An Investigation of School Administrators' Empowering Leadership Levels According to Teachers' Views*

Okul Yöneticilerinin Güçlendirici Liderlik Düzeylerinin Öğretmen Görüşlerine Göre İncelenmesi

ABSTRACT

This research is about empowering leadership, one of the leadership types. Empowering leadership is a leadership style that enables leaders to contribute to their employees' personal development and job performance by giving them a sense of power, self-confidence, and responsibility. The aim of the current research was to determine the empowering leadership levels of school administrators (SA) according to teachers' views. Besides, the differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA according to their different characteristics was addressed in the research. The research was designed in survey model. The research data were collected from a total of 411 teachers working in primary, secondary, and high schools in a metropolitan province in Central Anatolia in the 2022-2023 academic year by convenience sampling method. The demographic information form prepared by the researcher and the Empowering Leadership Scale were used to collect the research data. Frequency and percentage were used to report descriptive statistics in the research. In data analysis, t-test for independent groups and a one-way analysis of variance were used to reveal the differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA. After the analysis of variance, the TUKEY test was used to determine the source of the difference between the groups. As a result of the research, it was determined that the empowering leadership levels of SA were high according to teachers' views. Furthermore, it was concluded that there was a significant difference between the groups in terms of the variables of branch, gender, seniority, educational background, total working time with the principal in the school, and the type of institution in which the teachers were employed; whereas there was no significant difference between the groups in terms of the variables of marital status, faculty of graduation, presence of a previous administrative position, and educational stage of the school.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Management, Leadership, Empowering leadership, Teacher, School Administrators

ÖZET

Bu araştırma liderlik türlerinden güçlendirici liderlik ile ilgilidir. Güçlendirici liderlik, liderlerin çalışanlarına güç, özgüven ve sorumluluk hissi vererek onların kişisel gelişimlerine ve iş performanslarına katkıda bulunmalarını sağlayan bir liderlik tarzıdır. Mevcut araştırmanın amacı, öğretmen görüşlerine göre, okul yöneticilerinin güçlendirici liderlik düzeylerini belirlemektir. Bunun yanı sıra, öğretmenlerin farklı özelliklerine göre, okul yöneticilerinin güçlendirici liderlik düzeylerine ilişkin görüşlerinin farklılaşma durumu araştırmada ele alınmıştır. Araştırma tarama modelinde desenlenmiştir. Araştırma verileri 2022-2023 eğitim-öğretim yılında İç Anadolu'da büyükşehir statüsündeki bir ilde ilkokul, ortaokul ve liselerde görev yapan toplam 411 öğretmenden uygun örnekleme yöntemi ile toplanmıştır. Araştırma verilerinin toplanmasında araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan demografik bilgi formu ve Güçlendirici Liderlik Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada betimsel istatistiklerin raporlaştırılmasında frekans ve yüzde kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde öğretmenlerin okul yöneticilerinin güçlendirici liderlik düzeylerine ilişkin görüşlerinin farklılaşma durumunu ortaya koymak amacıyla bağımsız gruplar için t testi ve tek yönlü varyans analizi kullanılmıştır. Varyans analizlerinin ardından gruplar arası farkın kaynağını belirlemek için TUKEY testinden yararlanılmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda öğretmen görüşlerine göre, okul yöneticilerinin güçlendirici liderlik düzeylerinin yüksek olduğu belirlenmiştir. Ayrıca öğretmenlerin okul yöneticilerinin güçlendirici liderlik düzeylerine ilişkin görüşlerinde branş, cinsiyet, kıdem, öğrenim durumu, görev yapılan okuldaki müdürle toplam çalışma süresi, görev yapılan kurum türü değişkenleri açısından gruplar arasında anlamlı farklılık olduğu; medeni durum, mezun olunan fakülte türü, daha önce idari görev yapma durumu, görev yapılan eğitim kademesi değişkenleri açısından ise gruplar arasında anlamlı farklılık olmadığı sonucuna ulaşılmıştır.

Keywords: Yönetim, Liderlik, Güçlendirici Liderlik, Öğretmen, Okul Yöneticisi

Funda Özer [1] ID
Mustafa Çelikten [2] ID

INTRODUCTION

The education system has a structure that affects social life and is affected by social dynamics (Çelikten and Özkan, 2018). The goal of national education systems is to educate qualified students. Qualified students can be defined as individuals who meet the workforce need that countries demand, aware of social and cultural values, and keep up

---

*This research was produced from the master's thesis prepared by the first author under the supervision of the second author.
[1] Teacher, Ministry of Education, Kayseri, Türkiye. ORCID: 0000-0003-4470-6913
[2] Prof. Dr., Erciyes University, Faculty Of Education, Department Of Educational Scıences Kayseri, Türkiye. ORCID: 0000-0001-7966-3912

with the international arena. All fields of educational sciences serve to raise qualified individuals and contribute to the training of qualified teachers for this aim. Teachers are very prominent and highly valued in the Turkish education system and culture (Çelikten and Çelikten, 2007).

The process of raising qualified students involves a number of components, such as senior managers of the Ministry of National Education, SA, teachers, parents, and many more. It can be stated that effective and efficient educational management processes are one of the most important components of raising qualified students. In this regard, the educational leadership of SA comes to the forefront. It is stated that qualified and successful leaders can exhibit leadership skills, manage organizational changes, form teams in working processes, and have highly effective speaking skills when problems emerge (Gün and Aslan, 2018). Leaders also focus on priority objectives such as listening to stakeholders, creating a participatory decision-making process, developing teamwork skills, and improving students' academic success and staff satisfaction (Gümüş, 2013).

Due to their position, SA are responsible for leading, managing, and supporting the school culture (Çelikten, 2006). The most crucial element for a school to be an effective school is undoubtedly the administrator of that school (Bulut and Çelikten, 2021). Effective SA empower teachers. Empowering leaders give responsibility to their employees and enable them to increase their job performance (Conger and Kanungo, 1998). Moreover, empowering leaders help employees to develop self-discipline by providing them with the tools, information, and resources to solve their problems (Conger and Kanungo, 1998; Spreitzer, 1995).

Valuing the ideas and opinions of teachers, supporting their participation in various trainings, seminars, panels and meetings in their field, and guiding them in every area they need play an important role in their empowerment. Empowering leaders, with these attitudes and behaviors, contribute to the development of teachers' self-confidence, to increase their job satisfaction and motivation, and to the development of their professional skills (Darling-Hammond and Richardson, 2009; Goddard et al., 2007; Harris and Muijs, 2005; Laschinger and Finegan, 2005). It is stated that teachers who are professionally motivated and self-developing provide better self-control and contribute more to student success (Conger and Kanungo, 1998; Hanushek and Rivkin, 2010; Harris and Muijs, 2005). Considering the individual and social importance of empowering teachers, the role of empowering leadership in educational administration becomes more evident.

The empowering leadership roles of SA are the most critical components that affect the empowerment of teachers. The empowerment of teachers is significantly influenced by the empowering leadership roles of SA. Leaders determine the foundations of organizational behavior by influencing the formal and informal structure of the educational organization (Çelikten, 2006; Yukl, 2002). Based on this point, it is considered as a crucial problem to reveal the empowering leadership level of SA based on the teachers' perception in the current research. In addition, addressing teacher perceptions in terms of different variables is valuable in identifying the variables that stand out in empowering leadership.

Aim of the Research

The aim of this research is to determine teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA. Within the scope of this aim, answers to the following research questions were sought:

1. Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on their branches?

2. Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on their gender?

3. Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on their marital status?

4. Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on their seniority?

5. Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on the faculty of graduation?

6. Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on their educational background?

7. Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on their total working time with the principal in the school where they work?

8. Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on the presence of a previous administrative position?

9. Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on the educational stage of the school?

10. Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on the type of institutions they work in?

METHOD

Research Design

The current research was designed in survey model. Surveys are studies in which the opinions, interests, skills, abilities, talents, attitudes, and other similar characteristics of the participants regarding a subject or event are determined and are generally conducted on relatively larger samples compared to other studies (Büyüköztürk et al., 2008). Survey research is a quantitative research procedure in which researchers use instruments, such as interview questions, questionnaires, surveys, tests, and/or scales to describe the attitudes, opinions, behaviors, or characteristics of a sample or population (Creswell, 2012; Fraenkel et al., 2015). In this research, teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA were determined regarding different variables.

Population and Sample of the Research

The population of the research includes teachers working in primary, secondary, and high schools in Turkey. The research data were obtained from a total of 411 teachers selected from a metropolitan city in Central Anatolia by convenience sampling method. Descriptive statistics regarding the demographic characteristics of the teachers in the research are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics on Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Variable	Level	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Branch	Classroom teacher	124	30.2
	Social sciences	219	53.3
	Natural sciences	68	16.5
Gender	Female	303	73.7
	Male	108	26.3
Marital status	Married	347	84.4
	Single	64	15.6
Seniority	5 years or less	55	13.4
	6-10 years	176	42.8
	11-15 years	83	20.2
	16 years or more	97	23.6
Faculty of graduation	Faculty of education	291	70.8
	Faculty of science and letters	76	18.5
	Other faculties	44	10.7
Educational Background	Bachelor's degree	331	80.5
	Master's degree	80	19.5
Total working time with the principal at the school	Up to 1 year	52	12.7
	2-4 years	207	50.4
	5 years or more	152	37.0
Presence of a previous administrative position	Yes	112	27.3
	No	299	72.7
Educational stage of the school	Primary School	104	25.3
	Secondary School	227	55.2
	High School	80	19.5
Type of institution employed	Public school	328	79.8
	Private school	83	20.2
Total		411	100.0

Table 1 shows the distribution of the participants based on the variables of branch, gender, marital status, seniority, type of faculty graduated from, educational background, total working time with the principal in the school, presence of a previous administrative position, educational stage of the school, and type of institution. Based on Table 1, 124 (30.2%) of the participants were employed in classroom teaching, 219 (53.3%) in social sciences, and 68 (16.5%) in natural sciences. Of the participants, 303 (73.7%) were female and 108 (26.3%) were male. Of the participants, 347 (84.4%) were married and 64 (15.6%) were single. Of the participants, 55 (13.4%) had 5 years or less seniority, 176 (42.8%) had 6-10 years, 83 (20.2%) had 11-15 years, and 97 (23.6%) had 16 years or more. Of the participants, 291 (70.8%) graduated from the faculty of education, 76 (18.5%) from the faculty of science and letters, and 44 (10.7%) from other faculties. Of the participants, 331 (80.5%) had a bachelor's degree, and 80 (19.5%) had a master's degree. Of the participants, 52 (12.7%) had worked with the principal for up to 1 year, 207 (50.4%) for 2-4 years, and 152 (37.0%) for 5 years or more. While 112 (27.3%) of the participants had previously held administrative positions, 299 (72.7%) had not. Of the participants, 104 (25.3%) worked in primary school, 227

(55.2%) in secondary school, and 80 (19.5%) in high school. Of the participants, 328 (79.8%) worked in public schools, and 83 (20.2%) worked in private schools.

Data Collection Process and Instruments

The demographic information form prepared by the researcher and the Empowering Leadership Scale (Konan and Çelik, 2018) were used to collect the research data. The data collection process was carried out during the 2022-2023 academic year. Participants who took part voluntarily in the study were informed about the subject and purpose of the research and the content of the data collection instruments. The data collection period lasted 15-20 minutes on average, and questions from the participants were answered during this process. The principle of confidentiality was carefully observed during the implementation and collection of the measurement instruments.

Demographic information form

Demographic information form was prepared by the researcher. The form includes the variables of branch, gender, marital status, seniority, faculty of graduation, educational background, total working time with the principal in the school, presence of a previous administrative position, educational stage of the school, and type of institution. Data on these variables were collected through a demographic information form.

Empowering leadership scale

To measure teachers' perceptions of empowering leadership, the "Empowering Leadership Scale" developed by Konczak et al. (2000) and adapted into Turkish by Konan and Çelik (2018) was used. The scale has 17 items and 3 sub-dimensions that can be graded on a 5-point Likert type scale. The original empowering leadership scale, developed by Konczak et al. (2000), has a six-factor structure. These factors are "delegation of authority, accountability, self-directed decision-making, information sharing, skill development, and coaching for innovative performance."

In the adaptation study, the model and goodness of fit values related to the confirmatory factor analysis of the empowering leadership scale were examined, and a three-factor model was confirmed for the scale. The sub-dimensions of self-directed decision-making, information sharing, skill development, and coaching for innovative performance, which were different dimensions in Konczak et al.'s (2000) study, were combined under the same factor in the Turkish form. Considering the conceptual studies on empowering leadership in the literature, this dimension was named as the support sub-dimension. In the Turkish version of the scale, the dimensions are named as "delegation of authority, accountability, and support."

In the sub-dimension of delegation of authority, there are items related to delegation of authority to teachers, such as "my school principal gives me authority equal to my responsibility in the subjects assigned to me" and "my school principal relies on me to make decisions about issues that affect the way things are done." In the accountability sub-dimension, there are items related to giving responsibility to teachers such as "my school principal holds me responsible for the work I am assigned" and "my school principal holds me responsible for my actions and their consequences". In the support sub-dimension, there are items related to supporting teachers, such as "my school principal tries to help me develop my solutions rather than telling me what to do when a problem arises" and "my school principal encourages me to develop my solutions to the problems I face in my work." The Cronbach's α reliability coefficient reported for each dimension of the scale is 0.76 for delegation of authority, 0.82 for accountability, and 0.80 for support. In the current study, the Cronbach's α reliability coefficient was 0.74 for delegation of authority, 0.79 for accountability, and 0.75 for support.

Data Analysis

Frequency (f) and percentage (%) were used in the reporting of descriptive statistics. The normal distribution of the data sets was examined using the mean (X), mode, median (MD), skewness coefficient (SC), and kurtosis coefficient (KC). In the analysis of the data, the t-test for independent groups was used to reveal the differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on "gender, seniority" variables, and the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to reveal the differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on "gender, seniority" variables. After the analysis of variance, the TUKEY test was used to determine the source of the difference between the groups. The significance level was considered as 0.05 in the research.

FINDINGS

The findings obtained from the research are given in order as descriptive statistics and comparison tests. Descriptive statistics regarding the scale sub-dimensions and the total score of the scale used in the research are

presented in Table 2. After the descriptive statistics, the results regarding the total scores and sub-dimensions of empowering leadership are presented.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for the Measurement Tools Used in the Research

Scale and Sub-dimensions	$\bar{X}$	Md	Mode	SC	KC
Delegation of authority	11.71	12.00	12.00	-.94	.56
Accountability	12.08	12.00	12.00	-1.4	1.42
Support	36.54	38.00	39.00	-.39	-.64
Overall level of empowering leadership	60.33	63.00	64.00	-.46	-.21

Table x shows that the mode, median and mean values for the sub-dimensions and overall level of empowering leadership are close to each other. In addition, the skewness coefficients calculated for the sub-dimensions and total score were between -0.46 and -1.4, and the kurtosis coefficients were between -0.64 and 1.42. SC values within ±2 and KC values within ±7 for the sub-dimensions and total score indicate that the scores do not deviate excessively from normal (Curran et al., 1996).

✓ **What are teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA?**

This research question addresses the teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA. Descriptive statistics were used to determine the level of views. The findings of the analysis are given in Table 3.

Table 2: Level of Teachers' Views on SA' Empowering Leadership Levels

Scale and Sub-dimensions	$\bar{X}$	SD	Lowest score	Highest score
Delegation of authority	11.71	2.87	3.00	15.00
Accountability	12.08	2.29	3.00	15.00
Support	36.54	3.46	11.00	55.00
Overall level of empowering leadership	60.33	1.47	17.00	85.00

Table 3 shows that in the delegation of authority sub-dimension of empowering leadership, in which the minimum score is 3.00 and the maximum score is 15.00, the lowest score is 3.00 and the highest score is 15.00. Additionally, the average score is 11.71. Based on these findings, it can be said that teachers' views on SA' delegation of authority to them are high.

In the accountability sub-dimension of empowering leadership, in which the minimum score is 3.00 and the maximum score is 15.00, the lowest score is 3.00 and the highest score is 15.00. Additionally, the average score is 12.08. Based on these findings, it can be said that teachers' views on SA' holding them accountable are high.

In the support sub-dimension of empowering leadership, in which the minimum score is 11.00 and the maximum score is 55.00, the lowest score is 11.00 and the highest score is 55.00. Additionally, the average score is 36.54. Based on these findings, it can be said that teachers' views on SA' support for them are high.

In the total score, in which the minimum score is 17.00 and the maximum score is 85.00, the lowest score is 17.00 and the highest score is 85.00. Additionally, the average score is 60.33. Based on these findings, it can be said that teachers' views on the empowering leadership of SA are high.

✓ **Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on their branches?**

The differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on their branches was put forward with this research question. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to reveal the significant difference in teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on their branches. The findings of the analysis are given in Table 4 and Table 5.

Tablo 3: N, x, and sd Values of SA' Empowering Leadership Scores Based on Teachers' Branches

Dimensions	Branch	N	X	SD
Delegation of authority	Classroom teacher	124	11.45	2.82
	Social sciences	219	11.82	2.88
	Natural sciences	68	11.83	2.89
Accountability	Classroom teacher	124	12.41	1.62
	Social sciences	219	11.77	2.68
	Natural sciences	68	12.42	1.79
Support	Classroom teacher	124	36.22	13.66
	Social sciences	219	36.57	11.30
	Natural sciences	68	37.00	11.52
Empowering leadership	Classroom teacher	124	60.09	16.25
	Social sciences	219	60.17	13.93
	Natural sciences	68	61.23	14.27

Table 4 shows that the highest mean score of 11.83 for the delegation of authority sub-dimension of empowering leadership belongs to teachers whose branch is natural sciences, followed by social sciences teachers with a mean score of 11.82 and classroom teachers with a mean score of 11.45. It is observed that the highest mean score for the accountability sub-dimension belongs to the teachers whose branch is natural sciences with a mean score of 12.42, followed by classroom teachers with a mean score of 12.41, and social sciences teachers with a mean score of 11.77. It is seen that the highest mean score for the views on the support sub-dimension belongs to the teachers whose branch is natural sciences with a mean score of 37.00, followed by social sciences teachers with a mean score of 36.57, and classroom teachers with a mean score of 36.22. It is observed that the highest mean score for the overall level of empowering leadership belongs to the teachers whose branch is natural sciences with 61.23, followed by the teachers whose branch is social sciences with 60.17, and classroom teaching with 60.09. The results of the analysis of variance regarding teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels based on their branches are given in Table 5.

Table 4: Analysis of Variance Results Regarding Teachers' Views on SA' Empowering Leadership Levels Based on Their Branches

Dimensions	Branch	KT	sd	KO	F	p
Delegation of authority	Intergroup	11.89	2	5.94	.72	.48
	Intragroup	3356.64	408	8.22		
	Total	3368.54	410			
Accountability	Intergroup	41.96	2	20.98	4.04	.01
	Intragroup	2114.70	408	5.18		
	Total	2156.66	410			
Support	Intergroup	26.90	2	13.45	.09	.91
	Intragroup	59713.18	408	146.35		
	Total	59740.08	410			
Empowering leadership	Intergroup	67.83	2	33.91	.15	.85
	Intragroup	88480.48	408	216.86		
	Total	88548.31	410			

Table 5 shows that there is no significant difference in the views on the delegation of authority and support sub-dimensions of empowering leadership and the overall level of empowering leadership regarding teachers' branches. However, the F value (F=4.04; p<.05) calculated for the views on the accountability sub-dimension indicates that there is a significant difference between the groups at the .05 level in the related dimension. The results of the TUKEY test conducted to determine the source of the difference between the mean scores of the groups in the opinions on the accountability sub-dimension are given in Table x.

Table 5: The Tukey Test Results for the Mean Scores of Teachers' Views on the Accountability Sub-dimension of Empowering Leadership Based on Their Branches

Dependent variable	(I) Branch	(J) Branch	Difference between means (I-J)	p
Accountability	Classroom teacher	Social sciences	.64	.03

The difference between the mean scores of teachers' views on the accountability sub-dimension of SA' empowering leadership regarding their branches was examined. Table 6 shows that there is a significant differentiation at the .05 level between classroom teachers and social sciences teachers. Based on this finding, the views of classroom teachers on the level of accountability of SA are higher than those of social sciences teachers.

✓ **Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on their gender?**

The differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on their gender was put forward with this research question. To reveal the differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on their gender, the t-test analysis was conducted for independent groups. The findings related to the analysis are given in Table 7.

Table 6: T-test Analysis on the Differentiation of Teachers' Views on SA' Empowering Leadership Levels Based on Their Gender

Dimensions	Gender	N	X	SD	t	p
Delegation of authority	Female	303	11.46	2.94	-2.93	.00
	Male	108	12.39	2.52		
Accountability	Female	303	11.93	2.44	-2.10	.03
	Male	108	12.47	1.76		
Support	Female	303	34.97	12.52	-5.13	.00
	Male	108	40.92	9.43		
Empowering leadership	Female	303	58.37	15.19	-5.23	.00
	Male	108	65.79	11.59		

Table 7 shows that the mean of female teachers' views on the delegation of authority sub-dimension of empowering leadership is 11.46, while the mean of male teachers' views is 12.39. The t value calculated to test the

significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups (t=-2.93, p<.05) indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the groups is significant at the 0.05 level. Based on this finding, female teachers' views on the delegation of authority sub-dimension of empowering leadership are higher than those of male teachers.

Regarding the views on the accountability sub-dimension, the mean score of female teachers is 11.93 and the mean score of male teachers is 12.47. The t value calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups (t=-2.10, p<.05) indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the groups is significant at the 0.05 level. Based on this finding, female teachers' views on the accountability sub-dimension of empowering leadership are higher than those of male teachers.

Regarding the views on the support sub-dimension, the mean score of female teachers is 34.97 and the mean score of male teachers is 40.92. The t value calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups (t=-5.13, p<.05) indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the groups is significant at the 0.05 level. Based on this finding, female teachers' views on the support sub-dimension of empowering leadership are higher than those of male teachers.

The mean score of female teachers' views on the overall level of empowering leadership is 58.37, while the mean score of male teachers' views is 65.79. The t value calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups (t=-5.23, p<.05) indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the groups is significant at the 0.05 level. Based on this finding, female teachers' views on the overall level of empowering leadership are higher than those of male teachers.

✓ Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on their marital status?

The differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on their marital status was put forward with this research question. To reveal the differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on their marital status, the t-test analysis was conducted for independent groups. Findings related to the analysis are given in Table 8.

Table 7: T-test Analysis of the Differentiation of Teachers' Views on SA' Empowering Leadership Levels Based on Their Marital Status

Dimensions	Marital Status	N	X	SD	t	p
Delegation of authority	Married	347	11.6340	2.92316	-1.26	.21
	Single	64	12.1250	2.51661		
Accountability	Married	347	12.0548	2.37640	-.425	.67
	Single	64	12.1875	1.78952		
Support	Married	347	36.0865	12.16379	-1.78	.07
	Single	64	39.0000	11.33053		
Empowering leadership	Married	347	59.7752	14.83887	-1.77	.08
	Single	64	63.3125	13.61940		

Table 8 shows that there is no significant difference between the groups in terms of the marital status of the teachers regarding their views on the delegation of authority, accountability, and support sub-dimensions of empowering leadership. Furthermore, no significant difference was found between the groups in terms of marital status in the views on the overall level of empowering leadership. Marital status does not affect views on empowering leadership.

✓ Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on their seniority?

The differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on their seniority was put forward with this research question. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to reveal the significant difference in teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on their seniority. The findings of the analysis are given in Table 9 and Table 10.

Table 8: N, x, and sd Values of SA' Empowering Leadership Scores Based on Teachers' Seniority

Dimensions	Seniority	N	X	SD
Delegation of authority	5 years or less	55	9.47	3.93
	6-10 years	176	11.25	2.53
	11-15 years	83	12.01	2.67
	16 years or more	97	13.55	1.31
Accountability	5 years or less	55	11.09	3.96
	6-10 years	176	12.52	1.71
	11-15 years	83	11.87	1.40
	16 years or more	97	11.98	2.36
Support	5 years or less	55	25.80	15.42
	6-10 years	176	36.93	10.19
	11-15 years	83	38.28	12.11

	16 years or more	97	40.42	9.45
Empowering leadership	5 years or less	55	46.36	18.55
	6-10 years	176	60.70	12.50
	11-15 years	83	62.18	14.74
	16 years or more	97	65.96	10.53

Table 9 shows that the highest mean score of 13.55 for the delegation of authority sub-dimension of empowering leadership was found in teachers with a seniority of 16 years or more, followed by teachers with a seniority of 11-15 years with a mean score of 12.01, 6-10 years with a mean score of 11.25, and 5 years or less with a mean score of 9.47. The highest mean score of 12.52 for the accountability sub-dimension was observed for teachers with a seniority of 6-10 years, followed by teachers with a seniority of 16 years or more with a mean score of 11.98, 11-15 years with a mean score of 11.87, and 5 years or less with a mean score of 11.09. The highest mean score of 40.42 for the support sub-dimension was observed for teachers with a seniority of 16 years or more, followed by teachers with a seniority of 11-15 years with a mean score of 38.28, 6-10 years with a mean score of 36.93, and 5 years or less with a mean score of 25.80. The highest mean score of 65.96 for the overall level of empowering leadership was observed for teachers with a seniority of 16 years or more, followed by teachers with a seniority of 11-15 years with a mean of 62.18, 6-10 years with a mean of 60.70, and 5 years or less with a mean of 46.36. The results of the analysis of variance regarding teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on their seniority are given in Table 10.

Table 9: Analysis of Variance Results Regarding Teachers' Views on SA' Empowering Leadership Levels Based on Their Seniority

Dimensions	Seniority	KT	sd	KO	F	p
Delegation of authority	Intergroup	650.91	3	216.97	32.49	.00
	Intragroup	2717.63	407	6.67		
	Total	3368.54	410			
Accountability	Intergroup	92.42	3	30.80	6.07	.00
	Intragroup	2064.23	407	5.07		
	Total	2156.66	410			
Support	Intergroup	8087.37	3	2695.79	21.24	.00
	Intragroup	51652.71	407	126.91		
	Total	59740.08	410			
Empowering leadership	Intergroup	14121.75	3	4707.25	25.74	.00
	Intragroup	74426.56	407	182.86		
	Total	88548.31	410			

Table 10 shows that there is a significant difference in the views on the delegation of authority, accountability, and support sub-dimensions of empowering leadership and the general level of empowering leadership in terms of teachers' seniority. The F value (F=32.49; p<.05) calculated for the views on the delegation of authority sub-dimension, the F value (F=6.07; p<.05) calculated for the views on the accountability sub-dimension, the F value (F=21.24; p<.05) calculated for the views on the support sub-dimension and the F value (F=25.74; p<.05) calculated for the views on the overall level of empowering leadership indicate that there is a significant difference between the groups at 0.05 level. The results of the TUKEY test conducted to determine the source of the difference between the mean scores of the groups in the opinions on the sub-dimensions of delegation of authority, accountability, and support and the overall level of empowering leadership are presented in Table 11.

Table 10: The Tukey Test Results of the Mean Scores of the Views on the Delegation of Authority, Accountability and Support Sub-Dimensions of Empowering Leadership and the Overall Level of Empowering Leadership Based on the Seniority of the Teachers

Dependent variable	(I) Seniority	(J) Seniority	Difference between means (I-J)	p
Delegation of authority	5 years or less	6-10 years	-1.77	.00
		11-15 years	-2.53	.00
		16 years or more	-4.08	.00
	6-10 years	16 years or more	-2.30	.00
	11-15 years	16 years or more	-1.54	.00
Accountability	5 years or less	6-10 years	-1.43	.00
Support	5 years or less	6-10 years	-11.13	.00
		11-15 years	-12.48	.00
		16 years or more	-14.62	.00
Empowering leadership	5 years or less	6-10 years	-14.34	.00
		11-15 years	-15.81	.00
		16 years or more	-19.60	.00
	6-10 years	16 years or more	-5.26	.01

The difference between the mean scores of teachers' views on the delegation of authority sub-dimension of SA' empowering leadership based on their seniority shows that there is a significant difference at the 0.05 level between

teachers with a seniority of 5 years or less and teachers with a seniority of 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 years or more. Based on this finding, the views of teachers with a seniority of 5 years or less on the level of delegation of authority of SA were lower than those of teachers with a seniority of 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 years or more. Moreover, Table 11 shows a significant difference at the 0.05 level between teachers with 6-10 years of seniority and teachers with 16 years or more. Based on this finding, the views of teachers with a seniority of 6-10 years on the level of delegation of authority by SA were lower than those of teachers with a seniority of 16 years and above. Additionally, Table 11 shows a significant difference at the 0.05 level between teachers with 11-15 years of seniority and teachers with 16 years or more. Based on this finding, the views of teachers with a seniority of 11-15 years on the level of delegation of authority by SA were lower than those of teachers with a seniority of 16 years or more.

Table 11 shows that there is a significant difference at the 0.05 level between teachers with 5 or less years of seniority and teachers with 6-10 years of seniority when the difference between the mean scores of the views on the accountability sub-dimension is examined. Based on this finding, the views of teachers with a seniority of 5 years or less on the level of accountability of SA were lower than those of teachers with a seniority of 6-10 years. When the difference between the mean scores of the opinions on the support sub-dimension is examined, Table 11 shows that there is a significant difference at the 0.05 level between teachers with 5 years or less seniority and teachers with 6-10 years, 11-15 years and 16 years or more seniority. Based on this finding, the views of teachers with a seniority of 5 years or less on the level of support from SA were lower than those of teachers with a seniority of 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 years or more.

Regarding the difference between the mean scores of the views on the overall level of empowering leadership, Table 11 shows that there is a significant difference at the 0.05 level between teachers with 5 years or less seniority and teachers with 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 years or more seniority. Based on this finding, the views of teachers with a seniority of 5 years or less on the overall level of empowering leadership of SA were lower than those of teachers with a seniority of 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 years or more. Moreover, Table 11 shows a significant difference at the 0.05 level between teachers with 6-10 years of seniority and teachers with 16 years or more. Based on this finding, the views of teachers with 6-10 years of seniority on the overall level of empowering leadership of SA were lower than those of teachers with 16 years of seniority and above.

✓ **Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on the faculty of graduation?**

The differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on their faculty of graduation was put forward with this research question. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to reveal the significant difference in teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on the faculty of graduation. The findings of the analysis are given in Table 12 and Table 13.

Table 11: N, x, and sd. Values of SA' Empowering Leadership Scores Based on the Faculty of Graduation

Dimensions	Faculty of graduation	N	X	SD
Delegation of authority	Faculty of education	291	11.59	2.80
	Faculty of science and letters	76	12.10	3.14
	Other faculties	44	11.81	2.75
Accountability	Faculty of education	291	12.03	2.16
	Faculty of science and letters	76	12.00	2.86
	Other faculties	44	12.45	2.03
Support	Faculty of education	291	35.88	12.36
	Faculty of science and letters	76	37.68	12.00
	Other faculties	44	38.90	9.74
Empowering leadership	Faculty of education	291	59.51	14.59
	Faculty of science and letters	76	61.78	16.11
	Other faculties	44	63.18	12.35

Table 12 shows that the highest mean score for the delegation of authority sub-dimension of empowering leadership belongs to the teachers whose faculty of graduation is faculty of science and letters with a mean score of 12.10, followed by other faculties with a mean score of 11.81, and faculty of education with a mean score of 11.59. The highest mean score of 12.45 for the accountability sub-dimension belongs to teachers whose faculty of graduation was other faculties, followed by teachers whose faculty of graduation was faculty of education with a mean score of 12.03 and faculty of science and letters with a mean score of 12.00. The highest mean score of 38.90 for the views on the support sub-dimension belongs to the teachers whose faculty of graduation was other faculties, followed by the teachers whose faculty of graduation was faculty of science and letters with a mean score of 37.68, and faculty of education with a mean score of 35.88. The highest mean score of 63.18 for the overall level of

empowering leadership belongs to the teachers whose faculty of graduation is other faculties, followed by the teachers whose faculty of graduation is faculty of science and letters with a mean score of 61.78, and faculty of education with a mean score of 59.51. The results of the analysis of variance regarding teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels based on the faculty of graduation are given in Table 13.

Table 12: Analysis of Variance Results Regarding Teachers' Views on SA' Empowering Leadership Levels Based on The Faculty of Graduation

Dimensions	Faculty of graduation	KT	sd	KO	F	p
Delegation of authority	Intergroup	16.50	2	8.25	1.01	.37
	Intragroup	3352.04	408	8.21		
	Total	3368.54	410			
Accountability	Intergroup	7.16	2	3.58	.68	.51
	Intragroup	2149.49	408	5.26		
	Total	2156.66	410			
Support	Intergroup	472.00	2	236.00	1.62	.19
	Intragroup	59268.08	408	145.26		
	Total	59740.08	410			
Empowering leadership	Intergroup	714.42	2	357.21	1.65	.19
	Intragroup	87833.88	408	215.27		
	Total	88548.31	410			

Table 13 shows that there is no significant difference between the groups regarding the faculty of graduation of the teachers in terms of their views on the delegation of authority, accountability, and support sub-dimensions of empowering leadership. Furthermore, no significant difference was found between the groups regarding the views on the overall level of empowering leadership based on the faculty of graduation. Faculty of graduation does not affect the views on empowering leadership.

✓ **Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on their educational background?**

The differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on their educational background was put forward with this research question. An independent groups t-test analysis was conducted to reveal the differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on their educational background. Findings related to the analysis are given in Table 14.

Table 13: T-test Analysis on the Differentiation of Teachers' Views on SA' Empowering Leadership Levels Based on Their Educational Background

Dimensions	Educational Background	N	X	SD	t	p
Delegation of authority	Bachelor's degree	331	11.95	2.90	3.56	.00
	Master's Degree	80	10.70	2.48		
Accountability	Bachelor's degree	331	12.04	2.45	-.74	.46
	Master's Degree	80	12.20	1.44		
Support	Bachelor's degree	331	38.16	11.70	5.78	.00
	Master's Degree	80	29.80	11.25		
Empowering leadership	Bachelor's degree	331	62.16	14.45	5.34	.00
	Master's Degree	80	52.70	13.20		

Table 14 shows that there is no significant difference between the groups based on the educational background of the teachers regarding their views on the accountability sub-dimension of empowering leadership. Regarding the views on the delegation of authority sub-dimension of empowering leadership, it is observed that the average score of teachers with a bachelor's degree is 11.95, and the average score of teachers with a master's degree is 10.70. The t value calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups (t=3.56, p<.05) indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the groups is significant at the 0.05 level. Based on this finding, the views of teachers with a bachelor's degree on the delegation of authority sub-dimension of empowering leadership were higher than those of teachers with a master's degree.

Regarding the views on the support sub-dimension, it is observed that the average score of the teachers with a bachelor's degree is 38.16, and the average score of the teachers with a master's degree is 29.80. The t value calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups (t=5.78, p<.05) indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the groups is significant at the 0.05 level. Based on this finding, the views of teachers with a bachelor's degree on the support sub-dimension of empowering leadership were higher than those of teachers with a master's degree.

Regarding the views on the overall level of empowering leadership, it is observed that the average score of teachers with a bachelor's degree is 62.16, and the average score of teachers with a master's degree is 52.70. The t value

calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups (t=5.34, p<.05) indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the groups is significant at the 0.05 level. Based on this finding, the views of teachers with a bachelor's degree on the overall level of empowering leadership were higher than those of teachers with a master's degree.

✓ **Do teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA differ significantly based on their total working time with the principal in the school where they work?**

The differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on their total working time with the principal in the school was put forward with this research question. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to reveal the significant difference in the views of the teachers on the empowering leadership levels of the SA based on their total working time with the principal in the school. The findings of the analysis are given in Table 15 and Table 16.

Table 14: N, x, and sd. Values of SA' Empowering Leadership Scores Based on Teachers' Total Working Time with the Principal in the School

Dimensions	Total working time with the principal at the school	N	X	SD
Delegation of authority	Up to 1 year	52	12.69	2.32
	2-4 years	207	12.08	2.75
	5 years or more	152	10.86	2.98
Accountability	Up to 1 year	52	12.38	1.51
	2-4 years	207	11.82	2.35
	5 years or more	152	12.31	2.40
Support	Up to 1 year	52	39.38	11.19
	2-4 years	207	38.07	11.30
	5 years or more	152	33.47	12.78
Empowering leadership	Up to 1 year	52	64.46	14.06
	2-4 years	207	61.98	14.13
	5 years or more	152	56.65	14.95

Table 15 shows that regarding the views on the delegation of authority sub-dimension of empowering leadership, the highest mean score of 12.69 belongs to teachers who have a total working time of up to 1 year with the principal, followed by teachers who have a total working time of 2-4 years with the principal with a mean score of 12.08, and teachers who have a total working time of 5 years or more with the principal with a mean score of 10.86. The highest mean score of 12.38 for the view on the accountability sub-dimension belongs to teachers who have a total working time of up to 1 year with the principal, followed by teachers who have a total working time of 5 years or more with the principal with a mean score of 12.31, and teachers who have a total working time of 2-4 years with the principal with a mean score of 11.82. The highest mean score of 39.38 for the view on the support sub-dimension belongs to teachers who have a total working time of up to 1 year with the principal, followed by teachers who have worked with the principal for 2-4 years with a mean score of 38.07 and teachers who have worked with the principal for 5 years or more with a mean score of 33.47. The highest mean score of 64.46 for the overall level of empowering leadership belongs to teachers who have a total working time of up to 1 year with the principal, followed by teachers who have a total working time of 2-4 years with the principal with a mean score of 61.98, and teachers who have a total working time of 5 years or more with the principal with a mean score of 56.65. The results of the analysis of variance regarding teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on their total working time with the principal in the school are given in Table 16.

Table 15: Analysis of Variance Results Regarding Teachers' Views on SA' Empowering Leadership Levels Based on Their Total Working Time with the Principal in the School

Dimensions	Total working time with the principal at the school	KT	sd	KO	F	p
Delegation of authority	Intergroup	186.49	2	93.24	11.95	.00
	Intragroup	3182.04	408	7.79		
	Total	3368.54	410			
Accountability	Intergroup	27.12	2	13.56	2.59	.07
	Intragroup	2129.53	408	5.21		
	Total	2156.66	410			
Support	Intergroup	2339.12	2	1169.56	8.31	.00
	Intragroup	57400.96	408	140.68		
	Total	59740.08	410			
Empowering leadership	Intergroup	3501.25	2	1750.62	8.39	.00
	Intragroup	85047.05	408	208.44		
	Total	88548.31	410			

Table 16 shows that there is no significant difference in the views on the accountability sub-dimension of empowering leadership based on the total working time of the teachers with the principal in the school. However,

the F value calculated for the views on the delegation of authority sub-dimension (F=11.95; p<.05) and the F value calculated for the views on the support sub-dimension (F=8.31; p<.05) in the related dimensions and the F value calculated for the views on the overall level of empowering leadership (F=8.39; p<.05) calculated for the views on the overall level of empowering leadership indicate that there is a significant difference between the groups at 0.05 level. The results of the TUKEY test conducted to determine the source of the difference between the mean scores of the groups on the sub-dimensions of delegation of authority and support and the overall level of empowering leadership are given in Table 17.

Table 16: The Tukey Test Results of the Mean Scores of the Views on the Empowering Leadership Sub-dimensions of Delegation of Authority and Support and the Overall Level of Empowering Leadership Based on the Total Working Time of the Teachers with the Principal in the School

Dependent variable	(I) Total working time with the principal at the school	(J) Total working time with the principal at the school	Difference between means (I-J)	p
Delegation of authority	5 years or more	Up to 1 year	-1.82	.00
		2-4 years	-1.21	.00
Support	5 years or more	Up to 1 year	-5.91	.00
		2-4 years	-4.60	.00
Empowering leadership	5 years or more	Up to 1 year	-7.80	.00
		2-4 years	-5.32	.00

Table 17 shows that there is a significant difference at the 0.05 level between the mean scores of teachers' views on the delegation of authority sub-dimension of SA' empowering leadership based on their total working time with the principal at the school, between teachers who have a total working time of 5 years or more with the principal and teachers who have a total working time of up to 1 year and 2-4 years with the principal. Based on this finding, the views of the teachers who have a total working time of 5 years or more with the principal in the school on the level of delegation of authority of the SA are lower than the teachers whose total working time with the principal in the school they work is up to 1 year and 2-4 years. Looking at the difference between the mean scores of the teachers' views on the support sub-dimension, Table 17 shows that there is a significant difference at the level of 0.05 between the teachers whose total working time with the principal at the school is 5 years or more and the teachers whose total working time with the principal at the school is up to 1 year and 2-4 years. This finding indicates that regarding the support level of SA, the views of teachers whose total working time with the principal at the school is 5 years or more are lower than those of teachers whose total working time with the principal at the school is up to 1 year and 2-4 years. Table 17 shows that there is a significant difference at the 0.05 level between the mean scores of the teachers' views on the overall level of empowering leadership between the teachers whose total working time with the principal in the school is 5 years or more and the teachers whose total working time with the principal in the school is up to 1 year and 2-4 years. Based on this finding, the views of teachers whose total working time with the principal at the school is 5 years or more on the overall level of empowering leadership of SA were lower than teachers whose total working time with the principal at the school is up to 1 year and 2-4 years.

✓ **Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on the presence of a previous administrative position?**

The differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on the presence of a previous administrative position was put forward with this research question. An independent groups t-test analysis was conducted to reveal the differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on the presence of a previous administrative position. Findings related to the analysis are given in Table 18.

Table 17: T-test Analysis on the Differentiation of Teachers' Views on SA' Empowering Leadership Levels Based on the Presence of a Previous Administrative Position

Dimensions	Presence of a previous administrative position	N	X	SD	t	p
Delegation of authority	Yes	112	11.78	2.63	.32	.74
	No	299	11.68	2.95		
Accountability	Yes	112	11.89	2.31	-.98	.32
	No	299	12.14	2.28		
Support	Yes	112	36.10	10.57	-.44	.65
	No	299	36.70	12.59		
Empowering leadership	Yes	112	59.78	11.67	-.52	.64
	No	299	60.52	15.69		

Table 18 shows that there is no significant difference between the groups in terms of the presence of a previous administrative position in the views on the delegation of authority, accountability, and support sub-dimensions of empowering leadership. Moreover, no significant difference was found between the groups regarding the views on the overall level of empowering leadership based on the presence of a previous administrative position. Presence of a previous administrative position does not affect the views on empowering leadership.

✓ **Do teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels differ significantly based on the educational stage of the school?**

The differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on the educational stage of the school was put forward with this research question. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to reveal the significant difference in teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on the educational stage of the school they work. The findings of the analysis are given in Table 19 and Table 20.

Table 18: N, x, and ss. Values of SA' Empowering Leadership Scores Based on the Educational Stages of the School Where Teachers Work

Dimensions	Educational stage of the school	N	X	SD
Delegation of authority	Primary School	104	11.88	3.04
	Secondary School	227	11.56	2.74
	High School	80	11.90	2.98
Accountability	Primary School	104	12.07	1.59
	Secondary School	227	11.88	2.69
	High School	80	12.60	1.66
Support	Primary School	104	37.15	12.60
	Secondary School	227	36.41	11.83
	High School	80	36.10	12.15
Empowering leadership	Primary School	104	61.11	15.25
	Secondary School	227	59.86	14.35
	High School	80	60.60	15.04

Table 19 shows that the highest mean score of 11.90 on the delegation of authority sub-dimension of empowering leadership belongs to high school teachers, followed by primary school teachers with a mean score of 11.88, and secondary school teachers with a mean score of 11.56. The highest mean score of 12.60 for the accountability sub-dimension belongs to high school teachers, followed by primary school teachers with a mean score of 12.07 and secondary school teachers with a mean score of 11.88. The highest mean score of 37.15 for the views on the support sub-dimension belongs to primary school teachers, followed by secondary school teachers with a mean score of 36.41, and high school teachers with a mean score of 36.10. The highest mean score for the views on the overall level of empowering leadership was 61.11 for primary school teachers, followed by high school teachers with a mean score of 60.60, and secondary school teachers with a mean score of 59.86. The results of the analysis of variance regarding teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on the educational stages of the school are given in Table 20.

Table 19: Analysis of Variance Results Regarding Teachers' Views on SA' Empowering Leadership Levels Based on the Educational Stage of the School

Dimensions	Educational stage of the school	KT	sd	KO	F	p
Delegation of authority	Intergroup	10.90	2	5.45	.66	.51
	Intragroup	3357.63	408	8.23		
	Total	3368.54	410			
Accountability	Intergroup	29.83	2	14.91	2.86	.06
	Intragroup	2126.83	408	5.21		
	Total	2156.66	410			
Support	Intergroup	58.27	2	29.13	.19	.81
	Intragroup	59681.81	408	146.27		
	Total	59740.08	410			
Empowering leadership	Intergroup	118.46	2	59.23	.27	.76
	Intragroup	88429.85	408	216.74		
	Total	88548.31	410			

Table 20 shows that there is no significant difference between the groups regarding the views on the delegation of authority, accountability, and support sub-dimensions of empowering leadership based on the educational stage of the school. Moreover, no significant difference was found between the groups regarding the views on the overall level of empowering leadership based on the educational stage of the school. The educational stage of the school does not affect the views on empowering leadership.

✓ **Do teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA differ significantly based on the type of institutions they work in?**

The differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on the type of institutions they work in was put forward with this research question. An independent groups t-test analysis was conducted to reveal the differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on the types of institutions in which they work. Findings related to the analysis are given in Table 21.

Table 20: T-test Analysis of the Differentiation of Teachers' Views on the Empowering Leadership Levels of SA Based on the Types of Institutions They Work in

Dimensions	Type of institution employed	N	X	SD	t	p
Delegation of authority	Public school	328	11.53	2.90	-2.46	.01
	Private school	83	12.39	2.62		
Accountability	Public school	328	12.21	2.11	2.05	.04
	Private school	83	11.52	2.82		
Support	Public school	328	35.49	12.06	-3.55	.00
	Private school	83	40.68	11.25		
Empowering leadership	Public school	328	59.24	14.85	-3.01	.00
	Private school	83	64.61	13.29		

Table 21 shows that the mean of the teachers whose type of institution is a public school is 11.53 and the mean of the teachers whose type of institution is a private school is 12.39 regarding the views on the delegation of authority sub-dimension of empowering leadership. The t value calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups (t=-2.46, p<.05) indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the groups is significant at the 0.05 level. Based on this finding, the views of teachers whose type of institution is public school on the delegation of authority sub-dimension of empowering leadership were lower than those of teachers whose type of institution is private school.

In the views on the sub-dimension of accountability, the average score of the teachers whose type of institution is a public school is 12.21, and the average score of the teachers whose type of institution is a private school is 11.52. The t value calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups (t=-2.05, p<.05) indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the groups is significant at the 0.05 level. Based on this finding, the views of teachers whose type of institution is a public school on the accountability sub-dimension of empowering leadership were higher than those of teachers whose type of institution is a private school.

Regarding the views on the support sub-dimension, the average score of the teachers whose type of institution is a public school is 35.49, and the average score of the teachers whose type of institution is a private school is 40.68. The t value calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups (t=-3.55, p<.05) indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the groups is significant at the 0.05 level. Based on this finding, the views of teachers whose type of institution is a public school on the support sub-dimension of empowering leadership were lower than those of teachers whose type of institution is a private school.

Regarding the views on the overall level of empowering leadership, the average score of the teachers whose type of institution is public school is 59.24, and the average score of the teachers whose type of institution is private school is 64.61. The t value calculated to test the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the groups (t=-3.01, p<.05) indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the groups is significant at the 0.05 level. Based on this finding, the views of public school teachers on the overall level of empowering leadership were lower than those of private school teachers.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The current study examined the empowering leadership levels of SA based on teachers' views. Furthermore, the differentiation of teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA based on the variables of branch, gender, marital status, seniority, faculty of graduation, educational background, total working time with the principal in the school, presence of a previous administrative position, educational stage of the school, and type of institution was examined. As a result of the research, based on the views of the teachers, it was determined that SA showed a high level of empowering leadership in the delegation of authority, accountability, and support for teachers and in general. Studies in the literature revealed that the empowering leadership level of SA is high based on teachers' views (Bayın, 2021; Dağlı & Kalkan, 2021; Dash & Vohra, 2019; Gkorezis, 2015; Gümüş, 2013; Koçak, 2016; Koçak & Burgaz, 2017; Konan & Çelik, 2017; Konczak et al., 2000; Lee & Nie, 2015; Vecchio et al., 2010). The results of this research support the findings of the current research.

Significant differences were found between the total score of SA' empowering leadership levels and teachers' views on the sub-dimensions of empowering leadership based on the variables of branch, gender, seniority, educational background, total working time with the principal in the school, and type of institution. On the other hand, it was concluded that there was no significant difference depending on the variables of marital status, faculty of graduation, presence of a previous administrative position, and educational stage of the school. These results are commonly reported in numerous studies in the literature. The findings obtained from the research are discussed and interpreted separately for each variable.

Teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA showed a significant difference in the accountability sub-dimension of empowering leadership regarding the branch variable. Classroom teachers stated a higher level of accountability of SA, compared to teachers from the social sciences branch. There was no significant difference between teachers' views regarding delegation of authority and support sub-dimensions of empowering leadership and total score. Studies in the literature revealed that teachers' views on SA' empowering leadership levels did not differ based on their branches (Gümüş, 2013; Kıral, 2015; Koçak, 2016).

In terms of gender variable, teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA showed a significant difference in both sub-dimensions and total scores of empowering leadership. Male teachers stated a level of empowering leadership of SA, compared to female teachers. The difference in favor of male teachers can be attributed to the fact that the majority of SA are male. In addition, empowering leaders may interact more with male teachers in active communication and collaboration processes. This result obtained from the research is in line with the research results in the literature (Koçak, 2016; Konan & Çelik, 2017; Odabaş, 2014). On the other hand, Aras (2013) found that teachers' views did not differ in terms of gender.

In terms of the seniority variable, teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA showed a significant difference in both sub-dimensions and total scores of empowering leadership. Teachers with higher seniority stated a higher level of empowering leadership of SA, compared to the teachers with lower seniority. The fact that the communication, cooperation, authority, and accountability levels of teachers with high professional seniority are improved compared to teachers who are new to the profession or teachers with less professional seniority may be related to the perception of empowering leadership. In addition, the fact that teachers can overcome professional problems more easily as their professional seniority increases may have enabled them to have a more positive perspective in evaluating the empowering leadership levels of SA. This result obtained from the research is in parallel with the research results in the literature (Bayın, 2021; Gümüş, 2013; Kıral, 2015; Koçak, 2016; Özbek & Özdil, 2022). On the other hand, there are also research results indicating that teachers' views on empowering leadership do not differ based on seniority (Gümüş, 2013; Konan and Çelik, 2017).

Teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA regarding educational background showed a significant difference in both sub-dimensions and total scores of empowering leadership. Teachers with bachelor's degree stated a higher empowering leadership level of SA, compared to the teachers with master's degree. Teachers with postgaduate education develop new perspectives on education and management issues. Therefore, they may have shown a critical approach toward the empowering leadership levels of SA. On the other hand, Özbek and Özdil (2022) state that there is no significant difference between teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA.

Teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA regarding the variable of total working time with the principal in the school showed a significant difference in both sub-dimensions and total scores of empowering leadership. Teachers with a longer total working time with the principal at the school where they worked stated a lower level of empowering leadership of SA, compared to the teachers who had a shorter total working time with the principal at the school where they worked. Empowering leadership is based on the principles of communication, cooperation, a delegation of authority, duty and accountability, rewarding, training, and development. A teacher who has just started working with the principal at his/her school is highly motivated to work over these principles. Therefore, every initiative of the SA in the working processes could be positively perceived by the teachers compared to ones who had previously worked there. On the other hand, teachers who have worked with the same school principal for a longer period of time may have eroded their relationship with the school principal, leading to more negative evaluations regarding the school principal for various reasons. On the other hand, there are also findings in the literature that as the total working time with the principal increases, the principal becomes more closely known by the teachers, teacher-principal relationships strengthen, and thus teachers' perceptions of empowering leadership increase (Bayın, 2021; Konan and Çelik, 2017). Furthermore, there are also research results showing that teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA do not vary depending on the total working time with the principal in the school (Özbek and Özdil, 2022).

Teachers' views on the empowering leadership levels of SA showed a significant difference in both sub-dimensions and total scores of empowering leadership in terms of the type of institution. Teachers working in public schools stated a lower level of empowering leadership of SA, compared to teachers working in private schools. The studies in the literature do not address empowering leaders based on the type of school they work in. The finding obtained in this research could be associated with the decrease in the dynamic working process in public schools over time. In private schools, school management, students, and parents want an effective educational process in which teachers play a continuous active role. It could be argued that the strong

communication between teachers and SA in private schools in order to demonstrate this performance leads to a higher level of empowering leadership than in public schools.

Examining teacher perceptions of SA' empowering leadership level regarding different variables has been the subject of different studies (Konan and Çelik, 2017; Özbek and Özdil, 2022). Moreover, the concept of empowering leadership was examined in relation to many concepts such as collective competence (Özbek and Özdil, 2022), self-efficacy and job satisfaction perception (Dağlı and Kalkan, 2021), psychological empowerment (Gümüş, 2013), psychological contract (Koçak, 2016), organizational dissent (Bayın, 2021), and organizational resilience (Karagözoğlu, 2022). Furthermore, empowering leadership has been addressed as a research topic in many fields besides educational sciences due to its significant impact on professional motivation and professional performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Empowering leadership, which can be considered as one of the most significant concepts related to educational administration processes, is discussed in detail in this research. The empowering leadership level of SA based on teachers' perceptions was revealed in the research. Furthermore, teachers' perceptions about the level of empowering leadership of SA were analyzed comparatively in terms of different variables. As a result of the research, it was determined that the empowering leadership level of SA was high based on teachers' perceptions. The current study revealed that teachers' perceptions of the empowering leadership level of SA differed significantly based on teachers' branches, gender, seniority, educational background, total working time with the principal in the school, and the types of institutions where they work. On the other hand, this study revealed that teachers' perceptions of the empowering leadership level of SA did not differ significantly in terms of their marital status, faculty of education, presence of a previous administrative position, and the educational stage of the school.

Empowering leadership is arguably one of the most significant and important predictors of professional performance. Research in the literature has revealed that teachers working with SA with high levels of empowering leadership have high professional performance, professional motivation, and organizational commitment. Therefore, starting from the top management of the Ministry of National Education, an awareness of the concept of "empowering leadership" should be created. In-service training, seminars, and conferences should be compulsory for SA at least once a year to increase their empowering leadership level. Moreover, SA undertaking postgraduate education could be guided by their advisors to study empowering leadership. Especially for SA, studying this issue would be more useful regarding its influence on the understanding of the concept.

Measurement instruments in Turkey for the concept of empowering leadership could be diversified. In addition to improving measurement instruments, measurement instruments available in different cultures may be adapted to Turkish and presented for the use of researchers. Furthermore, examining the relationship between the concept of empowering leadership and various psychological constructs in educational sciences could be a research topic for numerous postgraduate thesis studies. In this regard, it may also be recommended to examine the concept in various disciplines. Considering that teachers' perceptions of empowering leadership differ significantly based on the variables of branch, gender, seniority, educational background, total working time with the principal in the school, and type of institution, it may be recommended to conduct qualitative studies on empowering leadership. Future studies could be designed in the scope of categories in different variables. Thus, each group's perspective on empowering leadership could be analyzed.

It is observed that the studies conducted to examine empowering leadership are generally carried out in descriptive or relational survey design. In future studies, prediction and classification could be emphasized. Thus, which variables come to the forefront regarding empowering leadership could be determined.

REFERENCES

Ahearne, M., Mathieu, J. ve Rapp, A. (2005). To empower or not to empower your sales force? An empirical examination of the influence of leadership empowerment behavior on customer satisfaction and performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90(5), 945-955.

Aras, G. (2013). Personel güçlendirme yönetiminde güçlendirici liderlik davranışları uygulaması: Kemer bölgesi beş yıldızlı otel işletmeleri örneği. (Tez No. 344601) [Yüksek lisans tezi, Gümüşhane Üniversitesi]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Bayın, M. A. (2021). Okul müdürlerinin güçlendirici liderlik düzeyleri ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel muhalefeti arasındaki ilişki. (Tez No. 691436) [Yüksek lisans tezi, İnönü Üniversitesi]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Bulut, S. ve Çelikten, M. (2021). Türk eğitim sisteminde kadın okul yöneticiliği. International Journal of Social, Humanities and Administrative Sciences, 7(40), 886-894. https://doi.org/10.31589/JOSHAS.621

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç-Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. ve Demirel, F. (2008). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri. Pegem Akademi.

Conger, J. A. ve Kanungo, R. N. (1998). Charismatic leadership in organizations. SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452204932

Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. Pearson Education.

Curran, P. J., West, S. G. ve Finch, J. F. (1996). The robustness of test statistics to non-normality and specification error in confirmatory factor analysis. Psychological Methods, 1(1),16-29. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.1.1.16

Çelikten, M. (2006). Okul kültürünün şekillendirilmesinde müdürün rolleri. Eğitim ve Bilim, 31(140), 56-61.

Çelikten, M. ve Çelikten, Y. (2007). Televizyon programlarında çizilen öğrenci, öğretmen ve yönetici profilleri. Erciyes Akademi, 23(2), 369-378.

Çelikten, M. ve Özkan, H. H. (2018). Öğretmen performans değerlendirme sistemi. Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi, 8(15), 806-824. https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.418565

Dağlı, E. ve Kalkan, F. (2021). Okul müdürlerinin güçlendirici liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin öz yeterlik algıları ve iş doyumu düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. Eğitim ve Bilim, 46(208), 105-123. https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2021.10083

Darling-Hammond, L. ve Richardson, N. (2009). Teacher learning: What matters? Educational Leadership, 66(5), 46-53.

Dash, S. S. ve Vohra, N. (2019). The leadership of the school principal impact on teachers' job crafting, alienation and commitment. Management Research Review, 42(3), 352-369. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-11-2017-0384

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. ve Hyun, H. (2015). How to design and evaluate research in education. McGraw Hill.

Gkorezis, P. (2015). Principal empowering leadership and teacher innovative behavior: A moderated mediation model. International Journal of Educational Management, 30(6), 1030-1044. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-08-2015-0113

Goddard, Y. L., Goddard, R. D. ve Tschannen-Moran, M. (2007). A theoretical and empirical investigation of teacher collaboration for school improvement and student achievement in public elementary schools. Teachers College Record, 109(4), 877-896. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146810710900401

Gümüş, A. (2013). İlkokul yöneticilerinde güçlendirici liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi: Psikolojik güçlendirmenin aracılık rolü (Ankara İli Örneği). (Tez No. 333539) [Yüksek lisans tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Gün, İ. ve Aslan, Ö. (2018). Liderlik kuramları ve sağlık örgütlerinde liderlik. Journal of Health and Nursing Management, 5(3), 217-226. https://doi.org/10.5222/SHYD.2018.217

Hanushek, E. A. ve Rivkin, S. G. (2010). Generalizations about using value-added measures of teacher quality. American Economic Review, 100(2), 267-271. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.2.267

Harris, A., ve Muijs, D. (2005). Improving schools through teacher leadership, Maidenhead Open University Press.

Karagözoğlu, A. A. (2022). Güçlendirici liderlik, örgütsel dayanıklılık, öz yeterlik ilişkisinin incelenmesi. (Tez No. 736113) [Doktora tezi, Fırat Üniversitesi]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Kıral, B. (2015). Lise yöneticilerinin öğretmenleri güçlendirmesi ve öğretmenlerin kayıtsızlık (sinizm) davranışı ile ilişkisi. (Tez No. 396158) [Doktora tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Koçak, S. (2016). Ortaöğretim kurumlarındaki psikolojik sözleşme üzerinde güçlendirici liderlik davranışlarının rolü. (Tez No. 435204) [Yüksek lisans tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Koçak, S. ve Burgaz, B. (2017). Ortaöğretim kurumlarındaki psikolojik sözleşme üzerinde güçlendirici liderlik davranışlarının rolü. Eğitim ve Bilim, 42(191), 351-369. https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2017.7101

Konan, N. ve Çelik, O. T. (2017). Okul müdürlerinin güçlendirici liderliğine ilişkin öğretmen algısı. Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 6(1), 322–335. https://doi.org/10.14686/buefad.274186

Konan, N. ve Çelik, O. T. (2018). Güçlendirici liderlik ölçeğinin eğitim örgütleri için Türkçeye uyarlaması: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. Kastamonu Education Journal, 26(4), 1043-1054. https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.434140

Konczak, L. J., Stelly, D. J. ve Trusty, M. L. (2000). Defining and measuring empowering leader behaviors: Development of an upward feedback instrument. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60(2), 301-313. https://doi.org/10.1177/00131640021970420

Laschinger, H. K. ve Finegan, J. (2005). Empowering nurses for work engagement and health in hospital settings. Journal of Nursing Administration, 35(9), 439-449. https://doi.org/10.1097/00005110-200510000-00005

Lee, A. N. ve Nie, Y. (2015). Teachers' perceptions of school leaders' empowering behaviors and psychological empowerment: Evidence from a Singapore sample. Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 45(2), 260-283. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143215578448

Odabaş, İ. (2014). Yapısal güçlendirme ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkide psikolojik güçlendirmenin ara değişken rolü: Öğretmenler üzerinde bir çalışma. (Tez No. 355883) [Yüksek lisans tezi, İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi]. Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Özbek, D. ve Özdil, A. N. (2022). Öğretmen görüşlerine göre okul müdürlerinin güçlendirici liderlik düzeyleri ile sınıf öğretmenlerinin kolektif yeterlik algıları arasındaki ilişki. International Social Sciences Studies Journal, 8(103), 3448-3461.

Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. Academy of Management Journal, 38(5), 1442-1465. https://doi.org/10.2307/256865

Vecchio, R. P., Justin, J. E. ve Pearce, C. L. (2010). Empowering leadership: An examination of mediating mechanisms within a hierarchical structure. The Leadership Quarterly, 21(3), 530-542. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.03.014

Yukl, G. (2002). Leadership in organizations. Pearson Education.