

## Cultural Adaptation of Headmasters' Transformational Leadership Scale and a Study on Teachers' Perceptions

Aydın BALYER\*

Kenan ÖZCAN\*\*

Suggested Citation:

Balyer, A. & Özcan, K. (2012). Cultural adaptation of headmasters' transformational leadership scale and a study on teachers' perceptions. *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*. 49, 103-128.

### Abstract

*Problem Statement:* Transformational leadership increases organization members' commitment and engagement in meeting organizational goals and it enhances skills and capacities. Many studies reveal that transformational leadership behaviors, such as idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, innovative climate, and intellectual stimulation, are positively related to better performance and increased job satisfaction. It is considered that since managers of the future will be transformational leaders, they should be trained as transformational leaders.

*Purpose of the Study:* The main purpose of this study is to introduce usability of the Cross-Cultural Adaptation of Headmasters' Transformational Leadership Scale. It also purposes to discover headmasters' behaviors based on teachers' perceptions.

*Methods:* In this study, a descriptive statistical model was employed, and 822 teachers participated in the Malatya (n=442) and Adıyaman (n=380) provinces. The sample of this study was chosen by a purposive sampling method. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was employed to obtain evidence related to construct validity of the scale, and it administered on 330 primary schools teachers in Mardin. For Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), it was administered to 390 teachers in Adıyaman, Turkey.

*Findings and Results:* After EFA and CFA processes, it was proven that this scale is valid and usable for the Turkish context. As a result of the

\* Corresponding Author: Dr. YTU School of Foreign Languages, [balyer2001@gmail.com](mailto:balyer2001@gmail.com)

\*\* Dr. Adıyaman University, College of Education, [kozcan04@hotmail.com](mailto:kozcan04@hotmail.com)

reliability and validity processes, the adapted form of the scale was composed of 23 items. Item sub-factor correlation was between 0.78 and 0.90, and item total correlation was between 0.61 and 0.80. Cronbach value was found to be 0.96. Other values found were 0.87 for vision building; 0.88 for individual consideration; 0.92 for intellectual consideration; and 0.91 for the innovative climate sub-dimension. As a result, it was discovered that 61.22% of the teachers remarked that their headmasters provided participation for vision building; 72.02% stated that their individual consideration were valued; and 65.07% claimed that their individual stimulation was supported. Finally, 80% asserted that they were encouraged for an innovative climate in their organizations.

*Conclusion and Recommendations:* Results reveal that teachers' perceptions about their headmasters' transformational leadership behaviors are positive in vision building, individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, and innovative climate. They perceive their headmasters' leadership qualities and communicative skills positively. It is recommended that headmasters who are incompetent should be trained carefully through in-service programs.

*Keywords:* Teachers' perceptions, transformational leadership, transformational leaders, headmasters.

## Introduction

The competition in the 21st century's global economy will be more complex and challenging (Ireland & Hitt, 2005; Chew & Chan, 2008), so leaders are expected to cope with this changing world of work, diverse communities, and parents (Lewis, Goodman, & Fandt, 1998). According to Fullan (2001), the more complex society gets, the more sophisticated leadership becomes; therefore, leaders must be effective, adaptable, dynamic, team-oriented, strong communicators, problem solvers, and transformational to thrive in these complex environments (Du Plessis, Conley, & Hlongwane, 2006; Yukl, 2005).

### Theoretical Framework

As an approach that originated in the military, transformational leadership increases organization members' commitment and engagement in meeting organizational goals and developing leadership potentials (Popper, Mayselless, & Castelnovo, 2000; Heck & Hallinger, 1999; Bass, 1998). It also enhances skills and capacities (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Marks & Printy, 2003; Northouse, 2001; Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999; Gronn, 1995; Evers & Lakomski, 1996).

Research on transformational leadership in educational settings was initiated in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Leithwood, 1994). McFarlin and Sweeney (1998) assert that successful managers in the future will be transformational leaders, and they

suggest that managers should be trained as such. It has been evaluated that this approach can help managers become exceptional leaders, and they can group together rather than perform tasks as individuals (Hallinger, 2003; Hall, Johnson, Wysocki, & Kepner, 2008).

According to Muenjohn and Anderson (2007) transformational leadership is flexible and can allow leaders to adapt their behaviors to meet the requirements of their subordinates. Transformational leaders build visions for schools and establish school goals (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000; Castanheira & Costa, 2011; Leithwood, 1992), provide intellectual stimulation. They also offer individualized support by modeling the best practices in organizational values (Silins, Mulford & Zarins, 2002), demonstrate high performance expectations, create a productive school culture and **provide participation in decisions at school, sharpen their subordinates' skills, and enhance others' knowledge** (Bennis & Nanus, 1997; Kreitner & Kinicki, 1998).

Transformational leadership has certain components. First, it has *idealized influence which is defined as both the leader's behavior and the followers' attributions* about the leader. Here, idealized leaders consider the needs of others before their own personal needs, avoid the use of power for personal gain, demonstrate high moral standards, and set challenging goals for others (Walumbwa & Lawler, 2003). Second is the *individualized consideration* that represents a **leader's consistent effort to treat each individual as a special person and be a mentor to develop his or her followers' potential**. Third is *intellectual stimulation*, which **means a leader's effort to stimulate followers to be innovative and creative, as well as reframe problems and approach them in new ways**. Another is *inspirational motivation*, which refers to the ways leaders motivate and inspire others around them by displaying enthusiasm, communicating high expectations, and demonstrating commitment to the shared goals (Geijsel, Slegers, Leithwood, & Jantzi, 2003; Nguni, Slegers, & Denessen, 2006; Yu, Leithwood, & Jantzi, 2002; Geijsel et al., 2003; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Leithwood, Steinbach, & Jantzi, 2002; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004). The last component is *innovative climate* defined as the shared perceptions of organization members concerning the practices, procedures, and behaviors that promote the generation of new knowledge and practices (Moolenaar, Daly & Slegers, 2010; Cho & Dansereau, 2010). Transformational leaders can help subordinates to achieve their objectives by creating a climate that emphasizes goal clarity and change, while alleviating ambiguity (Bass & Avolio, 1994-1997; Jung & Avolio, 2000; Yammarino, Spangler & Bass, 1993; Geijsel et al., 2009; Day et al., 2000; Geijsel et al., 2001; Leithwood et al., 2008; Nemanich & Keller, 2007; Ross & Gray, 2006).

Many studies reveal that idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation behaviors are positively related to better performance and increased job satisfaction (Anderson, 2008; Bass, 1997; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bommer, Rubin & Baldwin, 2004). Therefore, this study **aims to discover teachers' perceptions on their headmasters' transformational leadership behaviors concerning vision building, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and innovative climate**. Moreover, by determining

headmasters' transformational leadership behaviors, which are vital in any educational system, this study also aims to develop some practical recommendations supported by other studies. It seeks to make the system operate better by increasing awareness for all stakeholders.

### Method

The main purpose of this descriptive study is twofold. One aspect is to introduce whether the **Cross-Cultural Adaptation of Headmasters' Transformational Leadership Scale** developed by Moolenaar et al., (2010) can be used in the Turkish culture. The other aim is to discover the teachers' perceptions on headmasters' transformational leadership behaviors concerning the variables of gender, status, school experience, level that they are currently teaching, and professional experience.

#### *Sample*

The sample of this study was chosen by the purposive sampling method, which targets a particular group of people (Bailey, 1994). Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was employed to obtain evidence related to determining the validity of the scale. Therefore, it was administered to 330 primary schools teachers in Mardin, Turkey. Of these, 310 survey forms were returned and analyzed. For Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), it was administered to 390 teachers in **Adiyaman, Turkey**. After EFA and CFA, it was proven that this scale is valid and usable for the Turkish context. Finally, it was applied to 822 teachers in the provinces of Malatya (n=442) and **Adiyaman (n=380)** to discover teachers' perceptions on their headmasters' transformational leadership behaviours concerning vision building, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and innovative climate.

#### *Adaptation Work*

In the translation process of the original scale, the back translation technique was used. It is preferred despite being time consuming and expensive. In this process, a questionnaire is translated into the target language by one translator and then translated back into the source language by another independent translator who does not see the original one. The two-source-language versions are then compared (Sperber, 2004; Looman & Farrag, 2009).

In the translation process of this scale, a linguist translated it into Turkish, and then another academic translated it into English again. Two researchers and a linguist completed the translation process through group work. It was proofread by 15 teachers to find if all participants understood the questions equally. The original scale is used to measure **Headmasters' Transformational Leadership Behaviors** based on four theoretical dimensions, which are vision building, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and innovative climate (Daft & Becker, 1978; Damanpour & Evan, 1984; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995).

### Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

EFA was employed to discover the appropriateness of the scale for the Turkish culture. The factor conformity of EFA results was verified with CFA. For EFA analysis, the SPSS 15.0 program was used, and for CFA, Lisrel 8.80 was used. EFA is a complex, multi-step process and a widely utilized statistical technique in social sciences (Costello & Osborne, 2005). It is an approach for expressing the language of mathematical hypothetical constructs by using a variety of directly measurable and observable indicators. In an EFA process, the empirical data is explored to detect characteristic features and interesting relationships without imposing any definite model on the data (Jörreskog & Sörbom, 1993). Here, before using the EFA process, the sampling size was checked for compatibility with factoring that plays an important role in the application of almost all statistical methods to estimate the right parameters (Raykov & Marcoulides, 2000).

For EFA and CFA analysis, two independent sampling groups were taken consecutively (Group I: 310- Group II: 390). It has been stated that acceptable sampling size for CFA is 4:1 or 5:1 for each item (Floyd & Widaman, 1995). Gorsuch (1983) recommended that sample size should be at least 100, and Kline (1979) supports this recommendation. Guilford (1954) argued that sample size should be at least 200, and Cattell (1978) claimed the minimum desirable sample size is to be 250. Comrey and Lee (1992) offered a rough rating scale for adequate sample sizes in factor analysis: 100=poor, 200=fair, 300=good, 500=very good, and 1,000 or more=excellent. They urged researchers to obtain samples of 500 or more observations whenever possible in factor analytic studies (MacCallum & Widaman, 1999). For CFA, minimum sampling size is suggested as 250 people (Hoyle, 1995). However, for robust maximum likelihood, estimation needs relatively large sample sizes of at least  $N \geq 400$  (Schermele-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller, 2003). In this study, the sampling size rate for EFA was 13:1 and for CFA was 17:1 for each item.

In order to test the data collecting structure for EFA considering sampling size, another criterion is Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Test (KMO) results. The KMO results are accepted for values greater than 0.50. Furthermore, values between 0.50 and 0.70 are mediocre, 0.70 and 0.80 are good, 0.80 and 0.90 are great, and over 0.90 are superb (Hutcheson & Sofroniou, 1999). For these data, the values are about 0.95 for EFA and 0.96 for CFA, which falls into the range of being great.

**Bartlett's** spherical test (1954) is a notoriously sensitive test of the hypothesis that the correlations in a correlation matrix are zero. The test is available in SPSS factor, but because of its sensitivity and dependence on sampling size, it is likely to be significant with samples of substantial size even if correlations are very low. Therefore, use of the test is recommended only if there are fewer than, for example, **five cases per variable** (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). For these data, **Bartlett's tests** are highly significant for EFA ( $X^2_{(253)} = 5265.18; p < .01$ ) and CFA ( $X^2_{(253)} = 6597.63; p < .01$ ).

For factor design of the scale, principal component analysis and factor rotation maximum varimax was chosen for orthogonal rotation. In applied social science research, orthogonal rotation is used most often (Brown, 2006). As a result of the

analysis, it was discovered that 5 components had over 1 real value for 24 items (as in the original study). Factor load was accepted as 0.50 for all items. The magnitude of the factor loading must be at least 0.30 (Barnes et al., 2001). As a rule of thumb, only variables with loadings of 0.32 and above are interpreted. The greater the loading, the more the variable is a pure measure of the factor. Comrey and Lee (1992) suggest that loadings in excess of 0.71 (50% overlapping variance) are considered excellent, 0.63 (40% overlapping variance) are very good, 0.55 (30% overlapping variance) are good, 0.45 (20% overlapping variance) are fair, and 0.32 (10% overlapping variance) are poor. It is the researcher's preference to choose the cutoff size of loading to interpret. Sometimes there is a gap in loadings across the factors, and if the cutoff is in the gap, it is easy to specify which variables load and which do not. Other times, the cutoff is selected because one can interpret factors with that particular cutoff but not with a lower cutoff (Comrey & Lee, 1992; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). According to item-overlapping and accepted load values, since the difference of load values of one item is higher than 0.1 (item 12), it was taken out of the scale. Finally, the findings of factor design, factor load values, joint factor variances, and item analysis are given in Table 1.

Table 1

*The Factor Design of Headmasters' Transformational Leadership Behaviors Scale and Vertical Rotation-Varimax for Exploratory Factor Analysis*

Items	Factor Design and Item Loads				Item Analysis								Sum Scale Total $\alpha = .96$	
					Correlation		Item Discrimination		Feature		Reliability ( $\alpha$ )			
					Item-factor	Item-total	Lower %27 (n=83)	Upper %27 (n= 83)	t**	Items				
	F1	F2	F3	F4	Common Factor Variance (h <sup>2</sup> )	r**	r**	X	S D	X	SD			
Q1	.69	.32	.27	.16	.67	.83	.71	2.61	.84	4.34	.79	-13.66	.70	
Q2	.81	.18	.20	.11	.73	.83	.64	2.81	.80	4.10	.76	-10.30	.73	
Q3	.74	.22	.19	.22	.69	.82	.67	2.94	.82	4.25	.64	-11.52	.71	.87
Q4	.70	.15	.30	.26	.66	.80	.69	2.93	.71	4.34	.59	-13.89	.69	
Q5	.58	.29	.35	.25	.61	.78	.73	2.94	.76	4.39	.51	-14.43	.66	
Q6	.35	.72	.16	.26	.74	.86	.72	3.20	.75	4.59	.56	-13.51	.76	
Q7	.37	.63	.18	.30	.65	.81	.71	3.24	.64	4.60	.52	-15.14	.69	.88
Q8	.23	.79	.22	.16	.74	.84	.68	3.42	.72	4.55	.55	-11.44	.76	

Table 1-Continued

Q9	.12	.75	.28	.20	.70	.82	.67	3.37	.85	4.61	.60	-10.85	.71	
Q10	.18	.69	.38	.16	.67	.80	.70	3.14	.80	4.47	.53	-12.63	.69	
Q11	.23	.37	.63	.24	.64	.79	.75	3.12	.77	4.57	.57	-13.76	.71	
Q13	.28	.17	.71	.28	.69	.82	.74	2.98	.73	4.39	.56	-13.94	.75	
Q14	.22	.22	.83	.24	.85	.90	.78	3.02	.68	4.48	.55	-15.19	.86	
Q15	.26	.30	.67	.26	.68	.83	.76	3.06	.65	4.54	.59	-15.37	.76	.92
Q16	.26	.24	.69	.31	.70	.83	.79	3.01	.65	4.48	.53	-15.96	.76	
Q17	.24	.18	.65	.39	.66	.81	.75	2.82	.61	4.28	.61	-15.41	.74	
Q18	.29	.32	.57	.30	.60	.79	.75	3.05	.70	4.58	.57	-15.53	.71	
Q19	.11	.28	.38	.68	.71	.84	.73	3.12	.67	4.46	.57	-13.86	.76	
Q20	.23	.28	.40	.69	.77	.88	.80	3.07	.60	4.58	.50	-17.61	.83	
Q21	.28	.29	.32	.64	.67	.83	.76	3.06	.65	4.58	.52	-16.60	.74	.91
Q22	.15	.00	.15	.85	.77	.80	.61	2.96	.71	4.22	.68	-11.63	.70	
Q23	.22	.24	.36	.66	.67	.82	.74	2.96	.61	4.33	.54	-15.13	.74	
Q24	.32	.28	.33	.61	.66	.82	.76	3.01	.67	4.57	.50	-16.93	.73	



As a result of the analysis presented in Table 1, theoretically defined items were collected below their own factors. The Cronbach alpha values are between 0.58 and 0.81 for vision building, 0.63 and 0.79 for individual consideration, 0.57 and 0.83 for intellectual stimulation and 0.61 and 0.85 for innovative climate. There is a relationship between sampling size and factor loads. Guadagnoli and Velicer (1988) challenged such rules and argued that no sound theoretical or empirical basis exists for across-the-board participant-to-variable ratio recommendations. Most notably, with factor loadings of 0.80, solutions were highly stable across replicated samples regardless of the number of indicators, even with as few as 50 participants. When factor loadings were in the 0.60 range, stable solutions were obtained with sample sizes greater than 150, or with still smaller samples when each component contained at least four variables loading at 0.60. In general, larger samples of 300-400 were needed when the factor loadings were only 0.40 (Floyd & Widaman, 1995).

As a result of the reliability and validity process, the adapted form of the scale was composed of 23 items (*vision building: 5, individual consideration: 5, intellectual consideration: 7, and creating innovative climate: 6*). The lowest score that mean negative behaviors can be is 23, and the highest is 115. In order to verify the usability of the scale in Turkey, item total correlation, discriminant analysis, and item internal consistency were analyzed. As presented in Table 1, item sub-factor correlation is between 0.78 and 0.90, and item total correlation is between 0.61 and 0.80. The Cronbach value was found to 0.96. The correlation was found to be 0.87 for vision building; 0.88 for individual consideration; 0.92 for intellectual consideration; and 0.91 for innovative climate sub-dimension. Generally, reliability coefficients around 0.90 are considered "excellent," values around 0.80 "very good," and values around 0.70 "adequate" (Kline, 2011, p.70). Findings on correlation of sub-dimensions of the scale are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

*Correlation of Sub-dimensions of Headmasters' Transformational Leadership Behaviors*

<i>Sub Scales</i>	<i>Vision Building</i>	<i>Individualized Consideration</i>	<i>Intellectual Stimulation</i>	<i>Innovative Climate</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Vision Building</i>	1	.66	.70	.64	.85
<i>Individualized Consideration</i>		1	.70	.65	.84
<i>Intellectual Stimulation</i>			1	.78	.92
<i>Innovative Climate</i>				1	.88
<i>Eigenvalues</i>	12.13	1.53	1.23	1.05	15.94
<i>% of Variance Explained</i>	52.75	6.67	5.35	4.55	69.31

\*\* p<.01

In Table 2, the correlation of sub-dimensions of the scale is shown to be between 0.64 and 0.78, and factor total correlation is between 0.84 and 0.92. In applied research, for factor determination, total correlation among factors being between or equal to 0.85 or less is desired (Brown, 2006). As a result of this analysis, for the 23

items that remained in the certain criteria, the structure was composed of four determined dimensions with the value over 1 representing 69.31% of total variances. In social science, the variance rates changing in the range of 4% and 60 % are accepted as sufficient (Scherer et al., 1988); an explained variance of 60% and sometimes less is acceptable (Vieira, 2011). Real factor values and variant quantity that explain them respectively are 12.13 and 52.75% for the first factor, 1.53 and 6.67% for the second, 1.23 and 5.33% for the third and 1.05 and 4.55% for the fourth.

#### *Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)*

CFA is not concerned with discovering a factor structure, but it is evaluated as confirming the existence of a specific factor structure. It is considered to be a general modeling approach designed to test hypotheses about a factor structure whose number and interpretation are given in advance. In CFA, on the other hand, one builds a model assumed to describe, explain, or account for the empirical data in terms of relatively few parameters (Jörreskog & Sörbom, 1993) and to analyze a priori measurement models (Kline, 2011).

The 23-item adapted scale was tested with CFA. The overall model fit the statistics in Lisrel that are within the generally accepted thresholds and suggest an acceptable goodness-of-fit. In fact, although the chi-square test is significant ( $\chi^2=604.00$ ,  $N=390$ ,  $p=0.00$ ), the ratio chi-square/degrees of freedom is below 3 ( $\chi^2=506.93$ ,  $df=224$ ,  $\chi^2/df =2.3$ ). Normally a ratio in the range of 2:1 or 3:1 is indicative of an acceptable fit. In addition, the goodness of fit index (GFI=.90), the adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI=.85), the normed fit index (NFI=.98), the non-normed fit index (NNFI=.98), the comparative fit index (CFI=.98), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA=0.06) as well as the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR=.04) indicate good fit (Cote et al., 2001; Vieira, 2011; Hooper et al., 2008; Brown, 2006; Schreiber, Stage, King, Nora, & Barlow, 2006; Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003; MacCallum et al., 1996; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Baumgartner & Homburg, 1996). When the CFA results of the scale are evaluated, it can be accepted as a good model.

#### *Data Analysis*

In order to analyze the data percentage, frequency, crosstabs, t-test, and One-Way ANOVA tests were administered. In the analysis of quantitative data, SPSS was used. Each questionnaire was coded. Of the questionnaires administered, 822 were returned. A parametric Independent Samples Test and One-Way ANOVA Tests were used to determine the significance. Level of significance was accepted as  $p<.05$ .

## Results

This research was carried out to discover teachers' perceptions on their headmasters' transformational leadership behaviours in terms of vision building, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and innovative climate. First, demographic variances of the primary school teachers' were introduced. And then, headmasters' transformational leadership behaviors concerning aforementioned sub dimensions were also given here.

Table 3

*Percentage and Frequency Distributions of Teachers' Demographic Variances*

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Frequency (f)</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
<i>Gender</i>		
Women	402	48.9
Men	420	51.1
<i>Level of Teaching</i>		
Lower Elementary	343	41.7
Upper Elementary	479	58.2
<i>Status</i>		
Teacher	612	74.5
Expert Teacher	127	15.5
Novice Teacher	68	8.3
Contracted Teacher	15	1.8
<i>Professional Experience</i>		
1-5 years	400	48.7
6-10 years	144	17.5
11-15 years	135	16.4
16-20 years	66	8.0
21 years and over	77	9.4
<i>School Experience</i>		
1-3 years	483	58.8
4-6 years	160	19.5
7-9 years	106	12.9
10 years and over	73	8.9

The participants' demographic variables are shown in Table 3. Of them, 402 (48.9%) are male; 420 (51.1%) are female; 327 (39.8%) work at primary school first level, and 463 (56.35%) work at primary school second level. With respect to career status, 15 (1.8%) are contracted, 127 (15.5%) expert, 68 (8.3%) novice, and 612 (74.5%) teachers. Of them, 400 (48.7%) have 1-5 years professional experience, 144 (17.5%) of them have 6-10 years, 135 (16.4%) of them have 11-15 years, 66 (8.0%) of them have 16-20 years, and 77 (9.4%) of them have 21 years or more. When school experience is concerned, 483 (58.8%) of them have 1-3 years, 160 (19.5%) of them have 4-6 years, 106 (12.9%) them have 7-9 years, and 73 (8.9%) them 10 years or more.

After analyzing teachers' perceptions about their headmasters' communicative skills, motivation efforts, and leadership qualities, some results were obtained. According to the results, while 25.1% of them perceive their headmasters' communication skill as low, 34.1% perceive it as adequate, and 40.9% perceive it as very good. Of the teachers, 14.9% are motivated very little by their headmasters while 34.7% of them are motivated some, and 50.4% are motivated adequately. While 21.8% of the teachers perceive their headmasters' leadership qualities as low, 15.2% value them as good, and 63.0% think they are adequate. Percentage, mean, and standard deviation of teacher perceptions are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

*Percentage, Mean and Standard Deviation of Teacher Perceptions Related to Headmasters' Transformational Leadership Behaviors (N=822)*

Items Rank	The principal of my school,	Certainly Disagree and Disagree	Certainly Agree and Agree	Mean ( $\bar{X}$ )	SD
		%	%		
	<i>Vision Building</i>				
Q1	refers explicitly to our school's goals during decision-making processes	39.20	60.80	2.61	0.90
Q2	explains the relationship between the schools' vision and initiatives of the school district, collaborative projects, or the government	38.60	61.40	2.61	0.84
Q3	discusses the consequences of the school's vision for everyday practice	40.20	59.80	2.60	0.89
Q4	uses all possible moments to share the school's vision with the team, the students, parents, and others	36.90	63.10	2.67	0.89
Q5	incorporates the school's vision and goals for the future to talk about the current issues and problems facing the school	39.00	61.00	2.62	0.88
	<i>Mean</i>	38.78	61.22	2.62	0.88
	<i>Individualized Consideration</i>				
Q6	takes opinions of individual teachers seriously	28.50	71.50	2.90	0.87
Q7	listens carefully to team members' ideas and suggestions	28.90	71.10	2.87	0.86
Q8	is attentive to problems that teachers encounter when implementing innovations	26.80	73.20	2.88	0.86
Q9	shows appreciation when a teacher takes initiatives to improve the education	24.90	75.10	2.95	0.87

Q10	helps teachers talk about their feelings	30.80	69.20	2.83	0.87
	<i>Mean</i>	27.98	72.02	2.89	0.87
	<i>Intellectual Stimulation</i>				
Q11	encourages teachers to experiment with new didactic strategies	29.10	70.90	2.85	0.85
Q13	encourages teachers to try new strategies that match their personal interests	34.50	65.50	2.71	0.81
Q14	helps teachers to reflect on new experiences	34.90	65.10	2.71	0.87
Q15	motivates teachers to look for and discuss new information and <b>ideas that are relevant to the school's development</b>	32.40	67.60	2.74	0.87
Q16	stimulates teachers to constantly think about how to improve the school	40.40	59.60	2.63	0.89
Q17	<b>offers enough possibilities for teachers' professional development</b>	41.80	58.20	2.55	0.89
Q18	helps teachers talk about and explain their personal views on education	31.40	68.60	2.76	0.86
	<i>Mean</i>	34.93	65.07	2.71	0.86
	<i>Innovative Climate</i>				
Q19	teachers are generally willing to try new ideas	35.30	64.70	2.71	0.87
Q20	teachers are continuously learning and developing new ideas	33.20	66.80	2.77	0.88
Q21	<b>teachers have a positive "can-do" attitude</b>	31.60	68.40	2.79	0.85
Q22	teachers are willing to take risks to make this school better	41.30	58.70	2.58	0.87
Q23	teachers are constantly trying to improve their teaching	36.60	63.40	2.67	0.86
Q24	teachers are encouraged to go as far as they can	33.20	66.80	2.76	0.88
	<i>Mean</i>	35.20	64.80	2.71	0.87
Total Mean		34.33	65.67	2.73	0.87

In Table 4, the structure is given as negative (Certainly Disagree) to positive (Certainly agree) under each sub-scale. Although 61.22% of the teachers think their headmasters build vision by making teachers involved, counseling parents, and making efforts for shared vision by all partners, 38.78% of them disagree. Leithwood et al., (1999) and Rafferty and Griffin (2004) discovered similar results **stating that this leadership has direct and indirect effects on teachers' commitment** to change, vision building, high performance expectations, developing consensus about group goals, and intellectual stimulation (Geijsel et al., 2009; Leithwood et al., 2004).

Of the teachers, while 72.02% believe that their headmasters value their individualized considerations, take their ideas seriously, listen to them, and appreciate their efforts to increase quality, 27.98% of them disagree. However, Vinger and Cilliers (2006) claimed that the most frequently exhibited behavior was idealized influence, (60.1%), then inspirational motivation (58.5%), followed by intellectual stimulation (54.9%), and lastly individualized consideration (46.0%).

As for intellectual stimulation, although 65.07% of them believe that their headmasters encourage new teaching methods, contribute personal and professional developments, let them try new strategies, and support their new experiences related to motivation, 34.93% of them disagree. Similar evidence was discovered by Leithwood et al., (1999), Rafferty and Griffin (2004), Bass and Avolio (1997), Jung and Avolio (2000), Yammarino et al., (1993), Geijsel et al., (2009), and Karip (1998).

Considering the creation of an innovative climate, although 64.80% of them **perceive their headmasters' behaviors as positive in teaching, developing new ideas,** and risk taking to improve school, 35.20% of them disagree. This is also consistent with the results obtained by Moolenaar et al., (2010), Day et al., (2000), Geijsel et al., (2001), and Leithwood et al., (2008). These findings are also supported by a study that **Kurşunoğlu and Tanrıöven (2007)**. They found that school principals have significant effects on change initiations at school.

T-test results reveal that there are significant differences between teachers' gender and administrators' vision building ( $t_{(820)} = -2.73$ ,  $p < .05$ ), individual consideration ( $t_{(820)} = -2.72$ ,  $p < .05$ ), supporting intellectual considerations ( $t_{(820)} = -3.50$ ,  $p < .05$ ), and innovative climate behaviours ( $t_{(820)} = -3.26$ ,  $p < .05$ ). No significant difference was discovered between the levels that teachers teach and headmasters' behaviours ( $p < .05$ ).

When teachers' experience is concerned with vision building, male teachers think more positively ( $\bar{X} = 18.21$ ) than their female colleagues ( $\bar{X} = 17.42$ ). In individual consideration, male teachers ( $\bar{X} = 19.58$ ) have higher scores than females ( $\bar{X} = 18.81$ ). As for intellectual considerations, male teachers ( $\bar{X} = 26.22$ ) have more positive perceptions in terms of headmasters' support than female ones ( $\bar{X} = 25.06$ ), and in innovative climate, males have more positive perceptions ( $\bar{X} = 22.72$ ) than females ( $\bar{X} = 21.50$ ). As far as headmasters' individual consideration behaviors are concerned, the mean average of the teachers who have between 7-9 years experience

at the same school ( $\bar{X}$  =19.98) is higher than those with 4-6 years experience ( $\bar{X}$  =18.79). In addition, teachers who have experience between 1-3 years ( $\bar{X}$  =18.87) have higher means compared to those with 10 or more years of experience ( $\bar{X}$  =18.60).

When supporting teachers' intellectual consideration is considered, the mean average of the teachers who work at the same school between 4-6 years ( $\bar{X}$  =27.27) is higher compared to those between 7-9 years ( $\bar{X}$  =26.72). Moreover, average mean of those between 1-3 years ( $\bar{X}$  =24.98) is higher than those for 10 years or more ( $\bar{X}$  =24.94). As for creating an innovative climate, the average mean of the teachers who work at the same school between 4-6 years ( $\bar{X}$  =23.40) is higher than those between 7-9 years ( $\bar{X}$  =23.03); and those between 1-3 years ( $\bar{X}$  =21.81) is higher than those for 10 years or more ( $\bar{X}$  =21.04).

One-way ANOVA was administered in order to determine the difference between teachers' school experience and headmasters' behaviours concerning vision building ( $F_{(3-818)}=6.92$ ,  $p<.01$ ), individual consideration, ( $F_{(3-818)}=7.40$ ,  $p<.01$ ), intellectual stimulation ( $F_{(3-818)}=9.10$ ,  $p<.01$ ), and innovative climate ( $F_{(3-818)}=6.45$ ,  $p<.01$ ). In all variance analysis, "Test of Homogeneity of Variances" prerequisite was provided ( $p>.05$ ). According to the intergroup Scheffe multi-comparison test, teachers at the same school between 6-15 years ( $\bar{X}$  =18.77) perceive build vision positively in compared to those between 1-3 year ( $\bar{X}$  =17.50) ( $p<.05$ ). Teachers who are at the same school between 6-15 years ( $\bar{X}$  =20.22) appreciate support in individual consideration more compared to those between 1-3 years ( $\bar{X}$  =18.79) ( $p<.05$ ). Those who are at the same school between 6-15 years ( $\bar{X}$  =27.50) remark that their headmasters support their individual stimulation more compared to those at the school between 1-3 years ( $\bar{X}$  =24.90).

As far as vision building is concerned, those who work between 6-10 years ( $\bar{X}$  =23.40) state that headmasters motivate them to build an innovative climate more than do those between 1-3 years ( $\bar{X}$  =21.81). Significant difference has been found between teachers' status and headmasters' vision building ( $F_{(4-817)}=4.40$ ,  $p<.05$ ) and individual consideration ( $F_{(4-817)}=2.86$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Beginning teachers state that their administrators build vision well ( $\bar{X}$  =20.62) compared to expert teachers ( $\bar{X}$  =17.12) and teachers ( $\bar{X}$  =17.82) ( $p<.05$ ). They also state that their headmasters support their individual consideration ( $\bar{X}$  =21.62) compared to expert teachers ( $\bar{X}$  =18.92) and teachers ( $\bar{X}$  =19.16) ( $p<.05$ ). No significant differences were discovered about the perceptions between the teachers in the Malatya and Adıyaman provinces.

## Discussion and Conclusion

According to the results of this study, teachers' perceive their headmasters' transformational leadership behaviors positively in vision building, individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, and innovative climate in general. This may

stem from headmasters' experience and the in-service training education they have had. They are willing to develop themselves by taking some in-service training. Shao and Webber (2006), Leithwood et al., (1999), Rafferty and Griffin (2004), Moolenaar et al., (2010), Marks and Printy (2003), Walumbwa and Lawler (2003), Nemanich and Keller (2007) discovered parallel results, claiming headmasters' direct and indirect effects on teachers' commitment to change in vision building, high performance expectations, developing consensus about group goals and intellectual stimulation, communication, supportive leadership, and personal recognition. They also reveal that headmasters have effects on schools' innovative climate by influencing members to move beyond self-interest, motivating and increasing followers' motivation, and increasing organizational commitment (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Leithwood et al., 2004; Bono, 2000). Regarding teachers' gender, significant differences were found in vision building, individual consideration, supporting intellectual considerations, and innovative climate. Here, female teachers' perceptions are more positive. This may stem from female teachers' perceptions about their principals. As most principals are male in Turkey, they may be accepting those as authority figures. Celep (2004) found that as teachers' levels of education increased, they developed higher levels of standards and acceptance. However, Çelik and Eryılmaz (2006), Töremen and Yasan (2010), and Gronn (1995) discovered that female teachers evaluated their headmasters' transformational leadership behaviors more negatively. In another study, Akbaba-Altun (2003) discovered that although principals found transformational leadership behaviours important, they did not apply these behaviours in their daily practices as much as they attached importance. Transformational leaders know how to learn in order to be role-models for their subordinates, manage the change, and find creative solutions to problems (Çelik, 1998). Kariş (1998) states that transformational leaders perceive subordinates' needs and use them to motivate followers. Moreover, Demir (2008) claims that transformational behaviors of school principals were significantly related to collective teacher efficacy.

There are also significant differences between teachers' status and headmasters' vision building, in addition to individual consideration behaviours. Beginning teachers perceive building vision and supporting individual consideration more positively than other groups, which can be seen as that they learn everything from their headmasters and are affected heavily by their experience in the very beginning of their careers. When intellectual considerations are concerned, male teachers have more positive perceptions than females in support and innovative climates. Regarding teachers' professional experience, male teachers think more positively than female colleagues, and in individual consideration, male teachers have higher scores than females in understanding. Evaluation of the experienced teachers is better.

There are also meaningful differences between teachers' school experience and vision building, individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, and innovative climate. Teachers who have 6-15 years school experience state that their headmasters help them to build vision well compared to those who have 1-3 years experience. Those who have 6-15 years of school experience claim that their headmasters support



their individual consideration more compared to those with between 1-3 years. The teachers who have 6-15 years' experience remark that their headmasters support individual stimulation more compared to the ones with between 1-3 years. When vision building is concerned, those who have 6-10 years school experience believe that their headmasters motivate them to build innovative climate more compared to those who have 1-3 years experience. It can be seen that headmasters' efforts can be understood better by more experienced teachers. The novice teachers are in need of learning the very essentials of the profession to survive. They may not care about vision at this stage. Having no significant differences about the perceptions between the teachers in Malatya and Adıyaman provinces shows that the headmasters in the system may resemble each other. The findings based on the participants' responses have been corroborated by the literature on transformational leaders. The recommendations reached through the results obtained in this study are as follows:

- Headmasters who are incompetent should be trained on the job with in-service trainings designed with university-ministry cooperation.
- Headmasters should be chosen with an exam and appointed to their posts based on their qualifications without any political manipulations.
- Headmasters should be asked a post graduate degree or certificate from educational administration field.

#### References

- Akbaba-Altun, S. (2003). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin dönüşümcü liderliğe verdikleri önem ve uygulama düzeyleri [Elementary School Principals' Perceptions and Performance about Transformational Leadership]. *İlköğretim-Online*, 2(1), 10-17.
- Anderson, K. D. (2008). Transformational teacher leadership in rural schools. *The Rural Educator, National Rural Education Association*, 29, 8-17.
- Bailey, K. D. (1994). *Methods of social research*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Barnes, J., Cote, J., Cudeck, R. & Malthouse, E. (2001). Factor analysis—checking assumptions of normality before conducting factor analysis. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 10(1, 2), 79-81
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist* 52(2), 130-139.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, Free Press.
- Bass, B. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformation leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1997). *Full range leadership development: manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*, CA, Mind Garden.
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1997). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. Harper and Row.
- Bartlett, M. S. (1954). A note on the multiplying factors for various chi square approximations. *Journal of Royal Statistic Society* 16 (Series B), 296-298.
- Baumgartner, H. & Homburg, C. (1996). Applications of structural equation modeling in marketing and consumer research: a review. *International Journal of Marketing Research*, 13, 139-161.
- Bommer, W. H., Rubin, R. S. & Baldwin, T. T. (2004). Setting the stage for effective leadership: Antecedents of transformational leadership behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 195-210.
- Bono, T. A. (2000). Five factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 751-765.
- Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. The Guilford Press, New York.
- Castanheira, P. & Costa, J. A. (2011). In search of transformational leadership: a (meta) analysis focused on the Portuguese reality. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 2012-2015.
- Cattell, R. B. (1978). *The scientific use of factor analysis*. New York: Plenum.
- Celep, C. (2004). *Dönüşümcü liderlik*. [Transformational Leadership]. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Çelik, V. (1998). Eğitimde dönüşümcü liderlik. [Transformational Leadership in Education]. *Eğitim Yönetimi*, Pegem Publishing, 4(16), 443-464.
- Çelik, S. & Eryılmaz, F. (2006). Öğretmen algılarına göre endüstri meslek lisesi müdürlerinin dönüşümcü liderlik düzeyleri (Ankara İli Örneği). [Transformational Leadership Levels of Industrial Vocational High School Principals According to the Teacher's Perception (Ankara Province Case)]. *Politeknik Dergisi*, 9(4), 211-224.
- Chew, J. & Chan, C. C. A. (2008). Human resource practices, organizational commitment and intention to stay. *International Journal of Manpower*, 29(6), 503-522.
- Cho, J. & Dansereau, F. (2010). Are transformational leaders fair? a multi-level study of transformational leadership, justice perceptions, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 409-421.
- Comrey, A. L. & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Costello, A. B., Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(7), 1-9.
- Cote, J., R. Netemeyer, R. & Bentler, P. (2001). Structural equation modeling-improving model fit by correlating errors. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 10(1, 2), 87-88.
- Daft, R. & Becker, S. W. (1978). *The innovative organization*. New York: Elsevier
- Damanpour, F. & Evan, W. M. (1984). Organizational innovation and performance: the problem of organizational lag. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29, 392-409
- Day, C., Harris, A., Hadfield, M., Tolly, H. & Beresford, J. (2000). *Leading schools in times of change*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Demir, K. (2008). Transformational leadership and collective efficacy: The moderating roles of collaborative culture and teachers' self-efficacy. *Eğitim Araştırmaları- Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 33, 93-112.
- Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A. & Dorfman, P. W. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 219-257.
- Du Plessis, P., Conley, L. & Hlongwane, S. (2006). Changing landscape for principalship-new challenges for tomorrow's leaders. Retrieved December 24, 2007 from <http://apollo.instanthosting.com.au/~ace14897/conf07/papers/Du%20Lessis.doc>
- Evers, C. W. & Lakomski, G. (1996). *Exploring educational administration: coherentist applications and critical debates*. NY: Elsevier Science.
- Floyd, F. J. & Widaman, K. F. (1995). Factor analysis in the development and refinement of clinical assessment instruments. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 286-299.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Geijsel, F. P., Slegers, P. J. C., Van den Berg, R. & Kelchtermans, G. (2001). Conditions fostering the implementation of large-scale innovation programs in schools: teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(1), 130-166.
- Geijsel, F. P., Slegers, P. J. C., Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2003). Transformational Leadership effects on teachers' commitment and effort toward school re-form. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41, 229-256.

- Geijsel, F. P., Sleegers, P. J. C., Stoel, R. D. & Krüger, M. L. (2009). The effect of teacher psychological, school organizational and leadership factors on teachers' professional learning in Dutch schools. *Elementary School Journal*, 109(4), 406-427.
- Gronn, P. (1995). Greatness re-visited: the current obsession with transformational leadership. *Leading and Managing* 1(1), 14-27.
- Gorsuch, R. L. (1983). *Factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Guilford, J. P. (1954). *Psychometric methods* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Guadagnoli, E. & Velicer, W. F. (1988). Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 265-275.
- Hall, J., Johnson, S, Wysocki, A. & Kepner, K. (2008). Transformational leadership: the transformation of managers and associates. *UF University of Florida, Ifas Extention*, 1-3.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33 (3), 329-351.
- Heck, R. H. & Hallinger, P. (1999). Next generation methods for the study of leadership and school improvement. In J. Murphy & L. Seashore (Eds.). *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (pp 463-487). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hoyle, R. H. (1995). *Structural equation modelling: concepts, issues, and applications*. London: Sage Publication Inc.
- Hooper, D., Coughlan, J. & Mullen, M. R. (2008). Structural equation modelling: guidelines for determining model fit. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 6(1),53-60.
- Hu, L-T. & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.
- Hutcheson, G. & Sofroniou, N. (1999). *The multivariate social scientists*. London, Sage.
- Ireland, D. R. & Hitt, A. M. (2005). Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: The role of strategic leadership. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19(4), 63-77.
- Jörreskog, K. G. & Sörbom, D. (1993). *Structural equation modelling with the Simplis command language*. Scientific Software International, Inc., Lincolnwood, IL 60712-1704, USA.
- Jörreskog, K. G. & Sörbom, D. (1996). *LISREL 8: User's Reference Guide*. Scientific Software International, Inc., Chicago.
- Jung, D. & Avolio, B. (2000). Opening the black box: an experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 949-964.
- Karip, E. (1998). Dönüşümcü Liderlik. [Transformational Leadership in Education]. *Eğitim Yönetimi*. Pegem Publishing, 4(16), 443-446.

- Kline, P. (1979). *Psychometrics and psychology*. London: Academic Press.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. Third Edition, the Guilford Press, New York.
- Kreitner, R. & Kinicki, A. (1998). *Organisational behaviour*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Lewis, P. S., Goodman, S. H. & Fandt, P. M. (1998). *Management: challenges in the 21st Century*. Cincinnati: Thomson.
- Leithwood, K. (1992). Transformational Leadership: Where does it stand? *Educational Leadership*, 49, 8-12.
- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(4), 498-518.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational leadership research 1996-2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4(3), 177-200.
- Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R. & Jantzi, D. (2002). School leadership and teachers' motivation to implement accountability policies. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 38(1), 94-119.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for largescale reform: effects on students, teachers and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 201-228.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., Earl, L., Watson, N., Levin, B. & Fullan, M. (2004). Strategic leadership for large-scale reform: the case of England's national literacy and numeracy strategies. *Journal of School Leadership and Management*, 24(1), 57-80.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing Times*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A. & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 28(1), 27-42.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. [Electronic version] *Journal of Educational Administration* 38, 2, 112-129.
- Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for largescale reform: effects on students, teachers and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 201-228.
- Looman, W.S., Farrag, S. (2009) Psychometric properties and cross-cultural equivalence of the Arabic social capital scale: instrument development study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 46, 45-54.
- MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W. & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 130-149.
- MacCallum, R. C. & Widaman, K. F. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 4(1), 84-99.

- Marks, M. & Printy, S. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: an integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39 (3), 370-397.
- McFarlin, D. B. & Sweeney, P. D. (1998). *International management: trends, challenges and opportunities*. Ohio: South-Western College Publishing
- Moolenaar, N. M., Daly, A. J. & Slegers, P. J. C. (2010). Occupying the principal position: examining relationships between transformational leadership, social network position, and schools' innovative climate. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(5) 623– 670.
- Muenjohn, N. & Armstrong, A. (2007). Transformational leadership: the influence of culture on the leadership behaviors of expatriate managers. *School of Management, Australia*, 2(2), 265-283.
- Nonaka, I. & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: how Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press.
- Nemanich, L. A. & Keller, R. T. (2007). Transformational leadership in an acquisition: a field study of employees. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 49–68.
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P. J. C. & Denessen, E. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: the Tanzanian case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17, 145-177.
- Northouse, Peter G. (2001). *Leadership theory and practice*. Second Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Osborn, R. N. & Marion, R. (2009). Contextual leadership, transformational leadership and the performance of international innovation seeking alliances. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 191-206.
- Popper, M., Maysel, O. & Castelnovo, O. (2000). Transformational leadership and Attachment. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11(2), 267-289.
- Rafferty, A. E. & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: conceptual and empirical extensions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15 (2004) 329–354.
- Raykov, T., Marcoulides, G. A. (2000). *A first course in structural equation modeling*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Reichard, R. J., Riggio, R. E., Guerin, D. W., Oliver, P. H., Gottfried, A. W. & Gottfried, A. E. (2011). A longitudinal analysis of relationships between adolescent personality and intelligence with adult leader emergence and transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 471–481.
- Ross, J. A. & Gray, P. (2006). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values: the mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 179-201.

- Schreiber, J. B., Stage, F. K., King, G., Nora, A. & Barlow, E. A. (2006). Reporting structural equation modeling and confirmatory factor analysis results: a review. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(6), 323-337.
- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H. & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8(2), 23-74.
- Scherer, R. F., Wiebe F. A., Luther, D. C. & Adams J. S. (1988). Dimensionality of coping: factor stability using the ways of coping questionnaire. *Psychological Reports*, 62, 763-770.
- Shao, L. & Webber, S. (2006). A cross-cultural test of the 'five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Business Research* 59, 936-944.
- Silins, H. C., Mulford, W. R. & Zarins, S. (2002). Organizational learning and school change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 613-642.
- Stewart, J. (2006). Transformational leadership: an evolving concept examined through the works of Burns. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 54, 1-29.
- Sperber, A. D. (2004). Translation and validation of study instruments for cross-cultural research, gastroenterology. *American Gastroenterological Association*, 126, 124-128.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Fifth Edition, Pearson Education. Inc.
- Töremen, F. & Yasan, T. (2010). İlköğretim Okulu Yöneticilerinin Dönüşümcü Liderlik Özellikleri. [Primary School Administrator's Transformational Leadership Features (Example on the City of Malatya)]. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28, 27-39.
- Vieira, A. L. (2011). *Interactive LISREL in practice, getting started with a SIMPLIS Approach*. Springer Heidelberg Dordrecht London, New York.
- Vinger, G. & Cilliers, F. (2006). Effective transformational leadership behaviors for managing change. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4 (2), 1-9
- Yammarino, F. J., Spangler, W. D. & Bass, B. M. (1993). Transformational leadership and performance: a longitudinal investigation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4(1), 81-102.
- Yu, H., Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2002). The comparative effects of transformational leadership on teachers commitment to change in Hong Kong and Canada. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 1(4), 368-384.
- Yukl, G. A. (2005). *Leadership in organizations*. Ninth Edition, Prentice-Hall.
- Walumbwa, F. O. & Lawler, J. J. (2003). Building effective organizations: transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related attitudes, and withdrawal behaviors in three emerging economies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14, 1083-1101.

## Okul Yöneticilerinin Dönüşümcü Liderlik Davranışları Ölçeğinin Uyarlanması ve Öğretmen Algılarının Belirlenmesi Çalışması

### Atf:

Balyer, A., & Özcan, K. (2012). Cultural adaptation of headmasters' transformational leadership scale and a study on teachers' perceptions. *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*. 49, 103-128.

### (Özet)

#### Problem Durumu

1980lerin sonları ve 1990ların ilk yıllarında adından söz edilen Dönüşümcü liderlik, askeri kökenlidir bir yönetim yaklaşımıdır (Heck & Hallinger, 1999; Bass, 1998). En genel anlamıyla Dönüşümcü liderlik, örgüt çalışanlarının örgütlerine adanmışlıkları ve hedeflerin gerçekleştirilmesi sürecine bağlılıkları olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Popper ve diğerleri, 2000). Bu yaklaşım beceri ve kapasite gelişimini zenginleştirme üzerine odaklanır ve kendi davranışlarını astlarının gereksinimleri doğrultusunda değiştirirler (Leithwood ve Jantzi, 2006; Marks ve Printy, 2003; Northouse, 2001; Den Hartog ve diğerleri, 1999; Gronn, 1995; Evers ve Lakomski, 1996; Muenjohn ve Anderson, 2007). Bu yaklaşımda liderler, okul vizyonunu oluşturur ve hedefleri belirlerler (Leithwood ve Jantzi, 2000; Castanheira ve Costa, 2011; Leithwood, 1992), çalışanların bireysel motivasyonlarını artırır, yüksek performans beklentileri ve başarıya dayalı bir okul iklimi oluştururlar. Aynı zamanda liderler Dönüşümcü çalışanların karara katılımını artırır, astlarının beceri ve bilgilerini geliştirirler ve onlara bireysel destek sağlarlar (Silins ve diğerleri, 2002; Bennis ve Nanus, 1997). Hall ve diğerlerine (2008) göre Dönüşümcü liderlik yaklaşımı, yöneticilere sıra dışı liderler olma olanağı sağlar. Bu nedenle McFarlin ve Sweeney (1998), geleceğin başarılı yöneticilerinin Dönüşümcü liderler olarak yetiştirilmeleri gerektiğini vurgulamaktadırlar.

Dönüşümcü liderliğin bazı özellikleri vardır. Birincisi, liderin kendi davranışları ve astlarının ona attığı davranışlar olarak tanımlanan *idealleştirilmiş etki*, ikincisi, liderin koç ya da mentor olarak her bir bireye özel birisiymiş ilgi göstermeye yönelik sürekli çabası anlamına gelen *bireysel ilgi*, üçüncüsü, liderin yaratıcı ve yenilikçi olmaları yönünde astlarını güdülemesi anlamına gelen *entellektüel uyarımadır*. Dördüncü özellik, liderin astlarını ortak amaçlar doğrultusunda güdülemesi olarak bilinen *esinlenmiş etkidir* (Geijsel ve diğerleri, 2003; Nguni ve diğerleri, 2006; Yu ve diğerleri, 2002; Geijsel ve diğerleri, 2003; Leithwood ve Jantzi, 2005; Leithwood ve diğerleri, 2002; Rafferty ve Griffin, 2004). Sonuncusu da uygulama, süreç ve davranışlar ile ilgili olarak çalışanların örgütsel algılarının olumlu yönde değiştirilmesi anlamına gelen *yenilikçi iklim oluşturmadır* (Moolenaar ve diğerleri, 2010; Cho ve Dansereau, 2010). Birçok çalışma bu özelliklerin çalışanların performansı ve iş doyumunu üzerinde etkilerinin bulunduğunu ortaya koymaktadır (Anderson, 2008; Bass, 1997; Bass ve Avolio, 1994; Bommer ve diğerleri, 2004).



Yukarıda değinilen bütün özelliklerin çalışanların ve dolayısıyla da okulun değişimi ve dönüşümü üzerindeki etkileri bu çalışmanın ülkemiz eğitim sistemi bakımından önemini kaçınılmaz kılmıştır.

#### *Araştırmanın Amacı*

Bu araştırmanın iki amacı bulunmaktadır. Birinci amacı Moolenaar ve diğerleri (2010) tarafından geliştirilen *Okul Yöneticilerinin Dönüşümcü Liderlik Davranışları Ölçeği*'nin Türkçeye uyarlanmasıdır. İkinci amaç ise bu ölçeğe dayalı olarak öğretmenlerin ilköğretim okul yöneticilerinin dönüşümcü liderlik davranışlarına dair algılarını ortaya çıkarmaktır. Bu araştırma ile eğitim sistemimiz içerisinde önemli bir yere sahip olan okul müdürlerinin Dönüşümcü liderlik özelliklerini ne düzeyde olduğu belirlenmesi ve bu okul yöneticilerinin Dönüşümcü liderlik davranışlarının kazandırılması için yapılan diğer çalışmalarla da desteklenen bir takım somut öneriler geliştirilmektedir.

#### *Araştırmanın Yöntemi*

Araştırmada tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Ölçeğin gerçeklik ve güvenilirlik çalışmalarının yapılması amacıyla açıklayıcı (*exploratory*) ve doğrulayıcı (*confirmatory*) faktör analizleri yapılmıştır. Açıklayıcı faktör analizi, Mardin il merkezi ve ilçelerinde 310 ve doğrulayıcı faktör analiz ise Adıyaman il merkezi ve ilçelerinde görev yapan 390 ilköğretim öğretmeninin araştırmaya katılımıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bunun sonucunda ülkemizde uygulanabilirliği, geçerlik ve güvenilirliği kanıtlanan ölçme aracı, öğretmen algılarına göre ilköğretim okul yöneticilerinin Dönüşümcü liderlik özelliklerini belirlemek amacıyla, geçerlilik ve uyarlama çalışmalarının dışında kalan Adıyaman (n=343) ve Malatya il merkezinde görev yapan (n=479) katılımcılar olmak üzere toplam 822 ilköğretim öğretmenine uygulanmıştır.

Uyarlama çalışması sonucunda ölçek beşli Likert tipinde 23 maddeden oluştuğu anlaşılmaktadır. Buna göre ölçek, *vizyon oluşturma, bireysel ilgi, entelektüel uyarım ve yenilik iklimi oluşturma* olmak üzere dört alt boyuttan oluşmaktadır. Ölçekte puan yüksekliği okul yöneticilerinin dönüşümcü liderlik özelliklerinin iyi olduğunu göstermektedir. Ölçeğin kapsam geçerliliği için İngilizce 'den Türkçe' ye çevirisi ve geri çevirisi yapılmış ve bu konuda uzman görüşüne başvurulmuştur. Ölçeğin yapı geçerliliğini ve faktör yapısını incelemek amacıyla açıklayıcı faktör analizi yapılmıştır. Faktörleştirme tekniği olarak temel bileşenler analizi ve varimax dik döndürme tekniği seçilmiştir. Ölçeğin Türkiye koşullarında uygulanabilirliğini doğrulayabilmek için madde faktör ve madde toplam korelasyonları, ayırt edicilik ve madde iç tutarlılık (Cronbach Alfa) gibi madde analizleri yapılmıştır. 4 faktörlü yapı doğrulayıcı faktör analizi ile de test edilmiştir. Açıklayıcı faktör analizinde SPSS 15.0 ve doğrulayıcı faktör analizde ise için Lisrel 8.80 programı kullanılmıştır.

#### *Araştırmanın Bulguları*

Araştırmaya katılan öğretmenlerin demografik özellikleri değerlendirildiğinde katılımcıların % 47.6'sının kadın, %52.4'ü erkek olduğu ve % 41.5'inin ilköğretim

birinci ve %58.5'inin de ikinci kademedeki görev yapmakta olduğu görülmektedir. Ölçeğin uyarlanması sürecinde yapılan araştırmaya ilişkin iki araştırma bulgusu elde edilmiştir. Birinci bulguda, ölçeğin uyarlanmasına ilişkin açıklayıcı faktör analizinde, KMO= 0.95 ve Bartlett testinin  $\chi^2_{(253)}=5265,175$ ;  $p<.01$  olması dağılımın çok değişkenli normal dağılımdan geldiğini göstermektedir. Faktör yük değerlerinin kabul düzeylerine göre bir maddenin (12. madde) yük değerleri farkının 0.1 den büyük olması nedeniyle maddenin ölçekten çıkarılmasına karar verilmiştir. Buna göre, 23 madde ve 4 alt ölçekten oluşan ölçek, toplam varyansın % 69.31'ini açıklamaktadır. Ölçeğin tamamına ilişkin Cronbach Alfa güvenilirlik kat sayısı 0.96'dır. Doğrulayıcı faktör analizinde ise,  $\chi^2=506.93$ ,  $df=224$ ,  $\chi^2/df=2.3$ , GFI = 0.90, AGFI=0.85, NFI=0.98, NNFI=0.98, CFI=0.98 ve RMSEA= 0.066 olduğundan ve ölçeğin iyi bir model olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. İkinci bulgu ise katılımcı öğretmenlerin % 61.2'si müdürlerin okul vizyonunun paydaşlarca benimsenmesine, % 72.0'ı öğretmenlerin bireysel ilgi, % 64.8'i okulda yenilik ikliminin oluşturulması, % 65.1'i öğretmenlerin bireysel ilgi anlamında desteklenmesine önem verdiğini belirtmişlerdir. Öğretmenlerin cinsiyet değişkenleri ile ölçeğin alt boyutları arasında anlamlı farklılık bulunmuştur ( $p<.05$ ). Buna göre, erkek öğretmenler kadın öğretmenlere göre, okul yöneticilerinin Dönüşümcü liderlik özelliklerinin daha iyi olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan farklı statülerdeki öğretmenlerin algılarına göre, okul yöneticilerinin dönüşümcü liderlik davranışları alt ölçekleri arasında anlamlı bir farklılık yoktur ( $p>.05$ ).

#### *Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Öneriler*

Okul Yöneticilerinin Dönüşümcü Liderlik Davranışları Ölçeğinin uyarlanması çalışması sonucunda ölçeğin geçerli ve güvenilir nitelikte olduğu anlaşılmıştır. Hem açıklayıcı hem de doğrulayıcı analizlerle test edilen ölçekten sadece bir madde atılmıştır. Ölçeğin iyilik uyum indeksleri yeterli ölçüdedir. Bu çalışmada elde edilen sonuçlara göre öğretmenler, müdürlerinin *vizyon geliştirme, bireysel ilgi, entelektüel uyarım ve yenilikçi iklim oluşturma* davranışları konusunda genelde olumlu bir algıya sahiptirler. Yine araştırmada elde edilen bir sonuca göre öğretmenler, müdürlerinin liderlik özelliklerinin ve iletişim becerilerinin iyi olduğunu ve kendilerini yeterli bir şekilde güdülediklerini belirtmişlerdir. Bu sonuçlar değişik araştırmalar tarafından da desteklenmektedir. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre, okul yöneticilerinin dönüşümcü liderlik rolünü gerçekleştirme düzeyinin yükseltilmesi amacıyla, üniversite-bakanlık işbirliği, yöneticilikte eğitim yönetimi alanında lisansüstü eğitim koşulu aranması, yönetici atamalarında politik etkilerden uzak yeterlilik ölçütlerinin esas alınması ve öğretmenlerin kuramsal adanmışlığının sağlanmasına uygun bir okul kültürünün oluşturulması önerilerine yer verilmiştir.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** Öğretmen algıları, dönüşümcü liderlik, dönüşümcü liderler, müdürler