Examination of Self-Leadership and Self-Management Perceptions of Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School Administrators

Mesleki ve Teknik Anadolu Lisesi Yöneticilerinin Öz-Liderlik ve Öz-Yönetim Algılarının İncelenmesi

Dr. Muammer DEĞİRMENDERE [1], Dr. Halime GÜNGÖR [2]

Öz

Bu araştırmanın amacı Bursa ilindeki resmi mesleki ve teknik Anadolu liselerinde görev yapan yöneticilerin öz-liderlik ve öz-yönetime ilişkin görüşlerinin belirlenmesidir. Araştırma tarama modelinde olup, betimsel bir araştırmadır. Araştırmada nicel araştırma deseni kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın çalışma grubu Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı 2021-2022 istatistiklerine göre Bursa ilinde eğitim öğretime devam eden 115 resmi mesleki ve teknik Anadolu lisesinde görev yapan 94 yöneticiden oluşmaktadır. Araştırma verileri Öz-Liderlik Ölçeği ve Öz-Yönetim Ölçeği kullanılarak araştırmacılar tarafından toplanmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda yöneticilerin öz-yönetime ve öz-yönetimin kendini ayarlama boyutuna ilişkin algılarının cinsiyete göre farklılaştığı, öz-yönetimin kendini değerlendirme ve kendini pekiştirme boyutlarında ise istatistiksel olarak anlamlı olarak farklılaşmadığı görülmüştür. Yöneticilerin öz-liderliğe, öz-liderliğin alt boyutlarında algılarının cinsiyete göre farklılaşmadığı, sadece öz-liderliğin kendi kendine konuşma boyutunda farklılaştığı, kadın yöneticilerin erkek yöneticilere göre algılarının daha yüksek olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Yöneticilerin öz-yönetime ve öz-yönetimin alt boyutlarında ve öz-liderliğe ve öz-liderliğin alt boyutlarına yönelik görüşlerinin göreve, branşa, mesleki kıdeme, yöneticilik kıdemine, eğitim durumuna ve yaşa göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı olarak farklılaşmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Okul yöneticileri tarafından öz-liderlik ve öz-yönetim becerilerinin biliniyor ve uygulanıyor olmasının hem öğrencilere, hem öğretmenlere, hem de örgüte olumlu katkılar sağlayacağı söylenebilir. Bu anlamda, okul yöneticilerinin bu becerilerini geliştiren eğitim, danışmanlık, atölye ve farkındalık çalışmalarının yapılması yararlı olacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Mesleki ve teknik Anadolu lisesi, yönetici öz-yönetim, öz-liderlik, öz-değerlendirme

Makale Türü: Araştırma

Abstract

The aim of this research is to examine the views of the administrators working in the public vocational and technical Anatolian high schools in Bursa on self-leadership and self-management. The research is descriptive research in survey model. A quantitative research design was used. The study group consists of 94 administrators working in 115 public vocational and technical Anatolian high schools in Bursa, according to the 2021-2022 statistics of the Ministry of National Education. Personal Information Form, Self-Leadership Scale, Self-Management Scale were used as data collection tools in the research and research data was gathered by researchers. As a result of the research, it was seen that the perceptions of the administrators on self-management and self-adjustment dimension of self-management differed statistically significantly according to gender, but did not differ statistically in the dimensions of self-evaluation and self-reinforcement of self-management. As a result, we can say that the perceptions of the administrators on self-leadership and the sub-dimensions of self-leadership did not differ statistically according to gender, only differed in the dimension of self-talk of self-leadership, and the perceptions of

---

[1]Bursa Provincial Directorate of National Education, mdegirmendere@gmail.com.

[2]Aydın Söke Guidance and Research Center, gungor.halime@gmail.com.

female administrators were higher than male administrators in self-talk. The views of the administrators on self-management and the sub-dimensions of self-management and self-leadership and the sub-dimensions of self-leadership do not differ statistically significantly according to the task, branch, professional seniority, managerial seniority, educational status and age. Knowing and applying self-leadership and self-management skills by school administrators will contribute positively to both students, teachers and the organizations. In this sense, it would be beneficial to conduct training, consultancy, workshops and mindfulness studies that develop these skills of school administrators.

Keywords: Vocational and technical Anatolian high school, administrator, self-management, self-leadership, self-evaluation.

Paper Type: Research

1. Introduction

Although the concepts of self-leadership and self-management are necessary skills for every person, it is essential for managers to have these skills. It is possible that the managerial skills of administrators who are able to manage and lead themselves will also be positively affected. The self-leadership was first conceptualized by Manz as "the process of self-motivation and self-orientation in order to achieve individual and organizational success". Self-leadership concept emerged in the mid-1980s first with the extension of self-management, influenced by Kerr and Jermier's (1978)'s idea of leadership substitutions (Neck and Houghton, 2006). Self-leadership (Lovelace et al. 2007), which forms the basis of shared leadership, is based on the idea that people can share this process with others if they can lead themselves (Houghton et al. 2003, Manz 1992). The aim of self-leadership is for individuals to more effectively manage themselves to improve their lives or jobs by learning and applying certain behavioural and cognitive processes (D'Intino et al. 2007, Uğurluoğlu, 2011).

Self-leadership is the ability to act spontaneously within predetermined standards against environmental variables (Godwin et al. 1999), an alternative perspective to traditional structures where the power of control and influence lies with appointed leaders (Pearce & Manz, 2005), the process of self-influence in which individuals regulate their own behaviour, rewards, and thoughts to achieve their own set goals and objectives, the process of motivating individuals themselves to achieve individual and organizational success, controlling their behaviour and directing them by influencing themselves (Manz, 1986). Self-leadership is an effort to regulate the individual's own living space and responsibilities within the organization, to raise the level of social awareness, to increase the level of motivation towards work, life and the organization (Georgianna, 2007).

Generally, three strategies are used in self-leadership (Houghton & Neck 2006, Manz 1992, Manz & Sims 1980, Neck & Houghton, 2006, Doğan & Şahin 2008, Anderson & Prussia 1997):

- Behaviour-focused; goal setting, self-reward, self-punishment, self-observation, setting self-reminders,

- Natural reward; the individual frequently exhibits behaviours that he/she likes, and avoids doing the things he/she dislikes,

- Constructive thought pattern; imagining successful performance, self-talk, evaluating thoughts and ideas.

Self-leadership includes self-management behaviours and directs individuals' self-influencing systems (Manz, 1986) and combines behavioural dimensions suggested in self-control and self-management theories with intrinsic motivation and cognitive dimensions based on constructive thinking theories (Houghton & Neck, 2002). Self-control of employees in the organization is define "self-control" (Manz & Sims, 1980) or "self-management" in the field of management and is generally grouped under three headings as self-leadership, self-regulation, and mindfulness. Self-leadership has a three-stage structure based on self-control, social learning

and self-management theories; these stages are self-control, self-management and self-leadership (James, 2009). It is stated in the studies that self-leadership is closely related to self-regulation, social cognitive, self-control, intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, self-confidence, self-management and self-influence theories (Neck & Houghton, 2006, Manz, 1986, Doğan & Şahin, 2008, Palmer, 2012). Therefore, it can be said that self-management and self-leadership are closely related and intertwined concepts.

Self-management is based on the theory of self-control and includes individuals' self-control (Manz & Sims, 1980), setting individual goals, self-education to achieve goals, and self-direction to achieve goals (Neck & Houghton, 2006). Self-management helps employees to create their own work environment and self-motivation, and ensures the development of appropriate behaviours that will facilitate minimizing deviations from the standards established within the organization (Kör, 2015). Self-management helps both leaders and followers to develop the necessary skills to perform their duties in the most effective way and to control behaviours that hinder the effectiveness of individuals (Pearce and Manz., 2005).

Self-control and self-management skills which is developed by Kanfer (1970) and Bandura (1991) designed as a three-component model that consist of three interrelated processes as "Self-Monitoring", "Self-Evaluation" and "Self-Reinforcement". Self-monitoring phase includes the individual follows some behaviours that he or she intends to change or maintain; self-evaluation phase includes the individual's self-evaluation by comparing the intended behaviour with the internalized standard; self-reinforcement phase involves rewarding or punishing oneself according to the result of self-evaluation.

Although self-leadership includes self-management behaviour, there is a difference between them (Neck & Houghton, 2006). Self-management consist of a set of strategies that facilitate behaviour which serve to reduce deviations from existing standards so that an individual can manage their behaviour and combine cognitive strategies based on constructive intrinsic motivation and thought patterns concepts with behavioural strategies suggested by self-management and self-control (Manz, 1986). In order to cope with difficulties they face, individuals need to observe themselves very well, have self-management, and be able to influence and control themselves (Kör, 2015). Because self-leadership is related to individuals' ability to take their own responsibilities, make decisions and be willing to implement these decisions (Neck & Houghton, 2006). Especially in times of crisis, people who can make quick decisions, are competent in problem solving, can calm the people around them, have high creativity, and use their performance at the maximum level can become leaders not only on their own but also on their environment, and by using this power for the organization, they increase the success of the organization (Duran, 2022).

Concepts of self-leadership and self-management are close and supportive of each other. They can be explained with the concepts of managing and controlling one's own life, motivating oneself, and directing oneself in a correct and healthy way. In the study carried out by Gürbüz (2014) to evaluate primary and secondary school administrator behaviours according to leadership types, self-leadership was determined as the least applied leadership type by principals. As a matter of fact, since today's leaders exist in complex working environments characterized by rapid technological developments, decreasing resources and increasing costs, it is no longer practical or possible for contemporary leaders to have answers to increasing demands and make all decisions (Abaoğlu, 2021). Therefore, organizations have begun to focus their attention on the skills of their employees, where they can reveal their differences in qualifications, where each employee can assume their own leadership, and provide internal motivation (Sarı, 2021). On the other hand, while the leadership behaviors of the school principal may be effective on the performances of the teachers, academic achievement levels of the students and the attitudes of the parents of the students about participation in education (Şık & Atik, 2023). Since the effect area

of the leadership behaviors of the school principals is extensive, it is important to reveal how the self-leadership and self-management skills are perceived by the administrators in terms of the school and the school to achieve their goals. On the other hand, the importance of vocational education, and the efforts to improve vocational education are taken into account; it is undeniable that the managerial competence of vocational and technical Anatolian high school administrators must be high, because the need for intermediate staff in Turkey, the employment of graduates, the difficulties experienced in participation in higher education for vocational and technical Anatolian high school students. In this sense, it is thought that this research, which was carried out on the skills of vocational high school administrators to manage their own lives and themselves, will also be exploratory in terms of school management responsibilities.

The aim of this research is to examine the views of the administrators working in the public vocational and technical Anatolian high schools in Bursa on self-leadership and self-management. The problems and sub-problems of the research can be listed as follows. What are the views of the administrators working in public vocational and technical Anatolian high schools in Bursa on self-leadership? What are the views of the administrators working in public vocational and technical Anatolian high schools in Bursa on self-management? Do these views differ according to the demographic characteristics of the administrators? Is there a statistically significant relationship between the views of administrators working in public vocational and technical Anatolian high schools in Bursa on self-leadership and self-management?

2. Method

The research is a descriptive research in survey model. A quantitative research design was used. Survey models aim to describe a past or present situation as it is (Karasar, 1999). In this research, it is aimed to reveal perceptions of administrators working in the public vocational and technical Anatolian high schools in Bursa regarding self-leadership and self-management.

2.1. Study Group

The study group consists of 94 administrators from approximately 354 administrators working in 115 public vocational and technical Anatolian high schools in Bursa, according to 2021-2022 statistics of the Ministry of National Education. Simple random sampling method, which is one of the non-probability sampling methods, was used in the selection of the sample and was based on voluntariness.

2.2. Data Collection Tools

As data collection tools Personal Information Form which was prepared by the researchers, Self-Leadership Scale which was developed by Anderson and Prussia (1997) and adapted into Turkish by Tabak, Sığrı and Türköz (2013); Self-Control and Self-Management Scale, which was developed by Mezo (2009) and adapted into Turkish by Ercoşkun (2016), was used in this research.

The Self-Leadership Scale consists of 8 sub-dimensions and 29 items; self-punishment, self-observation, setting reminders, evaluating thoughts/ideas, self-rewarding, self-talk, focusing thought on natural rewards, setting goals for oneself, and imagining successful performance. 5-point Likert-type rating was used in the scale by using "never, rarely, occasionally, usually, always" terms. Items of negative sub-dimension "Self-Punishment" are reverse coded (Tabak, Sığrı & Türköz, 2013). Getting high score indicates a high level of self-leadership. When the averages are considered, scores between 1-2.5 indicate low, scores between 2.5-3.5 indicate medium and scores between 3.5-5 indicate high levels (Tabak, Sığrı & Türköz, 2013). In the validity-reliability study of the scale, the internal consistency coefficients were found between .61 and .80, and the test-retest reliability coefficients were between .51 and .90. In this study, the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient was calculated as .92. In the Confirmatory Factor Analysis

conducted for this study, the 8-dimensional structure of the scale was obtained, and it was observed that these 8 factors explained 70% of the variance of the scale, and the variances defined for the items ranged between .421 and .8677. The fit indices of the model were examined and the chi-square value (X2 =1720.952, sd=406, p=.00, X2 / sd=4.24) was found to be significant.

The Self-Control and Self-Management Scale consists of 3 sub-dimensions and 16 items: self-adjustment, self-evaluation and self-reinforcement. 6-point Likert-type rating was used in the scale by using "doesn't describe me at all, doesn't describe me mostly, doesn't describe me much, describes me a little, describes me highly, describes me completely" terms. The total score that can be obtained from this scale ranges from 0 to 80, and items 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 are reverse items (Ercoşkun, 2016). Items of the negative sub-dimension "Self-Evaluation" are reverse coded, the scores of the items belonging to each sub-dimension are summed up and divided by the number of items of the relevant sub-dimension, and the average of the relevant item is found. The average of the total score of the Self-Control and Self-Management Scale of all items. It is found by adding the scores and dividing by the total number of items, which is 16 (Mezo, 2009; Mezo & Heiby, 2011). Getting high score on the scale means that the administrator has high self-control-self-management skills, and a low score means low. When the arithmetic averages are considered, scores between 1.00-2.67 indicate low levels, scores between 2.68-4.33 indicate medium levels, and scores between 4.34-6.00 indicate high levels (Ercoşkun, 2016). In the validity-reliability study of the scale, the internal consistency coefficients were found between .74 and .81, and the test-retest reliability coefficients were between .62 and .75. In this study, the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient was calculated as .72. In the Confirmatory Factor Analysis conducted for this study, the 3-dimensional structure of the scale was obtained, and it was observed that these three factors explained 61.78% of the variance of the scale, and the variances defined for the items ranged between .416 and .777. The fit indices of the model were examined and the chi-square value (X2 =538.821, sd=120, p=.00, X2 / sd=4.49) was found to be significant.

2.3. Data Analysis

The data were collected by the researchers. The data was processed into the table in the excel program and then analyzed using the SPSS 23 program. First, it was checked whether the data were normally distributed. As a result of the Kolmogorov Smirnov Test, it was measured as p =.200 (p>.005). According to results of the skewness and kurtosis test are examined, kurtosis value is -.362, the skewness value is -.638, and the 5% confidence interval is within the expected interval (statistical value interval for the 5% confidence interval is ±2.58). Since the data showed a normal distribution, the data was analyzed with parametric test statistics. The characteristics of the participant administrators to research are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The characteristics of the participants

Duty		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Principal	40	42,6	42,6	42,6
	Vice Principal	54	57,4	57,4	100,0
	Total	94	100,0	100,0	

Gender	Female	26	27,7	27,7	27,7
	Male	68	72,3	72,3	100,0
	Total	94	100,0	100,0	
Branch	Vocational Courses	57	60,6	60,6	60,6
	Culture Courses	37	39,4	39,4	100,0
	Total	94	100,0	100,0	
Educational Status	Graduate	73	77,7	77,7	77,7
	[3]Master D. in Ed. Ad.	11	11,7	11,7	89,4
	Master D. in Other Science	10	10,6	10,6	100,0
	Total	94	100,0	100,0	
Managerial Seniority	1-5	26	27,7	27,7	27,7
	6-10	24	25,5	25,5	53,2
	11-15	13	13,8	13,8	67,0
	16-20	13	13,8	13,8	80,9
	21-25	9	9,6	9,6	90,4
	26 and over	9	9,6	9,6	100,0
	Total	94	100,0	100,0	
Professional Seniority	6-10	7	7,4	7,4	7,4
	11-15	9	9,6	9,6	17,0
	16-20	10	10,6	10,6	27,7
	21-25	24	25,5	25,5	53,2
	26 and over	44	46,8	46,8	100,0
	Total	94	100,0	100,0	
Age	31-35	2	2,1	2,1	2,1
	36-40	11	11,7	11,7	13,8
	41-45	14	14,9	14,9	28,7
	46-50	30	31,9	31,9	60,6
	51 and over	37	39,4	39,4	100,0
	Total	94	100,0	100,0	

According to Table 1, 42.6% of the administrators participating in the research are principals, 57.4% are vice principals, 27.7% are female, 72.3% are male, and 77.7% have undergraduate degree. 27.7% of them have managerial seniority of 1-5 years, 46.8% of them have a professional seniority of 26 years and above, and 39.4% are administrators aged 51 and over. Ethical approval was obtained with the decision of Bursa Uludağ University Research and Publication Ethics Committee dated February 25, 2022 and numbered 16.

2. Findings

The findings regarding views of the administrators on self-management and self-leadership are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Views of administrators on self-management and self-leadership

Variables	n	X̄	ss	Min	Max	Level
Self-Management	94	2.79	10.61	9.00	61.00	medium
1. Self-Adjustment	94	5.28	4.05	12.00	36.00	high
2. Self-Evaluation	94	2.59	5.88	5.00	29.00	low
3. Self-Reinforcement	94	4.83	4.88	6.00	30.00	high

[3] Master Degree in Educational Administration

Self-Leadership	94	3.08	13.19	29,00	115,00	medium
1. Self-Punishment	94	2.99	3.62	4,00	19,00	medium
2. Self-Observation	94	4.24	2.38	7,00	20,00	high
3. Setting Reminders	94	4.06	1.75	2,00	10,00	high
4. Evaluating Thoughts/Ideas	94	4.21	2.46	4,00	20,00	high
5. Self-Rewarding	94	3.48	3.01	3,00	15,00	medium
6. Self-Talk	94	3.69	2.88	3,00	15,00	high
7. Focusing Thought on Natural Rewards	94	4.28	1.32	3,00	10,00	high
8. Setting Goals for Oneself and Imagining Successful Performance	94	4.17	4.43	12,00	35,00	high

According to Table 2, it is seen that the administrators' perceptions of self-management are medium, with an average value of X̄=2.79. In sub-dimensions of self-management, self-adjustment (X̄=5.28) and self-reinforcement (X̄=4.83), the perceptions of the administrators were high, and the self-evaluation dimension (X̄=2.59), which is the reverse scored dimension of self-management, was low. Administrators' perceptions of self-leadership are moderate (X̄=3.08) and also high in self-observation (X̄=4.24), setting reminders (X̄=4.06), evaluating thoughts/ideas (X̄=4.21), self-talk (X̄=3.69), focusing thought on natural rewards (X̄=4.28), setting goals for oneself and imagining successful performance (X̄=4.17), medium in self-reward (X̄=3.48) and self-punishment (X̄=2.99), which is negatively scored sub-dimension of self-leadership. t-test results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership by gender are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. T-test results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership by gender

Variables	Gender	n	X̄	ss	sd	t	p
Self-Management	Female	26	3.05	8.02	92	2.454	.016*
	Male	68	2.68	11.08			
1. Self-Adjustment	Female	26	5.54	2.44		2.263	.026*
	Male	68	5.19	4.40	92		
2. Self-Evaluation	Female	26	1.90	5.04		-1.856	.067
	Male	68	2.40	6.07	92		
3. Self-Reinforcement	Female	26	5.02	3.94		1.154	.251
	Male	68	4.76	5.18	92		
Self-Leadership	Female	26	3.21	11.85		1.836	.070
	Male	68	3.02	13.44	92		
1. Self-Punishment	Female	26	3.04	3.28		.306	.760
	Male	68	2.97	3.76	92		
2. Self-Observation	Female	26	4.42	1.69		1.848	.068
	Male	68	4.17	2.55	92		
3. Setting Reminders	Female	26	4.23	1.21		1.142	.256
	Male	68	4.00	1.92	92		.169
4. Evaluating Thoughts/Ideas	Female	26	4.35	1.63		1.480	.142
	Male	68	4.15	2.69	92		
5. Self-Rewarding	Female	26	3.77	3.04		1.779	.079
	Male	68	3.36	2.95	92		
6. Self-Talk	Female	26	4.15	2.02		2.985	.004*
	Male	68	3.52	2.99	92		
7. Focusing Thought on Natural Rewards	Female	26	4.44	.99		1.470	.145
	Male	68	4.22	1.41	92		
8. Setting Goals for Oneself and Imagining Successful P.	Female	26	4.16	4.65		-.088	.930
	Male	68	4.17	4.38	92		

*p<.05

According to Table 3, the perceptions of administrators regarding self-management [t (92)= 2.454, p<.05] and self-adjustment dimension of self-management [t (92)= 2.263, p<.05] differ statistically according to gender. There is no significant difference in dimensions of self-evaluation [t (92)= -1.856, p>.05] and self-reinforcement [t (92)= 1.154, p>.05]. It was observed that female administrators (X̄=3.05, X̄=5.54) had higher perceptions of self-management and self-regulation than male administrators (X̄=2.68, X̄=5.19). There is no significant difference according to gender on self-leadership [t (92)= 1.836, p>.05], self-punishment [t (92)= .306, p>.05], self-observation [t (92)= 1.848] , p>.05], setting reminders [t (92)= 1.142, p>.05],

evaluating thoughts/ideas [t (92)= 1.480, p>.05], self-reward [t (92)= 1.779 , p>.05], focusing thought on natural rewards [t (92)= 1.470, p>.05], setting goals for oneself and imagining successful performance [t (92)= -.088, p>.05]. It was observed that the perceptions of the administrators differed significantly due to gender in self-talk [t (92)= 2.985, p<.05] dimension of self-leadership, and the perceptions of female administrators (X̄=4.15) were higher than male administrators (X̄=3.52). t-test results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership by duty are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. T-test results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership by duty

Variables	Duty	n	X̄	ss	sd	t	p
Self-Management	Principal	40	2.74	9.24	92	-.528	.599
	Vice P.	54	2.82	11.59			
1. Self-Adjustment	Principal	40	5.24	3.33		-.531	.596
	Vice P.	54	5.32	4.53	92		
2. Self-Evaluation	Principal	40	2.25	5.30		-.068	.946
	Vice P.	54	2.26	6.33	92		
3. Self-Reinforcement	Principal	40	4.73	4.40		-.790	.432
	Vice P.	54	4.90	5.23	92		
Self-Leadership	Principal	40	3.08	10.63		-.001	.999
	Vice P.	54	3.08	14.91	92		
1. Self-Punishment	Principal	40	3.07	3.84		.764	.447
	Vice P.	54	2.93	3.46	92		
2. Self-Observation	Principal	40	4.31	2.11		.988	.326
	Vice P.	54	4.19	2.56	92		
3. Setting Reminders	Principal	40	4.02	1.71		-.368	.714
	Vice P.	54	4.09	1.80	92		
4. Evaluating Thoughts/Ideas	Principal	40	4.27	1.58		.951	.344
	Vice P.	54	4.15	2.95	92		
5. Self-Rewarding	Principal	40	3.46	2.94		-.139	.889
	Vice P.	54	3.49	3.08	92		
6. Self-Talk	Principal	40	3.51	3.09		-1.638	.105
	Vice P.	54	3.83	2.67	92		
7. Focusing Thought on Natural Rewards	Principal	40	4.40	1.02		1.507	.135
	Vice P.	54	4.19	1.48	92		
8. Setting Goals for Oneself and Imagining Successful P.	Principal	40	4.20	3.56		.411	.682
	Vice P.	54	4.15	5.00	92		

*p<.05

According to Table 4, administrators' perceptions didn't differ significantly due to task on self-management [t (92)= -.528, p>.05] and self-adjustment [t (92)= -.531, p>.05], self-evaluation [t (92))= -.068, p>.05] and self-reinforcement [t (92)= -.790, p>.05] dimensions. Administrators' perceptions didn't differ significantly due to task on self-leadership [t (92)= -.001, p>.05], self-punishment [t (92)= .764, p>.05], self-observation [t (92)] = .988, p>.05], setting reminders [t (92)= -.368, p>.05], evaluating thoughts/ ideas [t (92)= .951, p>.05], self-rewarding [t (92)= -.139, p>.05], self-talk [t (92)= -1.638, p>.05], focusing thought on natural rewards [t (92)= 1.507, p>.05]], setting goals for oneself and imagining successful performance [t (92)= .411, p>.05]. t-test results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership by branch are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. T-test Results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership by branch

Variables	Branch	n	X̄	ss	sd	t	p
Self-Management	Vocational C.	57	2.73	10.75	92	-1.029	.306
	Culture Courses	37	2.87	10.39			
1. Self-Adjustment	Vocational C.	57	5.25	4.51		-.719	.474

	Culture Courses	37	5.35	3.25	92		
2. Self-Evaluation	Vocational C.	57	2.34	6.24		.825	.412
	Culture Courses	37	2.14	5.30	92		
3. Self-Reinforcement	Vocational C.	57	4.78	4.96		-.641	.523
	Culture Courses	37	4.91	4.80	92		
Self-Leadership	Vocational C.	57	3.97	13.90		-.104	.918
	Culture Courses	37	3.08	12.21	92		
1. Self-Punishment	Vocational C.	57	2.95	3.66		-.534	.595
	Culture Courses	37	3.05	3.59	92		
2. Self-Observation	Vocational C.	57	4.21	2.36		-.546	.586
	Culture Courses	37	4.28	2.43	92		
3. Setting Reminders	Vocational C.	57	4.08	1.86		.326	.745
	Culture Courses	37	4.02	1.60	92		
4. Evaluating Thoughts/Ideas	Vocational C.	57	4.20	2.66		-.059	.953
	Culture Courses	37	4.21	2.15	92		
5. Self-Rewarding	Vocational C.	57	3.51	3.01		.401	.689
	Culture Courses	37	3.42	3.04	92		
6. Self-Talk	Vocational C.	57	3.64	3.06		-.720	.473
	Culture Courses	37	3.78	2.59	92		
7. Focusing Thought on Natural Rewards	Vocational C.	57	4.27	1.49		-.182	.856
	Culture Courses	37	4.29	1.01	92		
8. Setting Goals for Oneself and Imagining Successful P.	Vocational C.	57	4.15	4.49		-.299	.766
	Culture Courses	37	4.19	4.38	92		

*p<.05

According to Table 5, administrators' perceptions did not differ significantly due to the branch on self-management [t (92)= -1.029, p>.05] and self-adjustment [t (92)= -.719, p>.05], self-evaluation [t (92))= .825, p>.05] and self-reinforcement [t (92)= -.641, p>.05] dimensions. Administrators' perceptions didn't differ significantly due to the branch on self-leadership [t (92)= -.104, p>.05], self-punishment [t (92)= -.534, p>.05], self-observation [t (92)] = -.546, p>.05], setting reminders [t (92)= .326, p>.05], evaluating thoughts/ ideas [t (92)= -.059, p>.05], self-rewarding [t (92)= .401, p>.05], self-talk [t (92)= -.720, p>.05], focusing thought on natural rewards [t (92)= -.182, p>.05]], setting goals for oneself and imagining successful performance [t (92)= -.299, p>.05]. ANOVA results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership by professional seniority are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. ANOVA Results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership by professional seniority

Variables	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p	Difference
Self-Management	B.Groups	297.842	4	74.461	.651	.628	-
	W. Groups	10183.136	89	114.417			
	Total	10480.979	93				
1. Self-Adjustment	B.Groups	31.757	4	7.939	.473	.756	
	W. Groups	1494.595	89	16.793			-
	Total	1526.351	93				

2. Self-Evaluation	B.Groups	172.504	4	43.126	1.260	.292	-
	W. Groups	3047.155	89	34.238			
	Total	3219.660	93				
3. Self-Reinforcement	B.Groups	22.253	4	5.563	.225	.924	
	W. Groups	2196.949	89	24.685			
	Total	2219.202	93				-
Self-Leadership	B.Groups	440.206	4	110.052	.622	.648	
	W. Groups	15752.954	89	176.999			
	Total	16193.160	93				-
1. Self-Punishment	B.Groups	69.392	4	17.348	1.345	.259	
	W. Groups	1147.513	89	12.893			
	Total	1216.904	93				-
2. Self-Observation	B.Groups	9.959	4	2.490	.429	.788	
	W. Groups	516.945	89	5.808			
	Total	526.904	93				-
3. Setting Reminders	B.Groups	7.361	4	1.840	.587	.673	
	W. Groups	279.107	89	3.136			
	Total	286.468	93				-
4. Evaluating Thoughts/Ideas	B.Groups	5.112	4	1.278	.204	.936	
	W. Groups	558.814	89	6.279			
	Total	563.926	93				-
5. Self-Rewarding	B.Groups	48.986	4	12.247	1.376	.249	
	W. Groups	791.993	89	8.899			
	Total	840.979	93				-
6. Self-Talk	B.Groups	36.772	4	9.193	1.114	.355	
	W. Groups	734.548	89	8.253			
	Total	771.319	93				-
7. Focusing Thought on Natural Rewards	B.Groups	5.102	4	1.276	.728	.575	
	W. Groups	156.015	89	1.753			
	Total	161.117	93				-
8. Setting Goals for Oneself and I. Successful P.	B.Groups	36.849	4	9.212	.458	.766	
	W. Groups	1789.077	89	20.102			
	Total	1825.926	93				-

*$p<.05$

According to Table 6, administrators' perceptions didn't differ significantly due to the professional seniority on self-management [$F_{(4,89)}=.651$, p>.05] and self-adjustment [$F_{(4,89)}=.473$, p>.05], self-evaluation [$F_{(4,89)}=1.260$, p>.05] and self-reinforcement [$F_{(4,89)}=.225$, p>.05] dimensions. Administrators' perceptions didn't differ significantly due to the professional seniority on self-leadership [$F_{(4,89)}=.622$, p>.05], self-punishment [$F_{(4,89)}=1.345$, p>.05], self-observation [$F_{(4,89)}=.429$, p>.05], setting reminders [$F_{(4,89)}=.587$, p>.05], evaluating thoughts/ideas [$F_{(4,89)}=.204$, p>.05], self-rewarding [$F_{(4,89)}=1.376$, p>.05], self-talk [$F_{(4,89)}=1.114$, p>.05], focusing thought on natural rewards [$F_{(4,89)}=.728$, p>.05]], setting goals for oneself and imagining successful performance [$F_{(4,89)}=.458$, p>.05]. ANOVA results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership by managerial seniority are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. ANOVA Results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership by managerial seniority

Variables	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p	Difference
Self-Management	B.Groups	259.983	5	51.997	.448	.814	-
	W. Groups	10220.996	88	116.148			
	Total	10480.979	93				
1. Self-Adjustment	B.Groups	111.616	5	22.323	1.389	.236	-
	W. Groups	1414.735	88	16.077			
	Total	1526.351	93				

2. Self-Evaluation	B.Groups	210.442	5	42.088	1.231	.302	-
	W. Groups	3009.218	88	34.196			
	Total	3219.660	93				
3. Self-Reinforcement	B.Groups	27.040	5	5.408	.217	.954	
	W. Groups	2192.162	88	24.911			
	Total	2219.202	93				-
Self-Leadership	B.Groups	950.984	5	190.197	1.098	.367	
	W. Groups	15242.175	88	173.207			
	Total	16193.160	93				-
1. Self-Punishment	B.Groups	130.131	5	26.026	2.107	.072	
	W. Groups	1086.774	88	12.350			
	Total	1216.904	93				-
2. Self-Observation	B.Groups	22.907	5	4.581	.800	.553	
	W. Groups	503.997	88	5.727			
	Total	526.904	93				-
3. Setting Reminders	B.Groups	25.125	5	5.025	1.692	.145	
	W. Groups	261.343	88	2.970			
	Total	286.468	93				-
4. Evaluating Thoughts/Ideas	B.Groups	38.407	5	7.681	1.286	.277	
	W. Groups	525.518	88	5.972			
	Total	563.926	93				-
5. Self-Rewarding	B.Groups	21.180	5	4.236	.455	.809	
	W. Groups	819.799	88	9.316			
	Total	840.979	93				-
6. Self-Talk	B.Groups	82.170	5	16.434	2.099	.073	
	W. Groups	689.150	88	7.831			
	Total	771.319	93				-
7. Focusing Thought on Natural Rewards	B.Groups	3.295	5	.659	.368	.870	
	W. Groups	157.822	88	1.793			
	Total	161.117	93				-
8. Setting Goals for Oneself and I. Successful P.	B.Groups	153.173	5	30.635	1.612	.165	
	W. Groups	1672.752	88	19.009			
	Total	1825.926	93				-

According to Table 7, administrators' perceptions didn't differ significantly due to the managerial seniority on self-management [$F_{(5,88)}$=.448, p>.05] and self-adjustment [$F_{(5,88)}$=1.389, p>.05], self-evaluation [$F_{(5,88)}$=1.231, p>.05] and self-reinforcement [$F_{(5,88)}$=.217, p>.05] dimensions. Administrators' perceptions didn't differ significantly due to the managerial seniority on self-leadership [$F_{(5,88)}$=1.098, p>.05], self-punishment [$F_{(5,88)}$=2.107, p>.05], self-observation [$F_{(5,88)}$=.800, p>.05], setting reminders [$F_{(5,88)}$=1.692, p>.05], evaluating thoughts/ ideas [$F_{(5,88)}$=1.286, p>.05], self-rewarding [$F_{(5,88)}$=.455, p>.05], self-talk [$F_{(5,88)}$=2.099, p>.05], focusing thought on natural rewards [$F_{(5,88)}$=.368, p>.05]], setting goals for oneself and imagining successful performance [$F_{(5,88)}$=1.612, p>.05]. ANOVA results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership by educational status are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. ANOVA Results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership by educational status

Variables	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p	Difference
Self-Management	B.Groups	135.085	2	67.542	.594	.554	-
	W. Groups	10345.894	91	113.691			
	Total	10480.979	93				
1. Self-Adjustment	B.Groups	34.143	2	17.072	1.041	.357	
	W. Groups	1492.208	91	16.398			
	Total	1526.351	93				-
2. Self-Evaluation	B.Groups	.564	2	.282	.008	.992	-

Variables	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p	Difference
	W. Groups	3219.095	91	35.375			
	Total	3219.660	93				
3. Self-Reinforcement	B.Groups	35.851	2	17.925	.747	.477	
	W. Groups	2183.351	91	23.993			-
	Total	2219.202	93				
Self-Leadership	B.Groups	703.452	2	351.726	2.066	.133	
	W. Groups	15489.707	91	170.217			-
	Total	16193.160	93				
1. Self-Punishment	B.Groups	9.947	2	4.973	.375	.688	
	W. Groups	1206.957	91	13.263			-
	Total	1216.904	93				
2. Self-Observation	B.Groups	5.831	2	2.916	.509	.603	
	W. Groups	521.073	91	5.726			-
	Total	526.904	93				
3. Setting Reminders	B.Groups	11.378	2	5.689	1.882	.158	
	W. Groups	275.090	91	3.023			-
	Total	286.468	93				
4. Evaluating Thoughts/Ideas	B.Groups	17.309	2	8.654	1.441	.242	
	W. Groups	546.617	91	6.007			-
	Total	563.926	93				
5. Self-Rewarding	B.Groups	9.688	2	4.844	.530	.590	
	W. Groups	831.291	91	9.135			-
	Total	840.979	93				
6. Self-Talk	B.Groups	17.092	2	8.546	1.031	.361	
	W. Groups	754.227	91	8.288			-
	Total	771.319	93				
7. Focusing Thought on Natural Rewards	B.Groups	3.243	2	1.622	.935	.396	
	W. Groups	157.874	91	1.735			-
	Total	161.117	93				
8. Setting Goals for Oneself and I. Successful P.	B.Groups	52.387	2	26.193	1.344	.266	
	W. Groups	1773.539	91	19.489			-
	Total	1825.926	93				

*$p<.05$

According to Table 8, administrators' perceptions didn't differ significantly due to the educational status on self-management [$F_{(2,91)}=.594$, p>.05] and self-adjustment [$F_{(2,91)}=1.041$, p>.05], self-evaluation [$F_{(2,91)}=.008$, p>.05] and self-reinforcement [$F_{(2,91)}=.747$, p>.05] dimensions. Administrators' perceptions didn't differ significantly due to the educational status on self-leadership [$F_{(2,91)}=2.066$, p>.05], self-punishment [$F_{(2,91)}=.375$, p>.05], self-observation [$F_{(2,91)}=.509$, p>.05], setting reminders [$F_{(2,91)}=1.882$, p>.05], evaluating thoughts/ ideas [$F_{(2,91)}=1.441$, p>.05], self-rewarding [$F_{(2,91)}=.530$, p>.05], self-talk [$F_{(2,91)}=1.031$, p>.05], focusing thought on natural rewards [$F_{(2,91)}=.935$, p>.05]], setting goals for oneself and imagining successful performance [$F_{(2,91)}=1.344$, p>.05]. ANOVA results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership by age are shown in Table 9.

Table 9. ANOVA Results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership by age

Variables	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p	Difference
Self-Management	B.Groups	105.332	4	26.333	.226	.923	-
	W. Groups	10375.647	89	116.580			
	Total	10480.979	93				
1. Self-Adjustment	B.Groups	8.143	4	2.036	.119	.975	
	W. Groups	1518.208	89	17.059			-
	Total	1526.351	93				
2. Self-Evaluation	B.Groups	97.576	4	24.394	.695	.597	-

	W. Groups	3122.083	89	35.080			
	Total	3219.660	93				
3. Self-Reinforcement	B.Groups	49.708	4	12.427	.510	.729	
	W. Groups	2169.494	89	24.376			-
	Total	2219.202	93				
Self-Leadership	B.Groups	718.631	4	179.658	1.033	.395	
	W. Groups	15474.529	89	173.871			-
	Total	16193.160	93				
1. Self-Punishment	B.Groups	75.177	4	18.794	1.465	.220	
	W. Groups	1141.727	89	12.828			-
	Total	1216.904	93				
2. Self-Observation	B.Groups	8.512	4	2.128	.365	.833	
	W. Groups	518.392	89	5.825			-
	Total	526.904	93				
3. Setting Reminders	B.Groups	4.044	4	1.011	.319	.865	
	W. Groups	282.424	89	3.173			-
	Total	286.468	93				
4. Evaluating Thoughts/Ideas	B.Groups	15.197	4	3.799	.616	.652	
	W. Groups	548.728	89	6.165			-
	Total	563.926	93				
5. Self-Rewarding	B.Groups	76.557	4	19.139	2.228	.072	
	W. Groups	764.422	89	8.589			-
	Total	840.979	93				
6. Self-Talk	B.Groups	44.222	4	11.055	1.353	.257	
	W. Groups	727.097	89	8.170			-
	Total	771.319	93				
7. Focusing Thought on Natural Rewards	B.Groups	8.043	4	2.011	1.169	.330	
	W. Groups	153.074	89	1.720			-
	Total	161.117	93				
8. Setting Goals for Oneself and Imagining Successful P.	B.Groups	19.726	4	4.932	.243	.913	
	W. Groups	1806.199	89	20.294			-
	Total	1825.926	93				

*$p<.05$

According to Table 9, administrators' perceptions didn't differ significantly according to the age on self-management [$F_{(4,89)}=.226$, p>.05] and self-adjustment [$F_{(4,89)}=.119$, p>.05], self-evaluation [$F_{(4,89)}=.695$, p>.05] and self-reinforcement [$F_{(4,89)}=.510$, p>.05] dimensions. Administrators' perceptions didn't differ significantly according to the age on self-leadership [$F_{(4,89)}=1.033$, p>.05], self-punishment [$F_{(4,89)}=1.465$, p>.05], self-observation [$F_{(4,89)}=.365$, p>.05], setting reminders [$F_{(4,89)}=.616$, p>.05], evaluating thoughts/ ideas [$F_{(4,89)}=.319$, p>.05], self-rewarding [$F_{(4,89)}=2.228$, p>.05], self-talk [$F_{(4,89)}=1.353$, p>.05], focusing thought on natural rewards [$F_{(4,89)}=1.169$, p>.05]], setting goals for oneself and imagining successful performance [$F_{(4,89)}=.243$, p>.05]. The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient analysis results of administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership are shown in Table 10.

Table 10. The pearson product moment correlation coefficient analysis results of the administrators' views on self-management and self-leadership

Variables		Self-Management	Self-Leadership
Self-Management	Pearson Correlation	1	.633**
	p		.000

	N	94	94
Self-Leadership	Pearson Correlation	.633**	1
	p	.000	
	N	94	94

p<.01

According to Table 10, it is seen that there is a moderate positive correlation (r = .633, p < .01) between self-management and self-leadership. An absolute correlation coefficient between 0.70-0.30 as a moderate level relationship (Büyüköztürk, 2004). When administrators' self-management skills increase, their perceptions of self-leadership skills also increase.

4. Results, Discussion and Recommendations

Results and recommendations of research, which was carried out to examine relationship between administrators' self-management and self-leadership perceptions with the participation of 94 administrators working in public vocational and technical Anatolian high schools in Bursa are given below.

It was observed that the perceptions of the administrators regarding self-management were medium, the perceptions of the administrators were high in sub-dimensions of self-management, self-adjustment and self-reinforcement, and low in the self-evaluation dimension, which was the reverse scored dimension of self-management. Administrators' perceptions of self-leadership are medium and high in self-observation, setting reminders, evaluating thoughts and ideas, self-talk, focusing thought on natural rewards, setting goals for oneself, and imagining successful performance, and medium in self-rewarding sub-dimensions and self-punishment sub-dimension, which is the negative-scored sub-dimension of self-leadership.

It is noteworthy that while perceptions of the administrators are high in sub-dimensions of self-management and self-leadership, they think differently in the dimensions of self-evaluation, self-reward and self-punishment. Considering that self-rewarding and punishment are not common attitudes of individuals, so increasing these skills in administrators may require awareness, training and work. As a matter of fact, in research carried out by Ay (2017) to determine self-leadership levels of managers and executive assistants working in organizations in the public and private sectors in Gaziantep; managers' and executive assistants' views are very high in the dimensions of setting reminders, self-observation, evaluating thoughts, setting goals, imagining successful performance, and focusing on natural reward; high in self-reward and self-talk dimensions. In the self-punishment dimension, it was determined to be at a moderate level.

It is seen that the perceptions of administrators regarding self-management and self-adjustment sub-dimensions of self-management differ significantly due to gender, while it does not differ statistically in sub-dimensions of self-management and self-reinforcement. Female administrators have higher perceptions of self-management and self-adjustment than male administrators. As a result, perceptions of administrators towards self-leadership, sub-dimensions of self-leadership such as self-punishment, self-observation, setting reminders, evaluating thoughts and ideas, self-rewarding, focusing on natural rewards, imagining successful performance by setting goals for oneself, did not differ statistically according to gender. It was observed that the perceptions of the administrators differed significantly in self-talk sub-dimension of self-leadership due to gender, and perceptions of female administrators were higher than male administrators. When results of studies in the literature are examined, some studies support research findings, while some studies differ. While findings researchs show that there is significant difference in women's favour (Uğurluoğlu, 2010, Akkuş, 2018) and men (Covarrubias & Stone, 2015) according to gender, there are also findings revealing that there is no significant difference between them in self-management strategies (Carmeli et al 2006; Kazan, 1999;

Kurman, 2001; Razieh et al 2013; Türköz, 2010). In a study conducted by Kör (2015) with the participation of personnel working in the finance sector in Istanbul to investigate innovative business behavior, entrepreneurial orientation and self-leadership of organizations, and the relationships between these concepts, it was found that self-leadership differs significantly in favor of women according to gender. In research conducted by Yavuz and Ayan (2019) to determine the self-leadership level of the staff in public institutions operating in Ankara, significant difference was found in favor of women in self-talk dimension of self-leadership.

Furthermore, views of administrators on self-management and sub-dimensions of self-management and self-leadership and sub-dimensions of self-leadership do not differ statistically according to the duty, branch, professional seniority, vocational seniority, educational status and age. According to results of research conducted by Yavuz and Ayan (2019) and Ay (2017) differ from the research findings, but study by Erdoğan (2019) supports the research findings. In the research conducted to determine the self-leadership level of staff in public institutions, significant difference was found between the total working time and the self-punishment dimension, self-rewarding and self-observation dimensions with the age, and the educational status and tself-observation dimension. (Yavuz & Ayan, 2019). Significant difference was found between education level of administrator and self-leadership, the age of administrator and executive assistant and the sub-dimensions of self-leadership (Ay, 2017).

In research conducted by Erdoğan (2019) the prominent qualities of school administrators in context of self-leadership were found that to focus on their work and produce analytical solutions in crisis situations. It was determined that self-leadership qualities of the school administrators participating in the research did not change according to age, gender, marital status, education level, total managerial time, total managerial time in the institution, type of job, monthly income status, residence status and co-working status; it has been determined that there is a difference according to the total tenure, and that the self-leadership qualities of the administrators with low tenure are higher. Furthermore, in the study conducted with teachers by Akkuş (2018), a significant difference was found in favor of new teachers and teachers close to retirement in terms of professional seniority.

As a conclusion, there is a moderate positive relationship between self-management and self-leadership, and as administrators' self-management skills increase, perceptions of self-leadership skills also increase. Self-leadership includes self-management behaviors and directs the self-influencing systems of individuals (Manz, 1986), and self-management and self-leadership are conceptually intertwined and closely related concepts.

Self-leadership and self-management are concepts that also have organizational effects. The behavior and management style of school principals affect all stakeholders, including parents, employees and students of the school. In addition, school administrators are a model in the organization in terms of managerial competence and leadership behaviors. Therefore, employees learn to think not only of themselves but also of the organization and can direct their behavior at the right time, place and subject in order to serve the organization (Duran, 2022). So, knowing and applying self-leadership and self-management skills by school administrators will contribute positively to both students, teachers and the organizations. In this sense, it would be beneficial to conduct training, consultancy, workshops and mindfulness studies that develop these skills of school administrators. In addition, designing another research on self-leadership and self-management skills with participation of teachers and students can contribute to the subject in the literature.

References

Abaoğlu H. (2021). The relationship between self-leadership skills and work-related quality of life among occupational therapists. *Arch Health Sci Res.8*(3), 169-174.

Akkuş, M. (2018) İlkokul ve ortaokul öğretmenlerinin öz-liderlikleri ile sınıf yönetimi öz yeterlik algıları arasındaki ilişki. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi) Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Gaziantep.

Anderson, J. S. ve Prussia, G.E. (1997). The Self-Leadership Questionnaire: Preliminary Assessment of Construct Validity. *The Journal of Leadership Studies,* 4 (2), 119-143.

Ay, G. (2017). Yönetici ve Yönetici Asistanlarının Öz-Liderlik Düzeylerinin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 10, 52, 929-940.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2004). *Sosyal Bilimler için Veri Analizi El Kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Carmeli, A., Meitar, R., & Weisberg, J. (2006). Self-leadership skills and work innovative behavior at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, *27*(1), 75–90.

Covarrubias, R., & Stone, J. (2015). Self-monitoring strategies as a unique predictor of Latino male student achievement. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *14*, 55–70.

D'Intino, Robert S., Michael G. Goldsby, Jeffery D. Houghton, and Christopher P. Neck: "Self-leadership: A process for entrepreneurial success." Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, Vol. 13, No. 4, 2007, pp. 105-120.

Doğan, Selen ve Faruk Şahin (2008). "Kendi Kendine Liderlik Ölçeğinin Türkçe Uyarlaması, Geçerlilik ve Güvenilirlik Çalışması". *H.Ü.İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 26(1): 139-164.

Duran, O. A. (2022). Kendi kendine liderlik ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı arasındaki ilişkide öz yeterliliğin aracı rolü. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara

Ercoşkun, M. H. (2016). Adaptation of Self-Control and Self-Management Scale (SCMS) into Turkish culture: A study on reliability and validity. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, *16*, 1125-1145.

Erdoğan, M. (2019). Eğitim Sektöründeki Yöneticilerin Değerleri, Öz-Liderlik Nitelikleri ve İş Tatminleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İstanbul Üniversitesi

Georgianna, S. (2015). Assessing and developing entrepreneurs' self-lead-ership and super-leadership. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Organ-ization Management, 4*(3), DOI: 10.4172/2169-026X.1000146.

Godwin, J. L., Neck, C. P., & Houghton, J. D. (1999). The impact of thought self-leadership on individual goal performance: A cognitive perspective. *The Journal of Management Development, 18*(2), 153–169. Retrieved from http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1108/02621719910257738.

Gürbüz, Y. (2014). İlk ve Ortaokul Yönetici Davranışlarının Liderlik Türlerine Göre Değerlendirilmesi (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Yedi Tepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. İstanbul.

Houghton, J. D. ve Neck, C. P. (2002). The revised self-leadership ques-tionnaire. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 17*(8), 672-691.

Houghton, J. D., Neck, C. P., & Manz, C. C. (2003). We think we can, we think we can, we think we can: The impact of thinking patterns and work team sustainability. *The Performance Management: An International Journal*, *9*(1/2), 31–41.

James, A. M. (2009). *Self-leadership and self-regulated learning: An investigation of theoretical relationships* (Doctoral dissertation, Capella Unıversıty).

Kanfer, F. H. (1970). Self-regulation: Research, issues, and speculations. In C. Neuringer & J. L. Michael (Eds.), *Behavior modification in clinical psychology* (pp. 178–220). New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts. Bandura, Albert (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Karasar, N. (1999) Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi, Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.

Kazan, A. L. (1999), *Exploring the concept of self-leadership: Factor impacting self leadership of Ohio AmeriCorps members* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Ohio).

Kerr, S., & Jermier, J. M. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, *22*(3), 375-403.

Kör, B. (2015). Öz Liderlik, Örgütlerin Girişimcilik Yönelimi ve Çalışanların Yenilikçi İş Davranışları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi: Bir Araştırma. (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi). İstanbul Üniversitesi

Kurman, J. (2001). Self-regulation strategies in achievement setting: culture and gender differences. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *32*(4), 491–503.

Lovelace, Kathi J., Charles C. Manz, ve Jose C. Alves (2007). "Work Stress and Leadership Development: The Role of Self-Leadership, Shared Leadership, Physical Fitness and Flow in Managing Demands and Increasing Job Control". *Human Resource Management Review* 17: 374-387.

Manz, C. C. (1992). *Mastering self-leadership: Empowering yourself for personal excellence*. New Jersey, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Manz, C. C. (1986). Self-leadership: Toward an expanded theory of self-influence processes in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), 585-600.

Manz, C. C. & Sims, H. P. (1980). Self-management as a substitute for leadership: A social learning theory perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 5*(3), 361-367.

Mezo, P. G. (2009). The self-control and self-management scale (SCMS): Development of an adaptive self-regulatory coping skills instrument. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *31*(2), 83-93. https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs10862-008-9104-2.pdf.

Mezo, P. G., & Heiby, E. M. (2011). Proposed cut-off scores for self-management questionnaires. *Clinical Psychologist, 15*(2), 78–84.

Neck, C. P., & Houghton, J. D. (2006). Two decades of self-leadership theory and research. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(4), 270–295.

Palmer, Robert B. "The relationship between self-leadership and effective leadership behaviors." PhD diss., Capella University, 2012, p. 113.

Pearce, C. L., & Manz, C. C. (2005). The new silver bullets of leadership: The importance of self- and shared leadership in knowledge work.

Razieh, A., Reza, H., & Saeid, R. (2013). The analysis of relationship between self-leadership strategies and components of quantum organization at universities. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences, 2*(5), 192–203.

Sarı, C. (2021). Pozitif psikolojik sermayenin öz-liderlik becerileri üzerindeki rolü. (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İstanbul Medipol Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Şık, E. & Atik, S. (2023). Öz (kendi kendine) Liderlik Ölçeği kısa versiyonu: Okul müdürlerine uyarlama, geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. İçinde Y.L. Mert(Ed.) *Sosyal, Beşeri ve İdari Bilimler Temel Alanında Akademik Çalışmalar –II.* 6. Bölüm, ss 137-154. İstanbul: Karadeniz Kitap

Tabak, A.; Sığrı, U. & Türköz, T. (2013). Öz Liderlik Ölçeği'nin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması çalışması. *Bilig Türk Dünyası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 67, 213-246.

Türköz, T. (2010). Çalışanların öz *liderlik algısının izlenim yönetimi taktiklerini kullanımlarına olan etkileri: Savunma sanayinde uygulamalı bir araştırma* [The effects of employees' self-leadership perceptions on impression management tactics: An applied research in Turkish defense industry] (Master's thesis, Turkish Military Academy Defense Sciences Institute Department of Defense Management, Ankara, Turkey).

Uğurluoğlu, Özgür: "Kendi Kendine Liderlik Stratejileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma." İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, Vol. 24, No. 1, 2011, ss. 175-191.

Yavuz, E. ve Ayan, B. (2019). Kamu örgütlerinde öz liderlik düzeyinin belirlenmesi. *OPUS– Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi, 10(17)*, 1002-1029. DOI: 10.26466/opus.513433.