Psychology Research on Education and Social Sciences, 2(2), 75-81, Dec 2021
e-ISSN: 2717-7602
dergipark.org.tr/press

Young Wise Publishing
youngwisepub.com
©2021

Review Article

Can teachers' organizational cynicism be explained by the empathic tendency and self-monitoring behavior they perceive from the administration?

Derya Kavgaoğlu[1];

Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Social Work, Istanbul Gelisim University, Istanbul, Turkey

Article Info

Received: 24 May 2021
Revised: 28 July 2021
Accepted: 02 August 2021
Available online: 15 Dec 2021

Keywords:
School leadership
School management
Self-monitoring

2717-7602 / © 2021 The PRESS. Published by Young Wise Pub. Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

Abstract

The success of the organization is closely related to administration philosophies. At this point, the main question is the question of which philosophy the educational institution will be governed by. School is an organization that has an important cultural and humanitarian dimension. The good upbringing of the person depends on the education of that person in strong school culture. In this study, it was aimed to raise the assumption that the self-monitoring behavior of school principals as instructional leaders in a school atmosphere where empathy is not dominant can be perceived by teachers as insincerity, which can create organizational cynicism, however, as a teaching leader, the self-monitoring behaviors that school principals show along with empathy can reduce the organizational cynicism that teachers perceive.

To cite this article

Kavgaoğlu, D. (2021). Can teachers' organizational cynicism be explained by the empathic tendency and self-monitoring behavior they perceive from the administration? *Psychology Research on Education and Social Sciences, 2*(1), 75-81.

Introduction

It is impossible for a human who is a social being to identify and meet the need for learning on his own. As Ertürk (1975) stated, every person is born into society and culture as an organism armed with certain characteristics and is formed and developed by being cultured in that society. So the biological side of humans is his first nature. Every human being as an organism needs to satisfy his airlessness, thirst, hunger, fatigue, and similar physiological needs. On this perspective, it can be said that human does not differ much from other creatures. However, with its second nature, mankind also has the potential to control this first nature. Indeed, the second nature is his reasoning ability, which makes him different from other creatures. Educational institutions are organizations that aim to develop this reasoning ability at the highest level; In other words, they are organizations aimed at educating people.

Can (2007) defines an organization as follows; an organization is the unity of power and action of human communities whose roles, activities, powers, and responsibilities are defined. Organizations arise for a single reason; to achieve collectively what we cannot achieve individually. When we have health problems, we apply to the hospital, when we want to worship, we go to the house of worship, and when we need education, we apply to a school. These are all organizations. In this sense, social life actually means organizational life. The existence of an organization depends on the existence of administration. Indeed, people form an organization, and the management of a person who is not clear what to do and how to behave is the responsibility of the administration. In other words, if we called the organization as anatomy, the administration would be physiology (Güney, 2007). Can (2007) describes

[1] Assist.Prof.Dr. Derya Kavgaoglu, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Social Work, Istanbul Gelisim University, Istanbul, Turkey. E-Mail: dkavgaoglu@gelisim.edu.tr ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5926-3081

administration as follows; administration is a mandatory activity that allows organizations to achieve their goals and purposes. It is a set of activities that cover the efficient, effective, and appropriate use of tools and resources that will be used to achieve predetermined goals in accordance with the missions and objectives of the organization. The success of the organization is closely related to administration philosophies. Educational institutions, as stated by Demirel (2005), also need to be governed by a philosophy based on the basics and consistent values depending on guiding and evaluating the practices in education and the continuous and critical examination. At this point, the main question is the question of which philosophy the educational institution will be governed by. According to Çelik (2009), the school is neither a system nor a machine carried out by purely bureaucratic rules. It is an organization that has an important cultural and humanitarian dimension. The good upbringing of the person depends on the education of that person in strong school culture. So how is a strong school culture possible with the administration?

Güney (2007) defines leadership as the most important administration dimension directly related to people and their behaviors. Leadership is the process of influencing, motivating, and directing people, groups, and organizations towards a common goal. How does a person affect others in this process? Or why are people influenced by people who are determined as leaders? Various leadership theories investigate which mechanisms are effective in this process of influencing and being influenced. It is possible to examine theories under basically four headings: trait theories, behavioral theories, situational theories, and new approaches. Koçel's (2010) explanations of the basic characteristics of these theories can be briefly stated as follows; the first approach developed to explain the issue of leadership is the trait theories. According to this rule, the leaders differ from other employees in terms of their physical and personal characteristics (age, height, gender, intelligence, knowledge, honesty, sincerity, accuracy, frankness). But later research supports that it is not just personal characteristics that make the leader successful. For example, in the same group, someone with more of these mentioned leader characteristics can remain in the background. Another criticism of the rule is that it is not possible to measure every trait. For example, we can measure intelligence with intelligence tests, but there is no scale for sincerity and honesty. The traits are important for effective leadership, but not enough. At this point, the idea that how the leader behaves is more important gains weight, and behavioral theories arise. In behavioral theories, leadership is not the only variable of the process. Followers are just as important as leaders. Ohio State University and the University of Michigan made studies to define leadership behavior; leadership behaviors defined by the axes of initiative and empathy, work-orientation, and person-orientation are important research on this subject, respectively. It can be said that the common result achieved by these studies is that an increase in productivity, an increase in job satisfaction, and a decrease in the rate of staff turnover depend on the behavior of the leader towards the person. But both studies have been criticized for their excessive conceptualization of the theory and their inability to adequately measure what is wanted to be measured. Blake and Mouton's managerial grid, Gregor's X, Y theory, Likert's System 4 model can be considered as thought systems put forward to describe various leadership behaviors within the framework of this theory. The most important criticism of behavioral theories is that this theory has neglected environmental conditions and is generally based on the assumption that democratic leader behavior is the most effective way to govern. At this point, there is no single best way; situational theories have emerged with the logic that changing environments and conditions must be taken into account. In this sense, there is a fundamental acceptance that the authoritarian style can be as effective as the democratic style. We can express the basic concept of situational theory as follows; different conditions require different leadership styles. Because leadership is a function of relationships between leaders, followers, and circumstances. In this case, it can be considered that the behavior of the teaching leader (headmaster) is influenced by the behavior of his superiors, subordinates, colleagues, the nature of the goal, the organizational climate and policies, his own personality, and experience. The followings can be considered as important research for the detection of variables that determine the effectiveness of the leader; Fred Fiedler's contingency model [three basic variables determine leader behavior; Leader-member relations-Task structure-Position power], path-goal theory [leader motivates by explaining the way to the goal], Hersey and Blanchard's life cycle theory of leadership [administration with a leadership style that differs according to the maturity levels of subordinates], Vroom-Joto-Yetton's the decision tree approach [the leader acts by evaluating the situation with the question of the extent to which participation the situation requires]. It is stated that these three theories (trait theory, behavioral theory, situational theory) that explain leadership fundamentally bring bureaucratic authority and drive the formal organization forward. In other words, these administration styles are administration ways in which subordinates act to achieve reward or escape punishment. For example, an employee can work overtime because they will get paid in return, behave in accordance with the leader's rules to get a promotion, or gain respectability. It is inconvenient for both the institution and students to base the motivation that constitutes teacher behavior on such logic in educational

institutions, whose main purpose is to educate people. Educational institutions need teachers who work with high commitment, and a sense of mission and responsibility to achieve their educational goals. However, as stated by Hogg and Vaughan (2007), it replaces the superego in groups. What is meant to be expressed is that; no matter how perfectly designed the curriculum in schools, no matter how well equipped the teachers are, the functioning of the education is shaped by the teaching leader (the headmaster). The functioning is limited by his/her understanding, behavior, and philosophy. In this case, the teaching leader (headmaster) should create a climate, a positive organizational climate that will bond teachers to the institution, accelerate their targeted mental activities, support their development, and should follow a leadership style that will support this climate. In the following section, a positive organizational climate and how a leader should use an administration style to create it are discussed.

The word climate comes from Greek and means tendency. This word not only describes physical events such as heat and pressure but also states how one of the members of the organization describes the inner environment. So it also has a psychological meaning (Gilmer, 1971, as cited in Ertekin, 1978). Aydogan [19.11.2010] states that the concept of organizational climate has been investigated since the late 1930s and that studies on this subject have been based on German-American psychologist Kurt Lewin's Field Theory and the point of view of Social Psychology. Bakırcıoglu (2006) explains Lewin's field theory as follows; Lewin's field is a psychological field, a space of life, where one's experience and needs are involved. As human experiences multiply, the living field also gradually changes. According to Lewin, the individual strives to maintain a balance with his/her environment. According to him, every need (tension) wants to restore balance by stimulating an activity (motion). In this case, the living field is considered a behavioral environment consisting of everything that affects a person's behavior, in which the climate is already formed.

Aydin (1993, quoted by Taymaz, 2007) describes the organizational climate in schools as features that vary between open and closed ends. He states that there is a high level of unity, intimacy, advanced mission-orientedness, and empathizing among people in the open-climate school and that, in contrast, people have a low level of unity and a low level of mission-orientedness, disconnection, and limited empathizing in the closed climate. It can be assumed that the main difference in open and closed climate is formed on the axis of commitment and separation. So what is commitment and why is the teacher's commitment to the institution important?

The strength of the bond that the employee feels towards the organization in which he works is the expression of his organizational commitment (Güney, 2007). A strong organization is strong with the commitment of its employees (Başaran, 1982, as cited in Çetin, 2004). Organizational commitment is generally shaped by an individual's psychological commitment to the organization, including participation in work, loyalty, and belief in organizational values (O'reilly, 1991, as cited in Çetin, 2004). In this sense, the administration of organizational commitment will be possible by solving the psychology underlying this commitment. Güney (2007) states that organizational commitment in a person occurs in three stages; Compliance, Identification, and Internalization. The compliance stage is superficial, instrumental, it's meant to achieve something such as getting recognition, prestige, having a position. At the stage of identification, the motive for intimacy predominates. A person is happy and proud to be a member of this organization and to live according to their values and beliefs. At the internalization stage, which is the final stage, the individual realizes that their own values and the values of the organization are almost the same. From an organizational point of view, the most desirable dimension of commitment is internalization. Employees with high levels of internalization take care of and defend their own organizations more. In this case, it can be assumed that it will be possible for the teacher to carry out his work to achieve the goals of the institution with high motivation, thanks to the strength of the intimacy he feels to his institution. What happens when that bond can't be established?

As stated by Cevizci (2008), individualist ethics, the ethics of indifference arise, in which social norms and compromises are thrown aside altogether, and the individual rather than society comes to the fore. Kalagan and Güzel [10.01.2011] consider this attitude, which consists of cognitive, affective, and behavioral tendencies of teachers, within the scope of organizational cynicism. Dean, Brandes & Dharwadkar (1998) and Kalagan and Güzeller [10.01.2011] describe organizational cynicism as 'the idea of the organization's lack of integrity and honesty' and 'the negative attitude of the individual towards his organization'. Accordingly, the belief that the organization lacks honesty in the cognitive dimension; disrespect, anger, shame, embarrassment, rage, anxiety, and tension in the affective dimension; and exposure to behavior such as derogation, degradedness in the behavioral dimension create organizational cynicism.

Kalagan and Güzeller [10.01.2011] emphasize that research on organizational cynicism shows that this situation is associated with organizational policy, organizational justice, psychological breach of contract, perceived organizational

support, organizational stress, performance, alienation, and emotional burnout and state that a teacher who experiences organizational cynicism exhibits the following behaviors:

- He may feel that attempts to improve the school are not being cared for by other employees,
- He may stop making suggestions to improve his school,
- He may think that the proposals he offers to improve the quality of the school are not taken into account,
- He develops the belief that his efforts to improve his school are underestimated,
- He may not believe that all teachers will make every effort to improve the school in which they work,
- He may think that as a result of the practices, everyone will not be treated fairly and thus a person or behavior will be respected unfairly,
- It can be difficult for him to be hopeful about the future of the school.

In parallel with what has been stated so far, it can be clearly determined that the teaching leader should create a positive climate to provide effective learning and teaching environments. Taymaz (2007) lists what the teaching leader can do to create a healthy and open climate in school as follows;

- Developing goals and policies to create a school climate, and clarifying them,
- Planning the work to be performed, and providing and describing the resources,
- Identifying and clarifying duties, powers, and responsibilities,
- Collaborating with teachers and students,
- Establishing communication networks, influencing people positively and avoiding possible conflicts,
- Caring and helping people's educational and professional development,
- Ensuring that tolerance and goodwill prevail,
- Creating a participatory environment, giving employee morale and activating them,
- Making the code of ethics dominate,
- Monitoring the entire organization, taking the necessary measures by immediately diagnosing deficiencies and failures

Such leadership requires an approach other than the above-mentioned leadership theories. Güney (2007) considers this kind of leadership within the framework of new approaches in leadership theories and defines it as transformational leadership. Accordingly, the transformational leader is the leader who creates the vision. He is the leader who can predict the ideal and the way to reach it. Such a leader is charismatic. Charisma can be considered a sum of exceptional powers and abilities that affect people more than expected. Such a leader intellectually motivates employees and contributes to their development. It inspires employees and creates an organizational culture for their vision, and this culture continues with the effort and presence of employees, even in its absence. In such a culture, employees are aware of the importance of their work, are aware of the need for their own development and the needs of their organization, and are ready to work in this direction. The employee works for his organization with high loyalty, abandoning his selfish attitudes. As a result of these explanations, the following question may come to mind. How is there a difference between transformational leadership and situational leadership, which defines leadership as a function of leaders, followers, and circumstances?

Bursalıoglu (2010) defines the situation as a mixture of events that occur at a given moment and states that the situation factor in leadership reduces the impact of experience in administration. According to this idea, since two similar situations are rare, the possibility to transfer experience in administration is also weak (Bursalıoglu, 2010). The factors that make up the situation are interval, duration, frequency, social structure, status, leadership, presentation, desire, values, and intimidation. The factor that changes the situation is the process (Bursalıoglu, 2010). In situational leadership, the emphasis is on situations. The leader prefers an administration style according to situations. As Keçecioglu (2006) states, the following styles can be given as exemplary; The challenging style to ensure obedience, authoritarian style when new employees are added to the organization, relational style when conflict occurs, democratic style when new ideas are needed, exemplary style when it is necessary to show the employee how to achieve the job in standards of excellence, and mentoring style when it is necessary to ensure the professional development of the employee in the long term. Similarly, an example is that the principal behaves more closely with teachers and students when the inspector arrives or treats parents who work for the parent-teacher association (PTA) more warmly. It is worth noting here that the dominant behavior in situational leadership is self-monitoring behavior. However, it is impossible to say that self-monitoring behavior is not dominant in the transformational leadership style, which

creates high motivation in its followers and allows them to act autonomously in achieving the vision. What is self-monitoring? Although it is the dominant fundamental trait in both leadership styles, why is transformational leadership considered to be more effective in mobilizing team behavior?

Bilgin (2007) treats self-monitoring as the manipulation of the image presented to others in interpersonal relationships. When considered in the context of the school, the teaching leader controls the self-image to regulate interpersonal relationships, become a role model, create and maintain the school culture in this process. He/she acts by analyzing the characteristics of people and situations. Cesur and Türetgen (2006) also consider the concept of self-monitoring as a combination of self-presentation and self-expression abilities. In the framework of this view, it is stated that a person can monitor himself to the extent that he can regulate his behavior according to environmental cues and cannot monitor himself to the extent that he is indifferent to cues. Self-presentation includes an individual's efforts to control his/her behavior in front of others and monitor his/her appearance. It happens in two basic ways; strategic presentation, authentic presentation. Impression administration is involved in the strategic presentation. The teaching leader can use this method to control the perceptions of the teacher and students. In cases where the teaching leader does not require strategic behavior, the authentic presentation can use this method (Bilgin, 2007).

Norris and Zweingeinhaft (1999 as cited in Kapıkıran 2007) state that from a moral point of view, the higher the level of self-monitoring, the lower the honesty. At this point, a self-monitoring based on situations can be considered to sabotage the climate of trust. However, in transformational leadership, it is considered that a high climate of trust prevails between followers and leaders, despite the situational attitude of the leader. This research is based on the assumption that empathy lies at the center of the aforementioned climate of trust. The following section briefly describes the concept of empathy and why it is thought that it should accompany the situational behavior of the leader.

The teaching leader should be visible in school corridors, between classes, at entrances and exits of school, at lunches, in the canteen, in the garden, and in all areas of the school, which also leads to the functioning of formal and informal communication processes. Keskinkılıç (2007) states that the teaching leader can effectively motivate people to make meaningful change through communication. According to him, the manager succeeds to the extent that he can convince people of the benefit and necessity of change. Impressive communication is needed to make people believe. With impressive communication ability, it is possible to touch the values of a person or group, and positive change in attitudes and behaviors can be created. Tarhan (2010) defines empathy as being able to see that person's point of view beyond feeling what the other people and being able to respect someone else's point of view and look at the event from their point of view and act jointly. In other words, the person recognizes the feelings of the other people when protecting his own feelings and acts in this way. However, Tarhan also emphasizes that empathy is a developable skill. According to Tarhan, empathy is a skill of understanding, it is first necessary to love, value, and share for empathy. You can't empathize without caring. In this sense, empathy is a psychological bridge between people. It creates a psychological bond. It is an emotion that feeds social perception, sociality in society. Where empathy decreases, people become self-centered, and sociality weakens, thus people become lonely. If we evaluate these thoughts in terms of situational behavior and empathy; purely situational behavior of a teaching leader (for example, a principal who acts warmly when he or she is collecting donations from students or parents for the school) can cause his or her followers to distance themselves from him or her with a low perception of intimacy. This form of behavior finds expression as political empathy in Tarhan (2010). Tarhan defines political empathy as playing the role of empathy, separating it from real empathy, and emphasizes that real empathy is to treat others by thinking that they are me, him, and us. As Bursalıoglu (2010) states, a teaching leader should treat his followers humanely and not make them the subject of investment. It's wrong to accept organizations as unmanned and manage them that way. It is also not possible to manage people or develop relationships between people without a thorough understanding of what a person is.

A study conducted by Çubukçu and Girmen (2009) aimed to determine the level of effective school characteristics of secondary schools. The five dimensions of the effective school; school administrator, teacher, student, school culture, and family participation were examined according to teacher and student perceptions. It can be considered that the most important finding of the study is that the most effective dimension is the dimension of the school administrator. It can be evaluated as another important finding that school principals give importance and support to the success in school according to the opinions of both teachers and students, but they spend more time dealing with bureaucratic tasks and do not give enough importance to communication in the eyes of the students. These findings also confirm the idea that the teaching leader at the school is the program itself. School effectiveness is generally associated with academic success. But acknowledging that academic success does not only occur with activities of a

cognitive dimension means maintaining a results-oriented attitude. Similarly, the research conducted by Engels et al. (2008) aimed to examine the creation of school culture-positive school culture- where the best learning and teaching would take place and that supports professional development in the context of the affective and behavioral characteristics of teaching leaders. As a result of the research, they determined that positive school cultures are primarily shaped by the specific attitudes and behaviors of teaching leaders. It was concluded that teaching leaders with high success tendencies and a focus on internal control, no matter how negative organizational and external conditions, have the potential to create a positive school culture with these qualities. A study conducted by McGuighan and Hoy (2006) examined a culture of academic optimism as a basic condition for academic success. As a result of the research, they concluded that the most important role in creating academic optimism belongs to the teaching leader. In this study, the concept of academic optimism, which generally means that the school exhibits integrity of thoughts, beliefs, and behaviors that affect student success, was conceptualized as a hidden mechanism for building and enabling student and school success. It is covered with 3 basic dimensions. Cognitive dimension (collective competence), affective dimension (confidence), and behavioral dimension (academic emphasis). It is emphasized that the teaching leader can create a cult of academic optimism by dominating these three dimensions. In such a school, it is stated that the teaching leader will not only be interested in academic outcomes, but will also follow the process, giving the teacher and student confidence inside the school, and giving the family confidence outside the school. Çankaya and Demirtaş (2010) examined the relationship between University climate and inertia according to the views of teacher candidates and found that University climate (shaped by motivation and social opportunities) significantly predicts the level of inertia of prospective teachers. An interesting finding of the study is that the power of motivation to block inertia is more effective than the existence of social opportunities. In other words, the most important factor that predicts the level of inertia of teachers is motivation. A study linking teacher commitment and leadership was conducted by Hulpia, Devos, and Keer (2009). They revealed that the distribution of authority and responsibility in schools to teams directly affects the organizational commitment of teachers, as well as the culture of cooperation and autonomy and that the support and cooperation perceived by teachers has a large impact on their commitment to the institution. A study examining the relationship between direct transformational leadership and ethical climate was conducted by Sagnak (2010) and concluded that transformational leadership is a predictor of the ethical climate.

Conclusion

In this study, it was aimed to raise the assumption that the self-monitoring behavior of school principals as instructional leaders in a school atmosphere where empathy is not dominant can be perceived by teachers as insincerity, which can create organizational cynicism, however, as a teaching leader, the self-monitoring behaviors that school principals show along with empathy can reduce the organizational cynicism that teachers perceive. In further scientific research, it may be suggested to focus on the following research questions; a. Is there a correlation between teachers' levels of organizational cynicism and the empathic tendency they perceive from school management? b. Is there a relationship between the levels of organizational cynicism of teachers and the level of self-monitoring they perceive from school management? c. Do teachers' levels of organizational cynicism differ significantly depending on the common influence of the empathic tendency of administration and self-monitoring behavior? d. Do teachers' levels of organizational cynicism differ significantly according to schools?

Biodata of Authors



Derya Kavgaoğlu is a doctor of education. His research interests focuses on Educational Sciences, Curriculum and Instruction, Curriculum Development, Curriculum Design, Teacher Training, Educational Psychology, Turkey. **Orcid:** 0000-0001-5926-3081 E-mail: dkavgaoglu@gelisim.edu.tr

References

Ataşalar, J. (1996). *The level of self disclosure of university students according to empatic tendency levels sex and ages.* Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences. Unpublished master's thesis.

Aydogan, F. [19.11.2010]. Organizational Culture and Climate. www.ttefdergi.gazi.edu.tr/makaleler/2004/Sayi2/203-215.pdf

Bakircioglu, R. (2006). *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Psychology.* Ankara: Ani Publishing.

Bilgin, N. (2007). *Dictionary of Social Psychology: Concepts and A*pproaches. İstanbul: Baglam Publishing.

Bursalioglu, Z. (2010). *The New Structure And Behavior On School Management* 15th Edition. Ankara: Pegem Academy.

Can, H. (2007). *Management Science and History*. Ed. Salih Guney. 2nd Edition. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Cesur, S., & Özalp Turetgen, I., (2006). The Reliability and Validity Study of the Revised Self-Monitoring Scale Abstract. *Turkish Psychological Articles, 9*(17), 1-17.

Cevizci, A. (2008). *Introduction to Ethics*. İstanbul: Paradigma Publishing.

Çankaya, I. N., & Demirtaş, Z. (2010). The Relationship Between University Climate and İnertia According to the Views of Teacher Candidates. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education, 28*(2), 1-9.

Çelik, V. (2009). *School Culture and Management*. 8th Edition. Ankara: Pegem Academy.

Çetin, M. (2004). *Organizational Culture and Organizational Commitment*. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Çubukçu, Z., & Girmen, P. (2009). Levels of Efectiveness Characteristics in Secondary Schools. *The Journal of Social Science, 16*, 121-136.

Engels, N., Hotton, G., Devos, G., Bouckenooghe, D., Aelterman, A. (2008). Principals in schools with a positive culture. *Educational Studies, 34*(3), 159-174.

Erturk, S. (1975). *Curriculum Development in Education*. Istanbul: Yelkentepe Publishing.

Guney, S. (2007). *Basic Concepts of Management and Organization. Management and Organization*. Ed. Salih Guney. 2nd Publishing. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Guney, S. (2007). *Organizational Commitment*. Management and Organization. Ed. Salih Guney. 2nd Publishing. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Hogg, M., & A., Graham, M.V. (2007). *Social Psychology*. trans. Ibrahim Yildiz, Aydin Gelmez. Ankara: Utopya Publishing.

Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & van Keer, H. (2009). The influence of distributed leadership on teacher's organizational commitment: a multilevel approach. *Journal of Educational Research, 103*(1), 40-52.

Kalagan, G., & Guzeller, C.O. (2010). Examining Teachers' Levels of Organizational Cynicism. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education, 27*, 83-97.

Kapikiran, N. A. (2007). An investigation of moral behavior in university students in terms of empathic tendency and self-adjustment. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal, 3*(28), 33-47.

Karasar, N. (2006). *Scientific Research Method*. Ankara:Nobel Publishing.

Keçecioglu, T. (2006). *Notes on understanding and changing your management styles*. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Koçel, T. (2010). *Business management: management and organization, behavior in organization, classical, modern, contemporary and current approaches*. Istanbul: Beta Publishing.

McGuighan, L., & Hoy, W.K. (2006). Principal leadership: creating a culture of academic optimism to improve achievement for all students. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 5,* 203-229.

Sagnak, M. (20109. The Relationship Between Transformational School Leadership and Ethical Climate. Educational Sciences. *Theory and Practice, 10*(2), 1113-1152.

Tarhan, N. (2010). Community Psychology: From Social Schizophrenia to Social Empathy. İstanbul: Timaş Publishing

Taymaz, H. (2009). School Management. 9th Edition. Anka Publishing