

Team Leadership: Leadership Role Achievement in Supervision Teams in Turkey

Ali SABANCI

(Corresponding Author)

Department of Educational Sciences, Educational Administration
Supervision, Planning and Economy, Faculty of Education
Akdeniz University, Dumlupinar Bulvari 07058
Kampus-Antalya, Turkey
E-mail: alisabanci@akdeniz.edu.tr; ali_sabanci@yahoo.com

Izzet OZDEMIR

Ministry of Education

The Head of Supervision Department of Antalya Province,
Phd. Student in Educational Administration and Supervision
E-mail: ozdemirizzet@hotmail.com

DOI Link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v5-i3/1516>

Published Date: 17 March 2015

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to explore the views of team leaders and team members of supervision teams about the extent that team leaders achieve their team leadership roles in Turkey. This research was conducted as a survey. The population of the study consisted of approximately 2650 supervisors (inspectors) working in 81 provinces distributed to seven geographical regions in Turkey. The sample consisted of 563 supervisors which were selected out by random sampling. The data were gathered by a questionnaire developed by the researchers and it was designed in two forms: one for team leaders and one for team members. In the analysis SPSS package programme was used. The study provides several noteworthy findings. Team leaders in general noted that they achieved their leadership roles affectively. The findings show that team members agreed with the views of their leaders. Team leaders and team members' views were both consistent in their views regardless of their gender, education, seniority and the time spent working in the same province were the same in regard to total statistical calculation and analysis. In order to have more effective teams there is a need to give place to team leadership in legal arrangements more, the one who is selected by the team members as team leader should be appointed regardless of any approval of upper managers. It can be asserted that the more democracy in the process of leadership positions the more voluntary participation among members of a team directed to effectiveness can be expected.

Keywords: Educational supervision, team leadership, team effectiveness.

Introduction

Team focus separates team leadership models from traditional leadership models because of the central focus on the team as a unit. Team work is characterized by recurring cycles of mutually dependent interaction. These temporal cycles of goal-directed activity can be divided into two distinctive phases. In the transition phase, teams engage in evaluation or planning activities designed to foster goal attainment. In the action phase, teams perform work activities that directly contribute to goal accomplishment (Morgeson, DeRue & Karam, 2009). The model provides a mental road map to help the leader diagnose team problems and take appropriate action to correct these problems (Hill, 2007). Kozlowski, Gully, Salas and Bowers (1996) stated that the labels 'groups' and 'teams' are often equated in the literature. So, the use of groups and teams mean (1) multiple individuals, (2) formed to perform task relevant functions, (3) who mutually interact, (4) exhibit task interdependence, (5) possess one or more shared goals and (6) are embedded in a broader organizational setting. Chrispeels and Martin (2002) concluded that establishing a new structural entity such as school leadership teams depends also on local structural, cultural and political conditions.

Team leadership is (1) to understand and interpret challenges, (2) to make and effectively communicate decisions (3) to manage the activities and needs of team members (4) to develop a stable and safe environment where team members can develop their skills and knowledge (Reader, Flin & Cuthbertson, 2011). Kozlowski et al. (1996) asserted that a team leader (1) prompts the development of social structure, sets an example by modelling appropriate behaviour and promotes an orientation to the team; (2) serves the role of instructor, providing an explicit technical schooling and practice experiences; (3) creates learning experiences that emphasize team goals and finally (4) as the team develops greater and greater expertise the leader role shifts to facilitator. A theory of team leadership and development needs to focus on the melding of individuals into a team and on the integration of task and team work skills (Kozlowski et al., 1996). As Senge (1998) stressed well all kinds of important decisions have been made in the teams considering them as a unique bodies. Nurmi (1996) pointed to the idea that team work can be applied properly or improperly. In order to add some value, team work has to be managed properly; it needs to be built on a responsibility-based organization, simple rules of conduct and skill in team work.

Research findings proved that leadership behaviours are correlated with team performance outputs (Burke, Stagl, Klein, Goodwin, Salas, & Halpin, 2006; Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater & Spangler, 2004; Eker, 2006; Ergen, 2011; Ensley, Pearson & Pearce, 2003; Irving & Longbotham, 2007; Karakas, 2009; Selcuk, Yalcinkaya & Uslu, 2013; Künze, Zala-Mezö, Kolbe, Wacker & Grote, 2010; Reader et al., 2011; Zaccaro, Rittman & Marks, 2001). Celik (2011) stated that it is the leader that affects the team to function and contribute at expected levels. Shared leadership has been addressed to increase effectiveness of the team by shared vision and increasing commitment of the members within the team (Ensley et al., 2003; Solansky, 2008). DeRue, Barnes and Morgeson (2010) suggested that leader charisma and team member self efficacy each have unique effects on the overall team performance. Mehra, Smith, Dixon, and Robertson, (2006) showed that certain forms of distributed leadership structures may be associated with superior team performance relative to traditional leader-centred structures. Somech (2006) argued that participative leadership was positively associated the extent to which team members collectively reflect upon the team's objectives, strategies and processes, and in turn fostered team innovation. Klein and

Kozlowski (2008) stated that adaptive leaders adjust their leadership behaviours and strategies to fit changes in team tasks, team competencies, and team composition. The same adaptive leader may be highly developmental at one moment and highly directive moments later.

LaFasto and Larson (2001) argued that the specific qualities and behaviours required to be effective in a team has been left unclear in most cases. Teams were set by putting people together, placing them within a team structure, charging with a goal or objective and finally they were expected to act like a team. They noted that a team is a unique type of group in two ways first the objective and secondly the collaboration and coordination capacity of the members to reach the objective. Dionne et al. (2004) proposed that team cohesion, creation of shared vision and commitment to the leader, leader's empowerment of team members and leader's creation of functional conflict will partially mediate the relationship of individually stimulating leadership with team performance. Kuo (2004) found that team social capital and team diversity have moderator impact on team effectiveness. Tse, Dasborough, and Ashkanasy (2008) asserted that individuals experiencing high-quality leader-member exchange relationships are more likely to develop friendships at work. Rosado (2004) symbolises this as having the knowledge about "natural flows" of human development. Baiden and Price, (2011) found that integration is desirable and helpful in team work effectiveness. Thamhain (2004) asserted that factors that satisfy personal and professional needs of team members are the strongest drivers to high team performance. According to Irving and Longbotham (2007) significant predictors of team effectiveness were (1) providing accountability, (2) supporting and resourcing, (3) engaging in honest self-evaluation, (4) fostering collaboration, (5) communicating with clarity and (6) valuing and appreciating. Künze et al. (2010) reported that during non-routine situations, teams engage in more leadership behaviour than in routine situations, and the result is higher levels of performance. In situations with higher levels of standardization, less leadership behaviour occurs and the result is higher levels of team performance. For effective team performance Zaccaro et al. (2001) stated that team members need to successfully integrate their individual actions because each role contributes to collective success. Dirks (2000), Ford and Seers (2006) and Webber (2002) argued that trust and aspects of both leader-member exchange quality relationships and team-member exchange quality relationships are critical part of an effective team climate and the leader is important in building quick trust in the team. According to Lee, Gillespie, Mann and Wearing (2010) as the team builds respect for each other's knowledge and expertise, the willingness to rely on each other is reinforced. The effective team member adds value by addressing issues, building confidence and trust, demonstrating personal leadership, and bringing out the best thinking and attitude of everyone on the team (LaFasto and Larson, 2001). Noe (1999) stated that responsibility of a leader is to provide the required conditions for team effectiveness. On the other hand, DeRue et al. (2010) spoke of developing the team's capacity to function effectively without direct intervention from the team leader. This approach involves setting clear expectations and goals, providing instructions to team members, monitoring team member performance, and directly implementing corrective actions in the team. Consequently as Day, Gronn and Salas (2006) argued, some adopt a collective level in examining the type of leadership in a team (vertical, shared, distributed) and the relative effects on team-level outcomes. Others adopted a more relational focus looking at the average exchange quality in teams in conjunction with the degree of differentiation in individual exchanges with their leader or the team as a whole. Still others conceptualized team leadership through the lens of an individual

leader and the effects of those individual behaviours on teams. Which of these approaches is the “real” team leadership? The answer could be all of the above.

Research in Turkey about leadership roles and team performance showed also congruent results. Ergen (2011) and Karakas (2009) found that there is positive correlation between effective leadership and effective team performance. Zehir and Ozsahin (2008) found that there is a positive correlation between communication, skills of the members and quality of the team process and between team synergy, performance targets, communication, skills of the members and renovation of the team. On the part of team leaders' roles Celik (2011) for example, concluded that team leadership roles were instructor, pioneer, motivator, communication facilitator, being symbol of reliability and team identity developer. Cankaya and Karakus (2010) stressed on reconciliation and providing cooperation, empowerment and motivation and effective communication skills of a team leader. Gökce (2011) provided a broader list of team leadership skills as orientation, management by contingent style of leadership, providing work discipline, motivation, decision making, conflict management, delegating authority, open communication, problem solving, providing an appropriate work environment and sources, time management, inspiring, supporting creativity, managing diversity and proving team spirit. Ince, Beduk and Aydogan (2004) found that creating high performance culture, managing change, developing adherence and managing team memory added to leadership effectiveness among other skills. Eker (2006) added risk taking, proving effective team climate, individual consideration, creating and sharing vision and convincing skills. Gokce (2009) searched how the supervisors in Turkey perceived themselves as a team member and found that they perceived themselves as (given in order of significance) an conductor-operator, coordinator-head, team worker, resource finder, formator-motivator, reflector- evaluator, perfectionist-fixer and creative-innovator.

Research results showed that team work has been seen as one of the central issues in reaching organizational achievement (Celik, 2011; Gokce, 2011). So, many scientists and practitioners in the educational field state that the current demand in organizations in Turkey is to raise team work (Ince et al., 2004; Kucuk, 2008; Zehir & Ozsahin, 2008). Bolden, Gosling, Marturano and Dennison, (2003) concluded that in today's organisation the alternative approach, the team leader, is more appropriate. A Team leadership style based upon the development of the strengths and the allowable weaknesses of all of the roles will permit a more holistic, or participative, style of leadership where team work, problem solving, decision making and innovation can flourish with heightened team work and work performance.

Supervision (Inspection) has been seen as one of the most significant processes in providing more quality in instruction (Aydin, 2008; Basar, 1993; Taymaz, 2011). The supervision (inspectorate) system of education in Turkey is organised at central level and provincial level under the “Ministry of National Education”. At central level the chairmanship of inspection committee is organised as inspection unit of the ministry. Education inspectors are formed as part of the “Directorates of National Education” in provinces. Schools and other educational intuitions are guided, inspected, examined and investigated by these supervisors [Milli Egitim Bakanligi, (MEB), 2001]]. For this reason, each province in Turkey is divided into supervision regions by means of geographical locations, the number of the schools, teachers and students etc. “Sufficient” number of education supervisors and assistant supervisors are appointed to each province by the authorities of Ministry of national education (MEB, 2011). The supervisors appointed to a province are divided into regional teams and are managed by a head supervisor appointed by the Ministry of education. The teams of the supervisors appointed to a supervision region are called supervision teams (Inspection group). The head

of the group used to be appointed among two supervisors nominated by the group by the province governor (MEB, 2011). But the last legal arrangement proposed that team leaders will be appointed by the head of the supervisors (MEB, 2014). To illustrate one of these provinces currently, the province of Antalya is supervised by 79 supervisors. They are responsible from 1448 kindergartens, primary, secondary and high schools and other institutions serves for educational issues such as adult education. Each inspection group is responsible from a central district (there are seven central districts) and at least one county (there are nineteen counties). The number of the teachers teaching 422.193 students in 2013-2014 education years is 26.420. The head or the leader of the team is responsible from coordination and cooperation to fulfil the whole duties shown in regulations such as inspection, supervision, guidance, on-the-job training and investigating (MEB, 2011).

Supervisors are responsible from increasing the value of the team work and thereby team effectiveness. Although there are a number of researches about team leadership, it is the first research dealing with supervision teams and leadership of these teams in Turkey. In this respect, this research is expected to contribute to both practitioners and theorists about especially team leadership literature by exploring the extent that leaders of the supervision teams achieve team leadership roles in Turkey.

The specific questions addressed were:

1) (a) What are the views of team leaders and team members about the extent that team leaders achieve their team leadership roles in Turkey? (b) Is there difference between the views of team leaders and team members about the extent that team leader achieve their team leadership roles in Turkey?

2) Do the team leaders and team members' views differ in relation to their gender, education, seniority and the time spent working in the same province?

Methodology

This research was conducted as a survey using a descriptive method in order to ascertain the extent that leaders of the supervision teams achieve their team leadership roles in Turkey (Balci, 2001; Karasar, 1994; Tanriogen, 2009). In order to determine the extent of the achievement of supervision team leaders' leadership roles first team leaders' views were used. Team members' views were the second source to explore achievement of supervision team leaders' leadership roles.

The population of the study consisted of approximately 2650 supervisors (inspectors) working in 81 provinces distributed to seven geographical regions in Turkey. In order to determine the sample 38 provinces from these seven geographical regions were selected by stratified sampling in the first step and in the next step the provinces from each region were selected by random sampling. In order to determine the number of the participants sample size tables were used and in the final step 563 supervisors were selected out of 38 provinces by random sampling. Consequently 563 supervisors consisting members and team leaders which included 28% of the population consisted the sample (Anderson, 1990; Balci, 2001). 561 questionnaires were included out of 575 returned questionnaires. Of the questionnaires included to the analysis 137 were team leaders and 426 were team members.

A survey which was developed by the researchers was used. The survey was designed in five-Likert scale ranging from 'I definitely don't agree' to 'I definitely agree'. The questionnaire was designed in two forms: one for team leaders and one for team members. Each questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first parts included four questions about demographic information. The second parts included 54 questions which aimed to gather

data about the extent that team leaders play their leadership roles effective. In order to prepare the questionnaires first the literature about leadership was surveyed. Using theoretical and practical information including the questionnaires developed such as by Morgeson et al., (2009); Ergen, (2011), Gokce, (2009), Karakas, (2009); Eker, (2006); Cankaya and Karakus, (2010) and Selcuk et al. (2013) about team leadership, a draft questionnaire was developed. After the draft questionnaire was reviewed and evaluated by a number of researches working in the field of educational administration and educational measurement, the final forms were applied to the participants.

In order to provide validity and reliability a number of tests were realized. First of all, principal axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted to 54 items. As a result the questionnaire comprised of 38 items, factor loadings of which were higher than .40. The items were distributed to four factors. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of the obtained questionnaire was .981, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was found to be 17351,181 and $p < .005$. The total variance explained by the questionnaire was 65.721%. Secondly, in the reliability analysis Cronbach's Alpha value was found to be .97 which means the questionnaire is reliable. As a result the questionnaire measured four dimensions 1) supporting social climate (14 items), 2) providing high performance culture (12 items), 3) managing team environment (6 items) and 4) planning role, responsibility and authority (6 items). Specific descriptive analyses which were conducted to calculate the data were frequencies, means, significance test, T-test, One-way Anova and Post-Hoc tests. In all of the significance tests $p < .05$ was considered. In the analysis SPSS package programme was used (Akgül & Cevik, 2003; Buyukozturk, 2003; Bryman & Cramer, 2001; Hair, Anderson, Tahtam & Black 1998; Leech, Barrett & Morgan, 2005; Mason 2002; Muijs, 2004).

Findings

In this section first demographic characteristics of the participants were given then the findings about the extent that supervisors achieve their team leadership roles were reported.

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

The participants comprised of two groups: team leaders and team members. 6 female and 131 male team leaders responded to the questionnaire. Of the team leaders 102 pre-licence (three years of university education) degree and 35 had graduate (four years of faculty education) degree. Of the team leaders 6 had 1-5 years of experience, 30 had 6-10 years, 23 had 11-15 years, 44 had 16-20 years and 23 had 21 and more years of experience. 21 team leaders stated that they have worked in the same province 2 years and less yet. 70 stated that they have worked 3-6 years and 46 team leaders stated that they have worked 7 and more years in the same province. 32 female and 394 male team members responded to the questionnaire. Of the team members 341 had pre-licence degree and 85 had graduate degree. Of the team members 60 had 1-5 years of experience, 70 had 6-10 years, 65 had 11-15 years, 103 had 16-20 years, and 128 had 21 and more years of experience. 124 team members stated that they have worked in the same province 2 years and less yet. 224 stated that they have worked 3-6 years and 78 team members stated that they have worked 7 and more years in the same province.

Findings about the extent that supervisors achieve their team leadership roles
The views of team leaders and team members about the extent that team leaders
achieve their team leadership roles in Turkey.

Statistical findings of the views of team leaders and team members were given in table
1 first and later the findings were explained.

Insert Table 1 here

Table 1 shows that both team leaders ($\bar{X}=4,32$) and team members ($\bar{X}=3,96$) think that team leaders demonstrated high level of achievement in team leadership roles. Team leaders ($\bar{X}=4,51$) and team members ($\bar{X}=4,16$) both think that team leaders achieved “planning role, responsibility and authority” roles best compared to the other dimensions. The scores showed that both of the groups had the same views about the extent that team leaders achieved their team leadership roles about each dimension. Team leaders and team members think that team leaders were successful in achieving “supporting social climate” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,45$; TM: $\bar{X}=4,01$) “managing team environment” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,27$, TM: $\bar{X}=3,97$) and “providing high performance culture” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,12$; TM: $\bar{X}=3,80$).

The mean scores of the items with the highest and the lowest scores of the two groups responses about the extent that leaders of the supervision teams achieve their team leadership roles were given below comparatively.

The mean scores about “supporting social climate” dimension were as follows “I communicate the members explicitly” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,61$; TM: $\bar{X}=4,17$), “I consider the views of the members in decision making” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,60$; TM: $\bar{X}=4,09$) “I am sensitive to meet needs of the members” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,50$; TM: $\bar{X}=4,09$); “I consider sacrifice my benefits to the benefits of the members of the team” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,37$; TM: $\bar{X}=3,81$) “I manage the conflicts among the members on behalf of the group” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,31$; TM: $\bar{X}=3,94$) and I try to provide personal satisfaction for each of the members (TL: $\bar{X}=4,30$; TM: $\bar{X}=3,97$).

The mean scores about “providing high performance culture” dimension were as follows “I develop and explore a group mission participating the members” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,33$; TM: $\bar{X}=3,98$) “I develop alternative ideas about how a job can be accomplished” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,31$; TM: $\bar{X}=3,86$); “I help the members to learn from the experiences” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,11$; TM: $\bar{X}=3,87$) “I encourage team members to evaluate their own performance” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,04$; TM: $\bar{X}=3,70$), “I provide team members with available settings to share individually constructed insights” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,01$; TM: $\bar{X}=3,76$) and “I encourage the members to participate local and national educational activities” (TL: $\bar{X}=3,80$; TM: $\bar{X}=3,61$).

The mean scores about “managing team environment” dimension were as follows “I defend the team against environmental arguments” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,42$; TM: $\bar{X}=4,05$) “I consider the views of the stakeholders” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,32$; TM: $\bar{X}=3,98$); “I encourage the team members to communicate the members of other teams” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,20$; TM: $\bar{X}=3,89$), “I provide and use networks for the team members to gather information” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,10$; TM: $\bar{X}=3,88$) .

The mean scores about “planning role, responsibility and authority” dimension were as follows “I plan who the tasks will be fulfilled by” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,66$; TM: $\bar{X}=4,34$) “I make the work flow chart clear and concrete to every member” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,57$; TM: $\bar{X}=4,11$) ; “I provide the members informative instructions about tasks” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,39$; TM: $\bar{X}=4,13$) and “I don’t allow uncertainty about perceiving their roles in the team” (TL: $\bar{X}=4,35$; TM: $\bar{X}=3,99$).

Comparison of the views of the team leaders and team members about the extent that team leaders achieve their team leadership roles.

In order to compare the views of the team leaders and team members about the extent that team leaders achieve their team leadership roles, t-test was conducted for the dimensions and the results were given in table1.

As seen in table 1, in “supporting social climate roles” of the team leaders the views differed [$t_{(561)}=6,519$, $p<.05$]. According analysis team leaders ($\bar{X}=4,4505$) believed to demonstrate this kind of roles more than team members reported ($\bar{X}=4,0099$). In “providing high performance culture” roles of the team leaders the views again differed [$t_{(561)}= 4,499$, $p<.05$]. The analysis showed that team leaders reported more positive ideas about providing high performance culture ($\bar{X}=4,1150$) than team members believed ($\bar{X}=3,8028$).

In “managing team environment” roles of the team leaders the views also differed [$t_{(561)}= 4,267$, $p<.05$]. The results showed also that team leaders believed that they achieved their managing team environment roles more successfully ($\bar{X}=4,2737$) than team members reported ($\bar{X}=3,9699$) relatively. The two groups views again was different in “planning role, responsibility and authority” roles of the team leaders [$t_{(561)}= 6,161$, $p<.05$]. According to the results team leaders reported more positive ideas ($\bar{X}=4,5134$) than team members did ($\bar{X}=4,1592$).

In the overall there was also significant difference in the views of the two groups [$t_{(561)}= 5,892$, $p<.05$]. The results showed also that team leaders believed that they achieved their roles in all dimensions more successfully ($\bar{X}=4,3265$), than team members reported ($\bar{X}=3,9618$) accordingly.

Team leaders and team members’ views in relation to their gender, education, seniority and the time spent working in the same province

Table 2 and table 3 shows team leaders’ and team members’ views in relation to independent variables

 Insert Table 2 here

As seen in table 2, in order to understand whether there was a difference in the views of the team leaders and team members about the extent team leaders were achieving their leadership roles in regard to independent variables t- test and One-Way Anova tests were conducted to the total items. As a result, we found that there is not any significant difference in their views statistically. This finding implies that both team leaders and team members, whatever their gender [$t_{(424)}= 188$; $p=.851$], education [$t_{(424)}= -096$; $p=,923$], seniority [$F_{(4-132)}= 1,972$; $p=,098$] and the time they spent working in the same province [$F_{(4-132)}= 1,397$; $p=,248$] are, believe that team leaders are successful at achieving their roles in supporting social climate, providing high performance culture, managing team environment and planning role, responsibility and authority.

Team leaders’ and team members’ views were also tested by means of the extent that they achieve leadership roles in each dimension using t-test and One-Way Anova. In order to explore the source of the difference, because the assumptions were met, post-hoc tests were conducted. The results are given in table 3.

 Insert Table 3 here

As seen in table 3, the only significant difference was found in the views of team members about “managing team environment” dimension [$F_{(4-421)}= 2,764$; $p<.05$] and “planning role, responsibility and authority” dimension [$F_{(4-421)}= 5,772$; $p<.05$].

Tukey HSD test conducted for “managing team environment” showed that team members who had between 6-10 years of seniority ($\bar{X}=3,7452$), had less positive views about the extent that team leaders achieved team leadership roles, compared to the team members who had 1-5 years of seniority ($\bar{X}=4,1389$) and these who had between 16-20 years of seniority ($\bar{X}=4,0696$).

Scheffe test conducted for planning role, responsibility and authority showed that team members who had between 6-10 years of seniority ($\bar{X}=3,8762$) again had less positive views about the extent that team leaders achieved team leadership roles, compared to the team members team members who had between 16-20 years of seniority ($\bar{X}=4,2136$) and these who had 21 years and more seniority.

Discussion

The present study examines the extent that leaders of the supervision teams achieve their team leadership roles in Turkey. Trent (2004) asserted it should not be assumed that individuals with leadership potential necessarily have the knowledge and skills to lead a team. Relatively few individuals have the qualifications, experience, or training to assume demanding team leadership positions, particularly in organizations that are individually focused or functional in design. Failing to select qualified individuals for demanding leadership roles can undermine the entire teaming process.

In this regard, the study provides several noteworthy findings. Team leaders in general noted that they achieved their leadership roles affectively. Their views were consistent regardless of their gender, education, seniority and the time spent working in the same province. With a slight weaker stress on the achievement level of the team leadership, team members also reported positive ideas. Team members’ views were also consistent in that their views regardless of their gender, education, seniority and the time spent working in the same province were the same in regard to total statistical calculation and analysis. On the other hand, team members’ views differed in regard to seniority variable. The findings imply that these who had moderate level of experience in this position tend to evaluate their leadership expectations with a different criteria and it can be asserted that their unmet expectations lead them to feel unsatisfied relatively about their team leaders. One might also expect these who had the least experience to report more dissatisfaction. These findings are surprising considering the findings of Ünal and Kantar (2011) and Polat, Arslan and Tastan (2003) that are likely to shed light about the negative effect of seniority on the perceptions of team leaders’ role achievement. According to their findings, assistant supervisors (supervisors start with assistantship position for three years) faced problems related to both personal benefits and to the profession itself such as unsatisfactory remuneration, appointment/replacement problems, appointment of their spouses, problems concerning not being able to benefit from public housing and problems related to location of work; inadequate training, structure of the inspection system and road safety, relations with managers, being inexpert on the supervised field. Similarly, Ozcan and Caglar (2013) found that in the process of on-the-job training vice supervisors believed that they did not benefit well enough from the mentorship of senior supervisors.

In regard to analysis based on totally calculated data, team leaders had more positive ideas about the extent that they achieved leadership roles compared to team members. But

because the mean scores of the two groups were found above the average, it can be concluded that the leaders of inspection teams are successful in achieving team leadership roles. In this sense one might expect that the ideas about the achievement in team leadership roles of the team leaders is likely to be the result of the feeling of the extent of well being of each member. But in the research conducted by Gokce (2009), which was based on one province out of 81 provinces in Turkey, the results showed that inspectors hardly perceived themselves as an effective member of their team. This argument leads us to think that the issue of leadership is a different argument than the membership. It can be asserted that supervision institution goes 150 years back and team work was considered in all legal arrangements during this period (Taymaz, 2011). So team work can be expected to settle down and be affective. In their research in Turkey, Ergen, (2011) and Karakas (2009) found positive correlation between effective leadership and effective team performance. As it is mentioned above, because team members' votes are valued in the process of team leader selection, they are more likely to cooperate effectively (MEB, 2011). Research findings also showed that supervisors were mostly affected by democratic values in their lives (Tok, 2013). According to the legal arrangements, team leaders are responsible from providing effective coordination and cooperation among the team members in relation to their duties which are supervising, guiding and investigating individuals and institutions (MEB, 2011).

It is significant to find that both team leaders and team members demonstrated similar awareness about the extent that leadership roles were achieved. For example "planning role, responsibility and authority" roles of the team leaders were stated to be achieved at highest level by both. In this sense, as it is also shown in the legal arrangement (MEB, 2011), team leaders seem to achieve scheduling daily routines, coordinating group work, providing instructions to team members, making the work flow chart clear and concrete to every member well. Similarly, the scores given to "supporting social climate", "managing team environment" and "providing high performance culture" gradually decreased in the same order and the last was given the lowest scores by two groups.

Implications for Future Research and Supervision Practice

Our results have implications for counselling supervisors and supervisor training programs. In order to have more effective teams there is a need to give place to team leadership in legal arrangements more, the one who is selected by the team members as team leader should be appointed regardless of any approval of upper managers. It can be asserted that the more democracy in the process of leadership positions the more voluntary participation among members of a team directed to effectiveness can be expected. For this reason, the way the team leaders were selected and appointed in the former arrangement should be substituted with the current method even giving opportunity to more participative ways in selecting team leaders (MEB, 2011; MEB, 2014). The Assistant supervisors should also be trained on-the job about team work. Another important issue is that these who are successful in team leadership should be encouraged and provided with upper positions.

The present study also yielded questions to be answered in further research. In this sense, the positive outputs of the group with the least seniority needs to be considered both by practitioners and researchers and these with moderate level of seniority in the position of inspection who are likely to have developed some other criteria in evaluating effectiveness of leadership need to be explored. On the other hand, by means of supervision practice the findings draw us to think further research about the type of the correlations between team leadership and concepts such as devotion, performance and concordance.

References

- Akgül A. & Çevik O. (2003). *İstatistiksel Analiz Teknikleri: SPSS'te İşletme Uygulamaları*. Ankara: Emek Ofset.
- Aydin, I. (2008). *Öğretimde denetim*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Balci, A. (2001). Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma: Yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Basar, H. (1993). *Eğitim Denetçisi*. [Education Supervisor]. Ankara: Pegem.
- Baiden, B.K., & Price, A. D. F. (2011). The effect of integration on project delivery team effectiveness. *International Journal of Project Management*, 29(2), 129-136.
- Bolden, R.; Gosling, J.; Marturano, A. & Dennison, P. (2003). A review of leadership theory and competency frameworks. Centre for Leadership Studies. Exeter: University of Exeter. Retrieved March, 09 from http://business-school.exeter.ac.uk/documents/discussion_papers/cls/mgmt_standards.pdf
- Burke, S., Stagl, K., Klein, C., Goodwin G.F., Salas, E. & Halpin S. M. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 288-307.
- Büyüköztürk, S. (2003). Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı: istatistik, araştırma deseni: SPSS uygulamaları ve yorum. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Bryman A. & Cramer D. (2001). Quantitative data analysis with SPSS release 10 for windows: A guide for social scientists. London: Routledge.
- Chrispeels J. H. & Martin, K. J. (2002). Four school leadership teams define their roles within organizational and political structures to improve student learning, school effectiveness and school improvement. *An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice*, 13(3), 327-365.
- Çankaya, H. I. & Karakus, M. (2010). Okul yöneticilerinin takım liderliği davranışlarına yönelik bir ölçme aracı geliştirme çalışması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 16 (2), 167-183.
- Çelik, V. (2011). *Eğitimsel Liderlik*, Ankara: Pegem.
- Day, D. V., Gronn, P., & Salas, E. (2006). Leadership in team-based organizations: On the threshold of a new era. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 211-216.
- DeRue, S., Barnes, C., & Morgeson, F. (2010). Understanding the motivational contingencies of team leadership. *Small Group Research*, 41(5), 621-51.
- Dionne, S. D.; Yammarino, F.J.; Atwater, L.E. & Spangler, W.D. (2004). Transformational leadership and team performance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17 (2), 177-193.
- Dirks, K. T. (2000). Trust in leadership and team performance: Evidence from NCAA basketball. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 1004-1012.
- Eker, T. (2006). İlçe milli müdürlerinin liderlik davranışlarının okul müdür ve müdür yardımcılarının kendilerini takım olarak algılamaları üzerindeki etkisi. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi) [Unpublished Master Thesis], İstanbul: Yeditepe Üniversitesi
- Ensley, M.D.; Pearson, A. & Pearce, C. L. (2003). Top management team process, shared leadership, and new venture performance: A theoretical model and research agenda. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13, 329-346.
- Ergen, T. (2011). Stratejik liderlik ve takım çalışmasındaki rolü. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi) [Unpublished Master Thesis], Erzurum: Atatürk Üniversitesi.
- Ford, L. R., & Seers, A. (2006). Relational leadership and team climates: Pitting differentiation versus agreement. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 258–270.

- Gokçe, H. (2011). Etkin liderlik ve takım çalışması. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi) [Unpublished Master Thesis], Isparta: Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi.
- Gokçe, F. (2009). İlköğretim denetçilerinin takım rolleri. [Educational Administration: Theory and Practice] *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 15(57), 35-51.
- Hair J. F., Anderson R. E., Tahtam R.L. & Black W.C. (1998). Multivariate data analysis. Fifth Edition, Pearson Education, New Jersey: Upper Saddle River.
- Hill, S. E. K. Team leadership. (2007) In P. G. Northouse (Ed.), *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, (4th ed., pp. 207 – 236). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Irving, J.A. and Longbotham, G. J. (2007). Team effectiveness and six essential servant leadership themes: a regression model based on items in the organizational leadership assessment. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(2), 98-113.
- Ince, M. Bedük, A. & Aydoğan, E. (2004). Örgütlerde takım çalışmasına yönelik etkin liderlik nitelikleri. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11, 423-446.
- Karakas, A. (2009). Etkin takım yönetimi ve etkin liderlik arasındaki ilişkinin kamu ve özel sektör bankalarında ampirik olarak incelenmesi. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi) [Unpublished Master Thesis], Kütahya: Dumlupınar Üniversitesi.
- Karasar, N. (1994). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi. 6. Basım. Ankara: 3A Araştırma, Eğitim, Danışmanlık Ltd.
- Klein, K. J. & Kozlowski, S. W. (2008). Leadership: Enhancing team adaptability in dynamic settings. Administration and Management. University of Maryland Department of Psychology, University of Maryland College Park, MD 20742 Technical Report 1228. U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral & Social Sciences 2511 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, VA 22202-3926.
- Kuo, C. C. (2004). Research on impacts of team leadership on team effectiveness. *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, 266-277.
- Kozlowski, S. W. J.; Gully, S. M.; Salas, E. & Bowers, J. A. C. (1996). Team leadership and development: Theory, principles, and guidelines for training leaders and teams. *Advances In Interdisciplinary Studies Of Work Teams*, 3, 253-291.
- Küçük, F. (2008). Kurumlarda takım çalışmasının yenilik (innovasyon) üzerine etkisi. *Kamu İş*, 10(1), 167-182.
- Künze, B., Zala-Mezö, E., Kolbe, M.; Wacker, J. & Grote, G. (2010). Substitutes for leadership in anaesthesia teams and their impact on leadership effectiveness. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 19(5), 505-531.
- Lafasto, F. & Larson, K. (2001). *When teams work best*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Lee, P., Gillespie, N., Mann, L., & Wearing, A. (2010). Leadership and trust: Their effect on knowledge sharing and team performance. *Management Learning*, 41(4), 473-491.
- Leech, N. L., Barrett, K.C. & Morgan, G. A. (2005). SPSS for Intermediate Statistics: Use and Interpretation. Second ed. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- MEB (2001). Millî eğitim bakanlığı ilköğretim müfettişleri başkanlıkları rehberlik ve teftiş yönergesi. Tebliğler Dergisi, 2521.
- MEB (2011). Milli eğitim bakanlığı eğitim müfettişleri başkanlıkları yönetmeliği. Resmi Gazete, 27974.
- MEB (2014). Milli eğitim bakanlığı rehberlik ve denetim başkanlığı ile maarif müfettişleri başkanlıkları yönetmeliği. Resmi Gazete, 27009.
- Mehra, A., Smith, B., Dixon, A., & Robertson, B. 2006. Distributed leadership in teams: The network of leadership perceptions and team performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 232-245.

- Morgeson, F. P., Derue, D. S. & Karam, E. P. (2009). Leadership in teams: A functional approach to understanding leadership structures and progresses. *Journal of Management*, 20(10), 1-39.
- Muijs D. (2004). *Doing Quantitative Research in Education with SPSS*, London: Sage Publications.
- Noe, R. A. (1999). *İnsan kaynaklarının eğitim ve gelişimi*. Prof.Dr. Canan Çetin (Çev.). İstanbul: Beta.
- Nurmi, R. (1996). Team work and team leadership. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 2(1), 9-13.
- Özcan, K. & Çağlar, C. (2013). İl eğitim denetmenlerinin mesleki gelişiminde mentorluk. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6(13), 177-204.
- Polat, S., Arslan, H. & Taştan, M. (2003). İlköğretim denetmen yardımcılarının sorunları, Eğitim ve Bilim [Education and Science], 28(128), 42-57.
- Reader, T, W. Flin, R. & Curthbertson, B. H. (2011). Team leadership in the intensive care unit: The perspective of specialists. *Critical Care Medicine*, 39(87), 1683-1691.
- Rosado, C. (2004). Building your leadership team: Value Systems, memetics, and education - A spiral dynamics approach. Rosado Consulting for Change in Human Systems. Retrieved in May, 10 from http://www.rosado.net/pdf/Building_Your_Leadership_Team.pdf.
- Selçuk, G., Yalçınkaya, M. & Uslu, A. Ç. (2013). Kadın okul müdürlerinin takım liderliği rollerini sergileme düzeyinin ve bu rollere verilen önem derecesinin incelenmesi. *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 11(1), 106-125.
- Senge, P. M. (1998). *Beşinci disiplin*, Ayşegül İldeniz, A. Doğukan (Çev.). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat.
- Solansky, S.T. (2008). Leadership style and team processes in self-managed teams. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 14(4), 332-341.
- Somech, A. (2006). The effects of leadership style and team process on performance and innovation in functionally heterogeneous teams. *Journal of Management*, 32, 132-157.
- Tanrıögen, A. (2009). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Anı yayıncılık.
- Taymaz, H. (2011). *Teftiş, kavramlar, ilkeler, yöntemler*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Thamhain H. J. (2004). Linkages of project environment to performance: Lessons for team leaderships. *International Journal of Project Management*, 22(7), 533-44.
- Tok, T. N. (2013). Türkiye’de eğitim denetmenlerinin profili. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33, 119-138.
- Trent, R.J. (2004). Team leadership at the 100-foot level. *Team Performance Management*, 10(5), 94-103.
- Tse, H. H. M., Dasborough, M. T., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2008). A multi-level analysis of team climate and interpersonal exchange relationships at work. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 195–211.
- Ünal, A. & Kantar, Ş. (2011). Problems of assistant supervisors in primary education İlköğretim Online [Elementary Education Online], 10(1), 180-196.
- Webber, S. S. (2002), Leadership and Trust Facilitating Cross-Functional Team Success. *Journal of Management Development*, 21(3), 201-214.
- Zaccaro, S.J.; Rittman, A. L. & Marks, M. A. (2001). Team leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 451-483.

Zehir, C. & Özşahin, M. (2008). Takım yönetimi ve takım etkililiğini belirleyen faktörler: savunma sanayinde ar-ge yapan takımlar üzerine bir saha araştırması. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 9(2), 266-279.

Table 1

Team Leaders and Team Members' Views and comparison of their views about the extent that supervisors achieve their team leadership roles

Dimensions				Comparison of the TL.'s and TM's views.					
	N	\bar{X}	SD	N	\bar{X}	SD	df	t	p
Supporting social climate	Views of 137	4,4505	,48100	137	4,4505	,48100	561	6,519	.000
	T.L. Views of 426	4,0099	,74228	426	4,0099	,74228			
Providing high performance culture	Views of 137	4,1150	,54055	137	4,1150	,54055	561	4,499	.000
	T.L. Views of 426	3,8028	,75187	426	3,8028	,75187			
Managing team environment	Views of 137	4,2737	,56075	137	4,2737	,56075	561	4,267	.000
	T.L. Views of 426	3,9699	,77024	426	3,9699	,77024			
	Views of 137	4,5134	,42398	137	4,5134	,42398	561	6,161	.000
	T.L.								

Planning role,Views of 426 4,1592 ,62821 responsibility T.M. and authority	426 4,1592 ,62821
Total Views of 137 4,3265 ,44047 T.L.	137 4,3265 ,44047 561 5,892 ,000
Views of 426 3,9618 ,68007 T.M.	426 3,9618 ,68007

Table 2
Team Leaders' Views in Relation to their Gender, Education, Seniority and the Time Spent Working in the Same Province.

		Team Leaders' Views					Team Members' Views					
T-test		n	\bar{X}	SD	df	p	n	\bar{X}	SD	df	t	p
Gender	Female	6	4,20	,125	135	-,708 ,480	32	3,98	,680	424	188	,851
	Male	131	4,33	,449			394	3,96	,680			
Education	Pre-licence	102	4,31	,443	135	-,956 ,341	341	3,96	,678	424	-	,923
	Graduate	35	4,89	,430			85	3,97	,691			096
One-Way ANOVA		n	\bar{X}	SD	F	p	n	\bar{X}	SD	F	p	
Seniority (by years)	1-5	6	4,05	,344	1,664	,162	60	4,05	,710	1,97	,098	
	6-10	30	4,43	,480			70	3,76	,704	2		
	11-15	23	4,19	,396			65	3,96	,644			
	16-20	44	4,33	,458			103	4,01	,668			
	21+	34	4,37	,402			128	3,98	,668			
The time spent working in the province	2 years and less	21	4,28	,498	,119	,888	124	4,03	,621	1,397	,248	
	3-6 years	70	4,34	,475			224	3,95	,703			
	7 years and more	46	4,33	,359			78	3,88	,697			

p<.05

Table 3

Team Members' views in relation to seniority about "managing team environment" and "planning role, responsibility and authority"

Dimensions	Seniority	n	\bar{X}	SD	F	p	Difference
Managing team environment (by years)	1-5	60	4,1389	,76417	2,764	,027	
	6-10	70	3,7452	,87767			6-10 and 1-5
	11-15	65	3,9718	,71174			6-10 and 16-20
	16-20	103	4,0696	,72028			
	21+	128	3,9323	,75684			
Planning role, responsibility and authority (by years)	1-5 years	60	4,1500	,68251	5,772	,000	
	6-10 years	70	3,8762	,64996			6-10 and 16-20
	11-15 years	65	4,1051	,66963			6-10 and 21 +
	16-20 years	103	4,2136	,56612			
	21+	128	4,3021	,56809			

p<.05