



Comparison of Taking Personal Initiative of Public and Private School Administrators According to the Perceptions of Teacher

Yılmaz KILIÇ¹

Abstract

This study was designed to compare the levels of taking personal initiative of school administrators who work in public and private schools with the perceptions of teacher. The sample of the study consists of teachers working in public and private schools in the centre of Konya in the 2018- 2019 academic year. The data were obtained randomly from 420 teachers through a scale within the framework of the quantitative research approach. The Personal Initiative Scale of School Administrators, developed by Akın (2012) and consists of 3 dimensions and 32 items, was used as a data collection tool in the study. In the analysis, it was observed that school administrators working in the private schools took more personal initiative than school administrators working in the public schools. In addition, in the light of the findings, it was determined that the levels of taking personal initiative of the private school administrators were higher in all sub-dimensions of taking personal initiative “self-starting, proactivity and persistency” and it has been concluded that there is a significant difference between public and private school administrators’ taking personal initiative levels.

Key Words

Public
Private
Personal initiative
Administrators

About Article

Sending date: 22.12.2020
Acceptance Date: 18.02.2021
E-Publication Date: 31.12.2021

¹ Dr. Retired academician and researcher, Turkey, kilic0442@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6040-7441>

Introduction

When viewed, the organizational and administrative mechanisms that make up the Turkish Education System are based on the central organizational structure. This central organizational structure basically derives its strength from the more authoritarian, hierarchical and bureaucratic management approach. Therefore, in this management approach, it is possible to see that the school administrator often does not have the chance to quickly take a problem that needs to be solved or a demanded decision to be taken. It can be expected from the school administrator to make a creative contribution to the success of the school, to take responsibility for keeping up with the innovation, and even to take personal initiative when necessary (Kılıç, 2019). However, in the education systems dominated by the central authority, the fact that most of the decisions about education are collected from the center and from a single source limits the authority of the school administrator and it is clearly seen that s/he cannot do anything except add her/his own comments to these decisions (Bursalıoğlu, 2011). In such a case, it will be beneficial for the school administrator to take initiative in accordance with her/his own position in order to make decisions that will provide an advantage to the school, based on the location, physical structure, atmosphere of the school and the relations of the employees, and to implement these decisions. In addition, the school administrator who will take initiative should have the competencies, equipment, an innovative perspective and contemporary leadership understanding (Kılıç, 2019). Because in modern leadership approaches, it is important for the leader to act prudently and rationally, to activate and implement the decision-making bodies, and to display an attitude and behaviour that respects the will. It should not be forgotten that this approach can force the school administrator to be a leader, as well as expand the areas of duty and responsibility of her/his.

Contemporary educational leadership; It is defined in the context of being transparent and accountable, student-oriented, making decisions according to research outputs, competing in attracting students to the school, integrating with the values of the society, adapting quickly to globalization and the information society, and having analytical skills at the same time (Balci, 2011). It is stated that school administrators should pay attention to be sensitive, tolerant and sincere in decision-making and implementation processes, instead of being formal and stay away from employees (Sezer & Akan, 2018). It is emphasized that the school principal to take personal initiative with the use of authority will gain a more integral dimension in terms of managerial behaviour (Akin, 2014) With the increasing workload in today's educational institutions, the duties and responsibilities of the administrators at the head of educational institutions have increased considerably. School administrators' taking initiative will facilitate their work and help them to overcome this task and responsibility (Kılıç, 2019). The duty of the school administrators is no longer just to sign documents by adhering to the legislation and to be a subcontractor between the central government and school stakeholders. 21st century school leadership is defined as a social concept with broader meanings. It should not be forgotten that today's school leader, who has so many features, can lead to advantageous situations in many respects, if necessary, to take initiative in order to be successful and show high performance.

The concept of taking personal initiative can be traced back to Taylor's theory of scientific management. Because Taylor emphasized that organization is important not only for the employer but also for the employee to be effective and earn money (Carson, 2005). Personal initiative can be defined as exhibiting a behavior sequence that causes the individual to start his/her work goals and duties actively, to adopt a spontaneous approach, and to continue to overcome obstacles and pressures (Frese, Fay, Hilburger, Leng, & Tag, 1997; Frese, Kring, Soose & Zempel, 1996). Personal initiative is an important process for both practical and theoretical reasons. One of the consequences of such an important process is that the environment has been changed by the individual. In addition, taking personal initiative gives the individual self-confidence. Taking personal initiative will become more important in the future, as a high degree of self-confidence will be needed in workplaces and organizations in the future (Frese, 1997). Personal initiative uses self-starting, proactivity and active persistency approaches in pursuit of goals in order to overcome difficulties. In other words, taking personal initiative does not only mean being self-starting, proactivity and persistency, but also has the meaning of observing goal orientation (Frese & Fay, 2001).

Goal orientation can be perceived as a personality concept implying the existence of individual differences in the dimensions of setting and pursuing goals. Highly goal-oriented people develop long-

term and clear goals. Especially when difficulties arise, they insist on following them. For this reason, goal orientation is considered to be an important prerequisite for effective leadership (Sonnentag, Frese, Brodbeck, & Heinbokel, 1997). Personal initiative is a self-starting action that transcends the job role. It implies a certain element of discomfort towards bureaucracy. However, in the long run personal initiative must be in line with the overall organizational goals. Otherwise, actions that being deprived of organizational orientation do not fall under the scope of personal initiative (Fay & Frese, 2001).

Self-starting means that an individual does something spontaneously without being told, receiving explicit instructions, or requiring a specific role. Therefore, personal initiative is to pursuit of spontaneous goals though opposed to set goals. Self-starting requires setting a goal. This purpose can be based on an idea developed personally, but it can also be considered as showing personal initiative when someone takes responsibility for an idea or a project that is known in this context but has not taken action (Frese & Fay, 2001; Frese, Garts & Fay, 2007). Self-starting indicates that the goals were not given or assigned by someone else, but that the person herself/himself developed these goals. Some jobs may be associated with very broad business goals, for example managers have broad goals such as increasing departmental effectiveness. This may seem to make his own goal development impossible, frankly, any action taken by the manager is likely to be traced to a broad goal (Fay & Frese, 2001).

Proactivity means that with the experiencing and practicing of having a long-term focus, one anticipates the problems and opportunities that will arise and takes precautions accordingly. Focusing long-term on work allows the individual to think about and proactively do something about new demands for the future, new or recurring problems, and emerging opportunities. Because the proactive person is in an effort to redesign the organization and work environment which s/he takes part in according to the future (Crant, 2000; Fay & Frese, 2001; Rank, 2006).

Persistency is a necessary process that a person often resorts to in order to achieve her/his goal. In this sense, personal initiative usually indicates that a process, a procedure or a task has been added or changed, and these changes often involve setbacks and difficulties. For example, people affected by changes may dislike having to adapt to something new and being forced to abandon their routine. This requires the person who takes the initiative to overcome technical problems and overcome the resistance and laziness of other people, to insist on overcoming obstacles (Frese et al., 2007; Frese et al., 1997).

Theoretically, the three behavioural dimensions of personal initiative, self-starting, proactivity, and persistency, reinforce each other. Taking a proactive stance is associated with developing self-starting goals, because a proactive orientation towards the future makes it more likely to develop goals that go beyond what is expected to be done. Self-starting goals are about persisting in overcoming obstacles due to natural changes in practices. Overcoming obstacles can also contribute to self-starting goals, and as a result, unusual solutions to overcome obstacles often require self-starting behaviour. Therefore, these three dimensions of personal initiative tend to occur together (Frese et al., 1997). The fact that the three dimensions are so interrelated can also be perceived as theoretical proof that they together form a structure. Therefore; self-starting, proactivity and persistency are examined as the basic components of personal initiative that comprehend related but different points (Akin, 2012).

Aim of Study

In recent years, increasing workload, adopting of a modern management approach and desiring to maximize employee performance have led organizations to new searches and processes. The main function of organizations is to reach the goals they set together with their employees and to realize their goals. Administrators, trying to achieve these sometimes apply to different methods. One of these methods is that administrators can take personal initiative from their own positions when necessary. The main purpose of this research is to determine the level of personal initiative taken by school administrators in line with teacher perceptions by comparing the self-starting, proactivity and persistency approaches, which are the sub-dimensions of initiative on the axis of public and private schools.

Method

Model of the Study

This study, which aims to compare the personal initiative levels of public and private school administrators in line with teacher perceptions, was designed in a descriptive survey model in a quantitative research design. Descriptive survey models aim to describe a phenomenon that existed in the past or that still exists (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012; Karasar, 2017).

Study group

The sample group of the research consists of teachers working in public and private schools in the city center of Konya in the 2018-2019 academic year. Data were obtained by reaching 420 teachers through the scale. Table 1 shows the distribution of teachers in the sample group according to their demographic characteristics.

Table 1. Distribution of demographic information of teachers who make up the sample group according to independent variables (N=420)

Independent Variables	Group	Public		Private		%	Total f
		f	%	f	%		
Gender	Female	121	28,8	112	26,7	55,5	232
	Male	119	28,3	68	16,2	44,5	188
Age	35 and younger	40	9,5	101	24,0	33,6	141
	36-40	72	17,1	48	11,4	28,6	120
	41-45	48	11,4	21	5,0	16,4	69
	46-50	42	10,0	8	1,9	11,9	50
	51 and over	38	9,0	2	0,5	9,5	40
Professional Seniority	1-5	19	4,5	69	16,4	21,0	88
	6-10	11	2,6	36	8,6	11,2	47
	11-15	42	10,0	36	8,6	18,6	78
	16-20	66	15,7	24	5,7	21,4	90
	21 and over	100	24,3	17	3,6	27,9	117
Working duration with the same administrators'	1-5	199	47,4	170	40,5	87,9	369
	6-10	41	9,8	10	2,4	12,1	51
Working duration in the same school	1-5	126	30,0	139	33,1	63,1	265
	6-10	66	15,7	27	6,4	22,1	93
	11-15	39	9,3	11	2,6	11,9	50
	16-20	6	1,4	2	0,5	1,9	8
	21 and over	3	0,7	1	0,2	1,0	4
Level of education	Associate degree	11	2,6	1	0,2	2,9	12
	Bachelor's degree	190	45,2	143	34	79,3	333
	Master's degree	39	8,3	36	8,6	17,9	75
Total		240		180			420

Table 1 shows that 55.5% of the teachers in the sample group were female (n=232) and 44.5% (n=188) were male. It was found that 28.8% (n=121) of women work in public and 26.7% (n=112) work in private, 28.3% (n=119) of men work in public and 16.2% (n=68) work in private. According to the age variable, it is seen that 33.6% of the teachers are 35 years and younger (n=141), 9.5% (n=40) are in public schools, 24% (n=101) are in private schools, 28.6% are in private schools. aged 36-40 (n=120), 17.1% (n=72) in public, 11.4% (n=48) in private, 16.4% aged 41-45 (n=69), 11.4 (n=48) public and 5.0% (n=21) private, 11.9% 46-50 years old (n=50), 10.0% (n=42) in public and 1.9% (n=8) in private, 9.5% in 51 and over (n=40), 9.0% (n=38) in public and % 0.5 (n=2) in private. When the professional seniority variable is examined, it is indicated that 21% of the teachers (n=88) with a seniority of 1-5 years, 4.5% (n=19) work in public, 16.4% (n=69) work in private, 11% .2 of the teachers (n=47) with a seniority of 6-10 years, 2.6% (n=11) work in public, 8.6% (n=36) work in private, 18.6% of the 11-15 years senior teachers (n=78), 10.0% (n=42) work in public, 8.6% (n=36) work in private, 21.4% are between 16-20 years seniority (n=90), 15.7% (n=66) of teachers work in public, 5.7% (n=24) in private, 27.9% of teachers with 21 years or more seniority (n=117), 24.3% (n=100) work in public

and 3.6% (n=17) work in private schools. Considering the variable of working duration with the same administrators', it was determined that 87.9% of the teachers (n=369) for 1-5 years, 47.4% (n=199) in the public sector and 40.5% (n=170) in private, 12.1% (n=51) work with the same administrators' for 6-10 years, 9.8% (n=41) in public and 2.4% (n=10) in private. When examined the working duration in the same school, it was understood that 63.1% of the teachers (n=265) for 1-5 years, 30.0% (n=126) in public and 33.1% (n=139) in private, 22.1% for 6-10 years (n=93), 15.7% (n=66) in public, 6.4% (n=27) in private, 11.9% for 11-15 years (n=50), 9.3% (n=39) in public, 2.6% (n=11) in private, 1.9% for 16-20 years (n=8), 1.4% (n=6) in public, 0.5% (n=2) in private, 1.0% for 21 years or more (n=4), 0% .7 (n=3) work in public, and 0.2% (n=1) work in private. According to the education level variable, it was included that 2.8% of the teachers had an associate degree (n=12), and 2.6% (n=11) of them work in public and 0.2% (n=1) work in private, 79.3% (n=333) had a bachelor's degree, 45.2% (n=190) of them work in public, 34% (n=143) work in private, 17.9% had a master's degree (n=75) and 8.6% (n=39) of them work in public, and 8.3% (n=36) work in private schools.

The evaluation range of the arithmetic averages of school administrators' taking personal initiative is given in Table 2.

Table 2. Evaluation interval of arithmetic averages of school administrators' taking personal initiative

Level of Participation		Score Intervals
Absolutely Disagree	Very low	1.00-1.79
Slightly Agree	Low	1.80-2.59
Moderately Agree	Middle	2.60-3.39
Strong Agree	High	3.40-4.19
Completely Agree	Very high	4.20-5.00

Data Collection Tool

The Personal Initiative Taking Scale of School Administrators, consisting of 32 items and 3 dimensions, developed by Akın (2012) was used to determine the level of taking initiative of school administrators. In the study conducted by Akın (2012), reliability analysis was performed together with the exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses of the scale, and it was determined that the scale is a high-reliability scale. In this context, the reliability coefficients calculated for the sub-dimensions of the scale are 0.88 for Self-starting, 0.83 for Proactivity and 0.89 for Persistency. The rating is in a five-point likert form; Completely agree (5), Strongly agree (4), Moderately agree (3), Slightly agree (2), Absolutely disagree (1). Around 540 prepared scales were taken to schools by the researcher and distributed to teachers. Two weeks later, the researcher personally toured the schools and returned 460 scales. The scales were examined one by one, and as a result of the examination, it was decided to transfer 420 healthy scales to the system and make their analysis.

Data analysis

The data collected in the research were analysed using SPSS 24.00 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) programs. Arithmetic mean, standard deviation and T-Test were used to analyse the data. Frequency and percentage were used to describe the demographic data obtained in the study. Mean and standard deviation analyses were used to describe to take personal initiative scores. The T-Test was used to compare the sub-dimensions of taking personal initiative.

Findings

In this part of the research, there are analyses made to determine to take personal initiative status of public and private school administrators in line with teacher perceptions. The arithmetic mean and standard deviations of the level of taking initiative of public and private school administrators are given in Table 3.

Table 3. The arithmetic mean and standard deviation distributions of school administrators' taking initiative levels according to teacher perceptions

Type of School	N	Mean	SD
Public	240	3,54	,57
Private	180	3,87	,42

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that the mean score for the personal initiative of the administrators working in private schools is higher according to the perceptions of the teachers. While the mean score of taking personal initiative of the administrators working in public schools was $\bar{x}=3.54$, this rate was $\bar{x}=3.87$ for private school administrators.

In line with the perceptions of the teacher, the results regarding the personal initiative situations of the school administrators according to the school type are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Examining the scores of school administrators regarding taking personal initiative according to teacher perceptions in the context of school type

Sub-dimensions of taking initiative	School Type	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Self-starting	Public	240	46,32	8,07	-5,506	,000 *
	Private	180	50,34	6,37		
Proactivity	Public	240	32,12	5,77	-5,961	,000 *
	Private	180	35,17	4,28		
Persistency	Public	240	34,93	5,91	-6,413	,000 *
	Private	180	38,36	4,69		

* $p<0.05$

In Table 4, when taking personal initiative situations of school administrators is examined in terms of teacher perceptions, in all sub-dimensions of taking personal initiative (self-starting, proactivity, persistency), it was determined that there was a statistically significant at the level of ($p<0.05$) difference between the personal initiative scores of public and private school administrators. Private school administrators' taking personal initiative scores were higher than the scores of public administrators in the sub-dimensions of self-starting, proactivity and persistency. The t value between the mean scores of public and private school administrators was calculated as -5,506 in the self-starting sub-dimension, -5.961 in the proactivity sub-dimension, and 6.413 in the persistency sub-dimension.

In line with the perceptions of the teacher, the scores of the public and private school administrators' taking personal initiative in the self-starting dimension are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Examination of the scores of public and private school administrators on taking initiative in the dimension of self-starting according to teacher perceptions.

	Self-Starting Dimension	Public			Private			t	P
		N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
1	Even if it is not clearly defined in the legislation as the duty of a school administrators', s/he does the work that needs to be done for the school.	240	3,95	1,096	180	4,23	,934	-2,707	,007*
4	S/he automatically aspires to take on important responsibilities, even though s/he is not given by higher authorities.	240	3,48	1,160	180	3,90	,916	-3,976	,000*
7	If s/he sees behavior and applications against the rules at school, s/he intervenes immediately.	240	3,95	1,005	180	4,11	,874	-1,716	,087
10	At school, s/he does not hesitate to perform unconventional applications that are not found in other institutions.	240	3,30	1,113	180	3,55	1,052	-2,382	,018*

13	S/he puts her own ideas into practice in her/his school without hesitation.	240	3,23	1,052	180	3,94	,978	-7,058	,000*
16	S/he tries to realize ideas that have not yet been put into action but will be useful to the school.	240	3,71	1,076	180	3,94	,830	-2,403	,017*
19	S/he usually does more than is expected of her in her job.	240	3,69	1,044	180	3,93	,894	-2,450	,015*
22	S/he offers suggestions to top managers for better running of business.	240	3,33	1,042	180	3,77	1,000	-4,358	,000*
25	S/he creates new goals and objectives that s/he thinks will improve the school.	240	3,38	1,150	180	3,80	,897	-4,562	,000*
28	S/he tries to realize the projects that were always wanted to be done but could not be done at school.	240	3,54	,984	180	3,70	,871	-1,713	,087
30	S/he encourages school staff to start new projects / applications.	240	3,37	1,027	180	3,75	1,040	-3,640	,000*
31	As a school administrators', s/he always looks for ways to do the job better, rather than following standard applications.	240	3,22	1,126	180	3,83	,994	-5,795	,000*
32	S/he tries to implement the applications that s/he sees and likes in other institutions at school as well.	240	3,77	,949	180	3,87	,862	-1,095	,274

*p<0.05

As seen in Table 5, while being a significant difference at the level of $p<0.05$ in the taking personal initiative of public and private school administrators in the self-starting sub-dimension according to the items (1, 4, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22, 25, 30, 31), it is understood that there is no differentiation in the items (7, 28 and 32). It is seen that the mean score of private school administrators is higher than public administrators in all items in which teachers express their opinions about school administrators. Meanwhile in public it was determined that it belonged to item 31 with the lowest mean score ($\bar{X}=3,22$), it belonged to items 1 and 7 with the highest mean score ($\bar{X}=3.95$). In private, it was stated that while it belonged to item 10 with the lowest mean score ($\bar{X}=3.55$), it belonged to item 1 with the highest mean score ($\bar{X}=4.23$). As the opinions of the teachers about the taking personal initiative in the dimension of self- starting situation of the school administrators in the public generally vary between medium and high levels, it has been determined that it is at a high level in private.

In line with the perceptions of the teacher, the scores of the public and private school administrators' taking personal initiative in the proactivity dimension are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Examination of the scores of public and private school administrators on taking initiative in the dimension of proactivity according to teacher perceptions.

	Proactivity Dimension	Public			Private			T	P
		N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
2	S/he is constantly looking for ways to do her/his job better.	240	3,87	1,056	180	4,15	,874	-2,880	,004*
5	S/he has always been a driving force for change in her/his school.	240	2,97	1,129	180	3,60	1,070	-5,700	,000*
8	S/he is good at seeing opportunities to benefit the school.	240	3,44	1,000	180	3,92	,815	-5,219	,000*
11	When s/he has a problem on work, s/he goes over it.	240	3,57	1,012	180	3,65	,814	-,921	,357
14	It gives her/him great excitement to see her/his thoughts become reality.	240	3,96	,890	180	4,11	,870	-1,660	,098

17	S/he notices opportunities earlier than people around her/him.	240	3,72	1,116	180	4,10	,846	-3,763	,000*
20	S/he sees problems occurring, problematic issues at school as an opportunity to address and correct.	240	3,75	1,052	180	3,76	,886	-,114	,909
23	S/he is constantly looking for ways to improve herself /himself in professional matters.	240	3,46	1,018	180	3,88	,896	-4,425	,000*
26	S/he has a great desire to make the changes that s/he thinks will improve the school.	240	3,35	1,103	180	3,98	,865	-6,385	,000*

*p<0.05

As indicated in Table 6, while the situations of taking personal initiative in the proactivity sub-dimension of public and private school administrators differed significantly at the level of $p<0.05$ according to the items (2, 5, 8, 17, 23, 26), (14, 20), it was concluded that there was no differentiation in the items (11, 14, 20) in line with the opinions of teachers. It is seen that the mean score of private school administrators is higher than public administrators in all items in which teachers express their opinions about school administrators. While item 5 got with the lowest mean score ($\bar{X}=2.97$), item 14 got with the highest mean score ($\bar{X}=3.96$) in public. In private, it was found that it belonged to item 5 with the lowest mean score ($\bar{X}=3.60$), it belonged to item 2 with the highest mean score ($\bar{X}=4.15$). As the opinions of the teachers about the taking personal initiative in the dimension of proactivity situations of the school administrators in public generally vary between medium and high levels, it has been determined that it is at a high level in private.

In line with the perceptions of the teacher, the scores of the public and private school administrators' taking personal initiative in the persistency dimension are given in Table 7.

Table7. Examination of the scores of public and private school administrators on taking initiative in the dimension of persistency according to teacher perceptions.

	Persistency Dimension	Public			Private			T	p
		N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
3	S/he continues to work with determination until s/he finishes the job s/he has undertaken.	240	3,87	1,031	180	4,09	,913	-2,265	,024*
6	S/he does not leave unfinished business in school-related matters.	240	3,57	,999	180	4,07	,924	-5,311	,000*
9	S/he defends her/his work related to school until the end.	240	3,50	,968	180	4,09	,795	-6,710	,000*
12	While bringing innovations to her/his school, s/he struggles with the status quo when necessary.	240	2,43	,957	180	2,99	1,027	-5,717	,000*
15	Although s/he is tired while working on a school-related task, s/he has a strong desire to complete it.	240	3,54	1,123	180	3,98	,873	-4,433	,000*
18	S/he always accomplishes whatever s/he puts her/his mind to about school.	240	3,75	,990	180	3,78	,858	-,376	,707
21	If s/he fails to solve a problem related school, s/he continues to look for new options until s/he finds a solution.	240	3,65	1,011	180	3,75	,960	-1,081	,280
24	S/he can work patiently in long and tedious jobs.	240	3,71	,939	180	3,81	,954	-1,117	,265
27	S/he does not give up easily in the face of obstacles in her/his work related to school.	240	3,62	1,002	180	3,88	,804	-2,855	,005*

29	S/he takes pleasure in overcoming the obstacles that will come her/his way while realizing her/his thoughts.	240	3,26	1,055	180	3,86	,829	-6,104	,000*
----	--	-----	------	-------	-----	------	------	--------	-------

*p<0.05

As seen in Table 7, while it was determined that public and private school administrators' taking personal initiative situations in the persistency sub-dimension differed significantly at the level of $p<0.05$ in items (3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 27, 29) in line with the opinions of the teachers, it was not differentiated in items (18, 21, 24). It is seen that the mean score of private school administrators is higher than public administrators in all items in which teachers express their opinions about school administrators. While item 12 got with the lowest mean score ($\bar{X}=2.43$), item 1 got with the highest mean score ($\bar{X}=3.87$) in public. In private, it was determined that it belonged to item 12 with the lowest mean score ($\bar{X}=2.99$), it belonged to items 3 and 9 with the highest mean score ($\bar{X}= 4.09$). As the opinions of the teachers about the taking personal initiative in the dimension of persistency situations of the school administrators in public generally vary between medium and high levels, it has been determined that it is at a high level in private.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

The findings obtained in this study, which was designed to determine the taking personal initiative levels of school administrators working in public and private schools, are given below. In addition, comments and studies supporting the findings of this study are also included.

While the mean score of taking personal initiative of the administrators working in public schools was ($\bar{x}=3.54$), this ratio resulted at the level of ($\bar{x}=3.87$) for private school administrators. Considering the mean score of public and private school administrators, it was concluded that the mean score of both sections was not very high, but the mean score of private school administrators was higher. Although private school administrators have high scores in taking personal initiative, the assumption revealed by these results shows that school administrators cannot take personal initiative both in public and private education institutions as they wish. School administrators, who are responsible to the central government, try to fulfil their duties in line with the directives of the central government rather than taking personal initiative. Therefore, they either take no initiative at all or sometimes feel the need to take personal initiative in small matters. Akin (2012) emphasizes that school administrators mostly take initiative in small-scale actions and do not take initiative in large-scale actions, even they behave shyly and avoid taking initiative. Keser (2007) revealed that public school administrators are able to fulfil their responsibilities by using the authority given to them. Şentürk (2018) states that school administrators take initiative in situations that do not require risk and creativity, but they do not take initiative in achieving organizational goals and they make active decisions to solve organizational problems. According to Frese & Fay (2001), taking initiative behaviour reflects the tendency to make instant decisions and to think pragmatically. Yücel (2006), it is seen that school administrators have difficulties in making decisions even in small tasks related to the school. However, school administrators need to make active decisions, and use authority and transfer authority in order to achieve organizational goals and overcome organizational difficulties. Aypay and Şekerci (2009) emphasize that due to the low level of taking initiative of school administrators, administrators should be given in-service training in order to develop their taking initiative skills and that taking initiative is important for all managerial duties.

When the results of school administrators' tendency to take personal initiative in the context of teacher perceptions were evaluated, it was observed that there was a significant difference between the taking personal initiative scores of public and private school administrators in all sub-dimensions of taking personal initiative (self-starting, proactivity, persistency). In the sub-dimensions of self-starting, proactivity and persistency, private school administrators' taking personal initiative scores were found to be higher than public school administrators. It has been understood that the administrators of private education institutions are more tolerant in the use of authority and take a little more initiative than administrators of public schools according to the public-school administrators. While the taking personal initiative levels of school administrators working in public schools generally varied between medium and high levels, the taking personal initiative levels of the administrators working in private schools were found to be high. In the research conducted by Karahan (2019), it is stated that public primary

school administrators have more problems in using authority than private institution administrators. Nayır and Taşkın (2017), in their study, revealed that teachers' taking initiative behaviour is moderate in all dimensions. Considering that school administrators come from teaching, this finding may be valid for them.

When the analysis results of the self-starting dimension are considered on the basis of items, it has been determined that the mean score in both groups is not very high, but the private school administrator works for the benefit of the school apart from the legislation, assigns important responsibilities, carries out new practices, is open to new ideas and thoughts, and performs more than expected, presenting suggestions to the senior management, s/he acts more privileged and takes more initiative than the administrator working in public schools in terms of setting new goals and targets that will improve the school, encouraging school employees to implement new projects, and making new searches for better execution of the work instead of standard applications. Fay and Frese (2001) self-starting, displayed by the individual without any instruction from anywhere is behaviour. Akın (2012), in his research, concluded that school administrators do not take initiative in the self-starting dimension at a very high level within the framework of teachers' opinions.

When the item analysis results of the proactivity dimension are examined, it has been concluded that private school administrators are more tolerant and take more initiative than public school administrators in terms of constantly searching for ways to do their job better, always being the driving force for change, having the ability to sense opportunities, and constantly improving themselves professionally. Akın (2012), in his study on public administrators, found that public administrators were proactive at a low level according to the perceptions of teachers. In Pamuk and Kaya's (2009) study, it was concluded that school administrators did not act very proactively in the use of duties and authority in the presence of teachers and they received low scores.

When the analysis results of the persistency dimension items are examined, it has been determined that the private school administrator takes more initiative than public school administrator in cases such as trying to finish her/his work with determination, not leaving her/his work unfinished, standing behind her/his work, struggling with the status quo even a little, overcoming obstacles and at the same time enjoying overcoming these obstacles. Akın (2012) states that school administrators continue to work diligently until they complete the tasks they have undertaken, do not leave the work they have started unfinished and defend it to the end, but they are less insistent on the struggle against the status quo. This statement is in line with the findings of the present study. The lowest mean score obtained by both public and private school administrators is struggling with the status quo. This situation is thought to be related to the structure of the education system. Bursalıoğlu (2011) emphasizes that most of the decision-making powers of school administrators are centralized by the Ministry, and the decision-making powers of the administrators are limited and therefore the decisions taken cannot go beyond interpretation. Sevil and Bülbül (2019) state that school administrators are under the influence of higher authorities in taking personal initiative and they mostly act according to the instructions of higher authorities.

It is understood from this result that school administrators working in private education institutions are more willing and inclined to take personal initiative. Private education institutions generally continue their activities in competition, and therefore, in order to be successful, they are required to take initiative in some cases. Because in private education institutions, issues such as accountability in cases of failure and investigating the causes of failure are brought to the agenda more frequently and solutions are sought. Kharat (2016), managements of private education institutions should have the capacity to manage viable and supportable issues in a purposeful manner. Private education institutions often benefit from more adaptive initiative decisions that improve education/training conditions, rather than organization and use of authoritative controls. Despite their formal procedural work, the implementation and compliance of formal education programs in private schools may not be as stringent as in public schools. Farooqi, Jan, & Gohar (2017), private education institutions contribute to the creation of educational awareness and civic senses, and to the physical nourishment of youth. Private schools play an important role in enlightening the society. It has been observed that private education institutions also guide public education institutions and make efforts to increase the welfare and development level of the society with them. In this context, administrators of

private education institutions can be expected to be flexible in the sharing of authority and responsibility in some cases.

Private school administrators are more likely to have a greater influence on curriculum formulation than public school administrators. In addition, while private school administrators tend to have more control and authority over basic administrative decisions regarding teacher recruitment, curriculum and student discipline policies, it has been observed that administrators working in public schools do not have the authority to hire teachers and the majority of their authority regarding other issues is determined by laws. Baker, Han & Keil, 1996). It is understood that private school administrators have a greater influence than public school administrators in terms of discipline, curriculum, in-service training, budgeting and recruitment (Synder, 1997). In the context of these statements, it can be said that private school administrators have a more liberal understanding and a more suitable environment in using personal initiative.

It is thought that small-capacity schools are generally easier to manage, and healthy communication between students, teachers and administrators and the sense of belonging are more developed; however, as large schools often offer a wider range of academic programs and support services, it may not be easy to provide them all at once. When viewed, it can easily be seen that private schools have smaller schools and classrooms than public schools (Bryk, Lee, & Holland, 1993). An important aspect of school management is where important decisions are made regarding curriculum, school policies, and classroom practices. Although public school administrators must receive some instructions from the central or top management in the process of running the business, private school administrators are more likely than their colleagues in public schools to believe that they have a great influence, especially in the determination of disciplinary policy and the conduct of administrative affairs (Bryk et al., 1993). From this perspective, private school administrators are more advantageous in using initiative, on the other hand, it can be thought that school administrators working in public schools could not take more initiative due to their adherence to the legislation.

It is seen that the education administrators think that the dominant unit in the decisions to be made about the basic principles and qualifications of education should be the central administration. It is observed that education administrators, who stated that the decisions on the planning of the education/training calendar should be made at the provincial level, think that they should be the authorized unit to make decisions, even partially, in all other subjects and services. Education administrators point to the school unit as the authorized decision level in implementation, supervision and evaluation, in determining and developing the school strategy. Therefore, it is seen that education administrators want more freedom and initiative in matters directly related to the school (Turan, Yücel, Karataş, & Demirhan, 2010). Within the framework of the Centralistic Turkish Education System, the roles, duties, authorities and responsibilities of school administrators should be redefined in the new structuring process. In addition, school administrators should be empowered as individuals who not only offer suggestions and implement the legislation, but also have administrative and financial autonomy, take initiative when necessary, involve employees in the decision-making process and direct the society with their actions (Şişman & Turan, 2003). In an increasingly global economy, an educated workforce is essential to maintaining and improving competitiveness. Society expects education institutions to prepare people for employment in a rapidly changing environment. Teachers, managers and school administrators are the ones who must deliver higher education standards. Their reauthorization and management style will play a big role in their ability to offer higher education standards.

Overall, private schools are reported to tend to have more autonomy, better resources, a better school environment, and better performance levels than schools managed by public. Administrators in privately run schools in 16 OECD countries have been observed to have more school autonomy in curriculum and assessment than schools administered by public. In addition, it has been determined that administrators working in private education institutions in 26 OECD countries have more school autonomy in resource allocation than administrators working in public schools (OECD, 2012). Public institutions are more bureaucratic, public administrators are less materialistic, and institutional commitment is weak in the public sector. These variables may cause different approaches on the basis of management in public institutions and private firms (Boyne, 2002). The decisions taken in the administrative process are the main factors in determining the extent to which school administrators are

democratic and autocratic. For school administrators, the scope of taking initiative on school issues is the key to more variable, humane and creative institutional processes (Şentürk, 2018). It has been observed that teachers and school administrators are more enthusiastic about change voluntarily rather than imposing it on themselves. According to the studies conducted in Canadian schools, it has been determined that while self-initiated change gives teachers mostly positive emotional experiences emotionally, compulsory changes mostly affect teachers negatively (Hargreaves, 2004).

According to Hall (1999), discretion not only brings innovation, professional motivation, speed and flexibility to the management, but also makes it more sensitive to make decisions in the face of different situations. Because the rules in the organization based on the legislation may not always be able to cope with complex situations that require different solutions that arise in unexpected situations. Moreover, in such cases, the rules may conflict with each other. One of the easiest ways to solve them is to use personal initiative. According to Nalçinkaya (2012), discretion has an important role in the success of the administration. In addition to implementing the legislation, the management also needs to use its discretion since it has to meet all the material and moral needs of the society. As a result, it is not possible for the management to be considered without discretion and the discretion to be considered without management (As cited in Koç, 2017).

In the light of the data obtained as a result of this research, the following recommendations for school administrators and practitioners can be presented:

Recommendations for school administrators:

- As a result of the research, it was concluded that both public and private school administrators could not take personal initiative at a very high level. The fact that almost all of the authorities and responsibilities of school administrators are determined at the center by the Ministry of National Education may affect this situation. In such a case, it may not be easy for school administrators to take more personal initiative, but it can be thought that they take personal initiative according to their own conditions and positions in matters they consider right.
- Private school administrators' taking personal initiative levels were found to be higher than public school administrators. This shows that private school administrators act more freely and apply a more tolerant management and governance model. These privileges may also be granted to public school administrators by top management.
- It should not expect the solution of every problem from the centralized management. Initiative can be taken in the quick solution of minor problems that need to be resolved within the school.
- In particular, it was seen that the administrators of both institutions were very less persistent on struggling with the status quo against innovations. It can be thought that school administrators should act more resistant and more insistent against the status quo.
- Considering that there is no one who knows the institutions they manage better than themselves, it is very important for them to know where and when to act rationally and take the initiative.
- It is important that the central top management support and encourage school administrators to take personal initiative. School administrators should be assisted by the top management in taking personal initiatives without breaking the integrity of the legislation and without going beyond the legislation too much.

Recommendations for practitioners:

- In this study, the level of taking personal initiative of school administrators was examined according to the perceptions of teacher. In other studies, the initiative status of school administrators can be examined according to their own perceptions.
- Studies can be conducted on the taking personal initiative level of teachers working in public and private schools
- Different researches can be done according to the demographic characteristics of teachers and school administrators.

- By making comparisons on the basis of provinces, regions and even countries, new comprehensive studies can be done.

References

- Akın, U. (2012). *Kamu ilköğretim okulu müdürlerinin kişisel inisiyatif alma durumları ve öz-yeterlikleriyle ilişkisi*, Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Akın, U. (2014). Okul müdürlerinin inisiyatif alma düzeyleri ile öz-yeterlikleri arasındaki *ilişki Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 20 (2), 125-149.
- Aypay, A., & Şekerci, M. (2009). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin yönetim becerileri ile grup etkililiği arasındaki ilişki, *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 15 (57), 133-160.
- Baker, D., Han, M., & Keil, C. T. (1996). U.S. Department of education, national center for education statistics, How different, how similar? Comparing key organizational qualities of American public and private secondary schools, Washington, D.C.
- Balcı, A. (2011). Eğitim yönetiminin değişen bağlamı ve eğitim yönetimi programlarına etkisi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 162, 196–208.
- Boyne, G. A. (2002). Public and private management: What's the difference? *Journal of Management Studies*, 39 (1), 92-122.
- Bryk, A. S., Lee, V. E., & Holland, P. B. (1993). Catholic schools and the common good. *Mass.: Harvard University Press*.
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2011). *Okul Yönetiminde Yeni Yapı ve Davranış* (16. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Carson, C. M. (2005). A historical view of Douglas McGregor's theory Y. *Management Decision*, 43 (3), 450-460.
- Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26, 435–462.
- Farooqi, I, Jan, M.F., & Gohar, F. (2017). The role of private educational institutions in the social development of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, 11(2), 285-302.
- Fay, D., & Frese, M. (2001). The concept of personal initiative: An overview of validity studies. *Human Performance*, 14(1), 97–124.
- Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. Columbus, OH: McGraw-Hill.
- Frese, M. (1997). Dynamic self-reliance: An important concept for work. In C. L. Cooper & S. E. Jackson (Eds.), *Creating tomorrow's organizations*, 399–416. Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Frese, M., Kring, W., Soose, A., & Zempel, J. (1996). Personal initiative at work: Defferences between East and West Germany. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39 (1), 37–63.
- Frese, M., Fay, D., Hilburger, T., Leng, K., & Tag, A. (1997). The concept of personal initiative: Operationalization, reliability and validity in two German samples. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70, 139-161.
- Frese M, Fay D. (2001). Personal initiative (PI): An active performance concept for work in the 21. Century. In B. M. Staw & R. M. Suttan (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 23, 133-187. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Frese, M., Garst, H., & Fay, D. (2007). Making things happen: Reciprocal relationships between work characteristics and personal initiative in a four-wave longitudinal structural equation model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1084-1102.
- Hargreaves, A. (2004) Inclusive and exclusive educational change: emotional responses of teachers and implications for leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 24(3), 287–306.
- Karahan, M. (2019). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin yetki kullanımında ve yetki devrinde yaşadıkları sorunlar (Kars İli Örneği), *Avrasya Sosyal ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi (ASEAD)* 6 (3),345-380.
- Karasar, N. (2017). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler*. Ankara: Nobel Akademi Yayınları.
- Keser Z. *Ortaöğretim okul müdürlerinin yetki ve sorumluluklarını kullanma derecelerinin belirlenmesi*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Gaziantep.
- Kharat, V.V. (2016). Private management institutions: challenges education and directions *Prime International Research Journal*, III (1), 17-24.
- Kılıç, Y. (2019). *Okul yöneticilerinin kişisel inisiyatif alma ve sergiledikleri liderlik davranışlarının öğretmen motivasyonuna etkisi*, Doktora Tezi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.

- Koç, Y. (2017). Kamu ortaöğretim okulu müdürlerinin hukuksal yetkilerini kullanımına ilişkin görüşleri, *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(1), 215-233.
- Nayır, F., ve Taşkın, P. (2017). Eğitim örgütlerinde örgütsel destek algısı ile inisiyatif alma davranışı arasındaki ilişki *YYÜ Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14(1):1319-1356
- OECD. (2012). Public and Private Schools: How management and funding relate to their socio-economic profile, OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264175006-en>
- Pamuk, H. ve Kaya, Ç. (2009). *Anadolu öğretmen lisesi müdürlerinin eğitim öğretim sürecindeki rolleri*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Eğitimi Araştırma ve Geliştirme Dairesi Başkanlığı.
- Rank, J. (2006). *Leadership predictors of proactive organizational behavior: Facilitating personal initiative, voice behavior, and exceptional service performance* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of South Florida. USA.
- Sevil, E., ve Bülbül, T. (2019). Okul yöneticilerinin benlik saygısı düzeyleri ile kişisel inisiyatif alma durumları arasındaki ilişki *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(3), 700-719.
- Sezer, Ş., ve Akan, D. (2018). Okul müdürlerinin yönetsel özellikleri, kültüre bağlı yönetsel değerleri ve kendilerinden beklenen evrensel liderlik değerleri, *Ordu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 8(3), 729-737.
- Snyder, T. (1997). U.S. Department of education, national center for education statistics, findings from the condition of education 1997: Public and private schools: How do they differ?, Washington, D.C.
- Sonntag, S., Frese, M., Brodbeck, F.C. ve Heinbokel, T. (1997). Use of design methods, team leaders' goal orientation, and team effectiveness: a follow-up study in Software Development Projects. *International Journal Of Human-Computer Interaction*, 9 (4), 443-454.
- Şentürk, İ. (2018). *The first step to leadership in school management: Taking initiative*, Chapter 2, We are IntechOpen, the first native scientific publisher of Open Access book
- Şişman, M., ve Turan, S. (2003). Eğitimde yerelleşme ve demokratikleşme çabaları. Teorik bir çözümleme. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 34,300-315.
- Turan, S, Yücel. C, Karataş, E., ve Demirhan, G. (2010). Okul müdürlerinin yerinden yönetim hakkındaki görüşleri, *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(1), 1-18.
- Yücel Z. (2006). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin yetki kullanımında ve yetki devrinde yaşadıkları sorunlar*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Denizli.

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

