An Analysis of the Relationship between School Managers' Change Leadership Style and Multi-Factorial Leadership Styles from the Views of Teachers

Suna Ozkan*
Gaziantep University, TURKEY

Sedat Alev
Mustafa Marangoz Primary School, TURKEY

Abdulkadir Ercan
Mardin Artuklu University, TURKEY

Abstract: The aim of this study has been to identify school managers' leadership styles and levels in terms of teachers' perceptions. The focus of the study includes primary, secondary and high schools in Şahinbey and Şehitkamil districts of Gaziantep. In the study, the selection of the sample, which consists of 228 teachers, was carried out by using the disproportionate cluster sampling method. The data have been collected via change leadership scale and multi-factorial leadership scale. For analysis of data Pearson Correlation coefficients have been used. According to the research results, teachers believe that among the multi-factorial leadership styles their managers show mostly transformational, transactional and change leadership behaviors, while they show laissez-faire leadership behaviors less frequently. It was also found out that there is a moderate relation between transformational and change leadership styles; a low-level weak relation between transformational and transactional leadership; and a low-level relation between transformational and laissez-faire leadership. On the other hand, there is a respectively low and meaningful relationship between change leadership and transactional leadership; a negative and very low relationship between change leadership and laissez-faire leadership. Finally, a low level relation has been detected between transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership.

Keywords: *Change leadership, transactional leadership, transformational leadership, laissez-faire leadership.*

Introduction

Leadership is one of the main concepts that is commonly discussed and investigated in the social sciences, especially in fields of management, psychology, sociology, and education. However, there is still no consensus about its definition. One of the reasons for this is that the reflection of leadership and priority has been different in every field (Bektas, Cogaltay and Sokmen, 2014).

As is well known, school managers are the ones who are in charge of school management and school business. According to Kul and Guclu (2010), a school manager's duty is to use all human and material sources in the most effective way to keep the school alive and suited to its goals. Besides this, school managers are the ones who facilitate communication among employees, coordinate employees, and finally, by evaluating the performance of all activities, try to bring the school to an effective and successful level.

Initiating change and keeping up with new developments at the school is mainly under the responsibility of school managers. School managers have to use their effectiveness in order to motivate teachers, gather them around organizational objectives, and make them to devote themselves to the school, and most importantly, they have to improve the educational process (Turan, 2002).

Transformational Leadership

Many theories and many approaches trying to explain the nature of leadership have been developed recently. When the literature is reviewed, it can be seen that the most common one is multi-factorial leadership. This leadership consists of three components: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership (Bektas, Cogaltay and Sokmen, 2014).

---

* **Corresponding author:**
Suna OZKAN, Gaziantep University, Higher School Of Foreign Languages, 27310, Gaziantep, TURKEY
Email: sunaozkan27@gmail.com

Traditional leadership approaches seem to be unable to keep up with the changes that take place in today's world. This situation has given birth to transformational leadership. Transformational leadership was first used under the name of "Rebel Leadership" by J.V. Downtown in 1973; however, as a theory it was developed by J. McGregor Burns in 1978 (Guney, 2011).

Transformational leadership is a kind of leadership that increases employees' inner knowledge and awareness levels and helps employees to have high performance levels (Hoy and Miskel, 2012). Transformational leaders are not only thoughtful and questioning risk-takers— they also teach some specific behaviors through their own actions (Celik, 2005). A transformational leader makes changes by forming an environment in which both leaders and followers improve their natural strengths.

Transformational leaders try to make their followers aware of ideals and moral values such as freedom, fairness, equality, peace, and humanism while trying to eliminate emotions like fear, hostility, passion and jealousy (Buluc, 2009).

Transformational leadership is the form of leadership in which moral values are given importance. In this mode of leadership, the leader's and followers' moral expectations and levels of human behaviors are increased, so a transformational effect exists for both sides (Cemaloglu, 2013).

According to Bass and Riggio (2006), the components of transformational leadership (cited by Cemaloglu, 2013) are as follows:

a) *Idealized Effect:* The leader is a wonderful role model for his followers. In idealized effect, the leader enables correct decisions to be taken for the organization by gaining the trust and respect of his followers. Leaders respect their followers, exert a strong effect on them, and gain their trust and make them believe in the organizational mission (Buluc, 2009).

b) *Inspiring Motivation:* These are the leaders that get their expectations over their followers, have a vision shared within the organization, and inspire the followers to be devoted. Team spirit is improved by these leaders (Northhouse, 2014). Leaders draw a picture of an attainable future and foster a feeling of team spirit in order to make the organization reach its objectives and increase their followers' devotion to these objectives (Turan and Bektas, 2014).

c) *Intellectual Stimulation:* Intellectual stimulation can be defined as a leader's enabling his subordinates to be aware of their problems and come up with creative solutions. There is no obligation of acting in accordance with the leader's thoughts while solving problems (Guney, 2011).

d) *Individual Support :*The leader brings personal awareness to the employees and guides each of them individually. He creates new opportunities for employees to improve themselves and pays attention to each employee's desires and needs (Sahin, 2004).

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leaders feel that they only need to work relations out with employees. They expect full obedience. The Management styles of these leaders depend on their negative and positive expectations of their employees. According to positive expectations, the leader follows his employees' performance, and if they make a mistake, he corrects them. According to negative expectations, the leader waits for employees' mistakes to reach a visible level and then corrects them via negative activities (Gedikoglu, 2015). Transactional leadership focuses on complementary relations between the leader and employees and concern about results. Transactional leadership resembles the concept of shopping. Relations between the leader and employees are like shopping for a valuable thing. The Leader approaches employees with an aim of using their specific skills or talents. Moreover, in transactional leadership, which is considered to be the style for increasing productivity, the leader is the one who shows the way to his employees, motivates them, and tries to clearly define the targets of the organization and the roles and duties of employees (Cemaloglu, 2007).

Dimensions of Transactional Leadership

Conditioned award: The leader defines duties and puts targets for the employees. Employees know that they will get an award when they reach the targets (Cemaloglu, 2013; Celik, 2005). Awards might consist of a certain amount of money or a certain type of status (Simsek, Akgemici, Celik, 2011). Employees are motivated to the extent that they attach importance to the awards offered (Cemaloglu, 2013).

Active management by exception: This means leaders applying standards. The leader follows the employees' performance closely and intervenes when they make mistakes (Hoy and Miskel: 2010).

Inactively management by exception (not interfering): Leaders are not active until the problems become serious. They pretend not to see the problems, or they are late in taking action (Hoy and Miskel, 2010).

Laissez-faire Leadership

As it can be understood from the name, laissez-faire leadership means not interfering and avoiding work. It is very clear that this kind of leadership is not preferable. Some studies show that subordinates have a preference for autonomy. In reality, autonomy is a popular concept in literature. Laissez-faire leadership expresses members' dissatisfactions as it does not include a systematic process in problem solving, and so it does not imply any autonomy in the sense of leadership (Baloglu, Karadag and Gavuz, 2009).

Change Leadership

As in all other fields, too, technologic, scientific and social developments in education make it obligatory to change managing techniques (Jones, 2010). However, change is a difficult process, and one of the main reasons for this is that people in the organization are reluctant or resistant to change. Therefore, change management is more important than the change itself. Stace and Dunphy (1994) mention two important dimensions in organizational change. The first is the size and degree of the change, and the second is the way that the leader will follow. Since educational institutions are considered to be the mechanism to change society and foster development (Carnoy and Samoff, 2014), school managers' change leadership features are invaluable.

The background of change implementation is traced back to Lewin's (1947) 3-stage model, which defined change as having three stages: unfreezing, changing, and refreezing. The unfreezing stage focuses on developing a reason why the change is necessary. The changing stage is where the actual change is implemented, whereas the refreezing stage is the phase when the new methods of work are internalized and established (Lewin,1947). Later, Judson (1991) developed a five-phase model, and Kotter (1996) imposed an eight-phase model and various change leading styles. Later on, in the 21st century, a new kind of change leadership was began to be mentioned (Caldwell 2009).

Although there is a large amount of literature on leading change, there has as yet been little study of change leadership behavior (Herold et al, 2008). Herold et al. developed a change leadership style grounded on practice-oriented recommendations, which includes specific leadership behaviors like visioning, enlisting, empowering, monitoring, and helping with individual adaptation. These behaviors focus on implementing a particular change which is aimed at hand rather than organizational change at all.

Change leadership behaviors might be linked to other leadership styles, such as transformational and transactional leadership styles, but there are several differences between these leadership behaviors and the change leadership behaviors. First, organizational changes are seen as "planned events," (Liu, 2010), and the effects of change leadership are episodic, rather than permanent and cross-situational. Change leadership behaviors aim at the specific change, whereas transformational and transactional leadership behaviors are general, long lasting and trans-situational. Liu (2010) also states that change leadership is the certain leadership style focusing on imposing a specific, discrete change, whereas transformational leadership is a more general leadership style that diffuses a variety of organizational events, which are not just limited to organizational change.

Change leaders are able to get employees' support for the change at hand by creating a change-related vision, getting employees involved in the change-specific decision-making and helping people deal with the difficulties related to the change, and finally providing routine feedback about the change process.

According to Liu (2009), the change leader, in contrast to the transformational leader, forms a vision of change, tries to make a specific change rather than a general one, motivates his employees for this change, tries to decrease the uncertainty and discomfort during the change, and helps employees with their problems during the change.

Change leadership has two dimensions. These are;

1) Change-selling behaviors, which are the attempts to promote the change and explain the employees why the change is necessary.

2) Change-implementing behaviors, which are the attempts to push a change forward and promote success in the implementation process.

Significance of the Study

In the literature, multi-factorial leadership styles have been examined with various variables, including organizational commitment (Buluc, 2009), authority transfer (Baloglu, Karadag and Gavuz, 2009), its effect on teachers (Korkmaz, 2005). However, there is no study regarding it and its relation with change leadership. In this context, this study is important as it contributes to the literature by examining the relation multi-factorial leadership styles and the change leadership.

Aim of the Study

In this study, we have sought to find out the relation between school managers' change leadership and multi-factorial leadership styles according to teacher perceptions. Accordingly, the answers of following questions have been investigated;

1) Do teachers' demographic variables predict their perceptions about leadership styles the managers use?

2) To what level do school managers working in different grades have these leadership styles?

3) From the teachers'' point of view, are school managers' transformational, transactional, laissez-faire and change leadership styles different?

Method

This study has aimed to investigate the relationship between school managers' change leadership and multi-factorial leadership styles. A correlational research model has been used. Correlational research is a research method that aims to find out relationships between two or more variables and aims to obtain clues about the cause and effects.

Universe and Sample of the Study

The domain of the study consists of primary, secondary and high schools in Sahinbey and Sehitkamil districts of Gaziantep in 2014-2015 educational year. In this study individuals are not taken one by one, but are chosen by the disproportionate cluster sampling method. The sample of the study consists of 228 teachers working in 17 schools in Gaziantep. Teachers taken as samples consist of (n=120) 52.6% men and (n=108) 47.4% women. A 57.5% (n=131) of these teachers are married, while 42.5% (n=97) are single. A85.5% (n=195) of teachers participated in the survey work in public schools while 14.5% (n=33) work in private schools. The most common age range is between 20-30 with a percentage of 44.3% (n=101). The most common seniority range is 1-5 years a number of 96 teachers (42.1%).

Measuring Instruments

The Multi-factorial Leadership Questionnaire, which was developed by Bass and Avolio (1990) and translated into Turkish by Akdogan (2002), was used in this study. There are 36 items and 3 main dimensions in the questionnaire. Factor 1(Transformational leadership) explains 38.12% of the total variance of measuring instrument. Factor 2 (Laissez-faire leadership) explains 15.69% 0f total variance and factor 3 (Transactional leadership) explains 12.29% of total variance. These three factors explain 66.12% of total variance in the measuring instrument. Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient is .96 for factor 1,and .91 for factor 2, and .76 for factor 3, and .88 for the total instrument.

The Change leadership scale developed by Liu (2010) and adapted into Turkish by Savas and Cagrici (2014) has been used. As change leadership scale's Bartlett test result is meaningful and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) coefficient is .95 and p<0.05. Its data matrix is suitable for factor analysis. The items that are cyclical have been removed from the scale instrument. 17 items remained in the scale instrument which was 18 initially. The change leadership scale which was adapted as two-dimensional by Savas and Cagrici (2014) has also been obtained as two-dimensional in our study after the factor analysis.

Factor 1 (Change selling behaviors of change leader) explains 30.34% of total variance of the scale instrument, factor 2 (change implementing behaviors) explains 37.13% of total variance and these two factors explain 67.48% of total variance in the scale instrument. Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient is .93 for factor 1, .94 for factor 2 and totally is .94.

Item numbers, averages, standard deviations and reliability coefficients of both scales are given in Table below.

Table 1.Averages, Standard Deviations and Reliability Coefficients of Change Leadership and Multi-Factorial Leadership Styles Scale and Their Sub-dimensions

Change Leadership	Number of Item	Alpha	$\overline{X}$	SS	N
1- Change Selling behaviors	7	.93	3.55	.81	228
2-Change Implementation Behaviors	10	.94	3.64	.77	228
Total	17	.94	3.60	.79	228
Leadership Style					
3- Transformational	13	.96	3.64	.91	228
4- Laissez-faire	5	.91	2.38	1.04	228
5- Transactional	7	.76	3.41	.72	228
Total	25	.88	3.14	.89	228

Procedure

The analysis of obtained data consists of two phases. These are:

(i) First Phase: Before the statistical analysis in the study, data collection instruments have been scored with 5 point Likert system.

(ii) Second Phase: Pearson Product Moment Correlation Analysis has been used to define the relation between scores obtained from Change Leadership and Multi-Factorial Leadership Style Scales.

Findings

Correlational Findings regarding the Relation between Change Leadership and Multi-factorial Leadership Styles

Table 2 shows the correlational analysis results done to evaluate the relation between change leadership and multi-factorial leadership styles of school managers according to teachers' perceptions. The result has been reached that there are positive relations between change leadership and change selling [r=.92], change implementing behaviors [r=.96], transformational leadership [r=.51], transactional leadership [r=.48] levels according to teachers' perception. In addition to these results, according to teachers' perception a positive [r=.57] relation has been found betweenchange leadership and multi-factorial leadership style total scores.

Table 2. Correlation Matrix Between Change Leadership and Leadership Style

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1- Change selling	1						
2- Change implementation	.77**	1					
3-Transformational leadership	.44**	.51**	1				
4- Transactional leadership	.43**	.47**	.18**	1			
5- Laissez-faire leadership	-.07	-.09	-.26**	.30**	1		
6- Change leadership (Total)	.92**	.96**	.51**	.48**	-.08	1	
7- Leadership styles (Total)	.50**	.60**	.81**	.62**	.26**	.57**	1

*** p<.001 **p<.01, *p<.05

The correlation matrix showing the relation among variables investigated in the study is given in Table 10. According to this, a positive and middle level relation is seen between Change leadership and transformational leadership (p<.01). The more school managers' change leadership behaviors increase the more transformational leadership behaviors increase. Explained common variance is 26% (R^2=.26). According to this result transformational leadership explains 26% of change leadership. It is seen that there is a weak level and positive relation between change leadership and transactional leadership (p<.01). The more school managers' change leadership behaviors increase, the more transactional leadership behaviors increase. Explained common variance is 23% (R^2=.23). According to this result,

transformational leadership explains 23% of change leadership. It is seen that there is no relationship between change leadership and laissez-faire leadership.

A positive and weak relation is seen between transformational leadership and transactional leadership (p<.01). As transformational leadership of school managers increases, their transactional leadership features will also increase a little. Explained common variance is 3% (R^2=.03). Transactional leadership explains 3% of transformational leadership.

There is a low and negative relation between transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership (p<.01). As transformational leadership of school managers increase, their laissez-faire leadership behaviors will decrease a little. Explained common variance is 7% (R^2= .07). According to this, laissez-faire leadership explains 7% of transformational leadership.

It is seen that there is a *weak* relation between transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership (p<.01). Explained common variance is 9% (R^2= .09). Laissez-faire leadership explains 9% of transactional leadership.

In addition to these results, there is a positive and meaningful relation between school managers' change leadership and the multi-factorial leadership styles according to teacher perceptions. Explained common variance is 33% (R^2= .33).

Discussion, Results and Suggestions

According to the findings obtained from the study, school managers most of time show transformational, transactional and change leadership behaviors, while rarely showing laissez-faire leadership behaviors from multi-factorial leadership styles according to teachers' perceptions. When the literature is reviewed, it is noticed that Transformational leadership is more effective in reaching the organizational goals than the more traditional leadership styles (Celik, 1998; Karip 1998; Korkmaz, 2005; Cemaloglu, 2007). Teachers' perception on school managers' leadership styles statistically show a meaningful difference on school variable. Participants indicate that primary and secondary school managers show more change leadership behaviors than those working in high school. In addition, it has been observed that primary school managers show more laissez-faire leadership behaviors than managers working in other schools. Teachers' evaluations show a meaningful difference according to the school that they work. Teachers working in private schools express that their managers show more *transformational*, *transactional, laissez-faire* and *change leadership* behaviors than managers working in public schools. Teachers' perceptions differ according to their branch, too. *Class teachers* indicate that their managers show *laissez-faire leadership* behaviors more than other branch teachers' managers. So class teachers feel themselves more free than other branch teachers.

According to the correlation analysis, there is a positive and middle-level relation between *change leadership* and *transformational leadership.* Explained common variance is defined to be 26%. According to this, it may be said that as school managers' change leadership behaviors increase, their transformational leadership behaviors also increase at middle level. This result is supported by Liu (2009) as he states that change leadership is a different leadership style from transformational leadership; however, shared common variance is more than other leadership styles. Tuncer (2001), cited from Ataman (2009), says that transformational leadership is in fact a leadership open to change. Transformational leadership appears especially in crisis periods, dynamic and unstable atmospheres, disorganized structures and institutions, and in undertakings whose degree of being analyzed is low and confusing.

A low-level relation has been observed between *change leadership* and *transactional leadership.* It may be said that 23% of change leadership's total variance stems from transactional leadership. According to Gedikoglu (2015), transactional leaders cannot easily abandon processes and procedures applied in organizations, and they perceive organization as a constantly developing and mechanical structure rather than having an organic structure. This means that in organizations that transactional leadership domains, leaders don't have enough skills to adapt to change.

It has been defined that common variance between *transactional leadership* and *laissez-faire leadership* is 9%. The weak relation found between transactional and laissez-faire leadership matches the findings of the study done by Dursun (2009).

It has been found that common variance shared between *transformational leadership* and *transactional leadership* is 3,3%. Burns (1978) maintains that transformational and transactional leadership styles constantly represent two opposite end of a union. In addition, Bass (1990), cited by Baloglu and Burns (1978)'s expressions, indicates that the more an individual is transformational, the less he is transactional. In a study carried out by Buluc (2009), it was found that school managers show both transformational leadership behaviors and conditional award behaviors of transactional leadership to a considerable degree. It was also found that the common variance shared between

transformational leadership and *laissez-faire leadership* is 7%. This situation also shows that transformational leaders cannot be laissez-faire leaders at the same time.

Further comparative studies can be carried out to investigate the subject under different parameters and with a larger sampling group. As change leadership is a comparatively new issue, it may be more useful to study it more before reaching definite decisions. Transformational and change leaderships are change and worker focused approaches. Therefore, enabling organizations to have a flexible structure for change may be a good decision. There could be in-service trainings, seminars and courses to educate managers.

References

Akdogan, E. (2002). *Ogretim elemanlarinin algiladiklari liderlik stilleri ile is doyum duzeyleri arasindaki iliski.* Yayinlanmamis Master Thesis, Marmara Universitesi, Istanbul.

Avolio, B. J.,Bass, B. M., Riggio, R. E., Orr, S. S., Ciulla, J. B., Krishnan, V. R., ... &Riggio, R. E. (2008). Transformational leadership. *Asia-Pacific Business Review*, *4*(1).

Baloglu, N., Karadag, E.,, & Gavuz, S. (2009). Okul mudurlerinin cok faktorlu liderlik stillerinin yetki devrine etkisi: Bir dogrusal, & yapisal esitlik modelleme calismasi. *Uludag Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, *22*(2), 457-479.

Bektas, Cogaltay, & Sokmen. (2014) Ogretmen algilarina gore okul mudurlerinin liderlik stillerinin orgutsel baglilik uzerindeki rolu, *Uluslararasi Turk Egitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, Ekim.

Buluc, B. (2009). Sinif ogretmenlerinin algilarina gore okul mudurlerinin liderlik stilleri ile orgutsel baglilik arasindaki iliski. *Kuram, & Uygulamada Egitim Yonetimi*, *15*(1), 5-34.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. NewYork: Harper, & Row.

Buyukozturk, S., Kilic Cakmak, E., Akgun, O.E., Karadeniz, S.,, & Demirel, F., (2013). *Bilimsel arastirma yontemleri* (14. Baski). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Carnoy, M., & Samoff, J. (2014). *Education and social transition in the third world*. Princeton University Press.

Caldwell, S. D.,Roby-Williams, C., Rush, K., Ricke-Keily, T. (2009). Influences of Context, Processand Individual Differences on Nurses' Readiness for Changeto Magnet Status, *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 65 issue 7, pp. 1412 – 1422.

Cemaloglu, N. (2013). Liderlik. S. Ozdemir (Ed.), Egitim yonetiminde kuram, & uygulama icinde (ss. 131-183). Ankara: PegemA.

Cemaloglu, N. (2007). Okul yoneticilerinin liderlik stillerinin orgut sagligi uzerindeki etkisi. *Turkiye Sosyal Arastirmalar Dergisi*, *11*(2), 165-194.

Cemaloglu, N. (2007). Okul yoneticilerinin liderlik stillerinin farkli degiskenler acisindan incelenmesi. *Turk Egitim Bilimleri Dergisi,* 5 (1), 73-112.

Celik V. (1998) Egitimde Donusumcu Liderlik. *Kuram, & Uygulamada Egitim Yonetimi,* (16), 423-441.

Celik, V. (2005). Liderlik. Icinde, Y. Ozden(Ed.). *Egitim, & okul yoneticiligi el kitabi* (ss. 187-215). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Dursun, Y. (2009). Ogretmenlerin tukenmislik duzeyleri ile yoneticileri icin algiladiklari donusumcu, & etkilesimci liderlik stilleri arasindaki iliski (Karabuk ilkogretim okullari ornegi). (Unpublished Master Thesis). Gazi Universitesi/Egitim Bilimleri Enstitusu. Ankara. Erisim Tarihi 20.12.2013, https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Gedikoglu, T. (2015). *Liderlik, & okul yonetimi.* Ankara: Ani Yayincilik.

Guney, S. (2011). *Orgutsel davranis.* Ankara: Nobel yayin dagitim.

Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (2010). *Educational Administration* (cev. editor: Selahattin TURAN), Ankara: Nobel Yayin Dagitim

Jones M. L. (2010). What do Managers do during Major Organisational Change.subat 2014 tarihinde mevcuttur. http://ro.uow.edu.au/commpapers/727

Judson, A. S. (1991). *Changingbehavior in organizations: Minimizing resistance to change*. B. Blackwell.

Karip, E. (1998). Donusumcu liderlik. *Kuram, & Uygulamada Egitim Yonetimi,* (16), 443-465.

Kul, M., & Guclu, M. (2010). Okul yoneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ile beden egitimi ogretmenlerinin orgutsel bagliliklari arasindaki iliski. *Uluslararasi Insan Bilimleri Dergisi*, *7*(2), 1021-1038.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leadingchange.* Harvard Business Press.

Korkmaz, M. (2005). Duygularin, & liderlik stillerinin ogretmenlerin performansi uzerinde etkisi. *Kuram, & Uygulamada Egitim Yonetimi*, *11*(3), 401-422.

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics. *Human Relations*, 1, 5-41.

Liu, Y. (2010). When Change Leadership Impacts Commitment To Change And When It Doesn't. A Dissertationfort he doctorate of philosopy. GeorgiaInstitute of Technology

Northouse, P.G. (2014). Liderlik: Kuram, & uygulamalar (cev.: Kaleli, M.), Istanbul: Surat Universite Yayinlari

Ozdamar, K. (2003). *Modern bilimsel arastirma yontemleri.* Eskisehir: Kaan Kitabevi.

Sahin, S. (2004). Okul mudurlerinin donusumcu, & surdurumcu liderlik stilleri ile okul kulturu arasindaki iliskiler (Izmir ili ornegi). *Kuram, & Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri*, *4*(2), 365-395.

Simsek, S.,Akgemici, T., & Celik, A. (2011). *Davranis Bilimlerine Giris, & Orgutlerde Davranis*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.

Turan, S. (2002). Teknolojinin okul yonetiminde etkin kullaniminda egitim yoneticisinin rolu. *Kuram, & Uygulamada Egitim Yonetimi*, *30*(30), 271-281.

Turan, S., & Bektas, F. (2014). Liderlik. S. Turan (ed.). *Kuram, & Uygulamada Teori, Arastirma, & Uygulama.* Icinde (ss. 293-336). Ankara. Pegem Akademi Yayincilik.

Tuncer, P. (2011). Orgutsel degisim, & liderlik. *Sayistay Dergisi*, *80*, 57-83.