iojes
www.iojes.net
International Online Journal of Educational Sciences
ISSN: 1309-2707

Examining the Agile Leadership Characteristics of School Principals According to Teacher Perceptions

Research Article

Sebnem YAZICI[1], Kaya YILDIZ[2], Mustafa OZGENEL[3]

[1]*Fatih Sultan Mehmet Vakıf University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Istanbul, Turkey* 0000-0001-8816-287X
[2]*Abant Izzet Baysal University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Management, Bolu, Turkey* 0000-0002-5390-7525
[3]*Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Istanbul, Turkey* 0000-0002-7276-4865

To cite this article: Yazici, S., Yildiz, K., & Ozgenel, M. (2022). Examining the agile leadership characteristics of school principals according to teacher perceptions, *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *14*(2), 296-308.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 16.11.2021

Available online: 21.03.2022

ABSTRACT

There is a growing belief that principals should be agile leaders to demonstrate effective management in the face of challenging situations such as uncertainty and confusion. This study, which takes the research to determine the qualities of the agile leader one step further, the differences in the agile leadership characteristics of the school principals according to the gender, age, seniority, educational status, and school levels of the teachers were examined. The research was carried out according to the descriptive research design, 1067 volunteer teachers from all education levels participated in the research and the data were obtained through the "Marmara Agile Leadership Scale". According to the findings of the study, the agile leadership levels of school principals were found to be "very high". While the agile leadership characteristics of school principals perceived by teachers do not make a significant difference according to their gender and educational status; There was a significant difference according to their seniority, age, and school level. The findings of the research are discussed with theory and other research findings.

Keywords:
Agility, Agile Leadership, School Administrator

Introduction

The rapid change is affected education as it has reflected in all aspects of life, and is included education leaders in this challenging process. In today's world, when is dominated by global education policies, the understanding of competitive education has changed the roles and expectations of school leaders and is increased its importance within the mechanism of improving existing problems (OECD, 2020). School leaders, just like other organizational leaders, are faced with uncertain, unfamiliar situations. Organizations need to be agile to cope with changing conditions, face difficulties, manage complexity, and achieve the power to compete

[1] Corresponding author's address: Fatih Sultan Mehmet Vakıf University
Telephone: +905325426801
e-mail: sebnemyaz@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2022.02.002

with their environment (Joiner, 2019). In recent years, agile leaders who can manage the increasing complexity in schools and make quick and smart moves by directing their colleagues correctly are presented as a key concept for solving problems (Breakspear, 2017).

Today, agile leadership is seen as a leadership approach that can manage chaotic environments, crises and adapt to developments in the fields of science and technology. In the literature, the ability to be agile is described as a meta-competence (self-management skills; Self-knowledge, time management, effective communication, teamwork, stress management, decision-making-problem solving skills) that is sensitive to the people and events around it, detects opportunities and problems early, and employs learning and improvement mechanisms (Breakspear, 2017; Jonier and Josephs, 2007). Agile leadership, on the other hand, is defined as effective leadership behavior in the face of rapid change, uncertain and challenging situations (Joiner, 2009). Agile leadership was first tried to be explained by the theory of learning agility, in which the ability to adapt to new situations is based on experiential learning (Bedford, 2011; Burke, 2018; Connolly, 2001; Dai et al., 2013; De Meuse, 2019; De Meuse et al., 2012; De Rue et al., 2012; Dries et al., 2012; Eichinger and Lombardo, 2004; Hallenbeck et al., 2011; Gravett and Calwell, 2016; Laxson, 2018; Lombardo and Eichinger, 2000). Subsequently, agile leadership has been addressed independently of learning agility and its positive reflections on the organization have been revealed by various researches (Akkaya and Üstgörül, 2020; Cestou, 2020; Fitaloka et al., 2020; Gren and Lindman, 2020; Hollis, 2017; Joiner, 2019; Kostrad, 2019; Kustyadjı et al., 2021; Lediju, 2016; Saro, 2017; Uyun, 2019; Young, 2013). Jonier and Josephs (2007) were the researchers who conceptualized the agile leader and brought more clarity to the subject. The researchers conducted comprehensive research on the agile leader, and as a result, they determined that learning agility is only one aspect of the agile leader and how leaders improve their agility. Agile leaders tend to develop skills that will adapt to change by constantly learning (De Meuse et al., 2012; Eichinger and Lombardo, 2004; Horney et al., 2010; Laxson, 2018). Agile leaders with high self-awareness, who have discovered their strengths and weaknesses, constantly turn to feedback to develop and learn more (Douglas and Chandler, 2005; De Meuse et al., 2010; Gravett and Caldwell, 2016; McCauley et al., 2014; Yukl and Mahsud, 2010). In this way, agile leaders have the competence that reduces burnout while increasing their effectiveness within the organization, the strength and vision to lead groups or organizations after them (Parker et al., 2015). Although the reflections of the agile leader on educational organizations have only just begun to be questioned, their important effects have been revealed recently. For example, the agile school leader has been reported to significantly affect teachers' professional development, performance (Yalçın and Özgenel, 2021), organizational commitment (Özdemir, 2020), and school effectiveness (Çalışkan Yılmaz, 2021). Additionally, the positive effects of the agile leader have been revealed in studies that aimed at increasing the level of success in education (Foote, 2013; Taylor, 2017). Besides, although the effects of agile leaders on teacher and organizational outputs are being tried to be determined in the context of education in the literature, it is necessary to investigate and explain more the perceptions of teachers who are followers of the characteristics of agile leaders. It is thought that this research will serve to identify and further explain agile leaders in schools. The purpose of this research is to examine the agile leadership characteristics of school principals perceived by teachers according to various demographic variables of teachers. For this purpose, the answers to the following questions have been sought;

- *What is the level* of agile leadership characteristics of school principals according to teacher perceptions?
- Do the agile leadership characteristics of school principals differ significantly according to the *gender* of the teachers?
- Do the agile leadership characteristics of school principals differ significantly according to the *educational status* of teachers?
- Do the agile leadership characteristics of school principals differ significantly according to the *school levels* where teachers work?

- Do the agile leadership characteristics of school principals differ significantly according to the *seniority* of teachers?
- Do the agile leadership characteristics of school principals differ significantly according to the *age* of the teachers?

Method

The Model of the Research

The research is carried out according to the descriptive survey model, as it is aimed to determine whether the agile leadership characteristics of the school principals perceived by the teachers differ significantly according to the teachers' gender, educational status, age, seniority, and school levels. The descriptive survey model is a research model that aims to describe a situation as it is (Karasar, 2014) and to make inferences about the universe (Toker Gökçe, 2018).

The Population and the Sample

The population of the research consisted of 198,165 teachers working in public schools affiliated with the Istanbul Provincial Directorate of National Education in the 2020-2021 academic year (Ministry of National Education [MoNE], 2021). When the data were collected during the Covid-19 Pandemic period, the sample was determined by the easily accessible sampling method. An easily accessible sampling method is defined as *"selecting the sample from easily accessible and applicable units due to the limitations that exist in terms of time, money and labor"* (Büyüköztürk, 2012). It was calculated that the sample size of at least 663 teachers would be sufficient for the 99% confidence interval and 5% margin of error from the population consisting of 198.168 teachers (Surveysystem, 2021). 1067 teachers participated in the study voluntarily and it was decided that the study group was large enough to represent the universe. The demographic information of the teachers is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic information about of the participants

	Groups	**n**	**%**
Gender	Female	760	71,2
	Male	307	28,8
Level of Education	Graduate	911	85,4
	Undergraduate	156	14,6
Seniority	5 years and under	216	20,2
	6-10 years	285	26,7
	11-15 years	204	19,1
	16-20 years	167	15,7
	21 years and above	195	18,3
Age	30 years and under	263	24,6
	31-40 years	456	42,7
	41- 50 years	256	24,0
	51 years and above	92	8,6
School Level	Primary	458	42,9
	Secondary	262	24,6
	High School	347	32,5
Total		**1067**	**100.0**

According to Table 1, 71.2% (n=760) of the participating teachers were female and 28.8% (n=307) are male; It is seen that 85.4% (n=911) undergraduate and 14.6% (n=156) graduate graduates. Additionally, 42.9% (n=458) of the teachers work in primary school, 24.6% (n=262) in secondary school and 32.5% (n=347) in high schools.

Data Collection Tool

Marmara Agile Leadership Scale: The scale was developed by Özgenel and Yazıcı (2020). The scale consists of 34 items and 3 sub-dimensions. There are 12 items (1-12) in the dimension of situational awareness, 14 items (13-26) in the dimension of human relations, and 8 items (27-34) in the dimension of Self-awareness. There is no reverse-scored item on the scale. As the total score is obtained from the scale, interpretation and evaluation can be made on the sub-dimension arithmetic mean. The scale was graded as a 5-point Likert (Never=0, Rarely=1, Sometimes=2, Often=3, Always=4). The evaluation of the scale based on the arithmetic mean is carried out as "0.00-0.79= very low; 0.80-1.59= low; 1.60-2.39 = medium; 2.40-3.19 = high; 3.20-4.00= very high". In this study, it was determined that the confirmatory factor analysis compliance values of the scale were at an acceptable level (x^2/df =3.661; RMR=.021; GFI=.903; NFI=.930; CFI=.948; RMSEA=.050).

Analysis of the Data

Before analyzing the data, skewness, and kurtosis values were examined for the assumption of normality.

Table 2. The kurtosis, skewness and reliability values of the Marmara Agile Leadership Scale

	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach Alpha
Agile Leadership	-.347	-,423	,968
- Situational awareness	-,424	-,440	,941
-Human Relations	-,375	-,246	,932
-Self-Awareness	-,604	-,283	,924

When Table 2 was examined, it was seen that the skewness and kurtosis values of the data were within ±1 (Cokluk, Şekercioğlu and Büyüköztürk, 2012), the reliability coefficients were 70 and above, and it was decided that the data showed a normal distribution and was reliable. Since the data showed normal distribution, independent groups t-test and ANOVA test were performed from parametric tests. Besides, when a significant difference was detected in the ANOVA test and the variance of the groups was homogeneous, the Post Hoc Bonferroni test was used to determine between which groups the difference was. The Bonferroni test is used when the variances are equal and the sample size is not equal (Kayri, 2009).

Findings

Frequency (N), mean (M), standard deviation (SD) coefficients belonging to the agile leadership characteristics of school principals were calculated and given in Table 3.

Table 3. The Arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of the agile leadership characteristics of school principals

	n	*M*	*SD*	*Evaluation*
Agile Leadership	1067	3,161	,536	High
-Situational Awareness		3,174	,580	High
-Human Relations		3,039	,604	High
-Self-awareness		3,354	,548	High

When Table 3 is examined, school principals' agile leadership characteristics (M=3.161; SD=.536), situational awareness (M=3.174; SD=.580), human relations (M=3.039; SD=.604) and self-awareness (M=3.354; SD=.604) =,548) are seen to be at a "high" level.

The results of the t-test conducted to compare the agile leadership characteristics of school principals according to the gender of teachers are given in Table 4.

When Table 4 is examined, agile leadership characteristics of school principals do not show a significant difference according to the gender of teachers (p>.05).

Table 4. Comparison of school principals' agile leadership characteristics by gender of teachers

Variables	Groups	n	M	SD	t	df	p
Agile Leadership	Female	760	3,161	,527	,035	1065	,972
	Male	307	3,160	,558			
-Situational Awareness	Female	760	3,181	,570	,689	1065	,491
	Male	307	3,154	,604			
-Human Relations	Female	760	3,026	,603	-1,111	1065	,267
	Male	307	3,072	,608			
-Self- Awareness	Female	760	3,367	,535	1,193	1065	,233
	Male	307	3,322	,578			

The results of the t-test conducted to compare the agile leadership characteristics of school principals according to the educational status of teachers are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Comparison of the agile leadership characteristics of school principals according to the educational status of teachers

Variables	Groups	n	M	SD	t	df	p
Agile Leadership	Undergraduate	911	3,168	,530	1,021	1065	,308
	Graduate	156	3,120	,572			
-Situational Awareness	Undergraduate	911	3,181	,572	,954	1065	,340
	Graduate	156	3,133	,625			
-Human Relations	Undergraduate	911	3,045	,599	,807	1065	,420
	Graduate	156	3,003	,637			
-Self-awareness	Undergraduate	911	3,362	,545	1,171	1065	,242
	Graduate	156	3,306	,565			

When Table 5 is examined; agile leadership characteristics of school principals do not show a significant difference according to the educational status of teachers (p>.05).

The results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to compare the agile leadership characteristics of the school principals according to the school levels of the teachers are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Comparison of the agile leadership characteristics of school principals according to the school levels where teachers work

	Type of School	n	M	SD	F	p	Sig.
Agile leadership	A- Primary	458	3,199	,538	15,318	,000	A>C; B>C
	B-Secondary	262	3,259	,521			
	C-Highschool	347	3,036	,523			
	Total	1067	3,161	,536			
Situational awareness	A- Primary	458	3,230	,581	12,663	,000	A>C; B>C;
	B-Secondary	262	3,244	,580			
	C-Highschool	347	3,046	,560			
	Total	1067	3,174	,580			
Human Relations	A- Primary	458	3,064	,606	11,980	,000	A>C; B>C;
	B-Secondary	262	3,154	,577			
	C-Highschool	347	2,921	,604			
	Total	1067	3,039	,604			
Self-awareness	A- Primary	458	3,389	,549	16,789	,000	A>C; B>C;
	B-Secondary	262	3,466	,522			
	C-Highschool	347	3,223	,540			
	Total	1067	3,354	,548			

Agile leadership, situational awareness, human relations, and self-awareness characteristics of school principals show significant differences according to the school levels of the teachers (p<,05). According to the

Post Hoc Bonferonni test performed to determine between which groups there is a significant difference *(Levene's test p>.05);*

- Teachers who are working in primary (M=3,199; SD=,538; M=3,230; SD=,581; M=3,064; SD=,606; M=3,389; SD=,549) and secondary (M=3,259; SD=,521; M=3,244; SD=,580; M=3,154; SD=,577; M=3,466; SD=,522) shools have higher perceptions regarding school principals' features of agile leadership, situational awareness, human relations, and self awareness than teachers who are working in high schools (M=3,036; SD=,523; M=3,046; SD=,560; M=2,921; SD=,604; M=3,223; SD=,540).

The results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to compare the agile leadership characteristics of the school principals according to the seniority of the teachers are given in Table 7.

Table 7. Comparison of school principals' agile leadership characteristics according to teachers' seniority

	Seniority	n	M	SD	F	p	Sig.
Agile Lead.	A-5 years and under	216	3,300	,532	6,351	,000	A>B, C, D
	B-6-10 years	285	3,102	,551			
	C-11-15 years	204	3,137	,543			
	D-16-20 years	167	3,063	,519			
	E-21 years +	195	3,201	,494			
	Total	1067	3,162	,536			
Situational Awareness	A-5 years and under	216	3,302	,569	6,709	,000	A>B, D; E>B
	B-6-10 years	285	3,086	,598			
	C-11-15 years	204	3,195	,569			
	D-16-20 years	167	3,066	,583			
	E-21 years +	195	3,232	,540			
	Total	1067	3,174	,585			
Human Relations	A-5 years and under	216	3,195	,611	5,537	,000	A>B, C, D
	B-6-10 years	285	2,997	,614			
	C-11-15 years	204	2,988	,626			
	D-16-20 years	167	2,949	,583			
	E-21 years +	195	3,068	,547			
	Total	1067	3,039	,604			
Self-awareness	A-5 years and under	216	3,475	,536	4,617	,001	A>B, C, D
	B-6-10 years	285	3,321	,555			
	C-11-15 years	204	3,319	,564			
	D-16-20 years	167	3,258	,536			
	E-21 years +	195	3,386	,522			
	Total	1067	3,354	,548			

Agile leadership, human relations, situational awareness, and self-awareness characteristics of school principals differ significantly according to teacher perceptions (p<,05). According to the Post Hoc Bonfer Deci test performed to determine which groups had a significant difference (Levene's test p>.05);

- Agile leadership perceptions of teachers with a seniority of 5 years and under (M=3,300; SD=,532) are higher than teachers whose seniority is 6-10 years (M=3,102; SD=,551), 11-15 years (M=3,137; SD=, 543) and 16-20 years (M=3.063; SD=.519) (F=6,351; p<,05).
- Situational awareness perceptions of teachers whose seniority is 5 years and under (M=3,302; SD=,569) are higher than teachers whose seniority is 6-10 years (M=3,086; SD=,598), 16-20 years (M=3,066; SD=, 583) (F=6,709; p<,05). Situational awareness perceptions of teachers whose seniority is 21 years and above (M=3,232; SD=,540) are higher than teachers whose seniority is 6-10 (M=3,086; SD=,598)
- Human Relations perceptions of teachers with a seniority 5 years and under (M=3,195; SD=,611) are higher than teachers whose seniority is 6-10 years (M=2,997; SD=,614), 11-15 years (M=2,988; SD=,626), 16-20 years (M=2,949; SD=,583) (F=5,537; p<,05).

- Self-awareness perceptions of teachers whose seniority is 5 years and under (M=3,475; SD=,536), are higher than teachers whose seniority is 6-10 years (M=3,321; SD=,555), 16-20 years (M=3,258; SD=,536) (F=5,537; p<,05).

The results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to compare the agile leadership characteristics of school principals according to the ages of the teachers are given in Table 8.

Table 8. Comparison of the agile leadership characteristics of school principals according to the age of teachers

	Age	n	M	Sd	F	p	Sig.
Agile Lead.	A-30 years and under	263	3,242	,534	3,516	,015	A>B
	B-31-40 years	456	3,122	,546			
	C-41-50 years	256	3,126	,517			
	D-51 years +	92	3,217	,521			
	Total	1067	3,161	,536			
Situational Awareness	A-30 years and under	263	3,241	,582	2,680	,046	---
	B-31-40 years	456	3,142	,583			
	C-41-50 years	256	3,132	,570			
	D-51 years +	92	3,254	,573			
	Total	1067	3,174	,580			
Human Relations	A-30 years and under	263	3,143	,596	4,083	,007	A>B
	B-31-40 years	456	2,987	,628			
	C-41-50 years	256	3,010	,573			
	D-51 years +	92	3,083	,567			
	Total	1067	3,039	,604			
Self-awareness	A-30 years and under	263	3,417	,551	1,986	,114	---
	B-31-40 years	456	3,328	,546			
	C-41-50 years	256	3,320	,549			
	D-51 years +	92	3,395	,533			
	Total	1067	3,354	,548			

While the situational awareness and self-awareness characteristics of school principals did not differ significantly (p>.05); Agile leadership and human relations characteristics show significant differences according to the ages of the teachers (p<,05). According to the Post Hoc Bonfer Deci test performed to determine which groups had a significant difference (Levene's test p>.05); Agile leadership perceptions of teachers who are 30 years and under (M=3,242; SD=,534), are higher than teachers who are 31-40 years (M=3,122; SD=,546) (F=3,516; p<,05). Additionally, human relations perceptions of teachers who are 30 years and under (M=3,143; SD=,596), are higher than teachers who are 31-40 years (M=2,987; SD=,628) (F=4,083; p<,05).

Discussion and Conclusion

In the research, the agile leadership characteristics of the school principals were examined according to the gender, educational status, age, seniority, and school level of the teachers. According to the results obtained, it was determined that the agile leadership characteristics of school principals, situational awareness, human relations, and self-awareness features were at a "high" level. Similar to these findings of the research, Fielitz and Hug (2019) conducted a study on managers, and almost all managers accepted agile leadership as an important issue and described their organizations as agile. It is also possible to encounter similar findings in Valencia's (2013) research. Based on the findings, it is thought that school principals give importance to development and cooperation, adapting to changing educational conditions, managing complexity easily, according to teacher perceptions. It can be said that school principals are capable of analyzing the environment, discovering their competencies, establishing strong communication and problem-solving. It is thought that they lead teachers to a common effort to make the working environment at school most efficient,

and they also cause them to respond more strongly to uncertain situations. Another result obtained in the research is that agile leadership characteristics of school principals do not show a significant difference according to their genders according to teacher perceptions. Looking at the relevant literature, it is possible to come across results that overlap and do not overlap with the results of the research. Lombardo and Eichinger (2000) concluded in their research with managers that learning agility, which is an indicator of leadership potential, is not related to gender. Similar to these findings, it is possible to come across in the studies of De Meuse et al. (2011), Mitchinson and Morris (2012), and Yazıcı (2020). Unlike the research findings, it has been reported that female managers develop more agile leadership skills according to the gender variable of Akkaya and Üstgörül (2020). Furthermore, in Saro's (2017) research, it was determined that female managers were agile leaders and their agility levels were determined. According to the findings obtained from the research, it is thought that school principals are not affected by gender-related characteristics and have equal opportunities in coping with difficult situations created by complex, uncertain, and ambiguous situations.

Another result obtained from the research is that the agile leadership characteristics of school principals do not show a significant difference according to the educational status of the teachers. According to the results of Özdemir's (2020) research on teachers in Turkey and England, it was found that the agile leadership perceptions of undergraduate teachers in Turkey were higher than those of graduate education graduates, however, it was determined that the education levels of teachers working in England did not make a significant difference in their perception of agile leadership. It can be said that the educational status of the teachers participating in the research does not make a certain difference in their perspective and expectations towards the agile leader. The quality of the undergraduate and graduate education received by the teachers made us think that agile leadership characteristics were not at a distinctive level. Additionally, the definition of an agile leader and the way they behave, their differences are still being examined, and the fact that discussions about education remain at a limited level can be interpreted as that their reflection on teacher and administrator education is not yet at a sufficient level. Another important finding of the study is that school principals' agile leadership, situational awareness, human relations, and self-awareness characteristics show significant differences according to teacher perceptions. According to perceptions of teachers working in primary and secondary schools, agile leadership, situational awareness, human relations, and self-awareness characteristics of school principals are higher than the perceptions of teachers working in secondary schools. Agile leaders are aware of their leadership skills and what they can do and the aspects that need improvement (Valencia, 2013). One of the most important elements to increase their agility is learning and the ability to learn something new is a leadership characteristic (Mitchinson and Morris, 2012; Narel, 2017). In the literature, it has been determined that primary school principals are more willing to professional development (Barut, 2013; Gürkan and Toprakcı, 2018). Çalıskan Yılmaz (2021) tried to reveal the relationship between agile leaders and school effectiveness according to teacher perceptions and determined situational awareness, human relations, and self-awareness in favor of primary schools. Considering the research findings, it is thought that primary and secondary school principals exhibit more agile leadership characteristics, showing their willingness to learn, and they create more learning environments for their teachers. It can be said that school principals' learning through experience and effective communication enables them to analyze the problems they encounter and to make quick decisions by producing the right solutions (Baydar, 2022). Besides, primary and secondary school principals are thought to be more agile in terms of handling and managing complexity, guiding teachers correctly, and responding to change compared to school principals working in high schools.

According to another finding obtained from the research, school principals' agile leadership, human relations, situational awareness, and self-awareness characteristics show significant differences according to teacher perceptions. Agile leadership, situational awareness, human relations, and self-awareness perceptions of teachers with a seniority of 5 years or under are higher than teachers with seniority of 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years. Additionally, the situational awareness perceptions of teachers with a seniority of 21 years

and above are higher than the perceptions of teachers with a seniority of 6-10 years. Looking at the literature, it was found that in Getmez's (2018) study, teachers with a seniority of 1-5 years had a positive level of communication with school principals, and in Şentürk's (2006) study, they were more motivated by school principals. Unlike these findings, according to the TALİS 2018 report, school principals found it necessary to strengthen teachers' content knowledge, professional identity, colleague cooperation, and pedagogical competence, while supporting the teaching of teachers with less experience fell behind the OECD average (TEDMEM, 2019). Based on the research findings, teachers who have just started their profession think that solution-oriented school principals are effective in overcoming the difficulties of starting the profession and in solving the problems they encounter. It is thought that groups of teachers at different levels within the school are more flexible in identifying and solving their needs, by exhibiting multiple approaches. Additionally, the perceptions of the teacher group who are new to the profession can be interpreted as that school principals are aware of and manage the areas where they are sufficient and insufficient. Furthermore, another finding of the research is that the situational awareness dimensions of teachers with a seniority of 21 years and above are high. Unlike the research findings, Şahin et al. (2011) found that the awareness skills of the school principals of teachers with a seniority of 20 years or more are low. Teachers who have spent long periods in the profession are more likely to see different leadership styles and evaluate more the difference between bad and good. According to the research findings, teachers with more seniority saw school principals as agile in analyzing situations and producing fast and effective results, and it was thought that these aspects were more prominent. While the situational awareness and self-awareness characteristics of school principals did not differ significantly; Agile leadership and human relations characteristics show significant differences according to the ages of the teachers. Agile leadership and human relations perceptions of teachers are 30 and under are higher than teachers are 31-40 years. Unlike the research findings, Haring et al. (2016) and Özgenel and Yazıcı (2021) found that principals between the ages of 46-50 have higher learning agility and human relations than other age groups. Unlike the results of the research, the agile leadership characteristics of school principals did not make a significant difference in the study of Çalışkan Yılmaz (2021). Based on the findings, it can be said that according to the perceptions of teachers who are 30 and under, school principals use human relations the most while displaying their agile leadership skills. It is thought that school principals communicate effectively with young teachers, seek feedback with these teachers, and possibly provide more individual support. In addition, it can be said that by eliminating the worries of starting the profession, they inspire confidence and lead them to cooperation. In the research, the agile leadership characteristics of school principals were determined according to teacher perceptions. Different aspects of the agile leader and their relations with the variables can be determined by conducting other research in this area with school principals and higher-level education administrators.

REFERENCES

Akkaya, B. & Üstgörül, S. (2020). Leadership styles and female managers in perspective of agile leadership. Akkaya, B. (Ed.) *Agile business leadership methods for industry 4.0.* (pp. 121-137). Emerald.

Baydar, F. (2022). The relationship between participation in administrative decisions and school effectiveness: An empirical study on teachers. *International Journal of Psychology and Education Studies, 9*(2), 143-152.

Bedford, C. L. (2011). *The role of learning agility in workplace performance and career advancement.* Retrieved From the University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy.

Breakspear, S. (2017). Embracing agile leadership for learning-how leaders can create impact despite growing complexity [online]. *Australian Educational Leader, 39*(3), 68-71.

Barut, Y. (2013). *İlkokul ve ortaokullarda görev yapan öğretmenlerin algılarına göre kendi okul müdürlerinin öğrenen liderlik davranışları* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi, Gaziantep.

Burke, W. W. (2018). *A guide for learning about learning agility.* Technical Report.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2012). *Örnekleme yöntemleri.* http://w3.balikesir.edu.tr/~msackes/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/ 03/ BAY-Final-Konulari.pdf

Connolly, J. J. (2001). *Assessing the construct validity of a measure of learning agility* (Doctoral dissertation). Florida International University, Miami.

Cestou, J. (2020). *The role of gender expression in agile leadership* (Doctoral dissertation). Benedictine University.

Çalışkan Yılmaz, F. (2021). *Okul müdürlerinin çevik liderlik özellikleri ile okul etkiliği arasındaki ilişki* (Yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi.

Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G. & Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2012). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik: SPSS ve LİSREL uygulamaları.* Pegem.

Dai, G., De Meuse, K. P. & Tang, K. Y. (2013). The role of learning agility in executive career success: The results of two field studies. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 25*(2), 108-131.

De Meuse, K.P., Dai, G. & Hallenbeck, G. S. (2010). Learning agility: Construct whose time has come. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 62*(2), 119-30.

De Meuse, K. P., Dai, G., Eichinger, R. W., Page, R. C., Clark, L. P. & Zewdie, S. (2011, January). The development and validation of a self assessment of learning agility. In *Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, Chicago*, Illinois.

De Meuse, K.P., Dai, G. & Swisher, V. V. (2012). Leadership development: Exploring, clarifyıng, and expanding our understanding of learning agility. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *5,* 280-315.

De Meuse, K. P., Dai, G., Hallenbeck, G. S. & Tang, K. Y. (2012). *Global talent management: using learning agility to ıdentify high potentials around the World*. Korn Ferry Institute.

De Meuse, K. (2019). A meta-analysis of the relationship between learning agility and leader success. *Jurnal Organizational Psychology*, *19*(1), 25-34.

De Rue, S. D., Ashford, S. J. & Myers, C. G. (2012). Learning agility: Many questions, a few answers, and a path forward. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *5*(3), 316-322.

Douglas, T. & Chandler, D. (2005). Psychological success: When the career is calling. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, *26*, 155–176.

Dries, N., Vantilborgh, T. & Pepermans, R. (2012). The role of learning agility and career variety in the identification and development of high potential employees. *Personnel Review, 41*(3), 340-358.

Eichinger, R. W. & Lombardo, M. M. (2004). Learning agility is a prime indicator of potential. *Human Resource Planning*, *27*(4), 12-15.

Fielitz, A. & Hug, C. (2019). Agile leadership – An online-based advanced training program for leaders ıncluding personal (online) coaching sessions. *International Journal of Advanced Corporate Learning, 12*(2), 50-53.

Fitaloka, R., Sugarai, B., Perkasa, A. R. A. & Saputra, N. (2020). Leadership agility and digital quotient influence on employee engagement: Between PT X and Pinrumah.com. *The Winners, 21*(2), 113-117.

Foote, L. M. (2013). Honing crisis communication skills: Using ınteractive media and student-centered learning to develop agile leaders. *Journal of Management Education*, *37*(1), 79–114.

Getmez, D. (2018). *Okul müdürlerinin iletişim becerileri ile okul iklimi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi.

Gravett, L. S. & Caldwell, S. A. (2016). *Learning agility: The impact on recruitment and retention*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Gren, L. & Lindman, M. (2020, June). What an agile leader does: The group dynamics perspective. In *International Conference on Agile Software Development* (pp. 178-194). Springer.

Gürkan, H. & Toprakcı, E. (2018). İlkokul müdürlerinin mesleki gelişimi. *E-Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *9*(2), 64-81.

Hallenbeck, G., Swisher V. & Orr, J. E. (2011). *Seven faces of learning agility: Smarter ways to define, deploy, and develop high-potential talent*. Korn/ Ferry Institute.

Haring, S., Shankar, J. & Hofkes, K. (2016). *The potential of learning agility*. Retrieved from https://www.hfmtalentindex.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/The-Potential-of-Learning-Agility-Research-Paper.pdf

Hollis, E. (2017). *Flexible, adaptıve, and agile leaders: a qualitatıve case study of experıences in leadıng and development* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Phoenix.

Horney, N., Pasmore, B. & O'Shea, T. (2010). *Leadership Agility: A. Bussiness Imperative for a VUCA World.* http://agilityconsulting.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Leadership-Agility-in-a-VUCA-World-1-12-15.pdf

Joiner, B. (2009). Creating a culture of agile leaders: A developmental approach. *People and Strategy*, *32*(4), 28-35.

Joiner, B. (2019). Leadership agility for organizational agility. *Journal of Creating Value*, *5*(2), 139–149.

Jonier, B. & Josephs, S. (2007). *Leadership agility*. Jossey- Bass.

Karasar, N. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Nobel.

Kayri, M. (2009). Araştirmalarda gruplar arasi farkin belirlenmesine yönelik çoklu karşilaştirma (post-hoc) teknikleri. *Journal of Social Science*, *19*(1), 51-64.

Kostrad, D, A. (2019). The role of leadership agility and organizational commitment toward organizational readiness for changes in Public Islamic Universities of Central Java in conditions of VUCA era. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*, *91*(7), 206-211.

Kustyadjı, G., Wındıjarto, W. & Wıjayanı, A. (2021). Ambidexterity and Leadership Agility in Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME)'s Performance: An Empirical Study in Indonesia. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, *8*(7), 303-311.

Lediju, T. (2016). *Leadership agility in the public sector: understanding the impact of public sector managers on the organizational commitment and performance of millennial employees* (Doctoral dissertation). Saybrook University

Laxson, E. N. (2018). *Within and between person effects of learning agility: A longitudinal examination of how learning agility impacts future career success* (Doctoral dissertation). Colorado State University.

Lombardo, M. M. & Eichinger, R. W. (2000). High potentials as high learners. *Human Resource Management, 39,* 321-330.

McCauley, C. D., DeRue, D. S., Yost, P. R. & Taylor, S. (2014). *Experience-driven leader development*. Wiley.

Ministry of National Education [MoNE] (2021). https://istanbul.meb.gov.tr/ adresinden 24.04.2021 tarihinde edinilmiştir.

Mitchinson, A. & Morris, R. (2012). *Learning about learning agility*. Center for Creative Leadership.

Narel, R. L. (2017). *Agility, learning and thriving in teams: A mixed-methods study of an organization development methodology for environments of continual change* (Doctoral dissertation). Benedictine University, Illinois

OECD. (2020). *TALIS 2018 results (Volume II) teachers and school leaders as valued professionals.* OECD Publishing.

Özdemir, A. N. (2020). *Okul yöneticilerinin çevik liderlik özelliklerinin örgütsel bağlılığa etkisi: İngiltere ve Türkiye okullarında karşılaştırmalı bir analiz* (Doktora tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Özgenel, M. & Yazıcı, Ş. (2020). Marmara çevik liderlik ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi, geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Anadolu 4. Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi,* 25-26 Temmuz 2020, Diyarbakır, Türkiye.

Özgenel, M. & Yazici, S. (2021). Learning agility of school administrators: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Progressive Education, 17*(1), 247-261.

Parker, D. V., Holesgrove, M. & Pathak, R. (2015). Improving productivity with self-organized teams and agile leadership. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 64*(1), 112-128.

Saro, S. N. (2017). *The leadership agility of women NGO executive directors in Cambodia* (Doctoral dissertation). University of La Verne.

Surveysystem (2021). *Sample size calculator.* https://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm adresinden 24.04.2021 tarihinde edinilmiştir.

Şahin, İ., Beycioğlu, K. & Fırat, N. (2011). Öğretmen görüşlerine göre çeşitli yönetim becerilerinin okul müdürleri için önem dereceleri. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (30), 58-75.

Şentürk, R. (2006). *İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin öğretmenleri motive etmede kullandıkları yöntemler ve davranışlara ilişkin öğretmen algıları* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Trakya Üniversitesi, Edirne.

Taylor, A. (2017). *An examinatıon of the relationships between agile leadership factors and curriculum reform in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Capella University, Minneapolis.

TEDMEM. (2019). *TALIS 2018 sonuçları ve Türkiye üzerine değerlendirmeler*. Türk Eğitim Derneği Yayınları.

Toker Gökçe, A. (2018). Tarama araştırma yöntemi. K. Beycioğlu, N. Özer ve Y. Kondakçı (Ed), *Eğitim yönetiminde araştırma* içinde (s. 239-268). Pegem.

Uyun, Q. (2019). Leadership agility, the influence on the organizational learning and organizational innovation and how to reduce imitation orientation. *International Journal for Quality Research*, *13*(2), 467.

Valencia, E. (2013). *Three key leadership arenas in leadership agility: A study of Head Start leaders in the State of California* (Doctoral dissertation). University of la Verne.

Yalçın, E. & Özgenel, M. (2021). The effect of agile leadership on teachers' professional development and performance. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, 5*(2), 1-15.

Yazıcı, Ş. (2020). *Öğretmenlerin öğrenme çevikliği, değişime hazır olma durumları ve performansları arasındaki ilişkiler örüntüsü* (Doktora tezi). İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Young, A. G. (2013). *Identifying the impact of leadership practices on organizational agility* (Master Thesis). Pepperdine University, California.

Yukl, G. & Mahsud, R. (2010). Why flexible and adaptive leadership is essential. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 62*(2), 81–93.