Research, 7(2), 110-126

Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 7(2), 110-126

bujer.bartin.edu.tr

Investigation of School Administrator Competencies Based on Teacher Perceptions

Hamza ÖZ*[a]

Article Information

DOI:

Article History:
Received :28.03.2023
Revised :30.07.2023
Accepted :06.09.2023

Keywords:
School,
Administrator,
School Administrator,
Competence

Article Type:
Research Article

Abstract

This research, which was conducted to reveal the competencies of school administrators based on teacher perceptions, was designed with a relational survey model. In the study, the competencies of school administrators were examined according to the demographic characteristics of teachers. "School Administrators' Competence Scale" was used as a data collection tool. In the research universe, there were 2552 teachers working in the Nizip district of Gaziantep in the 2021-2022 academic year. The research sample consisted of 390 teachers who were determined by simple random method among these people and participated in the study voluntarily. Data were analyzed through pairwise and multiple comparison techniques analysis. T-test was used for pairwise comparisons and Kruskal Wallis H test was used for multiple comparisons. In the study, according to the perceptions of the participants, the competence levels of the school administrators were discussed and interpreted in four dimensions: conceptual competence, technical competence, humanistic competence and technological competence. As a result of the research, the competencies of school administrators were found at the level of "very". While teachers' opinions about school administrator competencies do not change according to the variables of gender and status, it has been determined that they differ significantly according to marital status, age, professional seniority, education level, education level and branch. Various suggestions were made in the study based on these results.

Okul Yöneticisi Yeterliklerinin Öğretmen Algılarına Dayalı Olarak İncelenmesi

Makale Bilgisi

DOI:

Makale Geçmişi :
Geliş :28.03.2023
Düzeltme :30.07.2023
Kabul :06.09.2023

Keywords:
Okul,
Yönetici,
Okul Yöneticisi,

Öz

Okul yöneticilerinin yeterliklerini öğretmen algılarına dayalı olarak ortaya koymak amacıyla yapılan bu araştırma ilişkisel tarama modeli ile tasarlanmıştır. Çalışmada okul yöneticilerinin yeterlikleri öğretmenlerin demografik özelliklerine göre ele alınarak incelenmiştir. Veri toplama aracı olarak "Okul Yöneticilerinin Yeterlilikleri Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Araştırma evreninde, 2021-2022 eğitim-öğretim yılında Gaziantep ili Nizip ilçesinde görev yapmakta olan 2552 öğretmen yer almıştır. Araştırma örneklemi bu kişiler arasından basit tesadüfi yöntemle belirlenen ve çalışmaya gönüllü olarak katılın 390 öğretmenden oluşmuştur. Veriler ikili ve çoklu karşılaştırma teknikleri analizi yoluyla çözümlenmiştir. İkili

***İlgili Yazar:** hamza.oz@bozok.edu.tr
[a] Dr, Yozgat Bozok Üniversitesi, Türkiye, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5214-428X

Yeterlik

Makale Türü:
Araştırma Makalesi

karşılaştırmalarda t- testi, çoklu karşılaştırmalarda ise Kruskal Wallis H testi kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada katılımcıların algılarına göre okul yöneticilerinin yeterlik düzeyleri kavramsal yeterlik, teknik yeterlik, insancıl yeterlik ve teknolojik yeterlik olmak üzere dört boyutta ele alınıp yorumlanmıştır. Araştırmanın sonucunda okul yöneticilerinin yeterlikleri "çok" düzeyinde bulunmuştur. Okul yöneticisi yeterlikleri hakkındaki öğretmen görüşlerinin cinsiyet ve görev yapılan statü değişkenlerine göre değişmezken, medeni durum, yaş, mesleki kıdem, eğitim durumu, görev yapılan eğitim kademesi ve görev yapılan branşa göre anlamlı olarak farklılaştığı tespit edilmiştir. Araştırmada bu sonuçlara dayalı olarak çeşitli önerilerde bulunulmuştur.

Introductıon

Organizations also experience changes, just as nature and human communities change over time. Regarding change, Morgan (1989) and Tearle (2004) pointed out that it is an indispensable part of daily life. With this change, rapidly developing and changing social conditions, diversity in social demands and expectations have also diversified the competencies of managers in organizations and created a competitive environment (Güçlü, 2019). In a competitive environment, employees' use of their knowledge and skills for the purposes of the organization will provide an advantage for the organization. It is of particular importance for the success of organizations that managers demonstrate their competencies in order for employees to demonstrate these skills and knowledge (Özdemir et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2011). In this sense, the manager, who wants to achieve a successful result by providing organizational effectiveness and efficiency, has to manage human relations well within the organization (Basaran, 1992) and exhibit competencies.

Competence is the ability of the individual to have the necessary skills, equipment and knowledge in order to exhibit a behavior (Başaran, 2000; Töremen&Kolay, 2003), the capacity of the individual to fulfill his/her task at the desired level (Şahin, 2000). As a multidimensional concept, for the success of organizations, besides the competencies of the employees, the competencies of the managers also draw attention. Başaran (2004) emphasizes the effective use of managerial competencies in increasing the motivation and productivity of employees and making employees happy while emphasizing the importance of setting realistic goals together with employees and being a guide. Dogani (2010), on the other hand, emphasizes the importance of working in cooperation with the employees and meeting with a common mind instead of using the authority and authority of the managers on the employees.

Considering its contribution to social change, educational organizations have a privileged and important place. The competencies of school administrators are considered important in the management of schools, which are the source of social change movements, prepare individuals for life, and are at the center of conceptual and practical information (Akın, 2014). Being competent means that the manager acts in accordance with the organizational goals while fulfilling his duties, and also has the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities (Kayıkçı, 2001).

Manager competencies; According to Ozdemir et al. (2015), professional expertise and supervision, organizational leadership and instructional leadership are discussed in four dimensions, while Aydın (2005) deals with five dimensions: communication skills, effective work, effective organizational management, adequate educational environment and structure. Şahin (2000), on the other hand, presented a comprehensive list of competencies to determine the qualifications of primary school principals and discussed the competencies of school administrators in five dimensions: instructional leadership, effective communication, school management, effective human resources management and school-environment relations.

Manager competencies are the whole of knowledge, skills, attitudes, values and behaviors that managers should have in order for the organization to reach its goals (Ağaoğlu et al., 2012; Karadağ, 2011). Well-trained managers with leadership qualities are also individuals who are competent in the use of time (Açıkalın, 2000). Açıkalın (1994) describes school administrators as individuals who have effective communication skills and technology, have leadership characteristics, can use their mother tongue correctly and fluently, are physically and psychologically healthy and believe in education.

School administrators plan the future of the institution according to their competencies, determine its vision and direct the change (Şahin, 2000). For a school administrator to be competent in all aspects, he must be an expert

in personal relations, management, analytical thinking and quick decision-making (Sarpkaya, 1997). Indirectly, the level of a school administrator's conceptual, technical and humanistic competencies can give information about the capacity of that school administrator. For this reason, the quality of the school is directly affected by the competencies of school administrators and school management (Beycioğlu &Aslan, 2010).

School administrators should show leadership behaviors and be able to influence employees. Thus, it enables them to take action by achieving effective results in line with the objectives of the institution (Akbaşlı, 2018). In a study in which the relationship between organizational effectiveness and managerial competencies was tried to be explained, Colins (2001) stated that the most important competency of the managers of all successful organizations is leadership. Managerial competencies were evaluated in three categories by Başar (1993) as technical, humanistic and decision competencies, and by Baloglu (2020) as technical, theoretical-conceptual and human competencies. In a study conducted by Sevinç and Arslan (2019), the competencies of school administrators were discussed in four dimensions: conceptual competency, technical competency, humanistic competency and technological competency.

In the literature review, various studies were conducted to determine the qualifications required of school administrators (Agaoglu et al., 2012; Dönmez, 2002; Günay, 2001; Güven, 2002; Karadag, 2011; Madenoglu, 2003; Özdemir et al. 2015; Şahin, 2000; Şener, 2004) was found. These studies, since it is thought that will contribute to the creation of a standard framework regarding managerial competencies, increasing the number of studies to determine managerial competencies (Özdemir et al., 2015; Şahin, 2000) and repeating them in different provinces with different methods (Agaoğlu et al., 2012).) is recommended. Same way, in the study conducted by Sevinç and Arslan (2019), it was suggested that research should be conducted to measure the competencies of school administrators in four dimensions. It is thought that this study, which was conducted to determine the competencies of school administrators according to teacher perceptions, will contribute to filling this gap in the literature.

Purpose of the Research

The main purpose of this research is to determine the competencies of school administrators according to teacher perceptions. In order to achieve this main purpose in the research, answers to the following questions were sought.

1. According to teachers' perceptions, at what level are school administrators' competencies?
2. According to the perceptions of the teachers, do the competencies of school administrators differ according to gender, marital status, age, professional seniority, education status, education level served, seniority, employed status and branch of work?

Method

Model of the Research

This study was designed according to the relational survey model, which is one of the quantitative research method models, in order to determine the competencies of school administrators according to teacher perceptions. The relational screening model, according to Karasar (2017); is a model applied to reveal the presence or level of change between two or more variables.

Universe and Sample

The universe of this research consists of 2552 teachers working in the Nizip district of Gaziantep in the 2021-2022 academic year. The sample of the study consists of 390 teachers selected from the universe by simple random sampling method. The research was conducted by taking the opinions of the teachers who participated in the research voluntarily. Descriptive information for the participants is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Participants

Group	Subgroup	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Gender	"Female"	164	42.1
	"Male"	226	57.9
Marital Status	"Married"	288	73.8
	"Unmarried"	102	26.2
Age	"20-30 Years Old"	106	27.2
	"31-40 Years Old"	154	39.5
	"41-50 Years Old"	122	31.3
	"51-60 Years Old"	8	2.1
Professional Seniority	"0-5 Years"	110	28.2
	"6-10 Years"	66	16.9
	"11-15 Years"	76	19.5
	"16-20 Years"	52	13.3
	"21 Years and above"	88	22.1
Education Status	"Associate Degree"	6	1.5
	"Undergraduate"	344	88.2
	"Graduate"	36	9.2
	"Doctoral"	4	1.0
Education Level Served	"Kindergarten"	12	3.1
	"Primary School"	172	44.1
	"Middle School"	128	32.8
	"High School"	78	20.0
Employed Status	"Contractual"	68	17.4
	"Staffly"	322	82.6
Branch	"Preschool Teacher"	14	3.6
	"Classroom Teacher"	144	36.9
	"Branch Teacher"	222	56.9
	"Voc. Course Teacher"	10	2.6
	TOTAL	390	100

According to Table 1; 42.1% (n=164) of the participants of the study were female and 57.9% (n=226) were male. 73.8% (n=288) of the participants were married and 26.2% (n=102) were unmarried. The age groups of the participants in the research are; 20-30 age rate of 27.2% (n=106), 31-40 age rate of 39.5% (n=154), 41-50 age rate of 31.3% (n=122), 51-60 age rate while it is 2.1% (n=8). The professional seniority of the participants in the research is; 0-5 years 28.2% (n=110), 6-10 years 16.9% (n=66), 11-15 years 19.5% (n=76), 16-20 years 13.3% (n=52) and the ratio of participants who have 21 years or more professional seniority is 22.1 (n=88). The educational status of the participants was 1.5% (n=6) associate degree graduate, 88.2% (n=344) undergraduate, 9.2% (n=36) graduate and 1%, 0 (n=4) of them are doctoral graduates. 3.1% (n=12) of the participants worked in kindergarten, 44.1% (n=172) in primary school, 32.8% (n=128) in middle school and 20.0% (n=78) of them are working in high school. While 17.4% (n=68) of the participants work in contracted status, 82.6% (n=322) of them work in staffly status. Similarly, 3.6% (n=14) of the participants were in the preschool teacher branch, 36.9% (n=144) were in the classroom teacher branch, 56.9% (n=222) were branch teachers and 2.6% (n=10) of them are vocational course teachers.

Data Collection Tools

In this study, the "School Administrator Efficiency Scale" developed by Sevinç and Arslan (2019) was used as a data collection tool. Necessary permissions were obtained for the use of the scale. School Administrator Competence Scale; It aims to measure the competencies of school administrators in four dimensions: conceptual competency (items 1-10), technical competency (items 11-26), human competency (items 27-39), and technological competency (items 40-50). The scale consists of 50 items and is a five-point Likert scale. According to the results of the factor analysis performed to determine the validity of the scale, the KMO value was calculated as .910, the Barlett-Sphericity value as .00. The factor loads of the items are between .79 and .64 in the conceptual competence dimension and between .81 and .52 in the technical competence dimension. The

factor loads of the items in the human competence dimension vary between .82 and .54, and the factor loads of the items in the technological competence dimension vary between .90 and .66. The total explained variance value of the scale is 69,598.

The scores of the statements in the scale were planned as "1- no, 2- little, 3- moderate, 4- a lot, 5- full". A high score from the items in the scale indicates a high level of proficiency, and a low score indicates a low level of proficiency.In this study, the internal consistency coefficient was checked to be used in the reliability analysis of the scale and the "Cronbach's Alpha value was found to be .987". Within the scope of the reliability analysis of the scale, Cronbach's Alpha (α) value was examined in terms of dimensions. Among these dimensions, the reliability coefficient of the conceptual competence dimension (α) is .942, the technical competence dimension (α) reliability coefficient is .963, the human competence dimension (α) reliability coefficient is .967 and the technological competence dimension (α) reliability coefficient is .972. to create. Cronbach's Alpha (α) value indicates the reliability of a scale, and $\alpha \geq 0.9$ indicates that the scale is perfectly reliable (George & Mallery, 2010). Accordingly, it was decided that the scale used in the study was completely reliable.

Analysis of Data

The data were analyzed with the help of pairwise and multiple comparison techniques. Before the analysis, some applications were made to prepare the data sets for analysis. The presence of missing values was checked and the mean values were assigned instead of the missing values so that they would not affect the mean. Then, extreme values that would disrupt the normal distribution were checked and it was determined that there were no extreme values in the data set. It was investigated whether the data showed normal distribution according to the variables to be compared. When the kurtosis and skewness values, histogram and Kolmogorov--Smirnov values are examined to determine the distribution characteristics of the data sets, it is assumed that the Skewnes--Kurtosis (S-K) values are between -1.5 and +1.5 and the data show a normal distribution. Because, "according to Tabachnick, Fidell and Ullman (2007), the values of kurtosis and skewness in the range of -1.5 to +1.5 indicate the normal distribution of the data". In addition, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test result (sig=0.00) was found significant (sig<0.05). When these analyzes were examined together, it was determined that the data showed a normal distribution.

The proficiency levels of the school administrators included were determined by taking the standard deviation and arithmetic averages. The averages of the variables of gender, age, marital status, professional seniority, education status, education level served, employed status and branch of work of the participants were determined. While the t-test was preferred for paired groups, the Kruskal Wallis H test, which is one of the non-parametric tests, was used to determine the difference between the means, since the assumption of homogeneity between multiple groups could not be achieved. In order to determine the significant differences that emerged as a result of the analysis, the Tamhane T2 test was preferred because the variances were not equal and the sample group was not distributed homogeneously. Because, according to Efe, Bek and Şahin (2000), Tamhane T2 test can be preferred if the variances are not equal and the sample group is not homogeneously distributed.

In this research, the school administrators' ability to rate and interpret scale scores; "1.00 - 1.80 none, 1.81 - 2.60 low, 2.61 - 3.40 medium, 3.41 - 4.20 high and 4.21 - 5.00" are considered complete (Sevinçand Arslan, 2019).

Finding

In this section, information about the analyzes made for the sub-objectives of the research is given and the results of the analysis are presented in the tables.

Findings Related to Competence Levels of School Administrators

In this section, the arithmetic mean, standard deviation, highest and lowest values of the scores obtained from the "School Administrator Competence Scale" applied to the participants were calculated and the results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Competence Levels of School Administrators

Dimensions	n	Lowest Score	Highest Score	x̄	Ss	Level
Conceptual Competence	390	1.10	5.00	3.63	.77	Very
Technical Competence	390	1.00	5.00	3.80	.76	Very
Humanistic Competence	390	1.38	5.00	3.93	.76	Very
Technological Competence	390	1.00	5.00	3.80	.82	Very

According to Table 2, according to the perceptions of the participants, school administrators have the highest average in the humanistic competence dimension (x̄=3.93) and the lowest in the conceptual competence dimension (x̄=3.63). It is seen that they have the same level of average (x̄=3.80) in the dimensions of technical competence and technological competence. However, their competencies in all dimensions are at the "*very*" level. According to these findings, it can be considered as an important situation for schools that school administrators have a high level of humanistic competence.

Findings Related to Gender Variable

A t-test analysis was conducted to reveal whether the participant perceptions of school administrators' proficiency levels differed significantly according to the gender variable. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. "T-test" Results of Managerial Efficacy Perception Level Scores by Gender

Dimensions	Category	n	x̄	F	t	Sd	p
Conceptual Competence	"Female"	164	3.65	.230	-.39	388	.69
	"Male"	226	3.64				
Technical Competence	"Female"	164	3.76	1.375	-.97	388	.33
	"Male"	226	3.84				
Humanistic Competence	"Female"	164	3.89	1.930	-.99	388	.32
	"Male"	226	3.97				
Technological Competence	"Female"	164	3.73	1.056	-1.49	388	.13
	"Male"	226	3.86				

P< .05

According to the analysis in Table 3, it is seen that the competencies of school administrators do not differ significantly according to the gender variable of the participants.

Findings Related to Marital Status Variable

A t-test analysis was conducted to reveal whether the participant perceptions of school administrators' proficiency levels differed significantly according to the marital status variable. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 4.

Tablo 4."T-test" Results of Managerial Efficacy Perception Level Scores According to Marital Status Variable

Dimensions	Category	n	x̄	F	t	Sd	p
Conceptual Competence	"Married"	288	3.63	.002	.36	388	.72
	"Unmarried"	102	3.60				
Technical Competence	"Married"	288	3.82	.713	.85	388	.39
	"Unmarried"	102	3.75				
Humanistic Competence	"Married"	288	3.98	2.025	2.09	388	.03
	"Unmarried"	102	3.79				
Technological Competence	"Married"	288	3.83	1.271	1.23	388	.21
	"Unmarried"	102	3.72				

P< .05

According to the analysis in Table 4, the competencies of school administrators differ in the dimension of humanistic competency according to the marital status variable of the participants (p=.03). It does not differ in

terms of conceptual competence (p=.72), technical competence (p=.39) and technological competence (p=.21). It is seen that the arithmetic mean of married participants ($\bar{x}$=3.98) is higher than the arithmetic mean of single participants ($\bar{x}$=3.79) in the dimension of humanistic competence. According to this, it can be said that married participants perceive the humanistic competence level of school administrators at a higher level than singles.

Findings Related to Age Variable

The Kruskal Wallis H test was used to determine whether the proficiency levels of school administrators differ significantly according to the age variable, and the results of the analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 5."KruskalWallisH Test" Results of Managerial Efficacy Perception Level Scores by Age Variable

Dimensions	Category	n	Average	X^2	SD	P	Significant Difference
Conceptual Competence	"20-30 Years old(1)"	106	193.35	4.755	3	.19	
	"31-40 Years old(2)"	154	199.37				
	"41-50 Years old(3)"	122	187.34				
	"51-60 Years old(4)"	8	274.00				
Technical Competence	"20-30 Years old(1)"	106	190.35	5.852	3	.12	
	"31-40 Years old (2)"	154	187.50				
	"41-50 Years old (3)"	122	204.84				
	"51-60 Years old (4)"	8	275.25				
Humanistic Competence	"20-30 Years old(1)"	106	182.14	13.261	3	.00	4-1
	"31-40 Years old (2)"	154	189.14				4-2
	"41-50 Years old (3)"	122	206.89				4-3
	"51-60 Years old (4)"	8	321.25				
Technological Competence	"20-30 Years old(1)"	106	179.63	16.070	3	.00	4-1
	"31-40 Years old (2)"	154	186.47				4-2
	"41-50 Years old (3)"	122	212.37				4-3
	"51-60 Years old (4)"	8	322.25				

P<,05

According to the analysis in Table 5, the competencies of school administrators differ in terms of humanistic competency (p=.00) and technological competency (p=.00) according to the age variable of the participants. It does not differ in terms of conceptual competence (p=.19) and technical competence (p=.12). According to the results of Tamhane's T2 test analysis, which was conducted to determine which age groups' humanistic and technological competence levels differ, it was found that the humanistic and technological competence perceptions of the participants in the 51-60 age group were at a higher level than the other age groups.

Findings Related to the Variable of Professional Seniority

The Kruskal Wallis H test was used to determine whether the proficiency levels of school administrators differ significantly according to the professional seniority variable, and the results of the analysis are presented in Table 6.

Table 6.“KruskalWallisH Test” Results of Managerial Efficacy Perception Level Scores According to Professional Seniority Variable

Dimensions	Category	n	Average	X^2	SD	P	Significant Difference
Conceptual Competence	“0-5 Years.(1)”	110	196.74	5.740	4	.22	
	“6-10 Years. (2)”	66	213.11				
	“11-15 Years.(3)”	76	183.95				
	“16-20 Years.(4)”	52	170.38				
	“21 and over.(5)”	86	205.80				
Technical Competence	“0-5 Years. (1)”	110	192.68	1.604	4	.03	2-4
	“6-10 Years. (2)”	66	213.56				
	“11-15 Years. (3)”	76	178.63				
	“16-20 Years. (4)”	52	165.69				
	“21 and over. (5)”	86	218.17				
Humanistic Competence	“0-5 Years. (1)”	110	189.97	1.749	4	.06	
	“6-10 Years. (2)”	66	200.92				
	“11-15 Years. (3)”	76	176.13				
	“16-20 Years. (4)”	52	176.92				
	“21 and over. (5)”	86	226.76				
Technological Competence	“0-5 Years. (1)”	110	183.30	16.403	4	.06	
	“6-10 Years. (2)”	66	210.80				
	“11-15 Years. (3)”	76	173.53				
	“16-20 Years. (4)”	52	173.85				
	“21 and over. (5)”	86	231.87				

P<,05

According to Table 6, participants' perception levels of managerial competence do not differ in terms of conceptual competence (p=.22), humanistic competence (p=.06) and technological competence (p=.06) according to professional seniority variable. It is seen that there is a difference (p=.03) in the dimension of technical competence. According to the results of the Tamhane'sT2 test, which was conducted to determine which of the professional seniority groups this differentiation is, it is seen that the participants who worked between 6 and 10 years in the dimension of technical competence had a higher level of perception than the participants who worked between 16 and 20 years.

Findings Related to Educational Status Variable

The Kruskal Wallis H test was performed to determine whether the proficiency levels of school administrators differed significantly according to the educational status variable according to the perceptions of the participants, and the results of the analysis are presented in Table 7.

Table 7.“KruskalWallisH Test” Results of Managerial Efficacy Perception Level Scores According to the Variable of Educational Status

Dimensions	Category	n	Average	X^2	SD	P	Significant Difference
Conceptual Competence	“Associate Degree (1)”	6	309.17	10.714	3	.01	1-2
	“Undergraduate (2)”	344	191.45				1-3
	“Graduate (3)”	36	202.78				
	“Doctoral(4)”	4	308.00				
Technical Competence	“Associate Degree (1)”	6	302.17	11.385	3	.01	1-2
	“Undergraduate (2)”	344	192.54				1-3
	“Graduate (3)”	36	191.06				4-2
	“Doctoral(4)”	4	330.00				4-3
Humanistic Competence	“Associate Degree (1)”	6	272.83	9.649	3	.02	4-2
	“Undergraduate (2)”	344	193.96				4-3
	“Graduate (3)”	36	181.78				
	“Doctoral(4)”	4	335.50				
Technological Competence	“Associate Degree (1)”	6	290.50	9.939	3	.02	4-2
	“Undergraduate (2)”	344	192.02				4-3
	“Graduate (3)”	36	198.61				
	“Doctoral(4)”	4	324.50				

P<,05

According to Table 7, the perception levels of the participants' managerial competencies were measured in terms of conceptual competency (p=.01), technical competency (p=.01), humanistic competency (p=.02), and technological competency (p=.02) according to the variable of educational status appears to differ. According to the results of Tamhane'sT2 test, which was conducted to determine which categories of education status groups this differentiation is between, those who have an associate degree in conceptual competence compared to those who have undergraduate and graduate degrees, those who have an associate degree in technical proficiency compared to those who have undergraduate and graduate degrees, and those with a doctoral degree in terms of technical proficiency. It is seen that the participants with a doctoral level education in the dimensions of humanistic competence and technological competence have a higher level of perception than the participants with undergraduate and graduate education compared to those with undergraduate and graduate degrees.

Findings Related to the Variable of Education Level Served

The Kruskal Wallis H test was conducted to reveal whether the participant perceptions of school administrators' proficiency levels differed significantly according to the education level served variable. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 8.

Table 8.“KruskalWallisH Test” Results According to the Variable of Educational Level Served of Executive Efficacy Perception Level Scores

Dimensions	Category	n	Average	X2	SD	P	Significant Difference
Conceptual Competence	“Kindergarten(1)”	12	162.33	5.019	3	.17	
	“Primary School(2)”	172	185.76				
	“Middle School(3)”	128	199.33				
	“High School(4)”	78	215.81				
Technical Competence	“Kindergarten (1)”	12	149.67	7.684	3	.06	
	“Primary School(2)”	172	181.92				
	“Middle School(3)”	128	209.11				
	“High School(4)”	78	210.17				
Humanistic Competence	“Kindergarten (1)”	12	148.33	6.913	3	.07	
	“Primary School(2)”	172	183.59				
	“Middle School(3)”	128	205.23				
	“High School(4)”	78	213.06				
Technological Competence	“Kindergarten (1)”	12	160.83	15.667	3	.00	4-2
	“Primary School(2)”	172	182.14				4-3
	“Middle School(3)”	128	190.11				
	“High School(4)”	78	239.14				

According to Table 8, the perception levels of the participants regarding managerial competencies did not differ in terms of conceptual competency (p=.17), technical competency (p=.06), humanistic competency (p=.07) according to the variable of educational level. It differs in terms of technological competence (p=.00). “As a result of the Tamhane's T2 test analysis, which was conducted to determine between which education level this differentiation is, it is seen that the participants working at the high school level of educational institutions have higher technological competence perception levels than the participants working at the secondary and primary education level.”

Findings Related to Employed Status Variable:

T-test analysis was performed to determine whether the proficiency levels of school administrators differ according to the employed status variable according to the perceptions of the participants, and the results of the analysis are presented in Table 9.

Table 9.“T-Test” Results of Managerial Efficacy Perception Level Scores According to the Variable of Employed Status

Dimensions	Category	n	x̄	F	t	Sd	p
Conceptual Competence	“Contractual”	68	3.63	2.098	-.01	388	.99
	“Staffly”	322	3.62				
Technical Competence	“Contractual”	68	3.85	1.358	.60	388	.55
	“Staffly”	322	3.79				
Humanistic Competence	“Contractual”	68	3.98	.271	.60	388	.55
	“Staffly”	322	3.92				
Technological Competence	“Contractual”	68	3.82	.014	.15	388	.87
	“Staffly”	322	3.80				

According to the analysis in Table 9, it is seen that the competencies of school administrators do not differ significantly according to the employed status variable of the participants (p>.05).

Findings Related to the Variable of the Branch

The KruskalWallisH test was conducted to reveal whether the participant perceptions of school administrators' proficiency levels differed significantly according to the branch variable. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 10.

Table 10.“KruskalWallisH Test” Results of Managerial Efficacy Perception Level Scores According to the Branch Variable

Dimensions	Category	n	Average	X^2	SD	p	Significant Difference
Conceptual Competence	“Preschool Teacher(1)”	14	160.64	6.814	3	.08	
	“Classroom Teacher(2)”	144	183.94				
	“Branch Teacher(3)”	222	207.19				
	“Voc. Course Teacher (4)”	10	151.10				
Technical Competence	“Preschool Teacher(1)”	14	166.07	6.070	3	.10	
	“Classroom Teacher(2)”	144	180.64				
	“Branch Teacher(3)”	222	205.52				
	“Voc. Course Teacher (4)”	10	228.30				
Humanistic Competence	“Preschool Teacher(1)”	14	163.21	9.332	3	.02	3-2
	“Classroom Teacher(2)”	144	175.72				
	“Branch Teacher(3)”	222	209.76				
	“Voc. Course Teacher (4)”	10	208.90				
Technological Competence	“Preschool Teacher(1)”	14	146.07	8.792	3	.03	3-2
	“Classroom Teacher(2)”	144	179.65				
	“Branch Teacher(3)”	222	207.65				
	“Voc. Course Teacher (4)”	10	223.10				

According to Table 10, the participants' perceptions of managerial competence did not differ in terms of conceptual competence (p=.08) and technical competence (p=.10) according to the branch variable. It differed in the dimensions of humanistic competence (p=.02) and technological competence (p=.03). “As a result of the Tamhane'sT2-test analysis conducted to determine which branches this differentiation is between, it is seen that the participants who are branch teachers have a higher perception level than the participants who are classroom teachers.”

Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations

In this research, the competencies of school administrators were discussed in four dimensions: conceptual, technical, human and technological competency. As a result of this research, which was conducted to determine the competencies of school administrators according to teacher perceptions, it was found that school administrators' competencies were at the "very" level according to teacher perceptions. School management is a task that has versatile competence and skill characteristics due to its unique characteristics and complex structure (Özdemir et al. 2015). Since school management requires versatile skills and high level of competence, it is important in this study that school administrators' proficiency levels are "very" in all dimensions. Because this result can be accepted as an indication that school administrators have a holistic perspective on their institutions. It is seen that this finding also overlaps with the finding revealed as a result of the study conducted by Güven (2002). Because in this research, the competencies of school administrators were found to be at the "mostly" level by the teachers and themselves. However, in the study conducted by Dinç and Göksoy (2020), the technological competence levels of school administrators were found at "medium" level, and in the research conducted by Öztürk and Erdem (2020), the human competencies of school administrators were found at "weak" level. It is seen that the results of this study do not overlap with the results. The reason for this is that the research conducted by Dinç and Göksoy (2020) focused only on the competence of school administrators in the field of technology, while the research conducted by Öztürk and Erdem (2020) was evaluated only as a secondary school choice. Teachers as an example.

In this study, it was found that according to the gender variable, the proficiency levels of the participants did not differ according to their perceptions of the school administrators. This can be explained by the fact that the gender variable is not a determining factor in fulfilling the teaching profession.

In this research, it was found that the proficiency levels of school management did not differ in terms of conceptual competence, technical competence, and technological competence according to the marital status variable, but differed in the level of human competence according to the perceptions of the participants. It is seen that married participants have a higher perception level than single participants in the dimension of human

competence. According to the marital status variable, in the study conducted by Öztürk and Erdem (2020), it is seen that school administrators' competencies do not differ significantly, and according to Çetin (2009), single teachers find school administrators more competent than married ones. According to Öztürk and Erdem (2020), the reason for this differentiation stems from the fact that the expectations of single teachers from school administrators are lower than those of married teachers. In this study, the reason why married teachers' perceptions of human efficacy are higher than single teachers can be attributed to psychological reasons such as family responsibilities and perspective on life.

In this study, it was determined that the proficiency levels of school administrators did not differ in conceptual and technical dimensions according to the age variable, but differed in human and technological dimensions. In terms of human and technological competence, it has been observed that participants in the 51-60 age range are at a higher level than the participants in the 41-50 age range, 31-40 age range and 20-30 age range. In the study conducted by Öztürk and Erdem (2020), there was no significant difference between the competencies of school administrators according to the age variable, while in the study conducted by Dinç and Göksoy (2020), only the technological competence dimension of school administrators was found to be higher in the 31-40 age group. Such a conclusion may have been reached since it is accepted that teachers between the ages of 31-40 experience the most productive periods in terms of technology. The reason why participants in the 51-60 age range in this study have higher perceptions of human and technological competence than other age groups can be explained by the fact that they are related to the level of maturity in the profession.

One of the results of this research is that school administrators differ in conceptual, technical and technological competence dimensions according to the professional seniority variable of the participants, but they do not differ in the dimension of human competence. According to Beytekin (2004), teachers' perceptions in the first years of their profession are more positive than others. Similarly, in the study conducted by Babaoğlan and Çakan (2005), young participants find school administrators more competent than senior participants.

In the research conducted by Şener (2004), the proficiency levels of school management do not differ according to the educational status of the participants. In this study, it is seen that the proficiency levels of school administrators differ according to the perceptions of the participants in the dimensions of technical and human competence according to the educational status of the participants, but do not differ in the conceptual and technological dimensions.

According to the education level variable, while the competence levels of school management do not differ in conceptual, technical and human competence dimensions, they differ in technological competence dimensions. In terms of technological competence, it is seen that the participants who work at the high school level of educational institutions have a higher level of perception than those who work at the secondary and primary school level. This finding was confirmed by Agaoglu et al. (2012) and does not coincide with the results of the study. Because Agaoglu et al. (2012) revealed that the average of high school teachers' perceptions of the efficacy of school management is at the lowest level, while the average of primary school teachers is at the highest level, according to the education level of teachers.

In this research, it is seen that the perceptions of the participants do not differ according to the status variable, but the perceptions of the participants do not differ in terms of conceptual competence and technical competence, but differ in human and technological dimensions. It is among the results of the study that the participants who work as classroom teachers have a higher perception level than the participants who work as branch teachers. In the study conducted by Bayrakçı and Eraslan (2014), the technological competence levels of classroom teachers and school administrators were found to be higher than branch teachers.

In some countries where school administration is professional and accepted as an area of expertise, managerial competencies are accepted as the basic criterion for the appointment of school administrators (Ağaoğlu et al., 2012). For this reason, it is important to establish a pool of school administrator candidates by determining the qualifications of school administrators (Öz, 2019) and to appoint school administrators according to this pool.

A school principal may not have as much influence on students' success as a teacher. However, the decisions taken by the school administrator as a result of the examinations and observations to be made, the expectations regarding education, the ability to create resources, and positive behaviors such as creating a positive organizational climate indirectly affect the success of the students (Karip&Köksal, 1996; Korkmaz, 2005). For this reason, school administrators have a direct and indirect effect on creating an effective school (Bursalıoğlu,

2019). While an effective school administrator is seen as a person who provides resources to the school in accordance with the laws and rules and is focused on the goals of the institution, today the leadership characteristics of the administrators are emphasized before being a manager (Korkmaz, 2005). For this reason, creating and managing a correct school culture is considered among the most important competencies of school administrators (Baloğlu, 2020). Seminars, congresses, workshops, etc. to increase the level of competence of managers.studies are recommended.

Referanslar

Açıkalın, A. (1994). *Çağdaş örgütlerde insan kaynağının personel yönetimi*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Açıkalın, A. (2000). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin dönüşümcü liderlik özellikleri ve empati becerileri arasındaki ilişki (Ankara İli Örneği).*Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, Türkiye.

Agaoglu, E., Altınkurt, Y., Yılmaz, K. & Karaköse, T. (2012). Okul yöneticilerinin yeterliklerine ilişkin okul yöneticilerinin ve öğretmenlerin görüşleri (Kütahya ili). *Eğitim ve Bilim, 37* (164), 159-175.

Akbaşlı, S. (2018). Okul yöneticisi ve okul yöneticisinin yeterlikleri. N. Cemaloğlu ve M. Gürkan Gülcan (Ed.). *Kuramdan uygulamaya okul yönetimi* içinde. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Akın, U. (2014). Okul müdürlerinin inisiyatif alma düzeyleri ile öz-yeterlikleri arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Yönetimi Dergisi, 20*(2), 125-149.

Aydın, M. (2005). *Eğitim yönetimi* Ankara: Hatipoğlu Yayınları.

Babaoğlan, E. & Çakan, M. (2005). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin değerlendirilmesi: Müdürlerin insan ilişkileri, kavramsal ve teknik yeterliklerine ilişkin bir araştırma. *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 1*(10), 19-40.

Baloglu, N. (2020). Okul yöneticilerinin yeterlikleri. N. Baloğlu (Ed.). *Eğitim kurumlarında yönetim ve liderlik* içinde (s.1-24). Ankara: Gece Kitaplığı.

Başar, H. (1993). *Eğitim denetçisi: rolleri, yeterlilikleri, seçilmesi, yetiştirilmesi*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Başaran, İ. E. (1992). *Yönetimde insan ilişkileri: Yönetsel davranış*. Ankara:: Gül Yayınevi.

Başaran, İ. E. (2000). *Örgütsel davranış*. Ankara: Gül Yayınevi.

Başaran, İ. E. (2004). *Yönetimde insan ilişkileri*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

Bayrakçı, M. & Eraslan, F. (2014). Ortaöğretim okul yöneticilerinin inovasyon yeterlilikleri. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* (28), 96-135.

Beycioğlu, K. & Aslan, B. (2010). Öğretmen liderliği ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *İlkogretim Online, 9*(2), 2-13.

Beytekin, F. (2004). *İlköğretim okul müdürleri için eğitim liderliği standartlarının araştırılması.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Kocaeli Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu, İzmit, Türkiye.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2019). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış* (20. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Çetin, M. (2009). *İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin ve müdür yardımcılarının algılarına göre müdürlerinin liderlik yeterlikleri.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul, Türkiye.

Colins, J. (2001). *Good to great* (Çev. L. Cinemre). İstanbul: BoynerYayıncılık.

Dinç, H. & Göksoy, S. (2020). Okul müdürlerinin teknoloji liderliği yeterlilikleri. *International Journal on Lifelong Education and Leadership, 6*(1), 20-35.

Dogani, O. (2010). *Yönetim bilinci ve motivasyon*. İstanbul: Karma Yayıncılık.

Dönmez, B. (2002). Müfettiş, okul müdürü ve öğretmen algılarına göre ilköğretim okulu müdürlerinin yeterlikleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 29*(29), 27-45.

Efe, E., Bek, Y. & Şahin, M. (2000). *SPSS'te çözümleri ile istatistik yöntemler II* (10. Baskı). Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü Yayınları.

George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple study guide and reference*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Güçlü, F. (2019). *Yeni kamu yönetiminin önerdiği araçların milli eğitim sistemine yansımaları*. (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Niğde Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kamu Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı, Niğde.

Günay, M. (2001). *İlköğretim devlet okulu müdürlerinin yeterlik düzeylerinin öğretmenlerin ve müdürlerin kendi algıları ile incelenmesi.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, Türkiye.

Güven, İ. H. (2002). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin yeterliliklerinin değerlendirilmesi (Sakarya İli örneği).* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sakarya, Türkiye.

Karadağ, E. (2011). Okul müdürlerinin niteliklerine ilişkin olarak öğretmenlerin oluşturdukları bilişsel kurgular: Fenomonolojik bir çözümleme. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 36*(159),25-40.

Karasar, N. (2017). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: kavramlar ilkeler teknikler* (32. Baskı). Ankara: Nobel yayınları.

Karip, E. & Köksal, K. (1996). Etkili eğitim sistemlerinin geliştirilmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, *6*(6), 245.

Kayıkçı, K. (2001). Yönetici yetiştirme sorunu. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 150*(28-32).

Korkmaz, M. (2005). Okul yöneticilerinin yetiştirilmesi: sorunlar çözümler ve öneriler. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 25*(3), 237-252.

Madenoğlu, C. (2003). *Ortaöğretim kurumu yöneticileri ve öğretmenlerinin okul yöneticilerinde bulunması gereken niteliklere ilişkin öncelikleri.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir, Türkiye.

Morgan, G. (1989). Empowering human resources. *Human Resource Management in Education. Bristol: Open University Press, 12*, 32-37.

Öz, H. (2019). Veri temelli okul yöneticisi seçme, yetiştirme ve görevlendirme modeli. *Sosyal Bilimler ve Eğitim Dergisi, 2*(2), 311-334.

Özdemir, S., Sezgin, F. & Kılıç, D. Ö. (2015). Okul yöneticisi ve öğretmen görüşlerine göre okul yöneticilerinin liderlik yeterlikleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 40*(177),365-383.

Öztürk, K. & Erdem, M. (2020). Ortaokul öğretmenlerinin algılarına göre okul müdürlerinin yönetici yeterlikleri ile öğretmenlerin psikolojik dayanıklılık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Uluslararası Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 8*, 26-47.

Şahin, A. E. (2000). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin yeterlikleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 22*(22), 243-260.

Sarpkaya, R. (1997). Milli eğitim bakanlığındaki kurum yöneticilerinin atamalarının çağdaş işgören yönetimi ilkelerine göre değerlendirilmesi. *Eğitim ve Yaşam Dergisi, 2*(6),1-10.

Şener, S. (2004). *İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin müdürlük yeterliklerine ilişkin öğretmen algıları.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir, Türkiye.

Sevinç, N. & Arslan, H. (2019). Okul yöneticisinin yeterlikleri ölçeği geliştirme çalışması. *Research Studies Anatolia Journal, 2*, 126-135.

Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S., & Ullman, J. B. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5. Baskı), Boston, MA: Pearson.

Tearle, P. (2004). A theoretical and instrumental framework for implementing change in ICT in education. *Cambridge journal of education*, *34*(3), 331-351.

Töremen, F. & Kolay, Y. (2003). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin sahip olması gereken yeterlikler. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 160*.

Wang, W.-C., Lin, C.-H. & Chu, Y.-C. (2011). Types of competitive advantage and analysis. *International Journal of Business and Management, 6*(5), 100-104.

Türkçe Özet

Zamanla doğanın ve insan topluluklarının değişmesi gibi örgütlerde değişim yaşamaktadır. Örgütsel etkinliği ve verimliliği sağlayarak başarılı bir sonuca ulaşmak isteyen yönetici, örgüt içinde insan ilişkilerini iyi yönetmek (Başaran, 1992) ve yeterlikleri sergilemek zorundadır. Yeterlik, bireyin bir davranış ortaya koyabilmesi için gerekli beceriye, donanıma ve bilgi birikimine sahip olması (Başaran, 2000; Töremen ve Kolay, 2003) ve kişinin görevini istenilen düzeyde yerine getirebilme kapasitesidir (Şahin, 2000).

Toplumsal değişime katkısı göz önüne alındığında eğitim örgütleri ayrıcalıklı ve önemli bir yer tutmaktadır. Toplumsal değişim hareketlerinin kaynağı, bireyleri hayata hazırlayan, kavramsal ve uygulamaya yönelik bilgileri veren okulların yönetim ve organizasyonunda okul yöneticilerine önemli görevler düşmektedir. Okul yöneticilerinin görevlerini yaparken sergiledikleri liderlik stillerinin neler olabileceğinin anlatılması gerekmektedir (Akın, 2014).Yönetici yeterlikleri, örgütün hedeflerine ulaşabilmesi için yöneticilerin sahip olması gereken bilgi, beceri, tutum, değer ve davranışlar bütünüdür (Ağaoğlu, Altınkurt, Yılmaz ve Karaköse, 2012; Karadağ, 2011).

Türkiye'de eğitim yöneticilerinin yeterliklerini belirlemeye yönelik çalışmalar yapılmasına rağmen, okul yöneticiliği meslekleşemediği için bu yeterlikler uygulamaya geçirilememiştir (Ağaoğlu ve diğerleri, 2012). Okul yöneticisi, liderlik davranışları göstermeli ve çalışanları etkilemeyi başarabilmelidir. Böylece onları harekete geçirir ve örgüt amaçları doğrultusunda etkili sonuçlara ulaşabilir (Akbaşlı, 2018). Colins (2001) örgütsel etkililik ile yönetici yeterlikleri arasındaki ilişkiyi açıklamaya çalıştığı bir araştırma da, başarılı tüm örgütlerin yöneticilerinin en önemli yeterliğinin liderlik özelliğine sahip olmaları olduğunu belirtmiştir. Yönetici yeterliklerini, Başar (1993), teknik, insancıl ve karar yeterlikleri, Baloğlu (2020) ise teknik, kuramsal-kavramsal ve insani yeterlikler olmak üzere üç kategoride değerlendirmişlerdir. Sevinç ve Arslan (2019) tarafından yapılan bir çalışmada ise okul yöneticilerinin yeterlikleri, kavramsal, teknik, insancıl ve teknolojik yeterlikler olarak dört boyutta belirlenmiştir.

Literatür taramasında okul yöneticilerinin yeterliklerini belirlemeye yönelik olarak yapılan çeşitli araştırmalara (Ağaoğlu ve diğerleri, 2012; Dönmez, 2002; Günay, 2001; Güven, 2002; Karadağ, 2011; Madenoğlu, 2003; Özdemir ve diğerleri, 2015; Şahin, 2000; Şener, 2004) rastlanılmıştır. Bu araştırmalarda, yönetici yeterlikleri ile ilgili olarak standart bir çerçeve oluşturulmasına katkı sağlayacağı düşünüldüğünden yönetici yeterliklerini belirlemeye yönelik olarak yapılan çalışmaların sayılarının artırılması (Özdemir ve diğerleri, 2015; Şahin, 2000) ve farklı illerde, farklı yöntemlerle tekrarlanması (Ağaoğlu ve diğerleri, 2012) gerektiği önerilmiştir. Benzer şekilde Sevinç ve Arslan (2019) tarafından yapılan çalışma da okul yöneticilerinin yeterliklerini belirlenen bu dört boyutta ölçebilecek araştırmaların yapılması gerektiği önerilmiştir.

Nicel araştırma yöntemlerinden ilişkisel tarama desenine göre tasarlanan bu araştırmanın amacı, öğretmenlerin algılarına göre okul yöneticilerinin yeterliliklerini belirlemektir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda aşağıdaki sorulara cevaplar aranacaktır.

a) Öğretmen algılarına göre okul yöneticilerinin yeterlilikleri ne düzeydedir?
b) Öğretmen algılarına göre okul yöneticilerinin yeterlilikleri cinsiyet, medeni durum, yaş, mesleki kıdem, eğitim durumu, görev yapılan eğitim kademesi, çalışma durumu ve görev yaptığı branş değişkenlerine göre farklılaşmakta mıdır?

Okul yöneticilerinin yeterliklerini öğretmen algılarına göre belirlemek amacıyla yapılan bu çalışma ilişkisel tarama modeline göre tasarlanmıştır. Okul yöneticilerinin yeterliklerini değerlendiren öğretmen görüşleri katılımcıların cinsiyet, medeni durum, mesleki kıdem, eğitim durumu, görev yapılan eğitim kademesi, görev yapılan statü ve görev yaptığı branş değişkenlerine göre ele alınarak incelenmiştir. Araştırmanın evrenini, Gaziantep ili Nizip ilçesinde görev yapmakta olan 2552 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın örneklemi ise, evren içerisinden basit tesadüfi örnekleme yöntemi ile seçilen ve araştırmaya gönüllü olarak katılan 390 öğretmenden oluşmaktadır.

Öğretmen algılarına göre okul yöneticilerinin yeterliklerini belirlemeyi amacıyla bu çalışma ilişkisel tarama modeli ile tasarlanmış ve veriler, Sevinç ve Arslan (2019) tarafında geliştirilen "Okul Yöneticisinin Yeterlikleri Ölçeği" yardımı ile toplanmıştır.

Veriler ikili ve çoklu karşılaştırma teknikleri yardımıyla analiz edilmiştir. Verilerin dağılımının bağımlı ve bağımsız değişkenlerimize göre normal dağılım gösterdiği tespit edilmiştir. Araştırma kapsamına alınan okul yöneticilerinin yeterlik düzeyleri, aritmetik ortalama ve standart sapma cinsinden belirlenmiştir. Katılımcıların cinsiyet, yaş, medeni durum, mesleki kıdem, görev yaptığı branş, eğitim durumu değişkenlerine ait ortalamalar belirlenmiştir. Ortalamalar arası farkların tespitinde, ikili gruplar için t-testi, çoklu gruplar için Kruskal Wallis H testi tercih edilmiştir.

Analiz sonuçlarına göre okul yöneticilerinin yeterlik düzeylerini değerlendiren öğretmen görüşleri genel olarak "Çok" düzeyinde bulunmuştur.

Katılımcı görüşleri arasında *Cinsiyet* değişkenine göre, anlamlı bir farklılık yoktur (p<,05). *Medeni Durum* değişkeni bakımından insancıl yeterlik boyutlarında anlamlı farklar bulunurken; kavramsal yeterlik, teknik yeterlik ve teknolojik yeterlik boyutlarında anlamlı farklar bulunmamaktadır (p<,05).

Katılımcıların *Yaş Değişkenine* göre okul müdürlerinin kavramsal yeterlik ve teknik yeterlik boyutlarında farklılaşma bulunmamaktadır. Fakat bununla birlikte insancıl yeterlik ve teknolojik yeterlik boyutlarında anlamlı farklara rastlanmaktadır (p<,05).

Mesleki Kıdem değişkenine göre katılımcı görüşleri sadece teknik yeterlik boyutunda farklılaşırken kavramsal, insancıl ve teknolojik yeterlik boyutlarında anlamlı olarak (p<,05) farklılaşmamaktadır.

Eğitim Durumları değişkenine göre katılımcı görüşlerinin tüm boyutlarda anlamlı farklılıklar (p<,05) gösterdiği görülmektedir.

Yine katılımcı görüşleri *Görev Yapılan Eğitim Kademesi Değişkenine* göre kavramsal yeterlik, teknik yeterlik, insancıl yeterlik boyutlarında farklılaşmazken; teknolojik yeterlik boyutunda anlamlı olarak (p<.05) farklılaşmaktadır.

Katılımcıların istihdam şekline göre katılımcı görüşleri arasında anlamlı farklılaşma (p>,05) bulunmamaktadır.

Görev yapılan branş değişkenine göre katılımcı görüşlerinin kavramsal yeterlik ve teknik yeterlik boyutlarında farklılaşmadığı (p>,05), insancıl yeterlik ve teknolojik yeterlik boyutunda farklılaştığı (p<,05) görülmektedir.

Araştırmanın sonuçları literatür temelinde tartışılmakta ve yöneticilerin yeterlik düzeylerini daha da artırmaya yönelik seminer, kongre, çalıştay vb. çalışmalar önerilmektedir.