The Relationship Between the Instructional Leadership Behaviours Used by the School Principals and Their Readiness Level for Change

[1]**Kalender İlbeyiilingi**
[2]**Yusuf İnandı**

Abstract

The effectiveness of schools is heavily influenced by the behavior of school principals as instructional leaders in the fast-changing world of today. According to the perceptions of teachers employed by public schools, in this study tried to specify the relationship between the instructional leadership behaviors of school principals and their readiness for change. The sample of the study, determined through convenient sampling, consists of 535 teachers, working in public schools province of Adana in the 2021-2022 academic year. The Instructional Leadership Scale developed by Oktar (2019) and the "Readiness for Change" scale developed by Kondakçı, Zayim, and Çalışkan (2013) were applied as data collection tools. For the gathered data, T-test, Pearson Correlation analysis, and regression analysis methods were used. The results of the research indicate, there were significant gender differences between teachers' perceptions in determining and sharing objectives and managing the teaching process sub-dimensions of instructional leadership behaviors of school principals on behalf of the female teachers. In none of the sub-dimensions of school principals' readiness level for change, however, there was a significant gender distinction in teachers' perceptions. Furthermore, all sub-dimensions of school principals' instructional leadership behaviors and all sub-dimensions of readiness for change had a significant positive relationship, and all sub-dimensions of school principals' instructional leadership behaviors predicted all sub-dimensions of readiness for change.

Keywords: *Instructional Leadership; Readiness for Change; School Principal; Teacher.*

_____

[1]**Kalender İlbeyiilingi**, Karaisalı Atatürk Secondary School, Adana/Turkey
Email: kalender_ilbeyi@hotmail.com
[2]**Yusuf İnandı**, Prof. Dr., Mersin University, Faculty of Education, Mersin/Turkey
Email: inandiyusuf@gmail.com

The Relationship Between the Instructional Leadership Behaviours Used by the School Principals and Their Readiness Level for Change

Introduction

While change is a very broad concept, it can be generally described as all of the changes that occur over a time period (TDK, 2022). For organizations, change includes new strategies and processes, development of vision, conflict management, or key system applications covering all members of the organization (Anderson, 2016). In today's constantly changing world, it is impossible for organizations to continue their existence in a stable state. Sabuncuoğlu and Tüz (1996) emphasize that the successful understanding and realization of change by organizations is of critical importance for their survival. Schools, which have organizational characteristics and are educational institutions due to their characteristics, are also affected by the changes taking place in their environment.

Schools are living organizations and are encountering many factors that cause changes in their structures, policies, strategies, and technologies. Tabancalı (2003) stated that with their changing and transforming structure schools are affected by the changes in the environment and recreate themselves for the development of the society. Therefore, change is indispensable for schools as educational organizations. In particular, some indicators can be a reference for schools to achieve the changes they plan in the future, both nationally and internationally. Examples of these indicators are PISA and TIMSS reports. Reports such as the PISA report published by the OECD, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, provide information on the status of education by comparing all member countries. Also, TIMSS, conducted by the International Education Success Assessment Agency, reveals data obtained in relation to science and mathematics education conducted in schools. These reports show that change needs to be continuous in schools for better. Many changes have been made in our country, especially since 2000, to eliminate the problems in education. When the National Education Ministry legislation is reviewed, testing systems (secondary school and high school testing systems have been replaced continuously with different content and names for university entrance exams, curriculum, inter-institutional information sharing (e-school and similar systems used in schools), the integration of technological materials into the classrooms (Fatih Project) and the transition to 4+4+4 system, i.e. 12 years of compulsory education, are seen as many changes directly related to schools.

It is possible for schools to continue their effectiveness and functionality by keeping up with these changes. Because change makes itself felt as a necessity of the age and stands in front of organizations. Therefore, educational organizations should set aside the conventional and ordinary administrative structure and adopt contemporary education approaches (Çankaya & Karakuş, 2010). Özdemir (2012) emphasizes the importance of the role of school administrators, expressing a favorable relationship between effective leadership behaviors in schools and the achievement of the educational organization to achieve their goals. School principals who adopt instructional leadership can understand change in schools and implement it efficiently and effectively, in accordance with the organization's goals.

Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership described as a style of leadership that supports teachers, is based on the principle of serving the learning and development of students to meet their needs, mobilizes members of the school community in school-related work and transactions, and strives for school success (Hallinger, 2012; Krug, 1992; Şişman, 2018). Therefore, the school principals' role of instructional leadership is one of the most crucial aspects of school performance. Effects of instructional leadership have been the focus of studies on this topic on the organizational structure of schools, teacher behaviors, school climate, school culture, and student success (Balcı, 2013). With the model put forward by Hallinger and Murphy in the 1980s, a conceptual framework for instructional leadership was created and the sub-dimensions of instructional leadership were determined (İnandı & Özkan, 2006).

While Şişman (2018) defines instructional leadership as being able to mobilize all followers in the purposeful conduct of work and activities related to teaching and education, Krug (1992) defines it as using information to solve problems and ensuring that the school's objectives are realized through others. According to studies, instructional leadership focuses on a school's fundamental tasks, such as the teaching and learning process, by presenting the school's vision, goal, and objectives, along with performing the teaching program and maintaining the school atmosphere.

Balcı (2013) stated that school principals take on critical roles in the success of education activities conducted in schools and in the formation of an efficient environment. Şişman (2013) describes the school principal as a person in charge of providing the required human, financial, and material resources for the school and producing envisaged products through them, and responsible for the performance of school employees and students. As these definitions show, the instructional leadership of administrators responsible for school management is very important in achieving the school's objectives, improving the efficiency of teachers, students, and other employees at school.

Researchers have discovered several behavioral characteristics in studies conducted to evaluate the behavioral elements of instructional leadership in the literature. Instructional leadership was studied by Hallinger and Murphy (1985) in three primary dimensions and 10 associated sub-dimensions. The main dimension of defining the vision of the school is "Creating the school's goals", "Sharing the created goals with other stakeholders and informing them about the school's goal" sub-dimensions; the main dimension of curriculum management is "Coordinating the curriculum", "Evaluation and supervision of teaching", "Monitoring student success" sub-dimensions; The main dimension of creating a positive learning atmosphere in schools consists of the sub-dimensions of "Protecting the time devoted to teaching", "Rewarding successful teachers", "Rewarding student success", "Following the professional development of teachers" and "Being visible at school".

While Krug (1992) deals with the five main dimensions of instructional leadership as describing the school mission, syllabus and instruction management, supervision and evaluation of instruction, observing student development, and positive instructional climate, Lineburg (2010) examined instructional leadership in six main dimensions as aiming to transmit goals, supplying

resources, encouraging professional development, supervising instruction, supplying incentives, and supplying support. Şişman (2018), on the other hand, examined instructional leadership in five dimensions. Setting and communicating school goals, the teaching process and curriculum management, assessment of students and of the teaching process, support and development for teacher, a consistent environment for teaching-learning, and learning atmosphere are all examples. Although research about the aspects on the behavior of instructional leadership differs, it is clear that several dimensions are shared by most scholars (Oktar, 2019).

Determining and Sharing the School's Goals: Planning the future position of the school and setting attainable goals is an important indicator for putting instructional leadership into practice in the school (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Lezotto & Papperl, 1999; Lezotto & Synder, 2011; Stronge, Richard & Catano, 2008). While determining the vision of the school, the instructional leaders should look at the goals set in the past and analyze how much of these goals have been achieved (Şişman, 2018). They should identify students and staff who need support and plan what needs to be done to get support. They should be aware of school's resources such as manpower and educational material (Hallinger, 2012). Considering these elements in determining the school's goals will enable concrete and realizable goals to be put forward. In schools, principals have a key position in ensuring the connection of the institution with the region and closing the gaps between the school's policy and program and its means and the goals it sets (Hallinger et al., 2017). Therefore, school principals should ensure that factors that have a strong influence on the learning processes, such as teachers, students, and parents, participate in the process of determining the school's aims (Gümüşeli, 1996).

Evaluating Instruction and Monitoring Student Development: While describing instructional leadership, Özdemir (2018) refers to the school principal's influence on teachers' development of instructional strategies and learning new methods. Therefore, the dimension of monitoring the teacher and student of the instructional leadership is essential for the achievement of school goals. To monitor the teaching process, the situation of the teachers and students can be determined, the obstacles and mistakes made in reaching the targeted goals can be determined, the causes of the identified problems can be investigated, and corrective measures can be taken to eliminate these problems, and as a result, it can be revealed to what extent the school's goals have been achieved (Elmore, 2008; Horng & Loeb, 2010; Weber, 1987). For schools to achieve their aims, school administrator should constantly observe and evaluate the learning environments, students, and teachers, and take the necessary measures by giving feedback in this regard (Balcı, 2013; Şişman, 2018).

Supporting the Professional Development of Teachers: Professional development is the development of current professional knowledge and skills. It is extremely important for the school to be a professional learning area in the direction of instructional leadership, based on the needs of all education stakeholders, in a professional development system suitable for their fields (DeMatthews, 2014; Hopkins, 2003; Leonard, 2010). Personal development and professional learning activities of education staff are key factors that determine the quality of education. It is essential to encourage the development of professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes of all personnel inside and outside the school to identify the needs, provide a supportive attitude in the creation of efficient and functional teaching-learning environments, and carry out necessary

training activities for this. In a school where all these elements are realized, we can say that the school administrator adopts the instructional leadership. Because the instructional leader strives to create the necessary environment and conditions for teachers to be continuous learners at school (Şişman, 2018). It is the duty of instructional leaders to carry out studies that increase performance in studies that require different abilities for teachers (Aydın, 2010; Danışmaz Akgün, 2021).

Strong School Climate and Encouraging Learning: Encouraging teachers and students is an important instructional leadership behavior in terms of creating an effective teaching and learning climate (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; MacNeil, 2005; McEwan, 2003; Murphy, 1990). The school principal needs to notice the progress and efforts of teachers and students, and beyond that, show them that he has noticed. Such an approach will increase the motivation of teachers and students and contribute to their development. It is primarily the responsibility of a good instructional leader to create a team and family atmosphere in schools, to create a culture that is shared by everyone, and then to ensure that this culture continues and to unite around an ideal (Şişman, 2018).

Instructional leaders have a very important role in revealing and realizing all the dimensions mentioned. In addition, instructional leaders must constantly renew themselves and adapt themselves to new situations, taking into account all the changes that occur inside and outside the school. In other words, they should be constantly ready for change.

Readiness for Change

Burke (2008) defines organizational change as following a different path for the organization by giving employees a vision, creating a new decision-making and responsibility process or adopting a new approach, and emphasizes that organizational change is as old as the history of organizations. With the change in human relations and environmental factors, the need for change in the purpose, process, structure, and strategy dimensions of organizations is an undeniable fact. At this point, the ideas presented by Kurt Lewin, who has carried out many studies in social sciences about change, have an important place in the literature. Lewin, who considers the stages of change as thawing, mobilizing, and freezing, described the thawing stage as the preparation of the organization for change, the mobilizing stage as the change of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of organization members for the realization of organizational change, and the freezing stage as supporting new behavior patterns to ensure the permanence of change in the organization (Özdemir, 2020). The organization's ability to adapt to change and internalize change requires organizational members who are ready for change.

Readiness for change is a concept that expresses the attitudes, thoughts, and beliefs of organization members concerning the requirement and implementation of change, and reflects the capability of the organization to realize the change (Armenakis, Harris & Mossholder, 1993; Armenakis & Fredenberger, 1997; French, Bell & Zawacki, 2004). Luecke (2003) emphasizes that in organizations that are ready for change, employees are motivated and the leader is effective. Weiner (2009) states that when organization members have a high belief in readiness for change, they tend to show collaborative persistent behaviors about change. However, in organizations where the belief in readiness for change is low, it is seen that individuals avoid or

even resist situations in which they need to improve themselves (Shea, Jacobs, Esserman, & Weiner, 2014). These statements in the literature show that readiness for change is a complicated and multidimensional concept at the personal and organizational level. It is critical to understand the attitudes of employees affected by change toward change in order for change practices in businesses to be effective (Kondakçı, Zayim, & Çalışkan, 2010). In order to be ready for change, first of all, the organization's members must believe that the change will benefit them and the organization (Şimşek, Çelik, & Akgemci, 2014). The more the organizational members' belief in change is increased, the more their desire for change will increase. Therefore, for the organization to be ready for change, the perceptions of the organization's members on the necessity of change should be positive. Individuals who are convinced of the consequences of change and internalize that change is inevitable take an active part in the realization of change (Gılıç, 2015). There are many personal and organizational elements in readiness for change, such as the organization members' perceptions, self-efficacy, belief in change and organization's culture, policy, size, structure, and so forth. Factors such as these can determine readiness for change (Armenakis & Bedian, 1999; Armenakis & Harris, 2009; Cunningham et al., 2002; Holt & Vardaman, 2013; Rafferty, Jimmieson & Armenakis, 2013).

Educational organizations are at the forefront of organizations where change is inevitable. Because one of the functions of education is to produce change (Levent, 2016). In this context, educational organizations, which prepare the individuals for society and enable them to grow up as a social being, also play a key role in enabling societies to adapt to today's world and internalize changing and renewing developments. Especially the rapid changes experienced with the development of technology and the innovations that emerged as a result of these changes force schools to change and innovate in organizational terms. In this context, schools should be ready for change and should be able to manage the change process appropriately. Therefore, schools need school administrators who are dedicated to change, ready for change, and have the capacity to implement change in order not to fall behind.

Instructional Leadership and Readiness for Change

Schools are organizations that have the ability to change the society and also be affected by the changes in the society. Besides being an education center, the school is also at the center of social, political and economic change (Aytaç, 2013). Therefore, school organizations are structures integrated with change. Especially today's rapid changes, the technological requirements required by the information age have caused the change to progress at a dizzying speed, and this has also affected schools. In a period when such rapid changes are experienced, the readiness of the administrators responsible for the management of schools to change is crucial in the terms of not distracting the organization from change.

School principals' instructional leadership practices are strongly linked to preparing schools for changing new situations and boosting the efficiency of educational activities. Direct participation with students, instructors, curriculum, and teaching-learning processes is required for instructional leadership (Aksoy & Işık, 2008). School aim to educate the individuals by providing a qualified education in a way that will adapt them to the changing new conditions. Where there is education, change is inevitable. For this reason, with school principals who are

ready for change and have adopted the teaching leadership, the school will catch up with the age and guide it.

Change brings along many uncertainties. Liberating the members of the school community from this uncertainty and encouraging them cannot be accomplished with school principals who are behind the times, unaware of change, and distant. In today's world, where change has gained an unprecedented speed, leaders should renew themselves and develop their adaptability skills as the environment around them changes (Tunçer, 2011). Leaders who have the strength to apply the activities required by change in schools are instructional leaders.

The successful realization of the change process in educational organizations and the creation of an efficient educational environment by internalizing the change are closely connected with the instructional leadership behaviors of those responsible for school management. Therefore, determining the relation between the instructional leadership behaviors of school principals and their readiness level for change will be useful in terms of planning, implementation, and evaluation studies in the face of new situations that will occur in schools.

Purpose of the Research

Identifying the relationship between school principals' instructional leadership behaviors and their readiness for change is the main goal of this research. The following questions' answers were sought after for this main goal.

1- Do teachers' perceptions of principal's instructional leadership behaviors and readiness for change differ significantly depending on the teachers' gender?
2- Is there an important relationship between school principals' instructional leadership behaviors and their readiness for change?
3- Which extent do school principals' instructional leadership behaviors predict their readiness for change?

Method

In this study tried to describe the relationship relevancy between the instructional leadership behaviors of school principals and their level of readiness for change. In this respect, a correlational survery approach was used in the study. The correlational survey approach, which is one of the general survey models of the quantitative research method, is designed to specify the without any intervention, the relationship between two or more variables without any intervention, to explain and predict what kind of relationship it is (Christensen, Johnson, & Turner, 2015; Karasar, 2014). In correlational survey research, the relationship between the variables is revealed through estimation; no cause and effect relationship is sought (Gliner, Morgan & Leech, 2015).

Population and sample

The population consists of 23.746 (accessed from http://adana.meb.gov.tr/ on 29/01/2022) teachers teaching in public preschool, primary and secondary education levels throughout the Adana province in the 2021-2022 academic year. Consideration was given to the scale of 535 teachers who participated voluntarily and gave full answers to the questions. The sample was selected through convenient sampling from the study population. Of the 535 teachers making up the sample, 254 (47.5%) were female teachers and 281 (52.5%) were male teachers.

One of the non-probability sampling techniques is convenience sampling (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2013). Non-probability sampling techniques are used to make population predictions when probabilistic sampling techniques cannot be used. According to Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill claim (2009), the sample of this study is at the 95% confidence level and 5% error range, in line with the sample calculation for the cases with a certain number of universes. It is thought that sufficient sample size has been reached for this study.

Data collection tools

Research data and demographic information of the participants were collected with two different scales. "Instructional Leadership Scale" developed by Oktar (2019) to specify the instructional leadership attitudes of school principals, and the Kondakçı, Zayim, and Çalışkan (2013) developed the "Readiness for Change" scale was used to reveal the school principals' readiness for change.

Instructional Leadership Scale: "Instructional Leadership Scale" developed by Oktar (2019) to measure the instructional leadership behaviors of school principals consists of four sub-dimensions and twenty-eight items. The sub-dimensions are Setting and Sharing Goals, Management of the Teaching Process, Creating a Strong School Climate and Culture, and Providing Professional Development of Teachers. Sub-dimensions and distribution of items in the Instructional Leadership Scale are as follows: Determination and Sharing of Goals dimension (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9), Management of the Teaching Process dimension (10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17) , Creating a Strong School Climate and Culture dimension (items 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23) and Ensuring Professional Development of Teachers dimension (items 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28). Cronbach's Alpha reliability values for these dimensions were calculated as .92 for the dimension of Determining and Sharing of Goals, .91 for the Management of the Teaching Process, .95 for the Dimension of Creating a Strong School Climate and Culture, and .92 for the dimension of Ensuring the Professional Development of Teachers (Oktar, 2019). The scale is 5-point Likert type and is prepared as Never (1), Rarely (2), Sometimes (3), Mostly (4), and Always (5). The reliability coefficients for this study was .95 for the sub-dimension of Determining and Sharing the Goals, .95 for the Management of the Teaching Process, .97 for the Building a Strong School Climate and Culture sub-dimension, and .95 for the sub-dimension of Ensuring the Professional Development of Teachers. The reliability coefficient for the overall scale was .98.

The Readiness for Change Scale: According to what teachers' perceptions, the "Readiness for

Change (Cognitive, Emotional, Intention) Scale" developed by Kondakçı, Zayim, and Çalışkan (2013) was applied to determine the level of school principals' readiness for change. The scale consists of twelve items and three sub-dimensions, namely Readiness for Change in the Intention Dimension, Readiness for Change in the Cognitive Dimension, and Readiness for Change in the Emotional Dimension. Distribution of sub-dimensions and items in the scale are as follows: Cognitive Dimension (items 1, 2, 4, and 5), Emotional Dimension (items 3, 7, and 10), Intention Dimension (items 6, 8, 9, 11, and 12). Cronbach's Alpha reliability values were calculated as .87 for Cognitive Dimension, .67 for Emotion Dimension and .87 for Intention Dimension (Kondakçı, Zayim, and Çalışkan, 2013). The scale is 5-point Likert type and is prepared as Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Undecided (3), Agree (4), and Strongly Agree (5). The reliability coefficients for this study were .94 for the cognitive dimension, .88 for the emotion dimension, and .94 for the intention dimension. The reliability coefficient found for the overall scale was .96.

Analysis of data

To test the assumptions of the relational analysis, the responses given to the instructional leadership and readiness for change measurement tools used in the study were examined in terms of outliers, univariate and multivariate normality distribution, and linearity. Parametric tests were used during the analysis, since the sample size was larger than 30. The distribution is believed to be normal or close to normal in cases where the number of participants exceeds 30, and therefore parametric tests can be used (Gliner, Morgan, & Leech, 2015).

The t-test was applied to determine whether teachers' perceptions of school principals' instructional leadership behaviors and school principals' readiness for change differ significantly by teachers' gender. Pearson Correlation analysis was applied to specify whether there is a significant relation between school principals' instructional leadership behaviors and their readiness for change, and Regression analysis was conducted to specify whether the instructional leadership behaviors of school principals predict their readiness for change.

Results

To ascertain the relationship between the study's variables, the conclusions drawn from the data were presented in accordance with the research questions.

Results pertaining to the research's first question

In Tables 1 and 2, results pertaining to the first research question are given and the findings are interpreted.

Table 1. *Results of Teachers' Perception of Instructional Leadership by Gender Variable (T-test)*

Dimension	Gender	n	$\bar{x}$	SD	t	df	p
Setting and Sharing Goals	Male	281	3.6730	.92475	-2.589	533	.010*
	Female	254	3.8692	.81689			
Management of Teaching Process	Male	281	3.5111	1.00891	-2.386	533	.017*
	Female	254	3.7101	.91049			
Creating a Strong School Climate and Culture	Male	281	3.6489	1.16457	-.683	533	.495
	Female	254	3.7152	1.07413			
Ensuring Professional Development of Teachers	Male	281	3.4619	1.13842	-1.066	533	.287
	Female	254	3.5646	1.08289			
Instructional Leadership (General)	Male	281	3.5737	1.01198	-1.682	533	.093
	Female	254	3.7148	.91768			

*$p < 0.05$

When Table 1 is analyzed, it is possible to draw conclusion that the perceptions of the teachers regarding the instructional leadership behaviors exhibited by school principals in the sub-dimension of determining and sharing the goals ($t = -2.59$; $p < .010$) and the management of the teaching process ($t = -2.39$; $p < .017$) significantly differ on behalf of female teachers. In the sub-dimension of determining and sharing the goals, the average score of female teachers ($\bar{x} = 3.86$) is superior to the average value of male teachers ($\bar{x} = 3.67$), and in the sub-dimension of the management of the teaching process, the average score of female teachers ($\bar{x} = 3.71$) is superior to the average value of male teachers ($\bar{x} = 3.51$).

In the sub-dimension of creating a strong school climate and culture, the average score of female teachers ($\bar{x} = 3.71$) is superior to the average value of male teachers ($\bar{x} = 3.64$), and in the sub-

dimension of ensuring the professional development of teachers, the average score of female teachers (x̄ = 3.56) is superior to the average value of male teachers (x̄ = 3.46). In general, it was concluded that female teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership (x̄ = 3.71) were higher than male teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership (x̄ = 3.57). It was determined that there was no important difference in the other sub-dimensions, except for the sub-dimension of specifying and sharing the objectives and the sub-dimension of the management of the teaching process.

Table 2. *Results of Teachers' Perceptions of Readiness to Change According to Gender (T-test)*

Dimension	Gender	n	x̄	SD	t	df	p
Cognitive Dimension	Male	281	3.7198	1.02337	-.608	533	.543
	Female	254	3.7717	.94253			
Emotion Dimension	Male	281	3.5848	1.06011	-.964	533	.336
	Female	254	3.6680	.92185			
Intention Dimension	Male	281	3.6890	.93008	-.783	533	.434
	Female	254	3.7496	.85316			
Readiness for Change (General)	Male	281	3.6645	.90648	-.858	533	.391
	Kadın	254	3.7297	.84465			

*p < 0.05

As shown in Table 2, there was no important difference in any dimension according to the consequences of the t-test conducted to specify whether there was a considerable teachers' gender difference between the teachers' perceptions of the school principals about the readiness for change. In the cognitive dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of readiness for change, the average score of female teachers (x̄ = 3.77) is superior to the average score of male teachers (x̄ = 3.71), in the emotional dimension the average score of female teachers (x̄ = 3.66) is superior to the average score of male teachers (x̄ = 3.58) and the average score of female teachers in the dimension of intention (x̄ = 3.74) is superior to the average score of male teachers (x̄ = 3.68). In general, it was concluded that female teachers' perceptions of school

principals' readiness for change ($\bar{x}$ = 3.72) were higher than that of male teachers ($\bar{x}$ = 3.66). However, when all dimensions were examined, the conclusion was that there was no significant difference between the perceptions of male and female teachers.

Results pertaining to the research's second question

In Table 3, results pertaining to the second research question are given and the findings are interpreted.

Table 3. *Results of Correlation Analysis on the Relationship between Instructional Leadership Behaviors of School Principals and their Readiness for Change*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	$\bar{x}$	SD
1. Setting and Sharing Goals	1									3.76	.87
2. Management of the Teaching Process	.893**	1								3.60	.96
3. Creating a Strong School Climate and Culture	.863**	.861**	1							3.68	1.12
4. Ensuring Professional Development of Teachers	.845**	.865**	.896**	1						3.51	1.11
5. Cognitive Dimension	.756**	.756**	.820**	.776**	1					3.74	.98
6. Emotion Dimension	.534**	.530**	.577**	.517**	.700**	1				3.62	.99
7. Intention Dimension	.753**	.775**	.799**	.767**	.915**	.661**	1			3.71	.89
8. Instructional Leadership (General)	.941**	.949**	.957**	.953**	.820**	.568**	.815**	1		3.64	.97
9. Readiness for Change (General)	.741**	.747**	.797**	.747**	.950**	.865**	.932**	.799**	1	3.69	.87

**. At the 0.01 level, correlation is significant (2-tailed).

When the Table 3 is analyzed, there are correlation analysis results showing the relevancy between school principals' instructional leadership behaviors and their readiness for change. There is a high level of positive correlation between the first sub-dimension of instructional leadership, determining and sharing goals, and the first sub-dimension of readiness for change, the cognitive dimension ($r = .756$), a positive correlation between the second sub-dimension, the emotion dimension ($r = .534$), and a high level of positive correlation between the third sub-dimension, the intention dimension ($r = .753$).

The second sub-dimension of instructional leadership, the management of the instructional process, had a high positive correlation with the cognitive dimension ($r = .756$), a positive correlation with the emotion dimension ($r = .530$), and a high positive correlation with the intention dimension ($r = .775$).

The third sub-dimension of instructional leadership, the creation of a strong school climate and culture, had a high positive correlation with the cognitive dimension ($r = .820$), a positive correlation with the emotion dimension ($r = .577$) and a high positive correlation with the intention dimension ($r = .799$).

The fourth sub-dimension of instructional leadership, the professional development of teachers, had a high positive correlation with the cognitive dimension ($r = .776$), a positive correlation with the emotion dimension ($r = .517$), and a high level of positive correlation with the intention dimension ($r = .767$).

Accordingly, it is concluded that the sub-dimensions of instructional leadership of school principals and the sub-dimensions of readiness for change are positively and significantly related. Except for the emotion dimension, which is the sub-dimension of readiness for change, all other dimensions are highly and positively correlated. In particular, it is concluded that there is a very strong favorable relationship between the sub-dimension of teaching leadership to create a strong school climate and culture and the cognitive dimension of being ready for change. School principals' level of readiness for change also increases as their instructional leadership behaviors do.

Results pertaining to the research's third question

In Table 4, results pertaining to the third research question are given and the findings are interpreted.

Table 4. *Regression Analysis Results of School Principals' Level of Readiness for Change of Instructional Leadership Behaviors*

Predictive Variable	Cognitive					Emotion					Intention				
	B	S.H	β	t	p	B	S.H	β	t	p	B	S.H	β	t	p
Constant	.714	.095		7.516	.000	1.498	.138		10.855	.000	.983	.087		11.277	.000
Setting and Sharing Goals	.846	.032	.756	26.649	.000	.605	.041	.534	14.579	.000	.765	.029	.753	26.400	.000
Management of Teaching Process	.770	.029	.756	26.678	.000	.546	.038	.530	14.437	.000	.716	.025	.774	28.331	.000
Creating a Strong School Climate and Culture	.720	.022	.820	33.091	.000	.513	.031	.577	16.313	.000	.637	.021	.799	30.708	.000
Ensuring Professional Development of Teachers	.687	.024	.776	28.382	.000	.463	.033	.517	13.944	.000	.616	.022	.767	27.574	.000
	$R = .820$ $R^2 = .672$					$R = .568$ $R^2 = .323$					$R = .815$ $R^2 = .664$				
	$p < 0.05$					$p < 0.05$					$p < 0.05$				

Cognitive Dimension: When the Table 4 is analyzed, the instructional leadership behaviors of school principals significantly predict the cognitive dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of readiness for change ($R = .820$, $p < .05$). The instructional leadership behaviors of school principals account for 67% percent of the variance overall regarding the cognitive sub-dimension of readiness for change ($R^2 = .672$, $p < .05$).

Emotion Dimension: School principals' instructional leadership behaviors significantly predicted the emotional dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of readiness for change ($R = .568$, $p < .05$). The instructional leadership behaviors of school principals account for 32% percent of

the variance overall regarding the emotion sub-dimension of readiness for change (R^2 = .323, p < .05).

Intention Dimension: When Table 4 is analyzed, the instructional leadership behaviors of school principals significantly predict the intention dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of readiness for change (R = .815, p < .05). Instructional leadership behaviors of school principals account for 66% percent of the variance overall regarding the intention sub-dimension of readiness for change (R^2 = .664, p < .05).

Discussion, Conclusion, And Suggestions

In this research study, which investigates the relationship between the instructional leadership attitudes of school principals and their readiness for change, has been discussed and analyzed in line with the purpose and research questions, a judgment has been made and suggestions have been made in this regard.

When whole sub-dimensions of instructional leadership behaviors of school principals were examined, there was a considerable difference on behalf of female teachers in the sub-dimension of determining and sharing objectives and the sub-dimensions of management of the teaching process among teachers' perceptions according to their gender. Studies in the literature provide support for the research's findings. Greenwood (2009) found considerable differences on behalf of female teachers in all sub-dimensions of instructional leadership; Yasser and Amal (2015) found a considerable difference on behalf of female teachers in the sub-dimension of creating the school mission; Şenay (2017) found significant differences in all sub-dimensions of instructional leadership on behalf of female teachers; Özgün (2018) determined that there is a considerable difference on behalf of female teachers in the sub-dimension of determining and sharing objectives. In addition, Karatay (2011) found differences on behalf of male teachers in the sub-dimensions of supporting and improving teachers, creating learning climate and a regular environment for teaching-learning; Aydın (2017) concluded that there is a considerable difference on behalf of male teachers in the sub-dimensions of specifying and sharing the objectives of the school, management of the teaching process, creating a regular teaching-learning environment and climate. Toptimur (2021) and Tunçtan (2022) found that in all sub-dimensions of instructional leadership, male participants' perception of instructional leadership was higher than female participants. Accordingly, it is revealed that the gender of the participants is effective in determining the level of instructional leadership behaviors of school principals. In addition, many studies concluded that there is no considerable difference from the point of gender variable in whole sub-dimensions of instructional leadership (Aydoğan, 2018; Danışmaz Akgün, 2021; Demirbaş, 2020; Dorukbaşı, 2022; Dölen, 2016; Ebcim, 2019; Erdoğan, 2017; Ezer, 2014; Kazancı, 2022; Oktar, 2019) is also seen in the literature.

Instructional leadership behaviors of school principals have an important place in the positive behavior of teachers in the classroom, their activities, and the attitude they develop towards the school (Leithwood, 2018). There may be many reasons for the significant difference favoring female teachers in the sub-dimension of determining and sharing the objectives of instructional leadership and the sub-dimension of management of the instructional process. Especially cultural and regional differences are one of them (İnandı, Uzun and Yeşil, 2016). Şişman (2016) points

out that there are diversities on behalf of male teachers in the Eastern Anatolia Region and Southeastern Anatolia Region and on behalf of female teachers in the Black Sea Region. One of the reasons why male teachers' perceptions of school principals' instructional leadership are low may be that male teachers have more expectations than school principals from the point of displaying instructional leadership behaviors. In addition, the fact that the administrators of the teachers taking part in the research are different from each other from the point of knowledge and experience can be seen among the factors that cause this situation.

When the data obtained from all sub-dimensions of school principals' readiness for change are investigated, it is seen that there is no considerable gender diversity between the perceptions of teachers. Kurşunoğlu and Tanrıöğren (2006), Kıcıroğlu (2010), Kondakçı, Zayim, and Çalışkan (2010) reached findings that support these results. Tekin Bozkurt (2015), on the other hand, reached results different from this study. Readiness for change can be defined in consequence of the knowledge, motivation and desire that the organization creates together with all its members. Holt and Vardaman (2013) express this situation as the agreement between the individual and the organization regarding the planned changes. It can be said that there is no significant gender difference between teachers' perceptions of school principals' readiness for change in this study, and that they are in agreement about the school administrators' readiness for change.

There is a favorable and significant relation among all sub-dimensions of instructional leadership behaviors exhibited by school principals and all sub-dimensions of readiness for change. Fullan (2010) defines instructional leaders as individuals who are open to change and innovation and eager to learn. They use the change and uncertainty situations for growth and development and lead the changes (İnandı and Özkan, 2006; Kazak, 2016; Mestry, 2017; Demirbaş, 2020). In this regard, instructional leaders are change experts who believe in change and development and make their staff feel that they are a part of the change climate at school (Kurt, 2013; Erdoğan, 2017; Holland et al., 2018). Therefore, the instructional leadership behaviors of school principals also support their readiness for change. Hallinger (2017) state that change is an important factor for instructional leaders to make schools effective. Farrell (2018) also emphasizes that instructional leaders are leaders with an educational philosophy who see change and can adapt to these changes for the success of students. As can be seen in the literature, instructional leadership and readiness for change are interrelated concepts. The quality of education is to be able to adapt to the changing new conditions. Ensuring change in schools is possible with school administrators who are ready for change (İnandı & Gılıç, 2016). As stated in the literature, school administrators' readiness for change is closely related to their instructional leadership behaviors, supporting the findings of this research.

Whole sub-dimensions of school principals' instructional leadership attitudes considerably predict all sub-dimensions of readiness for change. In their research, Bellibaş, Polatcan and Kılınç (2020) concluded that the instructional leadership attitudes of school principals enable instructors to adapt more easily to changes in the school and encourage instructors to change their teaching practices. In his research, Newlove (2005) emphasizes that instructional leaders support change and encourage their team in this direction. Murphy, Louis ve Smylie (2017) states that instructional leaders create an environment that is understandable, applicable, learning-oriented, realistic and suitable for change, while Büyükdoğan (2021) states that school

principals who do not demonstrate instructional leadership behaviors adequately are closed to change and development. In particular, the creation of the school's vision and the preparation of the school for changes in this direction is a matter that can only be realized with the teaching leaders (Şişman, 2018).

The change process is an inevitable necessity for educational organizations. Many factors inside and outside the organization cause this situation to occur (Avşar, İnandı & Arslantaş, 2022). Therefore, the Ministry of National Education carries out many exchange activities regarding the learning and teaching process. It is a familiar fact that in recent years, changes in schools have accelerated and a great deal of material and moral effort has been exerted for these changes to be successful. Therefore, it is a critical issue that the changes made with so much effort and meticulously focused on, to be successful. In this context, school principals need to have characteristics such as being able to manage the process, coordinate their team, make education efficient, and be ready for change. The findings show that the success of the focused change process is directly connected with the instructional leadership behavior of school principals. Those who carry out change movements in education and training activities and those who make policy in this direction should definitely consider this strong relationship between instructional leadership and readiness for change (Zhan, Anthony & Beard, 2020). School principals should understand, internalize, and apply instructional leadership in their schools. In order to increase instructional leadership behaviors, seminars, trainings and workshops should be held.

Researchers who conduct research on the subject of the study can carry out their studies specific to different education levels. This research, which is carried out in public schools, can also be carried out in private schools and the difference between them can be revealed. In addition, the relevancy between school principals' other leadership behaviors and their readiness for change can be examined. Research was conducted in a limited number of schools in Adana. Therefore, the research findings obtained are limited to a certain region. The scope of the study can be expanded to put forth the relationship between instructional leadership behaviors of school principals and readiness for change of school principals in order to generalize the research findings.

References

Aksoy, E. & Işık, H. (2008). Instructional leadership roles of primary school principals. *Kyrgyzstan-Turkey Manas University Journal of Social Sciences*, Issue 10 (19), 235-249.

Anderson, D. L. (2016). *Organization development* (Trans. Dalkılıç, O. S.). Ankara: Nobel Publications.

Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations*, 46, 681–704.

Armenakis, A. A., & Fredenberger, W. B. (1997). Organizational change readiness practices of business turn around change agents. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 4(3), 143-152.

Armenakis, A. A., & Bedian, A. G. (1999). Organizational change: a review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 293-315.

Armenakis, A. A. & Harris, S. G. (2009). Reflections: our journey in organizational change research and practice, *Journal of Change Management*, 9(2), 127-142.

Avşar, D. Ş., Inandı, Y. & Arslantaş, H. I. (2022). Examining the relationship between the level of self-efficacy of teachers and the level of schools'openness to change. *I- Manager's Journal on Educational Psychology*, 15(33), 11-20.

Aydın, M. (2010). *Eğitim yönetimi [Educational administration]* (9th Edition). Ankara: Hatipoğlu Publishing House.

Aydın, M. (2017). *Investigation of instructional leadership behaviors of secondary education principals (Gaziantep example)*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Hasan Kalyoncu University, Gaziantep.

Aydoğan, A.G. (2018). *Instructional and administrative leadership behaviors of school administrators (Polatlı example)*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Başkent University, Ankara.

Aytaç, T. (2013). *Eğitim yönetiminde yeni paradigmalar: okul merkezli yönetim [New paradigms in educational management: school centered management]* (2th Edition). Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Balcı, A. (2013). *Etkili okul, okul geliştirme: kuram,uygulama ve araştırma [Effective school, school improvement: theory, practice and research]* (6th Edition). Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing.

Bellibaş, M. S., Polatcan, M., & Kılınç, A. C. (2020). Linking instructional leadership to teacher practices: The mediating effect of shared practice and agency in learning effectiveness. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, Online First. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220945706

Burke, W. W. (2008). *Organization change*. London, UK: Sage.

Büyükdoğan, B. (2014). A field study on the evaluation of instructional leadership behaviors of high school principals. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching*, 4 (2), 133-141.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, E. A, Karadeniz, Ş. and Demirel, F. (2013). *Scientific research methods* (15th ed.). Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing.

Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R. B., and Turner, L. A. (2015). *Research methods design and analysis*. (Trans. Aypay, A.). Ankara: Memoir Publishing.

Cunningham, C. E., Woodward, C. A., Shannon, H. S., Macintosh, J., Lendrum, B., Rosenbloom, D., & Brown, J. (2002). Readiness for organizational change: A longitudinal study of workplace, psychological and behavioral correlates. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 377-392.

Çankaya, I. H., & Karakuş, M. (2010). A study to develop a measurement tool for school administrators' team leadership behaviors. *Journal of Educational Management in Theory and Practice*, 16(2), 167-183.

Danışmaz Akgün, N. (2021). *Examination of the relationship between the instructional leadership behaviors of school principals and the culture of cooperation at school*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Karabük University, Karabük.

DeMatthews, D. E. (2014). How to improve curriculum leadership: Integrating leadership theory and management strategies. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies*, Issues and Ideas, 87(5), 192-19.

Demirbaş, A. (2020). *Examining the relationship between school principals' instructional leadership behaviors and course supervision according to teachers' views*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Düzce University, Düzce.

Dorukbaşı, E. (2022). *Examining the relationship between instructional leadership and teachers' teaching practices: The mediator role of teachers' professional learning*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Karabük University, Karabük.

Dölen, (2016). *School administrators relationship between instruction leader roles with teachers' work angagement:(As a sample of Mersin city)*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Zirve University, Gaziantep.

Ebcim, E. (2019). *Examining the instructional leadership behaviors of school principals according to teachers' opinions*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Sabahattin Zaim University, İstanbul.

Elmore, R. (2008). Leadership as the practice of improvement. D. Hopkins, D. Nusche, & B. Pont (Eds.), *Improving School Leadership* (pp. 37-67). OECD.

Erdoğan, H. (2017). *Examining the relationship between secondary school administrators' instructional leadership and teachers' job satisfaction*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Sabahattin Zaim University, İstanbul.

Ezer, O. (2014). *The relationship between instructional leadership and organizational commitment (Sakarya province example)*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Sakarya University, Sakarya.

Farrell, M. (2018). Leadership reflections: organizational culture. *Journal of Library Administration, 58*(8), 861-872.

Fullan, M. (2010). The awesome power of the principal. *Principal*, 89 (4), 10-15.

Gılıç, F. (2015). *The study of relationship between the teachers' level of participation in decision-making, school culture and teachers' level of readiness for change*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Mersin University, Mersin.

Gliner, J. A., Morgan, G.A., Leech, N.L. (2015). *An approach that integrates research methods, design and analysis in practice* (Trans. Turan, S.). Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Gümüşeli, A.İ. (1996). *Instructional leadership behaviors of primary school principals in İstanbul*. (Unpublished research report). Yıldız Technical University, İstanbul.

Greenwood, W. P. (2009). *Teachers' perceptions of principals as instructionalleaders in "distinguished" (high performing) and "needs improvement" (lowperforming) middle schools in urban metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia*. Doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, Mississippi.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86 (2), 217-248.

Hallinger, P. (2012). Assessing and developing instructional leadership in schools. In J. Shen (ed.), *Tools for improving the principalship* (pp. 47-69). Oxford UK. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280858234

Hallinger, P. (2017). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4*, 221–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244793

Hallinger, P., Walker, A., Nguyen, D. T. H., Truong, T., & Nguyen, T. T. (2017). Perspectives on principal instructional leadership in Vietnam: a preliminary model. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(2), 222-239. https://doi.org/10.1108/Jea-11-2015-0106

Holland, K., Hall, J., Gaylor, W., Johnson, L, & Shelby, D. (2018). Indicators of School Crime and Safety. *Psychology Health and Medicine, 68*(3).

Holt, D. T., & Vardaman, J. M. (2013). Toward a comprehensive understanding of readiness for change: The case for an expanded conceptualization. *Journal of Change Management*, 13(1), 9–18.

Hopkins, D. (2003). Effective leadership for school improvement. A. Harris, C. Day, M. Hadfield, D. Hopkins, A. Hargreaves, & C. Chapman (Eds.), *Instructional leadership and school improvement* (pp. 55-71). London: Routledge Falmer.

Horng, E., & Loeb, S. (2010). New thinking about instructional leadership. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 92 (3), 66-69.

İnandı, Y. and Özkan, M. (2006). According to the opinions of the administrators and teachers working in official primary and high schools, to what extent do the principals show instructional leadership behaviors? *Journal of Mersin University Faculty of Education*, 2 (2), 123–149.

İnandı, Y., Uzun, A. & Yeşil, H. (2016). The relationship between principals' leadership styles and their efficacy in change management. *Educational Sciences Research*, 6(11), 191-209.

İnandı, Y. & Gılıç, F. (2016). Relationship of teachers'readiness for change with their participation in decision making and school culture. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 11(8), 823-833.

Karasar, N. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi [Scientific research method]* (26th Edition). Ankara: Nobel Publication Distribution.

Karatay, S. (2011). *Instructional leadership behaviors of primary school administrators*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Selçuk University, Konya.

Kazak, E. (2016). *The relationship between the instructional leadership behaviors of school administrators and the intergenerational climate and intergenerational learning in the school*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Kocaeli University, Kocaeli.

Kazancı, E. (2022). *Examining the relationship between instructional leadership and teacher professional learning.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Karabük University, Karabük.

Kıcıroğlu, B. (2010). *The readiness levels of primary schools against change (Uşak province example)*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Uşak University, Uşak.

Kondakçı, Y., Zayim, M. & Çalışkan, O. (2010). Examination of school administrators' readiness for change attitudes in the context of school education level, administrators' experience and school size. *Journal of İnönü University Faculty of Education*, 11(2), 155-175.

Kondakçı, Y., Zayim, M. & Çalışkan, O. (2013). The validity and reliability study of the Readiness for Change Scale. *Elementary Education Online*, 12(1), 23-35.

Krug, S. E. (1992). Instructional leadership - a constructivist perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 28(3), 430-443. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161x92028003012

Kurşunoğlu, A. and Tanrıöğen A. (2006). Attitudes of primary school teachers towards organizational change. *Pamukkale University Faculty of Education Journal*, 20, 21-33.

Kurt, B. (2013). *The effect of instructional leadership behaviors of primary and secondary school administrators on teacher motivation*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University, İstanbul.

Leithwood, K. (2018). Characteristics of effective leadership networks: A replication and extension. *School Leadership & Management*, 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2018.1470503

Leonard, J. C. (2010). *Finding the time for instructional leadership*. United States of America: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Levent, F. (2016). Examination of teachers' readiness for change according to different variables. *Marmara University Atatürk Faculty of Education Journal of Educational Sciences*, 43, 117-134. https://doi.org/10.15285/ebd.09059

Lezotte, L. W., & Papperl, J.-A. C. (1999). *The effective school a proven path to learning for all*. Effective Schools Products.

Lezotte, L. W., & Synder, K. M. (2011). *What effective schools do: Re-envisioning the correlates*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Lineburg, P. N. (2010). *The influence of the instructional leadership of principals on change in teachers' instructional practices.* (Unpublished doctoral thesis.) Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg.

Luecke, R. (2003). *Managing change and transition*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.

MacNeil, A. J. (2005). Culture, climate, and school outcomes. L. W Hughes (Ed.), *Current issues in school leadership* (pp. 289-302). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

McEwan, E. K. (2003). *Seven steps to effective instructional leadership*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

Mestry, R. (2017). Empowering principals to lead and manage public schools effectively in the 21st century. *South African Journal of Education, 37*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080.15700/3ajier.v37nlal334

Ministry of National Education (2020). *Instructional leadership in the context of inclusive education*. Ankara: General Directorate of Teacher Training and Development.

Murphy, J. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. P. W. Thurston, N. A. Prestine, L. S. Lotto, & P. P. Zodhiates (Eds.), *Advances in educational administration: Changing perspectives on the school* (Volume 1, pp. 163-200). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Murphy, J., Louis, K. S., Smylie, M. (2017). Positive school leadership: How the professional standards for educational leaders can be bought to life. *Phi Delta Kappan, 99*(1), 21-24. https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721717728273

Newlove, K. (2005). *Principal' understanding of their role as leaders of curriculum and instruction*. Master Thesis. University of Saskatchewan.

Northouse, P.G. (2014). *Leadership theory and practices* (Trans. Şimşek, C.). İzmir: Sürat University Publications.

Oktar, Ç. (2019). *A modeling study on instructional leadership, organizational support, job satisfaction and organizational commitment*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Osmangazi University, Eskişehir.

Özdemir, M. (2012). Turkish version of the distributed leadership inventory: Validity and reliability studies. *Educational Management in Theory and Practice*, 18 (4), 575-598.

Özdemir, M. (2018). *Eğitim yönetimi: alanın temelleri ve çağdaş eğilimler [Educational administration: foundations of the field and contemporary trends]* (2nd ed.). Ankara: Memoir Publishing.

Özdemir, S. and Sezgin, F. (2002). Effective schools and instructional leadership. *Kyrgyzstan-Turkey Manas University Journal of Social Sciences*, 3, 266-282.

Özdemir, S. (2020). *Eğitimde örgütsel yenileşme [Organizational innovation in education]* (9th Edition). Ankara: Pegem Academy Publications.

Özgün, V. (2018). *The relationship between school principals' instructional leadership behaviors and teachers' motivation*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale.

Rafferty, A. E., Jimmieson, N. L., & Armenakis, A. A. (2013). Change readiness: A multilevel review. *Journal of Management*, 39(1), 110-135.

Recepoğlu, E. (2011). *The relationship between school principals' humor styles and instructional leadership behaviors and organizational health of the school according to teacher perceptions*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.

Sabuncuoğlu, Z. Tüz, M. (1996). *Örgütsel psikoloji [Organizational psychology]* (2nd Edition). Bursa: Ezgi Bookstore Publications.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., and Thornhill, A. (2009). *Research methods for business students* (5th Edition). Harlow: Prentice Hall.

Shea, C., Jacobs, S., Esserman, D., & Weiner, B. J. (2014). Organizational readiness for implementing change: A psychometric assessment of a new measure. *Implementation Science*, 9, 7. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-9-7

Stronge, J. H., Richard, H. B., & Catano, N. (2008). *Qualities of effective principals*. USA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Şahin Yener, H. (2017). *Investigation of instructional leadership behaviors of vocational high school principals (Example of Trabzon/Ortahisar)*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Eurasia University, Trabzon.

Şenay, T. (2017). *The relationship between preschool teachers' perceived instructional leadership behavior in their administrators and their organizational commitment*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale.

Şimşek, M. Ş., Çelik, A., Akgemci, T. (2014). *Davranış bilimlerine giriş ve örgütlerde davranış [Introduction to behavioral sciences and behavior in organizations.]* (7nd Edition). Ankara: Nobel Publication Distribution.

Şişman, M. (2013). *Eğitimde mükemmellik arayışı etkili okullar [The pursuit of excellence in education effective schools]* (4th Edition). Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing.

Şişman, M. (2016). Factors related to instructional leadership perception and effect of instructional leadership on organizational variables: A meta-analysis. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 16(5), 1761–1787.

Şişman, M. (2018). *Öğretim liderliği [Instructional leadership]* (6th Edition). Ankara: Pegem Academy Publishing.

Tabancalı, E. (2003). Örgütsel değişim [Organizational change]. In C. Elma & K. Demir (Eds.), *Yönetimde çağdaş yaklaşımlar uygulamalar ve sorunlar [Contemporary approaches in management: practices and problems]* (pp. 312-340). Ankara: Anı Publishing.

TDK (2022), accessed from https://sozluk.gov.tr/ on January 6, 2022.

Tekin Bozkurt, A. (2015). *Examining the readiness of school administrators and teachers for change and related main factors (Fatih project example)*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Gaziantep University, Gaziantep.

Toptimur, Z. K. (2021). *The effect of primary and secondary school administrators 'instructional leadership behaviors on teachers' 21st century skills.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Kütahya Dumlupınar University, Kütahya.

Tunçer, P. (2011). Organizational change and leadership. *Journal of the Court of Accounts*, (80), 57-84.

Tunçtan, L. (2022). *The relationship between instructional leadership of middle school principals and organizational health according to teachers' perceptions.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Van.

Ünal, A. and Çelik, M. (2013). Analysis of the instructional leadership behavior of school administrators and organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers. *Uşak University Journal of Social Sciences*, 6 (2), 239-258.

Weber, J. R. (1987). *Instructional leadership: A composite working model*. Elmhurst, IL: North Central Regional Educational Lab. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED287211.pdf

Weiner, B. J. (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. *Implementation Science*, 4(1), 67-75.

Yasser F. Hendawy Al-Mahdy & Amal Al-kiyumi, (2015). Teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership in Omani Schools. *American Educational research journal*, 3(2), 1504-1510.

Zhan, X., Anthony, A. B. & Beard, K. S. (2020). Development, factor structure, and reliability of the shared instructional leadership scale in public secondary schools. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 51(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220963103