

EĞİTİM YÖNETİCİLERİNİN YÖNETSEL BECERİLERİNE İLİŞKİN YÖNETİCİ VE ÖĞRETMEN ALGILARI VE BEKLENTİLERİ

TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS TOWARDS ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS*

Doç. Dr. Abdurrahman TANRIÖĞEN
Pamukkale University
Faculty of Education
Department of Educational Sciences

ABSTRACT

The administrative skills of educational administrators have been a subject of considerable debate and research in education. Many kinds of program are designed to improve school administrators' administrative capacities and skills. This study examines the administrative skills currently found among high school administrators, and teachers' and administrators' expectations concerning the ideal skills an administrator should have. The Administrative Skills Inventory (ASI) developed by the researcher was used to collect data. The results showed that while all the subjects' perceptions of the administrative skills of administrators' administrative skills were very low, expectations were very high.

ÖZET

Eğitim yöneticilerinin yönetsel becerileri eğitim alanında önemli tartışmalara neden olmuş ve konu üzerinde çeşitli araştırmalar yapılmıştır. Okul yöneticilerinin yönetsel kapasitelerini ve becerilerini geliştirme doğrultusunda çeşitli programlar tasarlanmıştır. Bu araştırmada, orta dereceli okul yöneticilerinin halen sahip oldukları ve sahip olmaları gereken beceriler, yönetici ve öğretmenlerin algıları ve beklentileri doğrultusunda belirlenmeye çalışılmaktadır. Bu araştırmanın verileri araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilen Yönetsel Beceri Envanteri (YBE) ile toplanmıştır. Araştırma sonuçları, tüm deneklerin mevcut yönetici becerilerine ilişkin algılarının oldukça düşük, beklentilerinin ise oldukça yüksek olduğunu göstermektedir.

INTRODUCTION

According to Chester I. Barnard (1971) any organization which achieves its goals can be considered "effective". So effectiveness is the life blood of organizations. In other words, for the continued existence of an organization, effectiveness is necessary. Therefore, educational research on school administration has recently been dominated by the concept of effectiveness. This intensification of research on effectiveness and effective schools has given rise to several theories about the factors within the school which can make a difference in students' learning experiences (Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer and Wisenbaker, 1979; Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger and Murphy, 1985). Researchers with this focus have paid particular attention to the administrative skills of the principals and school administrators, stating that they play a very important role in establishing and promoting instructional improvement within the organizational structure of schools (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan and Lee, 1982).

In almost all educational research on effective schools, the administrative skills of administrators and principals - including "a clear school mission", "instructional leadership", and "a climate of high expectations" have been stressed as the most important factor in improving teaching and learning experiences within the school systems (Cuban, 1990; Lunenburg and Ornstein, 1996). Other research carried out by NASSP Assessment Center also identified the importance of administrative skills such as "problem analysis", "judgment", "organizational ability", "decisiveness", "leadership", "sensitivity", "stress tolerance", "oral communication", "written communication", "range of interest", "personal motivation" and "educational values" in the more effective schools. (Sybout and Wendel, 1994).

The main responsibility of the school administration is to have effective schools. In order to reach this end, as seen in the educational literature, school administrators are expected to have some basic administrative skills.

* This research was supported by the Educational Research and Development Office of the Turkish Ministry of National Education. However, the findings, opinions, and recommendations expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Turkish Ministry of National Education.

The purpose of this research is to determine the expectations and perceptions of Turkish high school administrators and teachers towards the administrative skills of the administrators.

METHOD

This research was designed to provide a systematic analysis of the perceptions and expectations of high school teachers and administrators towards the administrative skills of educational administrators in Turkish high schools. There were four main research questions:

- 1- What are the levels of expectations of educators towards the administrative skills of school administrators?
- 2- Do these expectations differ according to selected demographic and professional variables?
- 3- To what extent do educational administrators currently perform administrative skills as perceived by high school administrators and teachers?
- 4- Do these perceptions of educators towards the administrative skills differ according to selected demographic and professional variables?

The Sample of the Study

In order to select the sample of the study, a list of cities was stratified according to seven geographical regions of Turkey. Three cities from each region and two high schools from each city (one urban and one rural) were selected randomly. By this procedure, the sample of the study was composed of 42 high schools and 630 educators working in these schools.

Questionnaire

The data of this study was collected by administering The Administrative Skills Inventory (ASI) which was developed by the researcher. As a first step in developing the ASI, an open ended question was directed to the administrators and teachers inquiring about their expectations towards the administrative skills of the school administrators. A random sample of 100 educators was asked to specify the most important skills a school administrator should have. The statements were tallied and in the selection process any statement mentioned by less than 25 percent of the subjects was omitted. This selection left 126 statements. The 126-item ASI was mailed to above-mentioned sample by the Ministry of National Education.

580 (92%) returned and appropriate questionnaires were taken into consideration for analysis and 580 subjects' responses to the 126 items were subjected to an item analysis. 18 non-contributing items (item-total correlation less than .30) were removed, resulting in the 108 item ASI used in this study.

These items in the ASI are framed positively and

represent perceptions and expectations of educators towards administrative skills. Each statement is rated on a five point Likert type scale ranging from "always" to "never" (5 for always, 4 for often, 3 for occasionally, 2 for seldom and 1 for never). The total scores on the 108 item ASI could range from 108 to 540.

To examine the dimensionality of the scale, both principal-factor analysis (PFA) and principal components analysis (PCA) were used and three factors were extracted. (Table I)

Table 1

Factor #	Eigenvalue	Pct of Variance	Cum pct
I	73.83160	58.6	58.6
II	5.11214	4.1	62.7
III	3.75882	3.0	65.6

The factors were rotated by the varimax method. Three factors were retained that accounted for 65.6 % of the common variance. The three interpretable factors were:

Factor I (Leadership), Factor II (Supervision) and Factor III (Planning and Decision Making). The factors' reliability coefficients are given in Table 2.

Table 2

Reliability Coefficients of Overall ASI and Factors

Overall ASI & Factors	Cronbach Alpha	Equal Length		Unequal
		Spearman-Brown	Gutman Split-Half	Length Spearman-Brown
Overall ASI	.9942	.9598	.9598	.9598
Factor I	.9879	.9734	.9730	.9734
Factor II	.9878	.9626	.9617	.9626
Factor III	.9837	.9697	.9677	.9697

N= 580

Factor I : Leadership (42 items)

Factor II : Supervision (38 items)

Factor III : Planning and Decision-Making (28 items)

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Findings about the first research problem

The analysis of 580 subjects' responses to the 108 items shows that educators' expectations towards the administrative skills of school administrators can be grouped into three factors: Factor I : Leadership, Factor II: Supervision and Factor III: Planning and Decision-Making. The factor loading of these three factors is given in the Appendixes A, B and C.

The expectation levels of the subjects towards the administrative skills of the school administrators in three

factors are given in the Appendixes D, E and F. As seen in the Appendixes D, E and F, the administrative skills clustered under the Leadership, Supervision and Planning/Decision-Making factors should be performed "always" according to the educators. In other words, Turkish educators' perceptions related to the administrative skills of the school administrators were found very high. Depending on this finding, we can say that Turkish educators (high school teachers and administrators) are aware of the importance of administrative skills in order to offer effective teaching and learning experiences for the students.

Findings about the second research problem

In order to find out if there were significant differences between the educators' expectations in terms of their titles, gender and the region in which they work, the independent sample t-test technique was employed. The t-test results are given in the following tables.

As we can understand from Table 3, although there are statistically significant differences between the expectations of teachers and administrators on the Overall ASI, Factor 1 (leadership) and Factor 3 (Planning and Decision-Making), there is no significant difference between the expectations of teachers and administrators

on Factor 2 (Supervision). The teachers' expectations towards the administrative skills on the Leadership, and Planning & Decision-Making factors, are higher than the expectations of the administrators. In general, the expectations of the administrators were found to be higher than the teachers' expectations on the overall ASI. No difference was found between the teachers' and administrators' expectations on Factor 2 (Supervision). This means that teachers and administrators expect the same administrative skills from the school administrators.

As seen in the Table 4, because all "p" values are bigger than .05, there are no statistically significant differences between the expectations of male and female subjects on the overall ASI and factors. These findings may indicate that gender is not an effective factor in the expectations of the subjects.

There is a statistically significant difference between the expectations of urban and rural educators on the overall ASI. As we can see in the table, the expectations of the educators working for rural high schools have relatively higher scores (509.1222) on the overall ASI then the scores of educators (496.1086) working for the urban schools. This may indicate that the educators working for rural high school expect more administrative skills from the school administrators than the educators

Table 3

Means, standard deviations, t values of expectation scores in terms of the titles of the subjects.

Expectations	Teachers (N=331)		Administrators (N=249)		t	p
	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd		
Overall ASI	494.5257	49.888	509.7631	31.033	-4.52*	.000
Factor 1	126.6042	45.148	116.1526	49.649	2.61*	.009
Factor 2	106.2659	43.105	103.3614	41.388	.82	.414
Factor 3	85.6495	28.779	77.8675	33.084	2.96*	.003

*p<.05

Table 4

Means, standard deviations, t values of expectation scores in terms of the gender of the subjects.

Expectations	Males (N=337)		Females (N=243)		t	p
	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd		
Overall ASI	503.5341	37.829	497.1213	50.293	1.67	.097
Factor 1	122.3561	48.284	121.6569	46.279	.17	.862
Factor 2	107.1039	42.665	101.9038	41.956	1.45	.147
Factor 3	83.1721	30.695	81.2092	31.231	.75	.453

Table 5

Means, standard deviations, t values of expectation scores in terms of the geographical regions of the subjects.

Perceptions	Educators working for urban schools (N=359)		Educators working for rural schools (N=221)		t	p
	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd		
Overall ASI	496.1086	48.745	509.1222	31.574	3.90*	.000
Factor 1	122.7493	50.947	45.098	50.947	-.40	.691
Factor 2	102.9471	41.980	108.3846	42.864	1.50	.133
Factor 3	82.6852	29.640	81.6968	32.940	-.36	.716

*p<.05

working for urban high schools. There were no significant differences found between the expectations of the subject groups towards the factors.

Findings concerning the third research problem

The third research problem was formed as follows: "To what extent do educational administrators currently perform administrative skills as perceived by high school administrators and teachers?" In order to answer this research question the tables in Appendixes B, C and D have been formed. As we can see from the tables, in general, administrative skills are currently being performed "occasionally" by the school administrators according to the perceptions of the educators. But some administrative skills, including item 72 (To reward the staff socially or economically for their contributions to the school in order to increase their level of productivity and morale), item 74 (To know and understand the personal needs of staff members), item 54 (To analyze the data of the performances considering the staff's personal, environmental and administrative factors), item 73 (To use rewards more than punishment as a motivator), item 55 (To use valid and reliable measuring instruments in order to measure performances) and item 47 (To consult his/her staff in determining the evaluation standards) have been rated as "seldom" by the educators.

The findings indicate that both school administrators and teachers working for Turkish high schools have very high expectations towards the administrative skills of the educational administration, and teachers and administrators think that school administrators rated very low in their performance of administrative skills, especially within the supervision factor. The low motivation levels of the Turkish school administrator can

be the reason of this inconvenience. The school administrators might have thought that supervision was the responsibility of the supervisors who visit the school from time to time to supervise the teachers. This understanding can also be a factor in their low performances in the supervision.

Findings about the fourth research problem

For the fourth problem of the study, the data was analyzed by using the independent sample t-test technique. The following tables show the t-test results related to the perceptions of the subjects, in terms of their titles, gender and the regions in which they work.

The t-tests results given in Table 6, show that the differences between the mean scores of teachers' and administrators' on overall ASI, Factor 1 (Leadership) and Factor 3 (Planning and Decision-Making) were found to be statistically significant. But no significant difference between their perception scores on Factor 2 (Supervision) was calculated. In the light of these findings, we can say that Turkish high school teachers and administrators have different perceptions towards the administrative skills as currently performed by school administrators. For instance, teachers' perception scores in the overall ASI, Factor 1 and Factor 3 are much higher than the administrators' perception scores on the same dimensions. This indicates that Turkish school administrators perceive their own administrative skills currently being performed, as very low. Teachers and administrators' perceptions within the Supervision dimension were found to be similar to each other.

As seen in Table 7, no statistically significant difference was found between male and female educators in terms of their perception scores on overall ASI, Factor 1 (Leadership), Factor 2c (Supervision) and Factor 3

Table 6

Means, standard deviations, t values of perception scores in terms of the titles of the subjects.

Perceptions	Teachers (N=331)		Administrators (N=249)		t	p
	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd		
Overall ASI	315.2447	109.065	294.5582	117.499	2.16*	.031
Factor 1	126.6042	45.148	116.1526	49.649	2.61*	.009
Factor 2	106.2659	43.105	103.3614	41.388	.82	.414
Factor 3	85.6495	28.779	77.8675	33.084	2.96*	.003

*p<.05

Table 7

Means, standard deviations, t values of perception scores in terms of the gender of the subjects.

Perceptions	Males (N=33)		Females (N=243)		t	p
	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd		
Overall ASI	309.5460	114.315	301.6946	111.682	.82	.413
Factor 1	122.3561	48.284	121.6569	46.279	.17	.862
Factor 2	107.1039	42.665	101.9038	41.956	1.45	.147
Factor 3	83.1721	30.695	81.2092	31.231	.75	.453

(Planning and Decision-Making). In other words, male and female educators perceive the administrative skills which are currently being performed in Turkish high schools in the same way. This can be an indicator that gender is not an effective variable on the perceptions of the educators towards the administrative skills of the school administrators.

According to the independent sample t-tests scores given in Table 8, no statistically significant difference was found between the subjects perception scores in the overall ASI, Factor 1 (Leadership), Factor 2 (Supervision) and Factor 3 (Planning and

Factor 2 (Supervision). The expectations of the administrators were found to be higher than the teachers' expectations on the overall ASI.

4- Gender was found as a variable which did not affect the expectations of the subjects towards administrative skills of the school administrators.

5- A statistically significant difference between the expectations of urban and rural educators on the overall ASI was found. The expectations of the educators working for rural high schools had relatively higher scores on the overall ASI.

Table 8

Means, standard deviations, t values of perception scores in terms of the geographical regions of the subjects.

Perceptions	Educators working for urban schools (N=359)		Educators working for rural schools (N=221)		t	p
	Mean	Sd	Mean	Sd		
Overall ASI	305.2479	108.774	308.1765	120.097	.30	.768
Factor 1	122.7493	45.098	121.0905	50.947	-.40	.691
Factor 2	102.9471	41.980	108.3846	42.864	1.50	.133
Factor 3	82.6852	29.640	81.6968	32.940	-.36	.716

Decision-Making). This means that educators working in urban schools and in rural schools have similar perceptions towards the administrative skills of the school administrators as they are currently being practiced. This can also be an indicator that the geographical region in which educators work is not an effective independent variable on the educators perceptions.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The following conclusions and recommendations were developed after analyzing the data collected from the educators working for Turkish high schools:

1- According to the expectations of Turkish educators, the administrative skills which should be practiced by the educational administrators have been grouped under the following three factors: (1) Leadership, (2) Supervision and (3) Planning and Decision-Making.

2- Turkish educators (teachers and administrators) have very high expectations towards the administrative skills of the educational administrators in all three factors. However, they think that the school administrators who are currently working for Turkish high schools are not performing these skills up to their expectations.

3- Statistically significant differences between the expectations of teachers and administrators on the overall ASI, Factor 1 (Leadership) and Factor 3 (Planning and Decision-Making) were found, but there was no significant difference between their expectation scores on

6- The administrative skills which were listed in the ASI are currently being performed "occasionally" by the school administrators according to the perceptions of the educators. Some administrative skills such as items 72, 74, 54, 73, 55 and 47 have been rated as "seldom" by the educators.

7- Statistically significant differences were found between the perceptions of teachers and administrators on the overall ASI, Factor 1 (Leadership) and Factor 3 (Planning and Decision-Making), and no significant difference between their perception scores on the Factor 2 (Supervision). The expectations of the teachers were found to be higher than the administrators' perceptions on the overall ASI, Factor 1 and Factor 3.

8- Gender was found as a variable which did not affect the perceptions of the subjects towards administrative skills of the school administrators.

9- The educators working in urban schools and in rural schools have similar perceptions towards the administrative skills of the school administrators as they are currently being practiced.

Recommendations

1- Administration is a profession which requires some basic skills. In the Turkish educational system, the school administrators are chosen by criteria of seniority among the teachers. This should be stopped immediately. In order to have more effective schools, the school administrators should have formal university education on school administration.

2- In-service education programs concerning school administration should be organized by the Ministry of National Education for all school administrators who are currently working in the Turkish Educational System. The content of these programs should be related to the topics which assist the administrators in performing their roles in the schools.

3- More authority and responsibility should be given to the administrators in order to increase their level of morale. Especially it should be stressed that instructional supervision is the main responsibility of the school administrators not the main responsibility of the supervisors coming from the central office of the Ministry of National Education.

REFERENCES

Barnard, Chester I. (1971) *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Bossert, S.T., Dwyer, D.C., Rowan, B. And Lee, G.V., (1982 Summer), "The Instructional Management

Role of the Principal", *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol.18, No:3, 34-64.

Brookover, W., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., and Wisenbaker, J. (1979). *School Social Systems and Student Achievement: Schools can Make a Difference*. New York: Praeger.

Cuban, Larry (1990), "Reforming Again, Again, and Again," *Educational Researcher*, 19, 3-13.

Edmonds, R. (1979, October). "Effective schools for the urban poor", *Educational Leadership*, 37, 15-24.

Hallinger, P., and Murphy, J. (1985) "Assessing the instructional Management behavior of principals". *Elementary School Journal*, 86, 217-242.

Lunenburg, Fred C. And Ornstein, Allan C. (1996). *Educational Administration : Concepts and Practice*. Second Edition, New York: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Sybouts, Ward and Wendel, Frederick C. (1994). *The Training and Development of School Principals: A Handbook*. Wastport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

APPENDIX A

The expectations and perceptions level of all subjects towards the leadership (Factor I) skills of educational administrators

1.00 - 1.79 3.40 - 4.19	Never Often	1.80 - 2.59 4.20 - 5.00	Seldom Always	2.60 - 3.39	Occasionally			
FACTOR I LEADERSHIP		Factor loadings	EXPECTATIONS (How often they should do this)		PERCEPTIONS (How often they do this in practice)			
ITEMS OF ASI			M	Sd	Level	M	Sd	Level
115. To treat all the members of the school with the same kindness and justice		.62	4.74	.56	Always	2.81	1.44	Occasionally
116. To encourage all members of the school to conceive and carry out their ideas		.65	4.70	.56	Always	2.79	1.40	Occasionally
106. To determine the tasks and responsibilities of all the units in the school clearly and definitely		.71	4.70	.55	Always	2.91	1.38	Occasionally
103. To make the staff understand and accept the goals of the school		.70	4.70	.55	Always	3.00	1.35	Occasionally
113. To provide a sense of unity and togetherness among the staff		.69	4.69	.60	Always	2.98	1.41	Occasionally
104. To give the staff working in the school appropriate tasks fitting their knowledge, skills and past experiences.		.65	4.69	.57	Always	2.81	1.37	Occasionally
107. To make the staff obey the predetermined rules and regulations.		.70	4.67	.60	Always	3.02	1.39	Occasionally
114. To provide an effective communication network among the interrelated tasks and positions in the school		.69	4.47	.57	Always	2.91	1.43	Occasionally
101. To determine the tasks to be done in detail in the school		.68	4.67	.60	Always	2.98	1.38	Occasionally
105. To divide up the tasks or work of the school among the staff in a balanced way		.65	4.67	.60	Always	2.75	1.39	Occasionally
102. To group the tasks and work in the school according to their similarities		.69	4.67	.58	Always	3.02	1.33	Occasionally
112. To ensure that everything (and everyone) should have a place and everything (and everyone) should be in its place		.68	4.66	.58	Always	2.94	1.37	Occasionally

100. To check whether the upward and downward messages reached their targets	.67	4.65	.60	Always	2.83	1.35	Occasionally
88. To be a good listener in the communication process	.63	4.64	.61	Always	2.97	1.35	Occasionally
117. To make them be aware of each others' activities by setting up meetings with the staff working in certain units in the school	.60	4.64	.63	Always	2.74	1.36	Occasionally
123. To have a co-operation appropriate for the goal and plans among the units and members of the school	.67	4.64	.58	Always	2.82	1.34	Occasionally
108. To give the staff authorities equal to their responsibilities	.68	4.64	.60	Always	2.89	1.37	Occasionally
109. To define clearly the relationship among all levels in the organizational hierarchy	.69	4.64	.62	Always	3.00	1.32	Occasionally
97. To communicate the information which interests the staff directly, in time	.67	4.64	.61	Always	2.89	1.40	Occasionally
126. To determine open and clear rules and regulations in order to make the staff have effective co-ordination activities	.66	4.63	.63	Always	2.74	1.36	Occasionally
111. To modify the goals of the school in the light of changing social, economic, cultural, legal and technological conditions	.67	4.63	.62	Always	2.79	1.33	Occasionally
99. To use the formal communication channels at the right time and in the right place in order to reduce grapevine	.67	4.62	.62	Always	2.84	1.39	Occasionally
93. To send messages to all members who are concerned	.70	4.62	.63	Always	2.89	1.38	Occasionally
92. To form clear and open messages by using words and symbols which could be understood by the receivers	.65	4.62	.67	Always	2.89	1.33	Occasionally
110. To give a chance to the staff members to participate in the decision-making process	.65	4.62	.64	Always	2.77	1.35	Occasionally
85. To make the tasks of the staff more enjoyable and easier	.54	4.62	.64	Always	2.76	1.32	Occasionally
87. To establish an effective communication system between the organization and its environment	.61	4.61	.63	Always	2.77	1.28	Occasionally
119. To control constantly the coordinated works of the members among themselves and with other groups	.69	4.61	.63	Always	2.78	1.31	Occasionally
98. To keep open not only the formal but also the informal communication channels	.64	4.61	.62	Always	2.81	1.34	Occasionally
94. To consider and use communication as a means in achieving organizational goals	.67	4.60	.62	Always	2.84	1.35	Occasionally
96. To select the most appropriate communication channel to transmit messages effectively	.63	4.59	.63	Always	2.79	1.33	Occasionally
89. To make it possible for subordinates to communicate their demands and complaints to the higher levels of the system	.54	4.59	.68	Always	2.80	1.38	Occasionally
121. To form inner regulations (communication and knowledge systems) which improve and provide a flow of knowledge among the staff.	.65	4.59	.65	Always	2.73	1.34	Occasionally
125. To ensure the coordination of various units in order to solve the various problems which occur from time to time in the organization	.64	4.58	.67	Always	2.68	1.29	Occasionally
84. To develop consistent procedures with each other related to the routine tasks performed in the organization	.57	4.57	.67	Always	2.95	1.29	Occasionally
122. To select a coordinator or a unit of coordination which will organize and evaluate coordinated activities	.64	4.57	.64	Always	2.72	1.35	Occasionally
124. To stress the importance of working in coordination in the organization whenever possible	.68	4.57	.68	Always	2.75	1.35	Occasionally
86. To consider the characteristics of the receiver in the communication process	.59	4.56	.66	Always	2.71	1.26	Occasionally

90. To be in a face-to-face interaction with the staff quite often	.58	4.56	.67	Always	2.88	1.36	Occasionally
95. To use the gestures appropriate to the content of the messages	.68	4.56	.70	Always	2.84	1.27	Occasionally
120. To work in coordination with the representatives of similar organization by gathering at certain times	.67	4.56	.64	Always	2.75	1.33	Occasionally
91. To recognize and prevent the factors which affect communication negatively	.61	4.53	.73	Always	2.78	1.30	Occasionally

APPENDIX B

The expectations and perceptions level of all subjects towards the Supervision (Factor II) skills of educational administrators

1.00 - 1.79 3.40 - 4.19	Never Often	1.80 - 2.59 4.20 - 5.00	Seldom Always	2.60 - 3.39	Occasionally			
FACTOR I LEADERSHIP		Factor loadings	EXPECTATIONS (How often they should perform this)			PERCEPTIONS (How often they perform this in practice)		
ITEMS OF ASI			M	Sd	Level	M	Sd	Level
81. To give importance and show interest to the staff's personal rights		.57	4.68	.64	Always	2.78	1.45	Occasionally
80. To respect the staff and to treat them as colleagues		.62	4.67	.67	Always	2.78	1.41	Occasionally
57. To evaluate the staff considering their tasks, authorities and responsibilities		.64	4.67	.61	Always	2.78	1.41	Occasionally
76. To provide possibilities of progress and promotion for the staff members in their profession		.69	4.64	.65	Always	2.63	1.36	Occasionally
77. To trust the staff and to make them feel this		.66	4.64	.64	Always	2.77	1.38	Occasionally
79. To have a sincere interest in the staff's problems and maintain close human relations		.63	4.63	.64	Always	2.76	1.34	Occasionally
34. To be friendly with the subordinates		.40	4.63	.61	Always	3.05	1.41	Occasionally
82. To determine rules which regulate the organizational behavior and enforce these consistently		.54	4.63	.64	Always	2.81	1.37	Occasionally
61. To believe that evaluation is not an end but a means of professional improvement		.61	4.62	.64	Always	2.74	1.39	Occasionally
56. To point out not only the weaknesses of the staff but the tasks performed as well in the evaluation process		.66	4.62	.67	Always	2.72	1.34	Occasionally
59. To establish reliable relations with the staff in the evaluation process		.65	4.61	.67	Always	2.79	1.35	Occasionally
53. To collect reliable, unbiased and sufficient data to measure and evaluate the performances of the staff		.67	4.60	.65	Always	2.61	1.37	Occasionally
68. To encourage the staff towards their professional progress and improvement		.67	4.60	.72	Always	2.62	1.33	Occasionally
71. To make each member of the organization realize his/her contributions to the school		.66	4.59	.67	Always	2.70	1.34	Occasionally
70. To provide efficient and sufficient working conditions for the staff		.65	4.59	.71	Always	2.67	1.36	Occasionally
83. To determine realistic expectations related to the performances of the staff		.54	4.59	.65	Always	2.76	1.29	Occasionally
72. To reward the staff socially or economically for their contributions to the school in order to increase their level of productivity and morale		.66	4.59	.71	Always	2.56	1.32	Seldom
62. To compare the predetermined evaluation standards with the outcomes at the end of the evaluation process		.58	4.58	.64	Always	2.71	1.30	Occasionally
75. To determine the positive staff performances and to improve the negative ones		.66	4.58	.70	Always	2.66	1.29	Occasionally

63. To understand whether deviations from standards are caused by personal abilities or some other forces (e.g. high expectation standards)	.61	4.58	.68	Always	2.66	1.31	Occasionally
78. To evaluate the staff objectively	.63	4.57	.68	Always	2.59	1.30	Occasionally
74. To know and understand the personal needs of staff members	.66	4.57	.70	Always	2.59	1.30	Seldom
60. To use various techniques and instruments appropriate to the goals and situations	.65	4.56	.68	Always	2.70	1.33	Occasionally
66. To provide feedback which propose solutions to the problems of the staff	.65	4.56	.70	Always	2.64	1.31	Occasionally
52. To determine the evaluation standards which specify which tasks should be performed, by whom, how, when and in which order	.58	4.56	.67	Always	2.73	1.30	Occasionally
58. To evaluate the staff not only at the end but also at certain other periods	.45	4.55	.68	Always	2.79	1.29	Occasionally
64. To give feedback to the staff related to both their positive and negative performances	.67	4.55	.68	Always	2.70	1.29	Occasionally
65. To give feedback on the behavior rather than the person	.63	4.54	.70	Always	2.73	1.31	Occasionally
48. To state the evaluation standards very simply and clearly	.54	4.54	.65	Always	2.73	1.31	Occasionally
54. To analyze the data of the performances considering the staff's personal, environmental and administrative factors	.66	4.53	.72	Always	2.58	1.37	Seldom
73. To use rewards more than punishment as a motivator	.67	4.53	.76	Always	2.57	1.29	Seldom
67. To organize in-service training in order to improve staff's knowledge, skills and attitudes	.59	4.52	.78	Always	2.62	1.29	Occasionally
55. To use valid and reliable measuring instruments in order to measure performance	.66	4.51	.71	Always	2.53	1.34	Seldom
49. To have measurable performance standards	.62	4.50	.74	Always	2.66	1.26	Occasionally
51. To form evaluation standards which do not exceed the staff's capacities and skills	.62	4.48	.75	Always	2.60	1.27	Occasionally
50. To ensure the evaluation standards are accepted by the staff as well	.60	4.48	.69	Always	2.69	1.31	Occasionally
47. To consult his/her staff in determining the evaluation standards	.61	4.43	.75	Always	2.56	1.27	Seldom
46. To determine standards in order to evaluate the performances	.53	4.38	.78	Always	2.63	1.25	Occasionally

APPENDIX C

The expectations and perceptions level of all subjects towards the Planning and Decision-Making (Factor III) skills of educational administrators

1.00 - 1.79 3.40 - 4.19	Never Often	1.80 - 2.59 4.20 - 5.00	Seldom Always	2.60 - 3.39	Occasionally			
ITEMS OF ASI	FACTOR I LEADERSHIP	Factor loadings	EXPECTATIONS (How often they should perform this)			PERCEPTIONS (How often they perform in practice this)		
			M	Sd	Level	M	Sd	Level
20. To implement the decision made, in time		.65	4.69	.58	Always	3.14	1.37	Occasionally
1. To notice problems in the school		.72	4.65	.62	Always	3.02	1.32	Occasionally
19. To make a clear implementation plan about the decision made and give it to the application agents		.70	4.64	.62	Always	3.06	1.41	Occasionally
27. To ensure that all staff understand the goals of the school		.56	4.64	.64	Always	3.06	1.36	Occasionally
18. To explain the goals and objectives of the school very clearly		.68	4.63	.67	Always	3.18	1.41	Occasionally

26. To inform the role expectations and responsibilities to the staff	.58	4.63	.64	Always	3.12	1.39	Occasionally
15. To consider how it will affect the school when each alternative is applied	.71	4.62	.65	Always	3.09	1.41	Occasionally
22. To detect and take the necessary precautions related to problems in the implementation process of plan/decisions	.66	4.61	.64	Always	2.93	1.33	Occasionally
5. To define the problems clearly	.71	4.60	.70	Always	2.86	1.30	Occasionally
4. To consult with staff members and experts regarding the problems in the school	.67	4.60	.68	Always	2.77	1.33	Occasionally
14. To consider if there are any legal, social and ethical constraints for each alternative	.68	4.60	.66	Always	3.08	1.42	Occasionally
21. To monitor closely the implementation process of the plan/decision	.66	4.60	.70	Always	3.08	1.35	Occasionally
3. To understand the problem by analyzing and interpreting reliable and scientific data	.73	4.59	.70	Always	2.77	1.38	Occasionally
24. To evaluate the implementation process of the plan/decision in collaboration with the staff	.65	4.59	.66	Always	2.77	1.31	Occasionally
2. To collect data related to problems in the school	.72	4.58	.75	Always	2.94	1.33	Occasionally
25. To explain the outcomes of plans/decisions to everybody in the school	.64	4.58	.67	Always	2.88	1.32	Occasionally
16. To determine measurable objectives towards the solution of the organizational problems	.71	4.57	.67	Always	2.92	1.35	Occasionally
9. To collect detailed information in order to determine rational alternatives	.72	4.57	.67	Always	2.79	1.33	Occasionally
7. To determine all potential solutions to the problems	.69	4.56	.69	Always	2.86	1.35	Occasionally
23. To analyze the outcomes of plans/decisions and to compare them with goals and objectives	.62	4.56	.66	Always	2.93	1.29	Occasionally
6. To assist the staff to understand the problems	.68	4.56	.70	Always	2.78	1.33	Occasionally
13. To specify the human and material resources which will be used for each alternative	.69	4.54	.67	Always	2.90	1.31	Occasionally
10. To indicate both the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative	.70	4.54	.72	Always	2.76	1.31	Occasionally
17. To determine goals which do not contradict with other goals of the school	.71	4.51	.76	Always	2.90	1.33	Occasionally
11. To anticipate all possible outcomes of each alternative	.66	4.48	.72	Always	2.79	1.26	Occasionally
8. To consider the past experiences of the school while he/she is listing the potential solutions to the problems	.67	4.47	.78	Always	2.87	1.33	Occasionally