Revista Argentina de Clínica Psicológica
2021, Vol. XXX, N°1, 227-239
DOI: 10.24205/03276716.2020.2019

Being a Female School Administrator in Turkey: An Analysis Based on Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy and Organizational Justice Perceptions

Dilek SÖNMEZ GENÇ[a], Ahmet GÜNEYLI[b], Pervin YIĞIT[c]

Abstract

This study aims to clarify how female school administrators are perceived by themselves and by their organisation, in fact by the society they live in. Based on three dependent variables; Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy Perception and Organised Justice Perception, the current situation of female school administrators in Turkey is examined. In the study, it is analysed whether the self-esteem, self-efficacy beliefs and organizational justice perceptions of female school administrators changed according to independent variables such as age, educational status, place and term of duty. In the research, descriptive model was used within the quantitative paradigm. The study group is comprised of female school administrators from the primary and secondary schools registered under the Ministry of Education in Turkey for the academic year of 2017-2018. Purposeful and snowball sampling were used to identify the number. Demographic data sheet, self-esteem scale, self-efficacy scale and organizational justice perception scale were used to collect data in the study. The data was analysed by descriptive statistics, mean, minimum and maximum values. Independent Samples t-test was used when comparing independent two groups and One-Way ANOVA is applied where there is a normal distribution in the comparison of more than two independent groups. For the comparisons with parametric tests, Tukey Test is used to analyse the variances between groups. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to examine the correlation between the continuous variables. The findings of the study revealed that the self-esteem level of female school administrators was identified as statistically significant by the age variable. Similarly, self-efficacy perception was also influenced by age. On the other hand, organizational justice perception differs by age variable as well as the place of duty. Another result of the study is that the variables of educational status and term of duty do not influence Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy Perception and Organised Justice Perception.

Keywords: Female school administrator, self-esteem, self-efficacy, organisational justice,

1. INTRODUCTION

The number of researches conducted in Turkey regarding the female school administrators has been increasing. It is significant to begin this study upon creating a skeleton on the status of female school administrators presented in the studies until today. The study by Altınışık (1995), which is one of the first studies performed about the female school administrators, concluded interesting results. Altınışık (1995) where she collected data from various districts of Ankara narrated the challenges hindering female teachers to become school principals. Pursuant to this research, female teachers do not want to be school principals; the supervisors authorized for appointment at the Ministry of Education prefer male teachers as principals; female principals cannot allocate sufficient time for school administration, and particularly the social structure and mindset in the periphery do not consider females as principals (Altınışık, 1995). The study by Ozan and Akpınar (2002:232), which was performed in the same period as Altınışık's study revealed that female administrators are as successful as male administrators at school.

A study by Aktaş (2007), which approached the subject from female perspective, identified that

[a] Ph. D candidate, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Near East University, Nicosia, North Cyprus, dlkgnc@hotmail.com
[b] Assoc. Prof. Dr., Faculty of Educational Sciences, Europen University of Lefke, Lefke, North Cyprus.
[c] Assist. Prof. Dr., Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Near East University, Nicosia, North Cyprus.

there is not any sexist reason about why female school administrators choose to be an administrator themselves. Additionally, none of the female administrators do not any have any regrets on their duties, and they fulfil all the requirements through tackling challenges. Although women perform their duties properly, they expressed that they are aware of the discrimination and impediments against them. On the other hand, the research by Izgar and Dilmaç (2008: 442) on administrator candidate teachers that refuted Aktaş's research findings reflected that the self-efficacy perceptions of male administrator candidates are higher than the female teachers, who are administrator candidates.

In the last decade, the studies conducted in Turkey about educational administration provide a number of outcomes and reports reflecting a concrete improvement on the status of female school administrators. Women continue higher education and the number of female teachers is increasing day by day. Thus, the number of women in education field is increasing, and they have a voice in education. However, there are not many female school administrators. Although, women in Turkey have the opportunity to improve themselves in education, there is not a parallel increase in the administration aspect, (Hausmann, Tyson & Zahidi, 2010; Leopold, Ratcheva & Zahidi, 2016; Tok & Yalçın, 2017; TÜİK, 2017; Türkiye World Economic Forum, 2016) which should be investigated respectively. The starting point of this research is to analyse how female school administrators perceive themselves and how they are perceived by teachers within an organization. Negiz and Yemen (2011) reflected the conspicuous situation about the female school administrators in Turkey. Despite of legal equality between women and men in educational administration, there are many unfavourable cases in practice; therefore, there is a need to investigate the reasons putting the female school administrators in a disadvantaged position with regard to the school administration. Hence, this study aims to analyse the status of women in school administration based on self-esteem, self-efficacy perception and organizational justice perception.

When the researches done other places than Turkey have been examined, as Growe and Montgomery (1999) suggested, it is seen that the schools managed by women are more successful than the schools managed by men and the quality of learning among the students and teachers' professional performance are higher in the schools which have female administrators. In Durrah's study (2009), teachers regarded their female administrators as the sincere leaders who create team spirit among colleagues and celebrate success with them. Although women constitute the majority of teachers working in both public and private sectors in many countries around the world, it is observed that the number of women is low at all levels of education and in leadership positions (Campbell, 2010; Zachry, 2009). However, according to the research report published by OECD, Teaching and Learning International Survey [TALIS], more than 70% of principals in primary education in Bulgaria, France, Poland, Slovakia, Sweden, the United Kingdom and Iceland are women. Yet, this rate is quite low in secondary education in countries such as France, Austria, Slovakia, Sweden and Iceland. For example, it is under 30% in the secondary and high school principals in Austria. In other EU countries, this rate is below 55% at high school level. The situation is not different in the secondary education in France and Finland (Tüzel, 2014).

1.1. Conceptual Framework

i. Self: In the most general sense, self is explained with how an individual defines oneself among the roles attributed him/her by the society. Self is defined where an individual evaluates himself/herself and feels close to a specific role. For instance, while the roles attributed to a female school administrator are "woman", "teacher", "mother" and "administrator", the self-perception in individuals is related where a female school administrator defines herself rather "an administrator" (Eisenberg & Delaney, 1998).

ii. Self-efficacy: Self-efficacy means where an individual is aware of one's abilities on certain issues and believe in what one can do (Chaplain, 2000: 178). Even under different circumstances, this brings individual success along as well. Self-efficacy level varies among people; thus, the self-efficacy level of an individual, which is the possibility to be successful based on one's belief, may vary respectively.

iii. Organizational justice: Organizational justice is about the fair distribution of acquisitions generated through organizational relations, and it is related with the fair execution of organizational decisions, regulations and practices by the administrators as well as their behaviours towards employees in an objective and non-arbitrary manner (İyigün, 2012: 50).

The aforementioned concepts that are reviewed and analysed within the framework of this study are vital to reflect how female school administrators,

who have significant roles within the society, perceive themselves and how they are perceived by their organization and consequently by their societies. Self-perception is where an individual decides what he/she is; self-efficacy is about the reflection of such decision. As the complementary pillar, organizational justice presents how much an individual bears his/her efficacy and feeling of justice within the context of one's own or attributed role/status.

1.2. Research Questions

i. Does the self-esteem of female school administrators in Turkey show significant change based on different variables (age, educational status, term of duty, place of duty)?
ii. Does the self-efficacy perception of female school administrators in Turkey show significant change based on different variables (age, educational status, term of duty, place of duty)?
iii. Does the organizational justice perception of female school administrators in Turkey show significant change based on different variables (age, educational status, term of duty, place of duty)?

2. Method

The methodology is explained under the following topics.

2.1. Research Model

The descriptive model is utilised within the framework of qualitative paradigm in order to collect and analyse of data in accordance with purposes of this research. The dependent variables of this research are self-esteem, self-efficacy perception and organizational justice perception, and the aim is to investigate whether the related dependent variables are affected by independent variables such as age, term of duty, place of duty and educational status.

2.2. Study Group

The study group is comprised of female school administrators from the primary and secondary schools registered under the Ministry of Education in Turkey for the academic year of 2017-2018. Purposeful and snowball sampling were used accordingly. Since it would be difficult to access every region and school as well as to perform probability-based sampling, the purposeful sampling was preferred upon considering such difficulties as limitation. With a purpose, the researchers included female school administrators from different regions of Turkey into the research. Hence, the research scales were shared on social media where female school administrators were asked to share the scale with their acquaintances and colleagues; hereby, snowball sampling was used. Table 1 shows the purposeful sample group in consideration with the population in the geographical regions.

While Table 1 presents the distribution by age, educational status and place of duty, Table 2 provides the average values on the female school administrators' age and term of duty.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

Demographic data sheet, self-esteem scale, general self-efficacy scale and organizational justice perception scales were used for the purposes of this research.

i. Demographic Data Sheet: This form was developed by the researchers to identify the age, educational status, term and place of duty for the female school administrators.

ii. Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale: This scale, which was considered as a reference in measuring self-esteem, was developed by Morris Rosenberg in 1963. In the measurement of self-esteem, Rosenberg focused on a holistic approach in the self-evaluation of individuals. In Turkey, Çuhadaroğlu (1986) performed the reliability and validity checks of scale. The attainment of low score means higher self-esteem under the scoring of scale while high scores means lower self-esteem (Tukuş, 2010).

iii. General Self-Efficacy Scale: This scale with a total number of 17 items is comprised of three sub-dimensions, namely initiative, effort and persistence. Each item is scored between 1-5. The items no. 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 17 are reverse scored. The total score of scale may vary between 17-85. The reliability and validity checks of scale in Turkey were conducted by Yıldırım and İlhan (2010).

iv. Organizational Justice Perception Scale: Organizational justice perception scale with 20 items was developed by Colquitt (2001) and adapted to Turkish by Özmen, Arbak and Özeri (2007). As a result of factor analysis, the first factor is defined as Procedural Justice Perception with a total number of 7 items. The second factor is called "Distributive Justice Perception" with 4 items. And finally, "Interpersonal Justice Perception" is comprised of 9 items as the third factor.

2.4. Procedure

Prior to the performance of research scales, the

necessary application approval was acquired from the Ministry of Education in Turkey. An ethical approval was obtained from the Near East University Ethics Review Board for the applicability of scales. The informed consent form was provided at the top of scales, and the research data were generated online during the academic year of 2017-2018 in accordance with the voluntary basis. Under the consent form, the participants were informed that data would be kept confidential, be solely used for scientific studies, and the names of institutions and individuals shall not be shared under any circumstances.

2.5. Data Analysis

In summarising the qualitative data generated from this study, the descriptive statistics are provided under a table as *average, standard deviation, minimum* and *maximum* for the continuous variables. Categorical variables are summarised as *number* and *percentage.* The normality test of numeric variables was checked with *Shapiro Wilks Test* for n<50 and *Kolmogrov Smirnov Test* was used in the case/cases of n>50. Where there is a normal distribution in the comparison of independent two groups, *Independent Samples t-test* was used as a parametric test. *One-Way ANOVA* is applied where there is a normal distribution in the comparison of more than two independent groups. For the comparisons with parametric tests, *Tukey Test* is used to analyse the variances between groups based on the data distribution if it is homogenous, if not then *Games-Howell Test* is applied accordingly.

3. Findings

This part is related with the "self-esteem", "self-efficacy perception" and "organizational justice perception" of the female school administrators in Turkey based on the following variables:

i. Age
ii. Educational status
iii. Term of duty
iv. Place of duty

The age levels and average self-esteem scores of female administrators working at the Ministry of Education (MEB) were compared under Table 3 where the difference between average self-esteems scores and age levels were found statistically significant ($F_{3,284}$=6,008, p=0,001). Such variance was identified to be due to the age groups of 38-44 and 24-30 and 45 + and 24-30. The self-esteem scores of participants from the age group of 24-30 are lower than both of these age groups (38-44 & 45+).

Table 4 presents the comparison between the age levels of participants, who are the female school administrators from MEB, their total scores from general self-efficacy scale and average scores of sub-dimensions. Hence, the difference between the average scores from the initiative sub-dimension under the general self-efficacy scale by their ages was found as statistically significant ($F_{3,284}$=6,772, p<0,001). Such variance was identified to be due to the age groups of 38-44 with 24-30, and 38-44 with 31-37. The difference between the average scores from the effort sub-dimension under the general self-efficacy scale by their ages was identified as statistically significant ($F_{3,284}$=3,348, p=0,020). The variance was originated from the age groups of 38-44 and 24-30. Moreover, the difference between the average scores from the general self-efficacy scale by their ages was found as statistically significant ($F_{3,284}$=5,514, p=0,001). Such difference was identified to be due to the age groups of 38-44 with 24-30 and 38-44 with 31-37. On the other hand, the difference between the average scores from the persistence sub-dimension under the general self-efficacy scale by their ages was not identified as statistically significant ($F_{3,284}$=1,006, p=0,391).

Table 5 presents the comparison between the age levels of participants, who are the female school administrators from MEB, and their total average scores from organizational justice scale in general and from its sub-dimensions. Consequently, the difference between the average scores from interpersonal justice perception by age levels was identified as statistically significant ($F_{3,284}$=3,604, p=0,014). Such difference was found to be from the age group of 38-44 and 24-30. The difference between the average scores from informational justice perception by age levels was found as statistically significant ($F_{3,284}$=4,784, p=0,003). The difference was originated from the age group of 38-44 and 24-30. The difference between the average total scores from the organizational justice perception scale by age levels was identified as statistically significant ($F_{3,284}$=3,865, p=0,010) due to the age group of 38-44 and 24-30. However, the difference between the average scores from procedural justice perception by age levels was not found as statistically significant ($F_{3,284}$=1,660, p=0,176). Finally, the difference between the average scores from distributive justice perception by age levels was not also found as statistically significant ($F_{3,284}$=1,509, p=0,212).

Table 6 provides the comparison between the educational status of participant female school

administrators and total score averages between self-esteem scale. Consequently, the difference between the total self-esteem score averages of women by their educational status is not statistically significant (t_{286}=-1,539, p=0,125).

Table 7 compares the educational status of female school administrators with the total score averages from the general self-efficacy scale together with sub-dimensions. Therefore, the difference between the average scores from initiative sub-dimension by the educational status was not found as statistically significant (t_{286}=-0,236, p=0,813). The difference between the average scores from effort sub-dimension by the educational status was not found as statistically significant (t_{286}=-1,192, p=0,234). Moreover, the difference between the average scores from persistence sub-dimension by the educational status was not found as statistically significant (t_{286}=-0,437, p=0,662). Lastly, the difference between the general total average scores from the general self-efficacy scale by the educational status was not found as statistically significant (t_{286}=-648, p=0,518).

Table 8 presents the comparison between the educational status of participants, who are the female school administrators from MEB, and their total average scores from organizational justice scale in general and from its sub-dimensions. Consequently, the difference between the average scores of procedural justice perception by educational status is not statistically significant (t_{286}=0,025, p=0,980) as well as the difference between the average scores of distributive justice perception by the educational status (t_{286}=-0,065, p=0,949). The difference between the average scores of interpersonal justice perception by the educational status is not statistically significant (t_{286}=-0,417, p=0,677) neither is the difference between the average scores of informational justice perception by the educational status (t_{286}=1,203, p=0,230). The difference between the general total average scores from the organizational justice perception scale by the educational status is not statistically significant (t_{286}=0,250, p=0,803).

Upon the comparison of the female school administrators' term of duty and average self-esteem scores as shown under Table 9, there is no significant linear correlation respectively (p=0,087).

Upon the comparison of the female school administrators' term of duty and average scores from the general self-efficacy scale in general and from its sub-dimensions as shown under Table 10, there is no significant linear correlation (p=0,061, p=0,442, p=0,811, p=0,162 respectively).

Upon the comparison of the female school administrators' term of duty and average scores from the organizational justice perception scale in general and from its sub-dimensions as shown under Table 11, there is no significant linear correlation (p=0,617, p=0,473, p=0,750, p=0,895, p=0,541 respectively).

Table 12 compares the female school administrators' place of duty and their average self-esteem scores; the difference between the average figures is not statistically significant ($F_{6,281}$=1,385, p=0,221).

Table 13 compares the female school administrators' place of duty and their average initiative, effort, persistence and general self-efficacy general total scores; the difference between the average figures is not statistically significant ($F_{6,281}$=0,635, p=0,702, $F_{6,281}$=1,481, p=0,184, $F_{6,281}$=0,497, p=0,810, $F_{6,281}$=0,913, p=0,486 respectively)

Table 14 compares the female school administrators' place of duty and their total average scores from the organizational justice perception scale in general and from its sub-dimensions; the difference between the average figures is not statistically significant ($F_{6,281}$=1,162, p=0,327). Based on their place of duty, the difference between the average scores of distributive justice perception is found as statistically significant ($F_{6,281}$=3,521, p=0,002) originated from the pairs of Eastern Anatolia Region-South-eastern Anatolia Region and Aegean Region-South-eastern Anatolia Region. The difference between their place of duty and interpersonal justice perception is not identified as statistically significant ($F_{6,281}$=1,605, p=0,146) as well as for the informational justice perception ($F_{6,281}$=1,985, p=0,0,068). With regard to their place of duty, the difference between the total average scores from the organizational justice perception is found as statistically significant ($F_{6,281}$=2,265, p=0,038) originating from the pair of Aegean Region-South-eastern Anatolia Region.

4. Conclusion and Discussion

In the discussion, firstly it is remarkable to analyse dependent variables (self-esteem, self-efficacy, organizational justice perception) as independent from the other variables examined in this study.

Self-esteem: The first variable addressed in this study is self-esteem. When the findings are examined, it is seen that female school administrators have high self-esteem levels. Prior to this study, it is seen that there are studies in the Turkish literature on self-esteem. For example,

Kılınç (2017) and Ağaoğlu (2018) explored that the self-esteem and personality traits of female school administrators affected their management skills. In these studies, female school administrators were seen as democratic people, successful in interpersonal relations who have good communication skills, empathy, ability of systematic thinking and good visual perception. In addition, it is seen that these female school administrators are creative, innovative, idealist, cooperative, self-confident and consistent. On the other hand, it is emphasized that they are insufficient and impatient in stress and crisis management.

Self-efficacy: Another dependent variable considered in this study is self-efficacy. It can be said that female school administrators' self-efficacy perception levels are also high like their self-esteem levels. There are studies regarding the self-efficacy of female school administrators in the literature. In some studies, it has been revealed that female school administrators perceive themselves inadequate in management (Moorisi, 2010; Ryan, Haslam, Hersby and Bongiorno, 2011). In one of the studies that saw its reason at individual level, Lüleci (2019) draws attention to the lack of self-confidence and the fear of failure-loneliness of female school administrators. In addition, it has been stated that glass ceiling syndrome is an important obstacle for female school administrators. According to Erkol's research (2015), the competencies of women who prefer to be administrators are as follows; women who have leadership and counselling skills, who are hardworking and able to fulfil the responsibilities both in school and outside prefer to have roles in administration. Tüzel's study (2014) revealed that the beliefs of female teachers regarding their professional competence and success became higher when they work with a female school administrator. Accordingly, working with a female administrator role model leads female teachers to have an idea that they could also succeed in administration.

Organizational Justice Perception: The dependent variable related to organisations in this study is organizational justice perception.The organizational justice level of female school administrators was not as high as their self-esteem and self-efficacy perceptions. Tüzel's study (2014) which is one of the studies on the organizational justice behaviours of female administrators in the literature suggested that the negative evaluations of teachers towards female school administrators were about objectivity and equal treatment. The reason of this could be found in Kılınç's (2017) study. Kılınç stated that female school administrators insist on obeying the rules and they are judgmental when they face with mistakes and so they are moral and attached to the principles. For this reason, their ability in achieving justice is questions and criticized. Unlike these studies, Loder and Spillane (2005) claimed that female school administrators are interacting with teachers more frequently and have an egalitarian leadership approach.

Discussion of the findings according to the age variable: In this study, it is seen that the self-esteem levels of female school administrators increase as their age increases. Similarly, the self-efficacy perception scores of female school administrators increase as the age increases. It is observed that the perception of self-efficacy especially in initiative, effort and persistence makes a significant difference according to the age variable. Similar to the perception of self-esteem and self-efficacy, it is seen that female school administrators manage their schools more justly when their get older. In two studies examining how female teachers perceive the female school administrators (Kiyer 2012; Tüzel, 2014), it is seen that the teachers' opinions on female school administrators became more positive as the age of the teachers increases. From this point of view, it can be said that female school administrators could have a better communication and relationship with the teachers who are close to their age. However, this situation may cause difficulties in ensuring organizational justice. Tüzel (2014) stated that the opinions of female teachers differ by the age variable. Female teachers believe that there are barriers to become an administrator due to their age and professional experience. Experienced female teachers perceive some experiences they encounter as discrimination based on their gender (Tüzel, 2014).

Discussion of the findings according to the educational status variable: The educational status variable is not identified as significant in self-esteem, self-efficacy perception and organizational justice perception scores of the female school administrators in this study. Although it is expected that the self-esteem and self-efficacy perception will get higher as the educational status increases, this view could be proven by the findings. In the studies of Kiyer (2012) and Tüzel (2014), in which female teachers were asked about their opinions about female school administrators, it was observed that as the educational status of female teachers increased, their opinions about female administrators became more positive. In addition, it was stated that female teachers with postgraduate degrees are more aware of the social discrimination

toward female school administrators in schools.

Discussion of the findings according to the term of duty: The term of duty variable is not identified as significant in self-esteem, self-efficacy perception and organizational justice perception scores of female school administrators. However, it was expected that ensuring organizational justice would be easier when experience increases yet this view is not supported by the findings. In his study, Korsan (2012) revealed that female teachers think more positively about female administrators when their term of duty increases. Tüzel (2014) states that female teachers having less years in the school have weak beliefs regarding that they will be successful in the school administrating than the female teachers who had worked in the school longer.

Discussion of the findings according to the place of duty variable: The place of duty variable is not identified as significant in self-esteem and self-efficacy perception but it is significant in organizational justice perception scores of female school administrators. Especially, the organizational justice perception scores of female school administrators working in Aegean region are higher than the others. Since the Aegean region is situated on the west of Turkey and regarded as one of the most developed regions of the country, Gerni's (2001) study also have similar results regarding the place of duty variable. Gerni (2001) examined the role of women in Turkish education system and found that the numbers of female school administrators decrease when we move from more developed regions to less developed regions in Turkey.

References

[1] Aktaş, N. (2007). The problems of women managers that they have. Master Thesis, Ankara University, Ankara.

[2] Altınışık, S. (1995). Kadın öğretmenlerin okul müdürü olmasının engelleri [Obstacles for female teachers to become school principals]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 1*(3), 333-334.

[3] Ağaoğlu, S. (2018). Views on educational administration of female education administrators: Tokat sample. Master Thesis, Gaziosmanpaşa University, Tokat.

[4] Campbell, S.B. (2010). A comparative study of educational leadership behavior by gender and race. PhD Thesis. Saint Louis University, USA.

[5] Chaplain, R.P. (2000). Beyond exam results? Differences in the social and psychological perceptions of young males and females at school. *Educational Studies, 26*(2), 177-190.

[6] Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 386-400.

[7] Çelikten, M. (2004). Women on the chair of school principal: The case of Kayseri. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 2,* 91-118.

[8] Durrah, T.M. (2009). A study of gender based school leadership and its perceived influence on the school climate. PhD Thesis, Union University, USA.

[9] Eisenberg, S. & Delaney, D. J. (1998). *Psychological counseling.* Translated in Turkish by N. Ören and M. Takkaç. İstanbul: Ministry of National Education Publications. pp, 128-130.

[10] Erkol, H. (2015). School management and female principals from the perspective of female school principals. Master Thesis, Düzce University, Düzce.

[11] Gerni, M. (2001). Yönetimde kadınlar [Woman in management], İstanbul: Beta Basım.

[12] Growe, R., & Montgomery, P. (1999). Women and the leadership paradigm: Bridging the gender gap. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal,* 1E(4), 38-46.

[13] Hausmann, R., Tyson, L.D. & Zahidi, S. (2010). The Global Gender Gap Report. World Economic Forum. Retrieved from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_ GenderGap_Report_2010.pdf in January 2021.

[14] Izgar, H., & Dilmaç, B. (2008). Analyzing the self-efficacy beliefs and epistemological beliefs of prospective school administrators. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 20,* 437-446.

[15] İyigün, N. Ö. (2012). Organizational justice: A theoritical approach. *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 11*(21), 49-64.

[16] Kılınç, H. (2017). Examining of women school administrators in terms of their leadership style. PhD Thesis, Gazi University, Ankara.

[17] Kıyıcı, P. (2012). The role of female teachers in employment as school administrators. Master Thesis, Yeditepe University, İstanbul.

[18] Kızıloluk, H. (2007). Toplum bilim yazıları [Sociological articles]. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

[19] Leopold, T.A., Ratcheva, V. &Zahidi, S. (2016). The global gender gap report. World Economic Forum. Retrieved from http://www3. weforum.org/docs/GGGR16/WEF_ Global_Gender_Gap_Report_2016.pdf in January 2021.

[20] Loder, T. L., & Spillane, J. P. (2005). Is a principal still a teacher? US women administrators' accounts of role conflict and role discontinuity. *School Leadership & Management, 25*(3), 263-279.

[21] Lüleci, S. (2019). Obstacles encountered by women in the course of being a manager in education system, and recommendations in this respect. Master Thesis, Kocaeli University, Kocaeli.

[22] Moorosi, P. (2010). South African female principals' career paths: Understanding the gender gap in secondary school management. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 38*(5), 547–562.

[23] Negiz, N. & Yemen, A. (2011). female administrators in public organizations: Female problematique in administration in terms of administrator and employee. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 24,* 194-214.

[24] Özan, M. B., & Akpınar, B. (2002). The success of women administrators in school administration. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 12*(2), 219-234.

[25] Özmen, Ö.N.T., Arbak, Y. & Süral-Özer, P. (2007). An inquiry about the effect of justice value on justice perception, *Ege Academic Review, 7*(1), 17-33.

[26] Ryan, M. K., Haslam, S.A., Hersby, M. D. ve Bongiorno, R. (2011). Think crisis–think female: The glass cliff and contextual variation in the think manager–think male stereotype. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(3), 470-484.

[27] Tok, T. N. & Yalçın, N. (2017). Women school principals in the eyes of school principals, *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 28,* 353-366.

[28] Tukuş, L. (2010). Investigating of the self esteem rating scale-short form reliability and validity, Kocaeli University, Kocaeli.

[29] Tüzel, E. (2014). A study on career barriers for women administrators in educational organizations. PhD Thesis, Gazi University, Ankara.

[30] Yıldırım, F. & İlhan, İ.Ö. (2010). The validity and reliability of the General Self-Efficacy Scale-Turkish form, *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi, 21*(4), 301-308.

[31] Zachry, C. A.R. (2009). Breaking the glass ceiling from the top ın what ways do women county superintendents support and encourage women in educational leadership. PhD Thesis. University of California Davis, USA.

Tables

Table 1. **Distribution of female school administrators by their age, educational status and place of duty**

		n	%
Age	24-30	62	21,53%
	31-37	109	37,85%
	38-44	84	29,17%
	45 and above	33	11,46%
Educational status	Undergraduate	188	65,28%
	Post-graduate	100	34,72%
Place of duty	Mediterranean	44	15,28%
	Eastern Anatolia Region	22	7,64%
	Aegean Region	47	16,32%
	South-eastern Anatolia Region	19	6,60%
	Central Anatolia Region	55	19,10%
	Black Sea Region	33	11,46%
	Marmara Region	68	23,61%

Table 1. **Age and Term of Duty of the Female School Administrators**

	Ave.	SS
Age	36,29	6,78
Term of duty (month)	33,89	55,83

Table 3. **Self-esteem of female school administrators by age variable**

		N	□	*ss*	**ANOVA Results**						
						KT	*Sd*	*KO*	*f*	*p*	*Difference*
Self-esteem	24-30	62	1,274	0,606	Between groups	5,61	3	1,870	6,009	**0,001***	
	31-37	109	1,373	0,573	Within group	88,39	284	0,311			38-44 >24-30
	38-44	84	1,583	0,492	Total	94,00	287				45 and above >24-30
	45 and above	33	1,667	0,572							age
	Total	288	1,447	0,572							

One-Way ANOVA is used. *: p<0,05

Table 4. **General self-efficacy of female school administrators by age variable**

		N	□	*ss*	**ANOVA Results**						
						KT	*Sd*	*KO*	*f*	*p*	*Fark*
Initiative	24-30	62	37,65	4,92	Between groups	465,72	3	155,242	6,772	**0,001***	38-44 >24-30 38-44 >31-37
	31-37	109	39,22	5,13	Within group	6510,11	284	22,923			
	38-44	84	41,20	3,62	Total	6975,83	287				
	45 and above	33	39,36	5,88							
	Total	288	39,48	4,93							
Effort	24-30	62	20,40	2,76	Between groups	81,22	3	27,073	3,348	**0,020***	38-44 >24-30
	31-37	109	20,86	3,00	Within group	2296,25	284	8,085			
	38-44	84	21,83	2,53	Total	2377,47	287				
	45 and above	33	21,09	3,21							
	Total	288	21,07	2,88							
Persistence	24-30	62	12,10	1,94	Between groups	12,30	3	4,100	1,006	0,391	-
	31-37	109	12,28	1,97	Within group	1158,02	284	4,078			
	38-44	84	12,58	2,00	Total	1170,32	287				
	45 and above	33	12,00	2,35							
	Total	288	12,30	2,02							
General self-efficacy scale	24-30	62	70,15	8,47	Between groups	1128,27	3	376,091	5,514	**0,001***	38-44 >24-30 38-44 >31-37
	31-37	109	72,37	8,57	Within group	19369,01	284	68,201			
	38-44	84	75,62	6,66	Total	20497,28	287				
	45 and above	33	72,45	10,28							
	Total	288	72,85	8,45							

One-Way ANOVA is used. *:p<0,05

Table 5. **Organizational justice perception of female school administrators by age variable**

					ANOVA Results						
		N	□	*ss*		*KT*	*Sd*	*KO*	*f*	*p*	*Fark*
Procedural Justice Perception	24-30	62	27,37	5,28	Between groups	162,55	3	54,185	1,660	0,176	
	31-37	109	28,73	5,17	Within group	9269,77	284	32,640			
	38-44	84	28,69	6,06	Total	9432,32	287				-
	45 and above	33	26,76	7,15							
	Total	288	28,20	5,73							
Distributive Justice Perception	24-30	62	15,52	3,93	Between groups	86,71	3	28,905	1,509	0,212	
	31-37	109	15,84	4,41	Within group	5440,75	284	19,158			
	38-44	84	16,69	4,26	Total	5527,47	287				-
	45 and above	33	15,03	5,29							
	Total	288	15,93	4,39							
Interpersonal Justice Perception	24-30	62	17,27	4,02	Between groups	147,34	3	49,113	3,604	**0,014***	
	31-37	109	18,57	3,32	Within group	3870,61	284	13,629			
	38-44	84	18,99	3,56	Total	4017,94	287				38-44> 24-30
	45 and above	33	17,27	4,49							
	Total	288	18,26	3,74							
Informational Justice Perception	24-30	62	13,29	4,65	Between groups	271,03	3	90,342	4,784	**0,003***	
	31-37	109	15,05	4,23	Within group	5363,44	284	18,885			
	38-44	84	15,85	3,87	Total	5634,47	287				38-44> 24-30
	45 and above	33	13,82	5,20							
	Total	288	14,76	4,43							
Organizational Justice Perception-Total	24-30	62	73,45	13,61	Between groups	2357,31	3	785,77	3,865	**0,010***	
	31-37	109	78,19	12,58	Within group	57743,97	284	203,32			
	38-44	84	80,21	14,66	Total	60101,28	287				38-44> 24-30
	45 and above	33	72,88	18,98							
	Total	288	77,15	14,47							

One-Way ANOVA is used. *:p<0,05

Table 6. **Self-esteem of female school administrator by educational status variable**

		N	□	*ss*	Sh□	***t Test***		
						t	*Sd*	*p*
Self-esteem	Undergraduate	188	1,41	0,56	0,04	-1,539	286	0,125
	Post-graduate	100	1,52	0,59	0,06			

Independent samples t test was used. *:p<0,05

Table 7. **Self-efficacy of female school administrators by the educational status variable**

		N	□	*ss*	Sh□	***t Test***		
						t	*Sd*	*p*
Initiative	Undergraduate	188	39,43	4,96	0,36	-0,236	286	0,813
	Post-graduate	100	39,57	4,90	0,49			
Effort	Undergraduate	188	20,93	2,94	0,21	-1,192	286	0,234
	Post-graduate	100	21,35	2,76	0,28			
Persistence	Undergraduate	188	12,26	1,99	0,15	-0,437	286	0,662
	Post-graduate	100	12,37	2,07	0,21			
General Self-Efficacy Scale	Undergraduate	188	72,61	8,66	0,63	-0,648	286	0,518
	Post-graduate	100	73,29	8,07	0,81			

Independent samples t test was used. *:p<0,05

Table 8. **Organizational justice perception of female school administrators by the educational status variable**

		N	□	*ss*	Sh□	***t Test***		
						t	*Sd*	*p*
Procedural Justice Perception	Undergraduate	188	28,21	5,62	0,41	0,025	286	0,980
	Post-graduate	100	28,19	5,96	0,60			
Distributive Justice Perception	Undergraduate	188	15,91	4,32	0,32	-0,065	286	0,949
	Post-graduate	100	15,95	4,53	0,45			
Interpersonal Justice Perception	Undergraduate	188	18,20	3,69	0,27	-0,417	286	0,677
	Post-graduate	100	18,39	3,85	0,39			
Informational Justice Perception	Undergraduate	188	14,99	4,39	0,32	1,203	286	0,230
	Post-graduate	100	14,33	4,49	0,45			
Organizational Justice Perception Scale	Undergraduate	188	77,31	14,17	1,03	0,250	286	0,803
	Post-graduate	100	76,86	15,09	1,51			

Independent samples t test was used. *:p<0,05

Table 9. **Correlation between the female school administrators' term of duty and self-esteem**

	n	**r**	**p**
Term of duty (month) & Self-Esteem Scale Scoring	288	0,101	0,087

Spearman Correlation Coefficient was used. *:p<0,05

Table 10. **Correlation between the female school administrators' term of duty and general self-efficacy scale**

	n	**r**	**p**
Term of duty (month) & Initiative	288	0,111	0,061
Term of duty (month) & Effort	288	0,045	0,442
Term of duty (month) & Persistence	288	0,014	0,811
Term of duty (month) & General Self-Efficacy Scale	288	0,083	0,162

Spearman Correlation Coefficient was used. *:p<0,05

Table 11. **Correlation between the female school administrators' term of duty and organizational justice perception**

	n	**r**	**p**
Term of duty (month) & Procedural Justice Perception	288	-0,030	0,617
Term of duty (month) & Distributive Justice Perception	288	-0,042	0,473
Term of duty (month) & Interpersonal Justice Perception	288	0,019	0,750
Term of duty (month) & Informational Justice Perception	288	-0,008	0,895
Term of duty (month) & Organizational Justice Perception Scale	288	-0,036	0,541

Spearman Correlation Coefficient was used. *:p<0,05

Table 12. **Self-Esteem of Female School Administrators by the place of duty variable**

		N	□	*ss*	ANOVA Results	*KT*	*Sd*	*KO*	*f*	*p*
Self-Esteem Scale	Mediterranean Region	44	1,432	0,638	Between groups	2,70	6	0,450	1,385	0,221
	Eastern-Anatolia Region	22	1,462	0,537	Within group	91,30	281	0,325		
	Aegean Region	47	1,621	0,572	Total	94,00	287			
	South-eastern Anatolia Region	19	1,236	0,615						
	Central Anatolia Region	55	1,401	0,504						
	Black Sea Region	33	1,356	0,594						
	Marmara Region	68	1,470	0,558						
	Total	288	1,447	0,572						

One-Way ANOVA was used. *:p<0,05

Table 13. **Self-Efficacy of female school administrators by the place of duty variable**

		N	□	*ss*	ANOVA Results	*KT*	*Sd*	*KO*	*f*	*p*
Initiative	Mediterranean Region	44	39,523	5,432	Between groups	93,34	6	15,556	0,635	0,702
	Eastern-Anatolia Region	22	39,000	6,234	Within group	6882,49	281	24,493		
	Aegean Region	47	40,277	4,164	Total	6975,83	287			
	South-eastern Anatolia Region	19	39,316	4,042						
	Central Anatolia Region	55	39,000	5,828						
	Black Sea Region	33	38,515	4,893						
	Marmara Region	68	39,941	4,063						
	Total	288	39,476	4,930						
Effort	Mediterranean Region	44	21,023	3,166	Between groups	72,89	6	12,148	1,481	0,184
	Eastern-Anatolia Region	22	21,409	2,343	Within group	2304,58	281	8,201		
	Aegean Region	47	21,681	2,814	Total	2377,47	287			
	South-eastern Anatolia Region	19	21,263	2,257						
	Central Anatolia Region	55	20,582	3,143						
	Black Sea Region	33	20,091	2,517						
	Marmara Region	68	21,397	2,907						
	Total	288	21,073	2,878						
Persistence	Mediterranean Region	44	12,318	1,986	Between groups	12,30	6	2,050	0,497	0,810
	Eastern-Anatolia Region	22	12,682	1,836	Within group	1158,02	281	4,121		
	Aegean Region	47	12,532	1,730	Total	1170,32	287			
	South-eastern Anatolia Region	19	11,842	2,141						
	Central Anatolia Region	55	12,109	2,291						
	Black Sea Region	33	12,182	1,862						
	Marmara Region	68	12,338	2,127						
	Total	288	12,299	2,019						
General Self-efficacy Scale Total Score	Mediterranean Region	44	72,864	9,080	Between groups	391,76	6	65,293	0,913	0,486
	Eastern-Anatolia Region	22	73,091	8,949	Within group	20105,52	281	71,550		
	Aegean Region	47	74,489	7,734	Total	20497,28	287			
	South-eastern Anatolia Region	19	72,421	6,850						
	Central Anatolia Region	55	71,691	10,050						
	Black Sea Region	33	70,788	7,296						
	Marmara Region	68	73,676	7,846						
	Total	288	72,847	8,451						

One-Way ANOVA was used. *: p<0,05

Table 14. **Organizational justice perception of female school administrators by the place of duty variable**

		N	□	*ss*	ANOVA Results	*KT*	*Sd*	*KO*	*f*	*p*	*Diff.*
Procedural Justice Perception	Mediterranean Region	44	28,64	5,301	Between groups	228,35	6	38,058	1,162	0,327	
	Eastern-Anatolia Region	22	28,68	6,785	Within group	9203,97	281	32,754			
	Aegean Region	47	29,32	4,891	Total	9432,32	287				
	South-eastern Anatolia Region	19	26,68	5,528							-
	Central Anatolia Region	55	26,82	6,856							
	Black Sea Region	33	28,64	4,379							
	Marmara Region	68	28,32	5,765							
	Total	288	28,20	5,733							
Distributive Justice Perception	Mediterranean Region	44	16,04	4,749	Between groups	386,46	6	64,410	3,521	**0,002**	
	Eastern-Anatolia Region	22	17,73	3,355	Within group	5141,01	281	18,295			Eastern Anatolia> South-eastern Anatolia
	Aegean Region	47	17,55	3,140	Total	5527,47	287				Aegean> Central Anatolia
	South-eastern Anatolia Region	19	13,79	3,824							Aegean> South-eastern Anatolia
	Central Anatolia Region	55	14,73	5,016							
	Black Sea Region	33	16,45	3,841							
	Marmara Region	68	15,46	4,550							
	Total	288	15,93	4,389							
Interpersonal Justice Perception	Mediterranean Region	44	18,91	3,759	Between groups	133,10	6	22,183	1,605	0,146	
	Eastern-Anatolia Region	22	17,45	5,124	Within group	3884,84	281	13,825			
	Aegean Region	47	19,34	2,109	Total	4017,94	287				
	South-eastern Anatolia Region	19	16,89	3,784							-
	Central Anatolia Region	55	17,87	3,712							
	Black Sea Region	33	18,15	3,289							
	Marmara Region	68	18,12	4,184							
	Total	288	18,26	3,742							
Informational Justice Perception	Mediterranean Region	44	14,84	4,817	Between groups	229,10	6	38,184	1,985	0,068	
	Eastern-Anatolia Region	22	13,82	5,552	Within group	5405,37	281	19,236			
	Aegean Region	47	16,30	3,507	Total	5634,47	287				
	South-eastern Anatolia Region	19	12,79	4,590							-
	Central Anatolia Region	55	15,14	4,348							
	Black Sea Region	33	14,21	4,144							
	Marmara Region	68	14,46	4,310							
	Total	288	14,76	4,431							
Organization Justice Perception Scale Total	Mediterranean Region	44	78,43	13,949	Between groups	2772,20	6	462,03	2,265	**0,038**	
	Eastern-Anatolia Region	22	77,68	17,148	Within group	57329,08	281	204,02			
	Aegean Region	47	82,51	10,620	Total	60101,28	287				
	South-eastern Anatolia Region	19	70,16	12,357							Aegean> South-eastern Anatolia
	Central Anatolia Region	55	74,56	16,042							
	Black Sea Region	33	77,45	11,153							
	Marmara Region	68	76,35	15,917							
	Total	288	77,15	14,471							

One-Way ANOVA was used. *: p<0,05