

**DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v7i1.1397**

**Citation:** Cansoy, R., Kutlu, H., Araşkal, S., Bozkurt, E., & Danişmaz, N. (2018). Factors That Limit Effective Administrative Behaviors of School Principals: A Mixed Method Study. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 7(1), 65-76. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v7i1.1397>

## **Factors That Limit Effective Administrative Behaviors of School Principals: A Mixed Method Study**

**Ramazan Cansoy<sup>1</sup>, Hayriye Kutlu<sup>2</sup>,  
Seçil Araşkal<sup>3</sup>, Emine Bozkurt<sup>4</sup>, Nurmelek Danişmaz<sup>5</sup>**

### **Abstract**

In this study, effective administrative behaviors that school principals exhibit according to teacher perceptions, their ineffective behavioral patterns, and their ineffective behavioral reasons were investigated. The study was conducted based on the mixed method. The explanatory design in which first quantitative data and then qualitative data are collected to explain quantitative data was conducted. A total of 200 teachers who could be reached from teachers employed in elementary, secondary and high schools located in Karabük province constituted the sample of the study. The participants in the qualitative section of the study were 19 teachers from different school types. Quantitative data were collected by the Administrative Effectiveness Scale. A semi-structured interview was used to obtain qualitative data. In this study, quantitative research findings showed that effective administrative behaviors of school principals were at the moderate level. According to these findings, it was observed that school principals' behaviors in the areas such as supporting teacher professional development, sparing time to improve education and training, and well running of the reward system were not at sufficient levels. The findings in the qualitative section of the study supported these findings. In this context, qualitative findings conducted with teachers revealed that school principals' administrative efforts to improve education and training in the school were not at the desired level. On the other hand, the fact that school administrators had shortcomings with respect to exhibiting behaviors for supporting teachers' professional development, rewarding teacher achievements, well structuring of the incentive system and developing the relationship between school and environment was intensely stated by the participants. The fact that school principals were mainly focused on daily routines in the school rather than education and training activities, spared too much time to improve the physical conditions of the school and intensely spent time for official works and operations was found to be the reasons for them.

**Keywords:** Effective principal, School leadership, School effectiveness.

<sup>1</sup> Karabuk University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Educational Sciences, Karabuk, Turkey.

<sup>2</sup> Graduate master students in educational administration, University of Karabuk, Turkey.

<sup>3</sup> Graduate master students in educational administration, University of Karabuk, Turkey.

<sup>4</sup> Graduate master students in educational administration, University of Karabuk, Turkey.

<sup>5</sup> Graduate master students in educational administration, University of Karabuk, Turkey.

## Introduction

The effectiveness of schools is related to increasing the quality of student learning outcomes, making teaching qualified, and the ability of schools to fulfill their objectives and functions (Balci, 2011; Demirtaş and Güneş, 2002; Hesapçioğlu, 2006; Şişman, 2011). Effective administrators and strong leadership are of vital importance for schools to be effective (Chandler, 1984; Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger and Murphy, 1986; Lezotte, 1992; Sammons, Hillman and Mortimore, 1995; Sergiovanni, 1995). Studies aimed at improving the quality of teaching are among the most important effectiveness criteria of school administrators (Balci, 2011; Şişman, 2011). According to Receptoğlu and Kılınc (2014), the effectiveness of the school principals depends on their leadership capacities.

There are effective behaviors exhibited by administrators in schools. According to Şişman (2011), in schools, administrators serve as a model for teachers by exhibiting effective behaviors, take a role as an instructional leader, try to improve the quality of education and training in most of their time, ensure environmental support to the school, and emphasize the objectives of the school. The behaviors of an effective administrator are focused on student learning (Özdemir and Sezgin, 2002), and an attempt to minimize all obstacles to learning is made (Parlar, 2014). The administrators of effective schools clearly reveal the objectives of the school, decide on the mission and vision of the school together with their teachers, and constantly monitor the teaching process (Bilge, 2013). They transfer the functions of the school to employees and provide the performance management and inspection of students and school personnel (Brookover and Lezotte, 1979). They clearly reveal what they expect from their teachers, and they visit learning environments and participate in these environments (Rutherford, 1984). They increase motivation and performance by ensuring that students and teachers are rewarded (Şişman, 2004). School administrators have more information about the needs of students and teachers by developing informal relationships with them. Thus, they provide the formation of a positive atmosphere regarding the attitudes and behaviors of students and teachers by determining the priorities of the school (Hallinger and Joseph, 1985). Then, the ability to exhibit these behaviors is achieved by fulfilling certain criteria. These criteria can be achieved by the behavioral patterns of school administrators to improve education and training in all areas of the school.

In the literature, there are a line of studies that reveal effective principal behaviors in schools from different aspects (e.g. Ayık and Ada, 2009; Hoy, 1992; Horng, Klasik and Loeb, 2010; Hofman, Hofman and Gray, 2015). In parallel, it is also observed that there are studies investigating the effectiveness of schools and administrators in the national literature (e.g. Arslantaş and Özkan, 2014; Cerit and Yıldırım, 2017; Gökçe and Kahraman, 2010). In most of these studies, general characteristics of effective principal behaviors were revealed as a component, and it was observed that they did not sufficiently focus on strong and weak behaviors exhibited by school principals. One of the aims of this study is to investigate the characteristics that constitute the effective behaviors of principals in a more detailed manner. Furthermore, although the effectiveness levels of school principals are found to be high in different studies, it is observed that there is a need for more explanatory information about which behaviors of administrators are effective at sufficient levels, which behaviors of them are effective at an insufficient level, and the reasons for them (e.g., Baş and Yıldırım, 2010; Serin and Buluç, 2010; Kuşaksız, 2010).

High expectations from students and teachers in effective schools, monitoring and evaluation of students' development, the belief in learning potential of each student, ensuring families' involvement in processes in school, and bringing the shared vision and mission to the school staff are among the important characteristics (Hallinger and Murphy, 1986; Morrison, 2002; Mortimore, 1993; Sammons, Hillman and Mortimore, 1995; Scheerens and Creemers, 1989; Stoll, 1992). It can be said that these characteristics will be brought to schools by the fact that school principals exhibit effective administrative behaviors. Therefore, revealing effective or ineffective behaviors of school principals may ensure making some

inferences about how schools can be more effective in terms of practitioners and policymakers. On the other hand, this study aims to explain more detail the factors that prevent school principals' effectiveness by using mixed method. In this context, answers to the following questions were searched "What is the level of exhibiting effective administrative behaviors of school principals according to teacher perceptions?" and "In which administrative behaviors are school administrators perceived to be insufficient and what are the reasons for this?".

## **Method**

### **Research Method**

In this study, quantitative and qualitative methods were used together, and the sequential mixed model approach was adopted (Creswell and Plano-Clark, 2007). In the study, first quantitative data and then qualitative data were addressed with an explanatory method (Creswell, 2012). Convenient sampling was used in selecting the study group. Easily accessible case sampling is preferred in terms of the speed and practice of the study (Miles and Huberman, 2015; Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2008). In the quantitative section of the study, the levels of effective behaviors of school administrators according to teacher perceptions were examined. In the study, the content analysis was performed in the analysis of qualitative data. According to Patton (2002), the content analysis can be regarded as an effort to reduce qualitative data and make them meaningful for determining basically consistent aspects of large data obtained. Qualitative methods was used as a design in accordance with this frame. Because, teachers have quite a lot experiences in school life. Secondly, these teachers are the teachers who can easily express their opinions on the subject studied.

Four of validity and reliability strategies indicated by Christensen et al. (2015) were used in the study. These strategies are data triangulation, comprehensive field study, external inspection and direct quotation. These strategies were implemented as follows: Observation notes were used for data triangulation, interviews with experts were used for external inspection, the opinions of the research participants were used by direct quotations, and the opinions of individuals conducting studies in the field about the research results were used for a reviewer assessment. Individual interviews are given in brackets with their names with direct speech (eg., Mrs. Ayla).

### **Research Population and Sample**

*Quantitative part:* A total of 200 teachers employed in elementary, secondary and high schools located in Karabük province included in the study. Convenient sampling was used in the selection of the participants. The sample consisted of 111 (45.5%) female and 89 (44.5%) male individuals. 45 (22.5%) teachers from elementary schools, 29 (14.5%) teachers from secondary schools and 126 (63%) teachers from high schools participated in the study. The distribution of teachers according to their seniority is 11% for 1-5 years, 15% for 6-10 years, 17% for 11-15 years, and 57% for 16 years and above.

*Qualitative part:* Interviews were conducted with a total of 19 teachers including 6 male and 13 female teachers. With respect to the seniority of the teachers interviewed, 3 of them had a seniority of 0-5 years, 2 of them had a seniority of 6-10 years, 3 of them had a seniority of 11-15 years, and 11 of them had a seniority of 16 years and above. 13 of teachers interviewed are teachers in high schools and equivalent schools, and 6 of them are elementary school teachers. With respect to the distribution of teachers according to their branches, 6 of them are primary school teachers, 3 of them are English teachers, 3 of them are Turkish Language and Literature teachers, 2 of them are Psychological Counselling and Guidance teachers, and the branches of the other four teachers are Physical Education, Biology, Chemistry and Information Technologies.

## Data Collecting Tools

Information on the demographic characteristics of the participants was collected as gender, age, seniority, working time in their schools, and the type of school where they worked. The Effective Administrator Scale, which is the sub-dimension of the Effective School Scale, was used to collect data in the study.

*Quantitative part:* Effective Administrator Scale was developed by Şişman (2011) and reveals the effectiveness levels of schools according to teacher perceptions. The scale consisting of 6 dimensions and 56 items was prepared with 5-point Likert-type grading expressed between "(1) Never agree" and "(5) Totally agree". In the scale, the administrator dimension consists of 10 items. In this study, the school administrator dimension of the relevant scale was used. In this study, there are items such as "spare most of their time in the school for education and training works" and "continuously control and evaluate the education and training process" for the administrator dimension. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient calculated for the administrative effectiveness dimension was found as .92.

*Qualitative part:* At first, interview questions were prepared depending on the literature review. Some preliminary interviews were conducted. The form was finalized by receiving expert opinions based on these interviews. Semi-structured interviews were conducted. During semi-structured focus group interviews, participants were asked 6 questions transformed from inventory questions and some other questions to get detailed understanding. Coding was made after performing the analyses, and then the themes and sub-themes were formed. Permissions were obtained on an individual basis for interviews with teachers.

## Findings

### Quantitative findings

The findings regarding the analysis of quantitative questions are presented in this section.

**Table 1.** Effectiveness levels of school principals' behaviors

Items	$\bar{X}$	S
Expect from teachers and students to be very successful.	3.29	1.41
Clearly reveal the objectives of the school and school program.	3.23	1.44
Appear all over the school frequently and visit classrooms.	3.20	1.34
Take the lead in the formation of a good working environment in the school.	3.20	1.46
Continuously control and evaluate the education and training process.	3.19	1.34
Ensure the necessary support of the environment and parents to the school.	3.19	1.47
Lead teachers in every issue related to education and training.	3.05	1.38
Spare most of their time in the school for education and training works.	3.04	1.43
Ensure that all kinds of success in school are rewarded.	2.96	1.44
Engage in activities for the professional development of teachers.	2.86	1.47
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>1.22</b>

Effective administrative behaviors of school principals are presented in Table 1. It is observed that effective administrative behaviors of school principals are concentrated in the option of agree at the moderate level ( $\bar{X} = 3.12$ ). In terms of the characteristics of effective administrative behaviors, it is observed that the most frequently exhibited behavior is the characteristic of "expect from teachers and students to be very

successful" ( $\bar{X} = 3.29$ ) and the behavior exhibited at the most insufficient level is the characteristic of "engage in activities for the professional development of teachers" ( $\bar{X} = 2.86$ ). Other behaviors are revealing the objectives of the school and school program ( $\bar{X} = 3.23$ ), appearing frequently in the school and visiting classrooms ( $\bar{X} = 3.20$ ), forming a good working environment in the school ( $\bar{X} = 3.20$ ), controlling and evaluating the education and training process ( $\bar{X} = 3.19$ ), ensuring the support of the environment and parents to the school ( $\bar{X} = 3.19$ ), leading for education and training ( $\bar{X} = 3.05$ ), sparing most of the time for education and training works ( $\bar{X} = 3.04$ ), ensuring that all kinds of success in school are rewarded ( $\bar{X} = 2.96$ ), respectively. It is observed that effective administrative behaviors of school principals are concentrated in the option of *agree at the moderate level*.

### **Qualitative findings**

The themes and sub-themes of the themes that should be developed with respect to effective administrative characteristics of school principals of the teachers who participated in the quantitative section of the study and were interviewed.

### **Themes needed to be Developed by School Principals**

#### **Supporting professional development**

Teachers think that school administrators do not exhibit sufficient incentive or guiding behaviors in the activities to ensure the professional development of teachers in their schools. In this study, when the question of "What does your school principal do for your professional development" was asked to teachers, it was observed that they were often in the tendency to state their own expectations in this regard rather than the existing state. This caused the researcher to feel that no sufficient work was performed in this regard. For example, they focused on the answers in the form of "Seminars related to our branch can be held" or "In particular, new students in each year are different from previous students. Activities on student psychology and changing perceptions can be performed to understand them better at the beginning of each year". Teachers emphasized that the support given for professional development cannot go beyond in-service training compulsorily given by the Ministry of National Education. Teachers often stated that they needed training to understand teaching methods and techniques and developmental psychology and wanted to reach sufficient levels in these areas. A major part of the teachers emphasized that school principals did not provide any reformative or improving feedback to ensure teachers' professional development. On the other hand, a limited number of teachers stated that they received support through seminars or academic resources in the school. Teachers expressed the following opinions:

"The school principal does not contribute to my professional development. He can encourage participating in central in-service activities. He can encourage being in a closer relationship with the higher education institution. He can encourage collaboration with other institutions." (Mr. Kerem)

"It cannot be said that he contributes. In particular, seminars on methods and techniques can be held (instructive and informative)." (Mrs. Ayla).

#### **Rewarding achievements**

Teachers think that rewarding made by school principals is mainly aimed at encouraging students and that behaviors for the rewarding of teachers are less often exhibited. According to teachers, students are rewarded by giving gifts according to their achievements. Teachers are often rewarded by appreciation, thanking or certification. The majority of teachers emphasized that there was no systematic reward system

in their schools. Furthermore, it is stated that the reward system works more effectively in situations that can be considered as a top-level achievement by everyone, such as national achievements. The findings of the interviews show that students are rewarded more intensely. It is acted more cautiously with respect to rewarding teachers, and very significant achievements are rewarded. On the other hand, teachers indicate that the fact that they are appreciated orally or through certification by their school administrators has a positive effect on increasing their motivation. Teachers emphasize that such awards arouse the feeling that they are valued and increase their commitment. For example, this situation was explained as follows: "The administrator rewards teachers and students who make a difference with the certificate of achievement. This increases motivation and commitment to school" (Mr. Cem). On the other hand, it is explained by stating that "Teachers and students are rewarded for academic achievements as well as social, cultural and sports activities. I think it is important to use words that express appreciation". In this context, it is observed that teachers in certain branches are rewarded at higher levels in schools. It is indicated that rewarding achievements is insufficient and that the morale of teachers improves when the reward system works.

### **Supporting teaching**

Teachers stated that school principals tried to provide appropriate conditions to support teaching in schools and that they made speeches about what can be done to improve academic achievement. In this context, it is stated that school principals try to make joint decisions with their teachers on what can be done to increase success in schools, especially in national exams. School principals generally leave in-class education and training process to teachers. They try to provide the tools and materials needed for teachers to teach their lessons better. On the other hand, it is emphasized that school principals have to deal with negative student behaviors and try to solve problematic situations that disturb the school climate. The fact that school principals are not involved in controlling or evaluating activities related to teaching in the classroom is among the common thoughts. There is a prevalent opinion that school principals try to support teaching in the school especially by creating resources or providing the necessary conditions. In these contexts, the following opinions were expressed:

"The principal talks more about the activities that can be done to eliminate negative student behaviors and to improve the working environments. Occasionally, when teachers' problems are discussed in detail, an attempt to find a solution is made, and a middle ground is found. He creates opportunities from which students and teachers can benefit." (Mr. Kaan).

"The school principal provides the conditions for the healthy functioning of teaching and takes the lead. He helps with technical problems in the teaching of lessons" (Mr. Cem).

### **Time spared for education and training**

The majority of teachers state that school principals spare much more time for administrative works in the school than efforts to improve education and training, and that daily routines are more at the forefront. Daily routines include correspondence, parents' meetings, or out-of-school meetings. On the other hand, few teachers stated that school principals visited classroom especially during breaks, controlled different areas of the school and had an interview with teachers. It was indicated that school principals exhibited behaviors especially to prevent disciplinary problems in their schools and that they had a high level of perceptions that they make more efforts to avoid problems in the school. It is observed that they are not involved in activities that directly support in-class student learning and do not provide an evaluation or feedback to teachers in this regard. The examples of opinions about school principals are as follows:

"My principal usually spares his time for administrative tasks. He visits classrooms only during breaks. It is for controlling and management" (Mr. Cem). "He generally has a guest. He does not visit and control too much. I do not think that he spares enough time. He spares time for the works of administration" (Mrs. Ela).

"In the mornings, he comes earlier than everybody else and deals with heating problems. He gets correspondence ready in time. In general, he controls whether teaching goes well by inspection. He continuously controls students to prevent them from exhibiting bad habits in the school. When we have problems with teaching, we go and tell him. If he is able to find a solution, he expects a response." (Mrs. Oya).

### **Ensuring the support of parents and the environment**

Teachers state that school administrators do work in the context of relationships with the family through different social activities or meetings. These studies can be in the form of seminars, visits or meetings according to the school levels. The most intensive activities to ensure parents' involvement are routine parents' meetings held during certain periods of the year in schools. Except this, it is stated that parents are called or invited to schools when necessary. The majority of teachers state that school administrators try to develop the relationship between school and parents by conducting different activities. On the other hand, it is stated that there are no sufficient studies to get the support of the school environment apart from parents. It is stated that school administrators try to establish good relations with families and encourage their support and involvement in activities in the school. For example, it was stated that "In our school, the relations between parents and school are tried to be kept tight through various organizations. Communication is tightened with the methods such as parent visits, parents' meetings and telephone contact. It is attempted to establish a connection by organizing seminars with the environment". "In our school, the relations between parents and school are tried to be kept tight through various organizations. Communication is tightened with the methods such as parent visits, parent meetings and telephone contact. It is attempted to establish a connection by organizing seminars with the environment". Furthermore, it is observed that teachers' environmental perceptions are concentrated in the parent dimension and that social, cultural, political or economic environment is excluded in this context. The opinions of teachers in schools vary by school levels. While parent support is perceived more intensely in elementary school and secondary school, it is perceived at lower levels in high school. On the other hand, it is stated that parents were called when necessary. For example, it was pointed out that an attempt to ensure parents' involvement was made by stating that "Parents are called and informed when necessary. Meetings are held. Parent-teacher association works are carried out". Moreover, it was found out that the school administrators of elementary school teachers are more willing to provide the support of parents and environment.

### **Conclusion and Discussion**

According to the survey results in this study, it is observed that effective administrative behaviors of school principals according to teacher perceptions are at the moderate level. Furthermore, the interviews conducted with teachers reveal that school principals are not at sufficient levels with respect to supporting teaching, sparing time for education and training, supporting professional development, well implementation of the reward system, and developing the relationship between school and environment.

According to the data obtained through the surveys in the study, school administrators were found to exhibit teacher professional development behaviors at moderate levels. The interviews conducted with teachers also support these findings. Most of the teachers in these interviews stated that school principals did not perform additional studies on professional development and it is stated that participation in in-

service training activities mandated by the Ministry of National Education is generally encouraged. A small group of teachers stated that they were professionally supported by seminars or some course resources in schools. In this context, it can be interpreted that school principals' activities for the professional development of school staff are insufficient. In particular, it is observed that the activities to ensure professional development related to the roles and behaviors of teachers in the classroom are at a very limited level. There are similar findings supporting these findings (Blase and Blase, 2010; Serin and Buluç, 2012; Kuşaksız, 2010; Hallinger and Joseph, 1985). It can be thought that school administrators do not fully find out the professional development needs of teachers or do not have enough knowledge in this regard. On the other hand, the branches of school principals during teaching years can be perceived as an obstacle in finding out their developmental needs. In this respect, it can be interpreted that studies are needed to increase administrative competence to higher levels.

The data obtained through the surveys in the study reveal that school administrators exhibit the behaviors of rewarding successful teachers at moderate levels. The findings obtained in the surveys are also explained by the interviews. The statements of the teachers interviewed in the study reveal that school administrators do not have a system to reward teachers and that the forms of rewarding may vary by the sense of rewarding of administrators. In this context, it is observed that appreciation or thanking behaviors towards teachers come more to the forefront and that high-level achievements are rewarded. Furthermore, it is stated that the behaviors of rewarding students are at higher levels and that school administrators are more willing to reward students. On the other hand, some teachers stated that the fact that they are rewarded orally or differently increases teachers' commitment to schools and strengthens their motivation. Different tasks performed by teachers are expected to be awarded. This reward expectation is not always a financial reward; it can be in the form of verbal thanking, appreciation or introducing the work done to other teachers. According to teachers' expectation for reward, they expect from administrators to be conscious and aware of what has been done and to be rewarded by their workmates rather than getting a financial gain. In effective school studies conducted, the administrator is expected to reward teachers for their various achievements (Çobanoğlu and Badavan 2017). However, it is observed that the reward system in schools is mostly run for students. In the study conducted by Baş and Yıldırım (2010), the dimensions of rewarding students and rewarding teachers with compliments were found to be high while rewarding them with certification was determined to be at a lower level. The reasons why school principals cannot run the reward system well can be the lack of resources or their low awareness in this regard. It is important to reward all kinds of achievements in the school, and these awards can be a source of motivation for the whole school. The fact that the dimensions of the reward system are larger and filled in terms of content can be the solution title that can be addressed first in the rewarding dimension. According to these statements, it can be stated that there is not a fully working reward system in schools and that this system works depending on the understanding of school principals.

The data obtained through the survey in the study reveal that school principals exhibit behaviors related to education and training at the moderate level. The interview results in the study also support this situation. Teachers show that school administrators make efforts to create a resource in the context of improving education and training in schools and to improve physical conditions at a higher level. It is observed that school principals are not too much involved in teaching activities in the classroom and do not focus on more specific issues such as the monitoring and evaluation of student development to support teaching in the school. It is generally stated that they try to organize out-of-class activities and students' behaviors, which may create disciplinary problems. In this context, it can be interpreted that school principals' efforts to establish a positive learning climate in the school are at higher levels and that teachers are charged with higher levels of responsibility in these matters. Although these findings are positive, it can be said that the assessment of learning practices and their results within the school and classroom is neglected. School



administrators' assessment of in-class practices may have been perceived as a one-way evaluation of the teacher. However, classroom and in-school assessments are a comprehensive process in which all applications that provide or prevent student learning are evaluated by being spread over the academic year. Effective administrators should have an understanding that supports the teacher and student for a high student achievement they expect from teachers. The school administrator should control and support in-class learning processes. It is important for school administrators to establish and monitor performance standards to increase student learning, and to take measures with teachers in these matters to increase success. When Arın (2006) examined the dimension of "the management of the education program and teaching process" of elementary school principals in schools in terms of effectiveness, administrators with postgraduate education were determined to be more effective compared to those with undergraduate education. In the study conducted by Küçükali (2001), teachers stated that the administrative behaviors of school principals were problematic. According to these findings, school administrators can be supported to receive postgraduate education in educational administration or in their fields or the criteria of having postgraduate education can be introduced for the selection of school administrators.

In the study, it is revealed that school principals exhibit the behaviors of sparing time for education and teaching at moderate levels. The interviews in the study explain that these behaviors are observed at moderate levels. It is stated that school principals spend time on daily routines such as daily correspondence, financial problems, having a guest, routine problems or participation in out-of-school meetings at higher levels. It is understood that although school principals try to appear in the school during school time, this is not very sufficient. In this context, it creates an impression that school principals are not sufficiently informed about in-class or out-of-class activities in their schools and cannot follow students and in-class or out-of-class studies very closely. In this regard, it can be interpreted that school principals cannot implement time management in the school at the sufficient level since they spend time on daily routines. Moreover, the fact that teaching and education activities within the school are mainly under the initiative of teachers gives rise to the thought that an evaluation and feedback system cannot be run by principals. The reason is that school administrators are away from the classroom environment for a long time (Özdemir and Sezgin, 2002). Some school principals may have a very little classroom experience. In this respect, theory and practice should be implemented together in education and teaching activities. School principals can ensure the formation of a positive climate by sparing their time to improve student learning along with effective communication to be established with teachers.

In the study, it was determined that school principals exhibited the behaviors of relationships with families and society at moderate levels. A situation that is partially different from this situation emerges in the interviews conducted with teachers. In this context, it is stated that school principals make intense efforts to increase the support of families to the school. These two findings support each other. Here, the activities to increase the relationships between school and family are concentrated in the areas such as meetings, visits or organizing social activities for parents. Along with these results, it is observed that these activities are conducted in a limited number of schools and vary by school levels. For example, it is stated that these activities are performed more intensely in elementary and secondary schools while fewer activities are performed in high schools. On the other hand, it is emphasized in the interviews that the contributions of social, cultural or political environments in which the school is involved to the studies in the school are not received a lot and that works to ensure parents' involvement are mainly carried out. It can be said that administrators cannot develop relations with these environments due to limited opportunities in the province where the study was conducted. In their study, Ayık and Ada (2009) showed that school-parent cooperation was lower than it should be. It is possible to encourage parents to be involved in decisions related to school and students in schools. Thus, parents can feel like a stakeholder of the school and can be included in the process by following education and teaching practices more closely.

When these research findings are discussed as a whole, it can be stated that school principals' levels of exhibiting effective administrative behaviors are not at the desired level in terms of educational outcomes and that they are more focused on daily routines rather than educational activities. Teachers generally find school principals sufficient in terms of human relations. The results of the interviews and survey confirm this situation. However, it is observed that school principals are not very sufficient in maintaining improvement in different areas of the school. In this context, it is possible to perform training studies to make school administrators more equipped. Furthermore, school improvement and development plans can be prepared and implemented by performing school-based studies for the areas in which schools are sufficient and insufficient. It is possible to help school administrators to increase instructional leadership behaviors (Balci, 2011) that can be addressed in relation to duty-based leadership styles to higher levels.

This study is limited to schools located in Karabük province and its districts. Effective administrative behaviors can be perceived differently depending on school types. In this respect, studies can present different data if they are conducted within the same school type. For example, administrative effectiveness can be perceived differently between Vocational High School and Science High School. On the other hand, these studies can be enriched by observations in schools. Furthermore, students and parents can be asked for their opinions to determine the effectiveness levels of school administrators and the administrative components in which they are insufficient because effective behaviors of administrators can be seen more clearly from a multiple perspective. Policymakers can make decisions that will allow school administrators to focus on teaching by keeping them away from daily routines. Standardized reward systems can be established in schools. It may be useful for administrators to spend more time on student assessments and to set performance targets at all class levels with teachers in this context. Qualified activities can be planned to establish good relationships with the out-of-school environment, and participation in studies can be achieved by giving responsibility to these circles. School principals should support education and teaching at a higher level by planning their time in the school. Parent involvement and cooperation can be ensured in national and international projects for which the school has taken responsibility and in activities performed in schools within the scope of community service. This cooperation will increase the support of parents to the school and may also lead to an increase in the academic achievement of a student who feels the support of his/her family.

When the school is considered a community, school administrators have important responsibilities and roles in leading, inspiring and developing this community. In this respect, it is important that school administrators are selected from among the individuals who have achieved competence to improve teaching and that they are supported by politicians. All kinds of contribution should be provided by considering the vital roles of school principals in making schools more successful.

## References

Arslantaş, H. İ. & Özkan, M. (2014). Öğretmen ve yönetici gözüyle etkili okulda yönetici özelliklerinin belirlenmesi. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 26, 181-193.

Arın, A. (2006). *Lise Yöneticilerinin Öğretim Liderliği Davranışları ile Kullandıkları Kararverme Stratejileri ve Problem Çözme Becerileri Arasındaki İlişki Düzeyi* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Eskişehir.

Ayık, A. & Ada, Ş. (2009). İlköğretim okullarında oluşturulan okul kültürü ile okulların etkililiği arasındaki ilişki. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(2), 429-446.

Balci, A. (2011). *Etkili okul ve okul geliştirme* (5. baskı). Ankara: PegemAkademi.

- Baş, G. & Yıldırım A. (2010). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin öğretim liderliği davranışlarının farklı değişkenler açısından değerlendirilmesi. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 5(4), 240-246.
- Blase, J. & Blase, J. (1999). Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 130-141.
- Bilge, B. (2013). Öğrenci başarısını arttırmada okul müdüründen beklenen liderlik özellikleri. *Anadolu Eğitim Liderliği ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 1 (2), 12-23.
- Brookover, W. B. & Lezotte, L.W. (1979). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement*. Michigan: MSU Press
- Chandler, H. N. (1984). Effective schools. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 17(5), 312-313.
- Cerit, Y. & Yıldırım, B. (2017). İlkokul müdürlerinin etkili liderlik davranışları ile okul etkililiği arasındaki ilişki. *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(3), 902-914.
- Christensen, L. B.; Johnson, R. B. & Turner, L. A. (2015). *Nitel ve karma yöntem araştırmaları* (M. Sever, Çev.), (A. Aypay, Çev. Ed.) *Araştırma yöntemleri desen ve analiz* (400-433). Ankara: Anı Yayınları.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. & Plano-Clark, V. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed method research*. California: Sage Publications.
- Çobanoğlu, F. & Badavan, Y. (2017). Başarılı okulların anahtarı: etkili okul değişkenleri. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 26, 115-134. DOI: 10.5505/pausbed.2017.24650
- Demirtaş, H. & Güneş, H. (2002). *Eğitim yönetimi ve denetimi sözlüğü*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-24.
- Gökçe, F. & Kahraman, P. B. (2010). Etkili okulun bileşenleri: Bursa ili örneği. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23(1), 173-206.
- Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. F. (1986). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education*, 94(3), 328-355.
- Hallinger, P. & Joseph, M. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217-247.
- Hesapçioğlu, M. (2006). Eğitim kurumlarında kalite olgusu ve kalite güvence sistemleri. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23, 143-160.
- Hofman, R. H.; Hofman, W. H. A. & Gray, J. M. (2015). Three conjectures about school effectiveness: An exploratory study. *Cogent Education*, 2(1), 1-13. doi:10.1080/2331186X.2015.1006977
- Hornig, E.; Klasik, D. & Loeb, S. (2010). Principal's time use and school effectiveness. *American Journal of Education*, 116(4), 491-523. doi:10.1086/653625
- Hoy, W. K. (1992). Faculty trust in colleagues: Linking the principal with school effectiveness. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 26(1), 38-45.

Kuşaksız, N. (2010). *Öğretmen görüşlerine göre ilköğretim okullarının etkili okul özelliklerine sahip olma düzeyleri (Üsküdar ilçesi örneği)* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.

Küçükali, R. (2001). *İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin yöneticilik becerilerine ilişkin müdür ve öğretmen algı ve beklentileri* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erzurum.

Lezotte, L. W. (1992). Effective schools: Past, present and future. <http://www.effectiveschools.com/images/stories/brockpaper.pdf> adresinden 13.1.2017 tarihinde indirildi.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (2015). Veri toplamaya odaklanmak ve veri toplamayı sınırlamak: anlamlı bir başlangıç (D. Örucü, Çev.), (S. Akbaba Altun, A. Ersoy, Çev. Ed.) Nitel veri analizi (16-39). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Morrison, K. (2002). *School leadership and complexity theory*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Mortimore, P. (1993). School effectiveness and the management of effective learning and teaching. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 4(4), 290-310.

Recepoğlu, E. & Kılınc, A. Ç. (2014). Türkiye'de okul yöneticilerinin seçilmesi ve yetiştirilmesi, mevcut sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 9(2), 1817-1845.

Özdemir, S. & Sezgin, F. (2002). Etkili okullar ve öğretim liderliği. *Kırgızistan Manas Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(3), 266-282.

Parlar, H. (2014). *Tüm yönleriyle okul geliştirme kuram, yaklaşım ve uygulama*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rutherford, W. L. (1984). Styles and behaviours of elementary school principals and their relationship to school improvement. *Education and Urban Society*, 17(1), 29-48.

Sammons, P.; Hillman, J. & Mortimore, P. (1995). *Key characteristics of effective schools: A review of school effectiveness research*. A report by the Institute of Education for the Office for Standards in Education. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED389826.pdf> adresinden 13.01.2017 tarihinde indirildi.

Scheerens, J. & Creemers, B. P. (1989). Conceptualizing school effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13(7), 691-706.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1995). *The principalship a reflective practice perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Serin, M. K. & Buluç, B. (2012). İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin öğretim liderliği davranışları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 3(3), 435-459.

Stoll, L. (1992). *Teacher growth in the effective school*, Teacher Development and Educational Change (in Fullan & Hargreaves (eds.). London: Famer Press, 104-123.

Şişman, M. (2004). *Öğretim liderliği*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Şişman, M. (2011). *Eğitimde mükemmellik arayışı etkili okullar*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.