



ISSN: 2636-8048

Uluslararası Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi

International Journal Of Management Academy

Yıl / Year: 2018 - Cilt / Volume: 1 - Sayı / Issue: 2



ULUSLARARASI YÖNETİM AKADEMİSİ DERGİSİ (UYAD)
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT ACADEMY

Cilt 1, Sayı 2, Yıl 2018
Volume 1, Issue 2, Year 2018
ISSN: 2636-8048

Sahibi / Owner
MEHMET MECEK

Genel Editörler / General Editors
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi. Selman Sacit BOZ
Öğr. Grv. Mehmet MECEK

İletişim / Contact:
Uluslararası Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi Editörlüğü
E-mail: meceklife@gmail.com
Web : <http://dergipark.gov.tr/mana>

Yayıncı / Publisher
Mehmet MECEK

Genel Editörler / General Editors
Asst. Prof. Dr. Selman Sacit BOZ
Lecturer Mehmet MECEK

Alan Editörleri / Departmental Editors

Yönetim Bilimleri / Management Sciences : Prof. Dr. Bekir PARLAK

Yerel Yönetimler / Local Governments : Prof. Dr. Uğur ÖMÜRGÖNÜLŞEN

Kent Politikaları / Urban Politics : Assoc. Prof. Dr. Neslihan SAM

Kırsal ve Dağlık Alan Yönetimi Prof. Dr. Zerrin TOPRAK KARAMAN

Rural & Mountainside Management :

Özel Çevre Koruma Bölgeleri Yönetimi Assoc. Prof. Dr. A. Menaf TURAN

Special Environmental Protection Zones Management :

Siyasi Coğrafya / Political Geography : Prof. Dr. Emin ATASOY

Kamu Politikaları / Public Policies : Prof. Dr. Hacer Tuğba EROĞLU

Güvenlik Yönetimi ve Politikaları Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Fuat GÖKÇE

Security Politics and Management :

Çevre Yönetimi ve Politikaları Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elif ÇOLAKOĞLU

Environmental Politics and Management :

Göç Yönetimi ve Politikaları Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mithat Arman KARASU

Immigration Politics and Management :

Afet Yönetimi ve Politikaları Prof. Dr. Zerrin TOPRAK KARAMAN

Disaster Politics and Management :

Sağlık Yönetimi ve Politikaları Assoc. Prof. Dr. Oğuz IŞIK

Health Politics and Management :

Turizm Yönetimi ve Politikaları Prof. Dr. Akyay UYGUR

Turism Politics and Management :

Teknoloji Yönetimi ve Politikaları Prof. Dr. Murat OKÇU

Technology Politics and Management :

Eğitim Yönetimi ve Politikaları Prof. Dr. Ercan YILMAZ

Edicational Politics and Management :

Yönetim Tarihi / History of Management : Prof. Dr. Mehmet SEYİTDANLIOĞLU

Yönetim Hukuku / Administrative Law : Prof. Dr. Halil KALABALIK

Kamu Mali Yönetimi / Public Financial Management : Prof. Dr. Özhan ÇETİNKAYA

İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi / Human Resources : Prof. Dr. Doğan Nadi LEBLEBİCİ

İşletme Yönetimi / Business Management : Prof. Dr. Mehmet ERYILMAZ

Siyaset Bilimi / Political Science : Prof. Dr. Turgay UZUN

Çalışma Ekonomisi ve Endüstri İlişkileri Prof. Dr. Özlem ÇAKIR

Labor Economics And Industrial Relations :

Büro Yönetimi ve Yönetici Asistanlığı Prof. Dr. Akyay UYGUR

Office Management and Executive Assistance :

Yayın Kurulu / Editorial Board

Öğr. Grv. Mehmet MECEK: Yayın Kurulu Başkanı / Genel Koordinatör

Lect. Mehmet MECEK : Head of the Editorial Board / General Coordinator

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi. Selman Sacit BOZ: ÜYE / Yayın Değerlendirme Ön Kontrol Sorumlusu

Asst. Prof. Dr. Selman Sacit BOZ: Member / Release Evaluation Pre-Control Officer

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi. Kadir Caner DOĞAN: ÜYE / İndeks Başvuru ve Değerlendirme Sorumlusu

Asst. Prof. Dr. Kadir Caner DOĞAN: Member / Index Application and Evaluation Officer

Öğr. Grv. Yusuf UYSAL: ÜYE / AR-GE Sorumlusu

Lect. Yusuf UYSAL: Member / Research and Development Officer

Öğr. Grv. Mehmet Akif AĞTAŞ: ÜYE / Görsel Tasarım Sorumlusu

Lect. Mehmet Akif AĞTAŞ: Member / Visual Design Officer

Akif ŞEN: ÜYE / Dizgi Sorumlusu / Web Sorumlusu

Akif ŞEN: Member / Layout Officer

Emine AĞTAŞ: ÜYE / İngilizce Çeviri Ön Kontrol Sorumlusu

Emine AĞTAŞ: Member / English Translation Pre-Control Officer

Gülsevil MECEK: ÜYE/Süreç Yönetimi ve Tanıtım

Gülsevil MECEK: Member / Process Management and Publicity Officer

Bilim ve Danışma Kurulu / Advisory Board

Prof. Dr. Adnan GERÇEK

(Uludağ University, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Ahmet Hamdi AYDIN

(Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Akif Argun AKDOĞAN

(TODAİE - Public Administration Institute For Turkey

And Middle East, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Akyay UYGUR

(Gazi University, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Andrzej RYKALA

(Lodz University, POLAND)

Prof. Dr. Bayram COŞKUN

(Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Bekir PARLAK

(Uludağ University, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Dilaver TENGİLİMOĞLU

(Atılım University, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Doğan Nadi LEBLEBİCİ

(Hacettepe University, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Emin ATASOY

(Uludağ University, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Ercan YILMAZ

(Necmettin Erbakan University, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Eric STRAUSS

(Michigan State University, USA)

Prof. Dr. Fatma Neval GENÇ

(Adnan Menderes University, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Hacer Tuğba EROĞLU

(Selçuk University, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Halil KALABALIK

(Türkiye İnsan Hakları Eşitlik Kurumu, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Hamza AL

(Sakarya University, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Hamza ATEŞ

(İstanbul Medeniyet University, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Hikmet KAVRUK

(Gazi University, TURKEY)

Prof. Dr. Jan A. WENDT

(Gdansk University, POLAND)

Prof. Dr. Kemal GÖRMEZ

(Gazi University, TURKEY)

Bilim ve Danışma Kurulu / Advisory Board

Prof. Dr. Kemal ÖKTEM (Hacettepe University, TURKEY)	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Zahid SOBACI (Uludağ University, TURKEY)
Prof. Dr. Mehmet ERYILMAZ (Uludağ University, TURKEY)	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mithat Arman KARASU (Harran University, TURKEY)
Prof. Dr. Mehmet SEYİTDANLIOĞLU (Hacettepe University, TURKEY)	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Murtaza HASANOV (Azerbaycan Devlet Üniversitesi, AZERBAIJAN)
Prof. Dr. Mete YILDIZ (Hacettepe University, TURKEY)	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa KOCAOĞLU (Necmettin Erbakan University, TURKEY)
Prof. Dr. Murat OKÇU (Süleyman Demirel University, TURKEY)	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Neslihan SAM (Uludağ University, TURKEY)
Prof. Dr. Musa EKEN (Sakarya University, TURKEY)	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Oğuz IŞIK (Hacettepe University, TURKEY)
Prof. Dr. Özhan ÇETİNKAYA (Uludağ University, TURKEY)	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sefa USTA (Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, TURKEY)
Prof. Dr. Özlem ÇAKIR (Dokuz Eylül University, TURKEY)	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Yunus Emre ÖZER (Dokuz Eylül University, TURKEY)
Prof. Dr. Selma KARATEPE (İnönü University, TURKEY)	Asst. Prof. Dr. Begüm İSBİR (Gazi University, TURKEY)
Prof. Dr. Tomasz MICHALSKI (Gdansk University, POLAND)	Asst. Prof. Dr. Cenay BABAOĞLU (Niğde Ömer Halisdemir University, TURKEY)
Prof. Dr. Turgay UZUN (Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, TURKEY)	Asst. Prof. Dr. Elvettin AKMAN (Süleyman Demirel University, TURKEY)
Prof. Dr. Uğur ÖMÜRGÖNÜLŞEN (Hacettepe University, TURKEY)	Asst. Prof. Dr. Kadir Caner DOĞAN (Gümüşhane University, TURKEY)
Prof. Dr. Veysel EREN (Mustafa Kemal University, TURKEY)	Asst. Prof. Dr. Recep TEMEL (Bozok University, TURKEY)
Prof. Dr. Zerrin TOPRAK KARAMAN (Dokuz Eylül University, TURKEY)	Asst. Prof. Dr. Selman Sacit BOZ (Selçuk University, TURKEY)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. A. Menaf TURAN (Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, TURKEY)	Asst. Prof. Dr. Sezai ÖZTOP (İstanbul Medeniyet University, TURKEY)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Fuat GÖKÇE (Gaziantep University, TURKEY)	Asst. Prof. Dr. Veysel ERAT (Bitlis Eren University, TURKEY)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elena GALAY (Belarusian State University, BELARUS)	Asst. Prof. Dr. Yasemin KAYA (Uludağ University, TURKEY)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elif ÇOLAKOĞLU (Jandarma ve Sahil Güvenlik Akademisi, TURKEY)	Dr. Adam SZYMANSKI (Warszawa University, POLAND)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Igor JELEN (Trieste University, ITALY)	

Sayı Hakem Kurulu / Rewiever Board

Prof. Dr. Adem ESEN (İstanbul University)	Prof. Dr. Ahmet YATKIN (Fırat University)
Prof. Dr. Alaattin KIZILÇAOĞLU (Balıkesir University)	Prof. Dr. Emin ATASOY (Uludağ University)
Prof. Dr. Erdal HAMARTA (Necmettin Erbakan University)	Prof. Dr. Füsün ÇINAR ALTINTAŞ (Uludağ University)
Prof. Dr. Hüsamettin İNAÇ (Kütahya Dumlupınar University)	Prof. Dr. Mehmet AYGÜN (Van Yüzüncü Yıl University)
Prof. Dr. Mehmet ERYILMAZ (Uludağ University)	Prof. Dr. Mesut DOĞAN (İstanbul University)
Prof. Dr. Refika BAKOĞLU (Marmara University)	Prof. Dr. Semih Mustafa ÖNEN (İnönü University)
Prof. Dr. Sebahat BAYRAK KÖK (Pamukkale University)	Prof. Dr. Tülay İlhan NAS (Karadeniz Teknik University)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Alper ÖZMEN (Eskişehir Osmangazi University)	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Barış ÖVGÜN (Ankara University)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Değer ALPER (Uludağ University)	Assoc. Prof. Dr. M. Fatih Bilal ALODALI (Necmettin Erbakan University)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mesut DOĞAN (Afyon Kocatepe University)	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa AVCI (Anadolu University)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nural İMİK TANYILDIZI (Fırat University)	Asst. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Kürşat ERSÖZ (Akdeniz University)
Asst. Prof. Ahmet SARITAŞ (Mehmet Akif Ersoy University)	Asst. Prof. Dr. Emine ÖNDER (Mehmet Akif Ersoy University)
Asst. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Barış YILMAZ (İnönü University)	Asst. Prof. Dr. Özge KOCAKULA (Adnan Menderes University)

ULUSLARARASI YÖNETİM AKADEMİSİ DERGİSİ

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT ACADEMY

Yıl/Year: 2018 - Cilt/Volume: 1 - Sayı/Issue: 2

ISSN: 2636-8048

Uluslararası Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi, başta kamu yönetimi ve işletme yönetimi olmak üzere “yönetim” ile ilgili teorik ve uygulamalı bilimsel/özgün makaleleri kabul etmektedir. Yönetim Akademisi, yönetim ile ilgili hazırlanan ulusal ve uluslararası düzeydeki akademik çalışmaları yayınlayan hakemli bir dergidir. Dergi ile multidisipliner bir çalışma alanı tesis edilerek literatüre ve uygulamaya katkı sağlanması hedeflenmektedir. Editörler tarafından yapılan ön değerlendirmeyi geçen çalışmalar, kör hakem sistemine göre seçilen en az iki hakem tarafından incelenmektedir. Derginin yayın dili Türkçe ve İngilizcedir. Yönetim Akademisi, yılda üç sayı (Nisan - Ağustos - Eylül) olarak yayınlanmaktadır. Makalelerin başvuru aşamasından yayın aşamasına kadar olan tüm süreçleri Dergi Park sistemi üzerinden gerçekleştirilmektedir. Yazarlardan çalışmalarının yayınlanması için herhangi bir ücret talep edilmemektedir. Ayrıca yazarlara ve hakemlere de bir ücret ödemesi yapılmamaktadır. Dergimize gönderilen makalelerin daha önce hiçbir fiziksel ve elektronik ortamda yayınlanmamış olması gerekmektedir. Aynı anda birden fazla dergiye gönderilen bir yayının tespit edilmesi halinde ilgili yazara/yazarlara ait tüm makale değerlendirmeleri iptal edilerek süreç sonlandırılacaktır. Bu nedenle başka bir bilimsel/aktüel dergiye gönderilen ve sonuçlandırılmayan çalışmaların sisteme yüklenmemesi önemle rica edilir. Yazarların ortaya koymuş oldukları veri, bilgi, belge, ifade ve değerlendirmeler kendi sorumluluklarındadır. Bu nedenle ortaya çıkabilecek olumsuzluklardan dolayı yayın, hakem, bilim ve değerlendirme kurulu ile diğer çalışanlarımızın sorumlu tutulamaz. Her yazarın makalelerini sisteme yüklemekle birlikte tüm bilimsel, hukuki ve etik kuralları bildiğini ve bu kurallara uygun bir şekilde yayını oluşturduğunu beyan ve taahhüt ettiği kabul edilmektedir. Dergide yer alan yazılarda ileri sürülen görüşler yazarlara aittir, yayınlayan kurulu ve dergiyi bağlamaz.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT ACADEMY accepts the theoretical and practical scientific/original articles on “management”, especially on public administration and business administration. It is aimed to contribute to the literature and practice by establishing a multidisciplinary workspace with the journal. The works having passed the preliminary consideration done by the editors is evaluated by at least two referees who are selected according to the blind referee system. The publication language of the journal is Turkish and English. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT ACADEMY is published three times a year (April - August - December). All the processes from the application process to the publication process are carried out through the DergiPark system. The writers don't charge a fee for publication of their works. There is also no payment for authors and referees. The articles submitted to our journal are supposed not to have been published in any physical or electronic environment before. In the event that it is identified that a publication has been sent to more than one journal at the same time, all article evaluations of the relevant author/authors will be cancelled, and the process will be terminated. For this reason, it is strongly recommended that the works, which have been sent to any other scientific/actual journal and not been completed, should not be loaded into the system. The data, information, documents, statements, and evaluations that authors present are at their own responsibility. The publication, referee, science and evaluation committee and other employees can not be held responsible for any inconvenience this may cause. It is accepted that along with the loading their articles to the system, all the authors know all legal and ethical rules and declares and undertakes that they have generated their publications in accordance with these rules. Any views expressed in this publication are the views of the authors and are not the views of International Journal Of Management Academy.

İÇİNDEKİLER / CONTENTS

MAKALE / ARTICLE

SAYFA / PAGE

Ümit CURA, Ercan YILMAZ

10-21

The Relationship between Principals' Leadership Styles and Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors

Okul Yöneticilerinin Liderlik Stilleri ile Demokratik Tutum ve Davranışları Arasındaki İlişki

İbrahim ÇOBANLAR, Halim Emre ZEREN

22-40

Yerel Siyasetçilerin Hizmet Öncesi Eğitimi

The Pre-Service Education Of Local Politicians

Bekir PARLAK, Kadir Caner DOĞAN

42-52

Türkiye’de Mevcut İl Yönetimi Ve İlçe Yönetimi: Tarihsel Ve Yapısal Bir İnceleme

Current Provincial Administration and District Administration in Turkey: A Historical and Structural Analysis

Emin ATASOY, Elif ALKAR

54-65

Bulgaristan Müslümanlarını Derinden Etkileyen Yeniden Doğuş Sürecinin Geçiş

Döneminde Sorgulanması ve Yargılanması

Investigation and Judgement of the Rebirth Process in the Transition Period that Deeply Affect the Bulgarian Muslims

Serhat DÜVENÇİ

66-93

Devletin Köken Teorileri Açısından Devleti Doğuran Etmenler: Çeşitli Uygarlıklar ve Topluluklar Üzerinden Bir Değerlendirme

The Factors That Form The State In Terms Of Origin Theories Of State: An Evaluation On Various Civilizations And Communities

Beytullah ÇETİN

94-112

Türk Hukuk Düzeninde Yetki Genişliği İlkesi

The Principle of Deconcentration in Turkish Legal Order

Özge KOCAKULA, Ali Ender ALTUNOĞLU

114-131

Obsesif Kompulsif Kişilik Bozukluğunun Karar Süreçlerine Etkisi

The Effect Of Obsessive Compulsive Personality Disorder On Decision Making Processes

Mesut DOĞAN

132-141

Kadın Yönetim Kurulu Üye Sayısının Finansal Performans Üzerinde Etkisi:

Literatür Taraması

The Effects of Women on Boards on Financial Performance: Literature Review

Murat ÇUBUKCU

İşletmelerde Uygulanan Strateji Tipleri ve Uygulamadan Örnekler

Strategy Types and Practice Examples Applied in Business

142-156

Yusuf UYSAL

Avrupa Birliği'nin Seçilmiş Bazı Ülkelerinde ve Türkiye'de Kamu Özel İşbirliği (KÖİ) Yatırımlarının Karşılaştırmalı Analizi

Comparative Analysis of Public Private Partnership (PPP) Investments In Selected Countries of European Union and Turkey

158-172



Uluslararası Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi (UYAD)

14 adet ulusal ve uluslararası dizin / veri tabanı tarafından indekslenmektedir.

Taradığımız dizinler / veri tabanları;

Journal of International Management Academy (JIMA)

is indexed by 14 national and international indexes / databases.

Indexes / databases which we scanned:

Google Scholar, Rootindexing, ResearchBib, ESJI (Eurasian Scientific Journal Index), COSMOS IF, Jurix Hukuk Dizini, Türkiye Turizm Dizini, İdealonline, Kaynakça.info, OpenAIRE, BASE (Bielefeld Academic Search Engine), ROAD, Sindex, CiteFactor



The Relationship between Principals' Leadership Styles and Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors*

Okul Yöneticilerinin Liderlik Stilleri ile Demokratik Tutum ve Davranışları Arasındaki İlişki

Ümit CURA

*PhD Student, Konya Necmettin Erbakan University,
Institute of Educational Sciences, umitcura@gmail.com*

Makale Başvuru Tarihi: 13.08.2018

Makale Kabul Tarihi: 28.08.2018

Ercan YILMAZ

*Prof. Dr., Konya Necmettin Erbakan University, Faculty of Education,
Educational Sciences, eyilmaz@konya.edu.tr*

ÖZET

Bu araştırmanın amacı, okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri ile demokratik tutum ve davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesidir. Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu Konya ili merkez ilçelerindeki okullarda çalışan 173 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Öğretmenlerin %54,3'ü kadın ve %45,7'si erkektir. Araştırmada Akan, Yıldırım ve Yalçın (2014) tarafından geliştirilen Okul Müdürleri Liderlik Stili Ölçeği ile Bakır (2007) tarafından geliştirilen Okul Müdürlerinin Okul Yönetiminde Sergiledikleri Demokratik Tutum ve Davranışlar Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda, öğretmenlerin cinsiyetlerine göre okul müdürlerinin dönüşümcü liderlik, serbest bırakıcı liderlik ve sürdürümcü liderlik puan ortalamaları anlamlı bir şekilde farklılaşmazken, demokratik tutum ve davranışlar puan ortalamasının anlamlı bir şekilde farklılaştığı görülmüştür. Öğretmenlerin öğrenim durumlarına göre okul müdürlerinin liderlik stilleri ile demokratik tutum ve davranışları puan ortalamalarında anlamlı bir farklılaşmanın olmadığı görülmüştür. Öğretmenlerin mesleki kıdem yılı değişkenine göre okul müdürlerinin demokratik tutum ve davranışları puan ortalaması anlamlı bir şekilde farklılaşmaktadır. Liderlik stilleri kendi içinde değerlendirildiğinde, öğretmenlerin mesleki kıdem yılı değişkenine göre dönüşümcü liderlik stili ile serbest bırakıcı liderlik stili alt boyutu puan ortalamalarında farklılaşmanın anlamlı olduğu, sürdürümcü liderlik stili alt boyutunda ise farklılaşmanın anlamlı olmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Okul müdürlerinin dönüşümcü liderlik puanlarıyla demokratik tutum ve davranışları puanları arasında pozitif yönde anlamlı bir ilişki vardır. Okul müdürlerinin serbest bırakıcı ve sürdürümcü liderlik stilleri puanlarıyla ile demokratik tutum ve davranışlar puanları arasında negatif yönlü anlamlı ilişki vardır.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between the leadership styles of principals and their democratic attitudes and behaviors. The study group consists of 173 teachers working in the public schools in the central districts of Konya. 54,3% of the teachers are female and 45,7% of the teachers are male. Akan, Yıldırım and Yalçın's (2014) Principals as Leadership Style Scale and Bakır's (2007) Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors Scale of Principals in School Management were used in this study. As a result of the research, it was seen that the means of democratic attitudes and behaviors significantly differed among the principals while the point averages of the transformational leadership, laissez-faire leadership and transactional leadership significantly did not differ among the principals according to gender variable of the teachers. According to the teachers' education level, it was seen that there was no significant difference in the means of the leadership styles and the democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals. According to the variation of teacher's professional seniority, the means of democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals differed significantly. When the leadership styles were assessed in themselves, it was found that the difference between the point averages of the transformational leadership style and sub-dimension of the laissez-faire leadership style was significant, whereas the difference in the sub-dimension of transactional leadership style was not significant according to the variable of teacher's professional seniority. There was a significant positive relationship between the democratic attitudes and behavior points of the principals and their transformational leadership style. There was a significant negative relationship between the democratic attitudes and behaviors points of principals and the points of transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles.

Anahtar Kelimeler:

*Okul Müdürleri,
Liderlik Stilleri,
Demokratik Tutum
ve Davranışlar*

Keywords:

*Principals,
Leadership Styles,
Democratic
Attitudes and
Behaviors*

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of leadership in the field of administrative sciences has been very popular and subject to many scientific researches. Accordingly, "leadership should be viewed as a complex process with its multiple dimensions" (Northouse, 2013:2). In the literature, though the leadership styles are defined in different forms, they are generally evaluated in three dimensions as the *transformational*, *transactional* and *laissez-faire*. "The laissez-faire leadership style was considered as a separate leadership style by Hoy and Miskel, although it was considered as a sub-dimension of the transactional leadership in some scientific studies" (Akan vd., 2014:394). This study is based on this classification.

1.1. Transformational Leadership

The transformational leadership approach that has been studied on by a large number of researchers since the early 1980s still keeps up to date and focuses more on the charismatic and affective aspects of leadership (Bryman, 1992). For the first time, the transformational leadership concept was expressed by Downton (1973) and conceptualized by Burns (1978) as distinct from transformational leadership.

Transformational leadership leads to fundamental democratic values, cooperative organizational culture, organizational values and, most importantly, organizational innovation and transformation (Avolio and Bass, 1988, Konan, 2015). One of the reasons for the success of the transformational leaders is that they have a charisma. Charismatic leaders inspire people and increase their motivation; they have a high level of confidence and identify with the leadership (Bass, 1990). Jantzi and Leithwood (1996) determined the dimensions of the transformational leadership behavior as follows: setting a vision, strengthening group goals, individual support, intellectual stimulation, behavior modeling and high performance (Jantzi and Leithwood, 1996:514).

1.2. Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership is a different activity than management and gives priority to identification with human values. Management values such as honesty, loyalty, commitment, responsibility and good behavior are important for transactional leadership. Transactional leaders strive to identify specific goals, problem solving, horizontal and vertical communication, program development and strong motivation (Burns, 1978; Starratt, 1995). Bass (1990) defines the dimensions of the transactional leadership as follows: rewarding high performance, researching deviations from criteria and rules, performing perfect action, not interfering with the criteria and developing criteria, avoiding decision making and responsibility (Bass, 1990:22). Teachers' having limited knowledge, ideas and solutions are among the basic understandings of transactional leadership (Ingram, 1997; Leithwood vd., 1999).

1.3. Laissez-Faire Leadership

Laissez-faire leaders lets things ride out, gives people liberty and directs them at the lowest level. In an organization where this leadership is dominant, people are left alone, according to the provided resources they are allowed to make plans and programs, management authority is needed at the lowest level. Therefore, the interaction and common activities are at low level between leader and followers (Bass, 1990; Bass and Avalio, 1999).

1.4. Democratic School Management

Democratic education is a concept that emerges when two concepts, democracy and education, characterize each other. It can be dealt with in two different contexts; the first is the teaching of democratic principles to individuals through education, and the second one is the educational management, the application of democratic principles in its content and program, and the reflection of democracy in education (Doğan, 2004).

"The training of democracy is depended on the democratization of the school environment" (Başaran, 1982: 88). A school manager who wants to meet the requirements of the age and defends the democratic management

approach should demonstrate democratic and ethical leadership qualities in order to increase the achievement levels of all the students by demonstrating an honest, fair and moral attitude (Gümüşeli, 2001).

Bakır (2007) aimed to measure how principals and teachers perceive the democratic attitudes and behaviors exhibited by primary principals in school management. As a result of this study, form tutors considered that principals were more democratic, and teachers of social sciences, mathematics and sciences considered that principals were not democratic, and the views of teachers regarding the democratic attitudes and behaviors of primary school principals did not have a significant difference in terms of gender variable of teachers.

Arslan (2012) aimed to measure the effects of principals working in primary schools on democratic attitudes and behaviors in their approach to teachers and, accordingly, the effects of these attitudes and behaviors on teacher motivation. As a result of this study, there was a significant difference between democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals and teacher motivation.

Özdemir (2012) examined whether there was a relationship between democratic attitudes of principals working in primary schools and teachers' perceptions of organizational commitment. As a result of the research, it was found that the perceived democratic attitudes and behaviors of elementary principals showed a significant difference according to the teachers' gender and professional seniority; compared to the level of education did not show any significant difference.

Özbek (2016) examined the views of teachers about the democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals according to various variables and reached that there was no significant difference between the teachers' gender, age and education level variables.

Çetiner (2008) examined teachers' views on the transformational leadership behaviors of elementary school principals. As a result of this research, it was found that there was no significant difference in evaluating the level of the principals showing the transformational leadership behaviors according to gender of teachers. In addition, it has been reached those teachers having professional seniority 21 years and over has a higher level of transformational leadership behavior than the teachers having professional seniority 6-10 years.

In the literature, the absence of a study examining the relationship between principals' leadership styles and the democratic attitudes and behaviors reveals the importance of this research. In this study, democratic attitudes and behaviors and leadership styles exhibited by principals are evaluated based on the views of teachers. It was aimed to determine the relationship between leadership styles and democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals according to teachers' perceptions. For this purpose, the following questions will be asked to answer.

- What kind of leadership styles do principals exhibit?
- According to the teachers' gender, education level and professional seniority variables, is there any significant difference between the means of principals' democratic attitudes and behaviors?
- According to the teachers' gender, education level and professional seniority variables, is there any significant difference between the means of principals' transformational leadership, transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership styles?
- Is there a significant relationship between means of democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals and their transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership styles?

2. METHOD

In this study, it was aimed to examine the relationship between the leadership styles of principals and their democratic attitudes and behaviors according to teachers' perceptions, and relational screening model was used as research method.

The relational screening model is one of the research models aiming to determine the degree of change and/or change between two or more variables. The variables to be searched for are symbolized, but this symbolization should be such as to allow for a relational analysis. In such research models, the current situation and conditions are tried to be revealed exactly (İslamoğlu, 2003; Kaptan, 1998; Karasar, 2005).

The research model used in this study includes two variables, one independent and one dependent variable. The "leadership styles of principals" is the independent variable of study and has three sub-dimensions:

transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership. "Democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals" were considered as dependent variable of this study.

2.1. Population and Sample

The population of this study is composed of teachers working in public primary, secondary and high schools in the province of Konya in the academic year of 2017-2018. The sample of the research consists of 173 teachers selected by random sampling method among the teachers in the schools. The distribution of the public primary, secondary and high school teachers participating in the survey according to gender, age, education level and professional seniority are given in Table 1.

According to distribution of teachers by gender variable, 79 (45.7%) of the participants are male and 94 (44.3%) are female. When the distribution of teachers according to their age range variable it has been observed that 41 (23,7%) of the teachers are 25-30 years old, 38 (22,0%) of the teachers are 31-35 years old, 30 (17,3%) of the teachers are 36-40 years old, 40 (23,1%) of the teachers are 41-45 years old and 24 (13,9%) of the teachers are 46 and over years old.

148 (85,5%) of teachers have an undergraduate degree and 25 (14,5%) of teachers have a graduate degree. When the professional seniority is considered, it has been seen that 25 (14.5%) of the teachers have 1-5 years, 42 (24,3%) of the teachers have 6-10 years, 37 (21,4%) of the teachers have 11-15 years, 45 (13.9%) of the teachers have 16-20 years, 24 (13.9%) of the teachers (13.9%) 21 and over years.

Table 1. Demographic Information of Teachers Participating in the Survey

		1	2	3	4	5	Total
Gender		Female	Male				
	η	94	79				173
	%	54,3	45,7				100
Age Range		25-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-	
	η	41	38	30	40	24	173
	%	23,7	22,0	17,3	23,1	13,9	100
Education Level		Undergraduate	Graduate				
	η	148	25				173
	%	85,5	14,5				100
Professional Seniority		1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-	
	η	25	42	37	45	24	173
	%	14,5	24,3	21,4	13,9	13,9	100

Source: Created by authors

2.2. Data Collection Method

In this study, two instruments were used to collect data. The first instrument is the Principals as Leadership Style Scale and the second one is the Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors of Principals in School Management Scale. In order to use these two instruments for this study, the permission was get from the researchers who developed them.

Principals as Leadership Style Scale was developed by Akan, Yıldırım and Yalçın (2014) consists of 35 items and three subscales: transformational leadership, transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership. The transformational leadership sub-dimension consists of 20 items (1-4-6-8-10-11-14-15-16-19-20-22-23-24-25-27-30-32-34-35), the laissez-faire leadership sub-dimension consists of 8 items (2-9-12-13-17-26-31-33) and the transactional leadership sub-dimension consists of 7 items (3-5-7-18-21-28-29). A Likert-type 5-point scale was used to measure the items. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients of sub-scales were calculated. The Cronbach alpha calculated 0,96 for transformational leadership, 0,85 for transactional leadership and 0,82 for laissez-faire leadership.

Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors of Principals in School Management Scale was developed by Bakır (2007) and consists of 33 items. A Likert-type 5-point scale was used to measure the items. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients of sub-scales were calculated. The Cronbach alpha calculated 0,98.

2.3. Data Analyses

Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilks tests were used to test whether the collected data provided normal distribution values or not. The relationship between leadership styles and democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals according to teachers' gender and educational level was tested by the Mann-Whitney U test. According to the professional seniority of the teachers, the difference between the leadership styles of principals and the means of democratic attitudes and behaviors was tested with Kruskal-Wallis test. The relationship between leadership styles of principals and democratic attitudes and behaviors was tested by Spearman-Brown sequence differences correlation technique.

3. FINDINGS AND COMMENTS

When the findings given in Table 2 are examined, it has been seen that the principals exhibit the highest level of laissez-faire leadership style ($\bar{X}=3,12$) and the lowest level of transformational leadership style ($\bar{X}=2,87$). It is also seen that the mean of the principals' transactional leadership style ($\bar{X}=2,88$) is very close to the mean of the transformational leadership style ($\bar{X}=2,87$).

Table 2. Descriptive Analysis of Teacher Perceptions Related to Principals' Leadership Styles

Scales	N	$\bar{X}$	SD
Transformational Leadership	173	2,87	1,15
Laissez-Faire Leadership	173	3,12	1,28
Transactional Leadership	173	2,88	1,24

Source: Created by authors

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilks tests were used to test whether the collected data showed a normal distribution, and the values are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Kolmogorov-Smirnov ve Shapiro-Wilk Normality Test

Scales	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	S	N	p	S	N	p
Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors	0,161	173	0,000	0,875	173	0,000
Transformational Leadership	0,288	173	0,000	0,765	173	0,000
Laissez-Faire Leadership	0,218	173	0,000	0,818	173	0,000
Transactional Leadership	0,230	173	0,000	0,816	173	0,000

Source: Created by authors

When the normality values of the table were examined, the analysis of the data obtained from the Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors of Principals in School Management Scale, and Principals as Leadership Style Scale showed no normal distribution. According to this result, it was reached that the non-parametric tests should be applied in the analysis of the data.

When Mann-Whitney U test results were examined in Table 4, there was a significant difference in the means of democratic attitude and behavior of principals perceived by teachers according to their gender ($U = 3092.00$, p

<0,05). The mean of democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals perceived by female teachers ($\bar{X}=105,72$) was higher than that of male teachers ($\bar{X}=98,08$).

Table 4. Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors Levels of Principals and Gender of Teachers

Scale	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors of Principals	1. Female	94	105,72	93,61	8799,00	3092,00	0,049
	2. Male	79	98,08	79,14	6252,00		

Source: Created by authors

The results of the Mann-Whitney U test were presented in Table 5 that the democratic attitude and behavioral means of the principals perceived by the teachers according to their education level did not show a significant difference ($U = 1512.50$, $p > 0,05$).

Table 5. Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors Levels of Principals and Education Level of Teachers

Scale	Education Level	N	$\bar{X}$	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors of Principals	1. Undergraduate	148	100,86	84,72	12538,50	1512,50	0,145
	2. Graduate	25	110,36	100,50	2512,50		

Source: Created by authors

When the results of the Kruskal Wallis test were examined in Table 6, it was seen that the total points of principals in terms of democratic attitudes and behaviors were significantly different according to the professional seniority of the teachers ($\chi^2 = 9.504$, $p < .05$). The Mann-Whitney U test was performed to determine the source of differentiation. According to the results of this test, the democratic attitudes and behavioral means perceived by the teachers having professional seniority 21 years and over were significantly higher than the teachers having professional seniority 11-15 years and 16-20 years.

Table 6. Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors Levels of Principals and Professional Seniority of Teachers

Scale	Professional Seniority	N	$\bar{X}$	Mean Rank	χ^2	p	Difference
Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors of Principals	1. 1-5	25	96,95	76,70	9,504	0,050	5>3 5>4
	2. 6-10	42	99,15	85,30			
	3. 11-15	37	100,96	71,99			
	4. 16-20	45	105,80	96,56			
	5. 21 and over	24	111,79	105,94			

Source: Created by authors

The Mann-Whitney U test results were presented in Table 7 that means of principals' transformational leadership ($U=3265.00$, $p>0,05$), transactional leadership ($U=3628.00$, $p>0,05$) and laissez-faire leadership ($U=3689.00$, $p>0,05$) did not significantly differentiate according to the gender of the teachers.

Table 7. Leadership Styles of Principals and Gender of Teachers

Scales	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Transformational Leadership	1. Female	94	59,22	91,76	8625,50	3265,50	0,172
	2. Male	79	55,08	81,34	6425,50		
Laissez-Faire Leadership	1. Female	94	24,98	87,26	8202,00	3689,00	0,942
	2. Male	79	25,07	86,70	6849,00		
Transactional Leadership	1. Female	94	19,95	86,10	8093,50	3628,50	0,796
	2. Male	79	20,36	88,07	6957,50		

Source: Created by authors

When the Mann-Whitney U test results were examined in Table 8, means of principals' transformational leadership ($U=1548.50$, $p>0,05$), transactional leadership ($U=1499.00$, $p>0,05$) and laissez-faire leadership ($U=1757.00$, $p>0,05$) did not significantly differentiate according to the education level of the teachers.

Table 8. Leadership Styles of Principals and Education Level of Teachers

Scales	Education Level	N	$\bar{X}$	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Transformational Leadership	1. Undergraduate	94	56,69	84,96	12574,50	1548,50	0,192
	2. Graduate	79	61,12	99,06	2476,50		
Laissez-Faire Leadership	1. Undergraduate	94	25,40	87,63	12969,00	1757,00	0,687
	2. Graduate	79	24,96	83,28	2082,00		
Transactional Leadership	1. Undergraduate	94	20,50	89,37	13227,00	1499,00	0,128
	2. Graduate	79	18,00	72,96	1824,00		

Source: Created by authors

When the Table 9 was examined, no significant difference was found between the means of the teachers who participating in the research in the transactional leadership sub-dimension ($\chi^2=8.360$, $p>0.05$). However, according to the professional seniority of the teachers participating in the research, it was seen that the difference between the difference of the principals in terms of transformational leadership ($\chi^2=9.608$, $p<0.05$) and laissez-faire leadership ($\chi^2=11.666$, $p<0.05$) was significant. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine which groups of differentiation existed. According to the results of this test, mean of the transformational leadership perceived by the teachers having professional seniority 16-20 years and 21 years and over were significantly higher than the teachers having professional seniority 1-5 years. Also, mean of the laissez-faire leadership perceived by the teachers having professional seniority 6-10 years was significantly higher than the teachers having professional seniority 16-20 years and 21 years and over.

Table 9. Leadership Styles of Principals and Professional Seniority of Teachers

Leadership Styles	Professional Seniority	N	$\bar{X}$	Mean Rank	χ^2	p	Difference
Transformational Leadership	1. 1-5	25	52,26	48,20	9,608	0,048	5>1 4>1
	2. 6-10	42	54,47	58,14			
	3. 11-15	37	55,86	51,54			
	4. 16-20	45	60,95	61,62			
	5. 21 and over	24	66,33	66,33			
Laissez-Faire Leadership	1. 1-5	25	25,82	25,40	11,666	0,020	2>5 2>4
	2. 6-10	42	28,92	27,30			
	3. 11-15	37	23,66	26,37			
	4. 16-20	45	23,52	23,35			
	5. 21 and over	24	21,70	21,70			
Transactional Leadership	1. 1-5	25	21,12	22,88	8,360	0,079	
	2. 6-10	42	19,05	18,38			
	3. 11-15	37	21,46	21,48			
	4. 16-20	45	19,37	19,33			
	5. 21 and over	24	19,83	19,83			

Source: Created by authors

The relationship between the leadership styles of principals and their democratic attitudes and behaviors was tested by the Spearman Brown rank difference correlation technique and the results were given in Table 10. When this table is examined, it has seen that there is a positive correlation between democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals and transformational leadership ($r=0,596$; $p<0,05$). Besides, there is a negative correlation between democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals and laissez-faire leadership ($r=-0,655$, $p<0,05$) and transactional leadership ($r=-0,251$; $p<0,05$).

Table 10. The Relationship between Principals' Leadership Styles and Their Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors

		Leadership Styles		
		Transformational Leadership	Laissez-Faire Leadership	Transactional Leadership
Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors of Principals	r	,596	-,655	-,251
	p	,000	,000	,001

Source: Created by authors

CONCLUSION

As a result of this study, it was observed that the teacher views on the democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals in school management did not differ according to the gender variable. Bakır (2007) and Tura (2012) reached that the teachers' views on the democratic attitudes and behaviors exhibited by the principals of the primary school in the school management did not differ significantly according to the gender variable. The results of these studies support the findings obtained as a result of this research. Özdemir (2012) and Özbek (2016) reached that views of male teachers on the democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals were higher than female teachers. Terzi and Kurt (2005) concluded that female teachers' views on the democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals are higher than male teachers.

In this study, it has been reached that there is no statistically significant difference on the democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals in school management according to education levels of teachers. Bakır (2007),

Özdemir (2016), Tura (2012) and Zencirci (2003) have found that teacher perceptions of democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals do not differ according to their education levels. The results of these studies support the findings obtained as a result of this research. This result of our research can be explained by two different interpretations. First, principals exhibit equal democratic attitudes and behaviors against teachers who have different education levels. Second, the perceptions of principals against their democratic attitudes and behaviors are at the same level, even though their level of education is different.

As a result of this study, it was seen that perceptions of the teachers about democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals in school management differ statistically according to the variable of professional seniority. While the teachers having professional seniority 21 years and over perceive the principals more democratic, the teachers having professional seniority 11-15 years and 16-20 years perceive the principals less democratic. Zencirci (2003) found that perceptions of the teachers having professional seniority 11-15 years on the democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals were higher than the other groups. Özdemir (2012) also found that perceptions of the teachers having professional seniority 20 years and over were higher than the other groups. The results of these two studies support the findings of this research. As a result of the studies conducted by Bakır (2007) and Tura (2012), it was observed that the teacher perceptions on the democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals did not differ according to the professional seniority variable.

In this study, the means of the leadership styles of principals are in the form of laissez-faire leadership, transactional leadership and transformational leadership. "In studies examining the leadership styles of principals, the transformational leader attained a higher level of leadership style than the other leadership styles" (Cemaloğlu, 2007; Cemaloğlu ve Okçu, 2012; Töremen ve Yasan, 2010; Çetinkaya, 2011; Kültür, 2006; Zeren, 2007; Çelik, 1998; Kazancı, 2010; Aslan, 2013; Kul, 2010; Buluç, 2009; Şirin, 2008; Özcan, 2013; Çimili-Gök, 2010; Tura, 2012; Gündüz ve Kuruçayır, 2010; İşcan, 2006; Yıldırım, 2006; Çetiner, 2008; Yavuz, 2008: as cited in Akan ve Yalçın, 2015: 142). On the other hand this study findings show that principals exhibit a higher level of laissez-faire leadership style than the transformational and transactional leadership styles.

Teachers' views on leadership styles exhibited by principals were not significantly different by gender variable. The researches conducted by Çetiner (2008), Şahin (2005), Tahaoğlu and Gedikoğlu (2009), Töremmen and Yasan (2010) revealed that there is no significant difference in the leadership behaviors of principals in terms of gender variable of teachers. The results of this researches support the results of this study.

Teacher views on leadership styles exhibited by principals show a statistically significant difference in terms of their professional seniority. This significant differentiation has been identified in the sub-dimensions of the transformational leadership and laissez-faire leadership. While the teachers whose professional seniority are 16-20 years and 20 years and over consider the principals as more transformational leaders, the teachers having professional seniority 1-5 years consider principals as less transformational leaders. While the teachers having professional seniority 6-10 years consider the principals as more laissez-faire leaders, the teachers having professional seniority 16-20 years and 21 years and over consider principals as less laissez-faire leaders. Çetiner (2008) reached that the teachers having professional seniority 21 years and over consider their principals more transformational leaders than the teachers having professional seniority 6-10 years. According to Şahin (2005), the teachers having professional seniority 5 years and under consider their principals more transformational leaders than the teachers having professional seniority 6-20 years. Töremen and Yasan (2010) revealed that teachers having 21 years and over professional seniority consider their principals more transformational leaders than teachers having 11-20 years professional seniority. Tahaoğlu and Gedikoğlu (2009) did not find any significant difference in the evaluation of leadership roles of primary principals according to professional seniority variables of teachers.

In this study, it has been reached that there is no statistically significant difference between leadership styles of principals in terms of teachers' education level. According to the variable of the education level of the teachers, Töremen and Yasan (2010) found that there is no statistically significant difference between the associate degree graduates and the undergraduate teachers in transformational leadership perception. Tahaoğlu and Gedikoğlu (2009) did not find any significant difference in the evaluations of leadership roles of primary principals according to the education level of teachers.

According to the results of the correlation analysis, there is a statistically significant positive correlation between the level of democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals and transformational leadership styles. According to this result, it can be said that the principals exhibiting transformational leadership styles exhibit more democratic attitudes and behaviors in school management.

There is a statistically significant negative correlation between level of democratic attitudes and behaviors of principals and laissez-faire leadership and transactional leadership styles. According to this result, it can be said that the principals exhibiting transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership styles exhibit less democratic attitudes and behaviors in school management.

It can be seen as an important finding that the mean of school principals' leadership style is low. Principals should be encouraged to exhibit more transformational leadership behaviors in order to find their democratic attitudes and behaviors at the desired level.

In this research, it was tried to determine the levels of principals' leadership styles and democratic attitudes and behaviors according to the perceptions of teachers working in central Konya. In the qualitative or quantitative research to be carried out after that, both teacher and manager views can be compared. In addition, new researches can be carried out with the views of students, parents and other school staffs.

REFERENCES

- AKAN, Durdağı ve SEZER, Şenol (2014), “Okul Müdürlerinin Liderlik Stilleri ile Okulların Öğrenen Örgüt Olma Düzeyi Arasındaki İlişki”, **Turkish Journal of Educational Studies**, S.1(2), ss.126-151.
- AKAN, Durdağı ve YALÇIN, İsa (2015), “Okul Yöneticilerinin Liderlik Stilleri ile Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi”, **Eğitim ve İnsani Bilimler Dergisi**, S.11, ss.123-150.
- AKAN, Durdağı, YILDIRIM, İsa ve YALÇIN, Sinan (2014), “Okul Müdürleri Liderlik Stili Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi”, **Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi**, S.13(51), ss.392-415.
- APPLE, W. Michael, AASEN, Peter, CHO, Misook Kim, GANDIN, Luis Armando, OLIVER, Anita, SUNG, Youl-Kwan, TAVARES, Hannah ve WONG, Ting-Hong (2003), **The State and the Politics of Knowledge**, Routledge Falmer, New York (USA).
- AVOLIO, Bruce J. ve BASS, Bernard M. (1988), “*Transformational Leadership Charisma and Beyond*”, **Emerging Leadership Vitas** (Ed. James G. Hunt, Bantwal Rabi Baliga, H. Peter Dachler ve Chester A. Schriesheim), Lexington Books, Lexington, MA, ss.29-49.
- BAKIR, Aslı Ağıroğlu (2007), “*Sergiledikleri Demokratik Tutum ve Davranışlar Açısından İlköğretim Okulu Yöneticilerinin Değerlendirilmesi: Malatya İli Örneği*” **Yüksek Lisans Tezi**, İnönü Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Malatya.
- BALL, Stephen (2007), “*Reading Michael Apple — The Sociological Imagination at Work*”, **Theory and Research in Education**, S.5(2), ss.153-159.
- BASS, Bernard M. (1990), **From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision**. Organizational Dynamics.
- BASS, Bernard M. ve AVOLIO, Bruce J. (1999), “*Re-Examining the Components of the Transformational and Transactional Leadership Using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*”, **Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology**, S.72, ss.441-462.
- BAŞARAN, İbrahim Ethem (1982), **Örgütsel Davranış**, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları, Ankara.
- BRYMAN, Alan (1992). **Charisma and Leadership in Organizations**. Sage Published, London (ENGLAND).
- BULUÇ, Bekir (2009), “*Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Algılarına Göre Okul Müdürlerinin Liderlik Stilleri ile Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişki*”, **Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi**, S.15(57), ss.5-34.
- BURNS, James MacGregor (1978), **Leadership**, Harper & Row, New York (USA).
- CEMALOĞLU, Necati (2007), “*Okul Müdürlerinin Liderlik Stilllerinin Örgüt Sağlığına Etkisi*”, **Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi**, S.11(2), ss.165-194.
- CEMALOĞLU, Necati, ve OKÇU, Veysel (2012), “*İlköğretim Okulu Yöneticilerinin Liderlik Stilleri ile Öğretmenlerin Yıldırma (Mobbing) Yaşama Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki*”, **Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi**, S.5(3), ss.214-239.

- ÇELİK, Vehbi (1998), “*Eğitimde Dönüşümcü Liderlik*”, **Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi**, S.4(4), ss.423-442.
- ÇETİNER, Azime (2008), “*İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Dönüşümcü Liderlik Davranışlarını Gösterme Düzeylerine İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşleri (Burdur İli Örneği)*”, **Yüksek Lisans Tezi**, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Isparta.
- ÇETİNKAYA, İpek (2011), “*Ortaöğretim Okul Müdürlerinin Liderlik Stilleri ve İletişim Becerileri Arasındaki İlişki*”, **Yüksek Lisans Tezi**, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- ÇİMİLİ-GÖK, Ebru Burcu (2010), “*Okul Müdürlerinin Liderlik Stiline İlişkin Öğretmen Algılarının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışlarına Etkisi*”, **Yüksek Lisans Tezi**, Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya.
- DEWEY, John (1991), **Liberalism and Social Action**, Prometheus Books, New York (USA).
- DOĞAN, İsmail (2004), **Toplum ve Eğitim Sorunları Üzerine Felsefi ve Sosyal Tahliller**, Pegem A Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- DOWNTOWN, James V. (1973), **Rebel Leadership: Commitment and Charisma in the Revolutionary Process**, The Free Press, New York (USA).
- GÜMÜŞELİ, Ali İlker (2001), “*Çağdaş Okul Müdürünün Liderlik Alanları*”, **Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi**, S.28, ss.531-548.
- GÜNDÜZ, Hasan Basri ve KURUÇAYIR, Ayçelen (2010), “*Okul Müdürlerinin Liderlik Stilleri ve Empatik Eğilim Düzeyler*”, **V. Ulusal Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi: Eğitim Yöneticilerinin Yetiştirilmesi ve Yönetici Yeterlilikleri Bildiriler Kitabı**, ss.398-411.
- HOY, Wayne K. ve MISKEL, Cecil G. (2012), **Eğitim Yönetimi**, Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- INGRAM, Patreese D. (1997), “*Leadership Behaviors of Principals in Inclusive Educational Settings*”, **Journal of Educational Administration**, S.35(5), ss.11-27.
- İSLAMOĞLU, Ahmet Hamdi (2003), **Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri**, Beta Yayınları, İstanbul.
- İŞCAN, Ömer Faruk (2006), “*Dönüştürücü/Etkileşimci Liderlik Algısı ve Örgütsel Özdeşleşme İlişkisinde Bireysel Farklılıkların Rolü*”, **Akdeniz Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakülte Dergisi**, S.11, ss.160-177.
- JANTZI, Doris ve LEITHWOOD, Kenneth (1996), “*Toward an Explanation of Variation in Teachers Perceptions of Transformational School Leadership*”, **Educational Administration Quarterly**, S.32(4), ss.512-538.
- KAPTAN, Saim (1998), **Bilimsel Araştırma ve İstatistik Teknikleri**, Takışık Web Ofset Tesisleri, Ankara.
- KARASAR, Niyazi (2005), **Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi**, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
- KAZANCI, Neşe (2010), “*İlköğretim Okullarındaki Yöneticilerin Liderlik Stilleri ile Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Adalet Algıları Arasındaki İlişki Düzeyi*”, **Yüksek Lisans Tezi**, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya.
- KONAN, Necdet (2015), **Eğitim Yönetiminde Yeni Liderlik Yaklaşımları**, Pegem Akademi Yayınları, Ankara.
- KUL, Murat (2010), “*Okul Müdürlerinin Liderlik Stilleri ile Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerinin Yıldırma (Mobbing) Yaşama Düzeyleri, Örgütsel Bağlılıkları ve İş Doyumu Arasındaki İlişki*”, **Doktora Tezi**, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- KÜLTÜR, Yusuf Ziya (2006), “*Ortaöğretim Kurumlarındaki Yöneticilerin Liderlik Stilleri ve Kişilik Özelliklerinin Karşılaştırılması*”, **Yüksek Lisans Tezi**, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- LEITHWOOD, Kenneth (1992), “*The Move Toward Transformational Leadership*”, **Educational Leadership**, S.49(5), ss.8-12.
- LEITHWOOD, Kenneth ve RIEHL, Carolyn (2003), **What We Know About Successful School Leadership**, Laboratory for Student Success, Temple University, Philadelphia (USA).

- LEITHWOOD, Kenneth, JANTZI, Doris ve STEINBACH, Rosanne (1999), **Changing Leadership for Changing Times**, Open University' Press, Philadelphia (USA).
- MCCOLL-KENNEDY, Janet R. ve ANDERSON, Ronald D. (2005), “*Subordinate–Manager Gender Combination and Perceived Leadership Style Influence on Emotions, Self-Esteem and Organizational Commitment*”, **Journal of Business Research**, S.58, ss.115-125.
- NORTHOUSE, Peter G. (2014), **Liderlik** (Çev. Cemal Şimşek), Sürat Üniversite Yayınları, İstanbul.
- ÖZBEK, Barış (2016), “*Öğretmenlerin Okul Müdürlerinin Demokratik Tutum ve Davranışlarına İlişkin Görüşlerinin Çeşitli Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi*”, **Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi**, S.27, ss.59-70.
- ÖZDEMİR, Adnan (2012), “*İlköğretim Okul Müdürlerinin Demokratik Tutumlarının Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılık Algısı ile İlişkisi*”, **Yüksek Lisans Tezi**, Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- STARRATT, Robert Jerry (1995), **Leaders with Vision the Quest School Renewal**, Corwin Press Inc.
- ŞAHİN, Semiha (2005), “*İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Dönüşümcü ve Sürdürümcü Liderlik Stilleri*”, **Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi**, S.30(135), ss.39-49.
- ŞİMŞEK, Şerif, AKGEMCİ, Tahir ve ÇELİK, Adnan (2011), **Davranış Bilimlerine Giriş ve Örgütlerde Davranış**, Gazi Kitabevi, Ankara.
- ŞİRİN, Erkan Faruk (2008), “*Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu Yöneticilerinin Liderlik Stilleri ve Çatışma Yönetimi Stratejilerinin İncelenmesi*”, **Doktora Tezi**, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- ŞİŞMAN, Mehmet, GÜLEŞ, Hatice ve DÖNMEZ, Ayşe (2010), “*Demokratik Bir Okul Kültürü İçin Yeterlilikler Çerçevesi*”, **Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi**, S.3(1), ss.167-182.
- TAHAOĞLU, Filiz ve GEDİKOĞLU, Tokay (2009), “*İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Liderlik Rollerini*”, **Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi**, S.15(58), ss.274-298.
- TERZİ, Ali Rıza ve KURT, Türker (2005), “*İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Yöneticilik Davranışlarının Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılığına Etkisi*”, **Milli Eğitim Dergisi**, S.166.
- TÖREMEN, Fatih ve YASAN, Tezcan (2010), “*İlköğretim Okulu Yöneticilerinin Dönüşümcü Liderlik Özellikleri (Malatya İli Örneği)*”, **Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi**, S.28, ss.27-39.
- TURA, Mustafa (2012), “*İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Liderlik Stillerinin Öğretmenlerin İş Doyumuna Etkisi/Karacabey İlçesi Örneği*”, **Yüksek Lisans Tezi**, Balıkesir Üniversitesi, Balıkesir.
- YAVUZ, Ercan (2008), “*Dönüşümcü ve Etkileşimci Liderlik Davranışının Örgütsel Bağlılığa Etkisinin Analizi*”, **Doktora Tezi**, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- YILDIRIM, Cansu (2006), “*Okul Müdürlerinin Liderlik Stillerinin Örgütsel Sağlık Üzerindeki Etkisi*”, **Yüksek Lisans Tezi**, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- ZENCİRCİ, İsmail (2003), “*İlköğretim Okullarında Yönetimin Demokratiklik Düzeyinin Katılım, Özgürlük ve Özerklik Boyutları Açısından Değerlendirilmesi*”, **Doktora Tezi**, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- ZEREN, Halit (2007), “*İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin Dönüşümcü Liderlik Stilleri ile Bu Okullarda Görevli Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılığı Arasındaki İlişki (Şanlıurfa İli Örneği)*”, **Yüksek Lisans Tezi**, Harran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Şanlıurfa.



Uluslararası
Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi
International Journal Of Management Academy