



## SPORMETRE

The Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences  
Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi

DOI: 10.33689/spormetre.1127616



Geliş Tarihi (Received): 07.06.2022

Kabul Tarihi (Accepted): 15.12.2022

Online Yayın Tarihi (Published): 31.12.2022

### EXAMINATION OF LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHERS\*

İsrafil Yaşın<sup>1†</sup>, Filiz Fatma Çolakoğlu<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Education, Muğla, TURKEY

<sup>2</sup>Gazi University, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Ankara, TURKEY

**Abstract:** The study group of the research conducted to examine the leadership orientations of physical education teachers consists of 329 voluntary physical education teachers working in public and private primary, secondary and high schools affiliated with the Ministry of National Education in Muğla in 2020. In the research where the general screening method was used, data were collected by applying the “Multidimensional Leadership Orientations Scale (MLOS)” developed by Dursun et al. (2019a) to physical education teachers via google form. The difference between the groups was examined by applying the Mann Whitney-U test from the non-parametric tests to the variables consisting of two groups and the Kruskal Wallis-H test was applied to the variables consisting of three groups to the scores of the physical education teachers from the scales. Mann Whitney-U test was applied to determine which groups favored the differences obtained as a result of Kruskal Wallis-H test. As a result of the research, it is seen that physical education teachers have more human-resources leadership orientations in terms of leadership orientations. It was determined that there were statistically significant differences in the structural leadership, human-resources leadership, political leadership and charismatic leadership sub-dimensions of MLOS according to age, professional seniority, managerial status and the variables of the institution studied ( $p<0.05$ ). As a result, it can be said that the higher human-induced leadership orientations of physical education teachers in terms of leadership orientations may have been due to the fact that physical education teachers, whose target audience is students, have mother, father and friendly approaches to their students or athletes in addition to their teaching roles.

**Key Words:** Physical Education Teacher, Leader, Leadership, Orientation

### BEDEN EĞİTİMİ ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN LİDERLİK YÖNELİMLERİNİN İNCELENMESİ

**Öz:** Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin liderlik yönelimlerinin incelenmesi amacı ile yapılan araştırmanın çalışma grubunu 2020 yılında Muğla ilinde Millî Eğitim Bakanlığına bağlı devlet ile özel ilkökul, ortaokul ve liselerde görev yapan gönüllü 329 beden eğitimi öğretmeni oluşturmaktadır. Genel tarama yönteminin kullanıldığı araştırmada, beden eğitimi öğretmenlerine Dursun vd. (2019a) tarafından geliştirilen “Çok Yönlü Liderlik Yönelimleri Ölçeği (ÇYLYÖ)” google form üzerinden uygulanarak veriler toplanmıştır. Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin ölçeklerden aldıkları puanlarına iki gruptan oluşan değişkenlerine non-parametrik testlerden Mann Whitney-U testi, üç gruptan oluşan değişkenlerine ise Kruskal Wallis-H testi uygulanarak gruplar arasındaki farka bakılmıştır. Kruskal Wallis-H testi sonucu elde edilen farkların hangi gruplar lehine olduğunu tespit etmek için Mann Whitney-U testi uygulanmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda liderlik yönelimleri bakımından beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin insan kaynaklı liderlik yönelimlerinin daha fazla olduğu görülmektedir. ÇYLYÖ'nün yapısal liderlik, insan kaynaklı liderlik, politik liderlik ve karizmatik liderlik alt boyutlarında yaş, mesleki kıdem, idarecilik yapma durumu ve çalışılan kurum değişkenlerine göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılıkların olduğu tespit edilmiştir ( $p<0,05$ ). Sonuç olarak beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin liderlik yönelimleri bakımından insan kaynaklı liderlik yönelimlerinin daha fazla olmasının hedef kitlesi öğrenciler olan beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin öğrencilerine veya sporcularına öğretmenlik rollerinin yanında anne, baba ve arkadaşça yaklaşımlarda bulunmalarından kaynaklanmış olabileceği söylenebilir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Beden Eğitimi Öğretmeni, Lider, Liderlik, Yönelim

\*This is a part of İsrafil YAŞIN's Ph.D. Thesis named "Examination of Physical Education Teachers' Interpersonal Self-Efficacy Levels and Leadership Orientations"

† \*Corresponding Author: İsrafil YAŞIN, Dr., e-mail: israfil\_58@hotmail.com

## INTRODUCTION

In social groups that occur as a result of mutual interactions of individuals in line with various goals and wishes such as meeting the needs they cannot realize individually (Güney, 1999), people who are trusted with their words in every environment and situation where they act collectively and who are effective in the decisions taken have been described as leaders in the historical process (Akın, 2020). As long as people lived in groups and acted together, leadership existed (Patterson, 2010), and when it was necessary for people to join forces and coordinate in an activity that needed to be accomplished as a group (Eren, 1993).

When the researches on leadership, which are the subject of researches in many fields, are examined, the definitions of leadership and leader described with different perspectives and approaches attract attention. Yenel (2019) stated that we can see the inability of researchers to meet in a common definition as a wealth gained to the concept instead of interpreting it as a confusion. In these definitions made by researchers; Vroom and Jago (2007) defined leadership as "the process of motivating people to work collaboratively to achieve great things", Yukl (2013) as "the process of influencing others to understand what needs to be done and how to do it, and facilitating individual and collective efforts to achieve common goals", Eren (1993) as "the sum of the knowledge and ability to gather a group of people around specific goals and mobilize them to achieve those goals" defined. Yenel (2019), who refers to a real person in every situation where the concept of leadership is used, explained the leader as "the person who moves, guides, guides and leads a group in line with its goals", Dursun et al. (2019b) defined the concept of leader as "the person who makes them adopt the goals and objectives of the organization with the influence of the organization on the individuals and directs and manages them for a planned and systematic performance in this direction". Ergezer (2003) as "the person who assumes the leadership position", Baltaş (2014) as "the person who changes the result", and Doğan (2015) as "the person who fulfills leadership functions".

The starting point of the researches on leadership, which began to be systematically examined since the 1930s, was the "Characteristics Theory" which focused on the characteristics of leaders (Yukl, 2013). According to this theory, innate abilities and the development of these abilities with the characteristics obtained through education and experience in childhood constitute the basis of leadership (Başoğlu, 2018; Eren, 1993; Güney, 1999; Yenel, 2019). In subsequent years, the focus was more on the behavior of leaders in their leadership processes than on who they were (Northouse, 2016; Vroom and Jago, 2007), has emerged the "Theory of Behavior," which suggests that actions or behaviors explain leadership skills (Kolzow, 2014). As a result of the studies carried out by the researchers who emphasized the importance of the need for the leader to keep up with the changing conditions who think that the characteristics and behavior theories are insufficient to fully explain leadership, "Situational Leadership Theories" have been developed. According to this theory, which is based on the idea that "there is no single best way" to influence others (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988), "there is no leadership style that is valid at all times and in all environments." (Mankan, 2012; Şişman, 2018; Yenel, 2019).

In addition to these theories, new approaches to leadership have been introduced by scientists today. Bolman and Deal (1991a), who stated that although scientists have been conducting research on the characteristics and behaviors of effective leaders for years, they do not focus on how leaders perceive and define situations, have brought a new approach to the literature on leadership styles called "Four Frameworks". According to Bolman and Deal (2015); In order to understand the world and the environment we live in, it is necessary to think from multifaceted,

comprehensive and diverse frameworks instead of narrow-minded approaches. Bolman and Deal developed four frameworks for understanding organizations and leadership; They called it the "Structural Framework", the "Human Resources Framework", the "Political Framework", and the "Symbolic Framework" (Bolman and Deal, 1991b; Bolman and Deal, 2015).

The Structural Framework takes its perspective from the science of sociology. Focused on goals and efficiency, structural leaders clearly define goals, roles, the politics of the group, rules, and instructions. Holding members accountable for outcomes, these leaders try to solve problems with new policies and rules or through restructuring the problem. The human resources framework takes its principles from the fields of psychology and organizational behavior. It focuses on the individual needs of the members by recognizing that organizations that meet the basic needs of individuals will be more efficient. Such leaders exhibit behaviors that value interpersonal relationships and members' feelings, make things easier, develop and strengthen members, and strive to harmonize organizations according to followers or followers according to the organization. The political framework takes its basic ideas from political science. Political leaders who focus on the interests of members and the group instead of institutional goals, who advocate realism and pragmatism, and who solve problems through negotiations, negotiate to build relationships and provide support and strength. Anthropology and several branches of science were used to create symbolic framework ideas and concepts. According to the symbolic framework, organizations contribute to the development of common mission, identity, and cultural symbols that unwittingly change people's attitudes. Symbolic leaders, who develop feelings of excitement, love, respect, and loyalty in the organization through their charisma, value ceremonies, celebrations, and cultural symbols (Bolman and Deal, 1991a; Bolman and Deal, 1991b).

Considering the criteria such as influencing people and achieving the determined goals that are at the basis of leadership, it can be said that teachers, who are the coordinators of educational activities, exhibit leadership behaviors while performing their professions because they aim to achieve successful learning results in students by influencing students. The form of communication, relationship and cooperation situations that physical education teachers, who exhibit leadership roles as well as coaching and coaching roles to their students and athletes with whom they are in constant communication and mutual interaction, and who also perform administrative duties in schools, carry out with the people they have a relationship with while performing these roles and duties are very important in terms of leadership orientations.

When the literature is examined, there are studies conducted using leadership scales that measure different characteristics of physical education teachers' leadership (Akıncı and Kubilay, 2020; Ayten, 2019; Castillo et al., 2017; Çelik and Tamer, 2018; Çiçek, 2014; Güllü and Arslan, 2009; Gürses, 2015; Kocaekşi et al., 2015; Öktem and Kul, 2020; Sucan et al., 2016; Şirin et al., 2018; Turan et al., 2020; Uğur and Çolakoğlu, 2019; Üşenmez, 2004). Along with these studies, there are also studies using the "Leadership Orientation Inventory", the "Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire" and the "Leadership Orientation Scale", which consist of similar dimensions to the sub-dimensions of the Multidimensional Leadership Orientation Scale (MLOS) (Can, 2002; Çelikdağ, 2018; Dinçer, 2012; Katkat et al., 2005; Öz, 2018; Üstün, 2004). Using the Multidimensional Leadership Orientations Scale, Güler et al.'s (2020) sports high school students, according to Eliçora (2021) teachers working in primary, secondary and high schools, Dursun and Göksel's (2022) studies with students studying at the faculty of sports sciences are also found. In addition to the information mentioned in the literature in the research conducted with the aim of examining the leadership orientations of physical education teachers, our research is important in terms of the fact that the

Multidimensional Leadership Orientations Scale is applied to physical education teachers for the first time. Within the scope of the research, is there a difference in the leadership orientations of physical education teachers according to the variables of age, professional seniority, managerial status and the institution they work in? The questions were also answered.

## METHOD

In this section, the model of the research, the universe and its sample, data collection tools, the analysis of the data and the ethics of the research are included.

### Model of the Study

The relational screening model, which is a general screening model from quantitative research methods, was used in the study. In scanning models, it is aimed to define the finished or ongoing situations as they are without intervention. Karasar (2018) uses the general survey model as "the screening arrangements made on the whole universe or a group, sample or sample to be taken from it in order to make a general judgment about the universe in a universe consisting of many elements", and the relational survey model as "two or more research models aiming to determine the existence of co-variation among a large number of variables".

### Universe and Sample

The universe of the study consists of 561 physical education teachers working in public and private primary, secondary and high schools affiliated with the Ministry of National Education in Mugla in 2020. The sample of the study consists of 329 volunteer physical education teachers working in Mugla province who agreed to participate in the research. In determining the sample, the appropriate sampling technique, which is the type of sampling in which the participants are selected because they are willing and suitable for the research, was preferred (Avcı and Yıldırım, 2014). The descriptive information of the physical education teachers participating in the study is presented in table 1.

**Table 1.** Descriptive information of physical education teachers

Variables	n	f	%
Age	329	22-34 between	16.7
		35-49 between	66
		50 and over	17.3
Professional Seniority	329	1-14 year	39.5
		15-29 year	52
		30 and over	8.5
Status of Managing	329	Yes	34.7
		No	65.3
Type of Institution Worked	329	State School	84
		Private School	16

As can be seen in Table 1, 55 of the 329 physical education teachers (16.7%) who participated in the study were in the age group of 22-34, 217 (66%) were in the range of 35-49, and 57 (17.3%) were in the age group of 50 and over. There are 130 (39.5%) physical education teachers working in the 1-14 year range, 171 (52%) working 15-29 years, and 28 (8.5%) working in the 30 years or more. Of the physical education teachers, 114 (34.7%) stated that they had been or are currently administrators in the past, while 215 (65.3%) stated that they had not been administrators during their professional lives. 275 (84%) physical education teachers work in state schools and 54 (16%) physical education teachers work in private schools.

### **Data Collection Tools**

In the study, the "Multidimensional Leadership Orientations Scale (MLOS)" developed by Dursun et al. (2019a) together with the personal information form consisting of the independent variables of the research was applied to physical education teachers via google form due to the COVID-19 Pandemic process and data were collected.

MLOS consists of a total of 19 items including "Political Leadership" (3, 6, 9, 10, 11), "Human Resources Leadership" (2, 8, 12, 14, 17), "Charismatic Leadership" (13, 15, 16, 18, 19) and "Structural Leadership" (1, 4, 5, 7). As a result of the analysis conducted to determine the reliability of the scale, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was determined as 0.85 for the overall scale, 0.80 for the "Political Leadership" dimension, 0.73 for the "Human Resources Leadership" dimension, 0.74 for the "Charismatic Leadership" dimension and 0.72 for the "Structural Leadership" dimension. From the findings obtained as a result of the reliability analysis, it was determined that the overall and sub-dimensions of the scale were quite reliable. The articles in the MLOS are rated in the 5-point likert type in the range of "Completely Disagree" to "Completely Agree". The high scores obtained from the lower dimensions of the scale evaluated within the scope of the sub-dimensions show that the tendency of the person to that leadership orientation is high (Dursun et al., 2019a).

### **Analysis of Data**

The data collected by applying MLOS to physical education teachers were entered into the SPSS 22.0 statistical program and analyzed. As a result of the tests carried out to perform reliability analyzes of the data obtained from the scales, Cronbach Alpha values; It was determined as 0.92 for the total score of MLO, 0.80 for the Structural Leadership dimension, 0.79 for the Human Resources Leadership dimension, 0.84 for the Political Leadership dimension and 0.79 for the Charismatic Leadership dimension. In general, Cronbach Alpha values above 0.7 are acceptable (Pallant, 2017), so it can be said that data collection tools provide reliable measurement for research.

When the assumption of normality of the distributions of the scores received by physical education teachers from the MLOS was analyzed, it was found that the statistics for Kolmogorov Smirnov (K-S) and Shapiro-Wilk (S-W) tests were significant compared to  $p < 0.05$ , and the scores obtained from the scales did not meet the normality assumption. Since the distribution of the groups was not normal, the difference between the groups was examined by applying the Mann Whitney-U test from non-parametric tests and the Kruskal Wallis-H test according to the age and seniority year variables to determine the leadership orientation of physical education teachers. Mann Whitney-U test was applied between the two groups to determine which groups favored the differences obtained as a result of Kruskal Wallis-H test. The results of the analysis were handled at a 95% confidence level and  $p < 0.05$  values were considered statistically significant.

### **Research Ethics**

At the meeting of Gazi University Assessment and Evaluation Ethics Sub-Working Group, dated 14.07.2020 and numbered 07, it was accepted that the research complies with the ethical rules.

## FINDINGS

In this section, the analyzes and results of physical education teachers in order to determine their leadership orientations in line with various variables are given.

**Table 2.** Descriptive statistics on the MLOS scores of physical education teachers

Sub-Dimensions	n	Average Points			Total Points			skewnes	kurtosis
		Min	Max	$\bar{X} \pm Ss$	Min	Max	$\bar{X} \pm Ss$		
Structural Leadership	329	3	5	4.44±0.45	12	20	17.76±1.82	-0.280	-0.856
Human Resources Leadership	329	1.80	5	4.46±0.41	9	25	22.34±2.05	-0.777	3.852
Political Leadership	329	2	5	4.07±0.56	10	25	20.36±2.84	-0.377	-0.100
Charismatic Leadership	329	1.80	5	4.13±0.53	9	25	20.67±2.66	-0.471	0.703

According to Table 2, it was determined that the total scores of physical education teachers from the sub-dimensions of the MLOS were the lowest 12, the highest 20 and average 17.76 points in the structural leadership dimension, the lowest 9, the highest 25 and average 22.34 points in the human resources leadership dimension, the lowest 10 highest 25 and average 20.36 points in the political leadership dimension, and the lowest 9, the highest 25 and the average 20.67 points in the charismatic leadership dimension. In addition, it was described that the human sourced leadership orientations (4.46±0.41) of physical education teachers were more dominant than other leadership dimensions in terms of leadership orientations according to the mean of the MLOS sub-dimension scores and that they had structural leadership (4.44±0.45), charismatic leadership (4.13±0.53), political leadership (4.07±0.56) orientations respectively.

**Table 3.** Kruskal Wallis-H test results of physical education teachers by age variable

Sub-Dimensions	Variables	n 329	$\bar{X} \pm Ss$	Md	Mean Rank	$\chi^2$	df	p	
MLOS	Structural Leadership	22-34 age	55	18.23±1.97	19	192.59	8.138	2	0.017*
		35-49 age	217	17.75±1.82	18	163.89			
		50-65 age	57	17.35±1.54	17	142.60			
	Human Resources Leadership	22-34 age	55	22.96±1.92	23	193.32	6.583	2	0.037*
		35-49 age	217	22.25±2.11	22	161.47			
		50-65 age	57	22.07±1.82	22	151.13			
	Political Leadership	22-34 age	55	20.76±3.21	22	181.89	2.474	2	0.290
		35-49 age	217	20.35±2.78	20	163.38			
		50-65 age	57	20.01±2.65	20	154.89			
Charismatic Leadership	22-34 age	55	21.25±2.97	22	188.53	6.460	2	0.040*	
	35-49 age	217	20.65±2.69	20	164.77				
	50-65 age	57	20.15±2.11	20	143.18				

\*p<0.05

According to the results of the Kruskal Wallis-H Test conducted according to the age variable of physical education teachers when Table 3 is examined, there was no statistically significant difference between physical education teachers in the dimension of political leadership ( $\chi^2=2.474$ ,  $p=0.290>0.05$ ). Statistically significant differences were obtained between physical education teachers in the dimensions of structural leadership ( $\chi^2=8.138$ ,  $p=0.017<0.05$ ), human-resources leadership ( $\chi^2=6.583$ ,  $p=0.037<0.05$ ) and charismatic leadership ( $\chi^2=6.460$ ,  $p=0.040<0.05$ ). The results of the Mann Whitney-U Test, which was conducted to determine which groups caused the difference in the dimensions of structural leadership, human-resources leadership and charismatic leadership are presented in table 4.

**Table 4.** Mann Whitney-U test results of physical education teachers by age variable

	Sub-Dimensions	Variables	n	$\bar{X}\pm Ss$	Md	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	z	p
MLOS	Structural Leadership	22-34 age	55	18.23±1.97	19	154.72	8509.50	-1.966	0.049*
		35-49 age	217	17.75±1.82	18	131.88	28618.50		
		22-34 age	55	18.23±1.97	19	65.87	3623.00	-3.054	0.002*
		50-65 age	57	17.35±1.54	17	47.46	2705.00		
		35-49 age	217	17.75±1.82	18	141.01	30599.00	-1.459	0.145
		50-65 age	57	17.35±1.54	17	124.14	7076.00		
	Human Resources Leadership	22-34 age	55	22.96±1.92	23	157.35	8654.00	-2.235	0.025*
		35-49 age	217	22.25±2.11	22	131.22	28474.00		
		22-34 age	55	22.96±1.92	23	63.97	3518.50	-2.431	0.015*
		50-65 age	57	22.07±1.82	22	49.29	2809.50		
		35-49 age	217	22.25±2.11	22	139.25	30217.00	-0.724	0.469
		50-65 age	57	22.07±1.82	22	130.84	7458.00		
	Charismatic Leadership	22-34 age	55	21.25±2.97	22	152.17	8369.50	-0.665	0.960
		35-49 age	217	20.65±2.69	20	132.53	28758.50		
		22-34 age	55	21.25±2.97	22	64.35	3539.50	-0.533	0.011*
		50-65 age	57	20.15±2.11	20	48.92	2788.50		
35-49 age		217	20.65±2.69	20	141.24	30649.50	-1.538	0.124	
50-65 age		57	20.15±2.11	20	123.25	7025.50			

\*p&lt;0.05

When Table 4 is examined, according to the results of the Mann Whitney-U Test, which was conducted to determine from which groups the differences in the structural leadership, human-resources leadership and charismatic leadership dimensions resulted from the Kruskal Wallis-H Test performed according to the age variable of physical education teachers; Between 22-34 and 35-49 age groups, in favor of 22-34 age groups ( $z=-1.966$ ,  $p=.049<.05$ ;  $Md_{22-34}=19>Md_{35-49}=18$ ), between 22-34 and 50-65 age groups, in favor of 22-34 age groups ( $z=-3.054$ ,  $p=0.002<0.05$ ;  $Md_{22-34}=19>Md_{50-65}=17$ ), in the human-resources leadership dimension, between the 22-34 and 35-49 age groups, in favor of the 22-34 age groups ( $z= -2.235$ ,  $p=0.025<0.05$ ;  $Md_{22-34}=23>Md_{35-49}=22$ ), between 22-34 and 50-65 age groups in favor of 22-34 age groups ( $z= -2.431$ ,  $p=.0015<0.05$ ;  $Md_{22-34}=23>Md_{50-65}=22$ ) and in the charismatic leadership dimension, statistically significant between the 22-34 and 50-65 age groups in favor of the 22-34 age groups ( $z=-2.533$ ,  $p=0.011<0.05$ ;  $Md_{22-34}=22>Md_{50-65}=20$ ). differences were determined ( $p<0.05$ ).

**Table 5.** Kruskal Wallis-H test results according to the variable of professional seniority of physical education teachers

	Sub-Dimensions	Variables	n	$\bar{X}\pm Ss$	Md	Mean Rank	$\chi^2$	df	p
MLOS	Structural Leadership	1-14 year	130	17.88±1.94	18	173.04	9.468	2	0.009*
		15-29 year	171	17.82±1.77	18	167.25			
		30 and over	28	16.85±1.20	16.50	113.93			
	Human Resources Leadership	1-14 year	130	22.67±1.90	23	179.61	16.272	2	0.000*
		15-29 year	171	22.29±2.15	22	164.39			
		30 and over	28	21.03±1.42	21	100.91			
	Political Leadership	1-14 year	130	20.76±2.78	20	177.22	3.890	2	0.143
		15-29 year	171	20.14±2.94	20	158.50			
		30 and over	28	19.82±2.19	20	147.98			
	Charismatic Leadership	1-14 year	130	20.90±2.59	21	172.21	4.802	2	0.910
		15-29 year	171	20.62±2.84	21	165.39			
		30 and over	28	19.85±1.55	20	129.13			

\*p&lt;0,05

When Table 5 is examined, according to the results of the Kruskal Wallis-H Test conducted according to the professional seniority variable of physical education teachers; There was no statistically significant difference between physical education teachers in the dimensions of political leadership ( $x^2=3.890$ ,  $p=0.143>0.05$ ) and charismatic leadership ( $x^2=4.802$ ,  $p=0.910>0.05$ ) ( $P>0.05$ ). Statistically significant differences were obtained between physical education teachers in the dimensions of structural leadership ( $x^2=9.468$ ,  $p=0.009<0.05$ ) and human-resources leadership ( $x^2=16.272$ ,  $p=0.000<0.05$ ). The results of the Mann Whitney-U Test to determine which groups are responsible for the differences in structural leadership and human-resources leadership dimensions are shown in table 6.

**Table 6.** Mann Whitney-U test results according to the variable of professional seniority of physical education teachers

Sub-Dimensions	Variables	n	$\bar{X}\pm Ss$	Md	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	z	p	
MLOS	Structural Leadership	1-14 year	130	17.88±1.94	18	154.06	20028.00	-0.544	0.587
		15-29 year	171	17.82±1.77	18	148.67	25423.00		
	Structural Leadership	1-14 year	130	17.88±1.94	18	84.48	10982.00	-3.007	0.003*
		30 and over	28	16.85±1.20	16.50	56.39	1579.00		
		15-29 year	171	17.82±1.77	18	104.58	17883.00	-2.826	0.005*
	Human Resources Leadership	30 and over	28	16.85±1.20	16.50	72.04	2017.00		
		1-14 year	130	22.67±1.90	23	158.97	20666.00	-1.407	0.159
		15-29 year	171	22.29±2.15	22	144.94	24785.00		
	Human Resources Leadership	1-14 year	130	22.67±1.90	23	86.14	11198.00	-3.992	0.000*
		30 and over	28	21.03±1.42	21	48.68	1363.00		
15-29 year		171	22.29±2.15	22	105.45	18031.50	-3.352	0.001*	
30 and over		28	21.03±1.42	21	66.73	1868.50			

\* $p<0,05$

When Table 6 is examined, according to the results of the Kruskal Wallis-H Test conducted according to the professional seniority variable of physical education teachers, the Mann Whitney-U Test results to determine which groups are responsible for the difference in structural leadership and human-resources leadership dimensions; in the structural leadership dimension, between employees of 1-14 years and 30 years and over, in favor of employees for 1-14 years ( $z=-3.007$ ,  $p=0.003<0.05$ ;  $Md_{1-14}=18>Md_{30\text{ over}}=16.5$ ), between employees of 15-29 years and 30 years and over, in favor of employees for 15-29 years ( $z=-2.826$ ,  $p=0.005<0.05$ ;  $Md_{15-29}=18>Md_{30\text{ over}}=16.5$ ), in the human-resources leadership dimension, between 1-14 years and 30 years and over employees in favor of 1-14 years employees ( $z=-3.992$ ,  $p=0.000<0.05$ ;  $Md_{1-14}=23>Md_{30\text{ over}}=21$ ) and statistically significant differences were found between employees of 15-29 years and 30 years and over in favour of employees 15-29 years ( $z=-3.352$ ,  $p=0.001<0.05$ ;  $Md_{15-29}=22>Md_{30\text{ over}}=21$ ).

**Table 7.** Mann Whitney-U test results according to the variable of being an administrator in the professional life of physical education teachers

Sub-Dimensions	Variables	n	$\bar{X}\pm Ss$	Md	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	z	p	
MLOS	Structural Leadership	Yes	114	18.17±1.65	19	184.00	20976.50	-2.692	0.007*
		No	215	17.54±1.87	17	154.92	33308.50		
	Human Resources Leadership	Yes	114	22.65±2.28	23	183.18	20883.00	-2.564	0.010*
		No	215	22.17±1.89	22	155.36	33402.00		
	Political Leadership	Yes	114	20.79±2.99	21	180.39	20564.00	-2.151	0.032*
		No	215	20.13±2.73	20	156.84	33721.00		
	Charismatic Leadership	Yes	114	20.81±2.77	21	171.68	19571.50	-0.934	0.350
		No	215	20.59±2.60	20	161.46	34713.50		

\* $p<0,05$



When Table 7 is examined, according to the results of the Mann Whitney-U Test conducted according to the variable of being an administrator in the professional lives of physical education teachers; structural leadership ( $z=-2.692$ ,  $p=0.007<0.05$ ;  $Md_{yes}=19>Md_{no}=17$ ), human-resources leadership ( $z=-2.564$ ,  $p=0.010<0.05$ ;  $Md_{yes}=23>Md_{no}=22$ ) and political leadership ( $z=-2.151$ ,  $p=0.032<0.05$ ;  $Md_{yes}=21>Md_{no}=20$ ) were statistically significant differences in favor of physical education teachers who were administrators in their professional lives ( $p<0.05$ ), while no statistically significant difference was obtained in the dimension of charismatic leadership ( $z=-0.934$ ,  $p=0.350>0.05$ ).

**Table 8.** Mann Whitney-U Test results according to the type of institution variable where physical education teachers work

Sub-Dimensions	Variables	n 329	$\bar{X}\pm Ss$	Md	Mean Rank	Sum of Rank	z	p	
MLOS	Structural Leadership	State	275	17.65±1.80	17	159.19	43778.50	-2.549	0.011*
		Private	54	18.31±1.83	19	194.56	10506.50		
	Human Resources Leadership	State	275	22.20±2.03	22	158.90	43696.50	-2.667	0.008*
		Private	54	23.01±1.99	23	196.08	10588.50		
	Political Leadership	State	275	20.06±2.84	20	155.16	42669.50	-4.262	0.000*
		Private	54	21.90±2.25	22	215.10	11615.50		
Charismatic Leadership	State	275	20.45±2.68	20	157.35	43270.00	-3.318	0.001*	
	Private	54	21.77±2.27	22	203.98	11015.00			

\* $p<0.05$

When Table 8 is examined, according to the results of the Mann Whitney-U Test conducted according to the variable of the institution where physical education teachers work; Statistically significant differences were obtained in favor of physical education teachers working in private schools according to the dimensions of structural leadership ( $z=-2.549$ ,  $p=0.011<0.05$ ;  $Md_{private}=19>Md_{state}=17$ ), human-resources leadership ( $z=-2.667$ ,  $p=0.008<0.05$ ;  $Md_{private}=23>Md_{state}=22$ ), political leadership ( $z=-4.262$ ,  $p=0.000<0.05$ ;  $Md_{private}=22>Md_{state}=20$ ) and charismatic leadership ( $z=-3.318$ ,  $p=0.001<0.05$ ;  $Md_{private}=22>Md_{state}=20$ ).

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This research was conducted with the aim of examining the leadership orientations of physical education teachers according to various variables. Dursun et al. (2019a) stated that the Multidimensional Leadership Orientation Scale is evaluated within the scope of sub-dimensions, and that the high scores obtained from the sub-dimensions mean that the individual has a high tendency towards that leadership orientation. As a result of the analyzes made based on this expression, it was concluded that human-based leadership orientations came to the fore according to the Multidimensional Leadership Orientations Scale sub-dimension point averages of physical education teachers. Güler et al. (2020) sports high school students, Eliçora (2021) primary, secondary and high school teachers, Dursun and Göksel (2022) students studying at the faculty of sports sciences in their research using the Multidimensional Leadership Orientations Scale. They stated that the human-based leadership orientations of students and teachers are at a higher level than other leadership orientations. In studies where the "Leadership Orientation Scale", which consists of dimensions and items similar to the Multidimensional Leadership Orientation Scale, was used, it was determined that the human-based leadership orientation scores of teacher candidates were at a higher level (Arslan and Uslu, 2014; Nacar et al., 2017; Onur Sezer and Bağçeli Kahraman, 2018; Sinanoglu, 2019). These results obtained by the researchers support the findings of our study. The fact that physical education teachers' human-based leadership orientations dominate compared to other dimensions is due to the fact

that the target audience of the teaching profession is students, they deal with their students one-on-one, value them and give importance to their ideas, and try to solve their problems in and out of school by listening to them possible to originate.

According to the results obtained from the analyzes made according to the age variable of physical education teachers, no statistically significant difference was found between physical education teachers in the dimension of political leadership. In the dimensions of structural leadership and human-resources leadership; Statistically significant differences were found between the ages of 22-34 and 35-49 in favor of physical education teachers in the 22-34 age range, and between the 22-34 and 50-65 age groups in favor of physical education teachers in the 22-34 age range. In the charismatic leadership dimension, a statistically significant difference was found between the 22-34 and 50-65 age groups in favor of physical education teachers in the 22-34 age range. It was determined that physical education teachers in the 22-34 age range had higher structural, human-resources, political and charismatic leadership orientations than physical education teachers in other age groups. Dursun and Göksel (2022) found a low-level positive and significant relationship between age and "Human-based leadership" and "Charismatic leadership" scores in their research. In addition to this result, Katkat et al.'s (2005) study found differences in favor of young physical education teachers in the dimension of "work-oriented" leadership, and Arslan and Uslu (2014) in favor of the 20-24+ age group in the dimensions of human-based perspective and structural perspective supports the results of our research. Unlike our research, Katkat et al. (2005) in favor of older physical education teachers in the dimension of "people-oriented" leadership, Öz (2018) in favor of physical education teachers in the age group of 41-45 and 46+ in the dimension of "establishing the structure", in Çelikdağ (2018) "human-oriented leadership" and "structural leadership" dimensions in favor of physical education teachers aged 41 and over. Nacar et al. (2017), Yaşar Ekici (2018) and Sinanoğlu (2019) stated that they did not find a statistically significant difference between the groups according to age in their research.

The data obtained according to the age variable of physical education teachers have been discussed with the literature, and the results obtained in our research show parallelism with the literature. It can be said that the different results obtained in other studies may be due to the different scales and samples. The difference in structural, human-resources and charismatic leadership dimensions in favor of physical education teachers in the 22-34 age range is that the teachers in this age group are not at the beginning of their professional lives because they do not have much burnout and wear levels, they are more attached to the rules, they are closer to the students in terms of age than other age groups, as a result of the students taking the teachers in this age group more as an example. it can be attributed to their greater influence from teachers.

According to the results of the analyzes made according to the professional seniority variable of physical education teachers, although no statistically significant difference was detected between physical education teachers in the dimensions of political leadership and charismatic leadership, in favor of physical education teachers who worked for 1-14 years between 1-14 years and 30 years and over in the dimension of structural leadership, in favor of physical education teachers who worked for 15-29 years between 15-29 years and 30 years and over, In the dimension of human-resources leadership, statistically significant differences were obtained between employees of 1-14 years and 30 years and over in favor of physical education teachers working for 1-14 years, and between employees of 15-29 years and 30 years and over, in favor of physical education teachers who worked for 15-29 years. In their research using a different leadership scale from MLOS, Katkat et al. (2005) stated that they found a difference

in favor of inexperienced physical education teachers in terms of "work-oriented" leader behavior. This result is in line with the findings of our research.

Unlike our research, Eliçora (2021), in her research with primary, secondary and high school teachers, stated that teachers' human-based, structural and charismatic leadership orientations do not change according to professional seniority. In the studies conducted using different leadership scales, Dinçer (2012) stated that they did not detect a significant difference between physical education teachers in the dimensions of "establishing the structure" and "showing understanding", and Yaşar Ekici (2018) stated that they did not detect a significant difference between preschool teachers in terms of leadership orientations according to professional seniority. In addition, Çelikdağ (2018) has 16 years and more in the "people-oriented leadership" sub-dimension, 2-8 years in the "charismatic leadership" dimension, 9-15 years and 16 years and above, Öz (2018), on the other hand, found statistically significant differences in favor of physical education teachers with 21 years or more professional experience in the dimension of "establishing the structure". The results of these studies do not show similarity with our research, since in our study, a difference was found in favor of physical education teachers with low professional seniority in the dimensions of structural and human-based leadership.

Finding a difference in favor of physical education teachers with a professional seniority of 1-14 years and 15-29 years in terms of structural and human-based leadership orientation. This may be due to the fact that the teachers in this seniority group are at the very beginning of their professional life, so that the burnout and weariness are at a very low level, they are more sensitive to their work and students, and that their students can communicate better with the teachers in this group. It can be said that the different results obtained in other studies may be due to the different scales and samples.

According to the findings obtained from the analyzes made according to the variable of being an administrator in the professional lives of physical education teachers; While statistically significant differences were found in the dimensions of structural leadership, human-induced leadership and political leadership in favor of physical education teachers who worked as administrators in their professional lives, no statistically significant difference was obtained in the charismatic leadership dimension. It was determined that physical education teachers who worked as administrators had higher structural, human-resources, political and charismatic leadership orientations than physical education teachers who did not do administrators. The difference in structural leadership, human-induced leadership and political leadership in favor of physical education teachers who are administrators at any time in their professional lives can be explained by the fact that administrators plan the educational activities of the school and direct the internal and external stakeholders in this regard by directing and directing them, and constantly establish relations with the relevant higher institutions and the environment to provide support for the operation and needs of the school. In the literature reviews, the variable of being an administrator in the professional lives of physical education teachers was not found and researches on leadership behaviors and orientations were not found.

According to the results of the analyzes made according to the variable of the institution studied by physical education teachers; Statistically significant differences were found in the dimensions of structural leadership, human-resources leadership, political leadership and charismatic leadership in favor of physical education teachers working in private schools. In the studies conducted using different scales, Can (2002) found that among physical education teachers working in public and private schools in the dimensions of "establishing the structure"

and "showing understanding", in favor of teachers working in private schools. The statistically significant differences that Yaşar Ekici (2018) found in favor of teachers working in private preschool education institutions between public and private preschool teachers in the dimensions of human-oriented, structure-oriented, transformational and charismatic leadership support the findings of our research. Unlike the results of these studies and our research, Çelikdağ (2018) did not find a statistically significant difference between physical education teachers working in public and private schools in the dimensions of "people-oriented leadership", "structural leadership" and "charismatic leadership".

The data obtained according to the institution variable of the physical education teachers are discussed with the literature, and the results obtained in our research show parallelism with the literature. It can be said that the results obtained different from our research may be due to the sample and scale differences. The reason for the difference in favor of physical education teachers working in private schools in structural, human-resources, political and charismatic leadership dimensions is that physical education teachers working in private schools are more dependent on the rules because they know that their contracts will end if they do not fulfill the contract requirements due to their contractual satisfaction and performance-based work, and that they are always warm with school administration, parents and students, they can be told to exhibit behaviors aimed at establishing close and positive relationships.

People follow good communication and are influenced by the leaders with whom they have a relationship. As Güney (1999) puts it, "leadership is the art of influencing people." In addition to the aim of creating behavioral change in students by influencing them during educational activities, it can be said that physical education teachers, who aim to achieve various success and degrees by preparing school teams for competitions, influence students and athletes and lead them towards the goal. The behaviors of physical education teachers in the specified processes constitute their leadership orientation. As a result of our research conducted in order to determine the leadership behaviors they exhibited while performing their various duties in schools, it was determined that the human-induced leadership orientation averages of physical education teachers were higher than their structural, political and charismatic leadership orientations according to the MLOS size averages. It can be thought that this result is due to the fact that physical education teachers focus primarily on people and give importance to them because they constantly repeat such behaviors due to the fact that they approach their students and athletes as mothers, fathers and friends as well as their teaching roles due to the fact that their target audience is students.

### **Suggestions**

1. Providing in-service training on communication and leadership skills to physical education teachers during the seminar periods held at the beginning, middle and end of the academic year every year in schools,
2. To make a large sample of the leadership orientations of physical education teachers that will allow comparisons to be made to cover different geographical regions and provinces, taking into account different variables,
3. It is recommended to investigate the leadership orientations of physical education teachers by using quantitative and qualitative research methods together.

## REFERENCES

- Akın, U. (2020). Liderlik. N. Cemaloğlu, M. Özdemir (Eds.), *Eğitim yönetimi içinde* (131-160). Ankara: Pegem.
- Akıncı, A., Kubilay, İ. (2020). An investigation of physical education teachers' perception of ethical leadership according to some variables. *European Journal of Health & Science in Sports*, 7(2), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.33598/V11I120201>
- Arslan, H., Uslu, B. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının liderlik yönelimlerinin incelenmesi. *e-Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(1), 42-60.
- Avcı, Ö. H., Yıldırım, İ. (2014). Ergenlerde şiddet eğilimi, yalnızlık ve sosyal destek. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 29(1), 157-168.
- Ayten, İ. (2019). *Okul sporlarında antrenör olarak yer alan beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmenlerinin liderlik algıları ile liderlik özellikleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Batman Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi, Rekreasyon Yönetimi Ana Bilim Dalı, Batman.
- Baltaş, A. (2014). *Ekip çalışması ve liderlik*. İstanbul: Remzi.
- Başoğlu, B. (2018). *Tarihsel süreç içinde Türk spor yönetimi*. Ankara: Gazi.
- Bolman, L. G., Deal, T. E. (1991a). Images of leadership. (7). *Washington: The National Center for Educational Leadership*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED332345.pdf> sayfasından erişilmiştir.
- Bolman, L. G., Deal, T. E. (1991b). Leadership and management effectiveness: A multi-frame, multi-sector analysis. *Human Resource Management*, 30(4), 509-534. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.3930300406>
- Bolman, L. G., Deal, T. E. (2015). Think or sink leading in a vuca world. *Leader to Leader*, 76, 35-40. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ltl.20176>
- Can, S. (2002). *Resmi ve özel okullardaki okul yöneticileri ve beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin liderlik davranışı yönünden karşılaştırılması*. Doktora tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eğitim Bilimleri Ana Bilim Dalı, Erzurum.
- Castillo, I., Álvarez, O., Estevan, I., Queralt, A., Molina-García, J. (2017). Passion for teaching, transformational leadership and burnout among physical education teachers. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 26(3), 57-61.
- Çelik, O. B., Tamer, K. (2018). Farklı liderlik stillerine sahip olan beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimi davranışlarının incelenmesi. *Gazi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 23(2), 85-101.
- Çelikdağ, C. (2018). *Beden eğitimi ve spor öğretmenlerinin duygusal zekâ düzeyleri ile liderlik özellikleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (Erzurum ili örneği)*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi, Kış Sporları ve Spor Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Ana Bilim Dalı, Erzurum.
- Çiçek, H. (2014). *Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin çalışma ortamlarındaki örgütsel adalet düzeyinin etik liderlik davranışlarına etkisi (Kırıkkale il örneği)*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Ana Bilim Dalı, Burdur.
- Dinçer, T. (2012). *Edirne ilinde görev yapan beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin liderlik davranışlarının değerlendirilmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Trakya Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Ana Bilim Dalı, Edirne.
- Doğan, O. (2015). *Spor psikolojisi*. Ankara: Detay.
- Dursun, E., Göksel, A. (2022). Öğrencilerin liderlik yönelimlerinin incelenmesi (spor bilimleri fakültesi örneği). *Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9(1), 111-123.
- Dursun, M., Günay, M., Yenel, İ. F. (2019a). Çok yönlü liderlik yönelimleri ölçeği (çylyö): Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Uluslararası Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi*, 2(2), 333-347.

Dursun, M., Arı, Ç., Adaş, S. K., Ulun, C. (2019b). Spor örgütlerinde çalışan bireylerin lider kavramına ilişkin metaforik algıları. Oktay Kızar (Ed.), *Spor bilimleri alanında araştırma makaleleri* içinde (s.199-214). Ankara: Gece.

Eliçora, A. (2021). Öğretmenlerin öğretmen öz yeterliliği, çeşitlilik ve sosyal adalet algıları ve çok yönlü liderlik yönelimlerinin araştırılması. *Route Educational & Social Science Journal*, 8(5), 362-377. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17121/ressjournal.2957>

Eren, E. (1993). *Yönetim ve organizasyon*. İstanbul: Beta.

Ergezer, B. (2003). *Liderlik ve özellikleri*. Ankara: Ocak.

Güler, B., Dursun, M., Günay, M. (2020). Spor lisesi öğrencilerinin liderlik yönelimlerinin incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Güncel Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(2), 576-587.

Güllü, M., Arslan, C. (2009). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin liderlik stilleri. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6(11), 353-368.

Güney, S. (1999). *Davranış bilimleri açısından Atatürk'ün liderliği*. Ankara: Ocak.

Gürses, N. (2015). *Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin öğretimsel liderlik davranışlarının incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Ana Bilim Dalı, Trabzon.

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H. (1988). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Karasar, N. (2018). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel.

Katkat, D., Tunçkol, M., Şahin, M. Y. (2005). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin liderlik yönelimlerinin demografik değişkenler bakımından analizi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(1), 39-47.

Kocaekşi, S., Özbal, A. F., Yavaş, H. (2015). Examination of student control ideologies and leadership behaviors of physical education and sports teachers in terms of different variables. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 186, 451-455.

Kolzow, D. R. (2014). *Leading from within: Building organizational leadership capacity*. [https://www.iedonline.org/clientuploads/Downloads/edrp/Leading\\_from\\_Within.pdf](https://www.iedonline.org/clientuploads/Downloads/edrp/Leading_from_Within.pdf) sayfasından erişilmiştir.

Mankan, E. (2012). *Yönetim ve organizasyon*. İzmir: İlyas.

Nacar, E., Gacar, A., Bayrak Ayaş, E. (2017). Beden eğitimi öğretmen adaylarının liderlik özelliklerinin demografik özellikler açısından incelenmesi. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 5(51), 492-501.

Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership theory and practice*. Sage.

Onur Sezer, G., Bağçeli Kahraman, P. (2018). Öğretmen adaylarının liderlik yönelimlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 26(5), 1551-1560. doi:10.24106/kefdergi.2142

Öktem, T., Kul, M. (2020). Investigation of perceptions concerning leadership roles of physical education and sport teachers. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 9(5), 277-283. doi:10.5539/jel.v9n5p277

Öz, N. (2018). *Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin iletişim becerilerinin liderlik davranışlarına olan etkisinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Ana Bilim Dalı, Gaziantep.

Pallant, J. (2017). *SPSS kullanma kılavuzu spss ile adım adım veri analizi* (S. Balcı, B. Ahi, Çev.). Ankara: Anı.

Patterson, C. (2010). *Management briefs management and leadership theory made simple*. Ventus Publishing ApS, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309699666\\_Management\\_Briefs\\_Management\\_and\\_Leadership\\_Theory\\_Made\\_Simple/link/581d425808ae40da2cab5421/download](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309699666_Management_Briefs_Management_and_Leadership_Theory_Made_Simple/link/581d425808ae40da2cab5421/download) sayfasından erişilmiştir.

Sinanoğlu, Ü. (2019). *Kişilik özellikleri ile liderlik yönelimleri arasındaki ilişki: eğitim fakültesi öğrencileri üzerine bir çalışma*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Eğitim, Öğretim ve Araştırma Enstitüsü, Eğitim Yönetimi ve Denetimi, Kuzey Kıbrıs.

Sucan, S., Turan, M. B., Pepe, O., Karaoğlu, B., Doğan, D. (2016). The relationship between leadership styles and assertiveness of physical education teachers [Special issue]. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*, 4(1), 11-22. doi:10.14486/IntJSCS530

Şirin, Y. E., Aydın, Ö., Bilir, F. P. (2018). Transformational-transactional leadership and organizational cynicism perception: Physical education and sport teachers sample. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(9), 2008-2018. doi:10.13189/ujer.2018.060920

Şişman, M. (2018). *Öğretim liderliği*. Ankara: Pegem.

Turan, M. B., Gözler, A., Koç, K., Yüce, M. S. (2020). Farklı branş öğretmenlerinin liderlik kültürlerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Akdeniz Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(1), 1-14. doi:10.38021asbid.685193

Uğur, O. A., Çolakoğlu, T. (2019). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin liderlik davranışlarının iletişim becerileri ile ilişkisinin incelenmesi (Ankara ili örneği). *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 12(65), 892-898.

Üstün, F. (2004). *Türkiye'nin coğrafi bölgelerine göre beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin liderlik özelliklerinin belirlenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Spor Yöneticiliği Ana Bilim Dalı, Konya.

Üşenmez, S. (2004). *Hava harp okulu'nda görev yapan beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin ders içi liderlik davranışlarının öğrenci gözüyle değerlendirilmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Ana Bilim Dalı, Ankara.

Vroom, V. H., Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62(1), 17-24. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.17

Yaşar Ekici, F. (2018). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin ve okul öncesi öğretmen adaylarının liderlik yönelimleri. *International Journal of Academic Value Studies (Javstudies)*, 4(19), 379-392.

Yenel, İ. F. (2019). Liderlik. A. A. Yetim (Ed.), *Yönetim ve spor içinde* (283-304). Ankara: Gazi.

Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8 b.). New Jersey: Pearson.