

## **Instructional Leadership Behaviors of School Administrators Working in Public Secondary Schools: A Mixed Method Research**

Sultan Dođru<sup>\*</sup>, Cenk Akay<sup>\*\*</sup> and Yusuf İnanđı<sup>\*\*\*</sup>

---

### **Abstract**

This study was conducted in order to reveal the level of instructional leadership behavior scores of school administrators working in public secondary schools according to the opinions of teachers and to examine them in terms of various variables. The working group of this research, which was designed in the converging parallel pattern of the mixed method, was formed through easily accessible sampling. 383 teachers in the central districts of Mersin province formed the quantitative data study group and 5 teachers formed the qualitative data study group. The semi-structured interview form prepared by the researcher and the “Instructional Leadership Scale” developed by Alig-Meilcarek (2003) and adapted to Turkish by Şahin (2011) were used as data collection tools. Kolmogorov Smirnov test was applied for normality test. Kolmogorov Smirnov value is  $<.05$ . Skewness value is between  $+3$  values and the kurtosis value is between  $+10$  values. Kline (2011) mentioned that normality tests can be performed if the normal distribution has a skewness value of  $\pm 3$  and a kurtosis value of  $\pm 10$ . Since the quantitative data showed a normal distribution, they were analyzed by independent T-test analysis, while the qualitative data were analyzed with the help of content analysis. When the research findings were evaluated, it was found that there was no significant difference between the school administrators' instructional leadership scores according to the gender of the participants.

**Keywords:** Instructional leadership, leadership, school administrator, teacher.

---

<sup>\*</sup> Faculty Member, Mersin University, Turkey Email: [sultandogrubu@gmail.com](mailto:sultandogrubu@gmail.com)

<sup>\*\*</sup> Associate Professor, Mersin University, Turkey, Email: [cenkakay35@hotmail.com](mailto:cenkakay35@hotmail.com)

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Associate Professor, Mersin University, Turkey, Email: [inandiyusuf@gmail.com](mailto:inandiyusuf@gmail.com)

## Introduction

In order to be able to talk about efficiency in an organization, it is necessary to inform employees about organizational goals, to take into account their internal and external needs, to associate the goals of the organization and the goals of the employee by participating in the decision-making process. And the ones who will do all of these effectively and efficiently are the leaders. According to Drucker (2012), leadership is about empowering the members of an organization to make predictions and improve their individual abilities, enabling them to perform above their usual levels. Vroom and Jago (2007) describes the leader as someone who brings a new perspective to society and enables them to follow him by influencing them in the process of changing the current system. The concept of instructional leadership comes to the fore more in institutions where educational activities such as schools are carried out. Instructional leadership means that the school administrator constantly thinks about how to organize a school and teaching where all students can learn, focusing on teaching and learning (Gedikoğlu, 2015). In addition, according to Cakir (2019), instructional leadership is an approach designed to achieve effective schools by increasing school effectiveness, requiring school administrators to prioritize activities for educational purposes and achieve educational goals while using resources. Instructional leadership also means that the school administrator constantly thinks about how to organize a school and teaching that all students can learn, focuses on teaching and learning (Gedikoğlu, 2015).

When the relevant literature is examined, it is seen that there are few mixed method studies conducted on the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators. The gender factor can be significantly effective in the study on the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators. It is thought that school administrators may differ according to the gender of teachers in exhibiting instructional leadership behaviors. It is envisaged that school administrators who think that it is more challenging to fulfill their household responsibilities and gender roles given by being a woman can positively discriminate against women and take initiative when involving them in the educational process.

Studies have been conducted in which instructional leadership behaviors have been examined in terms of various variables by considering their dimensions together (Altaş, 2013; İnandı ve Özkan, 2006; Kış ve Konan, 2014; Yörük ve Akdağ, 2010). In addition, it is observed that school administrators' instructional leadership behaviors are studied with variables such as organizational citizenship (Ünal ve Çelik, 2013), organizational climate (Ahmet ve Şayir, 2014), organizational commitment (Yaman ve Özlem, 2015) and teacher motivation (Kurt, 2013). In the research studies conducted about instructional leadership, the dimensions and classifications of instructional

leadership usually show similarities. It is useful to look at these dimensions and classifications.

### **The Dimensions of Instructional Leadership**

There are many classifications regarding the dimensions of instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators. According to Hallinger and Murphy (2013), instructional leadership has been studied in three dimensions: defining the mission of the school, managing the educational program and teaching, and developing a school climate conducive to learning. In his study, Őiřman (2004) also has discussed instructional leadership in five dimensions: determining and sharing school goals; managing the educational program and teaching process; evaluating the teaching process and students; supporting and developing teachers, as well as creating a regular teaching-learning environment and climate. According to Alig-Mielcarek (2003), there are three dimensions of teaching leadership: ensuring the professional development of the teacher, sharing the goals of the school and giving feedback to the teaching processes. From these dimensions, *ensuring their professional development* focuses on monitoring the continuous development of teachers and supporting students with activities that increase their academic achievements. In the dimension of *sharing the goals of the school*, leaders set goals in cooperation, define goals, share and manage the education and training process based on these goals. Leaders who provide *feedback and supervision* use the principles of being visible, communicating with students and teachers, rewarding, giving feedback and supervising them.

### **The Research Gap and Its Importance**

By setting a vision in an organization, capturing change in a timely manner, and even creating change itself, leaders can help the organization achieve its future goals in a healthy way. Organizations without effective leaders may experience entropy, losing their effectiveness over time. The leadership characteristics of school administrators play an active role in achieving the goals of educational organizations to increase teaching efficiency and maximize student success (Celik, 2012; Serin and Buluđ, 2012). It is observed that teachers also do efficient work in organizations where effective leaders are involved. In order for institutions to be successful and maintain their existence, they need to be constantly updated, adapt to the changing and developing era. Especially in secondary schools, student success in central exams is important, and as a result of this exam, they are placed in high schools, educational activities differ markedly in organizations at this level (Kruger, 2003).

When the related field literature is examined, it is seen that there are a large number of quantitative studies on instructional leadership, but the studies conducted with mixed method research are limited. It also reveals behavioral examples of educational institutions that practice educational leadership.

### **Purpose of The Study**

The purpose of this research is to reveal the level of instructional leadership behavior scores of school administrators according to the opinions of teachers and to examine them in terms of various variables. For this purpose, answers to the following questions were sought in the research:

1. What is the level of instructional leadership behavior scores of school administrators?
2. Does the instructional leadership behavior of school administrators show a significant difference according to gender variable?
3. How do teachers interpret the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators related to professional development?
4. How do teachers interpret the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators related to sharing goals?
5. How do teachers interpret the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators related to feedback?
6. What are the suggestions regarding the improvement of instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators?

### **Method**

In this section, the model of the research, the working group, the data collection tools, the data collection process and the analysis of the collected data are discussed in detail.

### **The Model of the Research**

This study is a “mixed method” research conducted to determine the level at which school administrators working in public secondary schools perform their instructional leadership behaviors. Since the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators cannot be examined in depth by collecting quantitative data only, and it will be difficult to generalize by collecting qualitative data only, it has been designed as a mixed method study. Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) mention six basic patterns that can be used in mixed method research: parallel pattern, sequential-explanatory pattern, sequential-exploratory pattern, embedded pattern, transformational pattern and multi-stage-enriched pattern. In this model, quantitative and qualitative data will be collected concurrently and then analysed separately (Creswell and Clark, 2015).

## Research Group

The research group was examined in two sections as the research group in which quantitative data were collected and the research group in which qualitative data were collected. Within the scope of this research, quantitative data were collected for the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators working in public secondary schools, as well as qualitative data were collected for teachers' opinions on this issue. Afterwards, the findings determined from both data sets were discussed at the same time.

### The Research Group in which Quantitative Data is Collected

The accessible universe of this research consists of 3984 teachers working in public secondary schools in central districts connected with one. In order to select the participants in the research group, they were determined using the easily accessible sampling method from teachers in the universe. The sample consists of a total of 383 teachers.

Table 1

*Characteristics of the Research Group*

		N	%
Gender	Female	165	43.1
	Male	218	56.9
Gender of the school administrator	Female	223	58.2
	Male	160	41.8

### Qualitative Data Working Group

For the study groups where qualitative data needs to be collected, a purposeful sampling method was selected and an easily accessible study group was used. Interviews were conducted with teachers on a voluntary basis. A total of 5 teachers, 3 women and 2 men, were contacted from school administrators working in different central districts.

### Data Collection Tools

In this study, different tools were used to collect data.

#### Quantitative Data Collection Tools

##### *Personal Information Form*

By examining the related field literature, gender question was included in this form, which contains structured and closed-ended questions aimed at determining the characteristics of school administrators related to the research topic.

### *The Scale of Instructional Leadership*

The “Instructional Leadership Scale” developed by Alig-Meilcarek (2003) and adapted to Turkish by Şahin (2011) was used as a quantitative data collection tool in the research. The scale consists of two parts, and in the first part there are questions about the demographic information of teachers. In the second part, there are a total of 23 items included in the 3 factors and they have been prepared as a five-point likert type rating.

As a result of Confirmatory Factor Analysis, it was found that t values were higher than 2.58. Then, the compliance values of the Instructional Leadership Scale were examined and it was determined that these values were at an acceptable level (RMSEA =.083, NFI = .97, CFI = .98, SRMR =.050,  $\chi^2 / sd = 3.68$ ).

The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the original scale in total is .94 . In the lower dimensions, it ranges from .89 to .94. In this study, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was used in the scale is .98; in the sub-dimensions of professional development, sharing goals and giving feedback, it is respectively .98, .98 and .96.

### **Qualitative Data Collection Tools**

#### *Personal Information Form*

A personal information form has been developed by the researcher to collect information about the opinions of the teachers who will participate in this study about the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators. The gender variable of the participants are included in the form.

#### *Semi-Structured Interview Form*

Semi-structured interview technique was used in this study. For the expert opinion, 5 lecturers from the field of Educational Management were interviewed. After the expert opinions, the appropriate interview form was created from the draft interview form with the questions deemed appropriate for the purpose of the study and the questions added by the experts. The form formed as a result of the study contains a total of 11 questions.

### **Data Collection Process**

In the study, the ‘Instructional Leadership Scale’ was applied to teachers working in public secondary schools in Mersin central districts in order to determine the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators. The scale questions created through Google Forms were applied to teachers online and data were collected. In addition, data were collected using a semi-structured interview form prepared by 5 teachers working in

public secondary schools in the central districts of Mersin province and the researcher, in which the necessary corrections were submitted to the expert opinion and made.

### Data Analysis

The values determined as multiple outliers were removed from the analysis and analyses were made with 383 data that met the calculations. Normality tests were applied to determine whether instructional leadership behaviors make a significant difference in terms of various variables. Skewness and kurtosis values of -1.5 and +1.5 between the values, since it is possible to say that the distribution is normal (George & Mallery, 2010; Gravetter and Wallnau, 2014; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). The normality test values are given in Table 2.

Table 2

*Normality test of distribution for instructional leadership scale*

		Statistics	Standard Error	Values
Instructional Leadership Scale	Skewness	-.285	.115	-2.585
	Kurtosis	-.224	.243	-1.425
	Kolmogorov Smirnov			.013

Table 2 states that Kolmogorov Smirnov value is  $<.05$ . Skewness value is between  $+3$  values and the kurtosis value is between  $+10$  values. Kline (2011) also mentioned that normality tests can be performed if the normal distribution has a skewness value of  $\pm 3$  and a kurtosis value of  $\pm 10$ .

Since the data showed a normal distribution, independent t-test analysis were performed. In addition, arithmetic mean and standard deviation values were used to determine the level of instructional leadership behaviors.

Qualitative data containing teachers' opinions on instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators were analyzed by content analysis technique. According to Creswell (2012), content analysis is a systematic working group that includes identifying research trends in the identified topics and descriptive consideration of research findings.

## Findings

In this section, the findings related to the examination of school administrators' instructional leadership behavior scores according to various variables and their views on the development of these behaviors are included.

The first sub-problem of the research is "What is the level of instructional leadership behavior scores of school administrators? descriptive statistics obtained from the findings related to the "problem" are presented in table 3.

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics on the Instructional Leadership Behaviors of School Administrators*

	N	Min	Max	$\bar{x}$	S
Professional Development	383	1,00	5,00	3,1343	1,05869
Sharing The Goal	383	1,00	5,00	3,0969	1,03799
Feedback	383	1,00	4,75	3,0388	0,97242

As can be seen in Table 3, the average of the scores they received from the professional development dimension of the instructional leadership scale ( $X = 3.13$ ), while the average of the scores they received from the goal sharing dimension ( $X = 3.09$ ) and the average of the scores they received from the feedback giving dimension ( $X = 3.03$ ). The range of points that can be obtained from the items that make up the sub-dimensions has varied between 1 and 5.

The second sub-problem of the research is "Does the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators show a significant difference according to gender variable? the results obtained from the findings related to the "problem" are presented in table 4, table 5, and table 6.

The findings regarding whether the instructional leadership behavior scores of school administrators show a significant difference according to gender variable are evaluated below.

### Findings on the Gender Variable

Since a normal distribution was achieved in the examination of school administrators' instructional leadership behaviors according to teachers' gender, the t-test was performed and the results are given in Table 4.



Table 4  
*Evaluation of the Levels of Instructional Leadership Behavior of School Administrators According to the Gender of Teachers*

	Groups	N	$\bar{x}$	S	Sd	T	P
Professional	Female	165	3.17	1.02	381	.65	.51
Development	Male	218	3.10	1.08			
Sharing The	Female	165	3.13	.99	381	.55	.57
Goal	Male	218	3.07	1.07			
Feedback	Female	165	3.06	.95	381	.40	.68
	Male	218	3.02	.99			

\*P<0.05

In Table 4, when the educational leadership behavior scores of school administrators were examined according to the gender of the participants, it was found that there was no statistically significant difference ( $p > 0.05$ ).

#### Findings on the Gender Variable of Teachers Who are Female School Administrators

Since a normal distribution was ensured in the examination of the instructional leadership behaviors of the managers of the teachers whose school administrators are women, the t-test was performed and the results are given in Table 5.

Table 5  
*The Evaluation of the Levels of Instructional Leadership Behavior of the Managers of the Teachers Who are Female School Administrators According to Their Gender*

	Groups	N	$\bar{x}$	S	Sd	t	p
Professional	Female	135	3.10	1.00	221	1.96	.049*
Development	Male	88	2.81	1.18			
Sharing The	Female	135	3.06	1.00	221	1.81	.072
Goal	Male	88	2.79	1.18			
Feedback	Female	135	2.99	.93	221	1.58	.11
	Male	88	2.77	1.10			

\*P<0.05.

In Table 5, when the instructional leadership behavior scores of the managers of the teachers who are female school administrators were examined according to their gender, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference on the women's side in the Professional development sub-dimension. There was no significant differentiation in the sub-dimensions of sharing goals and giving feedback ( $p < 0,05$ ).

*Findings on the Gender Variable of Teachers Whose School Administrators are Male*

Since a normal distribution was achieved in the examination of the instructional leadership behaviors of the managers of the teachers whose school administrators are male according to their gender, the t-test was performed and the results are given in Table 6.

Table 6

*The Evaluation of the Levels of Instructional Leadership Behavior of the Managers of the Teachers Who are Male School Administrators According to Their Gender*

	Groups	N	$\bar{x}$	S	Sd	t	P
Professional	Female	30	3.47	1.05			
Development	Male	130	3.29	.97	158	.87	.38
Sharing The	Female	30	3.43	.89			
Goal	Male	130	3.25	.94	158	.94	.34
Feedback	Female	30	3.37	.95			
	Male	130	3.18	.86	158	1.04	.29

In Table 6 according to the gender of the male teachers of the school manager administrators, instructional leadership behavior scores were examined, it was found that there is no significant difference in the all sub-dimensions ( $p < 0,05$ ).

The third sub-problem of the research is "What are the teachers' views on the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators related to professional development? Descriptive statistics obtained from the findings related to the "problem" are presented in table 7.

The codes determined based on the codes determined by the teachers participating in the research regarding the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators related to professional development were coded under the sub-themes of student development, teacher development and manager development. The codes related to the theme and their frequencies are given in table 7.

Table 7

*Evaluation of the Findings Related to Teachers' Opinions about the Instructional Leadership Behaviors of School Administrators Related to Professional Development*

		Theme : Ensuring Professional Development	F
Sub-Themes	Developing the student	Codes	
		Making a practice exam	5
		Referral to projects	3
		Organizing a quiz	2
		Organizing guidance activities	2
		Giving support	2
		Total	14
	Teacher development	Orientation to education	5
		Organizing an in-service course	4
		Being in cooperation	4
		Sharing responsibility	3
		Encouraging to make a career	2
		Total	18
	Developing the manager	Science	5
		Getting leadership training	4
		Communication training	3
		Ability to solve problems quickly	2
		Total	14

As can be seen in Table 7, the most frequently expressed codes were determined as conducting practice exams in the first theme, directing to education in the second theme and science in the third theme.

Some teacher comments obtained from the semi-structured interview form are mentioned below.

T2:"The school administration should conduct practice exams for students in coordination with teachers and try to complete the missing aspects according to the exam results. Students should test themselves and be directed to projects if necessary according to the exam results."

T3:" Although he does not provide any support, he applies mobbing to working teachers. Of course, in such a tense environment, it cannot be said that teachers can be productive because they cannot be motivated."

The fourth sub-problem of the research is "What are the teachers' views on the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators related to sharing goals?"

descriptive statistics obtained from the findings related to the "problem" are presented in table 8.

Two themes were formed from the responses received from the teachers participating in the study regarding the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators related to sharing goals. These themes are cooperation and dissemination themes. The codes related to the themes and their frequencies are given in Table 8.

Table 8

*Evaluation of the Findings Related to Teachers' Opinions about the Instructional Leadership Behaviors of School Administrators Related to Sharing Goals*

		Theme : Sharing the Purpose	F
Sub-Themes	Cooperation	Codes	
		Sharing success data	5
		Holding meetings at regular intervals	4
		Parent visits	4
		Making one-on-one interviews	3
		Informing students about the goals	2
		Total	18
		Dissemination	Board preparation
	Announcing goals from social media accounts		3
	Preparing school magazines		2
	Explaining the mission and temperament of the school on the school website		2
	Organizing events		1
	Total		12

As can be seen in Table 8, the most frequently expressed code for the first theme is sharing success data, while the clipboard preparation code for the second theme has been reached.

Some teacher comments obtained from the semi-structured interview form have been removed below.

T1: "If cooperation is required, the provider of this should be the school administrator first of all. I think you're missing out on this."

T4: "There is a high expectation of success, but there is no planning in this direction, no meetings are held, and everyone cannot unite around this goal, so success does not come."

T5: "Students and teachers do not know about the achievement data, and students do not know about it. Therefore, since the goal is not shared with everyone, not enough output can be obtained.

The fifth sub problem of the research is "What are the teachers' views on the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators related to feedback? descriptive statistics obtained from the findings related to the "problem" are presented in table 9.

Three themes were formed from the responses received from the teachers participating in the research regarding the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators related to giving feedback. These themes are sub-themes aimed at follow-up and observation, motivation-oriented and feedback-oriented. The codes related to the themes and their frequencies are given in Table 9.

Table 9

*Evaluation of the Findings Related to Teachers' Opinions about the Instructional Leadership Behaviors of School Administrators Related to Giving Feedback*

		Theme : Giving Feedback	F
Sub-Themes	Tracking, aimed at observation	Codes	
		Being a follower of good practices	4
		Being a good observer	3
		Making classroom visits	3
		Monitoring student development	2
		Monitoring teacher development	1
		Total	13
	Motivation-oriented	Rewarding the student	5
		Rewarding the teacher	5
		Exhibiting positive behavior	3
		Smiling, being humanistic	3
		Giving support, motivating	2
		Being neutral	2
		Being approachable	2
		Total	22
	For giving feedback	Quick sharing of test results	4
		Conducting evaluation meetings	3
		Helping to correct wrong practices	3
		Organizing extra programs for students with disabilities	2
		Making one-on-one interviews	1
		Total	13

As can be seen in Table 9, the most frequently expressed codes were determined as being a follower of good practices in the first theme, rewarding the student in the second theme and sharing the test exam results quickly in the third theme.

Some of the comments of the semi-structured interviewed teachers about their views on instructional leadership behaviors related to giving feedback are given below.

T2: "Gathering and meeting groups at regular intervals keeps the teacher dynamic and enables him to have an idea. "

T3:".... There are almost no class visits at all."

The sixth sub-problem of the research, "What are the suggestions for improving the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators? Descriptive statistics obtained from the findings related to the "problem" are presented in table 10.

Three themes were formed from the responses received from the teachers participating in the research within the scope of suggestions for improving the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators. These themes are sub-themes for professional development, for sharing goals and for giving feedback. The codes related to the themes and their frequencies are given in Table 10.

Table 10

*Evaluation of the Findings Related to Teachers' Opinions on the Development of Instructional Leadership Behaviors of School Administrators*

		Theme : Developing Instructional Leadership Behaviors	F
Sub-Themes	For professional development	Codes	
		The appropriate environment should be prepared	5
		Educational activities should be organized	5
		The physical care of the school should be done	4
		It should be ensured that the teacher comes to the lesson prepared	3
		The school must be mastered	3
		One must be responsible	2
		It should be innovative and progressive	2
		Total	26
	For sharing goals	Cooperation must be made	5
		A parent visit should be made	4
		Parents should be partners in education and training	4
		Communication should be strong	3
		Goals should be explained to students	3
		A humane behavior should be displayed	2
		A safe and neutral environment should be provided	2
		Total	23

For giving feedback	Must be reachable	5
	The parent should observe his child	5
	Politics should not be done	2
	Evaluation meetings should be organized	4
	He should organize brainstorming sessions	3
	He/She should be impartial and scientific	2
	Total	21

As indicated in Table 10, teachers' answers regarding improving the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators were collected in three sub-themes. While the most appropriate environment preparation code was reached in the professional development theme, the most cooperative code was reached in the objective sharing sub-theme and the most approachable code was reached in the feedback giving sub-theme.

Some of the comments of the teachers who were interviewed semi-structured about the development of instructional leadership behaviors are given below.

T1''When it fully complies with the principles of impartiality and scientificity, there will be no problem.''

T4''First of all, everyone should know their own responsibilities and duties and provide the necessary dedication to fulfill them. In addition to these, he/she should exhibit a humane behavior, be innovative and a developer.''

### Discussion and Comment

When the research findings were evaluated, when the educational leadership behavior scores of school administrators were examined according to the gender of teachers, it was found that there was no statistically significant difference. Similarly to the research findings of Aydın (2017) and Olukcu (2018), school principals 'instructional leadership behaviors in determining the levels of the teachers' responses, in terms of the gender variable did not cause a significant difference. In contrast to our study, in the research conducted by Winter (2013), the gender variable of teachers made a significant difference in favor of men.

When the instructional leadership behavior scores of the managers of the teachers whose principals are female were examined according to their gender, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference for the wellness of women in the professional development sub-dimension. The reason why male teachers consider female managers inadequate in the context of professional development may be because they are biased against women. When the literature is examined, it is stated that the fact that men do not want to accept women as managers may be due to the patriarchal structure (Kiraz,

2022). The inability of female administrators to provide instructional leadership to male teachers can be interpreted as the fact that they do not want to see themselves as an authority. Similarly to our study, Özan's (2009) research also found that female teachers do not feel any discomfort from working with female managers and that they think that their managers fulfill their leadership qualities in the best way. Contrary to the research findings, in the studies conducted by Olukçu (2018) and Özkaynak (2013), it has been found that the gender parameter does not create a significant difference on the educational leadership of school administrators.

When the instructional leadership behavior scores of the managers of the teachers whose principals are male were examined according to their gender, it was seen that there was no statistically meaningful difference in the all sub-dimensions. The fact that male managers receive similar scores from men and women may be due to the acceptance of a common perspective on male managers in society. Giving high scores to male managers by both women and men; it can be interpreted as not approaching them reactively and not putting obstacles in front of them to establish authority. Similarly to our study, gender did not create a significant differentiation in Yılmaz's (2019) research.

In the research, it has been determined that the school professional development of principals is insufficient to create an effective learning platform at school and they do not support the employees in this sense. The findings of this research are similar to the findings of Inandi and Özkan (2006), while contradicting the findings of Aksoy and Işık (2008).

It was stated by the teachers who participated in the study that school administrators showed a low level of instructional leadership behaviors related to sharing goals. Similar to our study, studies have been conducted that found that school administrators share the set goals less with their employees (Aksoy and Işık, 2008; Sağır and Memişoğlu, 2012). Contrary to our study, there are also studies suggesting that they share most of the time (Serin and Buluç, 2012).

In the research, it has been determined that school administrators should give feedback to their employees in order to provide an effective learning environment at school, but they do not give enough. The findings of this research are similar to the findings of Ahmet and Şayir (2014). Likewise, Sağır and Memişoğlu (2012) says that school administrators do not make classroom visits much. In Bayar and Önder's (2016) research, about half of the teachers stated that school principals follow the success status of classes, determine successful and problematic students, make in-class visits and give feedback.



When the findings related to the themes of professional development, sharing goals and giving feedback of instructional leadership behaviors are evaluated, it has been said that school administrators should prepare an appropriate environment, organize educational activities, take physical care of the school, ensure that the teacher comes to the lesson prepared, master the school, be responsible, be innovative and progressive. In addition, it was stated that school administrators who want to ensure effectiveness in schools should work in cooperation with teachers, students and parents and foresee that they should be united around common goals.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

When the research findings were evaluated, it was found that there was no significant difference between the school administrators' instructional leadership scores according to the gender of the participants.

When the instructional leadership behavior scores of the managers of the teachers whose principals are female school administrators were examined according to their gender, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference for the side of women in the professional development sub-dimension. There was no significant differentiation in the sub-dimensions of sharing goals and giving feedback.

When the instructional leadership behavior scores of the managers of the teachers whose principals are male were examined according to their gender, it was found that there was no statistically significant difference in the sub-dimensions of professional development, sharing goals and giving feedback.

The codes determined based on the codes determined by the teachers participating in the research regarding the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators related to professional development were coded under the sub-themes of student development, teacher development and manager development.

Two themes were formed from the responses received from the teachers participating in the study regarding the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators related to sharing goals. These themes are cooperation and dissemination themes.

Three themes were formed from the responses received from the teachers participating in the research regarding the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators related to giving feedback. These themes are aimed at follow-up and observation; they are sub-themes aimed at motivation and giving feedback.

In the sub-theme of professional development, the codes of appropriate media preparation, tutorial for organizing activities, the physical care of the school, the teacher come to class prepared to ensure that school-restraint, responsibility, innovativeness and progressiveness have been reached. For the sub-theme of sharing goals, the codes of cooperation, visiting parents, making parents partners in education and training, being strong in communication, explaining the goals to students, demonstrating a humane behavior, providing a safe and neutral environment have been gained. The codes reached in the feedback sub-theme are to be accessible, to have the parent follow their child, not to do politics, to organize evaluation meetings, to organize brainstorming sessions, to be impartial and scientific.

#### **Recommendations for researchers**

1. Evaluating the study within the scope of different variables (grade, type of school and marital status) and repeating will contribute to the field literature.
2. Within the scope of instructional leadership, determining the theoretical models of competence for managers and teachers and expanding them with in-service trainings will contribute to the development of school organizations.

#### **Recommendations for implementation**

1. As a result of the research, it is felt that teachers think that their managers do not have enough equipment in terms of instructional leadership. In this context, it will be useful to inform the administrator and the teacher through a common platform and to improve their competencies through in-service trainings.
2. Guidance should be provided to master's and doctoral programs that will improve the instructional leadership behaviors of school principals.

#### **References**

- Ahmet, A., & Şayir, G. (2014). The relationship between instructional leadership behaviors of school principals and organizational climate. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences, 13(49), 253-279.*
- Aksoy, E., & Işık, H. (2008). The instructional leadership roles of primary school principals. *Mana University Journal of Social Sciences, 19(2), 235-249.*
- Alig-Mielcarek, J.M., (2003). *A Model of school success: Instructional leadership, academic success and student achievement.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The Ohio State University Graduate School, Ohio.

- Altaş, M. (2013). *Instructional leadership roles of primary and secondary school administrators: The case of Beyođlu district*. Master Thesis. Maltepe University, İstanbul.
- Aydın, M. (2017). *An investigation of the teaching leadership behaviors of secondary school principals (Gaziantep sample)*. Unpublished master's thesis. Hasan Kalyoncu University.
- Bayar, T., & Önder, E. (2016). Teacher opinions about the levels of elementary school principals' teaching leadership behaviors. *Academic Point of View International Peer-Reviewed Journal of Social Sciences*, (56), 183-193.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2008). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* [Scientific research methods]. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and quantitative research*. Boston: Pearson.
- Creswell, J., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed method research* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Çakır, H. (2019). *The instructional leadership roles of lifelong learning institution managers: a mixed method research*. Master Thesis. Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Institute of Social Sciences, Rize.
- Çelik, V. (2012). *Eđitimsel liderlik* (6. Baskı) [Educational leadership]. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Drucker, P. (2012). *The practice of management*. Routledge.
- Ezer, Ö. (2014). *The relationship between instructional leadership and organizational commitment (Example of Sakarya province)*. Master's thesis. Sakarya University.
- Gedikođlu, T. (2015). *Liderlik ve okul yönetimi* [Leadership and school management]. Ankara: Anı.
- Gedikođlu, E. (2015). *The effect of modular teaching supported by reflective thinking structures on 5th grade students' academic achievement in information technologies and course software*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bartın University, Institute of Educational Sciences.
- George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference, 17.0 update (10a ed.)* Boston: Pearson.

- Glasman, N. (1984). Student achievement and the school principal. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 6(3): 283–296.
- Gravetter, F., & Wallnau, L. (2014). *Essentials of statistics for the behavioral sciences. 8th edition*. Wadsworth, Belmont, CA.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (2013). Running on empty? Finding the time and capacity to lead learning. *NASSP Bulletin*, 97(1), 5-21.
- İnandı, Y., & Özkan, M. (2006). According to the opinions of administrators and teachers working in official primary schools and high schools, to what extent do principals show instructional leadership behaviors?. *Mersin University Faculty of Education Journal*, 2(2) 123-149.
- Kıış, A., & Konan, N. (2014). A meta-analysis of teachers' opinions on the level of school principals' demonstration of instructional leadership behaviors according to their gender. *Educational Sciences in Theory and Practice*, 14(6), 1-17.
- Kiraz, Z. (2022). Evaluation of school administrators' instructional leadership competencies from the teachers' point of view. *Education as Long as You Live*, 36(1), 198-216.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). Convergence of structural equation modeling and multilevel modeling. *The SAGE handbook of innovation in social research methods*, 562-589.
- Kruger, A. G. (2003). Instructional leadership: The impact on the culture of teaching and learning in two effective secondary schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 23(3), 206-211.
- Kurt, B. (2013). *The effect of elementary and secondary school administrators' teaching leadership behaviors on teacher motivation*. Master's Thesis. Marmara University Institute of Educational Sciences, İstanbul.
- Olukçu, E. (2018). *The relationship between the instructional leadership roles of school administrators and the organizational identification levels of teachers (Çorum Province example)*. Master's thesis. Amasya University.
- Özan, M. B. (2009). An example of an island where the glass ceiling syndrome does not occur in school administration: Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(29), 15-33.
- Özkaynak, D. (2013). *Instructional leadership behaviors of primary school principals*. Doctoral dissertation. DEU Institute of Educational Sciences.

- Sađır, M., & Memiřođlu, S. P. (2012). Teacher and administrator perceptions of elementary school administrators about their instructional leadership roles. *Journal of Educational and Educational Research*, 1(2), 1-12.
- Serin, M. K., & Buluđ, B. (2012). The relationship between the instructional leadership behaviors of elementary school principals and the organizational commitment of teachers. *Educational Management in Theory and Practice*, 18(3), 435-459.
- řahin, S. (2011). The relationship between instructional leadership and school culture (Case of Izmir province). *Journal of Educational Sciences in Theory and Practice* 11 (4),1909-1928.
- řiřman M. (2014). *Öđretim Liderliđi* [Instructional Leadership]. Ankara: Pegem.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L.S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (sixth ed.). Pearson: Boston, p113.
- Ünal, A., & Çelik, M. (2013). The analysis of instructional leadership behavior of school administrators and organizational citizenship behavior of teachers. *Uřak University Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(2).
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American psychologist*, 62(1), 17.
- Yaman, E., & Özlem, E. (2015). According to teacher perceptions, the relationship between instructional leadership behaviors of secondary school principals and teachers' organizational commitment. *Journal of Bayburt Faculty of Education*, 10(1), 39-54.
- Yılmaz, O. (2019). *Teachers' opinions of school administrators on instructional leadership competencies in the process of technology integration in education (Example of Bařakřehir District of Istanbul province)*. Master's Thesis. Trakya University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Yörük, S., & Akdađ, G. A. (2010). The development of the scale of effectiveness of instructional leadership behaviors of primary school principals. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Sciences*, 3(1), 42-45.