

## **The Effects of Strategic Leadership Behaviors of School Managers on Crises Management**

Esra Töre, Adem Çilek

<sup>1</sup> Assist.Prof.Dr. İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, esra.tore@izu.edu.tr.

<sup>1</sup> Assist.Prof.Dr. Çankırı Karatekin University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, aacilek@gmail.com.

### **Abstract**

This study aims to examine the effect of strategic leadership behaviors of school managers on crises management. In the study, the relational screening model, one of the quantitative research methods, was used. The study sample consists of 401 teachers; Strategic Leadership Scale and Crises Management Scale were used to collect data. The data were tested using Pearson moments multiplication correlation coefficient, regression, T-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). As a result of the research, school managers' strategic leadership level is high, and crises management level is medium. In addition, it was found that strategic leadership behaviors levels of school managers vary significantly according to the settlement where the school is located and the frequency of encountering crises at school. Crises management vary significantly according to the frequency of encountering crisis at school but do not vary significantly according to the settlement where the school is located. A highly positive and significant relationship was found between the strategic leadership behavior and sub-dimensions of school principals and crisis management and its sub-dimensions. Strategic leadership behaviors of school managers have a positive effect on crises management and its sub-dimensions.

**Keywords:** *Strategic leadership behaviors, crises management, school manager*

### **Introduction**

In the new world order, where competition is the determinant of the future, the most dangerous possibility for organizations, regardless of which sector they are in, is a "crisis". Crises refer to chaotic situations that may occur in the lives of organizations and societies and cause confusion (Stephens & Malone, 2010; Schultz et al., 2011). It is crucial and imperative for schools to be better prepared for the unexpected as many schools have repeatedly demonstrated vulnerability to crisis (Lonigan et al., Coombs, 2007; 2003; Liou, 2015). Crisis management, against possible crises, by analyzing all situations that may cause a crisis, to take measures against the crisis in the organization with rational decisions and a systematic structure, within the framework of previous plans, and to work out the necessary activities for the organization to overcome the crisis in the most undamaged way during and after the crisis. It is the whole of efforts to carry out (Pheng & David, 1999; Coombs, 2007). Crisis management includes pre-crisis strategy determination, process preparation, increases prevention, responding and managing to the crisis during the crisis, and learn from crisis after crisis (Gainey, 2010). In the pre-crisis period, the management should perceive the crisis indicators and

include taking measures to prevent a crisis. That is the stage where possible crises are foreseen and necessary precautions are taken. During the crisis, the current process is tried to be overcome with the least damage. After the crisis, the leader prepares the structure that adapts to the changes and creates solutions suitable for the necessary activities and strategies (Bayazıt et al., 2003; Fener & Çevik, 2015).

Leadership can be defined as realizing the goals of an organization or initiating a new structure and procedure to change these goals (Erdoğan, 2010). Leadership shapes the organization in its current conditions and carries its position to the highest level. However, strategic leadership is to shape the organization by foreseeing the future, creating the necessary management understanding for this, and empowering other managers and employees in this direction. To direct them to be innovative and creative goals in line with the organization's goal is to provide rapid change when necessary in a competitive environment (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). In a crisis, 'leaders serve as a repository for people's fears. Leaders can also act as a mirror reflecting a group's anger, grief, resolve, or joy on a much larger stage than is available to most. Leaders say in effect "I hear you" '. It is essential to review and develop the school crisis management plan (Sapriel, 2003). The school leader is the first person responsible for planning, giving crisis, directing, and controlling activities in the crisis management process (Dewey et al., 1998).

A strategic leader is a leader who has strategic thinking and strategic planning. In strategic thinking, which is one of the characteristics of the strategic leader, the degree of importance and long-term return are the two essential elements. By importance is meant to be able to choose between very important, essential, and less important. In long-term returns, it is important to see the gains that can be obtained in the long-term instead of the short-term gains and to show their preference in this direction. The leader should also do the strategic planning well. Being practical and wise means doing the right thing at the right time. (Aldair, 2005; Küçük et al., 2021).

For this reason, it is thought that strategic leadership behavior will be effective in the crisis management process. Strategic leadership is a critical component in the effective development of schools. The debates in education today focus on how to achieve strategic sustainability rather than how to make short-term improvements (Davies & Davies, 2006).

The strategic leader focuses and develops the organization's human, structural and social capital and capabilities in meeting opportunities and threats. In this framework, strategic leadership provides a roadmap and vision that develops and renews the organization by giving meaning to environmental chaos and uncertainty (Boal, 2007). Crisis management is a process that includes the activities of predicting the crisis within the organization, being ready, determining its priorities, preventing, learning, planning, creating and implementing improvement tools, and trying to return the organization to its normal state as soon as possible (Lee et al., 2007; Çalışkan, 2020).

In Pisapia's strategic leadership model, which is the theoretical basis of this research; Pisapia, strategic leadership Transformational, Managerial, Ethical, Political, and Communicative Practices explains in 5 sub-dimensions (Pisapia, 2006). Strategic leaders think more broadly and perform effectively in many tasks in times of crisis (Boin et al., 2013). Wooten and James (2008) found those leadership competencies during each phase of a crisis building organizational capabilities through crisis management activities. There is a positive impact of the core leadership competencies on the

effectiveness of crisis management (Kapucu & Ustun,2018). Al Remeithi (2010) found that leaders have an essential responsibility in terms of eliminating crises. Leaders should know what implement and avoid indicate areas of crisis management. There is a significant effect of strategic leadership practices on the stages of crisis management (Al Thani & Obeidat, 2020).

Researchers found that a significant positive relationship between strategic leadership and organizational growth (Mutia, 2015), organizational practices and performance (Kitonga, 2017; Düzgün & Ataman, 2020), improvement of quality of educational service (Alayoubi, 2020), organizational learning (Aydm, 2012), organizational health (Aksulu & Köse, 2018), organizational change management (Çoban, 2016), organizational agility (Çetinkaya&Akkoca, 2020), job satisfaction (Azbari et al., 2015), crises preparedness (Wilson et al., 2011).

### **Method**

#### **Purpose of the Study**

The primary purpose of this study is to examine the effect of strategic leadership behaviors of school managers on crises management. In the research, the answers to the following questions were sought following the general purpose:

1. What is the strategic leadership behavior and the crises management level of school managers?
2. Do school managers' strategic leadership behaviors level vary significantly according to the school's settlement, frequency of encountering a crisis situation at school?
3. Do school managers' crises management levels vary significantly according to the school's settlement, frequency of encountering a crisis situation at school?
4. Is there a significant relationship between strategic leadership behaviors and crises management of school managers?
5. What is the effect of school managers' strategic leadership behaviors on crisis management and sub-dimensions?

#### **Research Model**

This research was conducted as a relational survey model. According to Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2006), relational research involves the relationships between two or more variables and the existence or degree of co-variation of these variables. The screening method is generally used in descriptive studies. In the screening method, the situations of the individuals in the sample group are tried to be described (Karakaya, 2009).

#### **Study Group**

The sample of the study consists of 401 teachers selected by stratified purposeful sampling. The stratified purposeful sampling method was preferred in order to show and describe the characteristics of certain subgroups and to allow comparisons between them (Büyüköztürk et al., 2017). Information on the demographic characteristics of the teachers who make up the sample is given in Table 1. As

shown in Table 1, 55.1% of the participants were female; the majority were between 36-45 years old, 47.9%; 61.3% of them have a bachelor's degree, 29.5% of their work in primary school (Table 1).

Table 1

*Information on Demographic Characteristics of Teachers in the Sample Group*

Baseline characteristic	Group	n	%
Gender	Female	221	55,1
	Male	180	44,9
Marital Status	Married	320	79,8
	Single	81	20,2
Age	25 years and under	2	,5
	26 - 35 years old	85	21,2
	36 - 45 years old	192	47,9
	46 - 55 years old	106	26,4
	55 years and above	16	4,0
Level of Education	Associate Degree	5	1,2
	Bachelor's degree	243	61,3
	Master and PhD	150	37,4
Profession	Teacher	254	63,3
	Manager	147	36,7
School Type	Kindergarten	38	9,5
	Primary School	119	29,5
	Secondary School	65	16,2
	High School	119	29,7
	Special Education	33	8,2
	Other	27	6,7
Receiving Crisis Management Training	Yes	119	29,7
	No	282	70,3
The Geographic Region Work in	Marmara	90	22,4
	Ege	47	11,7
	Akdeniz	37	9,2
	İç Anadolu	56	14,0
	Doğu Anadolu	25	6,2
	Güneydoğu Anadolu	36	9,0
	Karadeniz	110	27,4
Location of the School	Village	23	5,7
	District	159	39,7
	City or Central District	129	32,2

## The Effects of Strategic Leadership Behaviors of School Managers on Crises Management

	Metropolis	90	22,4
Number of students in the School	500 and under	227	56,6
	501-1000	108	26,9
	1001-1500	41	10,2
	1501-2000	25	6,2
Number of the Teacher in the School	30 and under	186	46,4
	31-60	137	34,2
	61-90	59	14,7
	91 and above	19	4,7
Frequency of Crisis Situation at School	Never	54	13,5
	Rarely	204	50,9
	Sometimes	115	28,7
	Often	28	7,0

### Data Collection Tools

The data in the study were collected by using the "Personal Information Form" created by the researchers, "Strategic Leadership Scale" and "Crises Management Scale". Strategic Leadership Scale was created by Aydın (2012) to measure the level of strategic leadership behavior of school managers. The scale consists of 35 items and five sub-dimensions as Scale Transformational Applications (2, 13, 15, 18, 21, 23, 29 items), Administrative Practices (5, 8, 14, 24, 28 items), Ethical Practices (3, 6, 10, 11, 17, 22, 32 items), Political Practices (4, 12, 16, 20, 26, 27, 31 items) and Communicative Applications (1, 7, 9, 19, 25, 30, 33, 34, 35 items). In the original form of the scale, the reliability coefficient was calculated as 0.92 (Cronbach alpha) by Aydın (2012). In the study, the reliability coefficient was calculated as .97 (Cronbach alpha). The items in the Strategic Leadership Scale, which is in the five-point Likert type, were written as "(1) Never", "(2) Rarely", "(3) Occasionally", "(4) Usually" and (5) "Always" grouped.

The other scale used in the study is the Crises Management Scale developed by Çalışkan (2005). The scale consists of 3 sub-dimensions as "Pre-Crisis Activities", "Activities During Crisis," and "Post-Crisis Activities". The first nine items constitute the first dimension, the following ten statements constitute the second dimension, and the last four statements constitute the third dimension. Answers in the scale were taken with a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree). Reliability analysis was found to be 0.97. In this study, the reliability analysis result of the scale was found to be .98

Based on the assumption that the scales used in the study are equally spaced, the score range coefficient for arithmetic averages was found to be 0.80.  $\text{Score Range} = (\text{Highest Value} - \text{Lowest Value}) / 5 = 4/5 = 0.80$ . Accordingly, the evaluation range of arithmetic means is as follows: 1.00-1.80 is "very low", 1.81-2.60 is "low", 2.61-3.40 is "medium", 3.41-4.20 is "high", 4.21-5.00 is "very high" (Gömleksiz & Bulut, 2006; Tanuğur et al., 2013).

### Data Collection and Analysis Process

The data collection form was applied online to the teachers and managers designated as a sample in the 2020-22021 Academic Year, after the permissions obtained from the Ethic Communion. In order to determine the analyzes to be used in the study, a normality test was conducted. Table 2 shows the normality test results of the scales.

Table 2

*Normality Test Results Strategic Leadership and Crises Management Scales and Its Sub-Dimensions*

	n	Kurtosis	Skewness	p
Strategic Leadership (Total)	401	-0,323	-0,828	0,01**
Transformational Applications	401	-0,661	-0,758	0,00**
Administrative Practices	401	0,999	-0,640	0,00**
Ethical Practices	401	-0,385	-0,907	0,00**
Political Practices	401	-0,116	-0,610	0,00**
Communicative Applications	401	-0,414	-0,819	0,00**
Crises Management (Total)	401	-0,954	-0,262	0,00**
Pre-Crisis Activities	401	-0,935	-0,234	0,00**
Activities During Crisis	401	-0,975	-0,289	0,00**
Post-Crisis Activities	401	-0,930	-0,273	0,00**

When the related literature is examined, it was concluded that the kurtosis and skewness values between -2.0 and +2.0 (George & Mallery, 2010), -1.5, and +1.5 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) are accepted as a normal distribution. Percentage and frequency analyses were used to analyze the data, the levels of the teachers were determined according to the results of the scale by using the arithmetic mean and standard deviation. Parametric tests (T-test, ANOVA. Correlation Analysis, and Regression Analysis) were used in the analysis of the study, as it was observed that the skewness and kurtosis values in organizational identification and emotional labor scales were examined to have a normal distribution.

### Findings

It was found that school managers' strategic leadership level is high ( $\bar{x}=3,74$ ) and crises management level is medium ( $\bar{x}=3,23$ ) (Table 3).

Table 3

*Strategic Leadership and Crises Management Levels of School Managers*

	n	M	SD	Level
Strategic Leadership(Total)	401	3,74	0,956	High
Transformational Applications	401	3,69	1,24	High
Administrative Practices	401	3,68	0,65	High
Ethical Practices	401	3,90	1,16	High
Political Practices	401	3,54	0,92	High
Communicative Applications	401	3,82	1,10	High

## The Effects of Strategic Leadership Behaviors of School Managers on Crises Management

Crises Management(Total)	401	3,23	1,17	Medium
Pre-Crisis Activities	401	3,23	1,14	Medium
Activities During Crisis	401	3,21	1,23	Medium
Post-Crisis Activities	401	3,25	1,23	Medium

As seen in Table 4, the management practices of school managers differ significantly according to the settlement where the school is located. It was found that the average score of the school managers working in the city or the central district in the management practices sub-dimension ( $\bar{x} = 3.77$ ) was higher than the average score of the school principals working in the district ( $\bar{x} = 3.55$ ) (Table 4).

Table 4

### *School Managers' Administrative Practices Regarding the Settlement Where the School is Located*

	Group	n	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Var. K.	Sum of Square	DF	KO	F	p	Dif f.
Administrative Practices	1. Village	23	3,86	0,80	G.Bet.	123,30	3	41,1	3,90	,009*	2<
	2.District	159	3,55	0,67	G.With.	4181,4	397	10,5		*	3
	3.City or Central District	129	3,77	0,64	Total	4304,7	400				
	4. Metropolis	90	3,74	0,55							

\*\*p< 0.01

The transformational practices of school principals show a significant difference according to the frequency of encountering a crisis at school. The mean score of the transformational practices sub-dimension ( $\bar{x} = 3.99$ ) of school principals who have never faced a crisis is higher than the mean score of school principals who have encountered crises frequently ( $\bar{x} = 2.81$ ) (Table 5).

Table 5

### *School Managers' Transformational Applications Regarding the Frequency of Crisis Situation at School*

	Group	n	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Var. K.	Sum of Square	DF	MS	F	Diff.	
Transformational Applications	Never	54	3,99	1,08	G.Betw.	1458,4	3	486,	6,70	,000*	4<
	Rarely	204	3,79	1,14	G.Withi	28792	397	1			1
	Sometimes	115	3,60	1,32	Total	30250	400	72,5			
	Often	28	2,81	1,47							

\*\*p<0.01

Ethical practices of school principals differ significantly according to the frequency of encountering crisis at school ( $F(8,35)$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). School principals who have never faced crisis ( $\bar{x} = 4.17$ ), rarely ( $\bar{x} = 4.02$ ), and occasionally ( $\bar{x} = 3.79$ ) school principals have higher ethical practices sub-dimension scores than school principals who have frequently encountered crises situations (Table 6).

Table 6

*School Managers' Ethical Practices Regarding the Frequency of Crisis Situation at School*

	Group	n	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Var. K.	Sum of Square	DF	M S	F	p	Diff.
Ethical Practices	<b>1. Never</b>	54	4,17	1,08	G.Betw.	1588,3	3	529,	8,35	,000*	4<1
	<b>2. Rarely</b>	204	4,02	1,00	G.Withi	25166	397	4			4<2
	<b>3. Sometimes</b>	115	3,79	1,29	Total	26754	400	63,3			4<3
	<b>4. Often</b>	28	2,97	1,41							

\*\* $p < 0.01$

School managers' communication practices differ significantly according to the frequency of encountering a crisis at school ( $F(6,17)$ ;  $p = 0.00 < 0.05$ ). School managers who have never encountered a crisis at school ( $\bar{x} = 4.07$ ) and rarely encountered a crisis ( $\bar{x} = 4.17$ ) have a higher mean of communication practices than school managers who frequently encounter crises ( $\bar{x} = 3.05$ ) (Table 7).

Table 7

*School Managers' Communicative Applications Regarding the Frequency of Crisis Situation at School*

	Group	n	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Var. K.	Sum of Square	DF	M S	F	p	Dif f.
Communicative Applications	1. Never	54	4,07	1,03	G.Betw.	1821,6	3	607	6,17	,000*	4<
	2. Rarely	204	3,91	1,00	G.Withi	16481	397	98,3			1
	3. Sometimes	115	3,75	1,21	n	16706	400				4<
	4. Often	28	3,05	1,36	Total						2

\*\* $p < 0.01$

School principals' total strategic leadership means scores differ significantly according to the frequency of encountering a crisis at school ( $F(5,63)$ ;  $p = 0.01 < 0.05$ ). It was found that the strategic leadership total score averages of school principals who had never encountered a crisis at school ( $\bar{x} =$

## The Effects of Strategic Leadership Behaviors of School Managers on Crises Management

3.94) and who had rarely encountered a crisis ( $\bar{x} = 3.80$ ) were higher than those who frequently faced crises ( $\bar{x} = 3.05$ ) (Table 8).

Table 8

*School Managers' Communicative Applications Regarding the Frequency of Crisis Situation at School*

	Group	n	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Var. K.	Sum of Square	DF	M S	F	p	Dif f.
Strategic Leadership Total	1. Never	54	3,94	0,85	G.Betw.	18319	3	610	5,63	,001*	4<
	2. Rarely	204	3,80	0,86	G.Withi	43034	397	6			1
	3. Sometimes	115	3,68	1,07	Total	9	400	108			4<
	4. Often	28	3,10	1,07		44866		4			2
						9					

\*\*p< 0.01

The pre-crisis sub-dimension score of school principals differs significantly according to the frequency of having a crisis at school (F 5.44); p = 0.01 <0.05). Never encountered a crisis at school ( $\bar{x} = 3,55$ ); It was found that the mean score of school principals who rarely encountered a crisis ( $\bar{x} = 3.28$ ) and sometimes encountered a crisis ( $\bar{x} = 3.18$ ) was higher than those who frequently encountered crises ( $\bar{x} = 2.55$ ). (Table 9).

Table 9

*School Managers' Pre-Crisis Activities Regarding the Frequency of Crisis Situation at School*

	Group	n	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Var. K.	Sum of Square	DF	M S	F	p	Dif f.
Pre-Crisis Activities	1. Never	54	3,55	1,08	G.Betw.	1690	3	563	5,44	,001*	4<
	2. Rarely	204	3,28	1,10	G.Withi	41080	397	103			1
	3. Sometimes	115	3,18	1,16	Total	42770	400				4<
	4. Often	28	2,55	1,23							2

\*\*p< 0.01

The crisis management of school principals differs significantly according to the sub-dimension score of the crisis and the frequency of having a crisis at school (F 5.07); p = 0.02 <0.05). It was found that the mean scores of school principals who had never encountered a crisis at school ( $\bar{x} = 3.58$ ) and rarely encountered a crisis ( $\bar{x} = 3.26$ ) were higher ( $\bar{x} = 2.51$ ) than school principals who were frequently faced with crises. (Table 10).

Table 10

*School Managers' Activities During Crisis Regarding the Frequency of Crisis Situation at School*

	Group	n	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Var. K.	Sum of Square	DF	M S	F	p	Dif f.
Activities During Crisis	1. Never	54	3,58	1,18	G.Betw.	2264	3	754	5,07	,002*	4<
	2. Rarely	204	3,26	1,18	G.Withi	59024	397	148			1
	3. Sometimes	115	3,12	1,25	Total	61289	400				4<
	4. Often	28	2,51	1,40							2

\*\*p < 0.01

School principals' crisis management differs significantly according to the post-crisis sub-dimension score and the frequency of having a crisis at school (F 3.28); p = 0.021 < 0.05). It was found that the mean score of school principals who had never encountered a crisis at school ( $\bar{x}$  = 3.53) and rarely encountered a crisis ( $\bar{x}$  = 3.30) was higher than that of school principals who frequently faced crises ( $\bar{x}$  = 2.66). (Table 11).

Table 11

*School Managers' Post-Crisis Activities Regarding the Frequency of Crisis Situation at School*

	Group	n	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Var. K.	Sum of Square	DF	M S	F	p	Dif f.
Post-Crisis Activities	1. Never	54	3,53	1,18	G.Betw.	237,2	3	79,0	3,28	,021*	4<
	2. Rarely	204	3,30	1,18	G.Withi	9572	397	24,1			1
	3. Sometimes	115	3,2	1,26	n	9809	400				4<
	4. Often	28	2,66	1,45	Total						2

\*\*p < 0.01

School principals' total score on crisis management differs significantly according to the frequency of crisis at school (F 5,12); p = 0.002 < 0.05). The average score of the school principals who have never faced a crisis at school ( $\bar{x}$  = 3,56) is compared to the average score of the school principals who sometimes encountered a crisis ( $\bar{x}$  = 3,16). It was found that the mean score of school principals who rarely encountered a crisis ( $\bar{x}$  = 3,27) was higher than the mean score of school principals who were frequently faced with crises. (Table 12).

Table 12

*School Managers' Post-Crisis Activities Regarding the Frequency of Crisis Situation at School*

	Group	n	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Var. K.	Sum of Square	DF	M S	F	p	Dif f.
a n a	1. Never	54	3,56	1,11	G.Betw.	10809	3	360	5,12	,002*	3<

## The Effects of Strategic Leadership Behaviors of School Managers on Crises Management

2. Rarely	204	3,27	1,11	G.Within	27939	397	3	1
3. Sometimes	115	3,16	1,19	n	2	400	703	4<
4. Often	28	2,54	1,31	Total	29020	1		2

\*\*p< 0.01

A highly positive and significant relationship was found between the strategic leadership behavior and sub-dimensions of school principals and crisis management and its sub-dimensions ( $p<0.01$ ) (Table 13).

Table 13

### *School Managers' Post-Crisis Activities Regarding the Frequency of Crisis Situation at School*

		Transformational Applications	Administrative Practices	Ethical Practices	Political Practices	Communicative Applications	Strategic Leadership (Total)
Pre-Crisis Activities	R	0,760**	0,295**	0,735**	0,674**	0,762**	0,766**
	P	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
During Crisis	R	0,746**	0,301**	0,722**	0,664**	0,741**	0,751**
	P	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
Post-Crisis Activities	R	0,736**	0,289**	0,720**	0,651**	0,739**	0,744**
	P	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
Crises Management (Total)	R	0,770**	0,305**	0,746**	0,684**	0,769**	0,776**
	P	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000

\*\*p< 0.01

The regression analysis results examining the effect of the strategic leadership behaviors of school principals on crisis management are given in Table 14. Strategic leadership behaviors of school managers positively affect the total score of crisis management, explains 60% ( $\beta = .77$ ;  $p<0.01$ ); affect to the pre-crisis situation positively and explains 58% ( $\beta = .76$ ;  $p<0.01$ ); affect to during crisis activities positively and explain 56% ( $\beta = .75$ ;  $p<0.01$ ); affect to the post-crisis activity positively and explains it at a rate of 55% ( $\beta = .74$ ;  $p<0.01$ ).

Table 14

### *Regression Analysis for the Effect of Strategic Leadership on Crises Management and Its Sub-Dimensions*

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	$\beta$	T	P	F	Model (p)	$R^2$
--------------------	----------------------	---------	---	---	---	-----------	-------

Crises Management	Constant		-2,14	,03	603,9	,00**	,60
	Strategic Leadership	,77	24,57	,00			
Pre-Crisis Activities	Constant		-1,35	,17	565,3	,00**	,58
	Strategic Leadership	,76	23,77	,00			
Activities During Crisis	Constant		-1,65	,01	517,1	,00**	,56
	Strategic Leadership	,75	22,74	,00			
Post-Crisis Activities	Constant		-2,05	,04	494,7	,00**	,55
	Strategic Leadership	0,74	22,24	,00			

\*\*p< 0.01

The results of the regression analysis, in which the effect of the strategic leadership behavior sub-dimensions of school principals on crisis management was examined, are given in Table 15. As sub-dimensions of strategic leadership behavior, transformational practices (b= ,33; p<0.01); communicative practices (b= ,34; p<0.01) affect crisis management positively and explains it by 60%. As sub-dimension of strategic leadership, transformational implements behavior (b= ,31; p<0.01); communicative practices (b= ,40; p<0.01) positively affect pre-crisis activity and explains it at a rate of 59%. As a sub-dimension of strategic leadership behavior, transformational practices (b=,35; p<0.01) positively affect the crisis activity and explain it 57%. As a sub-dimension of strategic leadership behavior, communicative practices (b=,34; p<0.01) positively affect the post-crisis activity and explains it by 55%.

Table 15

*Regression Analysis for the Effect of Strategic Leadership on Crises Management and Its Sub-Dimensions*

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	β	T	P	F	Model (p)	R <sup>2</sup>
Crises Management	Constant		,26	,79	122,8	,00**	,60
	Transformational Applications	,33	2,64	,008			
	Communicative Applications	,34	2,42	,016			
Pre-Crisis Activities	Constant		,88	,37	115,9	,00**	,59
	Transformational Applications	,31	2,50	,013			
	Communicative Applications	,40	2,82	,005			
Activities During Crisis	Constant		-,19	,84	104,5	,00**	,57
	Transformational Applications	,35	2,70	,007			
Post-Crisis Activities	Constant		,08	,93	100	,00**	,55
	Communicative Applications	,34	2,31	,021			

\*\*p< 0.01

## Results, Discussion and Recommendations

It was found that school managers' strategic leadership level is high and crises management level is medium. Küçük et al. (2021) found that Teachers' views on strategic leadership were at the level of "occasionally" in total score and all sub-dimensions. Güçlü et al. (2017) found that the strategic leadership total and sub-dimension scores of school managers were at medium and high levels. Çoban et al. (2019) found that the strategic leadership total and sub-dimension scores of school managers were at a medium level. Köse and Güçlü (2017) found that teachers' views on the strategic leadership characteristics exhibited by their principals have a high level. Kocaşışık (2015) found that school managers exhibit the ethical leadership dimension at a high level and the political leadership dimension at a moderate level. It is seen that school managers have high levels of managerial, transformational, ethical, political, and relational leadership scores from the strategic leadership sub-dimensions. In this context, they exhibit the most managerial leadership behavior (Demiraslan, 2018). Deeboonmee and Ariratana (2013) found that strategic leadership was ranked at a high level. Töre (2020) found that the crisis management skills of school principals are very high.

It was found that strategic leadership behaviors levels of school managers vary significantly according to the settlement where the school is located and the frequency of encountering crises at school. Crises management vary significantly according to the frequency of encountering crisis at school but do not vary significantly according to the settlement where the school is located. This can be explained by the fact that strategic leadership and crisis management are affected by situational factors.

A highly positive and significant relationship was found between the strategic leadership behavior and sub-dimensions of school principals and crisis management and its sub-dimensions. Strategic leadership behaviors of school managers have a positive effect on crises management and its sub-dimensions. Deeboonmee and Ariratana (2013) found that the relationship between strategic leadership and school effectiveness was a positive correlation at a medium level, with a prediction power of 52.0%. Chatchawaphun et al. (2016) developed a strategic secondary school manager enhancement program. The program's application showed that the participants receiving the development for the secondary school managers' enhancement program had higher strategic leadership after the development than before and managed the school more efficiently. It can be said that the way to be effective in crisis management is through strategic leadership.

Recommendations based on the research findings are presented following:

1. Strategic leadership behaviors of school managers has a positive effect on crises management and its sub-dimensions. Strategic leadership behaviors of school managers level will increase the crises management skills of managers.
2. Other independent variables can be modeled for effect to crisis management according to literature.

3. The questionnaire used in this study was quantitative, and the findings will present a starting point for future qualitative studies. Qualitative studies such as "focus group interview" and "observation" on multiculturalism are expected to contribute to the field.
4. Crises management vary significantly according to the frequency of encountering crisis at school. The result can be examined with future qualitative studies.

#### Ethical Text

"I, as the Corresponding Author, declare and undertake that in the study titled as The Effects of Strategic Leadership Behaviors of School Managers on Crises Management, scientific, ethical and citation rules were followed; Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry Journal Editorial Board has no responsibility for all ethical violations to be encountered, that all responsibility belongs to the author/s and that this study has not been sent to any other academic publication platform for evaluation. "

#### References

1. Aksulu Köse, A. (2018). *Özel okul müdürlerinin stratejik liderlik davranışları ile örgüt sağlığı arasındaki ilişki*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eğitim Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı, Eğitim Yönetimi ve Denetimi Bilim Dalı, Ankara.
2. Alayoubi, M. M., Al Shobaki, M. J., & Abu-Naser, S. S. (2020). Strategic leadership practices and their relationship to improving the quality of educational service in Palestinian Universities. *International Journal of Business Marketing and Management (IJBMM)*, 5(3), 11-26.
3. Aldair J. (2005). *Etkili stratejik liderlik*. (S. F. Güneş, Çev.), Babiali, İstanbul, Turkey.
4. Al Remeithi, A. A. A. (2010). *Leadership during crisis management* (Doctoral dissertation, The British University in Dubai).
5. Al Shobaki, M. J., Abu Amuna, Y. M., & Abu-Naser, S. S. (2016). The impact of top management support for strategic planning on crisis management: Case study on UNRWA-Gaza Strip. *International Journal of Academic Research and Development*, 1(10), 20-25.
6. Al Thani, F. B. H., & Obeidat, A. M. (2020). The impact of strategic leadership on crisis management. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 10(6), 307–326.
7. Aydın, M.K. (2012) *Kamu ve özel ilköğretim okulu müdürlerinin stratejik liderlik özellikleri ile kurumlarının örgütsel öğrenme düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara, Turkey.
8. Azbari, M. E., Akbari, M., & Chaijani, M. H. (2015). The effect of strategic leadership and empowerment on job satisfaction of the employees of University of Guilan. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 4(4).
9. Bayazit, Z.D., Cengel O., Tepe F.F., (2003). "Crisis Management in Organizations and a Case Study". 11th National Management and Organization Congress Leaflet of Notices. Afyon.p.366-377
10. Boal KB, Hooijberg R. (2001). *Strategic leadership research: Moving Leadership Quart*, 11(4): 515-549.
11. Boal KB. (2007). *Strategic leadership organizational learning and network ties*. G. J. R. Hooijberg (Ed). Being there even when you are not: leading through strategy structures and systems içinde. (4.b.), 69-86, Emerald, UK.
12. Boin, A., Kuipers, S., & Overdijk, W. (2013). Leadership in times of crisis: A framework for assessment. *International Review of Public Administration*, 18(1), 79-91.
13. Chatchawaphun, P., Julsuwan, S., & Srisa-ard, B. (2016). Development of program to enhance strategic leadership of secondary school administrators. *International Education Studies*, 9(10), 34-46.
14. Coombs, W.T., ve Holladay, S.J. (2009), Further explorations of post-crisis communication: Effects of media and response strategies on perceptions and intentions. *Public Relations Review*, 35(1), 1-6.
15. Coombs, W. T. (2007). *Ongoing crisis communication: Planning, managing, and responding*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
16. Cornell, Dewey G., and Peter L. Sheras. (1998) Common errors in school crisis response: Learning from our mistakes. *Psychology in the Schools* 35.3 (1998): 297-307.

## The Effects of Strategic Leadership Behaviors of School Managers on Crises Management

17. Çalışkan, A. (2020). Kriz yönetimi: bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması. *Türk Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(2), 108-123.
18. Çoban, Ö. (2016). *Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Merkez Teşkilatı yöneticilerinin örgütsel değişimi yönetme yeterlikleri ile stratejik liderlik davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*, Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Eğitim Denetimi ve Yönetimi Bilim Dalı, Ankara.
19. Çoban, O., Ozdemir, S., & Pisapia, J. (2019). Top managers' organizational change management capacity and their strategic leadership levels at Ministry of National Education (MoNE). *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 19(81), 129-146.
20. Çetinkaya, F. F., & Akkoca, Y. (2021) Stratejik liderlik ile örgütsel çeviklik arasındaki ilişkide örgütsel iletişimin aracı rolü. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8(1), 66-84.
21. Davies, B. J., & Davies, B. (2006). Developing a model for strategic leadership in schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 34(1), 121-139.
22. Deeboonmee, W., & Ariratana, W. (2014). Relationship between strategic leadership and school Effectiveness. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 112, 982-985.
23. Demiraslan, E. (2018). *Okul yöneticilerinin stratejik liderlik davranışları üzerine bir araştırma: Erdemli örneği*, Yüksek Lisan Tezi, Çağ Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme Yönetimi Anabilim Dalı, İstanbul.
24. Düzgün, A. (2020) Kriz yönetiminde etkili liderlik tarzı. *Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(23), 210-232.
25. Erdoğan, İ. (2010) *Eğitim ve Okul Yönetimi*. Alfa Yayınları.
26. Fener, T., & Cevik, T. (2015). Leadership in crisis management: Separation of leadership and executive concepts. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 26, 695-701.
27. Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E. & Hyun, H. H. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (6.baskı). McGraw-Hill.
28. Gainey, Barbara S. (2010) Crisis management in public school districts. *Organization Development Journal*, 28 (1), 89.
29. Gömleksiz M. N & Bulut, İ (2006). Yeni fen ve teknoloji dersi öğretim programına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 16(2), 173 - 192.
30. Güçlü, N., Çoban, Ö., & Atasoy, R. (2017). Okul yöneticilerinin stratejik liderlik özellikleri ile örgütsel sessizlik arasındaki ilişkinin öğretmen görüşlerine göre incelenmesi. *Millî Eğitim Dergisi*, 46(215), 167-191.
31. Hassan, A. (2017, April 9). Is Paninian grammar a Dependency grammar? Why or why not? *DIMENSION Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*.
32. Hassan, A., N. D.-e.-A. (2015). Language planning and language policy dilemma in Pakistan. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture (Linqua- LLC)*, 2, No 4
33. Hassan, A., Kazi, A. S., & Asmara Shafqat, Z. A. The Impact of Process Writing on the Language and Attitude of Pakistani English Learners. *Asian EFL Journal*, 27(4.3), 260-277.
34. Hitt, M. A., Haynes, K. T., & Serpa, R. (2010). Strategic leadership for the 21st century. *Business Horizons*, 53, 437-444.
35. Kapucu, N., & Ustun, Y. (2018). Collaborative crisis management and leadership in the public sector. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 41(7), 548-561.
36. Kitonga, D. M. (2017). *Strategic Leadership Practices and Organizational Performance in Not-For-Profit Organizations in Nairobi County in Kenya*. (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya
37. Köse, A. A., & Güçlü, N. (2018). Özel okul müdürlerinin stratejik liderlik davranışları ile örgütsel sağlık arasındaki ilişki. *Çağdaş Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5(3), 241-252.
38. Küçük, Y., Arslan, Ö., Baydemir, Y., Abdurrahmanoğulları, Ö., & Özkan, Ö. (2021) Okul müdürlerinin stratejik liderlik davranışlarının incelenmesi. *Black Sea Journal of Public and Social Science*, 3-4.
39. Lee, J., Woeste, J., H. ve Healt, R., L., (2007). Getting ready for crises: strategic excellence, *Public Relations Review*, 33, 334-336.
40. Liou, Y. H. (2015). School crisis management: A model of dynamic responsiveness to crisis life cycle. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 51(2), 247-289.
41. Lonigan, C. J., Phillips, B. M., & Richey, J. A. (2003). Posttraumatic stress disorder in children: Diagnosis, assessment, and associated features. *Child & Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 12, 171-194.
42. Manel, M., Hassan, A., & Buriro, H. A. (2019). Learners' Attitudes towards Teachers' switching to the mother

- tongue (The Case of Secondary school learners in Algeria). Indonesian TESOL Journal, 1(1), 9-26.
43. Mahmoudi, H. M., & Hassan, A. CHALLENGES AND ISSUES OF LANGUAGE USE BETWEEN MONOLINGUAL AND MULTILINGUAL SOCIETIES. Dimension Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 1-19.
  44. Mutia, P. M. (2015). *Strategic Leadership and its Influence on Church Growth in Kenya*. (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Chandaria School of Business. United States International University – Africa.
  45. Pheng, L.,S. ve David, K. H. (1999). Crisis management: survey of property development firms, *Property Management*, 17(3).
  46. Pisapia J. (2006) *Mastering change in a globalizing world: New directions in leadership, Education Policy Studies Series No. 61*. The Hong Kong Institute of Educational Research, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, China.
  47. Sapriel, C. (2003). Effective crisis management: Tools and best practice for the new millennium. *Journal of Communication Management*.
  48. Schultz, F., Utz, S., ve Göritz, A. (2011). Is the medium the message? Perceptions of and reactions to crisis communication via twitter, blogs and traditional media. *Public Relations Review*, 37(1), 20-27.
  49. sinjar Alsamaray, H. A. (2014). Impact of leadership styles on crisis management according to module H. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(2).
  50. Stephens, K.K., ve Malone, P. (2010). New media for crisis communication: Opportunities for technical translation, dialogue, and stakeholder responses. *The Handbook of Crisis Communication*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. p381-395.
  51. Tanuğur, B., Bekiroğlu, F., Gürel, C., Süzük, E . (2013). Yeni ortaöğretim fizik programının günlük hayatla ilişkilendirilmesinin öğretmen görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi. *Yalova Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2 (4).
  52. Tore, E. (2020). Okul müdürlerinin kriz yönetimi becerilerinin incelenmesi: devlet okulu ve özel okul karşılaştırması. *Akdeniz Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 14(33), 379-396.
  53. Uğurluoğlu, Ö., & Çelik, Y. (2009). Örgütlerde stratejik liderlik ve özellikleri. *Hacettepe Sağlık İdaresi Dergisi*, 12(2), 121-156.
  54. Wilson, L., & Waiganjo, D. M. (2011) The influence of strategic factors on effective crisis preparedness. *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences* 2(11), 25-41.
  55. Wooten, L. P., & James, E. H. (2008). Linking crisis management and leadership competencies: The role of human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 10(3), 352–379.
  56. Yeo, H., & Lee, Y.L. (2014). Exploring new potentials of blogs for learning: Can children use blogs for personal information management (PIM)? *British Journal of Educational Technology*. 45(5), 916-925.
  57. Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2006). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. (6<sup>th</sup> ed.), Seçkin Yayıncılık.
  58. Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:
  59. Sage Publications.