

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS' LEADERSHIP STYLES AND RESISTANCE TO CHANGE

Yusuf Inandi¹, Binali Tunc¹, Fahrettin Gilic²

¹Assist. Prof. Mersin University, Faculty of Education, Mersin, ²Ministry of Education, Mersin (TURKEY)
E-mails: inandiyusuf@gmail.com, tunc75@gmail.com, fgilic@yahoo.com

DOI: 10.7813/2075-4124.2013/5-5/B.30

ABSTRACT

In the study, the relation between school administrators' leadership style and resistance to change and prediction level of leadership styles for behaviours about resistance to change were discussed. Leadership styles of educational leaders which can vary according to their cultural, personal, psychological and educational qualities play a key role in change process. For this, it was tried to be determined in the study which leadership styles become prominent in managing successfully the change process in education. The study was based on field research using primary data gathered from 287 school administrators by Resistance to Change Scale (Oreg, 2003) and Leadership Style Scale (Tas, Celik and Tomul, 2007). Correlation analysis technique was used to analyze the relation between administrators' leadership style and resistance to change. In addition, multiple regression analysis technique was used to determine prediction level of leadership styles for resistance to change. There is a low relation between leadership styles and resistance to change, and leadership styles predict resistance to change at a low level. The study group was 287 administrators. The school administrators' leadership styles (autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transformational and transactional) are related at a low level with resistance to change. However, it is understood that resistance to change is also affected by factors other than leadership styles. This point appears to be reasonable when change is considered to be a complex process with multi-factors. Negative relation between autocratic or laissez-faire leadership styles and resistance to change seems a striking result of the study. Consistent with this, it isn't also expected that democratic leadership style increases routine behaviours. However, the fact that autocratic and laissez-faire leadership of administrators reduce resistance to change doesn't mean that they support change. It can be said that, no matter what the change is about, resistance is unavoidable due to uncertainties and loss of habits.

Key words: Leadership Styles, Resistance to Change, School Administrators

1. INTRODUCTION

Change means transition from a state in nature to another. Regarding this, change is inevitable and the question "Why do things change?" becomes meaningless. What is to be asked is "how, when and in what direction" things change. However, as the answer to these questions requires a profound philosophical discussion, it was excluded from the aim and content of this study. In the study, change refers to how the dynamism in daily life takes place especially in education and how it is perceived and achieved by administrators.

What the change is caused by is another point. Change results from the differences, diversities and conflicts between things. People do not have many choices in case of changing situations but trying to prevent it, resist it or involve in it in a particular way. Prevention or resistance to change causes more difficulties when compared with involvement in change process. Because of this, change should be managed in a controlled way.

No matter how different the reasons for change are, each organizational change is accepted in particular aspects while it may be given resistance in some other aspects. The acceptance of or resistance to change in organizations depend on a set of variables such as the content and timing of the changing situation and future risks.

Resistance to change is related to readiness for change. Readiness is to want it cognitively while resistance is not to want or accept it. Resistance to change is, to a great extent, related to fear. People do not like the change if they feel threatened about their beliefs, values and behaviours. Leadership styles of educational leaders which can vary according to their cultural, personal, psychological and educational qualities play a key role in change process. For that reason, we tried to determine which leadership styles (autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transformational and transactional) become prominent in managing successfully the change process in educational organizations.

1.1. Organizational Changes

We conceived change as "a transition from a state to another" (Erdogan, 2012; Honson, 2003; Tokat, 2012) in daily life resulting from behaviours. This transition can be planned or unplanned in a particular time as well as it can take place in behaviours, structure, aim or results of subsystems in organizations.

Increasing efficiency of organizations which means the integration of what the work requires and qualities of the employee is one of the aims of organizational change (Luecke, 2009; Sabuncuoglu and Tuz, 1995). In addition, increasing motivation and satisfaction level of the employee to get rid of monotony, preparing the organization for technological and social developments (Mittal, 2012), improving organizational communication, establishing trust and cooperation among organizational members, providing guidance based on specialization and competency instead of bureaucratic authority and making innovations in organizations are other aims of the organizational change.

It is possible to divide causes for organizational change into two: organizational and non-organizational factors. Economic, technologic, social and legal factors are non-organizational factors while aim, structure and programme of the organization, shortcomings caused by communicational processes and humans in organizations can be seen as organizational factors (Sabuncuoglu and Tuz, 1995). In addition to the inflation or recession in national economies (Lunenburg, 2010), economic conditions make organizational change inevitable in that globalized markets have become areas of international rivalry and events and decisions made in a part of the world have effects on societies and individuals in other parts of the world (Ussahawanitchakit, 2011). As technological developments require new knowledge and skills for employee, educational organizations need changing in their curriculum and staff in order to educate employee accordingly (Martincic, 2010). Socio-cultural factors such as traditions, culture, educational level, demographic structure are determinant in people's needs. Therefore, the fact that educational organizations have to adapt to the society in which they exist shows the effects of social conditions on organizations (Nadina, 2011). National and international legal regulations as educational reforms like 12-year-compulsory-education law gone in effect in Turkey in 2012 are legal factors which require organizational change.

Organizational factors for change are problems faced in administrative processes like communication, decision making, leadership and motivational strategies (Lunenburg, 2010). Change becomes inevitable when communication between teachers and administrators is weak, decisions are inefficient and inadequate, principal's leadership style is far from reaching aims of school or overcoming the problems, and motivational level of school staff is low (Honson, 2003). Absenteeism of pupils and teachers, their low performance, teachers' behaviours against school administration, students' domestic problems indicate the change for school administration while school's relations with family, environment and unions are human-factor causes of change (Erdogan, 2012; Lunenburg, 2010). Resistance to change is a normal phenomenon as much as inevitability of change.

1.2. Resistance to Change

Organizational members are not always ready or enthusiastic about change though change is a necessity in order for organizations to maintain themselves (Bovey and Hede, 2001). Hultman (1998) questions why change is resisted. As change, small-scale or full-scale, blocks the existing situation to continue in future, it is resisted. Employees resist to change because of various reasons such as uncertainties (loss of position, control and power) (Bruckman, 2008), quitting habits (Griffin and Moorhead, 1986), economic conditions (Sabuncuoglu and Tuz, 1995), group pressure (Lunenburg, 2010) and fear of failure (Trader-Leigh, 2002). As change happens from known to unknown, it means uncertainty for individuals (Agboola and Salawu, 2011). Resistance to change results from the reasons like changes in roles and responsibilities after change process (Andersen, 2006; Bordia *et al.*, 2004; Dijk and Dick, 2009; Hultman, 1998), perception of threat for organizational carrier (Mittal, 2012; Nodeson, *et al.*, 2012), loss of rights such as making decision, access to information and autonomy (Lunenburg, 2010) and perceiving beliefs, values, behaviours and habits under threat (Hultman, 1998; Griffin and Moorhead, 1986).

Resistance to change due to economic conditions goes back to the beginning of industrialization (Bruckman, 2008). Sabuncuoglu and Tuz (1995) states resistance to change occurs when machines and new technologies requires new skills for employees while Peus *et al.*, (2009) states that it occurs when employees worry more about adaptation to change.

Another source of resistance to change is group dynamics. Individuals in an organization form an identity in social groups and determine their behaviours according to group norms (Dijk and Dick, 2009). Lunenburg (2010) and Honson (2003) emphasize the importance of group dynamics. If change is perceived as a threat for the group, individuals can adopt group norms in order not to be excluded by the group.

Resistance to change can be very strict as well as soft. Hultman (1998) states that there are two types of resistance: active and passive. Active resistance involves being critic, finding mistakes, mobbing, expressing fear, accusing, choosing and utilizing some facts deliberately, sabotaging, threatening, manipulating, distorting truths, blocking, trivializing and discussion. Passive resistance occurs in the form of agreeing but not acting, failing to achieve change, behaving reluctantly, letting the change process fail and not sharing information, suggestion, help or support.

Main responsibility of the leaders charged with managing change is to transform the resistance to change into support. Benfari (1999) asserts that classical "fight or flight" style of leadership is not appropriate. This is because problems cannot be overcome either absolutely or by ignoring them. Applying strategies in which mutual benefits between both sides are taken into account are significant instead of being dominant or avoidance.

1.3. An Overview of leadership styles

Griffin and Moorhead (1986) indicate that many definitions of leadership have been offered, but none of them accepted by all researchers. However, we aimed by determining leadership styles to determine the behavioural tendencies and focus of administrators.

Benfari (1999) indicates six main factors for a successful management. Psychological style is related to personal attitude of the administrator and it is difficult to change as it is long termed. Therefore, instead of changing it, adaptation or guidance can work by determining weak and strong sides. Second factor is the needs. Individuals'

needs influence their personality. Third one is power. Concept of power, influencing other people, shows relations in life. Some people prefer influencing others in a positive way while some others prefer negative ways. The values are the fifth. It is about whether the conflicts will be taken in a win-lose or win-win strategy. The fifth is values. It is about determining ideals and beliefs and guiding them. Culture, social institutions and personal experiences affect the formation of values. The last factor is stress. Stress is the reaction to pressure. Stress reactions are indicators of how the conflict is being dealt with. Experiences through life and individual differences determine how we react to internal and external stress factors. It is important to try to understand and overcome the problem in its own course instead of staying away individually from the problem like "fight or flight".

Williams (1999) states that working styles of leaders appear on a bipolar continuum: from "developmental" styles to "controlling" styles. Encouragement, participation in relations, supporting change, expanding freedom area and creating space for individual choices, and behaving flexibly and adaptively are seen in developmental styles. Common benefits and efforts like discussion, debate, evaluation of change, cooperation and rearrangement are important in these styles. As approached to controlling styles, these behaviours tend to appear: giving instruction and controlling, one-way thinking, trying to preserve the existing situation, forming a disciplinarian and structured work environment, trying to doing things accurately, caring about consistency between works and willing to work alone. There is a dualist approach such as right-wrong or good-bad to a great extent in this style.

It is suggested as a result of the researches in the field that the leader has a significant role in overcoming resistance to change and managing organizational change (Vasilescu, 2012; Burnes ve Todnem, 2012; Luecke, 2009; Martincic, 2010; Shanker ve Sayeed, 2012). These studies show that leadership comes first for a successful change, an effective leadership is also essential for success of change and leadership and change are interrelated. Organizational leader can follow some of these strategies to overcome resistance to change: to provide an effective communication by keeping organizational communication channels open, to inform organizational members about wrong or inadequate information related to change process, to enable employees to take part in planning and applying the change, to give rewards to those who will lose after change through bargaining in order to reduce their resistance, to understand employees' emotions and ideas about change and feel an empathy with them to help them, to introduce change process in a different way to those who resist, to give resisting members important roles or to threaten them.

The strategies to be followed in overcoming resistance to change can differ according to the leadership style. Though there are various leadership styles; autocratic, democratic, transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles were discussed in this study. Autocratic leaders make the employee do their job without right to choose while democratic leaders try to have the work done by giving them right to choose (Ferguson, 2011; Griffin and Moorhead, 1986). Autocratic leaders choose the willing team members during preparation period, because they believe those who resist changing threaten the process (Martincic, 2010). On the other hand, democratic leaders give importance to increasing sharing and willingness in mutual respect by considering organizational communication and group dynamics (Ferguson, 2011). In other words, democratic leaders try to form an organizational power for a positive change by providing an atmosphere the employees can share their feelings, ideas and experiences and showing they value everyone's ideas (Brookfield, 2010).

Transformational leaders become a model for employees and try to create willingness to change by affecting them with their charisma, vision and self-confidence (Shanker and Sayeed, 2012). That's why it is asserted that transformational leadership is more appropriate for an organization to survive by exploring the innovation, initiating the change and meeting the needs in a competitive environment (Mokhber, Ismail and Vakilbashi, 2011). As leader's charisma is effective to manage the crisis especially during change process, it is important for a positive change that the leader adopts transformational leadership style in change management (Boga and Ensari, 2009). Transformational leaders encourage the employees to think critically and creatively, have a positive impact on them and increase their motivational level in addition to being a model for employees (Rehman et al, 2012).

Transactional leaders are the administrators who try to maintain the existing structure in a punishment and reward system by making the employees obey the rules, avoid taking risks and have interdependent relations with employees. Finally, laissez-faire leaders exhibit a passive administrative attitude, give a total freedom to the employees in their jobs, passes the decision making and responsibilities to employees and don't feel the need to motivate them to reach the organizational goals (Salman et al., 2011).

2. METHOD

It is aimed in the study to determine the relation between school administrators' leadership style and resistance to change and the prediction level of leadership styles for resistance to change.

General survey model which is one of the descriptive survey models was used in this study. As comparing the relations between leadership styles school administrators' exhibit and dimensions of resistance to change was issued, this is a relational study.

2.1. Study Group

Data were collected from 287 school administrators (208 principals and 79 vice-principals), working at primary, secondary and high schools of Ministry of Education in Adana, Mersin and Nigde in 2012-2013 school year. Service years of school administrators vary between 1 and 37 years and their average service year was 10.15 years. 114 of these administrators work at primary school, 84 at secondary school and 89 at high school. Convenience sampling method was used to obtain data.

2.2. Instrument

Data were collected through two scales by researchers: Resistance to change scale and the leadership style scale.

2.2.1. Resistance to Change Scale (RCS)

RCS developed by Oreg (2003), aims to measure the level of individuals' resistance to change. There are items about personal information of participants in the first part while there are 17 items to measure level of resistance to change in the second part. A six-point Likert-type scale was used in both instruments, where (1) equals strongly disagree, and (6) equals strongly agree. International validity of the scale was done with 4.201 participants from 17 countries (Bayazit adapted in Turkish) by Oreg *et al.*, (2008). According to this, cronbach alpha coefficient of the scale varies between .72 and .85 throughout 17 countries and cronbach alpha mean of 17 countries was found .80.

2.2.2. The RCS consists of four dimensions

Routine seeking (5 items), emotional reaction (4 items), short term focus (4 items) and cognitive rigidity (4 items). According to international validity analysis of the scale, factor load for routine seeking was found .54, .64, .70, .44 and .50; for emotional reaction, .64, .72, .64 and .54; for short term focus, .62, .72, .49 and .50; and for cognitive rigidity, .48, .63, .68, .64. Coefficient of internal consistency of the scale was found .70 for this study.

2.2.3. Leadership Style Scale (LSS)

LSS was developed by Tas, Celik and Tomul (2007) and aimed to measure leadership style of school administrators with 59 items. The researchers benefited from opinions of professors in the field for content validity. Coefficient of internal consistency of the scale was found .87 and it has five dimensions: Autocratic leadership (10 items), democratic leadership (13 items), laissez-faire leadership (11 items), transformational leadership (15 items) and transactional leadership (10 items). Coefficient of internal consistency was found .70 for autocratic leadership, .87 for democratic leadership, .61 for laissez-faire leadership, .91 for transformational leadership and .55 for transactional leadership. Coefficient of internal consistency of the scale was .87.

2.3. Analysis

Correlation analysis was done for the relation between leadership styles and resistance to change. In addition, multiple regression analysis was done to determine prediction level of leadership styles for resistance to change. In the study, 0.05 and 0.01 was taken as significance level.

3. RESULTS

In this part, the findings obtained according to aims of the study are given. Results of correlation analysis about the relation between leadership styles of school administrators and resistance to change come first and it is followed by results of multiple regression analysis about prediction level of leadership styles for resistance to change.

Table 1. Correlation analysis about the relation between leadership styles and resistance to change

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Mean	Sd
Routine seeking	1									4.67	0.78
Emotional reaction	.206**	1								3.71	1.07
Short term focus	.316**	.364**	1							4.48	1.07
Cognitive rigidity	.069	.220**	.205**	1						3.08	0.96
Autocratic	-.169**	-.100	-.174**	.090	1					2.50	0.52
Democratic	.215**	.110	.305**	-.031	-.308**	1				4.22	0.52
Laissez-faire	-.147*	.035	-.050	.036	.246**	.104	1			2.90	0.50
Transformational	.171**	.097	.235**	-.048	-.193*	.800**	.131*	1		4.12	0.55
Transactional	.038	.022	-.018	-.010	.035	.412**	.318**	.475**	1	3.41	0.42

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

According to Table 1, there is a negative relation between "routine seeking" dimension of resistance to change and autocratic leadership style ($r = -.169$, $p < .01$) and laissez-faire leadership style ($r = -.147$, $p < .05$) while routine seeking has a positive relation between democratic leadership ($r = .215$, $p < .01$) and transformational leadership ($r = .171$, $p < .01$). There isn't a significant relation between routine seeking dimension and transactional leadership.

A significant relation does not appear between "emotional reaction" dimension of resistance to change and autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transformational and transactional dimensions of leadership styles.

There is a negative relation between "short term focus" dimension of resistance to change and autocratic leadership ($r = -.174$, $p < .01$); however, short term focus dimension has a positive relation between democratic leadership ($r = .305$, $p < .01$) and transformational leadership ($r = .235$, $p < .01$). There is not a significant relation between short term focus and laissez faire and transactional leadership.

A significant relation cannot be seen between "cognitive rigidity" dimension of resistance to change and autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transformational and transactional dimensions of leadership styles.

Table 2. Multiple regression analysis of leadership styles predicting resistance to change

Resistance to Change Variable	Routine Seeking				Emotional Reaction				Short Term Focus				Cognitive Rigidity			
	B	SH	B	T	B	SH	β	T	B	SH	β	T	B	SH	β	T
Constant	4.270	.533		8.007	3.278	.754		4.346	3.151	.711		4.434	2.656	.678		3.916
Autocratic	-.100	.094	-.068	-1.065	-.176	.133	-.086	-1.323	-.112	.125	-.055	-.896	.156	.120	.086	1.305
Democratic	.283	.149	.189	1.896	.118	.211	.057	.558	.647	.199	.316	3.255	.102	.190	.055	.536
Laissez-faire	-.236	.096	-.153	-2.453	.120	.136	.057	.884	-.049	.128	-.023	-.383	.027	.122	.014	.224
Transformational	.040	.141	.028	.284	.088	.200	.045	.439	.102	.188	.053	.544	-.154	.179	-.088	-.857
Transactional	-.004	.125	-.002	-.035	-.096	.177	-.038	-.539	-.411	.167	-.164	-2.459	.047	.160	.021	.296
	R=.282		R ² =.079		R=.143		R ² =.020		R=.351		R ² =.123		R=.105		R ² =.011	
	F ₍₅₎ =4.843		p<.01		F ₍₅₎ =1.175		p>.05		F ₍₅₎ =7.871		p<.01		F ₍₅₎ =.623		p>.05	

Results of multiple regression analysis of leadership styles of school administrators predicting resistance to change can be seen in Table 2. Dimensions of leadership styles (autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transformational and transactional) predict significantly "routine seeking" and "short term focus" dimensions of resistance to change ($p < .01$). However, "emotional reaction" and "cognitive rigidity" dimensions of resistance to change are not significantly predicted by leadership styles ($p > .05$).

Routine Seeking: Points of school administrators from routine seeking dimension show a low level but significant relation with leadership styles ($R = .282$; $R^2 = .079$; $p < .01$). Leadership styles explain 7.9% of variance of routine seeking dimension.

According to standardized regression coefficient (β), relative importance sequence of predictor variables for routine seeking dimension is as follows: Democratic, transformational, transactional, autocratic and laissez-faire. According to t-test results about significance of regression coefficients, laissez-faire leadership is a significant predictor of routine seeking dimension. Other leadership styles do not have a significant effect on routine seeking.

Emotional Reaction: Points of school administrators from emotional reaction dimension do not indicate a significant relation with leadership styles ($R = .143$; $R^2 = .020$; $p > .05$). That is, leadership styles dimensions of school administrators are not a significant predictor of "emotional reaction" dimension of resistance to change.

Short Term Focus: Points of school administrators from short term focus dimension show a low but significant relation with leadership styles ($R = .351$; $R^2 = .123$; $p < .01$). Dimensions of leadership styles explain 12.3% of variance of routine seeking dimension.

According to standardized regression coefficient (β), relative importance sequence of predictor variables for short term focus dimension is as follows: Democratic, transactional, autocratic, transformational and laissez-faire. According to t-test results about significance of regression coefficients, democratic and transactional leaderships are significant predictors of short term focus dimension. Other leadership styles do not have a significant effect on short term focus.

Cognitive Rigidity: Points of school administrators from cognitive rigidity dimension do not show a significant relation with leadership styles ($R = .105$; $R^2 = .011$; $p > .05$). It means that leadership styles dimensions of school administrators are not a significant predictor of "cognitive rigidity" dimension of resistance to change.

4. DISCUSSION

In the study, prediction level of leadership styles for behaviours about resistance to change and relation between them were determined. According to research results, autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transformational and transactional leadership styles have a significant effect on behaviours about routine seeking and short term focus while they do not have a significant effect on emotional reaction and cognitive rigidity.

Routine seeking dimension of resistance to change has a negative relation with autocratic leadership. As school administrators tend more to exhibit autocratic behaviours, routine seeking behaviours decrease at school. It can be said in other words that administrators with positive attitudes to change tend to have autocratic leadership styles instead of routine behaviours. Autocratic behaviours of administrators against resistance to change may result from their efforts to reduce resistance to change at school. However, it is stated in studies (Bhatti *et al.*, 2012; Leblebici, 2008) that school stakeholders have limited area of freedom and thus they are restricted to make use of their creativity, knowledge and skills when school administrators have an autocratic style. School stakeholders may seem to adopt the change in autocratic atmosphere for the fear of being punished. Such an insincere situation can lead belief in long term change to fade. Hultman's (1998) statements support this judgement. Hultman states that trust plays a key role in breaking resistance to change, or there will be waste of time, energy and help. Similarly, Ozmen and Sonmez (2007) indicate that oppressive and threatening leadership demotivate employees.

There is also a negative relation between routine seeking and laissez-faire leadership. This finding shows that school administrators avoid routines in cases of change because of their laissez-faire leadership behaviours. To explain reversely, laissez-faire leaders, who tend to let the process go on its own course instead of being effective in management processes, don't adopt routine behaviours during change process.

However, a positive relation is seen between routine seeking and democratic and transformational leadership. In other words, school administrators' democratic and transformational leadership behaviours and their routine seeking behaviours are observed to rise in the same direction. According to this, the administrators seeking routines, or unwilling to change adopt democratic and transformational leadership styles. This can be because these administrators want to maintain the existing situation they are content with. Democratic leaders want to keep the democratic atmosphere they created at school and therefore, it can be inferred that they are not willing to change due to this fact. Brookfield (2010) states comfort, trust and the feeling of being valuable in democratic

organizations result in unwillingness to change. In this respect, it is obvious that change will not be accepted in organizations in which conditions are quite good (Benfari, 1999). As Hultman (1998) states, the most important way to achieve change in a democratic environment requires listening and understanding, improving in agreement, explaining what is expected, running win-win strategy, being reliable, sharing information, taking responsibility for mistakes, making the dependents participate in decision making and avoiding gossiping or accusing. Even though it seems difficult to manage change process with democratic leadership, it can be possible to produce long-term and permanent solutions after difficulties have been overcome.

Leadership styles of school administrators predict the variance in teachers' routine seeking at a low level. Independent from leadership styles, this finding indicates that that people tend to continue their life in a particular level. That leadership styles predict the variance in routine behaviours at a low level can be interpreted as routine behaviours are caused, to a great extent, by factors other than leadership styles.

There is a low and positive relation between emotional reaction dimension of resistance to change and democratic leadership. School administrators' adoption of a democratic approach leads to increase in emotional reaction level. When it is considered that each change causes negative feelings like anxiety, fear and loss of habits (Jung, Chow and Wu, 2003), expressing the feelings clearly in a democratic environment will help these feelings be taken into consideration during change process. In this way, change process can be directed collectively in a win-win strategy. On the other hand, there isn't a significant relation between emotional reaction and autocratic, laissez-faire, transformational and transactional leadership styles. It is also remarkable that dimensions of leadership style do not predict emotional reactions to change. It is understood that administrators' behaviours about emotional resistance to change are caused by factors other than leadership styles.

There is a negative relation at a low level between short term focus dimension of resistance to change and autocratic leadership. As school administrators have an autocratic attitude, they show long-termed resistance instead of focusing on short term. As Honson (2003) states, the administrators don't want to waste their energy with short-termed resistance since they think dealing with daily problems will not contribute to main goals of the school.

Contrary to this, there is a positive relation between short term focus and democratic and transformational leadership styles. Democratic and transformational leaders can be said to deal more with short-term problems arising from change. This can be interpreted as administrators try to understand short term results by observing change process. It can be asserted based on this inference that administrators behave this way at schools where democratic or transformational leadership is applied. Leadership styles of school administrators predict variance in short term focus at a low level.

There is not significant relation between cognitive rigidity dimension of resistance to change and leadership styles. It was also determined that leadership styles are not predictor of cognitive rigidity.

5. CONCLUSION

Research results generally show that there is a low relation between leadership behaviours of administrators and their resistance to change except from "cognitive rigidity". Regarding this, the differences in school administrators' behaviours about autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, transformational and transactional leadership are related at a low level with differences in behaviours about resistance to change. Besides, it is understood that resistance to change is also affected by factors other than leadership styles. This statement appears to be reasonable when change is considered to be a complex process with multi-factors. Negative relation between autocratic or laissez-faire leadership behaviours and resistance to change seems a striking result of the study. Consistent with this result, it is not also expected that democratic leadership style increases routine behaviours. However, the fact that autocratic and laissez-faire leadership of administrators reduce resistance to change does not mean that they support change. These behaviours may arise from pretending to adapt to the change because of their concerns about self protection. However, it can be understandable that democratic leadership causes increase in routine behaviours because change is thought to bring risks of damaging democratic atmosphere. It is stated in the literature that, no matter what the change is about, resistance to change is unavoidable due to uncertainties and loss of habits (Benfari, 1999; Hultman, 1998; Martincic, 2010; Nadina, 2011; Ussahawanitchakit, 2011).

Leadership styles of school administrators show a low relation with dimensions of resistance to change and leadership styles slightly (moderately) predict resistance to change according to regression analysis. Laissez-faire leadership is a significant predictor of routine seeking dimension and democratic and transactional leadership styles are of short term focus dimension. Leadership styles are not significant predictors of emotional reaction and cognitive rigidity dimensions of resistance to change.

REFERENCES

1. A.A. Agboola and R.O. Salawu. Managing deviant behaviour and resistance to change. *International Journal of Business and Management*. 6(1): 235-242 (2011).
2. G.R. Andersen. Conflicts during organizational change: destructive or constructive. *Nordic Psychology*. 58(3): 215-231 (2006).
3. R.C. Benfari. *Understanding and Changing Your Management Style*. Jossey-Bass Inc., California, 1999.
4. N. Bhatti, G.M. Maitlo, N. Shaikh, M.A. Hashmi and F.M. Shaikh. The impact of autocratic and democratic leadership style on job satisfaction. *International Business Research*. 5(2): 192-201 (2012).

5. I. Boga and N. Ensari. The role of transformational leadership and organizational change on perceived organizational success. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*. 12: 235-251 (2009).
6. P. Bordia, E. Hunt, N. Paulsen, D. Tourish and N. DiFonzo. Uncertainty during organizational change: Is it all about control? *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*. 13(3): 345-361 (2004).
7. W.H. Bovey and A. Hede. Resistance to organizational change: The role of defense mechanisms. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 16(7): 534-549 (2001).
8. S. Brookfield. Leading democratically. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*. 128: 5-13 (2010).
9. J. C. Bruckman. Overcoming resistance to change: Causal factors, interventions, and critical values. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*. 11: 211-219 (2008).
10. B. Burnes and R. Todnem. Leadership and change: The case for greater ethical clarity. *J Bus Ethics*. 108: 239-252 (2012).
11. V.R. Dijk and V.R. Dick. Navigating organizational change: Change leaders, employee resistance and work-based identities. *Journal of Change Management*. 9(2): 143-163 (2009).
12. I. Erdogan. *Egitimde Degisim Yonetimi*, 3. Baski. Pegem Akademi, Ankara, 2012.
13. E.D. Ferguson. What adierians consider important for communication and decision-making in the workplace: Mutual respect and democratic leadership style. *The journal of Individual Psychology*. 67(4): 432-437 (2011).
14. R.W. Griffin and G. Moorhead. *Organizational Behavior*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1986.
15. E.M. Honson. *Educational Administration and Organizational Behaviour*, 5th ed. Pearson Education, Boston, 2003.
16. K. Hultman. *Making Change Irresistible. Overcoming Resistance to Change in Your Organization*. Davies-Black Publishing, California, 1998.
17. D.I. Jung, C. Chow and A. Wu. The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypothese and some preliminary finding. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 14(4-5): 525-544 (2003).
18. D.N. Leblebici. 21. *yuzyilin liderlik anlayisina bakis*. C.U. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 32(1): 61-72 (2008).
19. R. Luecke. *Degisim ve Gecis Donemini Yonetmek*, Cev. U. Sensoy, Turkiye Is Bankasi Kultur Yayinlari, Istanbul 2009. [In Turkish]
20. F.C. Lunenburg. Forces for and resistance to organizational change. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*. 27(4): 1-10 (2010).
21. R. Martincic. Change management in adult educational organizations: A Slovenian case study. *Managing Global Transitions*. 8(1): 79-96 (2010).
22. S. Mittal. Managing employee resistance to change: A comparative study of Indian organizations and MNCs in Delhi-NCR region. *Journal of Arts, Science and Commerce*. 3(4): 64-71 (2012).
23. M. Mokhber, W. Ismail and A. Vakilbashi. The impact of transformational leadership on organizational innovation moderated by organizational culture. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*. 5(6): 504-508 (2011).
24. R.R. Nadina. Methods of identification of the need for organizational change as being opportune. *Annals of the University of Oradea. Economic Science Series*. 20(2): 707-712 (2011).
25. S. Nodeson, P. Beleya, G. Raman and C. Ramendran. Leadership role in handling employee's resistance: Implementation of innovation. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*. 4(1), 466-477 (2012).
26. S. Oreg. Resistance to change: Developing an individual differences measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 88: 680-693 (2003).
27. S. Oreg, M. Bayazit, M. Vakola, L. Arciniega, A. Armenakis, R. Barkauskiene, et al.. Dispositional resistance to change: Measurement equivalence and the link to personal values across 17 nations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 93: 935-944 (2008).
28. F. Ozmen and Y. Sonmez. Degisim surecinde egitim orgutlerinde degisim ajanlarinin rolleri. *Firat Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 17(2): 177-198 (2007). [In Turkish]
29. C. Peus, D. Frey, M. Gerkhardt, P. Fischer and E. Traut-Mattausch. Leading and managing organizational change initiatives. *Management Revue*. 20(2): 158-175 (2009).
30. S. Rehman, A. Shareef, A. Mahmood and A. Ishaque. Perceived leadership styles and organizational commitment. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*. 4(1): 616-626 (2012).
31. Z. Sabuncuoglu and M. Tuz. *Orgutsel Psikoloji*. Ezgi Yayinlari, Bursa, 1995. [In Turkish]
32. Z. Salman. A. Riaz. M. Saifullah and M. Rashid. Leadership styles and employee performance. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*. 3(6): 257-267 (2011).
33. M. Shanker and O.B. Sayeed. Role of transformational leaders as change agents: Leveraging effects on organizational climate. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*. 47(3): 470-484 (2012).
34. A. Tas, K. Celik and E. Tomul. Yenilenen ilkogretim programinin uygulandigi ilkogretim okullarındaki yoneticilerin liderlik tarzları. *Pamukkale Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*. 2(22): 85-98 (2007).
35. A. Tokat. *Orgutlerde Degisim ve Degisimin Yonetimi*. Seckin Yayıncılık, Ankara, 2012. [In Turkish]
36. K.E. Trader-Leigh. Identifying resistance in managing change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*. 15(2): 138-156 (2012).
37. P. Ussahawanitchakit. Building corporate innovation of information technology businesses in Thailand: Roles of employee creativity, organizational change and globalization force. *Journal of Academy of Business and Economics*. 11(1): 1-10 (2011).

38. C. Vasilescu. Change leadership for process improvement. *Management and Economics*. 3: 326-333 (2012).
39. M. Williams. *Test Your Management Skills*. Thorogood Limited, London, 1999.
40. S. Yolac. Yoneticinin algılanan liderlik tazi ile yoneticie duyulan guven arasindaki iliskide lider-uye etkilesiminin rolu. *Oneri*. 9(36): 63-72 (2011). [In Turkish]

Copyright of International Journal of Academic Research is the property of International Journal of Academic Research and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.