Investigation of the Primary School Principals' Sense of Self-Efficacy and Professional Burnout

Niyazi ÖZER

Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Education, Inonu University, 44280 Campus/Malatya-Turkey

Abstract: This study aimed to determine the school principals' sense of self-efficacy, burnout and the relationship between principal self-efficacy and burnout. The participants of the study comprised a total of 119 (F=7, M=112) primary school principals, attending an in-service training program arranged jointly by Inonu University Faculty of Education and TED Malatya College, during 3-5 May, 2009. Participants' sense of efficacy and burnout were measured by an adapted version of Principal Sense of Efficacy Scale and Friedman School Principal Burnout Scale. Results revealed that principals' views about sense of efficacy differ significantly in terms of professional experience and principals' levels of burnout differ significantly in terms of student population in school. Regression analyses showed that efficacy for management, instructional leadership and moral leadership accounted for approximately 15% of the variance for principal burnout, however, it was efficacy for moral leadership the only significant predictor of professional burnout.

Key words: School principals · Self-efficacy · Exhaustion · Depersonalization · Accomplishment

INTODUCTION

School effectiveness research has emerged a central position in the educational discourse that is taking place within many countries. Two of the most referred terms among education researches and practitioners are effective schools and school efficacy [1]. There are many factors affecting the efficacy and productivity of schools including principals, teachers, students, parents, school climate and culture, curricula, physical structure of the school and instructional technologies [2, 3]. However, the most important among them can be said to be the principals in affecting the general quality of educational activities. In many parts of the world, there is recognition that schools require effective leaders and managers if they are to provide the best possible education for their learners [4]. The research on different school environments in different countries found that those schools achieving remarkable improvement in student learning are administered by successful principals who can lead for change and improvement, can set realistic and achievable goals, visions and missions [5, 6].

One of the primary goals of principals is to make sure that their schools operate effectively and productively. To achieve this, they should establish a safe, organized and warm environment which allows each student to reveal his/her potential; build up a vision shared by all school stakeholders; and encourage all staff and students to work to achieve the school goals. This requires the principals to make attempts to improve the quality of education and use available material and human sources at the disposal of school goals. It is commonly believed that good principals characterize good schools. With their knowledge and skills, principals plan their schools' future, direct their route and lead the attempts for change [7]. In this context, it seems very difficult for a principal with poor leadership skills to improve educational activities. Thus, in order for the principals to successfully perform the role and responsibilities they should have strong belief in performing these roles and responsibilities.

Principal Self-Efficacy: The term self –efficacy is derived from Bandura's [8] social learning theory. Bandura [9] suggests that self-efficacy, which is an important factor in forming an individual's behaviors, refers to an individual's self perception, belief and judgment about his capacity to handle different situations, organize the activities required to exhibit and execute successfully a certain performance. Perceived self-efficacy refers to beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the

Corresponding Author: Niyazi ÖZER, Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Education, Inonu University,
44280 Campus/Malatya-Turkey. Tel: +90-422 3774567.

courses of action required to manage prospective situations [10]. In this respect, self-efficacy is not an indicator of individuals' actually competences but rather their beliefs and judgments about their competencies.

Self-efficacy has been studied by researchers from different disciplines, thus defined differently according to the field studied (e.g. science self-efficacy, chemistry self-efficacy etc.). Considering the self-efficacy of school principals, it refers to the judgment of a principal about his capacity to set an action plan to achieve desired outcomes like enhancing student learning and achievement in the school [11]. McCormick [12] defines principal self-efficacy as the principal's perception of his capacity to fulfill cognitive and behavioral functions required to arrange the group processes due to achieve the school goals.

A principal's sense of self-efficacy directly or indirectly affects the efficacy of teaching-learning activities by affecting the principal's goals, efforts and level of resistance and accordance against challenges [13, 14]. Bandura [15] argues that individuals suspicious about their capacities decrease their efforts, give up or find ordinary solutions in face of challenges, troubles and failure. However, individuals with strong belief in their skills tend to double their efforts to overcome the challenges. Previous research found an association between principals' sense of efficacy and learner achievement, school performance and principals' efforts for professional development [16, 17]. Similarly, other research findings suggest that principals with a strong sense of self-efficacy are more determined in achieving their goals, more flexible and willing to adapt themselves to changing situations, use intrinsic types of power like specialization, knowledge and relationship, rather than coercive and legal forces and have better communication with their superiors [11, 18, 19, 20]. However, principals with weak sense of self-efficacy are reported to prefer extrinsic or institutional power like coercive, legal forces or reward force more, to experience more anxiety and stress and to have poor communication skills [19, 20]. In this respect, due to the anxiety and stress they experience in schools where interpersonal relations are profound, principals with weak sense of self-efficacy can suffer physical wearout and sense of despair. This makes burnout a critical issue for principals.

Principal Burnout: Increasingly complicating structure of society, changing roles, problems in interpersonal communication, job-family conflicts, sense of loneliness, competitive business life etc. cause stress and depression, which in turn adversely affects one's energy and motivation, as well as psychological well being. The syndrome experienced as a result of these adverse conditions is called burn-out [21]. The term burnout first emerged as a social problem rather than an academic interest or problem [22]. Psychiatrist Freudenberger [23] used the term burnout to define the emotional wearout and lack of motivation and commitment which he observed to appear gradually among volunteers he worked together in non-profit health service. Burnout is defined as a state of disappointment or weariness caused as a result of a life style or relationship which does not meet one' expectations [24]. Thus burnout can be characterized as a physical, emotional and mental exhaustion which involve such symptoms as physical exhaustion, feeling of despair and hopelessness, emotional deterioration, negative feelings against others gibi [25, 26]. Friedman [27] associates burn out directly with stress and depression. Freudenberger [23] reports that burnout is often observed among drug and gamling addicts, over weight people and speed freaks as well as people oding business or trade.

A good number of researches [28-30] found that professionals like physicians, nurses, teachers and administers suffer burnout to a great extent since they experience intensive interpersonal relationships which have high potential of emotional tension. People working in these or similar professions have to use their social skills, attitudes and personality traits in addition to their professional technical skills while dealing with their clients [31]. Therefore, they may suffer from burnout induced by problems related to interpersonal relations in addition to personal or organizational sources of stress. In this respect, principals are expected to have experience burnout as they are directly in charge of managing a school whose main input and output is human. The responsibilities and commitments of principals who already have limited power are inflated with the shared management and decision-making as required by democratization process, reductions in allocation of resources, increased bureaucracy and workload, societal and administrative pressures for improving the student achievement [32, 33], which can cause the principals to suffer physical and emotional burnout [27, 34, 35].

The Purpose of the Study: The main purpose of the study was to determine the primary school principals' levels of perceived self-efficacy and burnout. It was also aimed to investigate the association between self-efficacy and burnout among principals. Finally, significant differences

in principals' levels of self-efficacy and burnout were sought in terms of such variables as professional seniority, educational background and number of students in the school.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Group: The participants were primary school principals working in city center of Malatya province who attended the inservice training seminars held by Malatya Province Directorate General of National Education and private TED Malatya Collage on 5-6 May 2009. The participating principals were informed about the purpose of the study and requested to complete the instruments during the inservice training program. As a result a total of 140 volunteering principals were administered the instrument. After discarding the 21 defectful or partially completed forms, data from 119 principals, 7 female and 112 male, were taken into consideration the analysis.

Instruments
Principal Self-Efficacy Scale: The self-efficacy perceptions of the principals were measured using *Principal Self-efficacy Scale* originally developed by Tschannen-Moran and Gareis [11]. Tschannen-Moran and Gareis [11] verified the validity and reliability of the scale, which involves 18 items under three factor structure, through a study conducted on 544 principals working in Virginia, US. Tschannen-Moran & Gareis [11] report that the six items in *efficacy for management* factor measure principals' self-efficacy beliefs about handling the management tasks (e.g. paperwork, time management etc.). Six items in *efficacy for instructional leadership* measure principals' self-efficacy about executing instructional tasks (e.g. creating a positive learning environment, facilitating student learning in your school etc.). Last six items in *efficacy for moral leadership* ask for principals' self-efficacy about ethical leadership (e.g. Promoting acceptable or ethiacal behavior among students and school personnel etc.).

The Turkish adaptation of the scale was done by the researcher after necessary permissions were granted from the writers through personal cossre pondance. Next, scale items were translated into Turkish using translation-back translation method with the help of a panel of four bilingual colleagues. The translated form was submitted to two scholars and two principals from the research sample to get their judgements about the comprehensibility of the items. Based on their feedback some minor corrections were done. In adapting the nine-point (1 Never-9 Always) Likert form, answers were reduced to five (1 Never-5 Always), as five-point format is more common and more useful to score for participants. The construct validity and reliability of the draft instrument was conducted based on the data obtained from 119 participating principals. The construct validity was tested using exploratory factor analysis (AFA). Prior to AFA, the sampling adequacy of the data was tested with Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett tests. As the data was found adequate for factor analysis (KMO =.80, Bartlett Test of Sphericity = 853.553, p=.000), we proceeded to analyzing factor structure using cprincipal components factor analysis. Extracting the factors following quidelines commonly suggested in the literature [36-39] were used: a) Kaiser criteria, b) scree plot, c) communalities and d) explained variance. The initial factor analysis revealed the same three-factor structure as in the original scale. However, four items (items 1, 4, 8 and 13) were discarded as they had low loadings or fell into different factors. The resulting scale form with 14 items explained for 58.96% of the total variance, *management* factor explaining 24.78%, *instructional leadership* factor explaining 17.69% and *moral leadership* factor explaining 16,49% of the variance. This can be regarded adequate as Kline [40] reports that for a scale to explain 40% or more of the total variance is a significant proof of construct validity. The factor loadings of the items in the adapted form of the scale ranged between ".43" and ".87". The internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach Alpha) were estimated ".844" for management factor, ".705" for *instructional leadership* factor, ".702" for *moral leadership* factor and ".83" for the whole scale. Item-total correlation coefficients were between.594 and.864, indicating salient internal consistency. The final form of the *Principal Self-efficacy Scale,* which proved to be valid and reliable, included 14 items measuring the self-efficacy perceptions of principals in terms of management, instructional leadership and moral leadership. Items were prepared in Likert type with five points ranging between *Never* (1 point) and *Always* (5 points). Minimum and maximum scores one can take from the scale are 14 and 70 respectively. Higher scores from the scale indicate higher self-efficacy perceptions on the part of principals and lower scores indicate vice versa. The factor loadings, item total-correlation coefficients and internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach Alpha) were presented at the end of the paper.

Friedman School Principal Burnout Scale: Principals' sense of burnout was measured using *Friedman School Principal Burnout Scale* originally developed by Friedman [34] and adapted in Turkish culture by Dönmez and Güven [21]. Turkish form of the scale consisted of 22 items under three factors: *exhaustion*, *depersonalization* and *personal accomplishment*. *Exhaustion* factor contains nine items measuring mental, cognitive and physical fatigue experienced by school principals. Sample items are "*I feel tired of running the school, to the extent that I wish to quit*"; "*I feel emotionally worn out by running the school*". Items in *depersonalization* scale indicate a shift in the principal's previous high level of enthusiasm and involvement as a leader, to a distinct withdrawal or aloofness. Friedman [41] had originally labeled this scale as *"Aloofness"*. However, in the light of responses from different scholars regarding the definition of burnout as aloofness, he changed the name of the factor as *"depersonalization"* while items in this scale remained unchanged [42]. Examples of items are "*I feel that my relations with teachers and students are more impersonal than they used to be*"," *I am less supportive and appreciative of teachers at my school*". Seven items in accomplishment scale measures the principal's sense of professional accomplishment and proper functioning as the school leader. Examples of items in this scale are: "*I find time to encourage teachers having difficulties and to assist them in solving problems*", "*During a day's work I find the peace and quiet to think and plan future activities*". High scores from *exhaustion* and *depersonalization* subscales and low scores on the *accomplishment* sub-scale indicate a high degree of principal burnout. In order to obtain total scores, as well as to be able to compare scores from the burnout sub-scales, items in accomplishment sub-scale were reverse coded.

Data Analysis: In analyzing the data obtained from the participating principals, first the descriptive statistics (mean scores and standart deviations) about principals' self-efficacy scale and burnout scale were given. Next, zero-order correlation coefficients between factor scores of principal burnout scale and principal self-efficacy were estimated. One way ANOVA test was used to find out whether the principals' self-efficacy scores and burnout scores differ significantly in terms of the school size. When significant differences were observed between groups, the effect size of the difference was also tested using omega squared coefficient.

Also multiple linear regression analysis was used in order to determine whether the sense of self-efficacy significantly predict principal burnout. While principal burnout served as dependent variable, dimensions of principal self-efficacy were served as the independent (predictor) variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive statistics including means and standard deviations were computed for each factor of burnout and self-efficacy scales and a correlation matrix was calculated, which are available in table 1.

Considering the minimum and maximum total scores from the sub-scales of the self-efficacy scale, principals were found to have high senses of self-efficacy in general (M=56.66, ss=5.71) and in particular in terms of *moral leadership* (M=16.49, ss=1.84)*, management* (M=24.67, ss=3.27) and *instructional leadership* (M=15.49, ss=2.34)*,* latter being relatively lower than the first two. The burn-out levels of principals, on the other hand, were at a moderate level in general (M=53.06, ss=10.30) and in particular in terms of *exhaustion* (M=25.27, ss=4.79) and *depersonalization* (M=15.05, ss=4.77). Principals' *accomplishment* score were the lowest (M=12.73, ss=3.69). That means principals suffer moderate level of *exhaustion* (mental, cognitive and physical fatigue) and depersonalization, but low level of personal accomplishment. The results of zero order correlation analysis in Table 1 indicate moderate to high levels of significant and positive correlations of ".650" to ".821" between factors of self-efficacy and ".604" to ".882" between factors of burn-out scale. The correlations between principal self-efficacy and burnout dimensions showed that moral leadership dimension was most highly correlated with two of the burnout dimensions ($r_{depersonalization}$=326 to $r_{accomplishment}$ =441). Considering the total scores, it was also revealed that there was a moderate and negative correlation between principal self-efficacy and burnout (r=-.312) indicating that as principals sense of efficacy increases their levels of burnout also decrease or vice versa.

Principals' Senses of Self-Efficacy and Experienced Burn-out by Professional Seniority: The one way ANOVA results testing the significance of the differences between principals' senses of self-efficacy and experienced burn-out according to professional seniority are presented in table 2.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics and correlations between research variables (N=119)

Scale	Sub-scale	M	Ss	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Self-Efficacy	*1.Management*	24,67	3,27							
	2. Instructional Leadership	15,49	2,34	.174						
	3. Moral Leadership	16,49	1,84	.545*	.431*					
	4. Total	56,66	5,71	.821*	.650*	.812*				
Burnout	*5. Exhaustion*	25,27	4,79	-.135	-.124	-.170	-.183*			
	6. Depersonalization	15,05	4,77	-.144	-.210*	-.326*	-.274*	.611*		
	7. Accomplishment	12,73	3,69	-.195*	-.057	-.441*	-.278*	.155	.373*	
	8. Total	53,06	10,30	-.200*	-.176	-.389*	-.312*	.804*	.882*	.604*

*p<.05

Table 2: Principals' senses of self-efficacy and experienced burn-out by professional seniority

Scale	Seniority	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	df	F	p	Posthoc (Scheffe)	ω^2
Self-efficacy	A) Below 10 years	45	57.11	4.37	2	11.176	.00	A-B	.161
	B) 11-20 years	40	53.75	6.20	116			C-B	
	C) Above 20 years	34	59.50	5.17	118				
	Total	119	56.66	5.71					
Burnout	A) Below 10 years	45	52.77	8.41	2	.087	.97		
	B) 11-20 years	40	53.62	11.82	116				
	C) Above 20 years	34	52.79	10.91	118				
	Total	119	53.06	10.30					

* p<.05

The ANOVA results suggest that principals' senses of self-efficacy differ significantly by their professional seniority, $F_{(2, 118)}$=11.176, p=.00. The post hoc Scheffe test revealed that principals with 11-20 years of seniority ($\bar{x}$=53.75) had significantly less self-efficacy than principals with 1-10 years of seniority ($\bar{x}$=57.11) and principals with 21 years and more seniority ($\bar{x}$=59.50). This finding indicates that professional seniority matters in self-efficacy. The estimated Omega square (ω^2 =.161, *a large effect*) for this association suggests that about 16 % of the variance in principals self-efficacy scores depends on their professional seniority. The burnout scores of principals were, however, observed to have no significant differences across different seniority levels, $F_{(2, 118)}$=.087, p=.97. This suggests that principals with different professional seniotiy levels experience similar degrees of burnout.

Principals' Senses of Self-Efficacy and Experienced Burn-out by School Size: The inadequate number of school Turkey causes overcrowded schools and classrooms, which in turn causes various problems in terms of the quality of education provided in these schools and classrooms [43]. Therefore, the sizes of the schools is considered a critical agent causing problems in the schools and thus taken as a variable in the present

study. As a limitation, the number of students in the school was taken as the indicator of schools size. The one way ANOVA results testing the significance of the differences between principals' senses of self-efficacy and experienced burn-out according to school size are presented in table 3.

No significant difference was observed in the self-efficacy scores of principals working in schools with different number of students, $F_{(2, 118)}$=.967, p=.38. This suggests that principals working in schools with different sizes have similar levels of self-efficacy. The ANOVA results about burnout, on the other hand, revealed that principals' senses of experienced burn-out differ significantly by school size, $F_{(2, 118)}$=10.690, p=.00. The post hoc Scheffe test showed that principals working in schools with 1000 and more students ($\bar{x}$=59,57) experience significantly more burn-out than principals working in less crowded schools, i.e schools with 501-1000 students ($\bar{x}$=52,53) and schools with less than 500 students ($\bar{x}$=49,40). This finding indicates that professional seniority matters in self-efficacy. In other words, as the student population increases, the principal burn-out also increases. The estimated Omega square (ω^2 =.154, *a large effect*) for this association suggests that about 15 % of the variance in principals' burn-out scores depends on the student population of their school.

Tablo 3: Principals' senses of self-efficacy and experienced burn-out by school size

Scale	School size	N	x̄	SD	df	F	p	Posthoc (Scheffe)	ω²
Self-efficacy	A) Below 500	54	57.42	5.00	2	.967	.38		
	B) 501-1000	32	55.84	5.11	116				
	C) Above 1000	33	56.12	7.30	118				
	Total	119	56.66	5.71					
Burnout	A) Below 500	54	49,40	9,72	2	10.690	.00	A-C	.154
	B) 501-1000	32	52,53	9,84	116			B-C	
	C) Above 1000	33	59,57	8,60	118				
	Total	119	53,06	10,30					

* p<.05

Table 4: Multiple linear regresion model on principals' level of burn out

Variable	B	Standard Error $_B$	β	t	p	Part	Partial
Constant	88.744	8.941		9.925	.00		
Management	.054	.323	.017	.166	.86	-.200	-.015
Instructional Leadership	-.037	.419	-.009	-.089	.92	-.176	-.008
Moral Leadership	-2.208	.628	-.394	-3.516	.00	-.389*	-.302*

R=.389, R²=.151

F(3,118)=6.844, p=.00

Principal Self-Efficacy as the Predictor of Principal Burn-Out: One purpose of the present study was to investigate the association and interaction between principals' self-efficacy and burn-out. In order to test the predictive power of components of principals' self efficacy on their burn-out, a multiple linear regression analysis was done. Results are shown in table 4.

Estimated correlation coefficients suggest that principal self-efficacy in terms of *management* and *instructional leadership* is not significantly correlated with principal burn-out. However, self-efficacy for *moral leadership* has a negative and moderate level of correlation with principal burnout, (r$_{(zero\ order)}$= -.389; r$_{(partial)}$= -.302. The regression model revealed a significant and moderate level correlation between three components of self-efficacy altogether (*management, instructional leadership* and *moral leadership*), R=.389, R²=.151; F(3,118)=6.844, p<.01. These three components of self-efficacy altogether explain about 15% of the total variance in burn-out scores. However, the t test results regarding the sigificance of regression coefficients suggest that only *moral leadership* is a significant predictor of burnout. Condidering the negative correlation between these two variables it can be said that as the principals' self-efficacy in terms of moral leadership increases their level of burnout decreases; and as it decreases they experience more burn-out.

CONCLUSION

The present study found that participating principals have moderate levels of self-efficacy and burn-out in general. They feel themselves relatively less efficient in terms of *instructional leadership* and rather *exhausted* in physical, emotional and mental terms. As a matter of fact the literature also suggests that management is one of the professions which invlolve high levels of burnout, so that Friedman [34] compares school principals to a port where the school staff discharge their problems.

Relatively high levels of self-efficacy beliefs among less experienced principals (working for 10 years or less) seem to decrease and gradually increase after 20 years of experience. This implies the versatile and experience-bound nature of the profession. A good principal has to be a specialized insructor, an effective leader and a successful manager at the same time [44]. Today, school principals as instructional leaders have to accomplish a series of tough roles including managing change, acting as curriculum experts, analyzing the school budget and managing the school and public relations [45]. It seems difficult for a beginning principal to overcome all these roles. However, with the initial passion and ambition, principals may naively feel themselves efficient enough to accomplish these roles and overcome the challenges ahead. Nevertheless, they may gradually realize the challenges of the profession. Parkay, Currie and Rhodes

[46] put that as the principals get more experienced, they begin developing a realistic approach to the problems at school. In this respect, based on the findings of the present research, it can be asserted that the experiences principals gain throughout their professional lives while overcoming challenges and problems can help enhancing their sense of professional self-efficacy. The lack of any significant difference between burnout levels of principals with different professional seniority implies the tough nature of the profession of principalship which, as Friedman [27, 34] states, constantly causes a sense of burnout and stress. Therefore, preservice or inservice training programs for principals should give weight to content about how to solve problems, cope with burnout, develop learned resourcefulness and activities that would enhance their self-confidence and self-efficacy.

Considering the results about school size, it was proved that principals working in crowded schools (with 1000 and more schools) experience more burnout than principals working in less crowded schools (especially those with less than 500 students). This finding is consistent with those of previous research [47-50] which have revealed that less crowded schools bring about positive teacher attitudes towards instruction, positive student behaviours, higher rates of student and teacher attendance, parental involvement, participation to extracurricular activities and higher student achievement. Paralel to these findings, some research findings suggest that the increase in student population in schools causes an increase in problems related with school climate, teachers and principals' management skills [51]. Generally student population and characteristics (e.g. SES, discipline behaviours, achievement etc.) is likely to make it difficult for the principals to perform their duties and cause stress due to the resulting work overload [52]. Though the literature posit that principals in large schools suffer more burnout, the criterion for "largeness" is not clear. If the human and physical resources of a school are insufficient, the overpopulation of students does not make the school large, but crowded. Then, what causes the principals to experience more burnout and feel less efficiant is not large schools but crowded schools. Thus, it deems necessary to arrange the student capacity of a school in accordance with the available human and physical resources in order to decrease the sense of burnout among school staff and principals in particular.

The results of regression analysis about how much self-efficacy predicticts burnout suggested that principals' senses of efficacy in terms of *management* and *instructional leadership* were not significant predictors of burnout. But self-efficacy for *moral leadership* was found to have a negative and moderate level of correlation with principal burnout (r=-.302). To Novak [53] educational leadership is about the caring and ethical relationships between and among people, institutions and the larger society. As a moral leader school principal should has a strong impact on teachers, has a moral point of view towards self and his/her profession and help to the teachers to achieve their professional goals [54]. A principal affects the members of the organization with his/her stance, knowledge, skills, character and understanding of human. In this context, school principals are expexted to excessively comply with the moral leaders [55]. Thus, a school principal with poor self-efficacy in terms of moral leadership is likely to experience stress and naturally suffer more burnout.

REFERENCES

1. Teddlie, C. and D. Reynolds, 2000. The international handbook of school effectiveness research. London. Great Britain: Falmer Press.

2. Creemers, B.P.M. and L. Kyriakides, 2008. The dynamics of educational effectiveness: A contribution to policy. Practice and theory in contemporary schools. London: Routledge.

3. Şişman, M., 1997. Etkili okul: İlkokullarda bir araştırma [Effective school: a research on primary schools]. IV. *Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi* [Paper presented at the 4th Annual meeting of Educational Congress] Anadolu University- Eskişehir Turkey.

4. Bush, T., 2007. Educational leadership and management: theory, policy and practice. South African Journal of Education, 27(3): 391-406.

5. Hallinger, P. and R.H. Heck, 1996. Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of the empirical research. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32(1): 27-31.

6. Hallinger, P. and R.H. Heck, 1998. Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9(2): 157-191.

7. Gareis, C.R. and M. Tschannen-Moran, 2005. Cultivating principals' sense of efficacy: Supports that matter. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration. Nashville. TN.

8. Bandura, A., 1977. Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice- Hall.

9. Bandura, A., 1986. Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice- Hall, Inc.

10. Bandura, A., 1997. Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies* (pp: 1-45). New York: Cambridge University Press.

11. Tschannen-Moran, M. And C.R. Gareis, 2004. Principals' sense of efficacy: Assessing a promising construct. Journal of Educational Administration, 42. 573-585.

12. McCormick, M.J., 2001. Self-efficacy and leadership effectiveness: applying social cognitive theory to leadership. Journal of Leadership Studies, 8(1): 22-33.

13. Smith, W., A.J. Guarino, P. Strom and C. Reed, 2003. Principal self-efficacy and effective teaching and learning environments. School Leadership and Management, 23: 505-508.

14. Virga, J., 2012. Examining the perceptions and sources of the self-efficacy beliefs of principals of high-achieving elementary schools. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation*. University of Maryland- College Park. MD:USA

15. Bandura, A., 2000. Cultivate self-efficacy for personal and organizational effectiveness. Handbook of principles of organization behavior, pp: 120-136.

16. Wiig, D.L., 2004. The role of principal efficacy in the context of professional development. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation*. The Graduate School of the University of Wyoming- Laramie. WY: USA

17. Williams, R.L., 2008. The relationship between principals' leadership self-efficacy, student achievement and school performance. Unpublished Dissertation. The University of Southern Mississippi- Hattiesburg. MS: USA.

18. Berry, B.A.R., 2004. Succession to school leadership: Challenge and response for principals. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Texas A&M University-Texas.

19. Lyons, C.A. and M.J. Murphy, 1994. Principal self-efficacy and the use of power. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans. (ERIC Document No. 373 421).

20. Osterman, K. and S. Sullivan, 1996. New principals in an urban bureaucracy: A sense of efficacy. Journal of School Leadership, 6: 661-690.

21. Dönmez, B. and M. Güven, 2001. Friedman okul müdürleri tükenmişlik ölçeğinin Türkiye'ye uyarlama çalışması [Adaptation of the Friedman's school principal burnout scale in Turkish]. *Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi* [*Educational Administration: Theory & Practice*]. 7(26): 221-225.

22. Maslach, C. and W.B. Schaufeli, 1993. Historical and conceptual development of burnout. in Schaufeli, W.B., Maslach, C. and Marek, T. (Eds), Professional Burnout: Recent Developments in Theory and Research, Taylor & Francis, Washington, DC, pp: 1-16

23. Freudenberger, H.J., 1975. The staff burn-out syndrome in alternative institutions. Psychotherapy: Theory. Research & Practice, 12(1): 73-82.

24. Pierucci, R.P., 1985. Burnout levels and leadership characteristics of California elementary school principals. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Brigham Young University- Provo. UT.

25. Babaoğlan, E., 2007. İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinde tükenmişliğin bazı değişkenlere göre araştırılması [Investigation of the school principal experienced burnout in terms of some variables]. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi., 8(14): 57-67.

26. Izgar, H., 2001. Okul yöneticilerinde tükenmişlik [*Burnout among school administrators*], Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

27. Friedman, I.A., 2002. Burnout in school principals: Role related antecedents. Social Psychology of Education, 5: 229-251.

28. Dönmez, B. and H. Güneş, 2001. İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinde tükenmişlik [Burnout among primary school administrators]. *Eğitim Araştırmaları* Euroasian Journal of Educational Research, 5: 71-78.

29. Maslach, C. and S.E. Jackson, 1984. Burnout in organizational settings. Applied Social Psychology Annual., 5: 133-153.

30. Maslach, C. and M.P. Leiter, 1997. The truth about burnout. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

31. Schaufeli, W.B., C. Maslach and T. Marek, 1993. The future of burnout. W.B. Schaufeli. C. Maslach ve T. Marek (Eds.). Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research (pp: 253-259). New York: Taylor & Francis.

32. Copland, M.A., 2001. The myth of the superprincipal. Phi Delta Kappan, 82(7): 528-533.

33. West, D., C. Peck and U. Reitzug, 2010. Limited control and relentless accountability: Examining historical changes in urban school principal pressure. Journal of School Leadership, 20: 238-266.

34. Friedman, I.A., 1995. Measuring school principal-experienced burnout. Educational & Psychological Measurement, 55(4): 641-651.

35. Whitaker, K., 1996. Exploring causes of principal burnout. Journal of Educational Administration, 34(1): 60-71.

36. Büyüköztürk, S., 2010. *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı* [*Handbook of data analysis for Social Sciences*] (11ᵗʰ Ed.). Ankara: PegemA Publishing.

37. Hair, J.F., W.C. Black, B.J. Babin and R.E. Anderson, 2010. Multivariate data analysis (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

38. Pallant, J., 2011. SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows (4ᵗʰ Ed.). Berkshire: Open University Press.

39. Tabachnick, B.G. and L.S. Fidell, 2007. Using multivariate statistics: Pearson Education Inc. Boston, MA.

40. Kline, P., 1994. An easy guide to factor analysis. New York: Routledge.

41. Friedman, I.A., 1995b. School principal burnout: The concept and its components. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16(2): 191-198.

42. Friedman, I., 1997. High and low burn-out principals: what makes the difference? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

43. Öğülmüş, S. and S, Özdemir, 1995. Sınıf ve okul büyüklüğünün öğrenciler üzerindeki etkisi [Effects of class and school size on students], Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi, 1(2): 261-273.

44. Ubben, Gerald C. and W. Hughes, Larry, 1992. The principal (2nd edn.) Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

45. Davis, S., L. Darling-Hammond, M. LaPointe and D. Meyerson, 2005. Review of research. School leadership study. Developing successful principals. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

46. Parkay, F.W., G.D. Currie and J.W. Rhodes. 1992. Professional socialization: A longitudinal study of first-time high school principals, Educational Administration Quarterly, 28(1): 43-75.

47. Cotton, K., 1997. School size: School climate and student performance. Portland. OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

48. Lee, V.E. and S. Loeb, 2000. School size in elementary schools: Effects on teacher's attitudes and student achievement. American Education Research Journal, 37(1): 3-31.

49. Raywid, M.A., 1999. Current literature on small schools. Charleston. WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. Erişim: 27 Ağustos 2009. www.ericdigests.org/1999-3/small.htm

50. Wasley, P.A., M. Fine, M. Gladden, N.E. Holland, S.P. King, E. Mosak and L.C. Powell, 2000. Small Schools: Great Strides. A Study of New Small Schools in Chicago.New York: Bank Street College of Education.

51. Demirtaş, H., M. Üstüner and N. Özer, 2007. Okul yönetiminde karşılaşılan sorunların öğrenci ve okul ile ilgili değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 13(51): 421-455.

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

53. Novak, J.M., 2002. Inviting educational leadership: Fulfilling potential and applying an ethical perspective to the educational process. Ft Press.

54. Çelik, V., 2007. Eğitimsel liderlik [Educational Leadership]. 4ᵗʰ Edition. Ankara: PegemA Publishing.

55. Yılmaz, E., 2006. Okullardaki örgütsel güven düzeyinin okul müdürlerinin moral liderlik özellikleri ve bazı değişkenler açısından değerlendirilmesi. [Investigation of the organizational trust levels of schools in terms of the school administrators` ethical leadership levels and some other variables] *Unpublished doctoral dissertation*, Selcuk University, Konya-Turkey.

Appendix. Principal Sense of Efficacy Scale -Turkish Form (PSES-T)

Bir okul müdürü olarak aşağıda belirtilen görevleri ne düzeyde gerçekleştirmektesiniz?

[In your current role as principal, to what extent can you...]	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Communalities	Item-total correlations
18. *Göreviniz gereği yapmanız gereken işler arasından önceliklerinizi doğru belirleyebilme*					
[Prioritize among competing demands of the job]	.874			.787	.864*
3. *Görevlerinizi yerine getirirken zamanı iyi yönetebilme*					
[Handle the time demands of the job]	.823			.729	.830*
11. *Günlük iş programınızı zamanında yetiştirebilme*					
[Maintain control of your own daily schedule?]	.782			.659	.797*
15. *Müdürlüğün gerektirdiği kırtasiyecilik işleri (örn. resmi yazışmalar) ile baş edebilme.*					
[handle the paperwork required of the job?]	.673			.468	.667*
12. *Okulunuzu yönetmek için gerekli olan işlevsel ilke ve prosedürleri belirleyebilme*					
[Shape the operational policies and procedures that are necessary to manage your school?]	.596			.619	.737*
17. *Okul müdürü olmanın stresi ile baş edebilme*					
[Cope with the stress of the job?]	.429			.441	.594*
2. *Personeli, velileri ve öğrencileri ortak bir okul vizyonu oluşturmaya teşvik edebilme.*					
[Generate enthusiasm for a shared vision for the school]		.814		.667	.745*
6. *Okulunuzda pozitif bir öğrenme ortamı oluşturma*					
[Create a positive learning environment in your school]		.759		.609	.681*
9. *Öğretmenlerinizi motive edebilme*					
[Motivate teachers?]		.693		.614	.821*
7. *Merkezi sınavlarda (Örn. SBS, ÖSS) öğrencilerin başarısının artmasına katkı sağlayabilme.*					
[raise student achievement on standardized tests?]		.632		.483	.726*
16. *Okul personelinin etik davranışlar sergilemesini sağlayabilme.*					
[Promote ethical behavior among school personnel]			.776	.632	.742*
5. *Okulunuzdaki öğrencilerin genelinde bir okul ruhu oluşturabilme.*					
[Promote school spirit among a large majority of the student population]			.670	.675	.750*
14. *Öğrencilerinizin olumlu davranışlar sergilemesini sağlayabilme*					
[Promote acceptable behavior among students?]			.589	.491	.740*
10. *Okulunuzda, toplumda kabul gören değerleri yansıtabilme*					
[Promote the prevailing values of the community in your school?]			.576	.481	.676*
Eigen Values	3.469	2.477	2.308	Total	
Variance Explained (%)	24.778	17.694	16.487	58.959	
Cronbach Alpha	.844	.705	.702	.833	