The Relationship between Leadership Styles and Assertiveness of Physical Education Teachers

Serdar SUCAN[1], Mehmet Behzat TURAN[1], Osman PEPE[1], Barış KARAOĞLU[1], Doğan DOĞAN[2]

[1]Erciyes University Physical Education and Sport Department, Kayseri, TURKEY

[2]South Russian University, Institute of Management Business and Law, RUSSIA

Email: sesucan@hotmail.com

Abstract

The aim of this research is to detemine the relationship between physical education teachers' leadership styles and assertiveness. Research, education in the academic year 2015-2016 in Kayseri working, ranging from 25-53 years, men and women, a total of a hundred and forty-three volunteers participated in a physical education teachers. For this purpose "Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire-MLQ 5X3" which was developed by Bernard Bass ve Bruce Avolio (1995) and "Rathus Assertiveness Inventory" which was developed by Rathus S. (1973). For analysis of the data, t test, ANOVA test, Tukey test and Spearman correlation analysis were used and $p<0.05$ level of significance was searched. According to our findings; significant dissimilarities were found between transformational leadership styles and ages. Furthermore, significant relationships were found between physical education teachers' leadership styles and assertiveness.

Keywords: leadership styles, assertiveness, physical education, teacher

Introduction

People interested in transportation, higher performance of their vision to higher standards and personalities is defined as the normal boundaries upgrade leadership, isteklendirme, interpersonal behavior and expressed in the communication process. Leaders influence people around them and making them voluntarily in their particular behavior is capable of providing (Huczynsky et al., 1991; Mullins, 2005). In recent years, made studies on teacher leadership and discussed the development of the school's effectiveness has been said and is an important factor that determines (Harris, 2003; Harris et al., 2008; Sammons et al., 1995; Spillane, 2005). That's why nowadays modern education approach, teachers have the ability to lead.

Interpersonal communication is a skill that establish, social. Considered a social skill is assertiveness, has an important role in interpersonal communication (Egan, 1976). In addition, the format of the assertiveness, the identity of the person and plays an important role in uncovering the predisposed to the profession. Enterprise behavior to a person's professional success and increases the constructive in human relationships (Phares, 1976; Beck et al., 1985; Bulecheck et al., 1995). May be in the form of a behavior is not shy, brash and assertive. Assertive, contempt of others, recognizing their rights to protect their own rights of the individual, developed as a way to let all thoughts and feelings clearly, some kind of interpersonal relationships in the form of a defined format (Alberti et al., 1976) and individuals were asked to show the enterprise behaviors in relationships (Alberti et al., 1998).

Individuals in a healthy way and help to adapt to society by exploring the capabilities of their citizens is among the basic purposes of education, ensuring its use as well. In schools, learning environment makes good taste, establishing healthy relationships with their students, effective methods and strategies successfully motivates students to learn about using contacts is usually physical education teachers (Büyükkaragöz et al., 1996). However, teachers, student behavior to successfully manage human behavior must know good (Güleç, 2004). Teachers communicate with students healthy, formation of undesirable behavior. Unwanted behaviors, teachers' classroom is prohibitive in performing the goals. In addition, teachers' self-confidence, Burnout, assertiveness etc. features, you can create a source of classroom discipline problems (Tertemiz, 2001). This type of behavior should be placed in the teacher's educational goals. Otherwise unremedied, this behavior can turn into lifelong individuals would become permanent. Therefore, the theoretical and practical training-teaching physical education teachers engaged in leadership and assertiveness, teaching-learning process of a mode of configuring point will provide significant contributions.

The aim of this study is, often with students in educational institutions that communicate physical education teachers leadership and assertiveness of the format, also teachers leadership styles and assertiveness of the format of sex, age, marital status and shows changes compared to the total work is to determine whether the.

Material and Method

Laying down the current state and descriptive quality, this research, in the academic year 2015-2016, in the province of Kayseri who served a total of 143 was made between physical education teacher. The data is "personal information form", "Rathus Assertiveness Scale", "Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire" gathered with.

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Bass and Avolio developed inventory (1985), by the "never (1)", "rarely (2)", "sometimes (3)", "often (4)", "always (5)" consists of 5 sized 36 questions. Participants, transformational leadership of "idealized influence attitudes and behavior", "inspirational motivation", "intellectual stimulation" and "individualized consideration" subscales and transactional leadership of "contingent reward", "passive management by exception" and "active management by exception" subscales with laissez-faire leadership to answer questions prepared to determine the format of misconduct. Cronbach Alpha coefficient in the reliability analysis of transformational leadership of; individualized consideration subscale to α=.850, idealized influence attitudes and behavior subscale for α=.900, inspirational motivation subscale for α=.840, intellectual stimulation subscale as calculated for α=.880; transactional leadership of contingent reward subscale for α =.870, active management by exception subscale for α =.740 and passive management by exception subscale for α=.700. Cronbach Alpha coefficient if laissez-faire leadership, α=.780 are found to be (Bass et al., 1996).

Rathus Assertiveness Scale

Rathus by (1977) to the Turkish adaptation developed and reliability study (Voltan, 1980), six likert type on the thirty item. Inventory items; it doesn't fit me at all (-3), doesn't fit me much (-2), not me (-1), fits me a little bit (+1), fits me (+2), fits me very well (+3) is scored. 1,2,4,5,9,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,19,23,24,26,30. if the items in the opposite direction points. Inventory total -90 to +90 and average score in the range +10 and they score above the assertive, +9 and it is considered as the shy down points level.

Analysis of the Data

The analysis of demographic characteristics number of teachers data (n) and percentage (%) was given in the distribution. Teachers' leadership styles and forms of demographic variables between assertiveness significant difference "t-test" to determine whether used and "ANOVA test". ANOVA test was between the difference after which variables to detect the Tukey test was used. Leadership styles and assertiveness to examine the relationship between Spearman Correlation test was used. For statistical analysis SPSS 22.0 computer package program is used and the level of meaningful p<0.05 were considered.

Findings

Physical education teachers participating in the survey 72% male, 58.7% single, 44.8% 30-35 years. Teachers mostly (58%) to adopt the behaviour of the shy (Table 1).

Physical education teachers leadership style points average of Table 2, transformational leadership of idealized influence attributed subscale maximum (17.69) average score, with transactional leadership of passive management by exception subscale is lowest (12.88) average points showed that.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Variables		n	%
Gender	Male	103	72.0
	Famale	40	28.0
Marital status	Single	84	58.7
	Married	59	41.3
Age	24-29	18	12.6
	30-35	64	44.8
	36-41	34	23.8
	42-47	16	11.2
	48-53	11	7.7
Total working years	1-5	87	60.8
	6-10	37	25.9
	11-15	9	6.3
	16-20	10	7.0
Assertiveness	Shy	83	58
	Assertive	60	42

Table 2. Scores of Physical Education Teachers' Leadership Style

Subscales of Leadership Styles		X	Sd
Transformational Leadership	Individualized Consideration	16,97	1,250
	Idealized Influence Attributed	17,69	1,188
	Idealized Influence Behavior	17,14	1,265
	Inspirational Motivation	16,67	1,378
	Intellectual Stimulation	14,28	1,701
Transactional Leadership	Active Management by Exception	13,24	2,110
	Passive Management by Exception	12,88	1,431
	Contingent Reward	16,06	2,194
Laissez-Faire Leadership		13,74	2,187

Table 3 physical education teachers' leadership style scores by gender t test results. Accordingly, the physical education teachers leadership styles do not show significant difference by gender. The mean score was examined, the dimensions of women's subscale of transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership has high averages than men. The

transactional leadership of passive management by exception and contingent reward subscales in men, it can be stated that they have higher averages.

Table 3. The Effect of Gender Teacher Leadership Styles

Subscales Of Leadership Styles		Gender	N	X	Sd	t	p
Transformational Leadership	Individualized Consideration	Male	103	16,95	,123	-,315	,753
		Famale	40	17,03	,201		
	Idealized Influence Attributed	Male	103	17,67	,117	-,361	,719
		Famale	40	17,75	,189		
	Idealized Influence Behavior	Male	103	17,14	,123	-,060	,953
		Famale	40	17,15	,210		
	Inspirational Motivation	Male	103	16,62	,137	-,695	,488
		Famale	40	16,80	,215		
	Intellectual Stimulation	Male	103	14,25	,172	-,307	,759
		Famale	40	14,35	,252		
Transactional Leadership	Active Management by Exception	Male	103	13,10	,205	-1,347	,180
		Famale	40	13,63	,341		
	Passive Management by Exception	Male	103	12,97	,147	1,205	,230
		Famale	40	12,65	,198		
	Contingent Reward	Male	103	16,07	,217	,105	,917
		Famale	40	16,03	,348		
	Laissez-Faire Leadership	Male	103	13,75	,224	,055	,956
		Famale	40	13,73	,312		

*p<0.05

Table 4. Effects of Leadership Styles of Marital Status of Teachers

Subscales of Leadership Styles		Marital Status	N	X	Sd	t	p
Transformational Leadership	Individualized Consideration	Single	84	16,99	,138	,183	,855
		Maried	59	16,95	,161		
	Idealized Influence Attributed	Single	84	17,76	,129	,835	,405
		Maried	59	17,59	,157		
	Idealized Influence Behavior	Single	84	17,01	,141	-1,449	,150
		Maried	59	17,32	,157		
	Inspirational Motivation	Single	84	16,54	,145	-1,409	,161
		Maried	59	16,86	,186		

Transactional Leadership	Intellectual Stimulation	Single	84	14,26	,179	-,149	,882
		Maried	59	14,31	,235		
	Active Management by Exception	Single	84	13,17	,200	-,527	,599
		Maried	59	13,36	,321		
	Passive Management by Exception	Single	84	12,90	,157	,235	,815
		Maried	59	12,85	,187		
	Contingent Reward	Single	84	16,23	,228	1,108	,270
		Maried	59	15,81	,303		
	Laissez-Faire Leadership	Single	84	13,95	,244	1,382	,169
		Maried	59	13,44	,274		

*p<0.05

Table 4 physical education teachers' leadership style scores by marital status t test results. Accordingly, the physical education teachers leadership styles do not show significant difference by marital status. The mean score was examined, physical education teachers transformational leadership of idealized influence behavior, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation subscales and transactional leadership of active management by exception subscale in single, it can be stated that they have higher averages. Laissez-faire leadership score is higher than singles.

Table 5 physical education teachers in leadership style scores by age ANAOVA results. Analysis results, physical education teachers transformational leadership of inspirational motivation subscales significant differences between ages. What is the differences between ages among the groups in order to find, according to the results of the test of Tukey, 48-53 encourage teachers to transformational leadership of inspirational motivation subscale ages child size points lower than the average of other ages it has been determined that the teacher.

Table 6 physical education teachers leadership style according to the total working years of ANAOVA results. The results of the analysis, physical education teachers leadership style according to the difference between total work years. Looking at Table 6, total working time of 11-15 years is transformational leadership of individualized consideration, idealized influence behavior and inspirational motivation subscales; total working time of 6-10 years is transformational leadership of intellectual stimulation subscale; total working time of 16-20 years is transformational leadership of idealized influence attributed subscale showed that these highest score. Furthermore, total working time of 6-10 years is transactional leadership of active management by exception, contingent reward subscales and total working time of 11-15 years is transactional leadership of passive management by exception subscale showed that these highest score. The size of the laissez-faire leadership total working time of 11-15 years with the highest average score.

Table 7 with physical education teachers leadership style of assertiveness, findings relating correlation between. Looking at Table, teachers' transformational leadership of individualized consideration subscale with assertiveness between the size of the medium-level, negative and significant relationship (r=0.326; p<0.01) and transformational leadership of inspirational motivation subscale with assertiveness between the size of the low-level, negative and significant relationship (r=-0.190; p<0.05) showed that. Among the laissez-faire leadership and assertiveness at low-level, positive and significant relationship (r=-0.172; p<0.05).

Table 5. Results of the Effects of Leadership Styles Age of teachers

	Subscales of Leadership Styles	Age	N	X	Sd	F	p
Transformational Leadership	Individualized Consideration	24-29	18	17,00	,256	1,214	,308
		30-35	64	16,86	,162		
		36-41	34	17,06	,215		
		42-47	16	17,50	,342		
		48-53	11	16,55	,282		
	Idealized Influence Attributed	24-29	18	18,06	,249	1,681	,158
		30-35	64	17,73	,141		
		36-41	34	17,71	,213		
		42-47	16	17,63	,301		
		48-53	11	16,91	,415		
	Idealized Influence Behavior	24-29	18	17,22	,298	,188	,945
		30-35	64	17,08	,160		
		36-41	34	17,26	,221		
		42-47	16	17,00	,289		
		48-53	11	17,18	,444		
	Inspirational Motivation	24-29	18	16,61	,372	6,738	**,001***
		30-35	64	16,64	,172		
		36-41	34	17,29	,177		
		42-47	16	16,69	,313		
		48-53	11	15,00	,234		
	Intellectual Stimulation	24-29	18	14,50	,398	1,824	,128
		30-35	64	14,52	,215		
		36-41	34	13,65	,307		
		42-47	16	14,13	,352		
		48-53	11	14,73	,428		
Transactional Leadership	Active Management by Exception	24-29	18	12,94	,424	,476	,753
		30-35	64	13,14	,249		
		36-41	34	13,59	,427		
		42-47	16	13,50	,577		
		48-53	11	12,91	,563		
	Passive Management by Exception	24-29	18	12,78	,222	,194	,941
		30-35	64	12,80	,194		
		36-41	34	12,97	,282		
		42-47	16	13,00	,258		
		48-53	11	13,09	,392		
	Contingent Reward	24-29	18	14,78	,552	2,447	,052
		30-35	64	16,31	,225		
		36-41	34	16,41	,390		

	42-47	16	16,25	,622	
	48-53	11	15,27	,843	
Laissez-Faire leadership	24-29	18	13,17	,500	,703
	30-35	64	13,70	,270	
	36-41	34	13,85	,368	
	42-47	16	13,75	,655	
	48-53	11	14,55	,608	

*$p<0.05$

Tablo 6. Results of the Effects of Leadership Styles Total Working Year of Teachers

	Subscales of Leadership Styles	Total Working	N	X	Sd	F	p
Transformational Leadership	Individualized Consideration	1-5	87	16,92	,130	,278	,841
		6-10	37	16,97	,228		
		11-15	9	17,22	,494		
		16-20	10	17,20	,291		
	Idealized Influence Attributed	1-5	87	17,64	,132	,259	,855
		6-10	37	17,78	,182		
		11-15	9	17,56	,377		
		16-20	10	17,90	,407		
	Idealized Influence Behavior	1-5	87	17,15	,140	1,007	,392
		6-10	37	17,24	,195		
		11-15	9	17,33	,471		
		16-20	10	16,50	,307		
	Inspirational Motivation	1-5	87	16,69	,155	,561	,642
		6-10	37	16,68	,205		
		11-15	9	17,00	,441		
		16-20	10	16,20	,416		
	Intellectual Stimulation	1-5	87	14,29	,183	2,100	,103
		6-10	37	14,57	,275		
		11-15	9	13,00	,577		
		16-20	10	14,30	,448		
Transactional Leadership	Active Management by Exception	1-5	87	13,23	,228	1,026	,383
		6-10	37	13,62	,390		
		11-15	9	12,56	,475		
		16-20	10	12,60	,371		
	Passive Management by Exception	1-5	87	12,95	,164	,283	,838
		6-10	37	12,73	,228		
		11-15	9	13,00	,333		
		16-20	10	12,70	,335		
	Contingent Reward	1-5	87	15,86	,241	,593	,621
		6-10	37	16,41	,289		
		11-15	9	16,22	,830		
		16-20	10	16,30	,932		
	Laissez-Faire leadership	1-5	87	13,72	,227	,524	,667
		6-10	37	13,89	,373		

11-15	9	14,11	,754
16-20	10	13,00	,816

*p<0.05

Table 7. The Relationship between Assertiveness and Leadership Styles

	Subscales of Leadership Styles		Aggression
Transformational Leadership	Individualized Consideration	r	**,326**[**]
		p	,001
	Idealized Influence Attributed	r	,029
		p	,729
	Idealized Influence Behavior	r	,046
		p	,588
	Inspirational Motivation	r	**-,190**[*]
		p	,023
	Intellectual Stimulation	r	-,013
		p	,874
Transactional Leadership	Active Management by Exception	r	-,041
		p	,624
	Passive Management by Exception	r	,098
		p	,245
	Contingent Reward	r	,084
		p	,319
	Laissez-Faire leadership	r	**,172**[*]
		p	,041

**p< 0.01 *p< 0.05

Discussion and Results

Research to obtain data that is used for the purposes of statistics and their analysis findings, teachers of transformational leadership style and impact on school organization of health assertiveness format might be a factor. The sample represents a limited universe, used the research findings could be generalized to all educational institutions are not qualified.

Idealized influence attributed and behavior styles have been charisma are known to the owner of the natural authority of individuals. This mindset is also examined in the transformational leadership has revealed the concept of charismatic leadership. Charismatic leaders that there is a sense of admiration in the face of his subordinates. Charisma, subordinates to be affected as a result of organizational change is an effective tool for. Nowadays, charismatic leadership approach, one of the leaders, according to the Attribution Theory in which Charisma behaviour, perceived as intended to figure out by their subordinates (Conger, 1994). Physical education teachers, is considered a leader in educational institutions and exhibit their behavior, both students of the institution they need to achieve their goals has an extremely

important role in the. Therefore, physical education teachers, students ' grade will increase the success of the institution will provide the realization and the goals of the school will create an integrity in the leadership behaviors are extremely important.

Based on our findings, physical education teachers who work in Kayseri, transformational leadership of idealized influence attributed and behavior feature has been adopted considerably. The charismatic leadership, educational institutions specified in article space at physical education teachers can create this result to being observed.

In this study, physical education teachers transformational leadership of inspirational motivation subscales significant differences between ages and among this diversity that make up the 48-53 years of transformational leadership of inspirational motivation subscales child size points lower than the average of other age groups. Accordingly, 48-53 ages of teachers' goals the students concluded they couldn't motivate enough. This is because, the people after the 40's along with the effect of hormones, frustration, anger, despair and bad mood swings are sudden changes in behavior and live around the mirrors, and therefore could not motivate enough people around him.

Leadership, a group of people around a collection of specific purposes and to achieve these goals is the sum of the knowledge and skills to action them. Transformational leadership, the leaders and followers of a higher level of morality and is a process of removing the motivation (Masood et al., 2006). An effective leader, don't convince people, communicating with them, without affecting the time management and assertiveness are expected with such behavior (Burnard, 1992; Uyar et al., 1996). Teachers' transformational leadership in schools, therefore, behaviors, it is important to bring out.

In this study, physical education teachers transformational leadership of individualized consideration subscale between assertiveness was found to be positive and meaningful relationship. Accordingly, the assertive physical education teachers, according to the shy teachers, students representing the more realistic and friendly against upcoming exhibits the students expect from their own behavior and students to gain different perspectives on events that help individuals believe that they were.

In this study, physical education teachers transformational leadership of inspirational motivation subscale between assertiveness was found to be negative and meaningful relationship. Accordingly, shy physical education teachers, believe that students in the achievement of the objectives for the future that they are more motivating individuals.

In this study, physical education teachers laissez-faire leadership between assertiveness was found to be positive and meaningful relationship. Accordingly, the assertive teachers, left to their own students, allowing students to do their homework, leaving them alone, we believe that they are liberal leaders.

Transformational leadership is a leadership style that is considered to be more effective than other leadership styles. In this study, assertive physical education teachers transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles was found to adopt more. An ideal leader features include problem solving, good communication, is expected to show that the behavior of the enterprise, the results seem to support the literature (Çağlar et al., 2005; Girvin, 1996; Vural, 1997). These results suggest that physical education teachers, who cared about the profession and yourself, featuring high self-confidence, leadership, human relationships are good, in

fulfilling its functions, the enterprise, the more successful in the society in which they live, they're prolific and sought-after profession members.

As a result, the good relations in the education of teachers, happy and can say that they should be assertive to succeed.

REFERENCES

Alberti R, Emmons M (1976). Your Perfect Right. Obispo Impact. San Louis, 299.

Alberti R, Emmons M (1998). Atılganlık Hakkınızı Kullanın. Çeviren: S. Katlan, 1.Basım, HYB Yayıncılık, Ankara.

Bass BM, Avolio BJ, Atwater L (1996). The Transformational and Transactional Leadership of Men and Women. International Review of Applied Psychology, 45:5-34.

Beck S, Collins L, Overholser J, et al (1985). Cross-sectional Assessment of The Relationship of Social Competence Measures to Peer Friendship and Likeability in Elementary-age Children. Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs, (111)1: 43-63.

Bulecheck M, Closkey G (1995). Nursing Interventions Treatments for Nursin Diagnisis. W.B. Saunders Comp. Philedelphia.

Burnard P (1992). Assertiveness. Nursing Times, 88(22): 289-295.

Büyükkaragöz S, Civi C (1996). Genel Öğretim Metotları. Öz Eğitim Yayınları. İstanbul,5.

Conger JA, Kanungo RN (1994). Charismatic Leadership in Organizations: Perceived Behavioral Attributrs and Their Measurement. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15: 439-352.

Çağlar A, Yakut Ö, Karadağ E (2005). İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Öğretmenler Tarafından Algılanan Kişilik Özellikleri ve Liderlik Davranışları Arasındaki İlişkinin Değerlendirilmesi. Ege Eğitim Dergisi, 6(1): 61-80.

Egan G (1976). Interpersonal Living: A Skills/Contract Approach to Human Relations Training in Groups. Brooks/Cole Publishing. Monterey, CA.

Girvin J (1996). Leadership and Nursing: Part Three Traditional Attitudes and Socialization. Nursing Management, 3(3): 20-22.

Güleç S, Alkış S (2004). Öğretmenlerin Sınıf Ortamında Kullandıkları Davranış Değiştirme Stratejileri. Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, (2)17: 247-266.

Harris A (2003). Teacher Leadership as Distributed Leadership: Heresy, Fantasy or Possibility? School Leadership and Management: Formerly School Organisation, 23(3): 313-324.

Harris A, Spillane JP (2008). Disributed Leadership Through The Looking Glass. M.I.E, 22(1): 31-34.

Huczynsky A, Buchanan D (1991). Organizational Behavior. (2.Edition). Prentice Hall International, UK.

Masood SA, Dani SS, Burns ND, et al (2006). Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture: The Situational Strength Perspective. Proceedings of The Institution of Mechanical Engineers. Part B: Journal of Engineering Manufacture, (6)220: 941-949.

Mullins JL (2005). Management and Organisational Behavior. (7.Edition). Prentice Hall Pearson Education, Essex, England.

Phares EJ (1976). Locus of Control in Personality. Kansas Stage University, General Learning Press. USA.

Sammons P, Hillman J, Mortimore P (1995). Key Characteristics of Effective Schools: A Review of School Effectiveness Research. In White J, Barber M (Eds.). Perspectives on School Effectiveness and School Improvement. Institute of Education. London.

Spillane JP (2005). Distributed Leadership. The Educational Forum, 69: 143-157.

Tertemiz N (2001). "Sınıf Yönetimi ve Disiplin" Sınıf Yönetimi. Editör. Leyla Küçükahmet, Nobel Yayıncılık, Ankara, 58.

Uyar G, Kocaman G, Oktay S, et al (1996). Hemşirelik Hizmetleri Yönetimi El Kitabı. Vehbi Koç Vakfı Yayınları, İstanbul.

Voltan N (1980). Rathus Atılganlık Envanterinin Geçerlik-Güvenirlik Çalışması. Psikoloji Dergisi, 10: 23-25.

Vural G (1997). Hemşirelikte Liderlik. Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi, 1(1): 15-22.