European Journal of Education Studies
ISSN: 2501 - 1111
ISSN-L: 2501 - 1111
Available on-line at: www.oapub.org/edu

doi: 10.5281/zenodo.1069685 Volume 3 | Issue 11 | 2017

SELF-LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS AS PREDICTOR OF TEACHERS' TAKING INITIATIVE

Sinem Konuk[i]
Yıldız Technical University
Department of Educational Administration
Istanbul, Turkey

Abstract:
The purpose of this research is to investigate whether teachers' self-leadership behaviors can predict whether they will take initiative behaviors. This research was designed with the relational survey method. Research sample consists of 585 elementary school teachers working in 32 different schools in Istanbul, Turkey. Additionally, the sample was determined with simple random sampling. The data of the research was collected with the Self- Leadership Scale and Taking Initiative Scale for Educational Organizations. The relationship between teachers' taking initiative behaviors and self-leadership behaviors was tested with Pearson Correlation analysis. Afterwards, multilinear regression analysis was utilized to analyze whether teachers' self-leadership behaviors predict taking initiative behaviors. According to the research results, it was revealed that teachers use the strategy of focusing the idea on the natural rewards the most, and the strategy of self-punishment the least among self-leadership strategies. Moreover, it was found that teachers enact proactive action the most and self-starting the least among taking initiative behaviors. It emerged that there is a positive and significant relationship between teachers' taking initiate behaviors and self-leadership behaviors, except for the sub-dimension of self-punishment. It was found that the sub-dimensions of self-leadership significantly predict the sub-dimensions of taking initiative. These results were discussed in the theoretical frameworks of action and self-influence theories. At the end of the research, these suggestions can be offered that in-service trainings on leadership development should be applied in order to foster taking initiatives. Further researchers can analyze the

[i] Correspondence: email sinemk@yildiz.edu.tr

relationship between taking initiative and self-leadership behaviors with qualitative analyze.

Keywords: self-leadership, taking initiative, elementary school teachers

1. Introduction

The rapid change occurring throughout the world has led to the introduction of new science and technology approaches and occasional fluctuations in the economy. Organizations should be able to predict the waves of change in order to avoid becoming negatively influenced by the changes. However, this is particularly difficult for organizations that have large and strict hierarchal structures, such as the Ministry of National Education (MoNE). According to Jarson & Kind (2005), in order for organizations to accommodate themselves to rapid changes, they should adopt structures based on teams consisting of individuals who manage themselves and where administrator roles are shared among team members rather than an administration based on hierarchy and status. Schools of the 21st century can adopt a team-based structure by eluding from their present stable structures and undertaking an active and productive role (Ilgen & Pulakos, 1999). At this point, the concept of self-leadership, defined as the self-direction and motivation process of an individual and organizational success (Manz, 1986).

2. Literature Review

Self-leadership is one of the crucial features required from self-managing team workers (Elloy, 2008). Self-leadership is defined as an individual's skill to take action against an environmental change (Godwin ve ark., 1999). Individuals motivate and direct themselves through various cognitive and behavioral strategies to attain success (Manz, 1986). Taking initiative can be defined as individuals taking action without any external forces to achieve success by integrating organizational goals at a common ground. The individual displays an active role in the taking initiative process and displays behaviors beyond the role given by the organization (Frese, & Fay, 2002; Kouzes & Posner 2014). With this respect, in order to achieve success, individuals who display both self-leadership and initiative taking behaviors are expected to take action in accordance with the organization's objectives without requiring any driving forces.

2.1. Taking Initiative

In the initiative taking process, the individual takes action to fulfill an objective without any external forces. According to Frese & Fay (2002), taking initiative emerges from a set of behaviors displayed by the individual. These behaviors require the individual to be active, to take action automatically to achieve a goal and display behaviors beyond the definition of the duty. It is stated that taking initiative consists of four components; self-starting, overcoming barriers, proactive action and self-investment (Frese & Fay, 2001; 2002; Frese, Kring, Soose & Zempel, 1996).

Self-starting can be defined as individuals carrying out operations beyond their responsibilities without receiving any instructions (Bass, 1990). Individuals who behave this way fulfill self-identified goals parallel with the organization's targets (Frese & Fay, 2002, Kouzes & Posner, 2014). Individuals who display self-starting behaviors can identify sub-goals in accordance with organizational targets and can perform actions aiming at increasing the quality of the work (Gündüz, 2008; Staw &Boettger, 1990).

Overcoming barriers is defined as individuals being persistent and decisive in overcoming the barriers they encounter (Frese, Kring, Soose & Zempel, 1996). Individuals make various changes in their plans to overcome barriers (Harris, 2009). Individuals who are affected by change can find it difficult to adapt to new conditions, and this can cause resistance against change. Individuals who display proactive action are ready to take actions for new demands, problems and opportunities (DePree, 1989; Karoly, 1993).

The individual exhibiting proactive action is ready to take action against new challenges that may arise, problems and opportunities (Burn, 1978). Individuals find solution before problems occur, predict opportunities beforehand and take action to execute those (Bass, Riggo, 2006). Crant (2000) defines proactive action as taking a step ahead by confronting the status quo. The proactive action component emphasizes that individuals undertake responsibilities (Morrison & Phelps, 1999) and strive to operate the work successfully (Parker, Williams & Turner, 2006).

Self-investment can be defined as individuals making progress in their career and striving to improve themselves to be able to increase organizational productivity (Frese & Fay, 2001). Individuals who display self-investment behaviors create a career plan parallel with the organization's targets (Pondy, 1989).and positively affect organizational productivity while contributing their own development (George, 2007; Kouzes, Posner, 2014; McCutcheon, Lindsey, 2006; Balyer, 2016)

The organizations that are proactive and are ahead of the curve utilize organizational development and results in the increase in performance (Burn, 1978; Bass, Riggo, 2006; Kouzes & Posner, 2014). Hence, operations within the organization become more complex, and the responsibilities of the manager of the organization

increases. Later, the manager fails to accomplish each task by himself (Greenleaf, 1977; Lovelace, Manz & Jose, 2007) and a necessity arises to include the other shareholders in the leadership process (Tabak, Sığrı & Türköz, 2013). In order to achieve organizational sustainability, the management unit should pave the way for a transition from a hierarchical structure to a team-based organizational structure. Thus, the workers will be given the opportunity to lead themselves and share the leadership roles within the organization (Barry, 1991). This opportunity will help organization members to develop a self-leadership behavior.

2.2. Self-leadership

The starting point of self-leadership is based on the theory of individuals affecting themselves throughout organizational processes. Manz (1986) defines self-leadership as, "*the self-motivation and direction process of an individual to achieve individual and organizational success*". The term self-leadership forms a basis for various leadership approaches. Participative leadership, which shares the leadership process with organization members, is one of them (Lovelace et al. 2007). Participative leaders should initially possess self-leadership skills in order to effectively share the process with the other shareholders (Houghton et al. 2003). In addition, individuals who undertake authorizer leadership role are also expected to display self-leadership behaviors (Pearce et al. 2008). Manz (1992) and Neck et al. (2006) state that self-leadership consists of constructive thought strategies, behavior focused strategies and natural reward strategy.

Constructive thought model strategies are accepted as the foundation of self-leadership and refer to individuals managing their own mental model and directing them (Manz, 1986). The constructive thought model strategy features imagery of successful performance, self-talk and evaluating beliefs and assumptions. Imagery of successful performance is defined as the individual making imaginary rehearsals in their mind about being successful in the task (Houghton vd. 2002). Self-talk refers to the verbal or non-verbal constructive suggestions one makes to himself to successfully complete his task (Houghton vd. 2007: 49). The last concept is evaluating beliefs and assumptions. Individuals detect their dysfunctional beliefs and assumptions about the task and strive to generate more functional beliefs and assumptions instead. While functional assumptions increase performance, dysfunctional assumptions lead the individual to depression and cause labor loss (D'Intino vd. 2007).

In the behavior focused strategy, individuals reward and discipline themselves at the end of a behavior (Anderson ve ark. 1997). Individuals aim at positively shaping their behaviors during this process (Manz 1992, Neck ve ark. 2006). Behavior focused strategies can be listed as: self-goal setting, self-reward, self-punishment and self-

cueing. The first behavior focused strategy is self-goal setting. Self-goal setting refers to the workers' setting challenging and personal goals by taking their own skills into consideration and the effort they put to achieve these goals. According to Manz and Sims (1980), self-goal setting gives favorable results at the individual and organizational level. Self-rewarding and punishment are also among behavior focused strategies. Rewarding one with a meal or a nice journey after accomplishing the task will increase motivation (Manz 1992). Self-punishment can be defines as the individual positively punishing himself so as to correct his negative behaviors (Neck et al. 2006). In the other behavior focused strategy, self-observation, the individual leads himself constructively about how to behave and certain situations (Alves et al. 2006). In the final strategy self-cueing, the individual is enabled to remember important issues through various objects or people named as clues (Doğan et al. 2008 & Manz 1992).

The final concept is the natural reward strategy, and it is defined as individuals displaying pleasant behaviors while they avoid displaying unpleasant behaviors (Anderson et al. 1997 & Houghton et al. 2002). The difference between natural reward strategy and behavior focused strategies is that, while in the natural reward strategy the award is within the behavior and individuals get pleasure when they display the behavior, in the behavior focused strategy the award is given after the task is accomplished with success (Manz, 1992).

The concept of self-leadership has recently become a subject of research for researchers. For this reason, the relationships between self-leadership and various variables such as job satisfaction (Neck & Manz, 1996), self-efficacy (Prussia, Anderson & Manz, 1998), inner focus of control (Kazan, 1999), effective coping skills, optimism, endurance, interpersonal distrust and perceived stress (Dolbier, Soderstrom & Steinhardt, 2001), gender (Kazan, 1999; Kurman, 2001; Uğurluoğlu, 2010), team work environment with self-management (Elloy, 2008), individual goal performance (Godwin, Neck & Houghton, 1999), job stress and leadership development (Lovelace, Manz, & Jose, 2007), personality (Williams, 1997), organizational citizenship (Göksoy, Emen ve Yenipınar, 2014) and learned forcefulness and supervision (Garipağaoğlu ve Güloğlu, 2015) have been examined. According to the above mentioned studies, studies have examined the relationship between self-leadership and various variables, but no studies examining the relationship with taking initiative have been detected.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between primary school teachers' self-leadership behaviors and initiative taking behaviors. Answers for the following questions were sought for the main purpose:

1. How do teachers perceive their own self-leadership behaviors?
2. How do teachers perceive their own initiative taking behaviors?

3. Is there a significant relationship between teachers' self-leadership behaviors and taking initiative behaviors?
4. Is the self-leadership behaviors of teachers a significant predictor of taking initiative?

3. Material and Methods

This section of the study consists of the following: the study model; population and sample; data collection instruments; validity and reliability of the scales; and data analysis.

3.1 Model

The study was conducted through the quantitative design and the relational survey method. The relational survey model aims at determining whether or not there is a covariance among two or more variables and the level of the relationship between the variables (Karasar, 2015, 81).

3.2. Sample

The population of the study consists of teachers working in private and public primary schools in Istanbul. According to Istanbul Provincial Directorate of National Education statistical data (2015), this number is approximately 76,806. Balcı (2011, 106), states that there needs to be at least 382 sample for a population, up to the size of 100,000 to be represented at 95% degree reliable. With this respect, study data was collected from 32 schools determined through the simple random sampling method from 24 districts in Istanbul. Demographic information related to the 585 teachers who participated in the study is given on Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic features of the teachers participating in the study

Variables	Category	F	%
Gender	Female	377	64,4
	Male	177	30,3
	No Answer	31	5,3
	Total	585	100
Job	Classroom teacher	284	48,5
	Branch teacher	284	48,5
	No Answer	15	2,9
	Total	585	100
Seniority	1-5 years	197	33,7
	6-10 years	135	23,1
	11-15 years	80	13,7

	16 years and over	138	23,6
	No Answer	35	6
	Total	585	100
Education	Undergraduate	442	75,6
	Graduate	75	12,8
	No Answer	55	9,4
	Total	585	100
Type of school	State	386	66,0
	Private	168	28,7
	No Answer	31	5,3
	Total	585	100

3.3. Instruments

The "Self-Leadership Scale", adapted into Turkish by Tabak, Sığrı and Türköz (2013) was used in the study to collect the data related to the teachers' self-leadership behaviors. The "Taking Initiative in Educational Organizations Scale", adapted into Turkish by Gündüz, Çakmak and Korumaz (2015) was used to collect data related to teachers' initiative taking behaviors.

The five point Likert type *Self-Leadership Scale* consists of three dimensions, eight factors and 29 items (Tabak, Sığrı ve Türköz, 2013). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value of the self-leadership scale was observed to be .846. This value is above 0.5 and the Bartlett result (p=.00) also indicates that the data are appropriate for factor analysis ($p<0.05$). According to the factor analysis, this scale has an eight factor structure and accounts for 61.8% of the total variance (Tabak, Sığrı ve Türköz, 2013). It was observed that the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient for this study was α = ,875. These results indicate that the scale is valid and the collected data are reliable.

The five point Likert type *Taking Initiative Scale* consists of four factors and 35 items (Gündüz, Çakmak ve Korumaz, 2015). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value of the scale was observed to be .862. This value is above 0.5 and the Bartlett test result ($p<.01$) also indicates that the data are appropriate for factor analysis. According to the factor analysis, this scale has a four factor structure and accounts for 73% of the total variance (Gündüz, Çakmak ve Korumaz, 2015). It was observed that the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient for the collected data was α = ,867. According to these results, the scale is valid and the collected data are reliable.

3.4. Data Analysis

In the normality tests conducted during the data analysis process, it was observed that the data has normal distribution and the parametric tests Pearson product-moment

correlation analysis and multiple linear regression analysis were conducted in data analysis.

4. Results and Discussion

Findings of the study based on data analysis are presented in this section in accordance with the sub-goals of the study.

Table 2: Descriptive statistical results showing the arithmetic mean, standard deviation and relative variable coefficient for the self-leadership and taking initiative scales

	Strategies	Sub-Dimensions	N	X	ss	V
Self- Leadership	Behavior Focused	Self-goal setting	585	4,075	,589	14,4
		Self-reward	585	4,075	,974	23,9
		Self-punishment	585	3,204	,808	25,2
	Constructive Thought	Self-observation	585	4,118	,499	12,1
		Self-cueing	585	3,628	,972	26,7
		Self-talk	585	3,578	,857	23,9
		Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	585	4,169	,490	11,7
	Natural Reward	Focusing on natural rewards	585	4,198	,624	14,8
Taking Initiative		Self-investment	585	3,884	,545	14,0
		Self-starting	585	3,792	,441	11,6
		Proactive action	585	4,008	,521	12,9
		Overcoming the barriers	585	3,822	,464	12,1

When the data related to the self-leadership and taking initiative attitudes on Table 2 are considered, it is evident that among the self-leadership behaviors, teachers display the thought focused strategy from natural rewards the most and the self-punishment strategy the least. Among the taking initiative related behaviors, teachers were observed to display proactive action mostly and display self-starting behaviors the least. Relative variable coefficients indicate that there is a large consensus between teacher opinions for both scales.

Table 3: Results of the Correlation Analysis Conducted to Determine the Relationship between the Sub-Dimensions of the Self-Leadership and Taking Initiative Scales

Sub-Dimensions	Self-investment	Self-starting	Proactive action	Overcoming the barriers
Self-goal setting	,361**	,449**	,586**	,524**
Self-reward	,174**	,179**	,267**	,212**

Self-punishment	-,042	,027	,121**	,048
Self-observation	,401**	,499**	,544**	,481**
Self-cueing	,167**	,206**	,303**	,184**
Self-talk	,099*	,077	,201**	,231**
Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	,314**	,376**	,442**	,429**
Focusing on natural rewards	,290**	,382**	,450**	,425**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

According to the Pearson correlation coefficients on Table 3, it is evident that most of the related coefficients among the dimensions are significant at 0.05 level. It can be observed from this data that there is a significant and positive relationship between the sub-dimensions of self-leadership and taking initiative. The highest relationship between teachers' self-leadership and taking initiative behaviors was observed to be between self-goal setting and proactive action sub-dimensions; the lowest relationship was observed to be between self-punishment and proactive action sub-dimensions.

Results of the multiple regression analysis conducted to examine whether or not the sub-dimensions of self-leadership predict taking initiative attitudes are given on Table 4.

Table 4: Multiple regression analysis results related to the self-investment sub-dimension of taking initiative

Variables	**B**	**ShB**	**β**	**t**	**p**	**Zero order r**	**Partial r**
Constant	1,156	,235	-	4,913	,000	-	-
Self-goal setting	,168	,047	,182	3,564	,000	,361	,147
Self-reward	,012	,023	,021	,492	,623	,174	,021
Self-punishment	,090	,026	,133	3,460	,001	,044	,143
Self-observation	,283	,052	,259	5,437	,000	,401	,221
Self-cueing	-,026	,024	-,047	-1,114	,266	,167	-,046
Self-talk	-,001	,026	-,001	-,027	,979	,099	-,001
Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	,116	,050	,105	2,317	,021	,314	,096
Focusing on natural rewards	,047	,040	,054	1,163	,245	,290	,048
R= ,468	R^2= ,219		$F_{(8, 576)}$= 20,243		p=0,000		

According to the findings, the sub-dimensions of self-leadership significantly predict the self-investment sub-dimension of taking initiative. [$F_{(8,576)}$= 20,243, p<0.000]. The sub-dimensions of self-leadership account for 22% (R^2 =,219) of the total variance of the self-investment sub-dimension of taking initiative.

Table 5: Multiple regression analysis results related to the self-starting sub-dimension of taking initiative

Variables	B	ShB	β	t	p	Zero order r	Partial r
Constant	1,354	,177	-	7,654	,000	-	-
Self-goal setting	,183	,036	,245	5,163	,000	,449	,210
Self-reward	-,010	,018	-,023	-,581	,562	,179	-,024
Self-punishment	,034	,020	,063	1,756	,080	-,026	,073
Self-observation	,277	,039	,314	7,088	,000	,499	,283
Self-cueing	-,022	,018	-,049	-1,244	,214	,206	-,052
Self-talk	-,036	,020	-,070	-1,823	,069	,077	-,076
Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	,090	,038	,100	2,390	,017	,376	,099
Focusing on natural rewards	,077	,030	,109	2,537	,011	,382	,105
R= ,570	R^2= ,325		$F_{(8, 576)}$= 34,660		p=0,000		

According to the findings, the sub-dimensions of self-leadership significantly predict the self-staring sub-dimension of taking initiative. [$F_{(8, 576)}$= 34,660, p<0.000]. The sub-dimensions of self-leadership account for 32% (R^2 =,325) of the total variance of the self-starting sub-dimension of taking initiative.

Table 6: Multiple regression analysis results related to the proactive action sub-dimension of taking initiative

Variables	B	ShB	β	t	p	Zero order r	Partial r
Constant	,805	,191	-	4,220	,000	-	-
Self-goal setting	,306	,038	,346	7,999	,000	,586	,316
Self-reward	-,002	,019	-,004	-,124	,901	,267	-,005
Self-punishment	,003	,021	,005	,141	,888	-,118	,006
Self-observation	,276	,042	,264	6,549	,000	,544	,263
Self-cueing	,007	,019	,012	,345	,730	,303	,014
Self-talk	-,002	,021	-,004	-,114	,910	,201	-,005
Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	,109	,041	,103	2,679	,008	,442	,111
Focusing on natural rewards	,083	,033	,099	2,528	,012	,450	,105
R= ,662	R^2= ,438		$F_{(8, 576)}$= 56,118		p=0,000		

According to the findings, the sub-dimensions of self-leadership significantly predict the proactive action sub-dimension of taking initiative. [$F_{(8,576)}$= 20,243, p<0.000]. The sub-dimensions of self-leadership account for 44 % (R^2 =,438) of the total variance of the proactive action sub-dimension.

Table 7: Multiple regression analysis results related to the overcoming barriers sub-dimension of taking initiative

Variables	B	ShB	β	t	p	Zero order r	Partial r
Constant	,916	,179	-	5,129	,000	-	-
Self-goal setting	,237	,036	,301	6,601	,000	,524	,265
Self-reward	-,012	,018	-,025	-,658	,511	,212	-,027
Self-punishment	,050	,020	,087	2,532	,012	-,047	,105
Self-observation	,224	,039	,241	5,683	,000	,481	,230
Self-cueing	-,051	,018	-,106	-2,834	,005	,184	-,117
Self-talk	,041	,020	,076	2,072	,039	,231	,086
Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	,128	,038	,135	3,351	,001	,429	,138
Focusing on natural rewards	,102	,031	,137	3,312	,001	,425	,137
R= ,615	R^2= ,378		$F_{(8, 576)}$= 43,811		p=0,000		

According to the findings, the sub-dimensions of self-leadership significantly predict the overcoming barriers sub-dimension of taking initiative. [$F_{(8,576)}$= 43,811, p<0.000]. The sub-dimensions of self-leadership account for 38% (R^2 =,378) of the total variance of the overcoming barriers sub-dimension.

5. Recommendations

The sub-dimensions of self-leadership are significant predictors of the self-starting, overcoming barriers, proactive action and self-investment sub-dimensions of taking initiative. More specifically, possessing self-leadership skills will facilitate teachers in taking initiatives when necessary to enable educational effectiveness. With this respect, teachers should be encouraged to display self-leadership behaviors at schools and organizational and administrational structures that can facilitate teachers in displaying self-leadership behaviors should be established. In addition, it will be beneficial to include target attainments for developing pre-service teachers' leadership and self-leadership skills in the curriculums of teacher training programs in higher education institutions.

6. Conclusion

Currently, following the changes and complying with them are rather difficult for large organizations with a hierarchal structure. Organizations can comply with changes more rapidly when they transfer to a team-based structure and assign a portion of the authority from the manager to the workers (Jarson & King, 2005). Thus, the Turkish educational system will change with the times when organizations, which have

hierarchal structures like schools, attach importance to teamwork and when teachers display self-leadership behaviors. In addition, it is crucial for teachers to be self-motivated, self-directed, and take the initiative to increase both individual and organizational success. Demiröz's (2014) study underlines that the increase in taking initiative behaviors of teachers will positively affect student achievement. This is rather favorable for the Turkish educational system.

According to the study findings, teachers' level of displaying self-leadership behaviors is high. Studies conducted by Göksoy, Emen, Yenipınar (2014) and Garipağaoğlu and Güloğlu (2015) on self-leadership are parallel with this finding. Teachers have stated that among self-leadership sub-dimensions, they display the thought focused strategy from natural rewards mostly and the self-punishment strategy the least. The study conducted by Arlı (2011) underlines that teachers display self-punishment strategy the least. According to Neck and Houghton (2006), the reason why teachers display self-punishment strategy the least is because self-criticism and feeling of guilt have negative effects on individual performance. According to the study findings, teachers believe their level of displaying taking initiative behaviors is high. Although the educational legislation has determined the details of the procedure, teachers are observed to make changes by taking initiative. According to Güner's (2001) study, conducted to determine primary school teachers' level of taking initiative during the teaching process, although they feel restricted at certain times, teachers are generally content with their state.

According to these findings, there is a significantly positive relationship between teachers' self-leadership behaviors and all of the sub-dimensions of taking initiative behaviors except for the self-punishment sub-dimension. The highest relationship was observed to be between self-goal setting sub-dimension of self-leadership and the proactive action sub-dimension of taking initiative. According to Locke and Latham (2006), the workers setting themselves a personal, high level and challenging goals will positively affect their performance and efforts. Proactive action refers to the individual being ready to take action for new demands, problems and opportunities, to find solutions before problems occur (Frese & Fay, 2001) and taking a step ahead by confronting the status quo (Crant, 2000). The self-goal setting sub-dimension of self-leadership and the proactive action sub-dimension of taking initiative are similar in that they focus on the future, emphasize creating a difference, and stress the willing to achieve constant improvement.

About the Author

Sinem Konuk was born in 1991 in Bursa/Mudanya, Turkey. She graduated from Kütahya/Gediz Anatolian Teacher High School, English department in 2009. She

completed her undergraduate education in Anadolu University, English Language Teaching Department in 2014. When she was an undergrad, she participated an exchange student program (Erasmus) as an exchange learner for 4 months (2011) and then as a trainee English teacher (2013) for 3 months in Poland. She also joined Work and Travel program in 2012, Maryland/USA for 3 months. In addition, she gave English lessons to 3 different primary school students at regular intervals. After graduating, she worked at My English Language School in Eskişehir, Turkey for 4 months as an English Teacher. In February 2015, he got a job as a research assistant in Yıldız Technical University, Department of Educational Administration. Between February 1 and June 30, 2017, she was visiting scholar at Santa Clara University California / USA, and studied with Barry Posner, Ph. D. She is still continuing her academic career at Yildiz Technical University. She is planning to complete her Master's thesis in 2018 and register to Ph.D. Program in Department of Educational Administration.

References

1. Arlı Ö, 2011. Antecedent and consequences of self-leadership: A study on primary school teachers. Master Thesis. Military Academy İnstitute for Defence Sciences.
2. Alves J C et al., 2006. A Cross-Cultural Perspective of Self-Leadership. Journal of Managerial Psychology 21(4), pp 338-359.
3. Anderson J S, Prussia G E, 1997. The Self-Leadership Questionnaire: Preliminary Assessment of Construct Validity. The Journal of Leadership Studies 4 (2), pp 119-143.
4. Balcı A. 2015. Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma: Yöntem, Teknik ve İlkeler**,** 11. bs. Ankara: Pegem Yayınvılık.
5. Balyer, Aydın. 2016. Okul Yılları ve Okul Dışındaki Sosyal İlişkilerin Kadın Liderlerin Liderlik Gelişimindeki Rolü. Kalem Uluslararası Eğitim ve İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi. c. 6. s. 1: 77-127, doi: 10.23863
6. Bass B M, 1990. Bass and Stogdill' Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of The Theory and Research. New York: Free Press.
7. Bass, Bernard M., Ronald E. Riggo. 2006. Transformational Leadership. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
8. Barry D, 1991. Managing the Bossless Team: Lessons in Distributed Leadership. Organizational Dynamic, 20(1), pp 31-47.
9. Burns, James MacGregor. 1978. Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

10. Büyüköztürk Ş, 2010. Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı. 11. Baskı. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
11. Crant J, 2000. Proactive behavior in organizations. Journal of Management, 26(3), 435–462.
12. D'Intino R. S, Goldsby M. G, Houghton J D, Christopher P N, 2007. Self-Leadership: A Process for Entrepreneuiral Success. Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies 13(4), pp 105-120.
13. Demiröz S, 2014. The relationship between the teachers' organizational citizenship behavior, organizational image perceptions and the student's success. Doctoral Thesis Hacettepe University.
14. DePree M, 1989. Leadership as an Art. New York: Dell Trade Paperback. https://books.google.com/books?id=Hmd9_VKbAQ8C&printsec=frontcover&hl=tr#v=onepage&q&f=false [20.06.2017]
15. Doğan S, Şahin F, 2008. A Study of Reliability, Validity and Adaptation of Self Leadership Questionnaire in a Turkish Context. Hacettepe University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 26(1), pp 139-164.
16. Dolbier C L, Soderstrom M, Steinhardt M A, 2001. The relationship between selfleadership and enhanced psychological, health, and work outcomes. The Journal of Psychology, 135(5), pp 469-485.
17. Elloy D F, 2008. The relationship between self-leadership behaviors and organization variables in a self-managed work team environment. Management Research News, 31(11).
18. Ergin B, 2014. In terms of quality and efficiency the effect of self-leadership on competencies of academics and organizational learning capacities of universities at higher education system in Turkey. Doctoral Thesis. Marmara University.
19. Eroğlu A, 2010. Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Tekniklerin Varsayımları. SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri (Ed. Ş. Kalaycı). Beşinci Baskı. Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım.
20. Frese M, Kring W, Soose A, Zempel J, 1996. Personal initiative at work: Differences between East and West Germany. Academy of Management Journal, 39(1), pp 37–63.
21. Frese M, Fay D, 2001. Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. In B. M. Staw & R. L. Sutton (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior, Stamford, CT: JAI Press, pp 133–187
22. Frese M, Fay D, 2002. Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. Research in Organizational Behavior, 23, pp 133-487.

23. Garipağaoğlu, B Ç, Güloğlu B, 2015. The Role of Learned Resourcefulness and Locus Of Control On The Self-Leadershıp Skılls Of Teacher Candıdates. Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Educatıon 15(2), pp 147-162.
24. George B, 2007. True North. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.
25. Göksoy S, Emen E, Yenipınar Ş, 2014. Investigation of The Relationship Between Teachers' Self Leadership Roles and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. / KSU Journal of Social Science, 11 (1), pp 103-116
26. Godwin J L, Neck C P, Houghton, J D, 1999. The impact of thought self-leadership on individual goal performance: A cognitive perspective. The Journal of Management Development, 18(2), pp 153-169.
27. Greenleaf R K, 1977. Servant Leadership A journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power & Greatness. New Jersey: Paulist Press.
28. Gündüz H B, 2008. An Evaluation on Belbin's Team Roles Theory. (The Case of Sakarya Anatol a Profess on High School, Profess on High School and Vocational High School for Industry). World Applied Sciences Journal. c. 4. s. 3: 460-469. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/257c/cf2792800d3224f6f96e815a77b28f4a9e60.pdf [21.07.2017].
29. Gündüz H. B, Çakmak E, Korumaz M, 2015. Taking initiative in educational organizations: A scale development study International Journal of Human Sciences, 12(2), pp 327-342.
30. Güner H, 2011. Determination of Level of Initatives That Elementary Schools Teachers Take in Instructional Process (Elazığ-Muş-Şırnak). Mater Thesis. Fırat University
31. Harris A, 2009. Creative Leadership: Developing Future Leaders. Management in Education. c. 23. s. 1: 9-11. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0892020608099076?journalCode=miea [21.06.2017].
32. Houghton J D, Cristopher P N, 2002. The Revised Self Leadership Questionnaire: Testing a Hierarchical Factor Structure for Self-Leadership. Journal of Managerial Psychology 17(8) pp 672-692.
33. Houghton J D, Christopher P N, Charles C M, 2003. We Think We Can, We Think We Can, We Think We Can: The Impact of Thinking Patterns and Work Team Sustainability. The Performance Management: An International Journal 9(1/2) pp 31-41.
34. Houghton, J D, Darryl L J, 2007. Constructive Thought Strategies and Job Satisfaction: A Preliminary Examination. Journal of Business and Psychology 22, pp 45-53.

35. Jarson C M, King J E, 2005. Leaving leadership: Solving leadership problems through empowerment. Management Decision, 43, pp 1049-1053.
36. Ilgen D R, Pulakos E D, 1999. The changing nature of performance: Implications for staffing, motivation, and development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
37. Karasar N, 2015.Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri, 28. bs. Ankara: Nobel Akademi Yayıncılık.
38. Kazan A L, 1999. Exploring concept of self-leadership: factor impacting selfleadership of Ohio Americorps Members. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University.
39. Kouzes J M, Posner B Z, 2014. Turning Adversity into Opportunity. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
40. Kurman J, 2001. Self-regulation strategies in achievement setting: culture and gender differences. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32(4), pp 491-503.
41. Locke E A, Latham G P, 2006. New Directions in Goal-Setting Theory. Current Directions in Psychological Science 15(5), pp 265-268.
42. Lovelace K J, Manz C C, Jose C A, 2007. Work stress and leadership development: the role of self-leadership, shared leadership, physical fitness and flow in managing demands and ıncreasing job control. Human Resource Management Review, 17, pp 374-387.
43. Manz C C, Henry P S, 1980. Self-Management as a Substitute, A social Learning Theory Perspective. Journal of Managerial Psychology 5(3), pp 361-367
44. Manz, Charles C. (1992). Mastering Self-Leadership: Empowering Yourself for Personal Excellence. Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
45. Manz C C, 1986. Self-Leadership: Toward an Expanded Theory of Self- Influence Processes in Organizations. Academy of Management Review, 11(3), pp 585-600.
46. McCutcheon R, Lindsey T, 2006. It Doesn't Take a Genius. McGraw-Hill, New York.
47. Morrison E W, Phelps C C, 1999. Taking charge at work: Extra-role efforts to initiate workplace change. Academy of Management Journal, 42(4), pp 403–419.
48. Neck C P, Manz C C, 1996. Thought self-leadership: the impact of mental strategies training on employee cognition, behavior, and affect. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17, pp 445-467.
49. Neck C P, Jeffery D H, 2006. Two Decades of Self-Leadership Theory and Search: Past Developments, Present Trends, and Future Possibilities. Journal of Managerial Psychology 21(4), pp 270-295
50. Parker S K, Williams H M, Turner N, 2006. Modeling the antecedents of proactive behavior at work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(3) pp 636–652.

51. Pearce C L, Charles C M, Henry P S, 2008. The Roles of Vertical and Shared Leadership in the Enactment of Executive Corruption: Implications for Research and Practice. The Leadership Quarterly 19, pp 353-359.
52. Pondy L R, 1989. Leadership Is a Language Game. London: University of Chicago Press. Readings in Managerial Psychology. ed. Harold J. Leavitt, Louis R. Pondy, David M. Boje
53. Prussia G E, Anderson J S, Manz C C, 1998. Self-leadership and performance outcomes: The mediating influence of self-efficacy. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19, pp 523-538.
54. Staw B M, Boettger R D, 1990. Task revision: A neglected form of work performance. Academy of Management Journal, 33(3), pp 534-559.
55. Tabak A, Sığrı Ü, Türköz T, 2013. Öz Liderlik Ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması çalışması. Bilig, 67, pp 213-244.
56. Uğurluoğlu Ö, 2010. Kendi kendine liderlik stratejileri üzerine bir araştırma. Atatürk Üniversitesi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 24(1), pp 175-192.
57. Williams S, 1997. Personality and Self-Leadership. Human Resource Management Review, 7(2), pp 139-155.