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ABSTRACT

In this study, the relationship between principals’ efficacy in change management and their democratic and autocratic leadership styles are examined. The data in the research were collected from 231 teachers and 49 principals working in the central districts of Mersin, Turkey. According to the results obtained, there is a significant difference between teachers’ and principals’ views about principals’ efficacy in change management and their leadership styles. While principals define their leadership style as one of democratic leadership, teachers define their principles’ leadership style as autocratic. Also, a positive relation at the middle level is observed between all the dimensions of principals’ efficacy in change management and their democratic leadership styles. According to the results of regression analysis to understand the degree of the relation, democratic leadership style applied by the principals very much determines the dimensions of their efficacy in change management.
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INTRODUCTION

Constantly changing environmental conditions and developments in science and technology force the educational organizations to depend more on the environment in which they are, have communication and interaction more with it, and adapt to it. Therefore, to maintain their existence, achieve their goals and become more efficient, educational organizations need to change and renew themselves continuously because of various organizational and environmental factors. Erdoğan (2002) defines change as producing new ideas to reconstruct organizations and meet their needs in terms of individual and organizational sense, making decisions and implementing them when present state and needs of the organizations fail to keep up with the changing and improving environmental factors. In this sense, it can be stated that change is to create and develop new ideas and practice them. As the aim of the change is to reach organizational goals more effectively and efficiently, change processes must catch up with this level of efficiency. Change management covers such sub-stages as examining the factors causing change, making diagnosis, practice and evaluation of change (Boztaş, 2007).

Social judgments, understanding and beliefs have been changing, which in turn influence and change educational organizations. Schools are grand organizations serving society, taking their inputs from society and returning them back to society as output. For that reason, taking input from their environment and returning them back to the environment as output, educational organizations cannot exist independent of their environment and can only survive together within the environment (Çalık, 2003; Çobanoğlu, 2008; Bakan & Büyükbeşė, 2010).

Organizations must have the capacity to follow the changes surrounding them and adapt to these changes so that they can maintain their existence and be successful (Bursañoğlu, 2000; Satî & Işık, 2011). In this respect, it is possible to divide the factors forcing organizations to change into two as organizational and non-organizational. Globalization, development of quality phenomenon, increasing consciousness of environment, changing understanding of efficiency and effectiveness, speed of information and technological changes, economic and political factors, and improvement in social awareness can be of non-organizational factors.

On the other hand, strategy, structure and administration style of the organization, cultural and skill level of the staff, system and process in which the organization exists are among the organizational factors. Occurrence of change in one of these mentioned organizational factors can be stated as the main reason for organizational change (Çalık, 2003). Factors related to structure, human, technology and organizational aims can also be included in organizational factors (Sağlam, 1979).

Organizations always feel in need for change due to these organizational and non-organizational factors. These constant changes cause educational organizations to experience such a need for change, too. Therefore, educational organizations must achieve the change in order to train individuals with qualifications of the time, take the lead for individual and social development and help social progress (Çalık, 2003). Changing human behaviors and management processes impact on organizational culture and this results in increased quality. That’s why change should mean reformation and improvement so that it contributes to the organization. Indicating some variables effective in achievement of change, Hultman (1998) lists them as needs, realities, beliefs, emotions, values and actions. Hultman states that there may be some prejudices against change and this is inevitable, adding that these prejudices arise from two sources as individual and organizational. Regarding individual prejudices,
people naturally fear change because they believe that their habits will undergo a change and their personal freedom will vanish. Moreover, fear of uncertainty, economical reasons, safety and hesitation are also of individual resistance. Reasons for organizational resistance can be listed as menace to power and effect, organizational structure, lack of communication and group structure (Çalık, 2003). Some people may resist change as they think change will unsettle their own power and authority. Emphasizing success of change depends on two important factors; Satı and Işık (2011) express that it is required to have enough technical sources such as human, equipment, information and money; and sufficient skills to manage all of these. As it is understood, change which is not well-managed will not bring positive results, even if there is everything required for change. Therefore, strategy and leadership become prominent as critical factors in successful change management. In order for organizations to achieve change, they need administrators who can foresee change and successfully manage the change process. Bakan and Büyükeş (2010) point out that leadership style preferred by administrators and leaders plays an important role in organizational success. The leadership style of the administrators is an important factor in achieving organizational aims, overcoming problems, and staff motivation.

Leadership has been the foremost subject researched in recent times. It was associated with military, political and religious areas in the past; however, it began to gain prominence in organizational terms after the industrial revolution of the 19th century, and has been constantly changing as the needs of organizations change (Uzun, 2005). It is seen that concept of leadership in administration has arisen since the 1960s. Besides, it is known that attitudes and behaviors exhibited by leaders have significant effects on their followers. Afkhami, Eisenberg, and Vaziri (2001) argue that a good and effective leadership must be comprehensive, participative and horizontal in order to serve all men and women, rich or poor, and both the weak and the strong.

Buluç (2009) states that, in the 21st century when competitiveness prevails, leadership has become important for organizations working based on efficiency and quality, and the role of effective leadership is extensive in organizational success. According to Buluç, the principal is the person who is regarded as the leader of school. Bülbul and Çuhadar (2012) define the principal as a person who determines the organizational strategy for attaining common vision constructed by the shareholders, provides integration of innovative technological tools with teaching, and offers time, source and infrastructure for professional development. It is evident that leadership styles of principals have considerable impact on the success of teachers and students (Buluç, 2009; Oğuz, 2010). Oğuz (2010) states that there is a positive relationship between leadership styles of principals and teachers’ attitudes, and teachers see themselves as part of their organization in accordance with the leadership style of their principal, and thus become more successful at their work.

Principals are foremost responsible for the administration and success of the schools. It is argued that educational administrators should not aim simply to apply the rules and sustain existing conditions, as such an understanding would constitute an impediment against creativity and transformation because of repeating oneself (Çobanoğlu, 2008; Okutan & Kahveci, 2012). It is known that structuring of organization, capabilities of staff, monetary resources and technological factors are effective in modern understanding of administration, in addition to experiences, theoretical competence and management mentality of the administrator (Bandura, 1994; Friedman & Kass, 2002; Akçay & Başar, 2004). Therefore, democratic and autocratic leadership styles are examined in this current study.
Democratic leadership with which leaders guide and pioneer their subordinates is defined as shared leadership by Lester (1975). Çelik and Sünbul (2008) state that democratic leadership known also as participative leadership enables leaders to make decisions together with the group, and support and encourage participation in decisions. The staff are treated more politely and made to feel valuable through this kind of leadership. Reward system is applied rather than punishment. Such leaders act not only with their own competences, but also take opinions of their subordinates (Saruşık, Ünal, & Taşar, 2010). It is also pointed out that staff will have increased job satisfaction and take on more responsibility when they have played an important role in the decision making process and will be more desirous and efficient in implementing the decisions. Reardon, Reardon, and Rowe (1998) express that, unlike the traditional leaders who employed their authority in order to dominate others, the leaders of the time are the ones who inspire and fascinate others, and share their authority, rather than impose it on others.

Frequently observed though being one of the oldest leadership styles, autocratic leadership gives the authority to manage and make decisions only to the leader. Jayasingam and Cheng (2009) define autocratic leadership as strict, directing, always instructing and taking power from his/her position. According to them, such leaders make all the decisions by themselves, direct the actions, order the subordinates what and how to do, and restrain subordinates’ creativity. A formal structure prevails in the organization and communication is one-way and top-down. Bakan and Büyükbeşe (2010) state that autocratic leadership has advantages in that it fits expectations of group members in societies, provides leaders with belief and confidence in freedom of action, and enables them to make decisions more quickly and efficiently; on the other hand, it causes decline in job satisfaction, motivation and creativity of the staff. It is also seen that participation of staff is low and staff turnover is quite high.

Reardon et al. (1998) emphasize that autocratic leadership focuses on performance, administrators are production-and-outcome focused, such a leadership is efficient when the goal is simply to succeed, and employed for short-term goals. The people who always exhibit this style are the suppressors who expect obedience without question. They tend to be controlling and negative. They do not care about followers’ reactions and feelings as long as the goal is attained. However, educational organizations like many others have been changing, and accordingly, management science has kept up with these changes. Improvements in management science have impacts on educational organizations and also changes in the roles of principals. It is stated in the literature that traditional roles and responsibilities of principals have undergone a change and turned into leadership based on communication, learning and teaching processes, and so on (Akçay & Başar, 2004; Northouse, 2010). Rapid changes and competitive environment make the term “leadership” more important than ever. Leadership behaviors of the leaders and their success in this influence the success of the groups they work with, too. Therefore, it is necessary to study principals’ leadership styles and their efficacy in change management according to teacher’ views along with those of the principals themselves.

The main aim of this study is to examine the relationship between principals’ leadership styles and their efficacy in change management according to principals’ and teachers’ views, and also to reveal to what degree principals’ leadership styles predict their efficacy in change management.

In accordance with the stated main aim, answers to the following research questions have been sought:
• Is there a significant differentiation between principals’ and teachers’ views about principals’ efficacy in change management?
• Is there a significant differentiation between principals’ and teachers’ views about principals’ leadership styles?
• Is there a significant relationship between principals’ leadership styles and their efficacy in change management according to teachers’ views?
• To what degree do principals’ leadership styles predict their efficacy in change management according to teachers’ views?

**METHOD**

The general survey model was used in this current study. Surveys models aim to describe a situation as it is now (Karasar, 1995). The relationship between principals’ leadership styles and their efficacy in change management was examined in the study. In addition, it was also studied whether or not principals’ leadership styles predict their efficacy in change management. Different kinds of groups were compared in terms of these variables; therefore, this is also a relational study (Erkuş, 2005).

**Population - Sample**

The population of the current study consists of 5,932 teachers and principals working at 165 public primary and secondary schools in the central districts (Mezitli, Yenişehir, Toroslar, and Akdeniz) of Mersin, Turkey (Mersin Directorate of National Education, 2014). The data were collected from 312 participants (250 teachers and 62 principals), selected through convenience sampling method. It is aimed with convenience sampling method to prevent loss of time, money and effort (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak-Kılıç, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2014). However, 30 of the selected participants were excluded as invalid, incomplete, or extreme values were noted in their responses. The return rate of the scale was found to be 90%. Analysis was therefore performed on the data collected from 282 participants. The number of the cells during analysis is significant in determining size of the sample (Karasar, 2004). The fact that there are more than 30 participants in each cell to be compared proves the size of the sample to be sufficient for parametric tests (Büyüköztürk, 2006). Detailed information about the sample is given in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority</td>
<td>0-5 year</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10 year</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 year</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-20 year</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 years or more</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Distribution of principals and teachers according to their gender, seniority and position (n=282)
Data about the sample can be seen in Table 1. According to those participants who indicated their gender (266 out of 282), there are 133 female (50%) and 133 male (50%) participants. Regarding those who indicated their seniority (275 out of 282), 43 participants have experience of 0-5 years (15.6%), 64 have 6-10 years (23.3%), 66 have 11-15 years (24%), 55 have 16-20 years (20%), and lastly 47 participants have 21 years or more (17.1%) experience. Based on those who indicated their position, there are 49 principals (17.5%) and 231 teachers (82.5%). The responses of principals and teachers were analyzed in this study.

Data Collection Tools

The data of the study were collected through the “Principals’ Efficacy in Change Management Scale”, as developed by Ak (2006), and the “Leadership Styles Scale” developed by Taş, Çelik, and Tomul (2007).

Principals’ Efficacy in Change Management Scale is a five-point Likert-type scale. It has four sub dimensions. The items in each sub dimension of the scale are assigned points of 1 (Never), 2 (Scarcely), 3 (Fairly), 4 (A lot), and 5 (Quite a lot). The intervals of 4.20-5.00 (quite a lot), 3.40-4.19 (a lot), 2.60-3.39 (fairly), 1.80-2.59 (scarcely), and 1.00-1.79 (never) were used to separate and interpret the weighted means. There are nine items about determining the need for change at school in the first part, 30 items about preparing school for change process in the second part, 22 items about implementing change in the third part, and five items about evaluation of the change in the fourth part. All items in the scale are positive statements. Validity and reliability analysis were performed for each sub dimension of the scale by Ak (2006). Validity analysis for the first sub dimension, “Determining the Need for Change”, showed factor loads for all items to be over .45 which explained 64.27% of total variance. The factor loads of the items in the “Preparing School for Change Process” sub dimension were found to be over .45 and they explained 64.11% of total variance. The factor loads of the items in the “Implementing Change” sub dimension were also over .45 and they explained 65.36% of total variance. The factor loads of the items in “Evaluation of Change” sub dimension were calculated as over .45 and they explained 78.48% of total variance. The reliability analysis performed by Ak (2006) showed that Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was .93 for the first sub dimension, .98 for the second, .98 for the third and .93 for the last.

Reliability analysis performed for this current study shows that the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient is .95 for “Determining the Need for Change”, .98 for “Preparing School for Change Process, .98 for “Implementing Change”, and .96 for “Evaluation of Change”.

The “Leadership Styles Scale” developed by Taş et al. (2007) is a five-point Likert-type scale. The items are designed according to five-point degree of “Always” (4.20-5.00), “Usually” (3.40-4.19), “Sometimes” (2.60-3.39), “Rarely” (1.80-2.59), and “Never” (1.00-1.79). Composed of two parts, it includes items about personal information in the first part and items about principals’ autocratic (10 items), democratic (13 items), laissez-faire (11 items), transformational (15 items), and transactional (10 items) leadership styles. Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of the scale was found to be .87 to test its reliability. As the role of principals’ autocratic and democratic leadership styles on their efficacy in change management is examined in this study, only 23 items (autocratic, 10; and democratic, 13) were taken into the data collection tool. There are no reverse items in these sub dimensions and all of them are positive statements. The reliability analysis done for this study shows that Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient is .80 for autocratic leadership and .94 for democratic leadership.
Analysis of Data

T-test was used to see whether or not there is a significant difference between teachers’ and principals’ perceptions about principals’ leadership styles and their efficacy in change management. Correlation analysis was performed to reveal the relationship between principals’ leadership styles and their efficacy in change management. Lastly, regression analysis was performed in order to determine to what degree principals’ leadership styles predict their efficacy in change management.

FINDINGS

Findings obtained from the data of the participants are given in this section. The results of t-test performed to compare teachers’ and principals’ views about principals’ efficacy in change management can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Principals’ efficacy in change management according to teachers’ and principals’ views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub dimensions</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determining the need for change</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing school for change</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing change</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of change</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 2, there is a significant difference statistically between teachers’ and principals’ views about “Determining the Need for Change” \(t_{(278)}=8.82, \ p<.05\]. Principals’ views (M=3.83, S=0.54) are more positive than teachers’ (M=2.63, S=0.91) in this dimension. There is also a significant difference statistically between teachers’ and principals’ views about “Preparing School for Change Process” \(t_{(278)}=9.06, \ p<.05\]. Principals’ views (M=3.80, S=0.63) are more positive than teachers’ (M=2.54, S=0.92). A significant difference is seen statistically between teachers’ and principals’ views on “Implementing Change” too \(t_{(278)}=9.72, \ p<.05\]. Principals’ views (M=3.92, S=0.63) are more positive than teachers’ (M=2.58, S=0.91). As in previous ones, there is also a significant difference statistically between teachers’ and principals’ views about “Evaluation of Change” \(t_{(278)}=8.88, \ p<.05\]. Principals’ views (M=4.01, S=0.68) are more positive than teachers’ (M=0.67, S=1.00). The difference in all four dimensions are because of the principals. A significant difference is observed in all dimensions. The principals consider themselves efficient in all dimensions while teachers regard them less efficient. The results of t-test performed in order to compare teachers’ and principals’ views about principals’ leadership styles can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Principals’ leadership styles according to teachers’ and principals’ views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub dimensions</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic Leadership</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Leadership</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in Table 3, there is a significant difference statistically between teachers’ and principals’ views about principals’ “Autocratic Leadership” style \( t(278) = 7.31, p<.05 \). Principals’ views (\( M=3.68, S=0.54 \)) are more positive than teachers’ (\( M=3.01, S=0.76 \)). There is also a significant difference statistically between teachers’ and principals’ views about principals’ “Democratic Leadership” style \( t(278) = 10.66, p<.05 \). Contrary to the former, principals’ views (\( M=1.84, S=0.55 \)) are more negative than teachers’ (\( M=2.91, S=0.93 \)). The results of correlation analysis to determine the relationship between principals’ leadership styles and their efficacy in change management according to teachers’ views can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. Correlation analysis: relationship between principals’ leadership styles and their efficacy in change management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership sub dimension</th>
<th>Determining the need for change</th>
<th>Preparing school for change process</th>
<th>Implementing change</th>
<th>Evaluation of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>-.332**</td>
<td>-.390**</td>
<td>-.399**</td>
<td>-.345**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>.620**</td>
<td>.681**</td>
<td>.679**</td>
<td>.617**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01

According to the results of correlation analysis in Table 4, there can be seen a weak and negative relationship between autocratic leadership and all dimensions of principals’ efficacy in change management, which are “Determining the need for change” (\( r=-.33 \)), “Preparing school for change process” (\( r=-.39 \)), “Implementing change” (\( r=-.39 \)), and “Evaluation of change” (\( r=-.34 \)). However, democratic leadership has a moderate and positive relationship with “Determining the need for change” (\( r=.62 \)), “Preparing school for change process” (\( r=.68 \)), “Implementing change” (\( r=.67 \)), and “Evaluation of change” (\( r=.61 \)). The results of regression analysis to reveal to what degree principals’ democratic leadership style predicts their efficacy in change management can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Regression analysis: degree principals’ democratic leadership predicts change management efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change management</th>
<th>Determining the Need for Change</th>
<th>Preparing School for Change Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>B SH ( \beta ) T</td>
<td>B SH ( \beta ) T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.39 155 28.43 4.50 146 30.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Leadership</td>
<td>-.603 051 620 -11.94 -673 048 -681 -14.08</td>
<td>( R=.620 ); ( R^2=.385 ); ( F=142 ) p&lt;.00 ( R=.681 ); ( R^2=.464 ); ( F=198 ) p&lt;.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change management</th>
<th>Implementing Change</th>
<th>Evaluation of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>B SH ( \beta ) T</td>
<td>B SH ( \beta ) T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.51 144 31.25 4.59 0.17 27.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Leadership</td>
<td>-.660 0.47 -679 -13.99 -659 0.55 -617 -11.87</td>
<td>( R=.679 ); ( R^2=.461 ); ( F=195.86 ) p&lt;.00 ( R=.617 ); ( R^2=.38 ); ( F=140.92 ) p&lt;.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 5, principals’ democratic leadership style predicts all dimensions of principals’ efficacy in change management at a significant level. Their democratic leadership style predicts 38% of “Determining the Need for Change” (\( R^2=.385 \)), 46% of “Preparing School for Change Process” (\( R^2=.464 \)), 46% of “Implementing Change” (\( R^2=.461 \)) and 38% of “Evaluation of Change” (\( R^2=.38 \)).
The results of regression analysis to reveal to what degree principals’ autocratic leadership style predicts their efficacy in change management can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. Regression analysis: degree principals’ autocratic leadership predicts change management efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change management</th>
<th>Determining the Need for Change</th>
<th>Preparing School for Change Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>B SH β T</td>
<td>B SH β T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1,437 233 6.16 1,107 231 4.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic Leadership</td>
<td>399 0.75 332 5.32 476 0.74 390 6.413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R=.332; R²=.110; F=28.302 p<.00
R=.390; R²=.152; F=41.122 p<.00

As seen in Table 6, principals’ autocratic leadership style predicts all dimensions of principals’ efficacy in change management at a significant level. Their autocratic leadership style predicts 11% of “Determining the Need for Change” (R²=.110), 15% of “Preparing School for Change Process” (R²=.152), 15% of “Implementing Change” (R²=.159) and 11% of “Evaluation of Change” (R²=.119).

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The relationship between principals’ leadership styles (democratic and autocratic) and their efficacy in change management has been examined in this current study. In addition, it has been discussed what teachers and principals think about principals’ leadership styles and their efficacy in change management.

Considering teachers’ and principals’ views about principals’ efficacy in change management, it is seen that principals regard themselves as more efficient in all dimensions of efficacy in change management than teachers’ do. Similarly, İnandı, Ağgün, and Atik (2010) indicate in their study that teachers and principals evaluate themselves more positive than others do according to the position variable. The study by İnandı and Özkan (2006) supports this result and reveals a significant difference between teachers’ and principals’ views about principals’ instructional leadership. Principals see themselves more positive in all dimensions of instructional leadership when compared with teachers’ views.

Similar results were obtained in the studies by Ak (2006), Argon and Özçelik (2008) and Yıldız (2012). Teachers do not agree with principals about this and they see principals as being less efficient. Ak’s (2006) study shows parallelism with this finding in that primary school principals’ efficacy in change management was found at a moderate level. This result goes along with the findings of the studies by Gümüşeli (1996), Şişman (2002), Kaşıkçı (2004) and İnandı et al. (2010). Moreover, in educational organizations which are susceptible to organizational and non-organizational influences, the differentiation between change-related expectations of principals and teachers who are specialized in their fields may impact on this result. Principals regard fulfilling the legal duties assigned to them as efficacy in change management during change initiated as a result of a top-down decision due to the bureaucratic structure of the Turkish education system. On the other hand, teachers take the outcomes of change process in a broader frame (its effects on their teaching activities, professional
development, present rights, responsibilities and positions, job satisfaction, etc.). As a result, principals, just like most people, think that they do the best as school administrators, and it may be that they feel more efficient in change management with regard to teachers’ views because they believe they wouldn’t be assigned to their current position if they did not meet the requirements of their position.

As to teachers’ and principals’ views about principals’ leadership styles, principals say that they exhibit democratic leadership while teachers think they have autocratic leadership style. This contradicts with the results of the study by Taş et al. (2007) in which they found that teachers “rarely” think that primary school principals show autocratic leadership behaviors and “mostly” agree that their principals exhibit democratic and transformational leadership. The differentiating results from these studies may be caused by school differences as Taş et al. (2007) carried out their scale at the schools where new primary education program was practiced. This may lead the teachers of these schools to have certain opinions about their principals.

It is accepted that autocratic leadership is not preferable at educational organizations. It can be misleading to expect principals who are aware of this fact to evaluate themselves objectively. It is probable to get more objective and healthy results through the views of teachers who are the most influenced stakeholders of a principal’s leadership style. Töremen and Döş (2009) argue that the supervision process to increase the quality of education, improve the roles of school stakeholders and enhance the efficiency of education does not satisfy the teachers a great deal. In short, a controlling, restricting atmosphere without initiative of autocratic leaders is not desired by teachers. Contrary to this, Reardon et al. (1998) assert in their study conducted at school in the USA, that autocratic leadership style still carries on and communication is one-way and top-down despite the improvement in democratic leadership style. Jayasingam and Cheng (2009) found in their research performed in Malaysia, that the most exhibited leadership style is participative (democratic). Though they revealed that principals adopted democratic leadership style more, Gonos and Gallo (2013) found in their study with 216 principals in the east of Slovakia that 120 principals exhibited autocratic leadership style while 96 of them showed democratic leadership. Stefanovic (2007) also states that principals employ autocratic leadership style more. These results above correspond to the findings of this study.

It appears difficult to reach a certain conclusion and judgment about principals’ leadership styles when considering the research conducted with different samples in different countries because the results of each study can vary as well. It can be stated that the differentiating results obtained from these studies arise from different cultural features of the countries, the meaning ascribed to schools, administration styles and understanding of education in those countries. However, it draws attentions that participative (democratic) leadership is increasingly employed at schools. It can be stated for certain that principals with democratic leadership style can administer the school in a healthier way. Therefore, Warrick (1981) expresses that democratic leaders’ interest in their subordinates and their feelings results in higher performance of the subordinates in terms of both quality and quantity. Ojokuku, Odeyato, and Sajuyigbe (2012) point out that, in case of democratic and transformational leadership, the organizational members develop a sense of belonging, take on more responsibility and exert more effort in order to attain their goals and enhance the organizational efficiency. Alhassan et al. (2014) found in their study that principals of engineering school employ autocratic and democratic leadership and the staff under
principals with democratic leadership increase their productivity while autocratic principals cause a negative effect on performance and productivity of the staff. Regarding these results, the principals need to show a democratic leadership style in order to increase school’s success, establish an effective communication, develop a high-level of organizational commitment and build a positive learning climate and organizational culture. As autocratic principals make decisions alone, conduct communication in a top-down way, and do not let the subordinates take initiative enough, it would not be reasonable to expect success from their schools. For that reason, principals should be participative, open to communication and visible leaders.

It is aimed with another question in the research to determine the relationship between principals’ leadership styles and their efficacy in change management. Research results reveal a strong relationship between principals’ leadership styles and their efficacy in change management.

It has been found that there is a weak and negative relationship between principals’ autocratic leadership style and all dimensions of their efficacy in change management, while there is a moderate and positive relationship with democratic leadership. In other words, principals’ efficacy in change management increases when they exhibit democratic leadership, but it decreases when they employ autocratic leadership. Alkahtani, Abu-Jarad, Sulaiman, and Nikbin (2011) studied the relationship between change management and leadership styles (participative, democratic, counseling, and autocratic). They found a positive relationship only between change management and participative leadership. In addition to this, Bhatti, Maitlo, Shaikh, Hashmi, and Shaikh (2012) revealed a positive relationship between principals’ democratic leadership style and job satisfaction. It is seen in Nadarasa and Thuraisingam’s (2014) study that autocratic leadership has a negative effect on teachers’ job satisfaction, whereas democratic leadership has a positive effect on their job satisfaction. Considering these results, it is obvious that principals with democratic leadership usually have a positive influence on their staff and organization. In this sense, the results of these various researches correspond to the findings of this study.

Similarly, Özmen and Sönmez (2007) state that an authoritarian and threatening leader can have negative effects on motivation of the subordinates. Taş et al. (2007) found a negative relationship between autocratic and democratic leadership at a moderate level (-.54), while autocratic leadership has a low-level relationship with laissez-faire (-.34), transformational leadership (-.45), and transactional (-.17) leadership styles. However, they also point out that democratic leadership has a medium-level positive relationship with laissez-faire (.54), transformational (.79), and transactional (.49) leadership styles. According to the study by Taş et al. (2007), teachers state that principals “rarely” exhibit autocratic leadership but “mostly” employ democratic leadership. Regarding all the results above for this sub goal, it is not reasonable to expect principals with autocratic leadership to create a positive process for their schools and teachers because such principals have problems in communication, just apply the legal regulations they are assigned, fall behind with innovations, have difficulty increasing staff job satisfaction, cause resistance to change, make staff feel uneasy, and are unable to present a mission and vision for the subordinates. Therefore, principals with democratic leadership style are charged with such important tasks as helping staff increase their organizational commitment, creating a positive atmosphere at school, breaking down prejudices against change, exhibiting a participative administration, introducing an open communication and setting achievable goals to move the school forward.
Principals’ democratic leadership style is seen to be predictive on all dimensions of principals’ efficacy in change management. It predicts 38% of “Determining the Need for Change” ($R^2=.385$), 46% of “Preparing School for Change Process” ($R^2=.464$), 46% of “Implementing Change” ($R^2=.461$) and 38% of “Evaluation of Change” ($R^2=.38$). It is probable to infer from these results that democratic leadership has a considerable effect on success of change process. Such a result is not unexpected when principals with democratic leadership style are thought to foresee what change can bring about, participate staff in decisions about the change and enable them to take on responsibility. Additionally, it is seen in correlation analysis that principals with democratic leadership style have a positive effect on change process, which will evidently positively influence the school and the staff.

Principals’ autocratic leadership style is found to be predictive on all dimensions of principals’ efficacy in change management at a low level. It predicts 11% of “Determining the Need for Change” ($R^2=.110$), 15% of “Preparing School for Change Process” ($R^2=.152$), 15% of “Implementing Change” ($R^2=.159$) and 11% of “Evaluation of Change” ($R^2=.119$). Principals’ autocratic leadership style is less predictive on all dimensions of their efficacy in change management in comparison with their democratic leadership style. This can be interpreted that principals with democratic leadership style can be more successful than those with an autocratic leadership style. It is also seen in correlational analysis that there is a negative relationship between autocratic leadership style and principals’ efficacy in change management. It can be alleged at this point that teachers working under a principal with autocratic leadership style resist change because they do not know about the outcomes of the change, and thus, behave reluctantly during the change process. A school administration of autocratic understanding will not seek change. When they initiate a change process by order from above, they will not feel the need to inform teachers about the change, nor let them know about the outcomes and not cooperate or communicate with them, resulting in negative perception of teachers about the change and a failure of the change process. As Oliver (2007) states, if a leader doesn’t build effective cooperation and communication, and offer support and recognition, he/she can cause an isolated and disjoined organization. İnandı, Tunç, and Gündüz (2013) indicate that principals who prefer dominating, ignoring and forcing others at school would use the authority as a power and pressurize and this will lead teachers who regard themselves as specialists not to consent with this situation.

However, the findings of this current study about predictivity of democratic leadership on change do not correspond to the findings of İnandı, Tunç, and Gülç (2013). In the study by İnandı, Tunç, and Gülç (2013), which examined the relationship between principals’ leadership styles and resistance to change, it was revealed that the principals who seek routine and are reluctant to change adopt democratic and transformational leadership. That’s because principals are happy with the existing situation. Democratic leaders may want to maintain the democratic atmosphere at school and are thus reluctant to change. İnandı, Tunç, and Gülç (2013) state that change management is difficult through democratic leadership style and principals’ autocratic behaviors about change can be because of their efforts to reduce the resistance to change at school. They also add that principals’ autocratic leadership style may restrain creativity, knowledge and skills of the school stakeholders who have limited freedoms. The stakeholders may pretend to adapt to the change for fear of being punished. They indicate that the fact that autocratic principals reduce resistance to change does not mean that they favor the change. Brookfield (2010) expresses that feeling of comfort, trust and being valuable in democratic organizations can result in reluctance to change.
As a result, principals regard themselves as highly efficient in change management. However, teachers do not agree with principals on this point. Therefore, principals need to take account of one or more observers’ opinions while evaluating themselves. Principals are expected to exhibit democratic leadership more in a developing and changing society. The seminars about democratic leadership can be held as in-service training programs of the Ministry of National Education. It will be easier to achieve in change process if teachers resistant to change are informed of outputs and advantages of the change. It is understood from research results that democratic leadership has positive effects on the change process. Success of change process will be enabled by principals who include teachers in change-related issues without prejudice. It is required that all the principals must be trained by the domain experts so that change processes can end up successful.
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Okul Müdürünenin Göstermiş Oldukları Liderlik Stilleri İle Değişimi Yönetme Yeterlikleri Arasındaki İlişki
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Giriş

Sürekli değişen çevre koşulları, bilim ve teknolojideki gelişmeler, eğitim örgütlerini içinde bulundukları çevreye giderek daha bağımlılı olmaya, çevreye daha fazla iletişim ve etkileşim kurmaya ve onu çevreye uyuma zorlamaktadır. Bu nedenle eğitim kurumları, hem kendilerinden kaynaklanan, hem de çevreden kaynaklanan çeşitli etkenlerden dolayı, varlıklardaki sürdürübilme, amaçlarına daha etkili bir biçimde ulaşabilmek ve daha verimli hale gelebilmek için sürekli değişme ve yenilenme ihtiyacı duymaktadırlar.

Verimlilik ve kalite anlayışına göre çalışan örgütler için liderliğin önemli hale ettiği ve örgütlerin amaçlarına ulaşımda etkili liderlerin rolünün büyük olduğu artık tartışılmaz bir konu haline gelmiştir. Okullarda lider olarak gören kişiler ise önçelikle okul müdürleridir. Örgütler değişimi gerçekleştirebilmek için değişimi öngörebilecek, değişim sürecini başarıyla yönetebilecek yetenekli yöneticilere ihtiyaç duymaktadırlar. Örgütsel başarının sağlanmasına, yöneticiler ve liderler tarafından seçilen ve yönetim anlayışlarını yansıtacak liderlik stilleri örgütler için vazgeçilmez bir hal almıştır.

Okul müdürlerinin sergiledikleri birçok liderlik stili vardır. Ancak bu çalışmada okul müdürlerinin sergilemiş oldukları liderlik stillerinde sadece demokratik ve otokratik liderlik stilleri ele alınmıştır. Bu kapsamda araştırmanın ana amacı okul müdürlerinin sergilemiş oldukları liderlik stilleri ile değişimi yönetme yeterlikleri arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek ve aralarındaki farkı ortaya koymaktır.

Yöntem

Bu çalışmada tarama modellerinden genel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Tarama modelleri, geçmişte ya da halen var olan bir durumu var olduğu şekilde betimlemeleyi amaçlayan araştırma yaklaşımlarındandır (Karasar, 1995). Bu çalışmada okul müdürlerinin sergilemiş oldukları liderlik stilleri ile değişimi yönetme yeterlikleri arasındaki ilişki ve okul müdürlerinin göstermiş oldukları liderlik stillerinin, değişimi yönetme yeterlikleri arasında ilişkiyi incelemek ve aralarındaki farklı ortaya koymaya çalışmaktadır.
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30 ölçek analize dahil edilmemiş, ölçek geri dönüş oranı %90 olarak gerçekleşmiştir. Araştırmaın analizleri 282 katılımcıdan toplanan veriler üzerinden yürütülmüştür.

Buna göre 133 kadın (%50) 133 erkek katılımcı (%50) örneklemde yer almaktadır. Katılımcıların kadın yıllarına bakıldığında 43 katılımcı (%15,6) 0-5 yıl, 64 katılımcı (%23,3) ile 6-10 yıl, 66 katılımcı (%24,0) 11-15 yıl, 55 katılımcı (%20,0) ile 16-20 yıl, son olarak 47 katılımcı (%17,1) ile 21 yıl ve üzeri kademe sahiptir. Konum değişkenine göre 49 müdür (%17,5) 231 öğretmen (%82,5) örneklemde yer almıştır.


Okul müdürlerin değişimi yönetme yeteneklerine ve göstermiş oldukları liderlik tarzlara ilişkin öğretmen ve okul müdürleri açısından bir farklılık olup olmadığını t-testi ile tespit etmek için t-testi uygulanmıştır. Okul müdürlerin değişimi yönetme yetenekleri ile göstermiş oldukları liderlik stilleri arasındaki tespit etmek için korelasyon analizi, liderlik tarzlarının değişimi yönetme yeteneklerini ne derece yordadığını belirlemek için regresyon analizi yapılmıştır.

Bulgular

Okul müdürlerin değişimi yönetme yetenekleri konusunda okul müdürleri ve öğretmenlerin görüşlerini karşılaştırmak amacı ile yapılan t-testi sonuçlarına göre konum değişkeni tüm boyutlarda anlamlı bir farklılığa neden olmuştur. Tüm boyutlarda okul müdürleri değişimi yönetme yetenliği konusunda öğretmenlerden daha olumlu düşünmektedirler.

Okul müdürlerinin göstermiş oldukları liderlik stilleri konusunda okul müdürleri ve öğretmenlerin görüşlerini karşılaştırmak amacı ile yapılan t-testi sonuçlarına göre konum değişkeni her iki boyutta da anlamlı bir farklılığa neden olmuştur. Otokratik liderlik konusunda müdürler kendilerini öğretmenlerden daha fazla olumsuz olarak değerlendirmişlerdir. Yine demokratik liderlik konusunda da öğretmenler müdürleri müdürlerin görüşlerinden daha olumlu olarak değerlendirmişlerdir.

Okul müdürlerinin göstermiş oldukları liderlik stilleri ile değişimi yönetme yeteneklerini asındaki ilişiğinya tespit etmek için yapılan korelasyon analizi sonuçlarına göre; okul müdürlerinin değişimi yönetme yeteneklerinin tüm boyutları ile otokratik liderlik tarzları arasında negatif yönde zayıf bir ilişki tespit edilirken, demokratik liderlik tarzı ile değişimi yönetme yeteneklerinin tüm boyutları arasında pozitif yönde orta düzeyde bir ilişki tespit edilmiştir. Buna göre okul müdürleri otokratik liderlik sergilediklerinde değişimi yönetme yeteneklerinin azalığı, demokratik liderlik sergilediklerinde ise değişimi yönetme yeteneklerinin arttığı söylenebilir.

Okul müdürlerinin göstermiş oldukları liderlik tarzlarının, onların değişimi yönetme yeteneklerini ne derece yordadığını belirlemek için yapılan regresyon analizi sonuçlarına göre, okul müdürlerinin sergiledikleri liderlik tarzlarından demokratik liderlik stili okul müdürlerinin değişimi yönetme yeteneklerinin tüm boyutlarını anlamlı düzeyde yordamaktadır. Okul müdürlerinin sergiledikleri demokratik liderlik “Değişim İhtiyacını Belirleme Boyutunu” %38 (R²=,385), “Okulu Değişim Sürecine Hazırlama” boyutunu %46
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(R²=464), “Okulda Değişimi Uygulama” boyutunu %46 (R²=.461) ve “Değişimi Değerlendirmeye” boyutunu %38 (R²=.38) yordamaktadır. Bu sonuçlara bakıldığında demokratik liderliğin değişiminin gerçekleştilmesi konusunda önemli bir etkiye sahip olduğunu söylemek olanağdır. Demokratik liderlik özelliği gösteren okul müdürleri değişimin neler getirebileceği öngörebildikleri, bunun için çalışanları değişime ilgili kararlar kabilecekleri ve sorumluluk almalarını sağlayan bilecekleri varsayıldığında böyle bir sonucun çıkması beklenen bir durumdur. Ayrca korelasyon analizi sonuçlarına da bakıldığında demokratik liderlik özelliği gösteren okul müdürlerinin değişiminin gerçekleştilmesi konusunda pozitif bir etkinin olduğu görülmüş, bu etkin ise okulu ve çalışanları olumlu yönde etkileyecedi açıktır.
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Bu araştırmada okul müdürlerinin sergilediği özellikleri liderlik stilleri ile değişimi yönetme yeterlikleri arasındaki ilişki ve okul müdürlerinin göstermiş oldukları liderlik stili, değişimi yönetme yeterlikleri yordama düzeyi incelenmiştir. Okul müdürlerinin değişimi yönetme yeterlikleri onların öz yeterlikleriili ilişkilendirilebilir. Yine Okul müdürlerinin problem çözme becerileri ve değişimi yönetme yeterlikleri ilişkilendirilebilir.
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