

Teacher Perceptions of Instructional Leadership Behavior, Self-Efficacy and Perception of Learning Organization

Özlem ERDEM^a, Fatma BAYSEN^b

Abstract

The environment in educational institutions is influenced by numerous factors, some of which pertain to the interactions of educators in the organization. Since the teacher effect, as an inschool factor, has been shown to have an important influence on student achievement; teachers' self-efficacy, instructional leadership, and their perception of the learning organization, which affect their performance and their perception of the school environment, need to be dealt with carefully. Various scales have been developed to measure these attitudes. This research analyzes the attitudes of primary and secondary school teachers on Instructional Leadership Behavior, Self-Efficacy, and Perception of Learning Organization in order to confirm the factorial structure of these measures and to shed light on the differences led by them. Results show that female teachers had higher attitudes towards dimensions of Instructional Leadership Behavior Scale and Learning Organization but no difference was found between male and female teachers regarding their experience. Secondary school teachers had lower Self-Efficacy attitudes in comparison to primary school teachers.

Keyword: Instructional Leadership Behavior, Self-Efficacy, Perception of Learning Organization, Educational Management, Productivity.

Introduction

Performances of teachers are influenced by various factors, such as administrators, colleagues, students, the classroom environment, etc. Increasing teachers' performances are highly correlated with the leadership of the principal. In line with this, the constantly fluctuating figure of school administrators has come to include instructional leadership into the concept of school principalship with increasing effect (Hallinger & Wang, 2015; Murphy, Neumerski, Goldring, Grissom & Porter, 2016). For this reason, the concept of instructional leadership has grabbed diverse attention from researchers.

Apart from this, the evolution of the school into a better performing body has come to require schools to continually improving their practices, which has lately been measured with the learning organization concept. Thus, focusing on the concepts of instructional leadership and learning organization together appeared to be providing a sounder picture of teacher performance in the

school. One reason for studying leadership and learning organization together is that learning at team and organizational levels along with the individual level should be the main concern of leaders (Phillips, Watkins & Marsick, 1996, p. 7).

Aside from the two above-mentioned concepts, self-efficacy, which is a trait seemingly not an extensively studied school variable came to take the attention of researchers. At this point, a brief feed about the background of these concepts would be in place.

Instructional Leadership

The history of integration of instructional leadership into principalship goes back to the 1960s (Hallinger, Hosseingholizadeh, Hashemi & Kouhsari, 2017) due to its influence on school quality and improvement along with student learning (Hallinger, 2011; Robinson, 2006), which has brought about ample literature on instructional leadership research. Parallel to this has come the need to quantify the leadership practices of principals both on the part of the school administrators and on those who are affected by their practices, namely teachers, students, and the parents.

^a. Near East University Doctoral student, Department of Educational Management and

Supervision Lefkosa, Mersin 10, Turkey, ozlemerdem02@gmail.com

^b. Near East University, Department of Educational Management and Supervision Lefkosa, Mersin 10, Turkey, fatma.baysen@neu.edu.tr

As there are great varieties in practices and perceptions over the countries, some researchers have chosen to measure attitudes and performances with locally developed instruments. For example, Şişman developed an instructional leadership scale with 5 dimensions. Şişman's scale has been used by a few researchers including Yıldırım, (2010) with Cronbach's alpha .89; Sayın, 2010, with a sample of 407 teachers and 52 school administrators, with Cronbach's alpha .98). One reason for focusing on instructional leadership in the eyes of the teachers is that good principal-teacher relationships may support distributing leadership roles that help improve other colleagues (Spillane, Harris, Jones & Mertz, 2015).

Self-Efficacy

Measuring self-efficacy in educational settings seems to be important for the reason that a high sense of personal efficacy has been shown to be connected to better health, higher success rates, and more social cooperation (Bandura, 1997; Schwarzer, 1992), which can be measured via existing sound, validated measures.

Wood and Bandura (1989, p.408) defined self-efficacy as "beliefs in one's capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive responses, and courses of action needed to meet given situation demands". Usually, self-efficacy is measured in two dimensions: General Self-Efficacy and Social Self-Efficacy.

Whereas Chen, Gully, and Eden, (2001, p. 63) see GSE as "differences among individuals in their tendency to view themselves as capable of meeting task demands in a broad array of contexts".

Various studies (Endler et. al. 2001; Yıldırım & İlhan, 2010 (n=895); Tian, Hasking & Phillips, 2007) have used the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSES) found by Sherer et. al.

Some of the studies focused only on General Self-Efficacy for the reason that studies on Social Self-Efficacy did not provide reliable results. In a study carried out in the Turkish context, for example, Yıldırım and İlhan's found the scale explained 41.5 % of the variance with three factors.

There is ample research on school leaders' self-efficacy behaviors. Principal efficacy, as described by Jacob, Goddard, Kim, Miller, Goddard (2014) based on the social cognitive theory of Bandura, is the degree to which principals believe that they can induce potential improvements in instruction in their schools, and therefore is expected to have a significant impact on the effort and persistence with which principals seek educational advancement in their schools. On the other hand,

self-efficacy on the part of the teachers implies behavioral modes of the teachers, social self-efficacy predicting professional achievement.

The General Self-Efficacy Subscale, according to Sherer and Adams (1983), forecasted past achievement in vocational, educational, and military settings.

Construct validity of the Self-Efficacy Scale was confirmed with personality measurements of

Locus of Control, Personal Control, Social Desirability, Ego Strength, Interpersonal Competence, and Self-esteem (Sherer & Adams, 1983). A study by Hallinger, Hosseingholizadeh, Hashemi, and Kouhsari (2017) found that there was a moderate positive relationship between instructional leadership and collective teacher efficacy, hinting at the need to look for relationships between them. Gareis and Tschannen-Moran (2008) and Lucas (2003) showed that stronger self-efficacy led to teachers and students modeling higher achievement goals.

Learning Organization

Even though a discussion of the learning organization would be beyond the scope of the study, it would be to the point to briefly go over the concept so as to consolidate the basis of the research. Senge was the first one to develop the concept of the learning organization (1990). A learning organization, according to Senge's definition, is one that promotes and facilitates learning in order to constantly alter itself to survive and excel (Senge, 1990). The concept has been used to include restructuring necessary to increase organizational adaptability (Argyris, 1992; Senge, 1990). Whereas, Garvin (1993) saw a learning organization as one that is capable of creating, obtaining, and transmitting knowledge, as well as modifying its behavior (p. 80), which is relevant to instructional leadership dimensions.

The definition, as argued by Senge (1990), focuses on the organization's ability to take appropriate action. Salner (1999) states that teamwork is essential: Individuals' capacity to collaborate to create knowledge in action results in organizational learning. The important factors that drive learning in an organization are the basis of the Dimensions of Learning Organization. On the other hand, McGill, Slocum, and Lei (1992) define the Learning Organization as "a company that can respond to new information by changing the "programming" by which information is processed and evaluated."

Yadav and Agarwal (2016) state five disciplines that are available in a learning organization;

namely, Personal Mastery, Mental Models, Shared Vision, Team Learning, and Systems Thinking.

Various studies produced scales to measure attitudes towards learning organization, one of which is Watkins and Marsick's (1997) Dimensions of the Learning Organization Questionnaire (DLOQ) reviewed by Kim, Egan, and Tolson (2015). The study makes a review of Learning Organization (LO) scale studies and recommends carrying out CFA for every different set of items. In another study, Singer, Moore, Meterko, and Williams (2012) developed a short form of LO for health care. Although the concept of the learning organization has been shaped within the framework of business, management, and human resources, it naturally came to include educational organizations as well. For example, in a study by Memduhoğlu and Kuşci (2012) in which they studied organizational learning, researchers used the "Organizational Learning in Primary Schools Scale" established by Güçlü and Türkoğlu, which concluded that the views of teachers and principals differed greatly depending on their title, sex, seniority and the number of teachers at school. The problems they found were: employees' personal mastery (control), building a collective mutual vision in schools, task success in teams, including employee perspectives on decisions, conducting environmental assessments, and staying current in education.

Another study was carried out by Töremen (1999), in which 545 teachers and 148 school administrators from seven regions of Turkey were included. Results showed that participation in individual research was low especially in private school, the rewarding system was not working, communication and planned to work was insufficient, team spirit was low, vision should be shared more, technology should be used more extensively, in-service training should be re-handled in a way to increase school quality. Yıldız (2011) studied perceptions of teachers about learning organizations in which he found private schools had characteristics of learning organizations but state schools did not have. Song, Chai, Kim, and Bae (2018) found that learning-organization culture in the Korean workforce influenced teachers' self-efficacy and work commitment positively.

Gender Differences

Because of the formation of educational institutions, gender may have an effect on teacher performances and attitudes. A study by Shaked, Gross, and Glanz (2017) found that female

principals gave the impression to have better instructive expertise and paid more attention to relationships. In a meta-analytic study on the differences between males and females in instructional leadership by Hallinger, Dongyu, and Wang (2016), it was discovered that gender had a "small but statistically significant effect" on instructional leadership, favoring females.

It is decided to study instructional leadership, learning organization, and self-efficacy for the reason that these measures give a comprehensive picture of school factors on the part of the teachers. For example, Hoy and Hoy (2009) state that the most significant characteristic among school principals is efficient instructional leadership. It is also posited that for an organization to improve itself it should be a learning organization. The other concept focused on is self-efficacy which can be explained as one's self to accomplish a task (Bandura, 1986). One of the most important determinants of individual behaviors is self-efficacy (Song et. al. 2018), thus pointing to its importance in educational settings. Moreover, Klassen and Tze (2014) found that self-efficacy was strongly related to teaching performance, which requires more attention. The findings of Holzberger, Philipp, and Kunter, (2013) show the significance of examining the self-efficacy of teachers as a consequence of educational processes as well.

Without carrying out CFA to validate the factor structures, it would be insufficient to make decisions on the basis of the results that the scales produce for the reason that the measures may not be confirmed in the sample. So, as a first step confirmatory factor analyses of the three scales should be carried out. There is a need to find out the differences with regard to teachers' attitudes towards instructional leadership, self-efficacy, and learning organization to help with concluding sound decisions about the attitudes of them and aiding them in their productive teaching in the school environment. Therefore, the research questions were as follows:

1. Are factor structures of Instructional Leadership Behavior Scale, Self-Efficacy Scale, and Perception of Learning Organization Scale confirmed in the current sample?
2. Do teachers differ in attitudes of Instructional Leadership Behavior, Self-Efficacy, and Perception of Learning Organization with regard to gender, school type, and experience?

Method

For the intent of the study, teachers were

selected to confirm the factor structure of the scales and to find out the differences. Participants were 400 primary school and secondary school teachers from two districts of a metropolitan city in Turkey. As the participants are adults their personal voluntary consent to participation in the study was enough. However, written official permission was granted by the national education district directorate. The study utilized three instruments for the purpose of the research question.

Instructional Leadership Behavior Scale

Instructional Leadership Behavior Scale developed by Şişman (2004) was administered. The scale consists of 50 items in five dimensions. A 5 point-likert scale was used with *1 = None of the time* and *5 = All of the time*. The scale had the following dimensions each of which had 10 items: Deciding and Sharing School Goals (10 items), School Program and Administering Schooling Process (10 items), Schooling Process and Student Assessment (10 items), Supporting and Improving Teachers (10 items), Establishing Orderly Teaching-Learning Environment and Climate (10 items). The original scale had Cronbach's alpha internal consistency of .92. On the scale, there were no reverse items.

General Self-Efficacy Scale

General Self-Efficacy Scale was developed by Sherer et. al. (1982), The scale includes 23 items. A factor analysis yielded two subscales: A General Self-Efficacy subscale (17 items) and a Social Self-Efficacy subscale (6 items), (Sherer, Maddux, Mercandante, Prentice-Dunn, Jacobs & Rogers, 1982). In the study carried out by Chen, Gully, and Eden (2001) internal consistency reliabilities of the Social and General Self-Efficacy Scale (SGSES) were moderate to high (.76 to .89). SGSES products, according to Woodruff and Cashman (1993), calculate three distinct factors: self-perception of behavior initiation, effort, and persistence. Some studies made use of the General Self-Efficacy Scale only, excluding Social Self-Efficacy, which sometimes did not produce consistent results. Imam (2007) used a group of 607 university students to assess the psychometric properties of the English version of Sherer et al.'s 17-item General Self-Efficacy Scale. Internal consistency, temporal stability, and construct validity were all satisfactory in the results. Cronbach's alpha was 0.85 ($p < .0001$) in this study. The study yielded a three-factor solution, similar to previous research, demonstrating the multi-dimensionality of the scale. In this study, factor loadings were: $F1 = .461$

to .598, $F2 = .452$ to .731, and $F3 = .443$, to .764. The Self-Efficacy Scale was adapted to the Turkish language by Yıldırım and İlhan (2010).

Learning Organization Scale

Learning Organization Scale was developed by Türkoğlu (2002) in the Turkish context and it was validated by Güçlü and Türkoğlu (2003). As a first stage, 67 items were developed and after expert views, 2 items were discarded. After the questionnaire was administered to 58 teachers, amendments and modifications were made and the item number decreased to 47. The improved version was applied to 188 administrators and teachers from seven schools, and after the analyses, item numbers were decreased to 42. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency of the final questionnaire was .97. To test the reliability of the questionnaire, a split-half test based on the Spearman-Brown correlation was used.

The questionnaire dimensions consisted of Individual Mastery (items 1-5), Intellectual Models (items 6-12), Shared Vision (items 13-23), System Thinking (items 24-32), and Team Learning (items 33-42). A 5 point-Likert scale was used beginning with 0 = None of the time and, 5 = All of the time. The study found school principals' and vice principals' perceptions in the dimensions of learning time, system thinking, individual capability, intellectual models, shared vision and learning were higher than the teachers' perceptions (Güçlü & Türkoğlu, 2003).

Learning Organization Scale developed by Türkoğlu was used by a few studies as well. Güler (2008) administered the scale in the police department of Konya with a sample size of 1051, the researchers used 38 of the items for the research as the remaining 5 items were not relevant for the police department. Cronbach's alpha was .93. Güler found a unidimensional scale.

Data Analyses/Process

In the first place, for the scales to be used soundly, all of the tests were subjected to confirmatory factor analyses. As the data were categorical, the WLSMV estimation algorithm was carried out; we did not carry out Maximum Likelihood (ML) as the data were not continuous. When assessing model-data fit, because sample size affects the Chi-square test, RMSEA, CFI, and TLI values were considered the basis. This being said, for good model-data fit, RMSEA should be < 0.05 , CFI should be > 0.95 and TLI should be > 0.95 . For acceptable model-data fit RMSEA should be < 0.08 , CFI should be > 0.90 , and TLI > 0.90 , for which there

is ample literature (MacCallum, Browne & Sugawara, 1996; Yu, 2002).

After sufficient model-data fit was achieved, mean factor scores for each teacher were calculated, which means scores for each factor were summed (for example, if the factor had 5 items, responses for 5 items were summed up and divided into 5).

As the final step, it was analyzed whether the

factor scores of teachers differed concerning gender, school type, and experience (seniority). Gender was tested using an independent samples t-test, and school form and background were studied using a one-way Anova.

Findings

Descriptive statistics achieved after CFA for all the dimensions are presented below.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for all the Dimensions of the Scales

O	Max.	\bar{X}	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	
Deciding and Sharing School Goals	1.20	5.00	3.91	.79	-.764	.407
School Program and Administering Schooling Process	1.40	5.00	3.85	.76	-.691	.229
Schooling Process and Student Assessment	1.20	5.00	3.86	.83	-.816	.186
Supporting and Improving Teachers	1.00	5.00	3.46	.95	-.559	-.299
Establishing Orderly Teaching-Learning Environment and Climate	1.00	5.00	3.81	.93	-.818	.150
Individual Mastery	1.00	5.00	3.43	.95	-.495	-.205
Intellectual Models	1.00	5.00	3.76	.79	-.669	.361
Shared Vision	1.00	5.00	3.70	.89	-.642	-.036
System Thinking	1.11	5.00	3.56	.78	-.578	.214
Team Learning	1.00	5.00	3.75	.83	-.826	.721
Gen. Self-Efficacy	2.33	5.00	4.23	.64	-1.063	.337
Soc. Self-Efficacy	1.40	5.00	3.79	.76	-.351	-.402

As is evident in Table 1, teachers had moderate to high attitudes toward all scale dimensions, the highest being General Self-Efficacy ($\bar{X} = 4,23$) and the lowest Individual Mastery ($\bar{X} = 3,43$).

CFA Results for All Scales

As the second step, Confirmatory Factor Analyses were carried out and the statistics for the scales are presented below.

CFA Results for Instructional Leadership Behavior Scale

Table 2. CFA Results for Instructional Leadership Behavior Scale

RMSEA Model (90 % CI)	χ^2	df	P	CFI	TLI	WRMR
	2731.67	1165	.000.058(.055,.06)	97	97	1.28

Note. RMSEA, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI, Comparative Fit Index; TLI, Tucker-Lewis Index; WRMR, Weighted Root Mean

Square Residual.

As Table 2 clearly demonstrates, the original model fits the sample data sufficiently.

Table 3. Factor Correlations and Reliabilities for Instructional Leadership Behavior Scale

	School Program and Administering Schooling Process	Deciding and Sharing School Goals	Schooling Process Student Assessment	Supporting and Improving Teachers	Establishing Orderly Teaching-Learning Environment and Climate
Deciding and Sharing School Goals	0,91	-	-	-	-
Schooling Process and Student Assessment	0,88	0,81	-	-	-
Supporting and Improving Teachers	0,80	0,75	0,80	-	-
Establishing Orderly Teaching-Learning Environment and Climate	0,88	0,82	0,86	0,90	-
Reliability	0.92	0.95.	0.94	0.94	0.96

*p<0.01

CFA Results for Learning Organization Scale

The initial model did not produce sufficient fit so

modifications were made in the model. Model fit values of LOS after these modifications are as follow:

Table 4. CFA Results for Learning Organization Scale (LOS)

Model	χ^2	df	RMSEA p (90 % CI)	CFI	TLI	WRMR
Initial Model	2997.69	809	.000.082 (.079, .085)	.96	.96	1.60
Model Two	2310.67	765	.000 .071 (.068, .074)	.97	.97	1.35

Note. RMSEA, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI, Comparative Fit Index; TLI, Tucker-Lewis Index; WRMR, Weighted Root Mean Square Residual.

Even though CFI and TLI values are higher than 0.95, the RMSEA value is higher than 0.80. Factor loadings and modification indices were analyzed. Even though factor loading of the first item was

significant (0.334), it was lower compared to other items. So, this item was excluded as the factor loading was lower than 0.40. When modification indices were analyzed it was noticed that 4 item pairs were correlated (LOS38 with LOS36; LOS14 with LOS13; LOS19 with LOS20 and LOS17 with LOS16. So the errors were allowed to correlate.

As Table 4 clearly demonstrates 2, the modified model fits the sample data sufficiently.

Table 5. Factor Correlations and Reliabilities for Learning Organization

	Individual Mastery	Intellectual Model	Shared Vision	System Thinking	Team Leader
Intellectual Model	0,78	-	-	-	-
Shared Vision	0,80	0,94	-	-	-
System Thinking	0,78	0,89	0,91	-	-
Team Leader	0,72	0,84	0,85	0,88	-
Reliability	0.88	0.90	0.96	0.93	0.95

*p<0.01

As results indicate, factors have high correlations with each other. Cronbach alpha values of the factors are also all higher than 0.70, which shows the high reliability of the scale.

Model data fit indices were quite insufficient. The main reason actually is that there are many negative items on the scale. When there are both negative and positive items on the scale, items tend to load in different factors. This is a method effect. Therefore, the method effect was added in the following phases of the analyses.

CFA Results for Self-Efficacy Scale

Table 6. CFA Results for General Self-Efficacy Scale

Model	χ^2	df	P	RMSEA	CFI	TLI	WRMR(90% CI)
Original	1209.11	229	.000	0.103(.098, .109)	.85	.84	1.84
Method Effect	650.48	216	.000	.071(.065, .077)	.94	.92	1.27
Model Three	419.61	157	.000	.065 (.057, .072)	.96	.95	1.07

Note. RMSEA, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI, Comparative Fit Index; TLI, Tucker-Lewis Index; WRMR, Weighted Root Mean Square Residual.

After controlling for method-effect, even though model-data fit indices were enough, some items (SE11 factor loading 0.165; SE13 factor loading 0.182; SE21 factor loading 0.102) had quite low factor loadings. As these values are far lower than 0.40, they are not good indicators. So, these three items were excluded from the analyses.

As is evident in Table 6, the second model fits the sample data sufficiently. The remaining items' factor loading was high and significant; to control for method-effect a factor was added and allowed negative items to load on other factors and this method factor. One reason other studies in Turkey cannot confirm factor structure can be that they

ignore method-effect, which is not analyzed in most studies.

Table 7. Factor Correlations and Reliabilities for Self-Efficacy Scale

	GSE	SSE
SSE	0,84	-
Reliability	0.87	0.61

*p<0.01

Social (SSE) and General Self-Efficacy (GSE) factors show high correlations with each other. The reliability coefficient is high for GSE but lower than 0.70 for social self-efficacy, which is a common situation in factors with fewer items. Reliability values between .6 and .7 are acceptable if other indicators of validity are sufficient (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, 2010).

After testing and confirming all the scales' factor structures, it was examined whether the calculated

factor scores of teachers differ significantly according to gender, school type, and experience.

Table 8. Gender Differences

Scale	Factors	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p				
Instructional Leadership Behavior Scale	Deciding and Sharing School Goals	Female	219	41,11	0,71	5,92 6,11 5,94 5,06 6,36 4,48 4,42 5,62 5,54 4,30	398,00 398,00 359,63 398,00 356,19 398,00 398,00 361,41 398,00 398,00	.000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000 .000				
		Male	181	36,61	0,81							
	Administering Schooling Process	Female	219	40,54	0,69							
		Male	181	36,07	0,77							
	Schooling Process and Student Assessment	Female	219	40,80	0,74							
		Male	181	36,01	0,85							
	Supporting and Improving Teachers	Female	219	36,77	0,92							
		Male	181	32,08	0,93							
	Establishing Orderly Teaching-Learning Environment and Climate	Female	219	40,66	0,82							
		Male	181	34,92	0,96							
	Learning Organization Scale	Individual Mastery Models	Female	219	36,21				0,90	4,48 4,42 5,62 5,54 4,30	398,00 398,00 361,41 398,00 398,00	.000 .000 .000 .000 .000
			Male	181	32,04				0,95			
Shared Vision System		Female	219	39,17	0,78							
		Male	181	35,71	0,77							
Thinking Team Learning		Female	219	39,22	0,80							
		Male	181	34,33	0,92							
		Female	219	37,44	0,74							
		Male	181	33,27	0,76							
		Female	219	39,06	0,78							
		Male	181	35,57	0,85							

*p<0.001

As the results show there were differences in all factors of Instructional Leadership Behavior Scale and Learning Organization Scale, but there were no differences between females and males with regard to Self-Efficacy Scale. In all factors of the two scales, females scored higher than the males(p<0.001).

Differences according to Experience

The differences among teachers were analyzed

with regard to experience as well as undertaking an Anova test. Even though some differences were expected, in terms of their teaching experiences no major difference was found among teachers in all three scales; namely, Instructional Leadership Behavior Scale, Learning Organization Scale and Self-Efficacy Scale.

Differences according to School Type

As relationships seem to differ among teachers with regard to the type of the school they are working in, it was sought to find out if there were the significant differences as regards school types.

Table 9. Differences according to School Type

Factors	School Type	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
General Efficacy	Self-Primary	270	43,46	0,54	4,68	192,90	.000*
Social Efficacy	Self-Secondary	130	39,98	0,76	3,93	220,95	.000
			38,99	0,82			
			35,69				

*p<0.001

Primary school teachers had significantly high self-efficacy scores than secondary school teachers. The differences were not significant in the other scales administered.

Discussion

Of the three scales tested for their models, the Instructional Leadership Behavior Scale developed by Şişman had sufficient model fit after the CFA was carried out, which shows the scale in its current form is a good measure of Instructional Leadership Behavior, at least for the teachers, the sample of this study. Learning Organization Scale also had a sufficient model fit. However, the Self-Efficacy scale did not have a sufficient model fit. But similar results have been seen in other studies as well.

Teachers had high General Self-Efficacy, but the lowest mean achieved was in the Individual

Mastery factor. This is somewhat interesting in that teachers seem to have higher self-efficacy but their mastery is somewhat lower compared to their self-efficacy.

In all dimensions of instructional leadership behavior, female teachers showed higher attitudes than males, contributing to earlier research, which presents conflicting results. For example, the study by Shaked, Gross, and Glanz (2017) showed that female principals had better instructional expertise and invested more attention to relationships. Shaked et. al. (2017) attribute this to the longer period female teachers spend on teaching. As for learning organization, Yiğit (2013) found male teachers and principals had higher means in learning organization scale and in two other studies (Şanal, 2009; Subaş, 2010) there were no differences with regard to gender. The study found primary school teachers had significantly high self-

efficacy scores than secondary school teachers, which may be attributed to the variety of courses and duties of branch teachers which increases the workload of teachers.

In the current study, there was no difference among teachers with regard to seniority/experience, but Subaş (2010) found attitudes (Individual Mastery, Shared Vision and Team Learning,) became positive as seniority increased. In Yiğit's study (2012) positive attitude towards Team Learning decreased but Shared Vision increased as seniority increased, but there was no difference in other dimensions. The reason for the lack of difference with regard to the experience may stem from the uniformity of the sample.

CFA results for Self-Efficacy yielded similar results with previous studies. Correlation between GSES and SSE was high as in other studies (Carrington, 1998). Social Self-Efficacy did not produce preliminary good results which may be attributed to the low number of items. Whereas, GSE had similar results to other researches, which confirmed the factor structure in the Turkish sample.

A study by Bellibaş and Liu (2017) showed a strong and positive connection between principals' perceived instructional leadership practice and the self-efficacy of teachers. In this same study, tenure status, gender, formal in-service training of teachers and experience were found to have a great impact on the self-efficacy perceptions of teachers. (Bellibaş & Liu, 2017).

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

The study is limited to a sample selected from a metropolitan city in central Turkey. Data from rural areas might give a different picture of what was found. Besides, the study is also limited to primary and regular school types and results from vocational or science schools might differ.

Another limitation is that the assessments (evaluation/measurement) were made using scales whose validity and reliability was studied in the Turkish context. To generalize the results it would be necessary to make cross-cultural comparisons. The relationship of the current measures with other similar measures could be investigated/ examined to provide more evidence of validity. To add to the literature on gender factor in educational institutions which give mixed results, comprehensive research on gender influence could be carried out.

It was found there were no differences with

regard to experience which may be due to the sample selection. Another study with a population from a wider spectrum of teachers might find differences.

References

- [1] Argyris, C. (1992). *On Organizational Learning*, Cambridge; MA Blackwell,
- [2] Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. ,
- [3] Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- [4] Bellibaş, M. Ş. & Liu, Y. (2017) "Multilevel analysis of the relationship between principals' perceived practices of instructional leadership and teachers' self-efficacy perceptions", *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(1), 49–69. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-12-2015-0116>
- [5] Bosscher, R. J., & Smit, J. H. (1998). Confirmatory factor analysis of General Self-Efficacy Scale. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 36, 339–343.
- [6] Carrington, E. M. (1998). "A Description of General Self-Efficacy and Specific Self-Efficacy for Health Promoting Practices in a Disabled Population" (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Grand Valley State University, MI. <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/theses/359>
- [7] Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new General Self-Efficacy Scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62–68.
- [8] Endler, N. S., Speer, R. L., Johnson, R. M., Flett, G. L. (2001). General self-efficacy and control in relation to anxiety and cognitive performance. *Social Spring*, 20(1), 36–52.
- [9] Gareis, C. R. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2005). Cultivating principals' sense of efficacy: supports that matter. In: The annual meeting of the university council for educational administration, Nashville, TN, 11 November 2005.
- [10] Garvin, D. A. (1993). Building a learning organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 71, 78 – 91.
- [11] Güçlü, N. & Türkoğlu, H. (2003). Perceptions of principals and teachers working in primary schools about the learning organization], *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1(2), 137–160.
- [12] Güler, M. (2008). Perceptions of personnel working in police force about Learning organization: The Case of Konya province]. [Unpublished Master's Thesis]: Selçuk

- University, Konya, TURKEY.
- [13] Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R.E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective*. (7th Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [14] Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2): 125–142.
- [15] Hallinger, P., Hosseingholizadeh, R., Hashemi, N. & Kouhsari, M. (2017). Do beliefs make a difference? Exploring how principal self-efficacy and instructional leadership impact teacher efficacy and commitment in Iran. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, XX(X), 1–22. doi: 10.1177/1741143217700283.
- [16] Hallinger, P. & Wang, W. C. (2015). *Assessing Instructional Leadership with the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer
- [17] Hallinger, P., Dongyu, L. & Wang, W. C. (2016). Gender differences in instructional leadership: A meta-analytic review of studies using the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(4), 567–601 doi: 10.1177/0013161X16638430
- [18] Holzberger, D., Philipp, A., Kunter, M. (2013). How teachers' self-efficacy is related to instructional quality: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105, 774–786. doi:10.1037/a0032198
- [19] Hoy, A. W. & Hoy, W. K. (2009). *Instructional leadership: A research-based guide to learning in schools*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- [20] Imam, S. S. (2007). Sherer et al. General Self-Efficacy Scale: Dimensionality, internal consistency, and temporal stability. *Proceedings of the Redesigning Pedagogy: Culture, Knowledge and Understanding Conference, Singapore*,
- [21] Jacob, R., Goddard, R., Kim, M., Miller, R., & Goddard, Y. (2014). Exploring the causal impact of the McREL Balanced Leadership Program on leadership, principal efficacy, instructional climate, educator turnover, and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 37(3), 314–332. doi: 10.3102/0162373714549620
- [22] Kim, J., Egan, T. & Tolson, H. (2015). Examining the Dimensions of the Learning Organization Questionnaire: A Review and Critique of Research Utilizing the DLOQ. *Human Resource Development Review*, 14(1), 91–112 doi: 10.1177/1534484314555402
- [23] Klassen, R. M. & Tze, V. M. C. (2014). Teachers' self-efficacy, personality, and teaching effectiveness: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 12, 59-76
- [24] Lucas, S. E. (2003). The development and impact of principal leadership self-efficacy in middle level schools: Beginning an inquiry. PhD Dissertation, University of Illinois at UrbanaChampaign, USA.
- [25] MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W. & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 1(2), 130-149. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.1.2.130>
- [26] McGill, M. E., Slocum, J. W., & Lei, D. (1992). Management practices in learning organizations. *Organizational Dynamics*, 21(1), 4–17.
- [27] Murphy, J., Neumerski, C. M., Goldring, E, Grissom, J. & Porter, A. (2016). Bottling fog? The quest for instructional management. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(4): 455–471.
- [28] Phillips, J. J. (Series Ed.), Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (Eds.). (1996). *In action, creating the learning organization* (Vol. 1). Alexandria, VA: ASTD.
- [29] Robinson, V. M. (2006). Putting education back into educational leadership. *Leading and Managing*, 12(1), 62–76.
- [30] Salner, M. (1999). Preparing for the learning organization. *Journal of Management Education*, 23(5), 489–508 Schwarzer, R. (Ed.) (1992). *Self-efficacy: Thought control of action*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- [31] Senge, P. M. (1990). The art and practice of the learning organization. The new paradigm in business: Emerging strategies for leadership and organizational change, 126–138. Retrieved from <http://www.giee.ntnu.edu.tw/files/archive/3809e53918d.pdf> Senge, P. M. (1990). <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-ibm/papers/Vol18-issue12/Version-1/D1812011824.pdf> *Journal of Business and Management*, 18(12), 18–24.
- [32] Shaked, H., Gross, Z. & Glanz, J. (2017). Between Venus and Mars: Sources of gender differences in instructional leadership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, X (XX), 1–19. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1741143217728086> doi:

- 10.1177/1741143217728086
- [33] Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The Self-Efficacy Scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports, 51*, 663-671.
- [34] Sherer, M. & Adams, C. (1983). The Self-Efficacy Scale: A Construct Validity Study. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association (29th, Atlanta, GA, March 23-26, 1983). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED233274.pdf>
- [35] Singer, S. C., Moore, S. J., Meterko, M. & Williams, S. (2012). Development of a Short-Form Learning Organization Survey: The LOS-27. *Medical Care Research and Review, 69*(4), 432-459 doi: 10.1177/1077558712448135
- [36] Song, J. H., Chai, D. S., Kim, J. & Bae, S. H. (2018). Job performance in the learning organization: The mediating impacts of self-efficacy and work engagement. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 30*(4), 249-271 <https://doi.org/10.1002/piq.21251>
- [37] Spillane, J.P., Harris, A., Jones, M. & Mertz, K. (2015). Opportunities and challenges for taking a distributed perspective: Novice school principals' emerging sense of their new position. *British Educational Research Journal, 41*(6), 1068-1085.
- [38] Subaş, A. (2010). *İlköğretim okullarında çalışan sınıf ve branş öğretmenlerinin öğrenen örgütü (okulu) algılamaları*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara University, İstanbul, TURKEY.
- [39] Şanal, E.E. (2009). *Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokullarında görevli akademik personelin öğrenen örgüt kültürüne ilişkin görüşleri*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi [Unpublished master's Thesis], Muğla University, Muğla, TURKEY.
- [40] Şişman, M. (2004). *Öğretim liderliği*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- [41] Tian, P. S. O., Hasking, P. & Phillips, L. (2007). A Comparison of General Self-Efficacy and Drinking Refusal Self-Efficacy in predicting drinking behavior. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 33*, 833-841.
- [42] Töremen, F. (1999). Devlet Liselerinde ve Özel Liselerde Örgütsel Öğrenme ve Engelleri, [Unpublished doctoral dissertation], Fırat University, Elazığ, TURKEY. <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/256451>
- [43] Türkoğlu, H. (2002). İlköğretim Okullarında Görev Yapan Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerin Öğrenen Organizasyona İlişkin Algıları, [Unpublished master's thesis], Gazi University, Ankara, TURKEY.
- [44] Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (1997). Dimensions of the Learning Organization Questionnaire Measurement instrument. Warwick, RI: Partners for the Learning Organization.
- [45] Woodruff, S. L., & Cashman, J. F. (1993). Task, domain, and general efficacy: A reexamination of the Self-Efficacy Scale. *Psychological Reports, 72*, 423-432.
- [46] Yadav, S. & Agarwal, V. (2016). Benefits and barriers of learning organization and its five discipline. *Journal of Business and Management, 18*(12), 18-24.
- [47] Yıldırım, F. ve İlhan, İ. Ö. (2010). Reliability and validity study of Turkish form of the General SelfEfficacy Scale. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi, 21*(4), 301-308. (Retrieved on 18-07-2018) <http://www.turkpsikiyatri.com/PDF/C21S4/301-308.pdf>
- [48] Yıldız, H. (2011). The perceptions of the teachers working in state and private primary schools related to learning organization: The case of Balıkesir Province. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Balıkesir University, Balıkesir, TURKEY.
- [49] Yiğit, Y. (2013). Relation between attitudes of teachers' knowledge management based on some of the variables and learning organization (school) perceptions. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Cumhuriyet University, Sivas, TURKEY.
- [50] Yu, C. Y. (2002). *Evaluating cutoff criteria of model fit indices for latent variable models with binary and continuous outcomes* Doctoral dissertation, University of California Los Angeles. <https://www.statmodel.com/download/Yudisertation.pdf>