

2016

πύ Greek School Principals Efficacy Beliefs on Teacher Performance Evaluation

Kaltsonoudi, Kalliope

Journal of Teacher Education and Educators

<http://hdl.handle.net/11728/9633>

Downloaded from HEPHAESTUS Repository, Neapolis University institutional repository

Greek School Principals' Efficacy Beliefs on Teacher Performance Evaluation

Yunan Okul Müdürlerinin Öğretmenlerin Performanslarını Değerlendirmeye Yönelik Yeterlik İnançları

(Received January 12, 2016 – Approved April 14, 2016)

Kalliope Kaltsonoudi¹, Anastasia Athanasoula-Reppa²

Abstract

This study, through quantitative approach, aims to determine the level of Greek school principals' self-efficacy (SE) beliefs regarding their new role as evaluators of their teaching staff. It also aims to examine how these principals' specific evaluative efficacy (SEE) relates to their: a) general self-efficacy (GSE), b) generalized leadership efficacy (GLE), and c) evaluation's expected results (EER). The sample of the study consisted of 151 principals working in the Primary and Secondary Education of a large region in Athens, in the autumn of 2014. The survey's results show that the principals report a quite high level of GSE and GLE but a lower level concerning SEE. The principals' educational level raises the perceived SEE. The survey's variables are positively correlated with each other. Finally, GSE compared to GLE, constitutes a better predictor model for SEE. Results are discussed along with implications and suggestions for further research and for enhancing efficacy.

Keywords: School principal, teacher evaluation, general & specific self-efficacy, generalized leadership efficacy, expected results

Öz

Yunanistan Eğitiminde, okul müdürleri öğretmenleri değerlendirecek kadar kendilerine güvenmekte midir? Bu araştırma nicel bir yaklaşımla, okul müdürleri için yeni olan öğretim kadrosunu değerlendirme rollerini de göz önünde bulundurarak, okul müdürlerinin öz-yeterlik (ÖY) inançlarının düzeyini belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma aynı zamanda okul müdürlerinin özgül değerlendirme yeterlikleri (ÖDY) ile (a) genel öz-yeterlikleri (GÖY), (b) genelleştirilmiş liderlik yeterlikleri (GLY) ve (c) değerlendirmenin beklenen sonuçları (DBS) arasında nasıl bir ilişkinin olduğunu incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırmanın örneklemini, 2014 Güz döneminde Atina'nın büyük bir bölgesinde yer alan ilköğretim ve ortaöğretim kurumlarında çalışan 151 okul müdüründen oluşmaktadır. Ölçeklerden elde edilen bulgulara göre, okul müdürlerinin GÖY ve GLY düzeyleri yüksek iken, ÖDY düzeyleri düşüktür. Okul müdürlerinin eğitim seviyesi arttıkça algılanan ÖDY artmaktadır. Ölçekte yer alan değişkenler birbirleriyle pozitif yönlü ilişkilidir. Son olarak GÖY GLY ile kıyaslandığında, ÖDY'yi daha iyi yordayan bir model oluşturmaktadır. Sonuçlar, gelecek araştırmalar ve yeterliği geliştirmek için yapılan çıkarımlar ve önerilerle birlikte tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Okul müdürü, öğretmen değerlendirme, genel & özgül öz-yeterlik, genelleştirilmiş liderlik yeterliği, beklenen sonuçlar

¹ Department of Primary Education, University of Thessaly, Volos, Greece – e-mail: kellykalt@yahoo.gr

² Hellenic Open University, Patra, Greece - e-mail: areppa54@gmail.com

Introduction

Principals of contemporary Greek schools face unprecedented challenges as they are called to evaluate teachers. They struggle to adapt to increasing changes regarding the upgrade of the provided educational quality. Quality, in the latest years, as a request and priority, appears to accompany every public discourse in the Greek educational setting. However, from the fall of dictatorship and the restoration of democracy in 1974 until the present day, the many educational reform attempts and the numerous laws and regulatory acts appear to be quite fragmentary and conflicting. The educational planning that has occasionally happened is deprived of a long term development horizon and mainly lacks the terms and conditions of educational quality and efficiency. For over 30 years, since the abolishment of the “Institution of Inspector”² in 1982 (Andreou & Papakonstantinou, 1994), governments have kept the many institutionalized laws and practices regarding evaluation of teaching work in abeyance (Athanasoula-Reppa, 2005, as cited in Papakonstantinou & Anastasiou, 2013). While laws are passed in parliament, they are never implemented in the school system due to continuous pressure exerted by teachers’ trade unions against governments. These unions characteristically claim that the outdated method of Inspector’s evaluation has such “burdened heredity” that they denounce any effort for educational evaluation as an unacceptable incarnation of the spirit of the authoritarian state. For decades, Greek teacher evaluation seems to be so difficult to implement that it resembles a Sisyphean task or a Herculean challenge. However, once the economic crisis struck the country, political authorities, as being supervised by the European Commission (EC) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) through Memorandums of Understanding (MOU), were obliged to override the abundance of inactive laws and to directly implement in practice a standardized form of educational evaluation.

Thus, under the concern for improving the quality of provided public education, the indirect pressure from international organizations (EU, UNESCO, OECD) (Dimitropoulos, 2002), the direct pressure exerted by the EC and the IMF, and according to contemporary educational theories, the Odyssey of teacher evaluation resulted in the introduction and implementation of the supplementary/illustrative Presidential Degree 152/2013: “*Teacher evaluation of primary and secondary education*”. According to its legislative framework, *administrative evaluation* – called “*Official Consistency and Efficiency*”- is part of teachers’ overall evaluation and is carried out by the school principal. He is responsible to evaluate teachers in three dimensions: (a) typical staff case obligations, (b) participation in school unit’s operation and its self-evaluation, (c) communication and cooperation with parents and stakeholders. Excellent information,

² “Institution of Inspector” is the most criticized method of teachers’ evaluation in the Greek educational history. It has been denounced for cruelty, unfairness, political interweaving, and non-pedagogical orientation.

knowledge, skills, and the appropriate training concerning evaluative issues are prerequisites for principal's effectiveness. Is that enough? The initial questions that caused research interest refer to "*whether Greek school principals feel confident enough to evaluate teachers*" and "*how they perceive their new role in the school context*".

As mentioned above, teacher evaluation comes at extremely difficult socio-economic conjunctures and political upheavals for Greece with strong elements of restructuring, dispute, and therefore, disruption even in educational setting. As the resistance to change is given (Fullan, 2007) especially when change is imposed upon teachers not only by the central political authority but also by external forces or institutions (EU, OECD), the role of the school principal as evaluator has been strongly criticized by many people from inside and outside educational sector, even by principals themselves. Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin and Bernstein (1985) mention that one of the major problems in assessment practices is the conflict of roles that principals may experience. Making things more complex, the implemented standardized evaluation system (P.D. 152/2013), despite the strong declaration of its formative nature and orientation (Matsagouras, Gialouris & Kouloumparitsi, 2014), definitely, incorporates features of summative assessment regarding grading and salary stagnation or promotion, including dismissal or removal from teaching profession. Therefore, school principals, inevitably, are expected to successfully cope with a number of different and perhaps conflicting areas of functioning, challenging not only their knowledge and skills but perhaps even more importantly, the self-conceptualizations of their leadership capabilities and psychological resources to respond to the ever increasing demands of their roles (Avolio & Luthans, 2006).

Empirical studies (i.e., Fisher, 2014; McCullers & Bozeman, 2010; Savvides, 2008) claim that the way school leaders are acting is guided by their beliefs of efficacy. Sense of efficacy is a central factor in motivational, learning, and self-regulative processes that govern performance on complex tasks. Self-efficacy (SE) is defined as people's judgments of their capabilities to "*organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances*" (Bandura, 1986, p. 391).

Efficacy has been broadly analyzed and explored in depth in various fields (i.e., Gist & Mitchell, 1992; Painter, 2000; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). However, empirical studies and research evidence in the Greek hierarchical and deeply centralized educational system are few. Moreover, principal efficacy regarding teacher evaluation is a rather unexplored field. This study contributes to the inexistent or limited body of research on Greek principal efficacy beliefs and seeks to discover how they affect effective evaluation and thus, teacher improvement.

Theoretical Framework

Successful leadership behavior relies upon an array of skills, knowledge, as well as intentions, dispositions, and motives, the organization of which revolves around efficacy beliefs. The concept of SE derives from Albert Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory (SCT), which integrates social/environmental and cognitive elements in specific behaviors through self-regulatory mechanisms (Luthans, 2008). Bandura (1986) determined four sources that contribute to SE formation: (a) mastery experi-

ence and performance attainment, (b) vicarious experience and modeling, (c) symbolic experience through social/verbal persuasion, and (d) physical and psychological arousal.

Specific vs General Self-efficacy

Scholars distinguish efficacy beliefs in a specific or a general dimension. Specific self-efficacy (SSE) relates to Bandura's original (1986) portrayal of SE (Luthans, 2008), and is considered to be a momentary state or a situational product subjected to transient influences and tailored to a specific task and context (Bandura, 1997).

Instead, general self-efficacy (GSE) refers to how well people think they can manage things in their everyday lives (Luszczynska, Scholz & Schwarzer, 2005). GSE has been conceptualized as a trait-like, global and de-contextualized belief with a corresponding stability over time and across situations (Eden & Zuk, 1995). GSE researchers state that efficacy can be viewed from both a specific and a general aspect. According to Hannah, Avolio, Luthans & Harms (2008, p. 675), "*efficacy is neither dichotomously specific nor general, but generalizable and can therefore be portrayed along a continuum*".

Chen, Gully & Eden (2001) claim that an important effect of individual's GSE is SSE. Shelton (1990) indicates that there is a positive correlation between GSE and SSE. Hence, the tendency people have to feel effective in various general tasks or situations diffuses to other particular/specific cases. Scholars (e.g., Shelton, 1990; Chen et al., 2001) propose that one of the key antecedents of GSE is the accumulation of prior experiences (successes or failures) in different contexts and task domains. GSE influences the general set of behaviors and expectations that individuals carry with them when they encounter new situations or roles (Sherer, Maddux, Mercandante, Prentice-Dunn, Jacobs & Rogers, 1982). Eden and Aviram (1993) claim that SSE predicts specific performances or outcomes of human action, while Eden (1988), and Eden and Zuk (1995) claim that GSE predicts performances in general situations. According to Hannah et al. (2008, p. 675), "*unfortunately, very little research is available that has assessed both general and self-forms of leader efficacy in the same study*". To address this challenge in the present study, first, an already existing valid measurement scale ("GSE" by Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) for measuring principals' perceived general efficacy was used, and then, two measurement scales were constructed: one, for measuring principals' generalized leadership efficacy (Hannah et al., 2008) regarding their everyday duties in Greek public schools; and the other, for measuring principals' SSE (Bandura, 1997) regarding their role as evaluators. Thereafter, all forms of principals' efficacy (general, generalized-leadership and specific-evaluative) were tested and correlated with each other, and their ability to predict effective evaluation performance was examined.

Principal self-efficacy

From the perspective of SCT, school principals are described as those who engage themselves in self-regulation processes in a complex and ever changing educational environment. In many cases, the effectiveness of school organizations depends on the ability of their leaders to be self-directed in an intense, prolonged, and often differentiated pursuit of achievement on organizational goals (Savvides, 2008). According to McCollum and Kajs (2009), school principals should have three essential/vital characteristics: current knowledge, relevant skills and SE. Analyzing each time the work principals have to perform, they weigh their competitiveness against their weaknesses or commitments. Subsequently, they result in SE judgments, which in turn are closely related to the performance outcome expectations (Smith, Guarino, Strom & Adams, 2006). Therefore, principals with the same knowledge and skills may perform poorly, well or excellent in evaluating teachers, depending on the fluctuations in the thought of efficacy (Gist & Mitchell, 1992).

Surveys support the view that principals should have confidence about their abilities as evaluators to effectively evaluate or supervise their teaching staff (i.e., Daly, Der-Martirosian, Ong-Dean, Park & Wishard-Guerra, 2011; Kalule & Bouchamma, 2014; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; McCullers & Bozeman, 2010; Murphy & Torff, 2012). Painter (2000) argues that principals' knowledge concerning the procedural and legal aspects of teacher evaluation is not enough to explain their behavior on evaluation practices. Regardless of focus, most of SE researches have examined the effect of personal or school demographic characteristics on SE with mixed, inconsistent and unclear results. About effective principal preparation programs, Kimball and Milanowski (2009) argue that the lack of proper training is one of the pitfalls in teacher evaluation process. Mitgang (2012) warns that the introduction of a new evaluation system (such as the P.D. 152/2013) requires from school leaders to learn how to identify and analyze the data, to use rubrics and tools based on specific criteria, and to give effective feedback to teachers. According to Pashiardis, Savvides and Tsiakkios (2005), one of the basic principles on which an evaluation system should be based, is the further education or training of school leaders or even better the acquisition of a post-graduate degree at administrative and staff appraisal subjects.

Purpose of the study

This research was conducted in autumn of 2014, just before teacher evaluation was programmed to start, that would be just after the completion of the process of educational executives'³ evaluation, in early 2015⁴. The basic objective of the study was to capture principals' perceived specific efficacy as evaluators at an early preparatory phase. Based on literature review and through the development of valid (in terms of structure) and reliable (in terms of internal consistency) scales for measuring re-

³ Directors of Education, School Advisors/Counselors and School Principals

⁴ However, the rise of the Coalition of the Radical Left (SYRIZA) party in the governance of Greece, in January 2015, overturned all previous government regulations and immobilized the evaluation process in order the institutional framework of P.D. 152/2013 to be reviewed on a more democratic base.

search variables, the main purpose of the study was to determine school principals' level of perceived efficacy [*general self-efficacy (GSE)*, *generalized-leadership efficacy (GLE)* and *specific-evaluative efficacy (SEE)*]. It also aimed to examine how principals' specific-evaluative efficacy (SEE) relates to their: (a) general self-efficacy (GSE), (b) generalized-leadership efficacy (GLE), and (c) evaluation's expected results (EER). Finally, significant differences in principals' level of SEE were sought in terms of variables such as personal and school characteristics. Schematically, as shown in Figure 1, the main axis of the research starts from a general level of efficacy and ends up with a quite specific task domain.

Research Questions

The under investigation *research questions* are formed as following:

1. Do personal demographic characteristics influence principal SEE?
2. Do school demographic characteristics influence principal SEE?
3. Is GSE positively correlated with SEE?
4. Is GLE positively correlated with SEE?
5. Is SEE positively correlated with EER?
6. Do GSE & GLE constitute predictor factors for SEE?




Figure 1: Main axis of the research

Methodology

Research design

In order to address the above questions, an exploratory study was designed to determine to what degree Greek school principals believe they can effectively evaluate teachers and how these beliefs are related to their general or leadership efficacy beliefs and the evaluation outcomes. This research adopted the quantitative methodological

approach with the use of a structured self-report questionnaire with closed questions (Likert-type) of 7 or 9-degree of hierarchical classification. According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007), three prerequisites for a survey's design are to determine the exact objective of the investigation, the population to which it is addressed and the available resources. With clearly imprinted the purpose of the investigation, the under examination population and the inexistent resources, this study is a descriptive and correlative survey, designed to examine relationships between principals' general and specific SE. It also uses proceedings of developing and validating of the newly constructed measurement scales.

Participants

The population of the research consisted of principals working in the public primary and secondary education of B' Directorate of Athens, Greece (September-November 2014). Out of 249 schools, through simple random sampling, 158 schools were selected. Finally, 151 fully completed questionnaires formed the survey sample (N = 151). This sample is equivalent to a percentage of 60.64% of the overall population of the under examination area, which was deemed sufficiently representative (Cohen et al., 2007).

In particular, 59.6% of the 151 respondents are male and 71.5% are above 45 years old. This is consistent with the corresponding percentage of 60.9% that has over 20 years of tenure. More than half of principals (53%) hold a master's degree, while few of them (19.2%) have specialization in educational administration and even less (9.9%) hold a doctorate degree. Regarding managerial experience, more than half of principals (63.6%) fell within the bracket of one to four years' managing experience, whilst the rest (36.4%) are quite experienced principals with five or more years of service in managing position. Finally, most of the "novice" principals (58.3%) have been employed at their school, simultaneously with the adoption of their managerial role.

Principals of primary schools constituted 53.7% of the sample, while the secondary school principals make up 42.4%. The remaining 4% refers to pilot schools, ecclesiastical, intercultural or special-needs schools. Regarding school size, 78.2% of schools had over 160 students and the 65.6% had over 20 teachers. This is associated with the large urban region in which the research was conducted.

Instrumentation

The first section of the research questionnaire consists of variables that refer to *demographic information* about the principal and the school unit: gender, age, educational level (master, master on educational administration and doctorate), overall years of tenure, years of tenure as school principal, years of tenure in the current school, school type, size of school (number of students) and number of in-service teachers. The next four sections consist of the following scales:

Principal GSE is measured by the "General Self-Efficacy - GSE" scale developed by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995). Principals were called to rate their confidence for their behavior and feelings at performing in different situations in everyday life. Alt-

though Schwarzer and Jerusalem recommended as a response format of GSE scale a 4-point classification, in the present research, a 7-point classification was selected from 1 (not at all true) to 7 (exactly true) in order to capture the magnitude and strength of principals' belief (Bandura, 1997). It is a unidimensional scale of 10 items. The coefficient of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) is $\alpha = .92$. Examples of items are: "I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort" or "When I am confronted with a problem, I can find several solutions".

Principal GLE is measured by the "Generalized Leadership Efficacy scale – GLEs". The items addressing GLEs are based on the "Principal Self of Efficacy Scale (PSES)" of Tschannen-Moran and Gareis (2004) and cover aspects of administrative, educational and moral leadership which are consistent with the Greek legislative framework of principal everyday school duties (Katsaros, 2008). The items taken from PSES (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004) were translated and modified in order to reflect Greek reality. All items begin with the phrase: "*As school principal, I believe I can....*" Respondents rated their confidence for performing different skills on administrative, educational and moral duties on a 9-point scale from 1 (none at all) to 9 (in a very large extent). In contrast with the initial three dimensional form of PSES (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004), factor analysis of GLEs led to a unidimensional scale of 18 statements. When one factor is extracted by the principal axis factoring, all items load on this factor with loadings ranging from .50 to .85. The internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of this scale is $\alpha = .94$. The items and the factor structure are given in the Appendix (Table 1).

Principal SEE is measured by the "Specific Evaluative Efficacy scale – SEEs". The items addressing SEEs were designed by the authors mostly on the basis of Bandura's SCT and the institutional framework of P.D. 152/2013. SEEs considers how confident participants are about their capability to evaluate teachers. Following Bandura's (1997) recommendations for constructing an efficacy scale, SEEs items refer to evaluative issues that are challenging for principals and are phrased in terms of "*I can...*" rather than "*I will...*" in order to reflect principals' subjective belief and not intention. All items begin with the phrase: "*As school principal, regarding teacher evaluation, I believe I can...*" Respondents rated their confidence as evaluators on a 9-point scale from 1 (none at all) to 9 (in a very large extent). Factor analysis of SEEs led to a two-dimensional scale of 15 items with Cronbach's $\alpha = .96$. When two factors are extracted by principal axis factoring and direct oblimin rotation, then: (a) 9 items, relating to the dimension of "objectivity" that derives from the practical application of evaluation's legislative framework (SEEs_F1) ($\alpha = .94$), load on the first factor with loadings ranging from .62 to .98, and (b) 6 items, relating to the dimension of "subjectivity" that derives from evaluator's emotion (SEEs_F2) ($\alpha = .95$), load on the second factor with loadings ranging from .70 to .95. There are no cross-loadings between the factors. The items and the factor structure are given in the Appendix (Table 2).

Expected results from the execution of the evaluative role are measured by the “Evaluation’s Expected Results Scale – EERs”. The items addressing EERs were designed by the authors mostly on the basis of literature and the institutional framework of P.D. 152/2013. All items begin with the phrase: “*As school principal, I believe that teacher evaluation will....*” Respondents rated their expectations on a 9-point scale from 1 (none at all) to 9 (in a very large extent). Factor analysis of EERs led to a three-dimensional scale of 29 items ($\alpha = .97$). When three factors are extracted by principal axis factoring and direct oblimin rotation, then: (a) 15 items, relating to the dimension of “interpersonal relationships, processes and school climate” (EERs_F1) ($\alpha = .975$), load on the first factor with loadings ranging from .51 to .99, (b) 11 items, relating to “potential improvements and benefits” (EERs_F2) ($\alpha = .975$), load on the second factor with loadings ranging from .78 to .92, and (c) 3 items, relating to “timing and financial requirements” (EERs_F3) ($\alpha = .724$), load on the third factor with loadings ranging from .52 to .67. There are no cross-loadings between the factors. The items and the factor structure are given in the Appendix (Table 3).

Method of data processing and analysis

The analysis of quantitative data was performed using the statistical program SPSSv21. After recoding the negative worded items of the EER scale, then, an EFA was conducted for the newly constructed scales. The internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) and the regularity of variables (test Shapiro-Wilk) were sequentially checked. Methods of descriptive statistics were used for the presentation and description of numerical data (such as means, medians, standard deviations), as well as methods of inferential statistics to data interpretation and research question testing (such as non-parametric tests Mann-Whitney (U) and Kruskal-Wallis, Spearman's rank correlation coefficient and linear regressions).

Results

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics

Variables (N=151)	M	SD	Min	Max
GSE	54,76	8.70	7	70
GLEs	134,75	16.69	18	162
SEEs	88.73	25.95	15	135
SEEs_F1	51.55	16.01	9	81
SEEs_F2	37.19	11.42	6	54
EERs	144.30	52.64	29	261
EERs_F1	68.82	32.33	15	135
EERs_F2	62.26	24.78	11	99
EERs_F3	13.22	5.12	3	27

Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations for research variables and their dimensions. Considering the minimum and maximum total scores, principal GSE (M = 54.76 with min = 7 and max = 70) and GLE (M = 134.75 with min = 18 and max = 162) are recorded at a rather high level. Instead, the score that principals recorded at SEE (M = 88.73 with min = 15 and max = 135) was marginally between moderate and high level. Notably, at the variable of EER, principals recorded quite a moderate average score (M = 144.30 with min = 29 and max = 261).

Research Questions testing

Principal Specific Evaluative Efficacy regarding principal and school demographic characteristics (research questions 1 & 2): Table 5 shows that holding or not a doctoral degree has statistically significant difference on principal SEE (U = 697.000, $p = .044$) and on the second dimension of subjectivity (U = 682.500, $p = .036$). Furthermore, holding or not a master's degree on educational administration has statistically significant difference on the second dimension of SEEs (U = 1345.500, $p = .045$). Table 6 reveals that principals holding a doctorate have statistically significant higher medians (116 and 42 for SEEs and SEEs_F2, respectively) than those who do not have (109 and 41 for SEEs and SEEs_F2, respectively). Similarly, principals holding a master's degree in educational administration have statistically significant higher medians at SEEs_F2 than those who do not have (44 vs 41, respectively).

Table 5: Results of non-parametric tests regarding the influence of principal and school unit demographics on SEEs (and its dimensions)

Variables	SEEs sig	SEEs_F1 sig	SEEs_F2 sig	test
Gender	.400	.228	.614	Mann-Whitney (U)
Age	.791	.629	.820	Kruskal-Wallis
Master	.712	.532	.658	Mann-Whitney (U)
Master on Ed. Admin.	.110	.190	.045*	Mann-Whitney (U)
Doctorate	.044*	.052	.036*	Mann-Whitney (U)
Years of tenure	.180	.103	.559	Kruskal-Wallis
Years of tenure as principal	.477	.784	.232	Kruskal-Wallis
Years of tenure at the current school	.104	.129	.279	Kruskal-Wallis
Type of school	.626	.423	.599	Kruskal-Wallis
Number of students	.571	.460	.704	Kruskal-Wallis
Number of teachers	.948	.665	.678	Kruskal-Wallis

*Statistical significance at the level of 95% or $p < 0.05$

Table 6: Means and medians of sees and sees_f2 in regard with doctorate and master on educational administration

			SEEs	SEEs F2
Doctorate	Yes	Mean	116.2667	43.9333
		Median	116.0000	42.0000
	No	Mean	100.4706	37.4926
		Median	109.0000	41.0000
Master on Educational Administration	Yes	Mean	-	41.4828
		Median	-	44.0000
	No	Mean	-	37.3361
		Median	-	41.0000

Principal General Self-Efficacy with Principal Specific Evaluative Efficacy (research question 3): A Spearman's rank-order correlation was run to determine the relationship between principal GSE and SEE. Table 7 shows that there is a statistically significant, positive and strong correlation between GSE and SEEs [$rho = .666$, $N = 151$, $p < .001$]. This means that the more GSE increases, the more SEE also does and vice versa. It should also be noted that statistically significant, positive but moderate correlations exist between GSE and both SEEs dimensions, i.e., [$rho = .642$, $N = 151$, $p < .001$] for SEEs_F1 (objectivity) and [$rho = .639$, $N = 151$, $p < .001$] for SEEs_F2 (subjectivity).

Principal Generalized Leadership Efficacy with Principal Specific Evaluative Efficacy (research question 4): Table 7 shows that there is a statistically significant positive and moderate correlation between GLEs and SEEs [$rho = .555$, $N = 151$, $p < .001$]. This means that the more GLE increases, the more SEE also does and vice versa. It should also be noted that statistically significant, positive and moderate correlations exist between GLEs and both SEEs dimensions, i.e., [$rho = .467$, $N=151$, $p < .001$] for SEEs_F1, and [$rho = .621$, $N=151$, $p < .001$] for SEEs_F2.

Table 7: Correlations among research variables (N=151)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 GSE		.689**	.666**	.642**	.639**	.483**	.466**	.439**	.085
2 GLEs			.555**	.467**	.621**	.485**	.428**	.486**	.103
3 SEEs				.967**	.876**	.727**	.672**	.688**	.224**
4 SEEs_F1					.753**	.699**	.647**	.677**	.243**
5 SEEs_F2						.653**	.624**	.564**	.164*
6 EERs							.926**	.820**	.454**
7 EERs_F1								.578**	.461**
8 EERs_F2									.170*
9 EERs_F3									

*Statistical significance at the level of 95% or $p < 0.05$

**Statistical significance at the level of 99% or $p < 0.01$

Principal Specific Evaluative Efficacy with Evaluative Expected Results (re-search question 5): Table 7 shows that there is a statistically significant, positive and strong correlation between SEEs and the EERs [$\rho = .727, N = 151, p < .001$]. Statistically significant positive correlations are also observed between all dimensions of SEEs and EERs dimensions, one by one. Analytically, statistically significant, positive and strong correlations are observed between:

- SEEs and EERs_F1 (interpersonal relationships, processes and school climate) [$\rho = .672, N = 151, p < .001$].
- SEEs and EERs_F2 (potential improvements and benefits) [$\rho = .688, N = 151, p < .001$].
- SEEs_F1 and EERs [$\rho = .699, N = 151, p < .001$].
- SEEs_F1 and EERs_F2 [$\rho = .677, N = 151, p < .001$].

Statistically significant, positive and moderate correlations are observed between:

- SEEs_F1 and EERs_F1 [$\rho = .647, N = 151, p < .001$].
- SEEs_F2 and EERs [$\rho = .653, N = 151, p < .001$].
- SEEs_F2 and EERs_F1 [$\rho = .624, N = 151, p < .001$].
- SEEs_F2 and EERs_F2 [$\rho = .564, N = 151, p < .001$].

Statistically significant, positive and weak correlations are observed between:

- SEEs and EERs_F3 (timing and financial requirements) [$\rho = .224, N = 151, p = .009$].
- SEEs_F1 and EERs_F3 [$\rho = .243, N = 151, p = .003$].
- SEEs_F2 and EERs_F3 [$\rho = .164, N = 151, p = .044$].

Principal General and Generalized Leadership Efficacy as Predictors of Principal Specific Evaluative Efficacy (research question 6): The significant positive and strong correlation between GSE and GLEs [$r = .689, N = 151, p < .001$] (Table 7) predisposes to a multicollinearity problem when both variables are simultaneously used as predictors of the variable SEEs in a multidimensional linear model. According to Roussos and Tsouros (2011), on a multicollinearity phenomenon, the multiple regression equation may not give reliable results. Therefore, through simple linear regression, the linear models of the dependent variable SEEs with the independent variable GSE and then with the independent variable GLEs are sequentially examined, so that the best model be selected. Table 8 presents the regression analyses of Models A and B (computed in SPSS with the “enter” method) which examine how GSE and GLE beliefs, respectively, predict specific evaluative behavior.

Model A: Linear regression model between GSE (independent variable) and SEEs (dependent variable)

The regression line fits the data quite well ($r^2 = .416$, Standard Error of the Estimate = 19.898). This means that 41.6% of the variability of the dependent variable SEEs is explained by the variability of the independent variable GSE (Gnardellis, 2013; Roussos & Tsouros, 2011). The Standard Error of Estimate, that essentially indicates the Standard Deviation of SEEs predicted by GSE, is used as an indicator of how successful the prediction model is. The smaller the value is, the more successful the predictive model is. Moreover, a validation and comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of that model is done by analysis of variance (ANOVA) of simple regression. The model is deemed appropriate [$F(1,149) = 106.173, p < .001$]. This means that the independent variable GSE contributes significantly to the interpretation of the score achieved by principals in variable SEEs. Finally, there is a significant correlation between the two variables ($\beta = .645, p < .001$). In this analysis, the more efficacious principals believe they are, regarding their personal capabilities, the higher perceived efficacy they have as evaluators.

Model B: Linear regression model between GLEs (independent variable) and SEEs (dependent variable)

The coefficient of determination ($r^2 = .228$, Standard Error of the Estimate = 22.883) appears lower than in Model A ($r^2 = .416$). This means that 22.8% of the variability of SEEs is explained by the variability of GLEs, as opposed to the 41.6% of the variability of SEEs explained by the variability of GSE. The Standard Error of Estimate (22.883) is larger than in Model A (19.898). Furthermore, the validation of this model, through analysis of variance (ANOVA), revealed that the model is appropriate and therefore, the existence of a linear relationship between the two variables [$F(1,149) = 43.936, p < .001$] is accepted. Finally, there is a significant correlation between the two variables ($\beta = .477, p < .001$). In this analysis, the more efficacious principals believe they are as school leaders, the higher perceived efficacy they have as evaluators.

Table 8: Simple linear regression models*Model A: Coefficients of regression model of SEEs on GSE*

Variable	B	SE B	Beta (β)	t	p
Constant	-16.611	10.351		-1.605	.111
GSE	1.924	.187	.645	10.304	.000

$r^2 = .416$, Standard Error of the Estimate = 19.89825
 $F(1,149) = 106.173$, $p < .001$

Model B: Coefficients of regression model of SEEs on GLEs

Variable	B	SE B	Beta (β)	t	p
Constant	-11.264	15.201		-.741	.460
GLEs	.742	.112	.477	6.628	.000

$r^2 = .228$, Standard Error of the Estimate = 22.88366
 $F(1,149) = 43.936$, $p < .001$

The control of these two linear models reveals that both independent variables GSE and GLEs are predictors of the dependent variable SEEs. However, due to: (a) better coefficient of determination r^2 , (b) lower price of the Standard Error of Estimation, (c) higher F value of ANOVA, and (d) higher price of regression coefficient (beta), the linear regression equation of the dependent variable SEEs with the independent variable GSE appears to be a better model.

Discussion

The statistical analysis of the research data revealed that Greek school principals declared high levels of general and generalized leadership efficacy. However, they reported moderate levels of specific evaluative efficacy, demonstrating less confidence for handling their new role. Considering Bandura's (1997) sources of efficacy, the absence of previous experience as evaluators and the general educational/economic turmoil may justify this lower SEE. Without mastery or vicarious experiences, with negative symbolic experiences (controversial/negative social persuasion), and with low psychological arousal caused by economic crisis (more work obligations, lower salaries, taxes, continuous pressure, uncertainty, memorandums), principals feel less

confident to effectively manage the new task. Indeed, principals felt uncertain that they would be able to handle the procedure of teacher evaluation objectively, as well as to control the potential intermediation of the subjectivity of their emotion. For example, it seemed difficult for them, not only to count on their knowledge, but even to evaluate with no emotional bias. This uncertainty/anxiety reveals, in some way, their concern for morality and for making proper use of power. Principals' concern on the intermediation of emotion may potentially ensure the effective management of the legal, political and social factors that protects their teachers (Painter, 2000). Therefore, it is expected that in the future, with the proper training and self-improvement, principals' SSE will have a positive effect on evaluation policies. Besides, according to Machida and Schaubroeck (2011), this lower efficacy, especially during the preparatory evaluation phase, is not discouraging as it may be transformed to an important motive for principals in order to pertain to the task. The self-correcting cycle of changes in SE will ensure high performance and avoid complacency or demoralization.

Along with SEE beliefs, outcome expectations of the evaluation are formulated with the mean score of the declared expected results to move very close to the mean value of the scale. A quite moderate attitude was observed as well as a divergence of views and a bifurcation in principals' consciences about the expected results of the evaluation. Principals seem almost divided. Half of them believed that teacher evaluation will bring positive results at the operation of the school unit (such as intensification and improvement of teachers' work regarding their typical official duties) and will not affect negatively interpersonal relationships, processes and school climate. The other half believed the opposite. The nature of the expected results (positive or negative) is of great importance, as it determines the level of the commitment to the task. High levels of SE associated with expectations of positive results will likely encourage high commitment, while high SE associated with negative results will probably cause complaint or protest (Smith et al., 2006). These conflicting beliefs of the principals may possibly imply, along with different views on improving educational quality, extremely opposite political views (adjacent to conservative and liberal or center-right and socialist parties vs left-radical or communist parties), which typically and phenomenologically affect attitudes, opinions and behaviors in Greece and reflect the general educational upheaval regarding educational planning or educational evaluation.

Finally, the examination of the research questions leads to results which are fully consistent with the existing literature. The unclear scenery regarding the effect of demographic characteristics on principal efficacy is still there and reinforces previous research results, enhancing Bandura's (1986) conceptualization of the occasional character of SE. The present research showed that principal high level training (i.e., holding a doctoral degree or a master on educational management) seems to raise SE levels (Pashiardis et al., 2005). A remarkable fact is that both degrees raise the level of the dimension of subjectivity and reduce the intermediation of evaluator's emotion. Similarly, other researches (Brama & Friedman, 2007; Friedman & Brama, 2010, as cited in Fisher, 2014) have shown that Israeli principals' preservice studies affect their SE. Instead, Murphy and Torff (2012) reported that educational level does not affect

SE. Moreover, GSE as a product of personality feature (Eden & Zuk, 1995), and GLE as a leader's competence (Hannah et al., 2008) are positively correlated with SEE as a product of intra-personal cognitive resources related to a context-specific task (Bandura, 1986, 1997). SSE is, sequentially, strongly related to motivation of EER (Bandura, 2000). Finally, both GSE (trait-like) and GLE (state-like) constitute predictor factors of SEE. However, GSE turned to be a better predictor model (Eden, 1988; Eden & Zuk, 1995; Sherer et al., 1982). This probably happens because GSE appears stability over time and across situations, while GLE is influenced by the interaction of internal and external factors (such as leadership styles, expectations of educational region, personal and organizational support, legislative regulations, etc.).

In conclusion, even if efficacy is not a stable personality trait, this does not mean that SSE judgments never generalize (Bandura, 1997). Instead, regardless stability of situations, general personal efficacy judgments may generalize to other contexts, depending on the situation, the task and the individual (Hannah et al., 2008). Based on this theoretical distinction of SE, the present research concluded that (a) Greek school principals' GSE, as a characteristic of their personality, is transferred to the specific task of teacher evaluation, and (b) school principals' belief for being generally good leaders, makes them to determine that they are capable enough of evaluating teachers, although they feel quite insecure and uncertain with both the procedural part of the evaluation and the potential intermediation of emotion.

Implications/Suggestions

The results from the newly constructed scales provide some evidence of content and structure validity and reliability for internal consistency. However, the scale measuring generalized leadership efficacy (GLEs) in comparison with the PSES of Tschannen-Moran and Gareis (2004) displays a different structure when used in Greek reality. As Tschannen-Moran and Gareis, mention, "*the issue of how to capture efficacy beliefs as a context-specific construct in a way that will nonetheless allow for comparisons across contexts is a thorny one*" (p. 580). Thus, further research should test its structure validity, especially, in the Greek centralized educational system where evaluation is, generally, absent. Furthermore, these self-referential measurement scales could contribute to the development of principals' self-evaluation culture and take the form of self-criticism leading to judgments of self-awareness.

Moreover, enhancing principal SE for both their well-being and accomplishments in different tasks should be an important objective for those responsible for improving the quality of leadership in schools (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). Configuring the appropriate principal training programs regarding not only the cognitive-procedural aspect of teacher evaluation but also the part of motivation, stimulation, SE and self-regulation should be a priority. SCT provides guidance regarding practical implications for principal professional preparation and development. Training can be set up around each of the sources of efficacy which are considered to be highly malle-

able and changeable. Besides this “pragmatic training”, Bandura (2000) proposes a more “sophisticated way” of enhancing SE, with categorizing it into three areas; guided mastery, cognitive mastery modeling and development of self-regulatory competences (Luthans, 2008).

Although the importance of principals’ confidence is broadly recognized; to date in Greece, there have been few attempts to measure and research the proposition drawn from SE theory. This proposition refers to the strong positive impact that principals’ efficacy has on teachers and school performance outcomes. Lack of experience of Greek principals as evaluators, makes SE training of great importance and the potential for the future seems unlimited. Undoubtedly, when the expectations and the standards change, Greek school principals should receive the needed support to meet the new expectations, implement the changes and attain high performances. When improved performances are expected, evaluation should be a reciprocal process and investments should be done in developing skills, knowledge, and SE of those who are expected to have improvement.

Özet

Giriş

Çağdaş Yunan okullarının müdürleri, eşi benzeri görülmemiş bir zorlukla yüzleşmektedir. Çünkü onlardan öğretmenleri değerlendirmeleri istenmektedir. 30 yılı aşkın bir süredir, dış baskılar (Andreou & Papakonstantinou, 1994; Dimitropoulos, 2002) öğretme sürecinin değerlendirilmesine yönelik kurumsallaşmış yasa ve uygulamaların uygulanmamasında hükümetleri zorlamıştır (Athanasoula-Reppa, 2005, akt. Papakonstantinou & Anastasiou, 2013). Ancak ekonomik kriz Yunanistan’ı bir kere vurduğuna göre, Avrupa Komisyonu ve IMF (Uluslararası Para Fonu) tarafından denetlenen siyasal otoriteler, etkin olmayan yasaların bolluğundan kurtulmalı ve eğitimsel değerlendirmenin standart bir yöntemini bulmalıdır (152/2013 Numaralı Başkanlık Kararnamesi). Yasal çerçeveye göre (Matsagouras, Gialouris & Kouloumparitsi, 2014), okul müdürü öğretmenin yönetsel değerlendirilmesinden sorumludur. Değişime karşı bir direniş olsa da (Fullan, 2007), okul müdürünün bu yeni rolü oldukça eleştirilmiştir. Değerlendirme uygulamalarındaki büyük sorunlardan biri okul müdürlerinin deneyimleyebileceği rollerin çatışmasıdır (Wise vd., 1985). Bu çatışma, okul müdürlerinin sadece bilgi ve becerilerini değil, aynı zamanda liderlik becerilerini kavramlaştırılmalarını da zorlamaktadır (Avolio & Luthans, 2006). Ampirik çalışmalar (Bkz. Fisher, 2014; McCullers & Bozeman, 2010; Savvides, 2008) okul liderlerinin davranışlarının yeterliğe olan inançları tarafından yönlendirildiğini öne sürmektedir. Yeterlik birçok farklı alanda kapsamlı bir şekilde araştırılmış ve incelenmiştir (Bkz. Gist & Mitchell, 1992; Painter, 2000; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). Buna rağmen Yunanistan’daki ampirik çalışmaların sayısı yetersizdir. Hatta öğretmenlerin değerlendirilmesinde okul müdürlerinin yeterliği neredeyse incelenmemiş bir alandır.

Öz-yeterlik (ÖY) kavramı, Bandura’nın (1986) Sosyal Bilişsel Kuramına (SBK) dayanmaktadır ve insanların belirli verim düzeylerine ulaşmak için bazı eylemleri düzenleyebilme ve yerine getirebilme becerilerine ilişkin yargıları olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Luthans, 2008). Bandura (1986) ÖY’nin oluşmasında dört kaynak belirle-

miştir: ustalık ve temsili tecrübe, sosyal ikna ve fiziksel/psikolojik uyarılma. Akademisyenler yeterlik inançlarını özgül boyut (Bandura, 1986, 1997) ya da genel boyut (Eden & Zuk, 1995; Luszczynska vd., 2005) olarak ikiye ayırmaktadır. Hannah ve diğerlerine (2008) göre yeterlik, ne özgül ne de genel olarak ikiye ayrılabilir fakat genelleştirilebilir. Genel Öz-yeterlik (GÖY), bireylerin yeni bir durum veya rol ile karşılaştıklarında gösterdikleri davranış ve beklentilerin genelini etkiler. Aynı zamanda GÖY ve ÖÖY (Özgül Öz-yeterlik) arasında pozitif yönlü bir ilişki vardır (Chen vd., 2001; Shelton, 1990; Sherer vd., 1982). Eden (1988) ile Eden & Aviram (1993) ÖÖY'nin insan eylemlerinin özgül performans veya çıktılarını yordadığını, GÖY'ün ise genel durumlardaki performansları yordadığını öne sürmektedir.

SBK'nın bakış açısından okul müdürleri, sürekli değişen ve karmaşık bir eğitim çevresinde öz-düzenleme süreçleriyle karşılaşan kişiler olarak tanımlanmaktadır (McCullum & Kajs, 2009; Savvides, 2008; Smith vd., 2006). Araştırmalar okul müdürlerinin etkili bir şekilde değerlendirme yapması ya da öğretim kadrosuna rehberlik etmesi için değerlendirme yapabilme becerilerine güvenmeleri gerektiği görüşünü desteklemektedir (Bkz. Daly vd., 2011; Kalule & Bouchamma, 2014; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; McCullers & Bozeman, 2010; Murphy & Torff, 2012; Painter, 2000). ÖY araştırmalarının çoğunda okulun veya bireylerin demografik özelliklerinin ÖY'ye olan etkileri üzerine karışık ve tutarsız sonuçlar elde edilmiştir. Etkili okul müdürü yetiştirme programları göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, uygun eğitimin verilmemesi öğretmen değerlendirme sürecinde karşılaşılan zorluklardan biridir (Kimball & Milanski, 2009; Mitgang, 2012; Pashiardis vd., 2005).

Araştırmanın temel amacı okul müdürlerinin algıladıkları yeterlik düzeylerinin belirlenmesidir [Genel öz-yeterlik (GÖY), genelleştirilmiş liderlik yeterliği (GLY) ve özgül değerlendirme yeterliği (ÖDY)]. Aynı zamanda ÖDY ile (a) GÖY, (b) GLY ve (c) değerlendirmenin beklenen sonuçları (DBS) arasında nasıl bir ilişkinin olduğunun incelenmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Son olarak okul müdürlerinin ÖDY düzeyleri ile bireysel ve okul özellikleri değişkenleri arasındaki anlamlı farklılıklara bakılmıştır. Araştırma soruları aşağıda verilmiştir:

1. Bireysel demografik özellikler okul müdürlerinin ÖDY'lerini etkilemekte midir?
2. Okul demografik özellikleri okul müdürlerinin ÖDY'lerini etkilemekte midir?
3. GÖY ile ÖDY arasında pozitif yönlü bir ilişki var mıdır?
4. GLY ile ÖDY arasında pozitif yönlü bir ilişki var mıdır?
5. ÖDY ile DBS arasında pozitif yönlü bir ilişki var mıdır?
6. GÖY ile GLY, ÖDY'yi yordayıcı faktörler oluşturmakta mıdır?

Yöntem

Araştırmada yapılandırılmış bir öz-bildirim anketi kullanılarak nicel yöntem yaklaşımı benimsenmiştir. Verilerin analizi SPSSv21 paket programı ile yapılmıştır. Araş-

tırmanın örneklemini oluşturan Yunanistan'ın Atina B' Müdürlüğüne bağlı kamu ilköğretim ve ortaöğretim okullarında (Eylül-Kasım 2014) görev yapan 151 okul müdürü basit seçkisiz örnekleme yöntemi ile belirlenmiştir. Örneklem araştırma evreninin %60.64 oranında yeterli düzeyde kapsamaktadır (249 okul müdürü) (Cohen vd., 2007). Araştırma anketinin ilk bölümünde okul müdürünün ve okul birimlerinin demografik özelliklerine ilişkin değişkenlerin olduğu bilgiler yer almaktadır. Diğer dört bölümde ise aşağıdaki ölçekler bulunmaktadır:

Okul Müdürlerinin GÖY'leri Schwarzer & Jerusalem (1995) tarafından geliştirilen "Genel Öz-yeterlik (GÖY) Ölçeği" ile belirlenmiştir. Ölçek 10 maddeden oluşan tek boyutlu bir ölçektir ($\alpha = .92$).

Okul Müdürlerinin GLY'leri "Genelleştirilmiş Liderlik Yeterliği (GLY) Ölçeği" ile belirlenmiştir. Ölçekte yer alan maddeler Tschannen-Moran & Gareis (2004) tarafından geliştirilen "Okul Müdürlerinin Öz-yeterlikleri Ölçeği (OÖYÖ)" temel alınarak hazırlanmıştır ve ölçek Yunanistan'da bir okul müdürünün yasal çerçevede yapması gereken günlük görevleri kapsayan yönetsel, eğitimsel ve ahlaki liderlik boyutlarını kapsamaktadır (Katsaros, 2008). GLY ölçeğinin faktör analizi sonucunda 18 maddeden oluşan tek bir boyut ortaya çıkmıştır ($\alpha = .94$).

Okul Müdürlerinin ÖDY'leri "Özgül Değerlendirme Yeterliği (ÖDY) Ölçeği" ile belirlenmiştir. Bu ölçekte yer alan maddelerin çoğu, Bandura'nın SBK'sı ve 152/2013 Numaralı Başkanlık Kararnamesinde yer alan yasal çerçeve temel alınarak yazarlar tarafından hazırlanmıştır. ÖDY Ölçeğinin faktör analizi sonucunda iki boyuttan oluşan toplam 15 maddelik bir ölçek oluşmuştur ($\alpha = .96$): (a) değerlendirmenin yasal çerçeveye bağlı olarak uygulanmasından kaynaklanan nesnellik boyutunu oluşturan 9 madde (ÖDYö_F1) ($\alpha = .94$) ve (b) değerlendirenin duygu durumundan kaynaklanan öz-nesnellik boyutunu oluşturan 6 madde (ÖDYö_F2) ($\alpha = .95$).

Değerlendirici rolün sergilenmesinden beklenen sonuçlar ise "Değerlendirmenin Beklenen Sonuçları (DBS) Ölçeği" ile ölçülmüştür. Ölçek maddelerinin çoğu, alan yazın ve 153/2013 Numaralı Başkanlık Kararnamesinde yer alan yasal çerçeve temel alınarak yazarlar tarafından tasarlanmıştır. Ölçeğe uygulanan faktör analizi sonucunda üç boyuttan oluşan 29 maddelik bir ölçek elde edilmiştir ($\alpha = .97$): (a) kişilerarası ilişkiler, süreçler ve okul iklimi boyutunu oluşturan 15 madde (DBSö_F1) ($\alpha = .975$), (b) potansiyel gelişim ve faydalar ile ilgili 11 madde (DBSö_F2) ($\alpha = .975$) ve (c) zamanlama ve mali gereklilikler ile ilgili 3 madde (DBSö_F3) ($\alpha = .724$).

Sonuçlar

Betimsel istatistik sonucunda elde edilen sonuçlar şu şekildedir: GÖY (\bar{x} =54.76; en düşük=7, en yüksek=70), GLY (\bar{x} =134.75; en düşük=18, en yüksek=162), ÖDY (\bar{x} =88.73; en düşük=15, en yüksek=135) ve DBS (\bar{x} =144.30; en az=29, en fazla=261).

Araştırmanın 1. ve 2. soruları doğrultusunda yapılan analizler sonucunda, *doktora* değişkeni ile okul müdürünün ÖDY'si ($U=697.000$, $p=.044$) ve öz-nesnellik boyutu ($U=682.500$, $p=.036$) arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark bulunmuştur. Ayrıca *eğitim yönetiminde yüksek lisans yapmış olma* değişkeni ile ÖDY ölçeğinin ikinci boyutu ($U=1345.500$, $p=.045$) arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark bulunmuş-

tur. Bu eğitim derecelerine sahip okul müdürlerinin ortalamaları, diğerlerine göre yüksek çıkmıştır.

Araştırmanın 3., 4. ve 5. soruları doğrultusunda değişkenler arasındaki ilişkileri belirlemek için Spearman sıra-derece korelasyonları testi kullanılmıştır. Analiz sonuçlarına göre, (a) okul müdürlerinin GÖY'leri ve ÖDY ölçeğine verdikleri cevaplar arasında [$rho=.666$, $N=151$, $p<.001$], (b) okul müdürlerinin GLY'leri ve ÖDY ölçeğine verdikleri cevaplar arasında [$rho=.555$, $N=151$, $p<.001$] ve (c) okul müdürlerinin ÖDY ölçeğine verdiği cevaplar ve DBS ölçeğine verdiği cevaplar arasında [$rho=.727$, $N=151$, $p<.001$] istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ilişkiler bulunmuştur. Bu ilişkiler araştırmanın değişkenleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve pozitif yönlü korelasyonların olduğunu göstermiştir.

Araştırmanın altıncı sorusu doğrultusunda, GÖY ve GLY inançlarının özgül değerlendirici davranışını nasıl yordadığını belirlemek amacıyla, basit doğrusal regresyon testi aracılığıyla iki model incelenmiştir. GSE ve GLE arasındaki pozitif yönlü ve güçlü korelasyon [$rho=.689$, $N=151$, $p<.001$] çoklu bağlantı problemine yatkın olduğu için çoklu regresyon kullanılmamıştır (Gnardellis, 2013; Roussos & Tsaousis, 2011). Model A'nın (GÖY bağımsız değişken ve ÖDY bağımlı değişken durumundayken yapılan doğrusal regresyon) analiz sonuçlarına göre, okul müdürlerinin kişisel becerileri göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, okul müdürlerinin kendilerinin yeterli olduklarına ilişkin inançları arttıkça, değerlendirenler olarak algılanan yeterlikleri de artmaktadır. Model B'nin (GLY bağımsız değişken ve ÖDY bağımlı değişken durumundayken yapılan doğrusal regresyon) analiz sonuçlarına göre, okul müdürlerinin kendilerini okul lideri olarak görmelerine ilişkin inançları arttıkça, değerlendirenler olarak algılanan yeterlikleri de artmaktadır. Bu iki doğrusal modelin kontrol edilmesi sonucunda, GÖY ve GLY'nin ikisi de ÖDY'nin yordayıcıları çıkmıştır. Ancak ÖDY bağımlı değişkeninin GÖY bağımsız değişkeni ile daha iyi bir doğrusal regresyon eşitliğinin olduğu görülmüştür. Bunun nedenleri şu şekildedir: (a) daha iyi determinasyon katsayısı r^2 ($r^2=.416$ 'ya karşılık $r^2 = .228$), (b) daha düşük standart hata tahmini (19.898'e karşılık 22.883), (c) ANOVA'da daha yüksek F değerleri [$F_{(1,149)}=106.173$, $p<.001$ 'e karşılık $F_{(1,149)}=43.936$, $p<.001$] ve (d) daha yüksek regresyon katsayısı (beta) [$\beta=.645$, $p<.001$ 'e karşılık $\beta=.477$, $p<.001$].

Tartışma/Öneriler

Araştırma verilerinin analizi sonucunda, okul müdürleri genel ve genelleştirilmiş liderlik yeterliklerinin yüksek düzeyde olduğunu ifade etmektedir. Öte yandan okul müdürleri özgül değerlendirici yeterliklerin orta düzeyde olduğunu belirtmektedir. Bu da onlara verilen bu yeni rol ile başa çıkmada daha az güvene sahip olduklarını göstermektedir. Bandura'ya (1997) göre yeterliğin kaynakları göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, değerlendirici olarak geçmişte tecrübelerinin olmaması ve genel eğitimsel/ekonomik karmaşa düşük ÖDY'yi açıklamaktadır. Machida & Schaubroeck'e (2011) göre, özellikle hazırlanma aşamasında ÖDY'nin orta düzeyde olması cesaret

kırcı değildir çünkü okul müdürlerinin görevlerini yapabilmeleri için bu durum önemli bir güdüleyiciye dönüştürülebilir. Gelecekte uygun bir eğitim ve kendini geliştirme ile ÖÖY'nin değerlendirme politikalarına olumlu bir etki yaratacağı beklenmektedir. Dahası okul müdürleri oldukça ılımlı bir tutum sergilemektedir. Bu durum değerlendirmeden beklenen sonuçlara ilişkin zihinlerinde bir ayrılık ve bir ikilemin oluştuğunu göstermektedir.

Bunlara ek olarak, araştırma sorularına ilişkin analiz sonuçları mevcut alan yazın ile tutarlılık göstermektedir. Okul müdürlerinin eğitim düzeyinin artması ÖY düzeylerini artırıyor gibi görünmektedir. Genel ve özgül yeterlik arasındaki pozitif yönlü ilişki ve hem GÖY ve GLY'nin ÖDY'nin yordayıcıları olduğu gerçeği şunları ortaya çıkarmıştır: (a) Kişiliklerinin bir özelliği olarak, Yunan okul müdürlerinin GÖY'leri öğretmen değerlendirme görevine de aktarılmaktadır ve (b) okul müdürlerinin iyi liderler olduklarına yönelik inançları, öğretmenleri değerlendirecek kadar yeterli olduklarına karar vermelerini sağlamaktadır fakat okul müdürleri duyguların sürece katılma potansiyeli ve değerlendirmenin sürece ilişkin kısımları konusunda kendilerini güvensiz ve şüphede hissetmektedir.

Sonuç olarak yeni oluşturulan ölçeklerden elde edilen sonuçlar içerik ve yapı geçerliği ile birlikte iç tutarlık için güvenilirliğe ilişkin kanıtlar ortaya koymaktadır. Buna rağmen gelecekte farklı araştırmaların yapılmasına ihtiyaç vardır çünkü Tschannen-Moran & Gareis'in (2004) OÖYÖ'si ile karşılaştırıldığında, genelleştirilmiş liderlik yeterliğini (GLY) ölçmek için kullanılan ölçek Yunanistan'da farklı bir yapı göstermektedir. Buna ek olarak okul müdürlerinin ÖÖY'lerinin geliştirilmesi okullarda liderlik kalitesini geliştirmekten sorumlu kişiler için önemli bir hedef olmalıdır. İşlenebilir ve değiştirilebilir olarak görülen yeterliğin her bir kaynağı için ayrı ayrı eğitim programları düzenlenebilir (Bandura, 2000; Luthans, 2008).

References/Kaynaklar

- Andreou, A., & Papakonstandinou, G. (1994). *Εξουσία και Οργάνωση - Διοίκηση ης Εκπαιδευτικού Συστήματος* [Power and Organization - Management of the Educational System]. Athens, Greece: Νέα Σύνορα – Εκδόσεις Α.Α. Λιβάνε.
- Avolio, B. J., & Luthans, F. (2006). *The high impact leader: moments matter in accelerating authentic leadership development*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2000). Cultivate self-efficacy for personal and organizational effectiveness. In E. A. Locke (Ed.), *The Blackwell Handbook of Principles of Organizational Behavior* (pp. 120-136). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62-83.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education* (6th edition). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Daly, A. J., Der-Martirosian, C., Ong-Dean, C., Park, V., & Wishard-Guerra, A. (2011). Leading under sanction: Principals' perceptions of threat, rigidity, effica-

- cy and leadership in underperforming schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 10(2), 171-206.
- Dimitropoulos, G. E. (2002). *Εκπαιδευτική αξιολόγηση. Η αξιολόγηση της εκπαίδευσης και της εκπαιδευτικής εργασίας* [Educational evaluation. Evaluation of education and educational work]. Athens, Greece: Εκδόσεις Γρεγόρε.
- Eden, D. (1988). Pygmalion, goal setting, and expectancy: Compatible ways to raise productivity. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 639-652.
- Eden, D., & Aviram, A. (1993). Self-efficacy training to speed reemployment: Helping people to help themselves. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(3), 352-360.
- Eden, D., & Zuk, Y. (1995). Seasickness as a self-fulfilling prophecy: Raising self-efficacy to boost performance at sea. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(5), 628-635.
- Fisher, Y. (2014). The timeline of self-efficacy: changes during the professional life cycle of school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 52(1), 58 – 83.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th edition). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review*, 17(2), 183-211.
- Gnardellis, Ch. (2013). *Ανάλυση δεδομένων με τη χρήση IBM SPSS Statistics 21* [Data Analysis with IBM SPSS Statistics 21]. Athens, Greece: Εκδόσεις Παπαδήξε.
- Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., & Harms, P. D. (2008). Leadership efficacy: Review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19 (6), 669-692.
- Matsagouras, G. E., Gialouris, P., & Kouloumparitsi, Ch. A. (2014). *Προκαταρκτικές Ενέργειες για την Εφαρμογή Συστήματος Αξιολόγησης. Επιμορφωτικό Υλικό για την Αξιολόγηση Σηλεσών και Εκπαιδευτικών Πρωτοβάθμιας και Δευτεροβάθμιας Εκπαίδευσης (152/2013)* [Preliminary Actions to Implement an Evaluation system. Training Material for the Evaluation of Executives and Teachers of Primary and Secondary Education (152/2013)]. Athens: Ινστιτούτο Εκπαιδευτικής Πολιτικής.
- Kalule, L., & Bouchamma, Y. (2014). Teacher Supervision Practices and Characteristics of In-school Supervisors in Uganda. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 26(1), 71-72.
- Katsaros, I. (2008). *Οργάνωση και Διοίκηση της Εκπαίδευσης* [Organization and Management of Education]. Athens: Παιδαγωγικό Ινστιτούτο.
- Kimball, S. M., & Milanowski, A. (2009). Examining teacher evaluation validity and leadership decision making within a standards-based evaluation system. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(1), 34-70.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 496-528.

- Luszczynska, A., Scholz, U., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). The general self-efficacy scale: Multicultural validation studies. *The Journal of Psychology*, 139(5), 439–457.
- Luthans, F. (2008). *Organisational Behaviour* (11th edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Machida, M., & Schaubroeck, J. (2011). The role of self-efficacy beliefs in leader development. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 18(4), 459–468.
- McCullum, D. L., & Kajs, L. T. (2009). A confirmatory factor analytic study of the goal orientation theory of motivation in educational leadership. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 33(1), 3-17.
- McCullers, J. F., & Bozeman, W. (2010). Principal self-efficacy: The effects of No Child Left Behind and Florida school grades. *NASSP Bulletin*, 94(1), 53-74.
- Mitgang, L. (2012). *The making of the principal: Five lessons in leadership training*. New York, NY: Wallace Foundation.
- Murphy, A. F., & Torff, B. (2012). Administrators' Sense of Self-efficacy in Supervision of Teachers of English as a Second Language. *Journal of International Education and Leadership*, 2(3), 1-12.
- Painter, S. R. (2000). Principals' efficacy beliefs about teacher evaluation. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(4), 368-378.
- Papakonstantinou, G., & Anastasiou, S. (2013). *Απέρ Διοίκηση Ανθρώπινος Δυναμικού. Η διοίκηση ης ανθρώπινος δςναμικού ηη εκπαίδεςζηη* [Principles of Human Resources Management. Management of human resources in education]. Athens: Gutenberg.
- Pashiardis P., Savvides, I., & Tsiakkiros, A. (2005). *Η Αξιολόγηζη ηος Διδακτικού Έργος ηων Εκπαιδευτικών: Από ηη Θεωπία ζηην Πράξη* [The Evaluation of Teachers' Work: from Theory to Praxis]. Athens: Εκδόεις Έλλεν.
- Roussos, L. P., & Tsaousis, C. (2011). *Σηαηζηηκή ζηηρ επιζήμερ ηηη ζςμπεπιθοπάρ με ηη σπήζη ηος SPSS* [Statistics on behavioral sciences using SPSS]. Athens: Εκδόεις Τόπος.
- Savvides, I. (2008). *Διεπύνηζη ηηη ζσέζηηρ ηων ηγεηικών ζηηλ και ηηη αςηηοεπάρκειαρ ηων διεςθςηηών με ηηη αςηηοεπάρκεια και ηηη ζςλλογηκή επάρκεια ηων εκπαιδευτικών* [Investigation of the Relationship of Leadership Styles and Principals' Self-Efficacy with Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Collective Efficacy]. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Cyprus.
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright & M. Johnston (Eds.), *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON.
- Shelton, S. H. (1990). Developing the construct of general self-efficacy. *Psychological Reports*, 66, 987-994.
- 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.
- Smith, R. W., Guarino, A. J., Strom, P., & Adams, O. L. (2006). Effective teaching and learning environments and principal self-efficacy. *Journal of Research for Educational Leaders*, 3(2), 4-23.

Kalliope Kaltsonoudi , Anastasia Athanasoula-Reppa

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2004). Principals' sense of efficacy: Assessing a promising construct. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(4/5), 573-585.

Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W., & Bernstein, H. T. (1985). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(1), 61-121.

APPENDIX

Table 1: Loadings for GLEs (principal axis factor analysis)

As school principal, I believe I can.....	Factor 1
...manage change in my school.	.849
...create a positive learning environment in my school.	.845
...generate enthusiasm for a shared vision for the school.	.841
...promote school spirit among a large majority of the student population.	.837
...motivate teachers.	.820
...shape the operational policies and procedures that are necessary to manage my school.	.768
...facilitate student learning in my school.	.727
...raise student achievement on written tests.	.725
...promote the prevailing values of the community in my school.	.679
...promote acceptable behavior among students.	.672
...promote a positive image of my school in society.	.656
...handle the time demands of the job.	.654
...handle effectively the discipline of students in my school.	.628
...maintain control of my own daily schedule.	.617
...prioritize among competing demands of the job.	.616
...promote ethical behavior among school personnel.	.564
...handle the paperwork required of the job.	.534
...cope with the stress of the job.	.503

Note. Extraction criterion: one factor. Rotation: Oblimin. Loadings below .45 are omitted.

Table 2: Loadings for SEEs (principal axis factor analysis)

As school principal, regarding teacher evaluation, I believe I can....	Factor 1	Factor 2
	Objectivity	Subjectivity
...count on my knowledge about the process.	.981	.252
...evaluate unbiased from negative social persuasion.	.749	-.132
...handle the overall process.	.740	-.150
...compile evaluation reports.	.730	-.103
...evaluate without leniency.	.669	-.180

...evaluate without spending much time and effort.	.665	-.003
...evaluate by using the legislative descriptive framework and the analytical criteria.	.649	-.174
...evaluate unbiased from previous teacher's good performance.	.636	-.270
...evaluate without preventing or facilitating teachers' careers, especially in the higher service echelons.	.616	-.334
...evaluate unbiased from my previous disputes with a teacher.	-.135	-.948
...evaluate unbiased from my personal/friendly relationship with a teacher.	.059	-.844
...evaluate with no subjective criteria.	.128	-.831
...evaluate not subject to my current physical or psychological state.	.101	-.813
...objectively evaluate teachers.	.154	-.721
...evaluate with no emotional bias.	.272	-.699
...evaluate a teacher without comparing him/her with another.	-.477	-.486

Note. Extraction criterion: two factors. Rotation: Oblimin. Loadings below .45 and two values cross loadings < .20 are omitted.

Table 3: Loadings for EERs (principal axis factor analysis)

As school principal, I believe that teacher evaluation will...	Factors*		
	1	2	3
...disrupt teachers' relationships.	.987	-.003	-.186
...cause conflicts and competition among teachers.	.981	.009	-.106
...worsen daily work interactions among teachers.	.960	-.025	-.068
...negatively affect the existing school climate.	.958	-.035	-.065
...disrupt my relationships with my colleagues.	.955	.001	-.104
...bring about my isolation from teachers' team of my school.	.859	.036	.006
...negatively affect school culture.	.843	-.108	.022
...raise complaints/objections from unsatisfied teachers.	.834	-.085	.015
...bring about negative personal feelings from a low rating of an inadequate teacher.	.756	-.079	.103
...reduce teachers' job satisfaction.	.676	-.060	.245
...limit the time of my engagement with other administrative or educational duties.	.647	.027	.222
...cause conflict with implicit norms, values or traditions of the school routine.	.614	-.171	.170

Kalliope Kaltsonoudi , Anastasia Athanasoula-Reppa

...cause conflict with the self-perception of my leadership role.	.585	-.202	.283
...degrade the decision-making process of the teachers' team of my school.	.581	-.084	.340
...increase teachers' formal and informal work obligations.	.515	.048	.478
...cause conflict with my personal beliefs.	.486	-.313	.253
...benefit school unit.	.010	-.918	.105
...benefit educational system.	.025	-.911	.094
...improve teachers' typical official duties.	-.050	-.898	-.113
...benefit teachers.	.095	-.875	.001
...improve teachers' communication and cooperation with parents and stakeholders.	.053	-.870	-.079
...enhance teachers' professionalism.	.056	-.867	.090
...maximize the active participation of teachers in the procedures of school unit's self-evaluation.	.070	-.863	-.170
...intensify teachers' work.	-.214	-.859	.011
...maximize the active participation of teachers in the operation of the school unit as a "learning organization".	.095	-.851	-.153
...benefit myself.	.051	-.849	.095
...encourage fair competition among teachers.	.168	-.779	.057
...increase costs at regional or state level.	-.141	.040	.671
...increase my working hours.	.310	.041	.546
...increase school bureaucracy.	.405	.020	.533
...increase costs at school level.	.143	-.080	.520

Note. Extraction criterion: three factors. Rotation: Oblimin. Loadings below .45 and two values cross loadings < .20 are omitted.

*Factor 1: interpersonal relationships, processes and school climate

Factor 2: potential improvements and benefits

Factor 3: timing and financial requirements