

Yunus Emre Karakaya,  
Çağrı Özdenk, Özgür Karataş  
Turkey

## Leadership Roles Displayed by Physical Education Teachers Working in Educational Institutions in Turkey

### Abstract

This study was done in order to determine the leadership roles displayed by physical education teachers working in primary and secondary education institutions in Turkey. The sample group of the study included 170 physical education teachers working in these educational institutions. So as to determine the ideas of the sample group, the scale form developed by Beycioğlu (2009) in order to determine the teachers' perceptions and expectations related to teacher leadership was used. At the end of the study, a statistically significant relation was found in the ideas of the teachers in terms of school type variance in the "Institutional Development" dimension and age variance in the "Collaboration with Colleagues" and "Professional Development" dimensions. In all the dimensions, for gender, educational status and professional service period variances, no statistical significant relation could be found. As a result, it is determined that in order to increase leadership behaviors of the physical education teachers, measures should be taken by managers and studies about improving leadership behaviors with education supervisors' counseling applications and in-service training for physical education teachers should be increased.

**Keywords:** *educational institutions, physical education teachers, leadership*

### 1. Introduction

Leadership is one of the main subjects for which scientific studies were done in the management field in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and which was analyzed by both theorists and practitioners. As a result of research into leadership and what leadership is,

many definitions were suggested about leadership in the related literature (Erçetin, 2000). Leadership abandoned the notion of “more managers few leaders” borrowed from management science at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Bogotch, 2005). This condition led to the change in leadership perception in an age when the leadership concept went through changes according to large-scale cultural, technological, economic and political forces (Mulford et al., 2004). In the studies on leadership, it was observed that leaders are not alone, there is collaboration among leaders, it is a matter of joint effort of other staff and different people display leadership roles (Anderson, 2004).

It is seen that many researchers in the management field define leadership as a process of directing and affecting the efforts of the people in the direction of reaching certain ends (Hodgetts, 1999). Leadership is affecting, guiding for redirection, efficient activity and appearance (Paksoy, 2002). Leadership is the efficiency to gather people around certain goals and to realize these goals together by motivating the individuals (Hale, 1998). Jagues and Celement (1991) define leadership as motivating more than one person in the direction of common goals with all their loyalty and efficiency and as a process of making them successful. Law and Glover (2000) stated that the managers displaying leader manager behaviors have a vision and they could gather the staff around a common goal.

Bolin (as cited in Murphy, 2005) states that leadership in educational institutions is now heading for a notion supporting the development and efficiency of education in contrast to the notion that controls education (Murphy, 2005). McCrackin (2007) lays emphasis on the fact that leadership in educational institutions should be away from a hierarchical structure depending on the scientific management approach. It is not possible to think that the leadership dependent on the bureaucratic principals of the past works in educational institutions, because leaders are now expected to make changes in their schools and to create learning groups focused on the improvement of school.

Teacher leadership means the support of educational staff such as social workers, heads of departments, experienced teachers, pioneer teachers and learning experts and supervisors (Sledge and Morehead, 2006). Teacher leadership is the efficiency to arrange class activities effectively by developing and sharing an educational vision and to play and improve functional roles in school activities (Can, 2006). A leader teacher means a person who teaches in the classroom and also spends all their time to fulfill their responsibilities and who plays some roles for this aim. Sometimes a leader teacher means a teacher whose teaching charge has been reduced and who displays some leadership roles in order to develop classroom practices spending all their time out of the classroom among other

teachers (Lord and Miller 2000). Leader teachers should establish an environment to make other teachers eliminate what they do in time, reflect and improve their practices. In this case, a leader teacher should be one who develops a professional development group in accordance with their goals (Sledge and Morehead ,2006). Teachers should tend to take various risks to be leaders (Buckner et al., 2000). In the process of education, leader teachers have unique leadership styles along with their knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors. According to their leadership style, while some teachers teach using passive learning activities, as an authoritative and repressive teacher in the classroom, other teachers teach with the use of active learning activities, as a democratic and participant teacher. This is directly related to the leadership style of the teacher (Güllü and Arslan, 2009).

### **1.1. The Goal and Importance of the Study**

Today, teachers' leadership behaviors are among the topics at issue in the field of organizational behavior. It is thought that to research the leadership behaviors of the teachers playing an important role in society will present data that could partially decrease the existing problems of the education system. Especially for physical education teachers, leadership roles are of particular importance for them to continue what they do successfully. In this study, it is aimed to determine the perceptions of physical education teachers working in primary and secondary educational institutions in relation to the leadership roles they display.

## **2. Methodology**

The main population of this study included physical education teachers working in primary and secondary educational institutions in Turkey. The sample group was limited to 170 physical education teachers working in provinces chosen at random (Tokat, Düzce, Muş, Sakarya, Malatya, Kocaeli, Şanlıurfa and Mardin).

In order to determine the ideas of the research group, "*The Scale to Determine Perceptions and Expectations related to Teacher Leadership*" was used. The data obtained from the research group were analyzed by SPSS 17.0 package software. As a result of reliability analysis, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient values were determined as "Collaboration with Colleagues .812", "Institutional Development .700" and "Professional Development .780". The total Cronbach Alpha value was found to be .831. So as to evaluate the data better, the quintet grading of the scale was determined as "Never" (1.00–1.80), "Seldom" (1.81–2.60), "Sometimes" (2.61–3.40), "Often" (3.41–4.20) and "Always" (4.21–5.00). Normality and homogeneity analyses

were made by assessing the statistical data of the scale. Because the data have a normal distribution and a homogenous structure, in paired comparisons t-test independent from parametric tests and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) parametric tests for multiple group comparisons were applied. LSD test was applied to find the reason for the differences among groups. The statistical significance value was found to be Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) and the level of significance was accepted as  $p < .05$ .

### 3. Findings

In the direction of the study goals, the findings about the leadership roles displayed by the physical education teachers working in educational institutions were shown in tables below.

**Table 1.** T-test result of research group according to school type variance

Scale	Institution	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	t	p
Collaboration with Colleagues	Formal	155	4.251	.632	-.804	.33
	Private	15	4.386	.486		
Institutional Development	Formal	155	4.018	.620	-1.787	.02*
	Private	15	4.311	.407		
Professional Development	Formal	155	4.357	.532	-.467	.59
	Private	15	4.424	.443		

After the independent T-test done to compare the research group according to formal and private educational institutions, a statistically significant difference was determined in the “Institutional Development” dimension ( $t = 1.787$ ;  $p = .02$ ). The physical education teachers working in private educational institutions presented more positive opinions when compared to the physical education teachers working in formal educational institutions. No significant difference could be found in the “Collaboration with Colleagues” and “Professional Development” dimensions.

**Table 2.** T-test result of research group according to gender variance

Scale	Institution	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	t	p
Collaboration with Colleagues	(a) Male	131	4.262	.624	-.036	.97
	(b) Female	39	4.266	.617		

Scale	Institution	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	t	p
Institutional Development	(a) Male	131	4.030	.637	-.545	.58
	(b) Female	39	4.091	.505		
Professional Development	(a) Male	131	4.364	.545	.031	.97
	(b) Female	39	4.361	.456		

After the independent T-test done to compare the research group according to males and females, a statistically significant difference was not determined.

**Table 3.** T-test result of research group according to educational status variance

Scale	Educational Status	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	t	p
Collaboration with Colleagues	(a) License	156	4.251	.611	-.858	.39
	(b) Master	14	4.400	.731		
Institutional Development	(a) License	156	4.033	.618	-.783	.43
	(b) Master	14	4.166	.494		
Professional Development	(a) License	156	4.353	.518	-.869	.38
	(b) Master	14	4.480	.599		

After the independent T-test done to compare the research group according to educational levels, a statistically significant difference could not be found.

**Table 4.** ANOVA test results of research group according to age variance

Scale	Age	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	F	p	Difference (LSD)
Collaboration with Colleagues	(a) 21-30	67	4.188	.601	2.886	.05*	a-c, b-c
	(b) 31-40	86	4.258	.654			
	(c) 41 and over	17	4.588	.409			
Institutional Development	(a) 21-30	67	4.263	.565	1.020	.36	-
	(b) 31-40	86	3.973	.634			
	(c) 41 and over	17	4.071	.640			
Professional Development	(a) 21-30	67	4.189	.533	2.891	.05*	a-c
	(b) 31-40	86	4.044	.529			
	(c) 41 and over	17	4.272	.391			

In the scope of the study, as a result of the one-way variance analysis made to determine whether leadership roles are equal according to the group age variance,

a statistically significant difference was found among the age groups in the “Collaboration with Colleagues” and “Professional Development” dimensions. In order to determine which age group is the reason for this difference, LSD test results were analyzed. In the “Collaboration with Colleagues” dimension, a significant difference was found among all the age groups ( $F=2.886$ ;  $p=.05$ ). The physical education teachers in the age group of 21–30 and 31–40 presented lower opinions in comparison with the physical education teachers at the age of 41 and over. In the “Professional Development” dimension, a significant difference was determined between the age group of 21–30 and 41 and over ( $F=2.891$ ;  $p=.05$ ). The physical education teachers in the age group of 21–30 presented lower opinions in comparison with the physical education teachers at the age of 41 and over. In the “Institutional Development” dimension, a significant difference among groups was determined ( $F=1.020$ ;  $p=.36$ ).

**Table 5.** ANOVA test results of research group according to professional service time variance

Scale	Service Time	N	$\bar{x}$	F	p
Collaboration with Colleagues	(a) 0–5	65	4.273	1.598	.17
	(b) 6–10	60	4.210		
	(c) 11–15	20	4.080		
	(d) 16–20	18	4.488		
	(e) 21 and over	7	4.571		
Institutional Development	(a) 0–5	65	4.037	1.124	.34
	(b) 6–10	60	4.013		
	(c) 11–15	20	3.894		
	(d) 16–20	18	4.271		
	(e) 21 and over	7	4.222		
Professional Development	(a) 0–5	65	4.318	1.051	.38
	(b) 6–10	60	4.354		
	(c) 11–15	20	4.295		
	(d) 16–20	18	4.555		
	(e) 21 and over	7	4.558		

In the scope of the study, as a result of the one-way variance analysis done to determine whether leadership role perceptions are equal according to professional service time variance, no significant difference could be found.

## **4. Discussion and Results**

A statistically significant difference was found in the “Institutional Development” dimension depending on *school type* variance of the research group (Table 1). The physical education teachers working in private educational institutions presented more positive opinions when compared to the physical education teachers working in formal educational institutions in the “Institutional Development” dimension ( $X_{\text{private}} = 4.311$ ;  $X_{\text{formal}} = 4.018$ ). No significant difference was found in the “Collaboration with Colleagues” and “Professional Development” dimensions. The physical education teachers working in formal and private educational institutions have the same education, namely undergraduate. However, it is thought that the reason for this difference is the changes in management and institutional assessments in terms of institutional development. In private educational institutions, administrative structure and assessment could focus on flexibility and efficiency more. In the study done by Beycioğlu (2009), it is stated that institutional development is considered more important in private primary schools. In addition, the participants working in private primary schools presented their opinions with a higher arithmetic average when compared to the participants working in formal primary schools in terms of both expectations and perceptions.

No significant difference was found depending on *gender variance* of the research group (Table 2). When the literature is evaluated, in the study done by Güllü and Arslan (2009), it was determined that there is not any significant difference among teaching styles according to physical education teachers’ gender. In the study done by Atar and Özbek (2009), no significant difference was found in terms of gender variance. Reason (2006), in his study on head masters’ harmony for teacher leadership and transformist and subscriber leadership approaches, did not find any relation between teacher leadership training and transformist and subscriber leadership in terms of gender variance.

No significant difference was found depending on the *educational status* of the research group (Table 3). In the study done by Buyrukcu (2007), according to the educational status variance, while there is a significant difference among the ideas the “maintaining teaching time” dimension, there could not be found a significant difference in other dimensions. In the study by Güllü and Arslan (2009), it was concluded that there is not a significant difference among leadership styles of physical education teachers depending on their educational status.

A statistically significant difference was found in the *age variance* of the research group in the “Collaboration with Colleagues” and “Professional Development” dimensions (Table 4). In the “Institutional Development dimension, no significant

difference could be determined among the groups ( $F=1.020$ ;  $p=.36$ ). The reason for this could be interpreted as the fact that as physical education teachers get older, they are more open to various activity richness and leadership roles in accordance with experience. In his research “The Investigation into the Relationship between Leadership Behaviors of Pre-school Teachers and Personal Characteristics according to Various Variances”, Akçadağ (2008) concluded that the teacher’s leadership perceptions do not change depending on the age variance.

In the scope of the research, no statistically significant difference was found in the group depending on the professional service time variance (Table 5). In the study by Seçkel (2005), it was concluded that there is not a significant difference among teaching styles of music teachers according to their service years. In their study, Güllü and Arslan (2009) stated that there is not a statistically significant difference among teaching styles of physical education teachers according to their service years. These results show similarities with the results of the research. In the research by Şen (2011), it was determined that students make the teacher’s leadership skills statistically different according to their professional seniority.

The above findings show that teachers’ leadership roles and perceptions, especially physical education teachers, are important while establishing an efficient educational institution. Not only teachers’ leadership behaviors are of capital importance but also the leadership behaviors of managers and other staff are necessary. In this case, an environment in educational institutions should be established in which physical education teachers could display their leadership behaviors. In educational institutions, they should be made to create team spirit and communication network with other branch teachers and managers. By giving necessary pre-service and in-service education to physical education teachers, they should be made more interrogator, active and dynamic. As physical education teachers are seen as role models by students, school management should take measures to increase leadership behaviors. Also, physical education teachers should be educated in displaying many more leadership behaviors in class management during their learning process.

## References

- Akçadağ, S. (2008). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin liderlik davranışları ve kişilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişkinin çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi (Ankara ili örneği), *Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü*, Ankara.



- Anderson, K.D. (2004). The nature of teacher leadership in schools as reciprocal influences between teachers and principals, *School Effectiveness and School Leadership*, 15 (1), 97–113.
- Atar, E. & Özbek, O. (2009). The leadership behaviours of the school of physical education and sports students, *Ankara Üniversitesi, Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, Ankara, 7 (2), 58.
- Bennis, W. (1994). On becoming a leader, *Reading, Mass: Addison Wesley*.
- Beycioğlu, K. (2009). İlköğretim okullarında öğretmenlerin sergiledikleri liderlik rollerine ilişkin bir değerlendirme (Hatay ili örneği), *İnönü Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı*, Malatya, 110–111, 117.
- Bogotch, I.E. (2005). A history of public school leadership, In F.W. English (Ed.). *The sage handbook of educational leadership: advances in theory, research, and practice*, *New Delhi: Sage Publications*, London, 7–33.
- Buckner, K. & McDowelle, J.O. (2000). Developing teacher leaders: providing encouragement, opportunities and support, *NASSP Bulletin*, 84 (616), 35–41.
- Buyrukçu, F. (2007). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğretimsel liderlik rolleri, *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, Bolu, 89.
- Can, N. (2006). The roles and the strategies of the principal in improving teacher leadership, *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 21 (2), 349.
- Erçetin, Ş.Ş. (2000) Lider sarmalında vizyon, *Nobel Yayıncılık*, Ankara.
- Güllü, M. & Arslan, C. (2009) Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin liderlik stilleri, *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 6 (11), 353, 359–361.
- Hale, R.P. (1998). Developing teacher leaders, *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 34 (3), 110–111.
- Hodgetts, R.M. (1999) Yönetim teori, süreç ve uygulama (Çev. Çetin, Ç ve Mutlu, E.C.), *Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.*, İstanbul, 534.
- Jagues, E. & Celement, S.A. (1991). Executive leadership, Cason Hall, Co., *Publishers Co.*, Arhington.
- Law, S. & Glover, D. (2000). Educational leadership and learning, *Open Uni. Pres*, Buckingham.
- Lord, B. & Miller, B. (2000). An appealing and inescapable force in school reform?, Education Development Center, <http://www.ed.gov/inits/Math/glenn/Lord-Miller.doc> (10.08.2006).
- McCrackin N.A. (2007). A study of teacher leadership roles and their association to institutional benefits as perceived by principals and instructional facilitators, *Doctorate Thesis, The University of Memphis*, Proquest Information and Learning.
- Mulford, B., Sillins, H. & Leithwood, K. (2004). Educational leadership for organizational learning and improved student outcomes, *Kluwer Academic*, Dordrecht.

- Murphy, J. (2005). Connecting teacher leadership and school improvement, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Corwin Press, Sage, London.
- Paksoy, M. (2002). Çalışma ortamında insan ve toplam kalite yönetimi, *İstanbul Üniversitesi, İşletme Fakültesi Yayınları*, İstanbul, 167.
- Reason, L.D. (2006). An investigation of the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership behaviors and an orientation in teacher leadership, *Doctoral Thesis, Capella University*, ProQuest Information and Learning.
- Seçgel, N. (2005). Müzik öğretmenlerinin liderlik stilleri, *Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, İstanbul, 55.
- Sledge, J.R. & Morehead, P. (2006). Tolerated failure or missed opportunities and potentials for teacher leadership in urban schools?, *Current Issues in Education*, 9 (3), <http://cie.ed.asu.edu/volume9/number3> (01.05.2009).
- Şen, NA. (2011). Öğretmen algılarına göre öğretmenlerin liderlik becerileri: ilköğretim okullarında bir araştırma, *Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, İstanbul, 100.