

**AN EMPIRICAL RESEARCH FOR LEADERSHIP
PERCEPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS IN SCHOOLS
OF AYDIN NATIONAL EDUCATION HEADSHIP**

**AYDIN İLİ MİLLİ EĞİTİM MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE BAĞLI
OKULLARDAKİ YÖNETİCİLERİN LİDERLİK
ALGILAMALARINA İLİŞKİN AMPİRİK BİR ÇALIŞMA**

Assist.Prof.Dr.Hulusi DOĞAN*

ABSTRACT

This study is composed of a conceptual analysis of leadership and an empirical research for the perceptions of administrators, who work in schools tied to Aydın National Education Headship, about leadership. The results, based on a sample of 391 administrators, indicate that both male and female administrators agree on a leadership requirement in National Education and the present conditions of National Education should be examined to train leaders. It is hoped that these types of researches will constitute a source for top-administrators, bureaucrats, and politicians to improve a better atmosphere in National Education to train leaders.

ÖZET

Bu çalışma liderlik kavramı ve Aydın ili Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü okullarında görev yapan yöneticilerin liderlik kavramına ilişkin algulamalarını belirlemeye yönelik bir ampirik çalışmayı içermektedir. 391 yönetici üzerinde yapılan araştırma sonuçları bay ve bayan yöneticilerin öncelikle Milli Eğitimde liderliğe gereksinim olduğu ve Milli Eğitim koşullarının lider yetiştirecek şekilde yeniden gözden geçirilmesi konusunda hem fikir olduklarını göstermektedir. Bu ve bu tür çalışmaların, Milli Eğitimde lider yetiştirmeye yönelik daha iyi bir ortam oluşturulması noktasında üst düzey yöneticilere, bürokrat ve siyasetçilere birer kaynak oluşturacağı umut edilmektedir.

Leadership, National Education, Administrator.
Liderlik, Milli Eğitim, Yönetici.

* Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Alanya İşletme Fakültesi

1. INTRODUCTION

The question of “whether leaders are born or to become?” has been asked for many years. Although, a common answer for this question has been found yet, a certain reality does exist today is almost all organizations need a leader. So, many researches have been carried out about leadership to understand the key traits of leaders. In other words, administrators as well as researchers have noticed the importance of leaders. And different leadership styles or types such as democratic leadership, innovative leadership, participative leadership, academic leadership concepts are being added and analyzed in literature. In short, leaders are needed in every field today. But another question that how educators/teachers in our country perceive and evaluate leadership concept makes an interesting subject to be examined. In particular, questions such as what do administrators, who work in schools of Ministry of National Education, think about leadership? Whether they need a leader in schools or not? does our education system need to be re-examined to train leaders? What are educator/administrator and school roles in training leaders? are waiting for answers. So, this study can be simply defined as a tool or a step which tries and aims to answer these questions.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In management literature, it is possible to see different theories about leadership simply defined as the ability to influence people toward the attainment of organizational goals.¹ Trait theory, one of them, focuses on the leader’s personal characteristics such as self-confidence, creativity, alertness, cooperativeness, intelligence, sociability, personal integrity, ethical conduct, judgement, decisiveness, and responsibility. The main goal of the theory is to explore common traits of great leaders to train future leaders. Shortly, it depends on the relationship between personal traits and leader success. And also, the classification of leaders as autocratic or democratic ones can be evaluated in the content of trait theory. Because the term of “autocratic” reminds us the typical characteristics of a leader who tends to centralize authority and rely on legitimate, reward, and coercive power to manage subordinates. But, democratic one delegates authority to others, encourages participation, and relies on expert and referent power to manage subordinates.²

On the other hand, contingency theory mainly analyzes the relationship between the leadership style and organizational situation and states about two types of leader; relationship-oriented leader and task-oriented leader. However a relationship-oriented leader is considered with people, a task-oriented leader is primarily motivated by task accomplishment.

¹ R.L. Daft, *Management*, 2nd Ed., The Dryden Press, Chicago: 1991: 370-399.

² G.A. YUKL, *Leadership in Organizations*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: 1981: 20-30; R. Albanese and D. D. Fleet, *Organizational Behavior: A Managerial Viewpoint*, The Dryden Press, Hinsdale: 1983; R.L. Daft, *Management*, 2nd Ed., The Dryden Press, Chicago: 1991: 370-399.

In other words, a relationship-oriented leader generally cares about and is sensitive to employee's feelings, but a task-oriented leader places greater value on task activities than on people.³

And a recent model, a two-factor theory of leadership processes, transactional-transformational model is offered by Bass and Avolio who describe transformational leadership as encouraging other people to perform and develop beyond what is normally expected of them, and differs from transactional leadership, which refers to a leadership style focused on interpersonal transactions between managers and employees.⁴ So the transformational leadership enhances transactional leadership by transforming the follower's mind-set and purpose, and bringing them to a higher level above immediate self-interests.⁵

Meanwhile, it is a reality that the concept and construct of leadership is continuously evolving.⁶ Today, leadership cannot mean only one thing because it can and does take on multiple meanings and appearances. A traditional appearance of leadership often takes the form of an individual in charge of a team providing direction, support to others in the team, and aligning the team's goals within a broader purpose. But a broader understanding, goes beyond this traditional approach, of leadership can take the form of team members working together collectively to set direction, build commitment, and create alignment.⁷ Furthermore, Day and Harrison

³ R.L. Daft, *Management*, 2nd Ed., The Dryden Press, Chicago: 1991: 370-399; F.E. Fiedler, *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*, McGraw-Hill, New York: 1967: 33-59.

⁴ B.M. Bass and B.J. Avolio B.J. *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-Manual and Sampler Set*, 3. Ed., CA: Mind Garden, Inc., Palo Alto: 2004: 15-38.

⁵ H.S. Khoo and G.J. Burch, "The dark side of leadership personality and transformational leadership: an exploratory study", *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44, 2008: 86-97; C.L. Pearce, "The future of leadership development: The importance of identity, multi-level approaches, self-leadership, physical fitness, shared leadership, networking, creativity, emotions, spirituality and on-boarding processes", *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 2007: 355-359; B.M. Bass and B.J. Avolio B.J. *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-Manual and Sampler Set*, 3. Ed., CA: Mind Garden, Inc., Palo Alto: 2004; B.M. Bass, B.M., *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, New York: 1985; T. Koçel, *İşletme Yöneticiliği*, Beta Ya., 9. Bası, İstanbul: 2003: 583-605.

⁶ D.V. Day, "Leadership development: A review in context", *Leadership Quarterly*, 11, 2000: 581-613; S.E. Murphy and R.E. Riggio.E. (2003), *The future of leadership development*, Mahwah, Lawrence Erlbaum, NJ: 2003; C.L. Pearce, D.A. Waldman and C. Csikszentmihalyi, "Virtuous leadership: A theoretical model and research agenda", *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion*, 3 (1-2), 2006: 60-77; C.L. Pearce, "The future of leadership development: The importance of identity, multi-level approaches, self-leadership, physical fitness, shared leadership, networking, creativity, emotions, spirituality and on-boarding processes", *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 2007: 355-359.

⁷ P.G.M. O'Connor and L. Quinn, L., Organizational capacity for leadership. In C.D. McCauley and E. Van Velsor (Eds.), *The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development*, 2nd Ed., Jossey-Bass, San Francisco: 2004: 417-437; C.L. Pearce and J.A. Conger, *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2003; J.F. Cox, C.L. Pearce and H.P. Sims, Toward a broader leadership development agenda: Extending the traditional transactional-transformational duality by developing directive, empowered, and shared leadership skills. In S.E. Murphy and R.E. Riggio (Eds.), *The future of leadership development*, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2003: 161-179; E. Van Velsor and C.D. McCauley, Our view of leadership development. In C.D. McCauley

prefers to demonstrate the evolution of historical bases of leadership concept in a table (see Table 1).⁸

According to Day and Harrison, leadership development process is composed of three different levels which are progressing from the most basic (least inclusive and complex) to the most advanced thinking (greatest sophistication, complexity, and inclusiveness).⁹ At the first/ the least complex level, leadership is something a person possesses and the leader is the source of leadership and the followers are the receivers. Leadership is therefore seen by others as an expression of these personally possessed qualities or characteristics.

and E. Van Velsor (Eds.), *The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development*, 2nd Ed., Jossey-Bass, San Francisco: 2004: 1-22; D.V. Day and M.M. Harrison, "A multilevel, identity-based approach to leadership development", *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 2007: 360-373.

⁸ Day and Harrison, 361.

⁹ Day and Harrison, 360-373.

Table 1: Summary of Evolvement of Thinking Around Leadership

Level of complexity and inclusiveness	Definition of leadership	Illustrative theories of	levels-of-analysis addressed	leadership development focus
•Most basic, Least complex and inclusive conceptualization of leadership	•Leadership is role-based authority	•Trait theory •Leader behaviors	•Individual level •Top-down influence of leader on followers	•Individual skills development
•Mid-level conceptualization of leadership	•Leadership is an influence process between individuals •Roles are also important in shaping influence processes	•Leader-member exchange	•Reciprocal dyadic influence •Top-down influence of leader on follower as well as bottom-up effect of follower on leader	Includes both: •Individual skill development •relationship building
•Most advanced, complex, and inclusive conceptualization of leadership	•Leadership is a property of a social system including interdependencies among individuals, teams, and organizations •Can also involve roles and influence processes depending upon situation	•Shared leadership •Collective leadership •Connective leadership	Multi-level approach (includes individual, team, and organizational level). •Includes both contextual influences of organizational influences on team and boundaries leadership emergence within a team •Also acknowledges dyadic and individual levels	Includes all: •Individual skill development •Relationship building •Empowerment •Collaboration •Working across

Source: D.V. Day and M.M. Harrison, "A multilevel, identity-based approach to leadership development", *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 2007: p. 361.

At the second/relational level, an individual may think of leadership in terms of influencing a follower, or within an interpersonal influence knowledge principle. This manner of thinking about leadership suggests that a leader engages followers in negotiating influence, of a process of agreeing or disagreeing, and planning and negotiating. Finally, at the most complex or collective level, leadership can be understood as happening when people participate in collaborative forms of thought and action. From this perspective, leadership mainly is a property of the social system and all entities within the given system (e.g., organization) have a responsibility to participate in the leadership process.¹⁰ Consequently, leadership development is inherently a multilevel phenomenon. Individual leader development is the foundation, but there is also need to develop leadership in collectives such as teams as well as the broader organization. Leadership development involves designing and implementing the social structures and processes that sustain ongoing and continuous development efforts.¹¹

3. THE STUDY

3.1. Aim

The aim of this study is to define the perceptions of administrators, who are working in the schools of Aydın National Education Headship, about leadership. So the main objectives of this study are to find an answer for the questions of “what are the outstanding tasks of school administrators?”, “whether a leader requirement exists in National Education?”, “whether a relationship exists between education and leadership?”, and “what is the basic role of administrators; administration or leadership?”. Moreover, gender differences and correlations among the research variables constitute the other part of the study. In short, our main and sub-hypotheses to be analysed in this study are

H1: There is a statistical difference between leadership perceptions of male and female administrators.

H1a: There is a statistical difference between perceptions of male and female administrators about the administrator task and leader requirement in National Education.

H1b: There is a statistical difference between perceptions of male and female administrators about leadership atmosphere in National Education.

H1c: There is a statistical difference between perceptions of male and female administrators about leadership and education relationship.

H1d: There is a statistical difference between perceptions of male and female administrators about administration or leadership first coming in National Education.

¹⁰ W.H. Drath and C.J. Palus, Making common sense: Leadership as meaning-making in a community of practice, Greensboro, NC: 1994; 17-31.

¹¹ Day and Harrison, 360-373.

3.2. Sample

The target administrators selected for this research are from the schools of Aydın National Education Headship. Official records taken from the National Education Headship of Aydın in 2008, January indicate that 602 schools are located in the centre and towns of Aydın. 391 (64.9%) completed administrator questionnaires were obtained from these 602 schools. The responses given by the administrators were anonymous and confidential. All analyses described below are based on the data from these 391 subjects.

3.3. Procedure/Instruments

Having an official permission from both Aydın National Education Headship and Aydın Governorship, the administrators were sended a demographic and a leadership survey questionnaire (designed by the author) via net for this study. Demographic survey part of the questionnaire is composed of 10 variables namely sex, age, marital status, education level, vocational experience, vocational branch, foreign language, membership of an association, journal subscription/preference, and administrative experience. Also the second part of the questionnaire is composed of 6 specific questions to determine general thoughts or approaches of administrators about administration and leadership. These 6 variables are favourite leader in National Education, the most outstanding trait in leadership, preference of behaviour style in subordinate relationship, causes of being administrator, thought on employee attitude, and having a course/seminar about administration. And finally, the third part of the questionnaire is composed of 20 items to define leadership perceptions of administrators. The instrument consisted of these 20 items answered on a five-point Likert scale anchored by the terms “strongly agree” (1) and “strongly disagree” (5).

3.4. Statistical Analysis

SPSS pc + version 15.0 was used for statistical analysis. Differences in the responses between the groups were tested by the Independent Samples Test. Factor analysis was used to group 20 items prepared to measure the leadership perceptions of administrators. Internal consistency was tested by Cronbach's alpha. Moreover the Pearson rank correlation coefficient was used to calculate the correlation among the factors and demographic variables. At the end of the factor analysis, items of the questionnaire were collected in four factor groups and 6 items were deleted as their factor loadings lower than 0.500. Administrators' perceptions for *Administrator Tasks and Leader Requirement* (shortly called as ATLER) in National Education (NE) were measured by five items collected in the first factor group which has 0.670 alpha coefficient value. Administrators' perceptions for *Leadership Atmosphere* (shortly called as LAT) in National Education were measured by also five items collected in the second factor group which has 0.695 alpha coefficient value. Also administrators' perceptions for *Leadership and Education Relationship* (shortly called as LER) were measured by two items collected in the third group which has 0.522 alpha

coefficient value. Finally, administrators' perceptions for *Administration or Leadership First Coming* (shortly called as ADLE) in National Education were measured by two items collected in the fourth factor group which has 0.469 alpha coefficient value.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Demographic Statistics

As can be seen from Table 1, the majority of our respondents were male administrators (88.2 %), and only 11.5 % of them were female. And 93.4 % of respondents were married, whereas 4.9 % were single and only 1.8 % were divorced.

Table 1. Demographic Statistics of The Respondents

Item	Frequency	Percent (%)	Item	Frequency	Percent (%)
<i>Gender</i>			<i>Vocational Experience</i>		
Male	345	88.2	1-5 years	8	2.0
Female	45	11.5	6-10 years	52	13.3
Missing	1	0.3	11-15 years	75	19.2
Total	391	100	16-20 years	74	18.9
<i>Marital Status</i>			21 and over	177	45.3
Married	365	93.4	Missing	5	1.3
Single	19	4.9	Total	391	100
Divorced	7	1.8	<i>Administrative Experience</i>		
Total.	391	100	1-5 years	126	32.2
<i>Age</i>			6-10 years	116	29.7
24-30	25	6.4	11-15 years	72	18.4
31-40	124	31.7	16 and over	76	19.4
41-50	178	45.5	Missing	1	0.3
51 and over	62	15.9	Total	391	100
Missing	2	0.5	<i>Member of an Ass./Society/Club</i>		
Total	391	100	Vocational Ass.	108	27.6
<i>Education Level</i>			Social Ass.	72	18.4
University			Sports Club	23	5.9
a 2-year degr.	55	14.1	Other/missing	188	48.1
a 4-year degr.	325	83.1	Total	391	100
master degr.	10	2.6	<i>Journal Subscription/Preference</i>		
Missing	1	0.3	Technical	44	11.2
Total	391	100	Economics	34	8.7
<i>Foreign Language</i>			Actuality	59	15.1
No For. Lang.	143	36.6	Sports	22	5.6
English	165	42.2	Education	164	41.9
German	16	4.1	Other/missing	68	17.5
French	30	7.7	<i>Branch</i>		
Other/Missing	37	9.4	Elementary Educ.	158	40.4
Total	391	100	Physics	55	14.0
			Social Sciences	78	19.9
			Vocational Educ	73	18.7
			Other/Missing	27	7.0

On the other hand, the majority of respondents (45.3%) had a vocational experience of 21 years and over, and followed by 19.2% were in the range of 11-15 years, 18.9% in 16-20, 13.3% in 6-10, and only 2.0% in 1-5 years range. Administrative experience of respondents was not so high as their vocational experience. 32.2 % of respondents had an administrative experience of 1-5 years. And sequentially 29.7% in 6-10, 19.4% in 16 and over, and 18.4% in 11-15. Vocational branch of respondents was generally (40.4%) elementary education. This was followed by social sciences (19.9%), vocational education (18.7%), and physical sciences (14.0%).

4.2. Findings for Administrative Traits of The Respondents

As can be seen from Table 2, 181 (46.3 almost half) of the respondents have not a course, seminar or an education about administration. This can be called an interesting finding/reality for administrators of National Education Ministry. Encouragingly, the majority of respondents (56.5%) admit administration responsibility as a personal goal. But the number of respondents who accept this role owing to an obligation such as lack of a personal is not so small (23.8%).

Table 2. Findings for Administrative Traits of The Respondents

Item	Frequency	Percent (%)	Item	Frequency	Percent (%)
<i>Got a course/seminar about administration</i>			<i>Have a favourite leader in NE</i>		
Yes	196	50.1	Yes	229	58.6
No	181	46.3	No	114	29.2
Missing	14	3.6	Missing	48	12.2
<i>Behavior styles in subordinate relationships</i>			<i>Causes of being an administrator</i>		
Authoritarian	11	2.8	Ideal/goal	221	56.5
Moderate	108	27.6	Prestige	17	4.3
Fatherly	17	4.3	Obligation	93	23.8
Democrat	223	57.0	(no other one)	7	1.8
Other/Missing	32	8.3	Pay/revenue	41	10.5
<i>Employees are</i>			giving lecture	12	3.1
-selfish and have a tendency to evade. Need for tight control.	6	1.5	Missing		
-trustable. No need for tight control.	63	16.1	<i>The most outstanding trait in leadership</i>		
-members of the organization and must be motivated	312	79.8	Faithfulness	113	28.9
Missing	10	2.6	Intelligence	97	24.8
			Self-confidence	87	22.3
			Oratory/Speking	55	14.1
			Well		
			Enterprising	22	5.6
			Physical	3	0.03
			Appearance		
			Other/Missing	14	4.27

Faithfulness is seen as the most outstanding trait in leadership by administrators (28.9%). Faithfulness is followed by intelligence (24.8), self-confidence (22.3%), speaking well (14.1%), and enterprising (5.6%). On the other hand, many administrators (58.6%) have not a difficulty in finding a favourite leader in National Education, whereas 114 of respondents do not see anyone as a leader in NE. Furthermore, 312 (79.8%) of respondents regard employees as the members of an organization and believe they should be motivated. And only 5 (1.5%) administrators think that employees must be tightly controlled because of their selfishness and aptness to evade. But 63 (16.1%) administrators think that there is no need for tight control on employees as they are trustable. Moreover it can be seen from Table 2 that administrators prefer different behaviour styles in their relationships with subordinates. The number of administrators who are in favour of a democratic-behaviour style is 223 (57.0%). And a moderate style is preferred by 108 (27.6%) administrators, whereas 17 (4.3%) administrators use a fatherly approach in their relationships with subordinates. Interestingly, authoritarian style in relationships is also preferred by 11 (2.8%) administrators.

4.3. Intercorrelations Among Variables

Correlations among the research variables are presented in Table 3. As can be seen, there is a positive and strong correlation between the variables of "age" and "vocational experience" of administrators ($r=0.792$; $p<0.01$). A similar correlation exists between the variables of "age" and "administrative experience" of administrators ($r=0.649$; $p<0.01$). Therefore it means that the older administrators participated in our research as a respondent, the higher vocational and administrative experience they have. But education level of administrators are negatively correlated with their vocational ($r=-0.248$; $p<0.01$) and administrative experience ($r=-0.146$; $p<0.001$). In other words, the higher vocational and administrative experience administrators had, the lower education level presented. Also inverse relation between the variables of age and education level ($r=0.260$; $p<0.01$) can be evaluated as a confirmation for the correlation among education level and vocational experience, and administrative experience.

Table 3: Pearson Correlation Values of Research Variables

Variables	Sex	Educ. Level	Age	Marital Status	VEX	AEX	ATLER	LANE	LER	ADLE
Sex	1	0.066	-0.119*	-0.176**	-0.105	-0.103*	-0.025	-0.010	-0.112*	-0.009
Educ. Level	0.066	1	-0.260**	-0.086	-0.248**	-0.146**	0.110*	0.002	-0.069	-0.041
Age	0.119*	-0.260**	1	0.193**	0.792**	0.649**	-0.149**	-0.061	-0.020	-0.051
Marital Status	-0.176**	-0.086	0.193**	1	0.259**	0.154**	-0.090	0.073	-0.006	0.019
VEX	-0.105	-0.248**	0.792**	0.259**	1	0.677	-0.147**	-0.103	-0.004	-0.016
AEX	-0.103*	-0.146**	0.649**	0.154**	0.677	1	-0.111*	-0.030	0.076	-0.099
ATLER	-0.025	0.110*	-0.149**	-0.090	-0.147**	-0.111*	1	0.155**	0.200**	-0.229**
LANE	-0.010	0.002	-0.061	0.073	-0.103	-0.030	0.155**	1	0.214**	-0.100
LER	-0.112*	-0.069	-0.020	-0.006	-0.004	0.076	0.200**	0.214**	1	-0.061
ADLE	-0.009	-0.041	-0.051	0.019	-0.016	-0.099	-0.229**	-0.100	-0.061	1

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

VEX: Vocational Experience, AEX: Administrative Experience, ATLER: Administrator Tasks and Leader Requirement

LANE: Leadership Atmosphere in NE, LER: Leadership and Education Relationship, ADLE: Administration or Leadership.

On the other hand, Table 3 presents interestingly a negative correlation between age and ATLER (Administrator Tasks and Leader Requirement) variable ($r=0.149$; $p<0.01$). It means that older ones participated in our research believe administrators should have a more limited responsibility and less need for a leader in National Education. Moreover, negative correlations among vocational experience, administrative experience, and ATLER have a supportive content. Explicitly, both vocational experience ($r=-0.147$; $p<0.01$) and administrative experience ($r=-0.111$; $p<0.05$) are inversely related with ATLER.

4.4. Group Statistics and Independent Samples Test Results

Group statistics and the results of Independent Samples Test are presented in Table 4. The results show that administrators generally agree on all items of the research except the last two ones. In other words, administrators have a positive view for the first three factor groups. Explicitly, administrators participated in our research think that creating a communication and collaboration atmosphere, and vision-creating for an organization are the responsibilities of administrators. Furthermore, they believe administrators should be concerned about off-job problems of subordinates. And they all agree that administrators have to be a leader, as there is a need for leaders in National Education (see the mean and standard deviation values of the first five items). Unfortunately, they think that not a suitable atmosphere exists in National Education for training leaders, so the present conditions must be re-examined.

According to the results of the third factor group, administrators believe that a firm relationship exists between the leadership and education. So they define a clear support for the idea of if not a leader is seen in a country, its education system and educators have to be re-examined. And finally, almost all administrators disagree for the last factor group. They think that participation in decision-making and administrator leadership are necessary tools in National Education.

Table 4: The Results of Group Statistics and Independent Samples Test

Variables/Factor Groups	Gender Male Female	Mean	Std. Devi- ation	Total Mean N Std. Dev.	Ind.Sam. Test		
					df	t	P Sig. 2- tailed
Administrator Tasks and Leader Requirement	331 45	1.766 1.728	0.500 0.497	1.762 376 0.499	374	0.477	0.634
Creating a communication and collaboration atmosphere is administrator responsibility.	342 45	1.725 1.688	0.698 0.701	1.720 387 0.697	385	0.327	0.744
Vision-creating for an organization is administrator responsibility.	342 45	2.002 1.911	0.930 0.972	1.992 387 0.934	385	0.619	0.536
An administrator has to be a leader.	341 45	1.498 1.355	0.680 0.608	1.481 386 0.672	384	1.341	0.181
There is a need for leaders in National Education (NE).	337 45	1.614 1.511	0.706 0.626	1.602 382 0.697	380	0.931	0.352
Administrators must be concerned about subordinate off-job problems.	342 45	2.055 2.177	0.788 0.777	2.069 387 0.787	385	- 0.979	0.328
Leadership Atmosphere in NE	328 41	2.336 2.312	0.729 0.673	2.333 369 0.722	367	0.198	0.634
Present conditions (in NE) are suitable for training loyal administrators, not leaders.	339 45	2.126 2.155	1.031 1.021	2.130 384 1.028	382	- 0.176	0.861
In NE, a personal administrative model (based on personal traits) is dominant, not a systematic administrative model.	339 45	2.339 2.600	1.008 1.156	2.369 384 1.028	382	- 1.601	0.110
Not a suitable atmosphere exists to be a leader in NE.	338 44	2.710 2.681	1.182 1.006	2.706 382 1.162	380	0.151	0.880
Objectivity is a certain rule in administrator promotions and everybody obeys this rule in NE.	333 42	2.340 2.334	1.324 1.223	2.339 375 1.312	373	- 0.028	0.978
Our education system has to be re-examined to train leaders.	340 45	1.852 1.644	0.795 0.712	1.828 385 0.788	383	1.671	0.096
Leadership and Education Relationship	340 45	1.989 1.711	0.805 0.694	1.957 385 0.797	383	2.214	0.027*
If not a leader is seen in a country, education system and educators of it have to be re-examined.	340 45	1.985 1.555	1.054 0.813	1.935 385 1.037	383	2.631	0.009
Leaders, as administrators, can be trained only by a qualified education system.	340 45	1.994 1.866	0.899 0.868	1.979 385 0.895	383	0.897	0.370
Administration or Leadership	338 45	4.031 4.011	0.709 0.711	4.028 383 0.711	381	0.177	0.860
Decision-making is administrator task, it does not concern subordinates.	342 45	4.014 4.044	0.933 0.952	4.018 387 0.934	385	- 0.201	0.841
Administrator responsibility is obeying rules, not leadership.	340 45	4.035 3.977	0.854 0.783	4.028 385 0.845	383	0.428	0.669
Leadership Requirement Perception	316 41	2.011 1.920	0.422 0.374	2.000 357 0.418	355	1.304	0.193

1: Strongly agree, 2: Agree, 3: Neither agree nor disagree, 4: Disagree, 5: Strongly disagree.

* Accepted hypothesis; Significance, $p < 0,05$ ((two-tailed)).

On the other hand, when we analyze the results of Independent Samples Test presented in Table 4, no significant difference exists between the views of male and female administrators on research factor groups, except for the third one. Thus, 3 sub-hypotheses of our research are rejected according to the results of Independent Samples Test. In other words, we have to reject sub-hypotheses H1a, H1b, and H1d as their p-values are greater than 0,05. In other words, male administrators do not differently think from female ones about the *Administrator Task and Leader Requirement* in National Education ($t=0.477$; $p=0.634>0.05$). Similarly, male administrators do not differently think from female ones about *Leadership Atmosphere* ($t=0.198$; $p=0.634>0.05$) and *Administration or Leadership First Coming* ($t=0.177$; $p=0.860>0.05$) in National Education. Conversely, there is a statistical difference between the perceptions of male and female administrators about *Leadership and Education Relationship* ($t=2.214$; $p=0.027<0.05$). In other words, we have to accept H1c and confirm that female administrators are more decisive than male ones on leadership and education relationship. And finally it is not possible to say that there is a statistical difference between leadership perceptions of male and female administrators. So the main H1 hypotheses is rejected as p-value is greater than 0.05 ($t=1.304$; $p=0.193>0.05$).

5. CONCLUSION

The most outstanding finding of this research is both male and female administrators of schools, tied to Aydın National Education Headship, think that there is a relationship between education and leadership. They believe that leaders can be trained by a qualified education system. So, the administrators agree that if a leader is not seen in a country, its education system and educators must be examined. But, administrators do not see a suitable atmosphere for leadership in our National Education. Furthermore, they think that a personal administrative model rather than a systematic one is dominant in our NE. Therefore, re-examination of present conditions of NE to train leaders is regarded as a necessary step by administrators. Because they believe administrators should support participation in decision-making and make leadership in NE. Moreover, they agree that each administrator has to be a leader by creating vision, corporation and collaborative atmosphere in organization and also concern about off-job problems of subordinates. Consequently school administrators admit that education has a key role in leader training.

On the other hand, research results display that no significant difference exists between the perceptions of male and female administrators about leadership. In general, they all agree on the research factors, namely leader requirement, leadership and education relationship, a weak leadership atmosphere, and leadership first coming than administration in National Education. But research results indicate that female administrators are a little more decisive than male ones on leadership and education relationship.

Meanwhile, one of the major findings of this research is that administrators regard faithfulness as the most outstanding trait in leadership. Faithfulness is followed by intelligence, self-confidence, speaking well, and enterprising capability. Interestingly, many administrators have a favourite leader in National Education and prefer a democratic-behaviour style in their relationships with their subordinates.

Consequently, we believe that this study makes an important contribution to the understanding of leadership and education relationship and administrator perspectives about leadership in our National Education. We hope that this type of studies may be a source for top-administrators, bureaucrats, and politicians to re-evaluate the present conditions of National Education System to train leaders. So, we suggest to apply these types of researches frequently to investigate and improve general atmosphere for leadership in NE. And also further researches are compulsory for academicians to analyze the relationship between education and leadership.

REFERENCES

1. ALBANESE, R. and FLEET, D.D., *Organizational Behavior: A Managerial Viewpoint*, The Dryden Press, Hinsdale: 1983.
2. BASS, B.M (1985), *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, New York: 1985.
3. BASS, B.M., and AVOLIO, B.J., *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-Manual and Sampler Set*, 3. Ed., CA: Mind Garden, Inc., Palo Alto: 2004.
4. COX, J.F., PEARCE, C.L. and SIMS, H.P., Toward a broader leadership development agenda: Extending the traditional transactional-transformational duality by developing directive, empowered, and shared leadership skills. In S.E. Murphy and R.E. Riggio (Eds.), *The future of leadership development* (pp. 161-179). Mahwah, NJ: 2003.
5. DAFT, R.L., *Management*, 2nd Ed., The Dryden Press, Chicago: 1991.
6. DAY, D.V., "Leadership development: A review in context", *Leadership Quarterly*, 11, 2000: 581-613.
7. DAY, D.V. and HARRISON, M.M., "A multilevel, identity-bases approach to leadership development", *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 2007: 360-373.
8. DRATH, W.H. and PALUS, C.J. (1994), *Making common sense: Leadership as meaning-making in a community of practice*, Greensboro, NC: 1994.

9. FIEDLER, F.E., *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*, McGraw-Hill, New York: 1967.
10. KHOO, H.S., and BURCH, G.J., “The dark side of leadership personality and transformational leadership: an exploratory study”, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44, 2008: 86-97.
11. KOÇEL, T., *İşletme Yöneticiliği*, Beta Ya., 9. Bası, İstanbul: 2003.
12. O’CONNOR, P.G.M. and QUINN, L., Organizational capacity for leadership. In C.D. Mccauley and E. Van Velsor (Eds.), *The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development* (pp. 417-437), 2nd Ed., Jossey-Bass, San Francisco: 2004
13. MURPHY, S.E. and RIGGIO, R.E., *The future of leadership development*, Mahwaj, NJ: 2003.
14. PEARCE, C.L., “The future of leadership development: The importance of identity, multi-level approaches, self-leadership, physical fitness, shared leadership, networking, creativity, emotions, spirituality and onboarding processes”, *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 2007: 355-359.
15. PEARCE, C.L. and CONGER, J.A., *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whysof leadership*, Thousand Oaks, CA: 2003..
16. PEARCE, C.L., WALDMAN, D.A. and CSIKSZENTMIHALYI, C., “Virtuous leadership: A theoretical model and research agenda”, *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion*, 3 (1-2), 2006: 60-77.
17. VAN VELSOR, E. and MCCAULEY, C.D., Our view of leadership development. In C.D. Mccauley and E. Van Velsor (Eds.), *The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development* (pp. 1-22), 2nd Ed., Jossey-Bass, San Francisco: 2004.
18. YUKL, G.A., *Leadership in Organizations*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: 1981.