



Teachers' and School Administrators' Perceptions and Expectations on Teacher Leadership*

Semra Kiranlı

Asst. Prof., Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Turkey
semk2009@gmail.com

In this study it is aimed to find out primary school teachers' and principals' expectations and perceptions related to teachers' leadership. The population of this survey consists of primary school teachers and principals in Odunpazarı, one of the two central municipalities in Eskişehir, in 2011-2012 educational year. Teachers and principals of eight primary schools were taken as a sample among low, middle, high socio-economic level primary schools in Odunpazarı. 195 teachers and principals participated in this study. In this study a data device which consisted of two sections was used to accomplish the purpose of the study. A personal information form to define teachers' and principals' demographical features made the first section, whereas "The Questionnaire of Expectations and perceptions of Teacher Leadership Roles" developed by Beycioğlu (2009) and consisting of 25 items made the second section. Each item in the questionnaire has a five scale Lykert type evaluation and belongs to one of the three dimensions of both perception and expectation. These dimensions are institutional development, professional development and collaboration with colleagues.

Key Words: Primary Schools, Teacher Leadership, Perception, Expectation, Quantitative Research, Teachers, School Administrators

INTRODUCTION

Although leadership researches on education and school management and similarly educational and school leadership studies have a long history, teacher leadership has recently become a frequently used concept, especially since 1990s (Smylie and Denny, 1990; Harris, 2003). The focus of the recent researches related to school and educational leadership have been mainly on the concept of instructional leadership for the past few decades. This implies that school administrators are considered to be mainly responsible for providing effective learning environments (Şişman, 2011a). School administrators are considered to be sources of learning and head teachers. Moreover, they are also required to provide necessary environments and conditions for

effective learning and to support teachers in every possible way (Şişman, 2011a; 2011b).

The main learning environment at school is classroom where a teacher has to carry out the role of a leader as a person of authority and power. However, learning is not limited to classroom environment. Teachers have to undertake the role of a leader both inside the school and in extra-curricular environments. Variables such as in-school environment, the school structure, school climate and school culture may either hinder or support teachers undertaking leadership roles. According to TIMSS 2007 results, schools in Turkey seem to have problems in terms of school environments and culture. In order to develop a better understanding of learning schools and to get the intended results from educational and school reforms in Turkey, school administrators and teachers must take on teacher leadership roles in the ongoing process (Şişman, Acat, Aypay and Karadağ, 2011c).

In Turkey, teachers' tasks and responsibilities were defined by rules and regulations under the headings of education, teaching and administration. The concept of administration here can be taken closely associated with teacher leadership terms. Although there has been quite a large literature on teacher leadership, it has not got a clear, standard, widely accepted single definition. Teachers may be expected to take on various roles as the roles in school structures and functions may vary from country to country. Teacher leadership is closely related to school effectiveness and school development studies which have gained high popularity since the 1980s. In short, teacher is one of the key elements of school effectiveness, effective learning and school development.

It is suggested that conceptualization of teacher leadership entails radical cultural changes in educational systems (Silva, Gimbert and Nolan, 2000). Similarly, when the contents of the concept are analyzed, it will be understood that teachers are required to give up or change some of their habits. It is preferred that teacher leadership be conceptualized based on school rather than be handled classroom based. Teacher leadership should be considered in terms of its positive effects on schools, teachers, students and school environment (Blase and Blase, 2001; Silins and Mulford, 2004; Lieberman and Miller, 2005). Teacher leadership behaviors as intellectual models are prerequisites for schools to challenge status quo and to become learning schools and organizations (Senge, 1990).

Literature Review

Defining Teacher Leadership and Dimensions of Teacher Leadership

There have been various teacher leadership definitions in the international literature of the field. One of them briefly defines that teacher leadership is the ability to encourage

colleagues to change (Wasley, 1991). Another definition gives emphasis on teacher leaders' contributions to build learning teacher and leader societies both inside and outside classroom and on ability to influence others for improvement of educational practices. This definition reveals that teacher leadership has three dimensions which are: the act of leading teachers and students which entails facilitating, coaching, mentoring, leadership in study groups and teaching; leadership in school related tasks which entails focusing on school's achievement, participating in task forces and being an active researcher; and leadership in collaboration or decision-making process which entails taking part in school development teams while serving in committees, willingness to collaborate with business and higher education institutions, and participation in parent-teacher organizations (Katzenmeyer and Moller, 2001). Day and Harris (2003) claimed that teacher leadership has four dimensions which are application of school improvement principles in classroom, taking on the role of a participative leader in the process of changing and development, being a negotiator in school development, and providing interpersonal learning which results from close individual and mutual relations with colleagues and in which mutual learning takes place.

When the literature of the field is reviewed, it can easily be noticed that some certain dimensions of teacher leadership have been given stronger emphasis. Among these dimensions are decision-making process, school improvement process and school development planning, teaching and evaluation, inter-colleagues relations, guidance for novice teachers, relations with society and parents, professional development, participation in school's task-forces, contribution to school policies (Greenlee, 2007). Thus, debates on teacher leadership in literature generally conceptualized around the theory of distributed leadership and teacher leadership equals distributed leadership (Gron, 2000; Harris, 2003). Headings of teacher leadership gather around school efficacy, school improvement, teachers' morale and keeping it at high level and democratic values (Frost and Durrant, 2003).

Measuring Teacher Leadership

There have been numerous attempts to develop some models and devices to measure teacher leadership. In their qualitative research, Beachum and Dentith (2004) interviewed 25 teachers from five well-known different schools in one school district to find out the value of teachers as leaders. Teachers were found as valuable leaders in three subtitles. Certain school frames and organizational types, particular identities and duration shared among teachers, and particular use of outside resources with powerful community relationship were the subtitles they evaluated teachers. Triska (2007) handled teacher leadership based on classroom at three public elementary schools in Northern California with 56 teachers. He studied teacher leadership using both questionnaires and interviews in his study within five dimensions. Namely, these

dimensions are students' success and contact, initiating and risk taking, reliability, focus on collaboration and traditional leadership. A measuring device was used to measure and to analyze teachers' leadership behaviors based on the quantitative data gathered.

In a quantitative research Ngang, Abdulla and Mey (2010) studied teacher leadership within seven dimensions; developmental focus, collaboration with colleagues, being recognized, positive environment, autonomy, open communication and participation. The study revealed that positive environment, open communication and autonomy were dominant dimensions of teacher leadership. A different study which used an inventory of Likert type with 17 statements to measure teacher leadership looked through relationships between teacher leadership and reliability and efficacy among the school staff. The result of their research was the existence of strong positive connection among the three factors (Angelle, Nixon, Norton, Niles, 2011). Limited number of teachers and administrators were interviewed and archival data were utilized in a qualitative study of teacher leadership (Rutledge, 2009). Teachers' roles, teacher leaders' influence on and their support for administrators, teacher leaders' influence on and contributions to school developmental process, and administrators' support for teacher leadership were the key elements to decide on their research problem.

Although there have been a lot of studies on school administrators' leadership roles and behaviors, the number of studies on teacher leadership have been limited to few in Turkey. In his study, Çeküç (2008) interviewed 32 teachers. The study handled teacher leadership in terms of sufficiency of teacher leaders' accomplishment of mission and vision, communication, collaboration, methods and techniques, professional perspectives, loyalty to teaching profession and personal traits. Can (2006a) interviewed 35 teachers and 12 school administrators in primary and middle schools in three cities so as to conduct a research on teacher leadership and barriers to teacher leadership. The study revealed that teachers perceived student-centered education, in-class teaching techniques, principals motivating and supporting teachers, and reliable stimulating school climate as supportive of teacher leadership. Additionally, school administrators perceived quality of education, discipline, school oriented activities and behaviors as supportive of teacher leadership. In his teacher leadership research, Can (2006b) aimed to find out the roles and strategies of principals to improve teacher leadership and put the roles of principals into four categories which are roles inside and outside the classroom, sharing developmental constructive experiences with colleagues, awareness and recognition of the strengths of colleagues, and participation in preparation programs for administration. Can (2007) interviewed 15 teachers and 8 administrators from three cities to find out the existing teacher leadership skills and the practice level of teacher leadership skills.

Beycioğlu (2009) devised an inventory and used it in his study in which he dealt with teacher leadership in terms of institutional development, professional development and development with colleagues. His study showed that both teachers and administrators submitted their opinions for the existence of teacher leadership in all of its dimensions to some extent. However, the perceptions on teacher leadership have been found less than the expectations on teacher leadership. Reyhan (2010) studied primary school teacher leadership in Turhal town of Tokat, with 610 primary school teachers. She studied her survey within four zones; reliability and influencing others, appreciation and meeting the expectations, ability and openness to change, and educational roles. The study found out that most teachers adopted their educational roles while they were less likely to be open to change. In a research study by Apaydın, Vilkinas and Carton (2011) a measuring instrument devised by Vilkinas and Carton was applied to 300 middle school teachers. It was aimed to determine at what level the teachers were saviors, developers, innovators, entrepreneurs, observers, and integrators. The teachers were found to be at higher levels as saviors, developers and entrepreneurs than as other dimensions.

Both school administrators who were supposed to lead the change process and teachers who were supposed to adopt the process and internalize the change might be blamed for Turkey's failure in getting the desired results from striving reforms to improve education and schools. Teachers undoubtedly play the most important part in educational reforms of all kinds. It is not possible to change and improve education without taking teachers into consideration.

Statement of the research problem

1. What are the levels of primary schools teachers' and administrators' expectations and perceptions on teacher leadership roles?
2. Are there any significant differences among primary schools teachers' and administrators' expectations and perceptions on teacher leadership roles in terms of the individual variables of (a) type of position, (b) gender, (c) branch, (d) school graduated, and (d) experience?

METHOD

The study designed in descriptive survey model. A questionnaire is the technique which is used in descriptive survey model. This study aimed to find out the levels of primary schools teachers' and administrators' expectations and perceptions on teacher leadership roles.

Population of the research is state primary school administrators and teachers in Odunpazarı city centre, one of the two central municipalities of Eskişehir, in 2011-2012 educational year. There are 54 state primary schools in Odunpazarı. Administrators and

teachers in eight primary schools were taken as sample. This is the %14.5 percent of population. The number of participants in the research survey was 76 classroom teachers, 97 subject teachers and 22 administrators as school directors and vice-directors, which made 195 in total. A data collection instrument consisting of two sections was used. In the first section, the participants' gender, the last higher education school they graduated, their experience, and positions were asked in order to get information about their demographic features. The second section was the "The Questionnaire of Expectations and Perceptions on Teacher Leadership Roles" developed by Beycioğlu (2009).

Beycioğlu did the validity and reliability tests of his questionnaire while he was developing it. The initial form with 29 items was developed after literature review. Then, six experts were consulted to evaluate the quality of each item in the context of clarity, ambiguity, generality, and to validate the content of the questionnaire. The items were also assessed by two inspectors, four teachers, and two school administrators to ensure the clarity and appropriateness of the items. The initial format of the scale was 5- point Likert response set was used. The 29 item initial form was administered to 317 participants who were working for state elementary schools in Hatay city centre. To test the construct validity of the data gathered from the participants Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett tests were performed. For validity studies, exploratory factor analyses were carried out, and also item-total correlations estimated. For reliability studies, Cronbach Alpha and test-retest correlation coefficients were applied. 4 items were found nonsense, so they were left out. The results of the construct validity tests showed the scale was valid in both perception (Kaiser Meyer Olkin = .95, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity= 5463.25 p =.000) and expectation (Kaiser Meyer Olkin =.94, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity= 4297.67, p =.000) parts. Factor analysis revealed that there are 3 subscales both in Perception and Expectation part in the scale. The coefficient of Cronbach's alpha for expectation part of the scale is 0.93 and it is 0.95 for perception part. for one factor The analysis on the test-retest scores gathered from 40 participants revealed a correlation coefficient of "r=.80" in expectation part and of "r=.87" in perception part which shows that the instrument is reliable over time (Beycioğlu, 2009; Beycioğlu and Aslan, 2010).

After gathering data, reliability tests for this study were done. The results of the coefficient of Cronbach Alpha for expectation part of the scale is 0,94 and for perception part it is 0,92. Moreover, for the validity of his questionnaire, with the total scores of perception and expectation part levels the least and the most the percent of 27, independent groups t-test was applied. As a result of analysis it is seen a significant differences between groups (p<0,05).

Therefore, it can be said the questionnaire form used in this study is reliable and valid. The questionnaire consists of 25 items, each of which belongs to one of three dimensions of both perception and expectation and is to be evaluated in five scale (from 1 – Always to 5 – Never) Likert type inventory. The three dimensions are institutional development, professional development and collaboration with colleagues. Nine of these items, items 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 16 were about the dimension of institutional development. Eleven of them, items 10, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 were about the dimension of professional development, and items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were the five items in the questionnaire about the dimension of collaboration with colleagues. The personal information form and “The Questionnaire of Expectations and Perceptions on Teacher Leadership Roles” which researcher was permitted to use by Beycioğlu (2009), the developer of the questionnaire, were combined and delivered to participants. Collected responses were transferred into, coded and analyzed through the software SPSS 17. The significance level was taken as 0.05 in the evaluation process.

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

Findings from the analysis of the gathered data and findings related interpretations were presented in this section. Quantitative findings were tabulated according to the individual variables and then they were interpreted.

1. Findings and Interpretations According to the First Research Problem

The first research problem was stated as “What are the levels of primary school administrators’ and teachers’ expectations and perceptions on teacher leadership roles (a. institutional, b. professional, c. collaboration) Table 1 and Table 2 show a general evaluation of the participants’ expectations and perceptions on teacher leadership roles. There are three dimensions of teacher leadership. They are: institutional development, professional development and collaboration with colleagues. So their mean (\bar{x}) is calculated.

Table 1: Levels of the participants’ expectations on teacher leadership roles

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>ss</i>
Institutional development	195	18,00	45,00	36,72	5,43
Professional development	195	27,00	55,00	49,76	4,7
Collaboration with colleagues	195	13,00	25,00	22,01	2,63
Total	195	66,00	125,00	108,49	10,90

Table 2: Levels of the participants’ perceptions on teacher leadership roles

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maksimum</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>ss</i>
Institutional development	195	15,00	44,00	31,11	6,25
Professional development	195	15,00	55,00	43,67	7,18
Collaboration with colleagues	195	10,00	25,00	18,75	3,52
Total	195	48,00	124,00	93,53	14,73

Considering the mean values in the tables above, it is seen that administrators’ and teachers’ expectations are higher than their perceptions. This reveals that actual teacher leadership practices in their schools are lower than they expected and they have more

expectations on teacher leadership roles. This can easily be concluded from the total mean values, $x=108,49$ (Always) for expectations and, $x=93,53$ (Often) for perceptions.

a. For the dimension of institutional development, mean value for teacher leadership roles expectations of the participants' responses is 36,72 (Often), while the mean value for their perceptions is 31,11 (Often). Considering the values for the participants' expectations, the mean value for the item 9 which is intended to measure "*the willingness level of the participants in activities for school development*" is represented by the highest score, $x=4,37$ (Always) whereas the lowest mean value $x=3,64$ (Often) belongs to the item 6, which is intended to measure *expectations level of the participants to take part in study groups around the town, city or the country.*" Similarly in Table 2 showing the perceptions of the participants, item 6 has the lowest mean value, $x=2,96$ (Sometimes) and again item 9 has the highest mean value, $x=3,79$ (Often). These findings suggest that participants want to see more practices of teacher leadership roles in activities for school development at both expectation and perception levels. The participants tend to give less importance in participating school development activities outside their schools connected with teacher leadership roles.

b. As for Professional development dimension, mean value for the participants' expectations on teacher leadership roles is 49,76 (Always), while the mean value for their perceptions is 43,67 (Often). Item 24 which states "*giving confidence to students*" has a mean value of $x=4,77$ (Always) and item 19 which states "*appreciation of colleagues as a valuable members of school*" has a mean value of $x=4,66$ (Always) as the two highest mean values. The lowest mean value $x=4,36$ (Always) belongs to the item 20 which states "*Making effort to make the colleagues participate in school related decision-making.*" Related to Administrators' and teachers' perceptions, item 24 which states "*giving confidence to students*" has the highest mean value $x=4,27$ (Always) while the lowest mean value $x=3,34$ (often) belongs to item 25, which measures the level of "*showing positive attitudes towards solutions to school related problems.*"

c. When it comes to dimension of "*collaboration with colleagues,*" the arithmetic mean value for the participants' expectations is 22,1 (Always) and the arithmetic mean value for their expectations is 18,75 (Often). In this dimension, the highest mean value for the participants expectations is $x=4,69$ (Always) is that of the item 1, which is about "*helping the novice or just appointed teachers.*" The lowest mean value $x=4,19$ (Always) belongs to item 5 which is about "*inclusion in the process of teacher related studies or projects in their preparation, execution, or participation phases.*" Similarly, as the participants' perceptions, the highest mean level $x=4,10$ belongs to item 1, whereas the lowest mean level $x=47$ (Often) belongs to item five. These findings suggest that participants highly adopt helping other teachers in expectation and

perception level. On the other hand they are not considering participating teacher related studies or project as little relevant to teacher leadership.

2. Findings and Interpretation According to the Second Research Problem

The second problem of the research was previously stated as “Are there any differences in the primary school administrators’ and teachers’ expectations and perceptions on teacher leadership roles according to a. their positions (administrator-teacher), b. gender, c. branch, d. the schools they graduated, and e. the years of experience.

2.a There are comparison between different two group as an administrator and teacher. There are three dimensions of participants. They are: institutional development, professional development and collaboration with colleagues. Therefore the independent group t-test was applied to find out if the participants’ expectations and perceptions on teacher leadership roles differ significantly according to the variable of the participants’ positions and its scores were shown in Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 3: Analysis of the participants’ expectations on teacher leadership roles according to the variable of their positions at school.

Dimension	Position	n	X	S	t	p
Institutional development	Administrator	22	41,00	3,46	-4,081	,001*
	Teacher	173	36,18	5,39		
Professional development	Administrator	22	51,68	3,34	-2,029	,044*
	Teacher	173	49,51	4,86		
Collaboration with colleagues	Administrator	22	22,95	3,03	-1,811	,072
	Teacher	173	21,88	2,55		
Total	Administrator	22	115,64	6,87	-3,350	,001*
	Teacher	173	107,58	11,00		

Table 4: Analysis of the participants’ perceptions on teacher leadership roles according to the variable of position at school.

Dimension	Position	n	X	S	t	p
Institutional development	Administrator	22	36,59	6,04	-4,587	,000*
	Teacher	173	30,42	5,94		
Professional development	Administrator	22	47,86	4,91	-2,969	,003*
	Teacher	173	43,13	7,26		
Collaboration with colleagues	Administrator	22	20,36	3,89	-2,299	,023*
	Teacher	173	18,55	3,43		
Total	Administrator	22	104,82	11,48	-3,956	,000*
	Teacher	173	92,10	14,50		

The findings from Table 3 reveal that the participants’ views on teacher leadership roles do not vary in the dimension of collaboration. However, they significantly vary in the dimension of professional development ($p < ,05$). When the findings for professional and institutional development are examined, school administrators are found to have higher arithmetic averages than teachers.

When the findings in Table 4 are examined, it is seen that participants’ perceptions of teacher leadership roles show significant difference in terms of the dimensions of professional development, institutional development and collaboration ($p < ,05$). The

findings in the table also revealed that school administrators have higher arithmetic averages than teachers in all dimensions, which means school administrators have significantly higher perceptions of teacher leadership roles than teachers.

2b. Table 5 and Table 6 show the scores of t-test which was applied to find out if the participated school leaders' and teachers' expectations and perceptions on teacher leadership roles differ significantly according to variable of gender.

Table 5: Analysis of the participants' expectations on teacher leadership roles according to the variable of gender.

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Institutional development	Male	81	36,47	5,98	-,550	,583
	Female	114	36,90	5,01		
Professional development	Male	81	49,60	5,42	-,380	,704
	Female	114	49,87	4,24		
Collaboration with colleagues	Male	81	21,91	2,93	-,410	,683
	Female	114	22,07	2,40		
Total	Male	81	107,99	12,36	-,538	,591
	Female	114	108,84	9,78		

Table 6: Analysis of the participants' perceptions on teacher leadership roles according to the variable of gender.

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Institutional development	Male	81	31,84	6,52	1,372	,172
	Female	114	30,60	6,02		
Professional development	Male	81	44,89	6,00	2,020	,045*
	Female	114	42,80	7,82		
Collaboration with colleagues	Male	81	19,19	3,68	1,444	,150
	Female	114	18,45	3,39		
Total	Male	81	95,91	13,95	1,915	,057
	Female	114	91,84	15,09		

The findings in Table 5 do not give away any significant differences in participants' expectations on teacher leadership roles in institutional development, professional development and collaboration dimensions according to the participants' genders. That is to say, both male and female participants have similar expectations on teacher leadership roles.

Although the values for the participants' perceptions on teacher leadership roles according to the variable of gender do not show significant differences in institutional development and collaboration dimensions, findings in the table signify a noticeable difference in professional development dimension in favor of males. In other words, both male and female participants have similar views on institutional development and

collaboration dimensions of teacher leadership roles. However, male participants have higher expectations in professional development dimension of teacher leadership roles.

2c. Table 7 and Table 8 below show the scores of t-test which was applied to find out if the participated school leaders' and teachers' expectations on teacher leadership roles differ significantly according to variable of branch

Table 7: Analysis of the participants' expectations on teacher leadership roles according to the variable of subject

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Subject taught</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Institutional development	Classroom teacher	76	36,71	5,35	1,148	,253
	Subject teacher	97	35,76	5,42		
Professional development	Classroom teacher	76	50,50	4,38	2,393	,018*
	Subject teacher	97	48,74	5,09		
Collaboration with colleagues	Classroom teacher	76	22,32	2,31	1,983	,049*
	Subject teacher	97	21,55	2,69		
Total	Classroom teacher	76	109,53	10,51	2,082	,039*
	Subject teacher	97	106,05	11,18		

Table 8: Analysis of the participants' perceptions on teacher leadership roles according to the variable of subject

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Subject taught</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Institutional development	Classroom teacher	76	31,12	6,23	1,381	,169
	Subject teacher	97	29,87	5,67		
Professional development	Classroom teacher	76	43,21	8,00	,124	,901
	Subject teacher	97	43,07	6,66		
Collaboration with colleagues	Classroom teacher	76	18,66	3,52	,368	,714
	Subject teacher	97	18,46	3,38		
Total	Classroom teacher	76	92,99	16,10	,712	,477
	Subject teacher	97	91,40	13,16		

When the findings in Table 7 were examined, it is seen that participants' expectations on teacher leadership roles in institutional development dimension do not have any significant difference according to the variable of branch. On the other hand, there is a significant difference in professional development and collaboration dimensions of teacher leadership roles in favor of classroom teachers which infer classroom teachers have higher expectations on teacher leadership roles in professional development and in collaboration dimensions than subject teachers.

When the values in Table 8 are considered, participants' perceptions on teacher leadership roles in institutional development, professional development and collaboration dimensions according to the variable of branch, subject teachers and classroom teachers do not reflect any significant difference.

2. d and e. One-way ANOVA test was applied in order to find out if there is a significant difference in participants' expectations and perceptions on teacher leadership roles according to the variable of school graduated and years of experience. When findings examined, there are no significant differences in the participants' views according to the sub-dimensions of the scale.

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The following conclusions were drawn from the research findings and they were discussed by comparing the conclusions of the researches in the field.

1. Participants usually had high expectations and perceptions on teacher leadership roles (a. institutional, b. professional, c. collaboration). However, their level of expectations was higher than their level of perceptions. Katzenmeyer and Moller (2001) emphasized that if school leaders believe and give more importance to teacher leadership, teachers can be awakened to show more teacher leadership roles. Conclusions of various researches show both some similarities to and differences from this study's conclusions. Grant, Gardner, Kajee, Moodley and Somaroo's (2010) research's conclusion is parallel to this research's. Their conclusion is that teachers' level of expectations is higher than their level of perceptions on teacher leadership. Chirume's (2008), Akert's (2009) and Boyd's (2011) research conclusions showed that the administrators' level of perceptions on teacher leadership is higher than the level of their expectations. Muijs and Haris (2006) claimed that a high level of institutional development promotes teacher leadership roles of teachers and administrators. Teacher leadership in professional dimension can be developed if teachers involve in teacher development activities and programmes. They added that collaboration brings professional development, and professional development brings institutional development. According to Kenyon (2008), Katzenmeyer and Moller (2001) teachers' professional development is found as an important value. Teachers demanded that they should be provided with formal opportunities for professional development to perform more teacher leadership roles.

2. The following conclusions have been gained from primary schools teachers' and administrators' expectations and perceptions on teachers' leadership roles in terms of the individual variables of: type of position, gender, branch, and school graduated, and experience.

a. Participants' expectations and perceptions on teacher leadership roles according to the variable of position except for collaboration, in institutional development and professional development dimensions differed against teachers and in favor of administrators. Teachers were seen to have lower expectations and perceptions. Angelle and DeHart (2011) found that the administrators' have stronger viewpoints on teacher leadership than teachers'. Bartfield's (2011) research conclusion is that the level of

administrators' perceptions is higher than teachers' level of expectations on teacher leadership. Estes's (2009) research put forth no relationship among teacher leadership behaviors, institutional development and teacher professional development according to school administrator's perceptions on teacher leadership. In Chirume's (2008) and Burke's (2009) research, administrators and teachers collaboration level was found to be the highest level.

b. It was seen that there were no differences in participants' expectations on teacher leadership roles according to the variable of gender in institutional development, professional development and collaboration with colleagues dimensions. Participants' perceptions on teacher leadership roles according to the variable of gender differed significantly only in professional development dimension in favor of male participants. Chirume's (2008) and Grant and others' (2010) survey research conclusion pointed no differences in regard to variety of gender on teacher leadership.

c. It was seen that there was a significant difference in participants' expectations on teacher leadership roles in favor of classroom teachers according to the variable of branch in professional development and collaboration dimensions. It was seen that participants' perceptions on teacher leadership roles according to the variable of branch did not differ at all in any of the dimensions. Angelle and DeHart (2011) searched if elementary, middle and high school teachers' collaboration makes differences. Their research conclusion showed that elementary school class teachers have higher collaboration level than high school subject teachers. According to Johnson and Birkeland (2003) veteran-oriented professional development provides more development and encouragement on teacher leadership. If novice teacher gets professional guidance and support, they gain more job satisfaction and professional development.

d. The study showed no significant difference either in the expectations or in the perceptions of the participants on teacher leadership roles according to the variable of school graduated. Grant and others' (2010) research's conclusion is parallel to this research's conclusion. They found no significant difference in the variable of school graduated. Angelle and DeHart (2011) research conclusion showed no differences between administrators and teachers according to the variable of school graduated. However, having a master or doctorate degree brought lower level of teacher leadership, especially in the dimension of collaboration. Triska (2007) asserted that a high level of collaboration in schools is an indicator of overall school leadership. Harris and Lambert (2003) said that collaboration is at the heart of teacher leadership, as it is premised on change that is undertaken collectively.

e. The study showed no significant difference either in the expectations or in the perceptions of the participants on teacher leadership roles according to the variable of experience. Sides's (2010) research's result is similar to this research's. Years of

teaching experience isn't an accurate predictor of level of teacher leadership. But, Johnson and Birkeland (2003) identified that novice teachers need veteran-oriented teacher leadership.

The following suggestions could be made according to the results of the research.

1. In general, participants in the sampling of this study had high level of expectations and perceptions on teacher leadership. Thus, it would be better to carry out some works and studies to support and promote teacher leadership at schools. Some courses and projects could be held both for teachers and administrators with their co-participation or separately for teachers and administrators.

2. One of the noteworthy results of the study is that teachers have lower levels of expectations and perceptions on teacher leadership than administrators. Unlike the administrators, teachers have recessive attitudes towards their own leadership roles. Therefore, administrators should give teachers more time, confidence and support them motivationally to improve their leadership skills and give them responsibilities and opportunities that require more leadership practices and skills.

3. As this study revealed that the female participants have lower level of perceptions on teacher leadership roles in professional development dimension than male participants, school administration should provide female teachers for required conditions and encourage them to improve professionally at least to the level of male teachers.

4. Because the participants' expectations on teacher leadership roles in the professional development and the collaboration dimensions according to variable of branch differed significantly in favor of the class teachers, subject teachers should also be made to develop professionally as much as class teachers. In order to this, there should be more educational activities enabling professional development of subject teachers. Also, more opportunities for them to take part in school related works should be created. To promote collaboration among subject teachers, more emphasis should be given in subject group teachers' co-operation as in secondary schools.

5. In the framework of this study, the finding that neither the participants' expectations nor their perceptions on teacher leadership roles differed significantly according to school graduated and experience that this factor is not efficient in teacher leadership. It might have been a result of school culture, climate or organizational development. Teachers should receive in-service trainings on teacher leadership combined with trainings on school culture, school improvement and school climate.

6. Future research should be repeated in different cities, in different levels of schools by adding observation and interview techniques.

REFERENCES

Akert, N. (2009). *The Perceptions of Teachers And Principals In Regard To Teacher Leadership And School Improvements*. Phd. Thesis. University of Missouri, Colombia.

- Angelle, P. S., Nixon, T.J., Norton, E.M., Niles.C.A. (2011). *Increasing organizational effectiveness: An examination of teacher leadership, collective efficacy, and trust in schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, 19 Nov. 2011.
- Angelle, P. S., DeHart, C.A.(2011). Teacher Perceptions of Teacher Leadership: Examining Differences by Experience, Degree and Position. *Nass Bulletin* 95 (2), 141-160.
- Apaydın, Ç., Vilkinas, T., Carton, G. (2011). Türkiye’de ortaöğretim okul öğretmenlerinin etkili liderlik belirleyicileri. *Ankara Üniversitesi. Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 44(1), 107-129.
- Bartfield, C.S.H. (2011) *The Perceptions of Teachers And Principals In Regard To Teacher Leadership And School Improvement*. Phd. Thesis. Louisiana Tech University, U.S.A.
- Beauchum, F; Dentith, A.M. (2004): *Teacher Leaders Creating Cultures of School Renewal and Transformation*, The Educational Forum, 68:3, 276-286, Routledge. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131720408984639> [Accessed December 01, 2011].
- Beycioğlu, K. (2009). *İlköğretim okullarında öğretmenlerin sergiledikleri liderlik rollerine ilişkin bir değerlendirme*. Doktora Tezi. İnönü Üniversitesi. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Malatya.
- Beycioğlu, K. ve Aslan. (2010). B. Teacher leadership scale: A validity and reliability study. *İlkoğretim Online*, 9 (2), 764-775.
- Blase, J. & Blase, J. (2004). *Handbook of instructional leadership* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Boyd, K.A.(2011). *High school principals’ perceptions on teacher leadership*. Phd. Thesis. California State University.
- Burke, K.A.(2009). *The Principals’ Role In Supporting Teacher Leadership and Building Capacity: Teacher and Administrator Perspectives*. Phd. Thesis. San Diego State University, California, U.S.A
- Can, N. (2006a). Öğretmen liderliği ve engelleri. *Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2006(2), 137-161.
- Can, N. (2006b). Öğretmen liderliğinin geliştirilmesinde müdürün rol ve stratejileri. *Erciyes Üniversitesi. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 21(2), 349-363.
- Can, N. (2007). Öğretmen liderliği becerileri ve bu becerilerin gerçekleştirilme düzeyi. *Erciyes Üniversitesi. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 22 (1), 263-288.
- Can, N. (2009). *Öğretmen liderliği* (Teacher leadership). Ankara: Pegem.
- Chirume, E. (2008) *A Study of Educational Leadership. The Principals’ And Teachers’ Perceptions On Teacher Leadership Dynamics In Southeast Ohio*. Phd Thesis. The College Education of Ohio University, U.S.A.
- Çeküç, S. (2008). *Lider öğretmen yeterliliklerinin incelenmesi üzerine empirik bir araştırma*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Marmara Üniversitesi. Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Day, C. and Harris, A. (2003) Teacher leadership, reflective practice and school improvement in Leithwood K & Hallinger P (eds) *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Estes, K.R.(2009). *An Analysis of The Relationship Between High School Principals’ Perception of Teacher Leadership*. Phd. Thesis. Tarleton State University, Texas, U.S.A.
- Frost, D. and Durrant J. (2003). Teacher leadership: Rationale, strategy and impact. *School Leadership and Management*. 23(2), 173-186.
- Grant, C., Gardner, K. , Kajee, F., Moodley, R., Somaroo. S. (2010). Teacher Leadership: A Survey Analysis is of KwaZulu-Natal Teachers’ Perceptions. *South African Journal of Education*. 30, 401-419.

- Greenlee, B. J. (2007). Building Teacher leadership capacity through educational leadership programs. *Journal of Research for Educational Leaders*, 4 (1), 44-74.
- Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new Architecture for Leadership. *Educational Management & Administration* 28(3), 317-338.
- Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership as distributed leadership: Heresy, fantasy or possibility, *School Leadership & Management*, 23(3), 313-324.
- Harris, A. and Lambert, L.(2003).*Building Leadership Capacity for School Improvement*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Johnson, S.M and Birkeland, S.E. (2003). Pursuing a "Sense of Success": New Teachers Explain Their Career Decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*. 40 (3), 581-617.
- Katzenmeyer, M. and Moller, G. (2001) *Awakening the sleeping giant: Helping teachers develop as leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Kenyon, C.L. (2008). *Reframed Teacher Leadership: ANarrative Inquiry*. Phd. Thesis. University of Northern Iowa, U.S.A.
- Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (2005). Teachers as leaders. *The Educational Forum*, 69, 151-159.
- Muijs,D. and Harris.A. (2006). Teacher led school improvement: Teacher leadership in the U.K. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 2, 961-972.
- Ngang, T.K., Abdulla, Z., Mey, S.Z. (2010). Maldivler temel eğitim okullarında öğretmen liderliği ve okul etkililiği. (Teacher leadership and school effectiveness in the primary schools of maldives). *Hacettepe University. Journal of Education*,39, 255-270.
- Reyhan, G. (2010). *Cumhuriyetten günümüze öğretmen liderliğine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi.Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Tokat.
- Rutledge,L. (2009). *Teacher leadership and school improvement: A case of Teachers Participating in the Teacher Leadership Network with Regional education Service Center*, Phd Thesis, Texas State University, U.S.A.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sides, L. R. (2010). *Teacher Leadership: What Are Teachers Currently Practising And What To They Want To Practice?* Phd.Thesis. The Faculty of Lehigh University, Pnnsylvania, U.S.A..
- Silins, H. & Mulford, B. (2004). Schools as learning organizations – effects on teacher leadership and student outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 15(3-4), 443-466.
- Silva, D. Y., Gimbert, B and Nolan, J. (2000) 'Sliding The Doors: Locking and Unlocking Possibilities for Teacher-Leadership', *Teachers College Record* 102(4): 779-804.
- Smylie, M.A. & Denny, J.W. (1990). Teacher leadership: Tensions and ambiguities in organizational perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(3), 235-259.
- Triska, J.W. (2007). *Measuring Teacher Leadership*. MA Thesis. The Faculty of Humboldt State University.
- Wasley, P. A. (1991). *Teachers who lead: The rhetoric of reform and the realities of practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Şişman, M. (2011a). *Öğretim liderliği* Ankara:PegemA.
- Şişman, M. (2011b). *Eğitimde mükemmellik arayışı* Ankara:PegemA.
- Şişman ve Diğerleri, (2011). *Türkiye ulusal TIMSS 2007 raporu*, MEB.