

İLKÖĞRETİM YÖNETİCİLERİNİN ÖZ-YETERLİK DÜZEYLERİ İLE OKUL LİDERLİK UYGULAMALARININ DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ

Kübra ÖZSAT*
Serdal IŞIKTAŞ**
Hülya ŞENOL***
Recep ABAKAN****

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı KKTC Milli Eğitim ve Kültür Bakanlığına bağlı ilköğretim okullarında görev yapan okul yöneticilerinin öz-yeterlik düzeyleri ile okul liderlik uygulamalarını değerlendirmektir. Araştırmanın evrenini KKTC'de Milli Eğitim ve Kültür Bakanlığı İlköğretim Dairesi'ne bağlı ilköğretim okullarında 2020-2021 eğitim yılında görev yapan öğretmenler ve okul yöneticileri oluşturmaktadır. Çalışmaya randomize örneklem yöntemi ile seçilen 350 öğretmen ve 50 okul yöneticisi olmak üzere toplam 400 birey dahil edilmiştir. Çalışmada elde edilen veriler Kişisel Bilgi Formu, Öz-yeterlik Algısı Ölçeği ve Okul Liderliği Ölçeği aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Her iki gruba araştırmacılar tarafından hazırlanan Kişisel Bilgi Formu verilmekle birlikte okul yöneticilerine yanıtlamaları için Yönetici Öz-yeterlik Algısı Ölçeği, öğretmenlere ise Okul Liderliği Ölçeği sunulmuştur. Verilerin istatistiksel çözümlenmesinde SPSS 25 paket programından yararlanılmıştır. İstatistiki yöntemlerden Kruskal-Wallis H ve Man Whitney-U testleri kullanılmıştır. Analizler sonucunda elde edilen bulgular incelendiğinde yöneticilerin öz-yeterlik algılarının yüksek olduğu görülmüştür. Çalışmada yöneticilerin öz-yeterlik algıları ile cinsiyet, görev yaptığı okuldaki çalışma süresi ve görev değişkenleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark bulunmadığı tespit edilirken eğitim düzeyi ile Yönetici Öz Yeterlilik Algısı Ölçeğinde bulunan Etik Öz Yeterlilik alt boyutundan alınan puanlar arasındaki farkın istatistiksel olarak anlamlı olduğu; Lisansüstü mezunu olan yöneticilerin Etik alt boyut puanlarının lisans mezunu olanlara göre daha yüksek olduğu saptanmıştır. Bununla birlikte çalışmada yöneticilerin yöneticilikteki kıdemlerine göre öz yeterlik düzeylerinin farklılaştığı; kıdemi düşük olan yöneticilerin Yönetici Öz Yeterlilik Algısı Ölçeğinde bulunan Psikolojik Öz Yeterlilik alt boyutundan aldıkları puanların kıdemi yüksek olan okul yöneticilerine kıyasla daha yüksek olduğu ortaya çıkarılmıştır. Çalışmada öğretmen görüşlerine göre yöneticilerin okul liderlik uygulamaları incelenmiş ve yöneticilerin okul liderlikleri puanlarının destek, işbirliği ve açıklık boyutlarında yüksek olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Çalışmada ayrıca öğretmenlerin cinsiyet, mezun olunan fakülte, okuldaki görev süresi, branş ve kıdem değişkenleri ile yöneticilerin göstermiş oldukları okul liderlikleri puanları arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark bulunmadığı tespit edilirken öğretmenlerin eğitim düzeyleri farklılaştıkça yöneticilerin algılanan okul liderlikleri puanlarının da farklılaştığı; eğitim düzeyi lisansüstü olan öğretmenlerin yöneticilerin göstermiş oldukları okul liderlikleri puanlarının lisans mezunu olan öğretmenlere göre daha yüksek olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Yöneticilerin öz-yeterlik algılarının artırılması adına hizmet içi eğitim kurslarının düzenlenmesi önemlidir. MEB tarafından öğretmen ve yöneticilerin kendilerini mesleki açıdan geliştirebilmeleri için gerekli teşvik programlarının uygulanması hem öğretmenler hem de yöneticiler için faydalı olacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İlköğretim, Liderlik, Öğretmen, Okul liderliği, Okul yöneticiliği, Öz-yeterlik

EVALUATION OF PRIMARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS' SELF-EFFICACY LEVELS AND SCHOOL LEADERSHIP PRACTICES**ABSTRACT**

The aim of this study is to evaluate the self-efficacy levels and school leadership practices of school administrators working in primary schools affiliated to the TRNC Ministry of National Education and Culture. The universe of the research consists of teachers and school administrators working in primary schools affiliated to the Ministry of National Education and Culture, Primary Education Department in the 2020-2021 academic year. The Universe of the research consists of 90

* Uzman, Kıbrıs Sağlık ve Toplum Bilimleri Üniversitesi, Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Fakültesi, kubra.ozsat@kstu.edu.tr ORCID: 0000-0002-2237-771X

** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Kıbrıs Sağlık ve Toplum Bilimleri Üniversitesi, Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Fakültesi, serdal.isiktas@kstu.edu.tr ORCID: : 0000-0001-7678-0494

*** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Kıbrıs Sağlık ve Toplum Bilimleri Üniversitesi, Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Fakültesi, hulya.senol@kstu.edu.tr ORCID: 0000-0003-1701-8103

**** Kıbrıs, ozsatk@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-9358-6674

primary school, 1717 primary school teachers and 186 administrators. A total of 400 individuals, 350 teachers and 50 school administrators, were included in the study, selected by randomized sampling method. The data were collected through the survey consisting of Demographic Information Form, the Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and the School Leadership Scale. Both groups were given the Demographic Information Form prepared by the researchers, and the Administrator Self-Efficacy Perception Scale was presented to the school administrators, and the School Leadership Scale was presented to the teachers. SPSS 25 package program was used for statistical analysis of the data. Kruskal-Wallis H and Man Whitney-U tests were used to analyze the data. The analysis of data showed that the self-efficacy perceptions of the administrators were high. In the study, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the self-efficacy perceptions of the administrators and the variables of gender, working time at the school, and the task variables, while the difference between the education level and the scores obtained from the Ethical Self-Efficacy sub-dimension in the Administrator Self-Efficacy Scale was statistically significant; It has been determined that the Ethics sub-dimension scores of the managers with a graduate degree are higher than those with a bachelor's degree. However, in the study, it was found that the self-efficacy levels of the managers differed according to their seniority in management; It was revealed that the scores of the administrators with low seniority from the Psychological Self-Efficacy sub-dimension in the Administrator Self-Efficacy Scale were higher than the school administrators with high seniority. The school leadership practices of the administrators were examined according to the opinions of the teachers and it was concluded that the school leadership scores of the administrators were high in the dimensions of support, cooperation and openness. In the study, it was also determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the gender, faculty graduated, tenure at the school, branch and seniority variables, and the school leadership scores of the administrators. It has been determined that scores of the teachers with a graduate education level from the school leadership scale are higher than the teachers with a bachelor's degree. It is important to organize in-service training courses in order to increase the self-efficacy perceptions of managers. It will be beneficial for both teachers and administrators to implement the necessary incentive programs for teachers and administrators to develop themselves professionally by the Ministry of National Education.

Keywords: Primary School, Leadership, Teacher, School leadership, School administration, Self-efficacy

1. INTRODUCTION

The ability of school administrators to fulfill the goals in institutions and to solve a problem they encounter or problems that are likely to occur is related to their self-efficacy perceptions. Self-efficacy, which is defined as an individual's belief in his or her ability to achieve a goal or task, is undoubtedly one of the most important concepts in educational environments (Negiş Işık and Gümüş, 2017). Bandura (2001) who has conducted many studies on self-efficacy states that the perception of self-efficacy affects not only the activities of the individual, but also his personal and social characteristics, and also affects the perception of the opportunities or problems encountered in the environment along with the goals and objectives that the individual has set. The self-confidence and efficacy beliefs of individuals with high self-efficacy perceptions enable them to find practical solutions to potential problems. Individuals with high self-efficacy perceptions are more motivated and willing to fulfill their goals. In this context, it can be said that individuals with a high sense of self-efficacy are determined people who make use of opportunities, can easily rule out obstacles, are not afraid of failure, have goals and objectives and make every effort to achieve them (Bandura, 1997). In the literature, self-efficacy is considered as a multidimensional concept. While Bandura (1993) dealt with the concept of self-efficacy in two basic dimensions as individual and organizational self-efficacy, Tschannen Moran and Gareis (2004) expanded this concept and discussed the competencies of administrators in three dimensions as managerial, instructional and ethical self-efficacy. In later studies, dimensions such as social, psychological and economic self-efficacy were added to the concept, and the concept gained a meaning that expanded day by day. In this study, the proposed five-factor (social, psychological, ethical, economic and managerial) model to explain the concept of self-efficacy is discussed. Managerial self-efficacy dimension is the knowledge and skills related to the routine work of the institution. The belief of managers that they can do the ongoing work is considered as managerial self-efficacy (Champoux, 2016).

Ethical self-efficacy represents ethical values in organizations. Ethical self-efficacy dimension, which emphasizes that the manager has an ethical and fair management approach, allows the creation of a healthy organizational climate in the corporate environment. When the understanding of ethical and fair management is evaluated within the framework of educational institutions, it is seen that it expresses knowledge and skills about ethical behaviors such as reducing conflicts within the institution, developing harmonious personality traits in students, ensuring student discipline in the school and creating a positive school climate (Wahab, Fuad, Ismail and Majid, 2014).

The economic self-efficacy dimension represents the efficacy belief of the manager to develop various skills in the economic sense, to follow the economic developments and to make rational economic plans in the face of changing market conditions day by day. Self-efficacy for a manager requires intense social interaction skills. At this point, social self-efficacy belief can be expressed as the manager's ability to communicate effectively with both employees and business partners, to motivate employees in the right way and to make necessary changes (Ramchunder and Martins, 2014).

On the other hand, psychological self-efficacy qualifies that the manager's self-efficacy level is generally associated with awareness of internal processes. It is known that internal motivations such as the desire to be successful, self-confidence, sense of competence, self-esteem and psychological resilience determine the limits of the level of self-efficacy. The motivation potential of the manager to increase the performance of the employees and the ability of the manager to manage his/her emotions represent this dimension (McCollum and Kajs, 2015).

The developments in today's world have made it necessary to make some innovations in the field of education, as in every field. School principals have a great role to play in adapting schools to these developments and innovations and meeting the expected needs. Self-efficacy perceptions and leadership styles of school administrators affect the whole school like a chain. The school administrators' self-belief and confidence are reflected both on the teachers and on the students. High self-efficacy perceptions of institution managers are important in terms of raising more qualified students and reaching the objectives of the institution (Işık and Gümüş, 2017).

However, another determining feature in school success is the leadership styles exhibited by the administrators. The concept of leadership, which is defined as the ability to influence a certain community or individuals by gathering them in a common framework in order to achieve predetermined goals and objectives, is important for educational institutions as well as in every field (Tatlah and Iqbal, 2012). However, today, not every school administrator is a leader; the opinion that they have leadership qualities to be an effective manager is dominant (Wachia, Gitumu and Mbugua, 2017).

When the literature is examined, it is observed that there are many leadership styles developed from past to present. While trait theory, behavioral theories, situational leadership theories and contemporary leadership theories are the prominent styles among these leadership styles (Sanaghan and Lohndorf, 2015), it is clear that contemporary leadership theories are more prominent in today's world. School leadership styles, which are evaluated as every effort made by administrators to improve the quality of the educational institutions they work in, are directly related to the quality of education. The more effectively school leadership is performed, the easier it will be for the school to achieve its goals. In addition, success of the students and teachers will increase equally (Northouse, 2016).

There is a need for managers who can keep up with the changing and developing opportunities of our age, who are flexible and who positively direct the working environment with their leadership characteristics. The managerial skills of the school principal and assistant principals are directly proportional to the leadership characteristics they can reflect. The fact that school administrators take responsibility for exhibiting their

managerial skills and creating a more effective school plays a role in the formation of a positive school climate by affecting both teachers and other employees in schools. In this context, it is possible to say that the most important role and duties in creating a qualified school fall on school principals. Therefore, it is clear that it is necessary to exhibit not only a managerial understanding that pours orders, as in the classical management approach, but also a management approach that develops with a sense of responsibility and the desire to perform duties as required by our age (Aunga and Masare, 2017).

When the literature is examined, it is seen that the managerial roles of school leaders are examined in three dimensions: openness, support and cooperation. In this study, the proposed three-factor model (openness, support and cooperation) to explain the concept of school leadership is discussed. The support sub-dimension, which reflects the view that school leaders should create appropriate educational environments, emphasizes that the instructional support behaviors of school principals have an important role for schools to be effective schools. According to this understanding, school principals should provide teachers with materials and resources related to the teaching process, provide feedback, provide information on teaching methods, and provide the necessary motivation during the putting into practice of all this information.

As a result, school leaders are responsible for creating appropriate educational environments (Beycioğlu, Özer, Uğurlu and Köybaşı, 2018). Leaders' openness behaviors characterize a wide range of behaviors such as sharing information about the organization in a transparent way and being committed to the accountability view. The characteristics and behaviors that school administrators should have define the principle of openness (Köybaşı, Beycioğlu, Uğurlu and Özer, 2017).

The principle of cooperation expresses the support of leaders in establishing cooperative relations with their subordinates. This qualification is also provided by school principals in educational institutions. According to this principle, as long as school principals have a management approach that supports cooperation with their subordinates, the learning and teaching quality of schools will increase (Yukl, 2012). It will be beneficial for school climate and efficiency if school principals talk to both students and teachers about educational processes, provide feedback, encourage them to learn and develop, and finally, implement supportive policies to ensure cooperation between teachers (Köybaşı, Beycioğlu, Uğurlu & Özer, 2017).

In the studies of Nartgün and Demirer (2015) and Arıcı (2019), it was determined that the school administrators' self-efficacy levels were high. In different studies examining the self-efficacy levels of school administrators, it was reported that the self-efficacy levels of administrators did not differ according to gender and seniority at the school (Yıldırım and İlhan, 2010; Aylar and Aksin, 2011; İnandı, Tunç and Gündüz, 2014). In another study, in which the demographic characteristics affecting the self-efficacy perceptions of administrators were examined, no statistically significant difference was found between self-efficacy and role type, similar to this study (Çelikay, 2019), while in another study, unlike these studies, the self-efficacy levels of administrators differed according to the role type. ; It has been reported that school principals' self-efficacy levels are higher than principal assistants (Bümen and Özaydın, 2013).

Many studies in the literature showed that the difference between the education level of school administrators and the scores obtained from the Ethics sub-dimension of the Administrator Self-Efficacy Scale was statistically significant; the Ethics sub-dimension scores of the managers with a graduate degree are higher than those with a bachelor's degree, self-efficacy levels of the administrators differ according to their seniority in management, and the scores of the administrators with low seniority in the psychological sub-dimension of the Administrator Self-Efficacy Scale were higher than those of the school administrators with high seniority

(Baltacı, 2017; Kılınç and Receptoğlu, 2013; Sađnak, 2010; Acat, Özyurt, and Karadađ, 2011; Çolak, Yorulmaz and Altinkurt, 2017).

In the studies of Gençay (2014), Serin and Buluç (2012), and Odetunde (2013), it was found that the school leadership scores of the school administrators were high and there was no statistically significant difference between the variables of teachers' gender, graduated faculty, tenure at the school, branch and seniority, and the school leadership scores of the administrators (Aksoy and Işık, 2008; Özçetin, 2013; Çelik, 2010; Özan, 2009; Avcı, 2015; Beyciođlu, 2009; Sezer, Akan and Ada, 2014; Hansen, 2016; Gökyer, 2010; Kazancı, 2010), the school leadership scores of the teachers with a graduate education level shown by the administrators are higher than the teachers with a bachelor's degree (Kılınç and Receptoğlu, 2013; Sađnak, 2010).

Giving feedback to the teachers in the institution, being solution-oriented in the face of possible problems and working in cooperation will not only enable teachers to work more productively and motivated, but also increase the quality of education in schools (Balyer, 2013). In this context, it is clear that the leadership styles of administrators are important in the quality of educational environments. With this awareness, in this study, the self-efficacy levels and school leadership practices of school administrators working in primary schools affiliated to the TRNC Ministry of National Education were evaluated according to the opinions of teachers and administrators.

2.METHOD

In this quantitative research, the descriptive survey model was used. In quantitative studies, in the light of numerical data, it indicates how much, how often, how much the variables are based on questions. The numerical data obtained by adhering to this is passed through some statistical processes and the result is reached (Creswell, 2014). The descriptive survey model, on the other hand, is a technique used to reveal a previous or current event as it is (Özcan, Aydođan and Bulut, 2014). The universe of the study consists of teachers and school administrators working in the primary schools affiliated to the Ministry of National Education and Culture Primary Education Department in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) in the 2020-2021 academic year. The Universe of the research consists of 90 primary school, 1717 primary school teachers and 186 administrators. A total of 400 individuals, including 350 teachers and 50 primary school administrators, selected by simple random sampling method were included in the study. In simple random sampling, the participants are randomly selected and the probability of being selected is equal (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2003). The survey consists of Demographic Information Form, Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and School Leadership Scale. Both groups of participants were given the "Sociodemographic Information Form" prepared by the researchers, and the Administrator Self-Efficacy Perception Scale was presented to the school administrators and the School Leadership Scale was presented to the teachers. Ethics Committee Approval was obtained from Cyprus Health and Social Sciences University before the data collection (KSTU/2021/001). Participants were informed by the researchers about the scope, purpose, confidentiality and filling conditions of the scales before administration of the survey. In this context, responses were collected from the participants who agreed to participate in the study on a voluntary basis. Information about the scales used in the study is given below:

The Demographic Information Form was developed by the researchers. Demographic information form consists of questions that aim to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants such as gender, education level, seniority, duty, graduated faculty, working time at the school, and branch.

Köybaşı, Beyciođlu, Uđurlu and Özer (2018) developed the School Leadership Scale in order to measure whether the school leadership of school administrators was put into practice. In the first part of the scale, which

consists of two parts, there are demographic questions about teachers such as gender, seniority, branch, education level, year of service at the school and graduated faculty. In the second part of the scale, questions about the school leadership of the administrators were included. The scale, which consists of 31 items in total, has 3 sub-dimensions: "Collaboration", "Support" and "Openness". The cooperation dimension consists of 15 items, the support dimension consists of 12 items, and the openness dimension consists of 4 items. Scale items were determined as five-point Likert type. In this direction, it consists of "strongly agree", "agree", "partially agree", "disagree" and "strongly disagree" options. The reliability coefficient value of the scale was stated as .97.

The Administrator Self-Efficacy Scale was developed by Baltacı (2020) to determine the self-efficacy perceptions of administrators. The scale consists of 2 parts and 20 items. First part of the survey consists of the demographic characteristics of school administrators (gender, seniority, duty). In the second part, there are 20-item scale questions about the self-efficacy of managers. The scale consists of 5 dimensions: "Administrative Self-Efficacy", "Social Self-Efficacy", "Psychological Self-Efficacy", "Ethical Self-Efficacy" and "Economic Self-Efficacy". A five-point Likert-type scale was used in the scale: "Quite Sufficient", "Sufficient", "Partly Sufficient", "Insufficient" and "Very Insufficient". The stated reliability coefficient value of the questionnaire is .79.

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 25.0 software was used to analyze the data. The distribution of the participant teachers and administrators according to their socio-demographic characteristics was determined by frequency analysis. Descriptive statistics are given regarding the administrators' Self-Efficacy Perception Scale scores and teachers' School Leadership Scale scores. The normal distribution of administrators' Self-Efficacy Perception Scale scores and teachers' School Leadership Scale scores was examined with the Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests and it was determined that they did not comply with the normal distribution. The results of normality test are given below:

Table 1. The Normality Test Results

| Group | Scale | Kolmogorov-Smirnov | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----|-------|--------------|-----|-------|
| | | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Teacher | Cooperation | 0,183 | 350 | 0,000 | 0,860 | 350 | 0,000 |
| | Support | 0,159 | 350 | 0,000 | 0,880 | 350 | 0,000 |
| | Openness | 0,245 | 350 | 0,000 | 0,827 | 350 | 0,000 |
| | School Leadership Scale | 0,163 | 350 | 0,000 | 0,866 | 350 | 0,000 |
| Administrator | Administrative | 0,292 | 50 | 0,000 | 0,734 | 50 | 0,000 |
| | Social | 0,228 | 50 | 0,000 | 0,787 | 50 | 0,000 |
| | Psychological | 0,199 | 50 | 0,000 | 0,842 | 50 | 0,000 |
| | Ethical | 0,217 | 50 | 0,000 | 0,850 | 50 | 0,000 |
| | Economic | 0,185 | 50 | 0,000 | 0,860 | 50 | 0,000 |
| | Administrator Self-Efficacy Scale | 0,150 | 50 | 0,006 | 0,912 | 50 | 0,001 |

For this reason, non-parametric hypothesis tests were used in the research. In testing the research hypotheses, the Mann-Whitney U test was used if the independent variable consisted of two groups, and the Kruskal-Wallis H test was used if it consisted of more than two groups. If there is a difference between the groups of the independent variable as a result of the aforementioned Kruskal-Wallis H test, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine from which group the difference originated.

3. RESULTS**Table 2. Socio-Demographic Features of Administrators**

| | Number(n) | Percentage(%) |
|---|-----------|---------------|
| Gender | | |
| Female | 26 | 52.0 |
| Male | 24 | 48.0 |
| Education level | | |
| Undergraduate | 31 | 62.0 |
| Post graduate | 19 | 38.0 |
| Role | | |
| Principal | 24 | 48.0 |
| Assistant principle | 26 | 52.0 |
| Seniority in school management | | |
| 0-5 years | 20 | 40.0 |
| 6-11 years | 23 | 46.0 |
| 12 years and above | 7 | 14.0 |
| Duration of duty at current school | | |
| 0-5 years | 35 | 70.0 |
| 6-11 years | 11 | 22.0 |
| 12 years and above | 4 | 8.0 |

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that 52.0% of the managers included in the research are female and 48.0% are male, 62.0% are undergraduate and 38.0% are postgraduate graduates, 48.0% principals and 52.0% are assistant principals, 40.0% have 0-5 years, 46.0% have 6-11 years and 14.0 have 12 years or more managerial seniority. 70% have been working at their current school for 0-5 years, 22.0% for 6-11 years, and 8.0% for 12 years or more.

Table 2. Self-Efficacy Perception Scale Scores of Managers

| | N | \bar{x} | sd | Min | Max |
|---|----|-----------|------|-------|-------|
| Managerial | 50 | 14.44 | 1.76 | 12.00 | 16.00 |
| Social | 50 | 14.24 | 1.71 | 12.00 | 16.00 |
| Psychological | 50 | 14.16 | 1.57 | 12.00 | 16.00 |
| Ethical | 50 | 14.24 | 1.52 | 12.00 | 16.00 |
| Economical | 50 | 14.28 | 1.50 | 12.00 | 16.00 |
| Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale | 50 | 71.36 | 6.44 | 60.00 | 80.00 |

Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics regarding the Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale scores of the participant managers. When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that managers obtained an average of 14.44 ± 1.76 points from the managerial sub-dimension, 14.24 ± 1.71 points from the social sub-dimension, and 14.16 ± 1.57 points from the psychological sub-dimension of the Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale. It was determined that they scored an average of 14.24 ± 1.52 points from the ethical sub-dimension and 14.28 ± 1.50 points from the economic sub-dimension. The managers included in the study got an average of 71.36 ± 6.44 points from the Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale, and their lowest score was 60.0 and the highest score was 80.0.

Table 4. Self-Efficacy Perception Scale Scores of Managers By Gender

| | Gender | N | \bar{x} | sd | M | SO | Z | p |
|---|--------|----|-----------|------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| Managerial | Female | 26 | 14.54 | 1.73 | 15.50 | 26.17 | -0.366 | 0.714 |
| | Male | 24 | 14.33 | 1.83 | 15.00 | 24.77 | | |
| Social | Female | 26 | 14.46 | 1.68 | 15.00 | 27.23 | -0.912 | 0.362 |
| | Male | 24 | 14.00 | 1.74 | 14.00 | 23.63 | | |
| Psychological | Female | 26 | 14.15 | 1.59 | 14.00 | 25.42 | -0.040 | 0.968 |
| | Male | 24 | 14.17 | 1.58 | 14.00 | 25.58 | | |
| Ethical | Female | 26 | 14.38 | 1.47 | 14.00 | 26.83 | -0.692 | 0.489 |
| | Male | 24 | 14.08 | 1.59 | 14.00 | 24.06 | | |
| Economical | Female | 26 | 14.54 | 1.30 | 14.50 | 27.85 | -1.214 | 0.225 |
| | Male | 24 | 14.00 | 1.67 | 14.50 | 22.96 | | |
| Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale | Female | 26 | 72.08 | 5.79 | 71.50 | 26.54 | -0.529 | 0.597 |
| | Male | 24 | 70.58 | 7.11 | 70.00 | 24.38 | | |

Table 4 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, which is used to compare the Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale scores according to the gender of the managers. When Table 3 is examined, it has been determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of the managers included from the General Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and the managerial, social, psychological, ethical and economic sub-dimensions of the scale ($p>0.05$). The scores of female and male administrators in the General Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and in the managerial, social, psychological, ethical and economic sub-dimensions of the scale were found to be similar.

Table 5. Self-Efficacy Perception Scale Scores Of Managers According To Their Educational Status

| | Educational status | N | \bar{x} | sd | M | SO | Z | P |
|---------------|--------------------|----|-----------|------|-------|-------|--------|------------|
| Managerial | Undergraduate | 31 | 14.35 | 1.82 | 15.00 | 25.11 | -0.259 | 0.796 |
| | Postgraduate | 9 | 14.58 | 1.71 | 15.00 | 26.13 | | |
| Social | Undergraduate | 31 | 14.29 | 1.60 | 15.00 | 25.52 | -0.010 | 0.992 |
| | Postgraduate | 9 | 14,16 | 1.92 | 15.00 | 25.47 | | |
| Psychological | Undergraduate | 31 | 13.94 | 1.55 | 14.00 | 23.40 | -1.341 | 0.180 |
| | Postgraduate | 9 | 14.53 | 1.58 | 14.00 | 28.92 | | |
| Ethical | Undergraduate | 31 | 13.87 | 1.48 | 14.00 | 22.13 | -2.158 | 0.031 * |
| | Postgraduate | 9 | 14.84 | 1.42 | 16.00 | 31.00 | | |
| Economical | Undergraduate | 31 | 14.13 | 1.54 | 14.00 | 24.06 | -0.912 | 0.362 |
| | Postgraduate | 9 | 14.53 | 1.43 | 15.00 | 27.84 | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|--------|-------|------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale | Undergraduate | 3 1 | 70.58 | 6.51 | 71.00 | 24.35 | -0.716 | 0.474 |
| | Postgraduate | 1 9 | 72.63 | 6.28 | 70.00 | 27.37 | | |

* $p < 0,05$ Z: Mann-Whitney U testi

In Table 5, the results of the Mann-Whitney U test used to compare the scores of the Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale according to the educational status of the managers are given. When Table 4 is examined, it has been determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of the managers from the General Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and the managerial, social, psychological and economic sub-dimensions of the scale according to their educational status ($p > 0.05$). The scores of the managers with undergraduate and post-graduate degrees from the General Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and the managerial, social, psychological and economic sub-dimensions of the scale were found to be similar. It was determined that the difference between the scores obtained from the Ethics sub-dimension in the Managerial Self-Efficacy Scale according to the education level of the administrators was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). Managers with a post-graduate degree received higher scores in the Ethics sub-dimension of the Managerial Self-Efficacy Scale compared to those with a bachelor's degree.

Table 6. Self-Efficacy Perception Scale Scores According to The Role of The Administrators

| | Role | n | \bar{x} | sd | M | SO | Z | p |
|---|---------------------|----|-----------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Managerial | Principal | 24 | 14.58 | 1.67 | 15.00 | 26.02 | - | 0.794 |
| | Assistant principal | 26 | 14.31 | 1.87 | 15.50 | 25.02 | 0.262 | |
| Social | Principal | 24 | 14.17 | 1.79 | 15.00 | 24.83 | - | 0.746 |
| | Assistant principal | 26 | 14.31 | 1.67 | 15.00 | 26.12 | 0.324 | |
| Psychological | Principal | 24 | 14.38 | 1.61 | 14.00 | 27.52 | - | 0.331 |
| | Assistant principal | 26 | 13.96 | 1.54 | 14.00 | 23.63 | 0.972 | |
| Ethical | Principal | 24 | 14.38 | 1.47 | 14.00 | 26.79 | - | 0.534 |
| | Assistant principal | 26 | 14.12 | 1.58 | 14.00 | 24.31 | 0.622 | |
| Economical | Principal | 24 | 14.67 | 1.52 | 15.00 | 29.29 | - | 0.070 |
| | Assistant principal | 26 | 13.92 | 1.41 | 14.00 | 22.00 | 1.812 | |
| Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale | Principal | 24 | 72.17 | 6.53 | 70.00 | 26.73 | - | 0.563 |
| | Assistant principal | 26 | 70.62 | 6.39 | 71.50 | 24.37 | 0.578 | |

The Mann-Whitney U test results regarding the comparison of the Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale scores according to the roles of the managers are given in Table 6. When Table 6 is examined, it has been determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of the managers in the General Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and in the managerial, social, psychological, ethical and economic sub-dimensions of the scale ($p > 0.05$). Accordingly, the scores of the principals and assistant principals in the General Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and in the managerial, social, psychological, ethical and economic sub-dimensions of the scale were found to be similar.

Table 7. Self-Efficacy Perception Scale Scores of Managers According to Managerial Seniority

| | Seniority | n | \bar{x} | sd | M | SO | X ² | p | Difference |
|---|---------------------------------|---|-----------|------|-------|-------|----------------|-------|------------|
| Administrative | 0-5 years ^a | 2 | 14.2 | 1.8 | 14.50 | 24.03 | 3.192 | 0.203 | |
| | | 0 | 0 | 5 | | | | | |
| | 6-11 years ^b | 2 | 14.9 | 1.5 | | | | | |
| | | 3 | 1 | 3 | 16.00 | 28.76 | | | |
| | 12 years and above ^c | 7 | 13.5 | 1.9 | 12.00 | 19.00 | | | |
| | | | 7 | 9 | | | | | |
| Social | 0-5 years ^a | 2 | 14.5 | 1.8 | 15.50 | 27.75 | 4.966 | 0.084 | |
| | | 0 | 0 | 2 | | | | | |
| | 6-11 years ^b | 2 | 14.4 | 1.6 | | | | | |
| | | 3 | 3 | 2 | 15.00 | 26.85 | | | |
| | 12 years and above ^c | 7 | 12.8 | 1.0 | 13.00 | 14.64 | | | |
| | | | 6 | 7 | | | | | |
| Psychological | 0-5 years ^a | 2 | 14.5 | 1.7 | 15.50 | 29.18 | 6.190 | 0.045 | a-c |
| | | 0 | 5 | 3 | | | | | |
| | 6-11 years ^b | 2 | 14.2 | 1.4 | | | | | |
| | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 14.00 | 25.87 | * | | |
| | 12 years and above ^c | 7 | 12.8 | 0.9 | 13.00 | 13.79 | | | |
| | | | 6 | 0 | | | | | |
| Ethical | 0-5 years ^a | 2 | 14.6 | 1.76 | 16.00 | 28.95 | 2.655 | 0.265 | |
| | | 0 | 0 | 176 | | | | | |
| | 6-11 years ^b | 2 | 13.8 | 1.2 | | | | | |
| | | 3 | 7 | 5 | 14.00 | 22.04 | | | |
| | 12 years and above ^c | 7 | 14.4 | 1.5 | 15.00 | 27.00 | | | |
| | | | 3 | 1 | | | | | |
| Economical | 0-5 years ^a | 2 | 14.5 | 1.7 | 15.00 | 28.00 | 1.670 | 0.434 | |
| | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 6-11 years ^b | 2 | 14.2 | 1.3 | | | | | |
| | | 3 | 6 | 6 | 14.00 | 24.98 | | | |
| | 12 years and above ^c | 7 | 13.7 | 1.3 | 13.00 | 20.07 | | | |
| | | | 1 | 8 | | | | | |
| Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale | 0-5 years ^a | 2 | 72.3 | 8.2 | 74.50 | 28.43 | 4.307 | 0.116 | |
| | | 0 | 5 | 9 | | | | | |
| | 6-11 years ^b | 2 | 71.7 | 4.7 | | | | | |
| | | 3 | 0 | 3 | 71.00 | 26.04 | | | |
| | 12 years and above ^c | 7 | 67.4 | 4.1 | 68.00 | 15.36 | | | |
| | | | 3 | 2 | | | | | |

* $p < 0,05$ X²:Kruskal-Wallis H testi

Table 7 shows the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test for the comparison of the Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale scores according to the seniority of the administrators. It was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of the managers in the General Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale and in the managerial, social, ethical and economic sub-dimensions of the scale according to their seniority in management ($p > 0.05$). It was determined that the difference between the scores of the managers

in the psychological sub-dimension of the Managerial Self-Efficacy Scale according to their managerial seniority was statistically significant, and it was determined that those with 0-5 years of seniority got higher scores than those with a seniority of 12 years and above ($p < 0.05$).

Table 8. Self-Efficacy Perception Scale Scores of Administrators According to Their Years of Service At School

| | Year of service at school | n | \bar{x} | sd | M | SO | X ² | p |
|---|---------------------------|----|-----------|------|-------|-------|----------------|-------|
| Managerial | 0-5 years | 35 | 14.34 | 1.78 | 15.00 | 24.80 | 0.988 | 0.610 |
| | 6-11 years | 11 | 14.82 | 1.83 | 16.00 | 28.86 | | |
| | 12 years and above | 4 | 14.25 | 1.71 | 14.50 | 22.38 | | |
| Social | 0-5 years | 35 | 14.34 | 1.71 | 15.00 | 26.14 | 0.258 | 0.879 |
| | 6-11 years | 11 | 14.00 | 1.79 | 13.00 | 24.23 | | |
| | 12 years and above | 4 | 14.00 | 1.83 | 14.00 | 23.38 | | |
| Psychological | 0-5 years | 35 | 14.43 | 1.54 | 15.00 | 27.89 | 3.344 | 0.188 |
| | 6-11 years | 11 | 13.55 | 1.69 | 13.00 | 20.18 | | |
| | 12 years and above | 4 | 13.50 | 1.00 | 14.00 | 19.25 | | |
| Ethical | 0-5 years | 35 | 14.14 | 1.57 | 14.00 | 24.60 | 1.067 | 0.587 |
| | 6-11 years | 11 | 14.27 | 1.42 | 14.00 | 25.91 | | |
| | 12 years and above | 4 | 15.00 | 1.41 | 15.50 | 32.25 | | |
| Economical | 0-5 years | 35 | 14.40 | 1.52 | 15.00 | 26.59 | 0.720 | 0.698 |
| | 6-11 years | 11 | 14.00 | 1.67 | 13.00 | 23.41 | | |
| | 12 years and above | 4 | 14.00 | 0.82 | 14.00 | 21.75 | | |
| Managerial Self-Efficacy Perception Scale | 0-5 years | 35 | 71.66 | 6.97 | 72.00 | 26.30 | 0.360 | 0.835 |
| | 6-11 years | 11 | 70.64 | 5.78 | 70.00 | 23.55 | | |
| | 12 years and above | 4 | 70.75 | 3.30 | 71.00 | 23.88 | | |

Table 8 shows the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test for the comparison of the Self-Efficacy Perception Scale scores of the administrators according to their years of service at the school. When Table 8 is examined, it has been determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores obtained by the administrators from the Self-Efficacy Perception Scale in general and the administrative, social, psychological, ethical and economic sub-dimensions according to the years of service at the school ($p > 0.05$).

Table 9. Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Teachers

| | Number(n) | Percentage(%) |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Gender | | |
| Female | 148 | 42.29 |
| Male | 202 | 57.71 |
| Education level | | |
| Undergraduate | 232 | 66.29 |
| Postgraduate | 118 | 33.71 |
| Faculty | | |
| Atatürk Teacher Academy | 284 | 81.14 |
| Other | 66 | 18.86 |
| Branch | | |
| Class teacher | 209 | 59.71 |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----|-------|
| Branch teacher | 141 | 40.29 |
| Seniority | | |
| 1-10 years | 116 | 33.14 |
| 11-20 years | 147 | 42.00 |
| 21 years and above | 87 | 24.86 |
| Seniority at current school | | |
| 1-10 years | 132 | 37.71 |
| 11-20 years | 107 | 30.57 |
| 21 years and above | 65 | 31.71 |

When Table 9 is examined, it was determined that 42.29% of the teachers were female and 57.71% were male, 66.29% had undergraduate education, 33.71% had postgraduate education, 81.14 % were graduate of Atatürk Teachers Academy. 59.71% of the teachers were classroom teachers, 40.29% were branch teachers; 33.14% had 1-10 years of seniority, 42.0% had 11-20 years, 24.86% had 21 years and above seniority. It has been determined that 37.71% of them have been working at their current school for 1-10 years, 30.57% of them have been working for 11-20 years and 31.71% of them have been working for 21 years or more.

Table 10. School Leadership Scale Scores According To Teacher Attitude

| | N | \bar{x} | sd | Min | Max |
|-------------------------|-----|-----------|-------|-----|-----|
| Cooperation | 350 | 60.01 | 11.94 | 15 | 75 |
| Support | 350 | 48.22 | 9.86 | 12 | 60 |
| Openness | 350 | 16.33 | 3.27 | 4 | 20 |
| School Leadership Scale | 350 | 124.56 | 24.16 | 31 | 155 |

When Table 10 is examined, it is seen that teachers obtained an average of 60.01 ± 11.94 points from the cooperation sub-dimension,, an average of 48.22 ± 9.86 points from the support sub-dimension, and an average of 16.33 ± 3.27 points from the openness sub-dimension of School Leadership Scale according to their attitudes. It was determined that the teachers got an average of 124.56 ± 24.16 points from the School Leadership Scale in general, the lowest score from the scale was 31 and the highest score was 155.

Table 11. School Leadership Scale Scores By Gender of Teachers

| | Gender | n | \bar{x} | sd | M | SO | Z | p |
|-------------------------|--------|-----|-----------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| Cooperation | Female | 148 | 60.03 | 11.46 | 62.00 | 176.60 | -0.175 | 0.861 |
| | Male | 202 | 60.00 | 12.32 | 61.00 | 174.69 | | |
| Support | Female | 148 | 48.38 | 9.24 | 50.00 | 176.14 | -0.101 | 0.920 |
| | Male | 202 | 48.10 | 10.32 | 49.00 | 175.03 | | |
| Openness | Female | 148 | 16.41 | 3.05 | 16.00 | 176.44 | -0.153 | 0.879 |
| | Male | 202 | 16.28 | 3.43 | 16.00 | 174.81 | | |
| School Leadership Scale | Female | 148 | 124.81 | 22.88 | 129.00 | 177.40 | -0.301 | 0.763 |
| | Male | 202 | 124.38 | 25.11 | 126.00 | 174.11 | | |

Table 11 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U test for the comparison of the School Leadership Scale scores according to the gender of the teachers. When Table 10 is examined, it has been determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of the teachers in the School Leadership Scale in general and in the sub-dimensions of cooperation, support and openness ($p > 0.05$).

Table 12. School Leadership Scale Scores According to Teachers' Educational Status

| | Educational level | n | \bar{x} | sd | M | SO | Z | p |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Cooperation | Undergraduate | 23 | 59.46 | 11.3 | 60.00 | 165.96 | - | 0.013* |
| | Postgraduate | 2 | | 1 | | | 2.47 | |
| Support | Undergraduate | 11 | 61.11 | 13.0 | 63.00 | 194.25 | 9 | 0.021* |
| | Postgraduate | 8 | | 9 | | | 2 | |
| Openness | Undergraduate | 23 | 47.75 | 9.16 | 49.00 | 166.65 | - | 0.135 |
| | Postgraduate | 2 | | 3.07 | 16.00 | 169.87 | 1.49 | |
| School Leadership Scale | Undergraduate | 11 | 123.47 | 22.6 | 126.00 | 166.23 | - | 0.016* |
| | Postgraduate | 8 | | 3 | | | 2.40 | |
| | | 11 | 126.70 | 26.9 | 132.00 | 193.72 | 5 | |
| | | 8 | | 0 | | | | |

* $p < 0,05$ Z: Mann-Whitney U testi

In Table 12, the results of the Mann-Whitney U test for the comparison of the School Leadership Scale scores according to the educational status of the teachers included in the study are given. According to Table 11, it was determined that the difference between the scores of the teachers in the School Leadership Scale and in the cooperation and support sub-dimensions in the scale was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

Table 13. School Leadership Scale Scores According to The Faculty From Which The Teachers Graduated

| | Faculty | n | x | sd | M | SO | Z | p |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Cooperation | ATA | 284 | 60.53 | 11.28 | 62.00 | 179.23 | -1.432 | 0.152 |
| | Other | 66 | 57.80 | 14.36 | 60.00 | 159.47 | | |
| Support | ATA | 284 | 48.75 | 9,27 | 50.00 | 180.33 | -1.856 | 0.063 |
| | Other | 66 | 45.91 | 11.8 | 48.00 | 154.73 | | |
| Openness | ATA | 284 | 16.43 | 3.05 | 16.00 | 175.44 | -0.023 | 0.982 |
| | Other | 66 | 15.92 | 4.11 | 16.50 | 175.75 | | |
| School Leadership Scale | ATA | 284 | 125.71 | 22.75 | 128.00 | 179.72 | -1.620 | 0.105 |
| | Other | 66 | 119.64 | 29.17 | 124.00 | 157.35 | | |

ATA: Atatürk Teacher Academy

The results of the Mann-Whitney U test for the comparison of the School Leadership Scale scores of the teachers according to the faculty they graduated from are shown in Table 13. The difference between the scores of the teachers in the overall School Leadership Scale and in the cooperation, support and openness sub-dimensions in the scale according to the faculty they graduated from was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). According to the faculty from which the teachers graduated, the scores they got from the School Leadership Scale in general and the sub-dimensions of cooperation, support and openness in the scale were similar.

Table 14. School Leadership Scale Scores of Teachers According To Their Branches

| | Branch | n | \bar{x} | sd | M | SO | Z | p |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----|-----------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| Cooperation | Class teacher | 209 | 59.90 | 12.25 | 61.00 | 175.26 | -0.054 | 0.957 |
| | Branch teacher | 141 | 60.18 | 11.52 | 61.00 | 175.85 | | |
| Support | Class teacher | 209 | 48.45 | 9.99 | 49.00 | 178.47 | -0.671 | 0.502 |
| | Branch teacher | 141 | 47.87 | 9.70 | 50.00 | 171.09 | | |
| Openness | Class teacher | 209 | 16.22 | 3.24 | 16.00 | 171.38 | -0.949 | 0.343 |
| | Branch teacher | 141 | 16.49 | 3.32 | 16.00 | 181.61 | | |
| School Leadership Scale | Class teacher | 209 | 124.58 | 24.60 | 126.00 | 176.54 | -0.233 | 0.815 |
| | Branch teacher | 141 | 124.54 | 23.59 | 127.00 | 173.96 | | |

When Table 14 is examined, it has been determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of the teachers in the School Leadership Scale in general and in the sub-dimensions of cooperation, support and openness in the scale ($p>0.05$). The scores of the classroom teachers and branch teachers in the School Leadership Scale in general and in the cooperation, support and openness sub-dimensions of the scale were found to be similar.

Table 15. School Leadership Scale Scores According to The Professional Seniority Of The Teachers

| | Seniority | n | \bar{x} | sd | M | SO | X ² | p |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----|-----------|-------|--------|--------|----------------|-------|
| Cooperation | 1-10 years | 116 | 59.28 | 12.26 | 60.00 | 165.04 | 3.320 | 0.190 |
| | 11-20 years | 147 | 61.20 | 11.16 | 62.00 | 186.81 | | |
| | 21 years and above | 87 | 58.99 | 12.74 | 62.00 | 170.33 | | |
| Support | 1-10 years | 116 | 47.82 | 10.13 | 48.00 | 168.81 | 4.227 | 0.121 |
| | 11-20 years | 147 | 49.07 | 9.99 | 50.00 | 188.26 | | |
| | 21 years and above | 87 | 47.31 | 9.26 | 49.00 | 162.86 | | |
| Openness | 1-10 years | 116 | 16.32 | 3.28 | 16.00 | 173.77 | 0.106 | 0.948 |
| | 11-20 years | 147 | 16.41 | 3.14 | 16.00 | 177.50 | | |
| | 21 years and above | 87 | 16.22 | 3.51 | 16.00 | 174.43 | | |
| School Leadership Scale | 1-10 years | 116 | 123.41 | 24.96 | 124.00 | 166.71 | 3.304 | 0.192 |
| | 11-20 years | 147 | 126.68 | 23.32 | 130.00 | 187.03 | | |
| | 21 years and above | 87 | 122.52 | 24.48 | 126.00 | 167.74 | | |

Table 15 shows the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test for the comparison of School Leadership Scale scores according to the professional seniority of the teachers. When Table 14 is examined, it has been determined that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of the teachers in the School Leadership Scale in general and in the cooperation, support and openness sub-dimensions of the scale according to their professional seniority ($p>0.05$). The scores of teachers with 1-10 years, 11-20 years and 21 years or more in the School Leadership Scale generally and in the sub-dimensions of cooperation, support and openness in the scale are similar according to their professional seniority.

Table 16. School Leadership Scale Scores According to The Working Duration of The Teachers In Their Current Schools

| | Work duration | n | \bar{x} | sd | M | SO | X ² | p |
|-------------|---------------|-----|-----------|-------|-------|--------|----------------|-------|
| Cooperation | 1-10 years | 132 | 61.09 | 11.49 | 62.00 | 183.25 | 1.249 | 0.535 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----|--------|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
| | 11-20 years | 107 | 59.96 | 10.89 | 61.00 | 170.87 | | |
| | 21 years and above | 111 | 58.78 | 13.35 | 61.00 | 170.75 | | |
| Support | 1-10 years | 132 | 49.25 | 9.40 | 50.00 | 185.20 | 3.749 | 0.153 |
| | 11-20 years | 107 | 48.50 | 9.69 | 49.00 | 178.93 | | |
| Openness | 21 years and above | 111 | 46.71 | 10.45 | 49.00 | 160.65 | | |
| | 1-10 years | 132 | 16.66 | 3.23 | 17.00 | 188.86 | 3.943 | 0.139 |
| School Leadership Scale | 11-20 years | 107 | 16.26 | 2.94 | 16.00 | 165.57 | | |
| | 21 years and above | 111 | 16.01 | 3.61 | 16.00 | 169.19 | | |
| School Leadership Scale | 1-10 years | 132 | 127.00 | 23.09 | 128.50 | 184.50 | 2.068 | 0.356 |
| | 11-20 years | 107 | 124.73 | 22.87 | 127.00 | 174.39 | | |
| School Leadership Scale | 21 years and above | 111 | 121.50 | 26.39 | 126.00 | 165.87 | | |

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test, which is used to compare the School Leadership Scale scores of teachers according to their duration of work in their current school are shown in Table 16. When Table 15 is examined, it has been determined that the difference between the scores of the teachers in the School Leadership Scale in general and in the cooperation, support and openness sub-dimensions of the scale is not statistically significant ($p>0.05$). The scores of teachers were found to be similar.

3. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, the self-efficacy levels of school administrators working in primary schools affiliated to the TRNC Ministry of National Education and Culture and school leadership according to teachers' opinions were examined. In the study, it was determined that the school administrators' self-efficacy levels were high. When the studies on the subject are examined, it is seen that similar results have been reached (Nartgün & Demirer, 2015; Arıcı, 2019).

In the study, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the self-efficacy perceptions of the administrators and the variables of gender, duty and working time in the school where they worked. In different studies examining the self-efficacy levels of school administrators, it was reported that the self-efficacy levels of administrators did not differ according to gender and seniority at the school (Yıldırım and İlhan, 2010; Aylar and Aksin, 2011; İnandı, Tunç and Gündüz, 2014). In another study, in which the demographic characteristics affecting the self-efficacy perceptions of administrators were examined, no statistically significant difference was found between self-efficacy and role type, similar to this study (Çelikay, 2019), while in another study, unlike these studies, the self-efficacy levels of administrators differed according to the role type. ; It has been reported that school principals' self-efficacy levels are higher than principal assistants (Bümen & Özaydın, 2013).

It is thought that this difference may be related to the characteristics represented by the sample groups. In this study, the difference between the education level of school administrators and the scores obtained from the Ethics sub-dimension of the Administrator Self-Efficacy Scale was statistically significant; It has been determined that the Ethics sub-dimension scores of the managers with a graduate degree are higher than those with a bachelor's degree. In the study, it was also found that the self-efficacy levels of the administrators differ according to their seniority in management; It was revealed that the scores of the administrators with low seniority in the psychological sub-dimension of the Administrator Self-Efficacy Scale were higher than those of the school administrators with high seniority. The relevant literature supports these results (Baltacı, 2017; Kılınç & Receptoğlu, 2013; Sağnak, 2010; Acat, Özyurt & Karadağ, 2011; Çolak, Yorulmaz & Altinkurt, 2017).

In the study, the school leadership scores of the administrators were examined according to the opinions of the teachers and it was determined that the school leadership scores of the school administrators were high. This finding overlaps with similar studies (Gençay, 2014; Serin & Buluç, 2012; Odetunde, 2013). In the study, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the variables of teachers' gender, graduated faculty, tenure at the school, branch and seniority, and the school leadership scores of the administrators. The literature on the subject is similar to the findings obtained in this study (Aksoy & Işık, 2008; Özçetin, 2013; Çelik, 2010; Özkan, 2009; Avcı, 2015; Beycioğlu, 2009; Sezer, Akan & Ada, 2014; Hansen, 2016; Gökyer, 2010; Kazancı, 2010). Finally, in the study, as the education levels of the teachers differed, the perceived school leadership scores of the administrators also differed; It has been determined that the school leadership scores of the teachers with a graduate education level shown by the administrators are higher than the teachers with a bachelor's degree. This result obtained from the study is compatible with the studies in the literature (Kılınç & Receptoğlu, 2013; Sağnak, 2010). Based on the results obtained in the study, it would be beneficial to provide in-service training to school administrators in order to increase their self-efficacy levels and to gain effective leadership behaviors and to encourage them to do graduate studies. However, it is clear that the school leadership styles exhibited by school administrators affect the efficiency of both the school and the teachers. Therefore, all obstacles that will restrict the effective school leadership behaviors of school administrators should be removed and appropriate environments should be prepared for them to exhibit these behaviors.

In the present study, the self-efficacy levels of school administrators working in primary schools and school leadership perceived by teachers were tried to be determined with a limited sample size. This limitation constitutes the most important limitation of the study. However, the fact that the data obtained in the study was obtained with two measurement tools is considered as another limitation. It is assumed that the participants who participated in the study on a voluntary basis filled in the measurement tools objectively. The results obtained from the study revealed that school administrators' self-efficacy levels and school leadership styles should be examined in depth. Therefore, it is important to carry out more comprehensive studies.

REFERENCES

- Acat, M. B., Özyurt, O., & Karadağ, E. (2011). İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin mevzuat görevleri öz-yeterlilik düzeylerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Education Sciences*, 6(1), 605-620.
- Aksoy, E., & Işık, H. (2008). İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin öğretim liderliği rolleri. *Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 10(19), 235-249.
- Arıcı, M. (2019). *Okul yöneticilerinin kişilik özelliklerinin duygusal zekâları ve öz-yeterlilikleri açısından incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Konya.
- Aunga, D. A. ve Masare, O. (2017). Effect of leadership styles on teacher's performance in primary schools of Arusha district Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, 4(4), 45-52.
- Avcı, A. (2015). Öğretmen algılarına göre okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12-2(24), 161-189.
- Aylar, F. & Aksin, A. (2011). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmen adaylarının öz-yeterlilik inanç düzeyleri ve problem çözme becerileri üzerine bir araştırma (Amasya örneği), *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12(3), 299-313.
- Baltacı, A. (2017). Okul müdürlerinin öz-yeterlilik algıları ve mesleğe yönelik tutumları arasındaki ilişki. *Uşak Üniversitesi Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(2), 35-6. doi: 10.29065/usakead.306507.
- Baltacı, A. (2020). Yönetici öz yeterlilik algısı ölçeği: geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Uluslararası Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2 (1), 8-16. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ukmead/issue/55651/673912>

- Balyer, A. (2013). Okul müdürlerinin öğretimin kalitesi üzerindeki etkileri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 19(2), 181-214.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 1-26. Bass, B. M. ve Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Beycioğlu, K. (2009). *İlköğretim okullarında öğretmenlerin sergiledikleri liderlik rollerine ilişkin bir değerlendirme (Hatay ili örneği)*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, İnönü Üniversitesi, Malatya.
- Beycioğlu, K., Özer, N., Uğurlu, C. T., & Köybaşı, F. (2018). Okul liderliği ölçeği (OLÖ) geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Amasya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(1), 21-42.
- Bümen, N. T., & Özaydın, T. E. (2013). Adaylıktan göreve öğretmen özyeterliliği ve öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumlardaki değişimler. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 38(169).
- Champoux, J. E. (2016). *Organizational behavior: Integrating individuals, groups, and organizations*. New York: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. (2014). *Research Desing: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Uniden States Of America: Sage Puplications.
- Çelik, M. (2010). *Öğretmen görüşlerine göre okul yöneticilerinin öğretimsel liderlik davranışı ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının analizi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.
- Çelıkay, P. (2019). *Okul yöneticilerinin genel öz yeterlik inançları ve sahip oldukları liderlik stillerinin yetenek yönetimi ile ilişkisi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Mersin Üniversitesi, Mersin.
- Çolak, İ., Yorulmaz, Y. İ. ve Altınkurt, Y. (2017). Öğretmen özyeterlik inancı ölçeği geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(1), 20-32.
- Gençay, A. (2014). *Öğretmenlerin görüşlerine göre okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ve okul imajı*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Gökyer, N. (2010). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin öğretim liderliği rollerini gerçekleştirme düzeyleri ve bu rolleri sınırlayan etkenler. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(29), 113-129.
- Hansen, K. M. (2016). *Effective school leadership practices in schools with positive climates in the age of high-stakes teacher evaluations*. Unpublished master's thesis, Northern Michigan University, USA.
- İnandı, Y., Tunç, B., & Gündüz, B. (2013). Okul yöneticilerinin özyeterlik algıları ile çatışmayı çözme stratejileri arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 19(2), 275-294.
- Kazancı, N. (2010). *İlköğretim okullarındaki yöneticilerin liderlik stilleri ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel adalet algıları arasındaki ilişki düzeyi*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya.
- Kılınç, A. Ç., & Receptoğlu, E. (2013). Ortaöğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin öğretmen liderliğine ilişkin algı ve beklentileri. *Kalem Eğitim ve İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(2), 175-215.
- Köybaşı, F., Beycioğlu, K., Uğurlu, C. T. & Özer, N. (2018). Okul Liderliği Ölçeği (OLÖ) geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Amasya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(1), 21-42. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/amauefd/issue/37607/309463>
- Köybaşı, F., Beycioğlu, K., Uğurlu, C. T., & Özer, N. (2017). Müdürlerin okul liderliği davranışları: Öğretimsel destek, ilişki ve açıklık düzeyleri. *Bayburt Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12(24), 781-808.
- McCollum, D. L. ve Kajs, L. T. (2015). School Administrator Efficacy: Assessment of Beliefs About Knowledge and Skills for Successful School Leadership. In *Teaching Leaders to Lead Teachers*. Published online: 08 Mar 2015; pp. 131-148.
- Nartgün, Ş. S., & Demirer, S. (2015). Okul yöneticilerinin örgütsel yaratıcılık ve öz-yeterlik düzeylerine ilişkin görüşleri. *Uluslararası Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, (4), 170-199.

- Negiş-Işık, A., & Gümüş, E. (2017). Okul yöneticilerinin öz-yeterlik algıları ile okul etkililiği arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 5(1), 419-434.
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership; Theory and practice* (7 th). Washington DC: Sage Publications.
- Odetunde, O. J. (2013). "Influence of transformational and transactional leaderships, and leaders' sex on organisational conflict management behaviour." *Gender & Behaviour*, 11(1), 5323-5335.
- Özan, M. B. (2009). Okul yöneticiliğinde cam tavan sendromunun yaşanmadığı bir ada örneği: Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(29), 15-33.
- Özcan, K. V., Aydoğan, Y., & Bulut, İ. (2014). Gaziosmanpaşa üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi'nde uygulanan çoktan seçmeli sınavların betimsel analizi. *Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(4), 281-294.
- Özçetin, S. (2013). *Öğretmen liderliğinin okulun liderlik kapasitesinin gelişimine etkisi: bir durum açıklaması*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Antalya.
- Ramchunder, Y. ve Martins, N. (2014). The Role of Self-Efficacy, Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Style as Attributes of Leadership Effectiveness. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(1), 1-11.
- Sağnak, M. (2010). Dönüşümcü okul liderliği ile etik iklim arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 10(2), 1113-1152.
- Sanaghan, P. and Lohndorf, J. (2015). *Collaborative leadership; The new leadership stance*. Collaborative Leadership in Higher Education Conference, Philadelphia.
- Serin, M. K. & Buluç, B. (2012). İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin öğretim liderliği davranışları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 3 (3), 435-459. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/kuey/issue/10323/126581>
- Sezer, Ş., Akan, D., & Ada, Ş. (2014). Ortaöğretim kurumları yöneticilerinin öğretim liderliği rollerini gerçekleştirme düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(1), 239-249.
- Tatlah, I. A. and Iqbal, M. Z. (2012). Leadership styles and school effectiveness: emprical evidence from secondary level. *Procedia – Social and Behavioal Sciences*, 69, 790-797.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2004). Principals' sense of efficacy: Assessing a promising construct. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(5), 573-585.
- Wachia, F. M., Gitumu, M. and Mbugua, Z. (2017). Effects of principals leadership styles on teachers' job performance in public secondary schools in Kieni West Sub-County. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 6(8), 72-86.
- Wahab, J. A., Fuad, C. F., Ismail, H. & Majid, S. (2014). Headmasters' Transformational Leadership and Their Relationship with Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Teachers' Commitments. Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education, Yayın No.: 2014/13.
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2003). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık
- Yıldırım, F. & İlhan, İ. Ö. (2010). Genel özyeterlilik ölçeği Türkçe formunun geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 21(4), 301-308.
- Yukl, G. (2012). Effective leadership behavior: what we know and what questions need more attention. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(4), 66-85. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2012.0088>
- Çıkar Çatışması Beyanı:** Bu çalışmada taraf olabilecek herhangi bir kişi, kurum veya kuruluş arasında bir çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır.
- Destek ve Teşekkür:** Çalışma için herhangi bir kurum ya da kuruluştan finansal destek alınmamıştır.
- Etik Kurul İzni:** Araştırmanın etik kurul onayı, Kıbrıs Sağlık ve Toplum Bilimleri Üniversitesi Etik Kurulundan 2021/001 sayısı ile alınmıştır.
- Katkı Oranı:** Makaleye tüm yazarlar eşit katkıda bulunmuştur.