Trust in School Principal and Self-efficacy as Predictors of Teacher Professionalism

Serkan Koşar [1]

Abstract

This study examined the relationships between teacher professionalism of primary and secondary school teachers, their perceptions of trust in school principal and levels of their self-efficacy. The present study was designed in correlational research model. A total of 279 primary and secondary school teachers participated in the study. Research data was analyzed through descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients and multiple linear regression. Results indicated that there were positive and significant relationships between teacher self-efficacy, trust in school principal and teacher professionalism. Furthermore, results revealed that teachers' levels of trust and perceptions of self-efficacy were significant predictors of teacher professionalism. In the study, suggestions were made for improving teacher professionalism and following researches.

Introduction

In recent years, teacher professionalism has been widely discussed in terms of increasing the quality of classroom practices and contributing well to student learning in the field of educational administration. Teacher professionalism has been the subject of a line of studies especially since 2000s as a construct focusing on helping the students by improving personal and professional developments of teachers (Demirkasımoğlu, 2010), defining higher but accessible targets for students (Furlong, 2001), improving teaching in the classroom and school as a whole (Day, 1999; Hildebrandt and Eom, 2011; Tschannen-Moran, 2009). Within this context, when the related literature is examined, it has been seen that relationships between teacher professionalism and school culture, school structure, student success, and work performance have been examined and some empirical findings were produced (Cerit, 2013; Dowling, 2006; Kılınç, 2014; Tschannen-Moran, 2009; Tschannen-Moran, Parish and DiPaola, 2006). Furthermore, it is obvious that there have been conceptual studies searching for ontological origin, historical development, basic dynamics, assumptions, features and claims of teacher professionalism (Darling-Hammond, 1990; Evans, 2011; Furlong, 2001; Hargreaves, 2000; Hodkinson, 1997; Shain and Gleeson, 1999). In consideration of empirical studies carried out for examining teacher professionalism and conceptual analysis about the concept, it can be stated that professional behaviors displayed by teachers in classroom and school context are essential in fostering student learning and developing the quality of education in school (Day, 1999).

[1] Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, skosar@gazi.edu.tr

Professional teachers are expected to take responsibility for student learning (Timperley, 2008), doing activities for proper learning environment in classroom, designing and applying the most effective teaching applications, and questioning the effectiveness of these applications, developing a strong emotional commitment for the targets of the school (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). Professionalism primarily refers to teachers' developing their professional and field knowledge continuously, questioning their teaching skills and closely following innovation and developments in their fields (Skyes, 1990; as cited in Sachs, 1997). In this respect, teachers' displaying professional behaviors is important in improving teaching quality and ensuring school development as a whole. From this point of view, organizational and personal variables effective upon teachers' displaying professional behaviors in school environment should be investigated to better understand the construct of teacher professionalism and to make inferences for practice.

It is thought that one of the variables related to teacher professionalism is trust in school principal. School principal takes an important role in the point that school members have a professional tendency and ensuring more effective teaching in school (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). In this regard, school principals are required to give confidence and lead for adopting ethical principles (Bryk and Schneider, 2003). Hoy and Sweetland (2001) mention that schools where teachers have a strong professional tendency, mistakes are perceived as a learning opportunity and communication between school members are built upon honesty and sincerity. In other words, in a school environment where teachers and school principals trust in each other there is likely to be more focus on school development and student learning. Tschannen-Moran (2009) argues that trust level between school members effects communication and cooperation processes, there is a one-way communication pattern in schools where trust level is low, teachers continually question teaching and making cooperation more efficient and developing teaching practices helping students learn more in schools where trust level is high. Sergiovanni (2000) defines school as a network community where teaching processes are intertwined and states that it is necessary to form a school environment where school members trust each other for having professional tendency. Moreover, it is stated that in schools where relationships based on trust exist, teachers share more with each other about teaching, make use of each other's knowledge and skills (DuFour, Eaker and DuFour, 2005) and trust is an important factor in developing human capacity in schools (Hord, 1997). Supporting these ideas, findings of Tschannen-Moran (2009) and Dean (2011) indicate that school environment in which teachers trust in school principals, teachers display far more professional behaviors. In this sense, it is expected that in an environment where members trust each other, professional tendencies of teachers become stronger and they display a lot more professional behaviors.

It is also thought that another variable related to teacher professionalism is self-efficacy. It is necessary that teachers' beliefs that they can analyze teaching environment and student features and develop teaching practices for fulfilling learning needs of the students should be strong (Khmelkov, 2000). Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy and Hoy (1998) relate self-efficacy with teachers' attempts to foster student learning, to set challenging but accessible targets defined for students and teachers' maintaining their ambitions despite the problems they experience. Self-efficacy belief, defined as an assessment related to teachers' performance over student learning, is a determining factor for whether teachers make an effort in this way or not (Goddard, Hoy and Woolfolk-Hoy, 2000; Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy, 2007). On the other hand, Evans (2011) states that teachers' perceptions that they can contribute to student learning by professional knowledge and skills they have are essential in teachers' displaying professional behaviors. In other words, the belief of teachers that they can be successful by means of teaching practices they design and practice for meeting the learning needs of students may affect their perception of professionalism in a positive way. In fact, it is stated in the

related literature that teachers having high perception of self-efficacy practice the most effective teaching activities in classroom, spending more time for students having difficulty of learning and contributing to the students for taking responsibility for their own learning by actively participating in learning process (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca and Malone, 2006; Guskey, 1987; Ross and Gray, 2006). In this respect, it can be expected that there is positive relationship between teacher self-efficacy and teacher professionalism.

Teacher Professionalism

Teaching is a professional occupation. So teachers should have a set of skills and competencies in their own fields and should use these for increasing their students' learning. Hargreaves (1994; 2000) in recent years stated that teachers face some pressures about making more significant contributions on student success, social, cultural, academic and aesthetic learning of students. In the light of this, as a professional, teachers should continue their professional developments, design the most effective training practices by collaborating with the colleagues and evaluate the effectives of them. In other words, in providing a qualified learning and teaching environment and meeting the learning needs of students as professional, teachers' acting together and spending time and effort on students play critical role.

It is seen in the related literature that researchers regards teacher professionalism in different perspectives and deal with the construct in different ways. Demirkasımoğlu (2010) links teacher professionalism with teachers' sustaining their professional growth and developing their qualifications for increasing the quality of teaching. According to Lai and Lo (2007), teacher professionalism emphasizes professional and technical knowledge that teachers need for being successful, taking responsibility for improving teaching and autonomy for decision making. On the other hand, the relationship between professionalism and professionalization should be analyzed for understanding the construct more clearly (Hargreaves, 2000). Professionalization denotes to the perceptions of how the employers are seen in the eyes of others within the context of their job status, prestige, and rewards to be gained. For this reason, it is possible to define professionalization as the attempts to improve the status and prestige of the job whereas professionalism, as stated above, focuses on practice, aims to foster student learning and make teaching more effective. Discussions over teacher professionalism are centered upon teachers' contribution to the quality of teaching in classroom and school as well as school development process by displaying professional behaviors (Cerit, 2013; Day, 1999; Demirkasımoğlu, 2010; Evans, 2011; Hargreaves, 2000; Lai and Lo, 2007). From this point of view, it is necessary to know the expectations from professional teachers.

Darling-Hammond (1990) trying to analyze the construct of professionalism argues that the construct has three main features. Knowledge as the first dimension is related to professionals' making decisions over their own fields and to directing the practices through their decisions. Second dimension is the customer satisfaction. Customers are the priority of professionals. Hence, professionals give importance on high-level customer satisfaction. Third dimension refers to professional standards and ethical principles. In this context, professionals take responsibility for improving practicing standards of the profession and creating ethical principles that influence practice. According to Darling-Hammond, the main reason for discussing professionalism in teaching profession is the perception that teachers can help student learning more through professional behaviors. As to Day (1999) and Furlong (2001) in recent years, teacher professionalism is seen as a solution for analyzing student failures, dropouts, violence and the problem of gaining the skills of critical thinking and problem solving.

The most significant feature of the teachers displaying professional behaviors is taking the responsibility of student learning. In other words, when teachers create a positive atmosphere for student learning, design high-quality classroom practices and apply them effectively each student can learn (Timperley, 2008). Furthermore, Tschannen-Moran (2009) emphasizes that teachers displaying professional behaviors are committed to school emotionally and eager to spend time and effort for improving teaching capacity of the school. Evans (2011) claiming that teachers having professional tendency differ from others in terms of behavioral, attitudinal, and intellectual aspects, argues that professional teachers are making effort to improve their skills for fostering student learning, having positive perceptions towards teaching profession and continually improving their knowledge of the field and profession.

Trust in School Principal

Since 1980s, the construct of trust has begun to take place in the studies about organization, administration and organizational behavior (Lewicki, McAllister and Bies, 1998). In mentioned studies, trust environment in various dimensions of organizations was attempted to be defined and evaluated from this points. Although there is a consensus that trust takes an important place in organizational administration, the only point that is not agreed upon is that trust doesn't have a common meaning (Arlı, 2011). Fukuyama (1998) links this difficulty in defining trust with its having a key role in understanding plenty of subjects and cultures in micro and macro levels.

Trust can be defined as the perception of the individuals towards others' intentions, expectations, and words (Lewicki et al., 1998) or condition of willingness to commit to people by believing their words and behaviors (McKnight, Cummings and Chervany, 1998). Trust can be defined as both a result of interpersonal affairs and a condition changing according to cultural and ethical values (Börü, 2001). From another point of view, it is stated that trust is an expectation appearing in communities where the members behave dependent on the norms commonly shared and in the way of honesty and cooperation (Fukuyama, 1998). Considering the definitions of trust, it is seen that these definitions have some common features such as mutual dependence of attitudes, behaviors and benefits (Arlı, 2011; Hosmer, 1995). Trust not only exists in interpersonal relations but also in organizations. According to Doney and Cannon (1997), trust appears in individual level with regard to individual behaviors and relations; in organizational level with regard to organizational behaviors and relations.

Although organizational trust has a line of definitions, the most common terms in all definitions are belief and willingness. Organizational trust expresses the belief of employers and administrators in sympathy and sincerity (Çokluk-Bökeoğlu and Yılmaz, 2008). Because a trustful environment ensures that all the employers act together in improving the vision and accomplishing the mission of organization. (Arlı, 2011; Rosen, 1998; Scribner, Hager and Warne, 2002; Tschannen-Moran, 2001; 2004). In other words, trust between employees themselves and administrators is determinant on productivity, efficiency, and targets. In an organization where organizational trust doesn't exist it is inevitable that inadequacy in reaching the target will appear (Yılmaz, 2006). Organizational trust is the degree of employers' trust into administration. Namely, organizational trust is individuals' or groups' willingness to be aware of the organization's basic targets, norms and values based on the cultural structure of the organization (Mishra, 1996; Sashkin and Sashkin, 1990).

It is seen that in organizations where perception of trust is high, open organizational culture is more likely to be built, communication patterns are open and cooperation is higher (Polat, 2007). From this point, when the construct of trust is examined with regard to educational system, trust environment is very important in facilitating cooperation, enhancing organizational citizenship, improving organizational culture and commitment and rising the quality of education (Arlı, 2011; Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Because one of the factors determining the quality of relationships in schools is the level of trust and mistrust among the individuals in school (Özer, Demirtaş, Üstüner and Cömert, 2006). Briefly, teachers expect a school where they can trust their principals, colleagues and the organization they are employed in. When these expectations are

fulfilled, it is possible to argue that employers will have a tendency to show organizational citizenship, thus rising school performance and creating an open school culture (Arlı, 2011).

Results of some studies indicate that trust of teachers in their colleagues and principals is related to practices in school, the number of teachers and students, the quality of teaching and the efficiency of school (Brewster and Railsback, 2003; Bryk and Schneider, 2002; 2003; Çokluk-Bökeoğlu and Yılmaz, 2008; Hoy, Tarter and Witkoskie, 1992; Koşar and Yalçınkaya, 2013; Polat, 2007; Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 1998; Yılmaz and Sünbül, 2009). When evaluated from these points, in order to create a sustainable trust environment it is necessary that employers in school should have the proficiency for conducting the profession of teacher and principal, be honest and open in their relations, and be transparent (Bryk and Schneider, 2002; 2003). Furthermore, trust level between the principal and teachers is influenced by several factors such as the size of the school, the quality of relationships between teachers and principal, the school-family cooperation and the level of conflict in school (Arlı, 2011). School administrator has the most significant role for building trust in school. Because school principal is supposed to perform educational and instructional tasks and to ensure cooperation among colleagues. For this reason, school principal finds ways to increase trust, loyalty and commitment of teachers. Among these ways, some practices such as arranging meetings, including all the employers in decision making process can be used (Arlı, 2011; Buluç, 2008). When viewed from this aspect, trust in school principal takes an important place among the predictors of teacher professionalism. Hence, it is thought that this construct is significant in defining the relationships between teacher self-efficacy and teacher professionalism.

Teacher Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is a construct examined in three dimensions as cognitive, affective and behavioral based on social cognitive theory. Self-efficacy is regarded as beliefs of the individuals towards their managing environmental factors and being durable to obstacles (Bandura, 1997). Teacher self-efficacy is defined as a belief in their changing the knowledge and behaviors of students having different levels of preparedness and motivation (Guskey and Passaro, 1994). In other words, teacher self-efficacy can be seen as teacher practices for providing all the students with high-quality learning facilities. Bandura (1997) mentions that there are four important variables having the potential to influence teacher self-efficacy. The first is verbal persuasion that is encouraging and supporting words and behaviors they hear from other teachers, principals, and supervisors. The second is a vicarious experience which is defined as teachers' making comments on their colleagues' individual proficiency by observing their success and failures. The third is psychological state and it refers to seeing psychological state of the individuals as an important factor in teacher self-efficacy. The last one is mastery experiences which refers to seeing past professional experiences as an important factor in teacher self-efficacy. Besides the complex and multi-dimensional nature of teacher self-efficacy Bandura states that teacher self-efficacy has an organizing role between teachers' beliefs and behaviors. When considered in this context, the construct of teacher self-efficacy is given much importance as it enriches teaching facilities for the students in schools and giving responsibility to the teachers for providing the necessary academic and social support.

In recent years, when studies on teacher self-efficacy are examined, it is seen that teacher self-efficacy is related to principal leadership style, resistance to change, organizational citizenship behaviors and academic success of students (Çalık, Koşar, Kılınç and Er, 2013; Çapa, Çakıroğlu and Sarıkaya, 2005; Goddart, Hoy and Hoy, 2000; Griffin, 2009; Kurt, 2009; Ross, 1992; Yücel, Yalçın and Ay, 2009). According to Jerald (2007), teachers having high levels of self-efficacy are skilled in planning and organization, open to change and innovation for meeting student needs. Furthermore, they do not react severely to student mistakes. In other words, teachers having high levels of self-efficacy give social, cognitive and affective reactions proper for student interests, needs, and expectancies. It is argued that teachers having high levels of self-efficacy have a tendency to spend more time for students having difficulty in understanding, differentiating the content of lessons according to needs and expectancies of students, try to practice new teaching methods and techniques and have high levels of commitment to their jobs (Gibson and Dembo, 1984; Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001). Moreover, it can be said that teachers having high levels of self- efficacy have a tendency to use recent teaching methods and change teaching practices (Guskey, 1988).

In a study, it was identified that teachers' level of self- efficacy was a significant predictor for efficiency in practicing individualized teaching programmes (Neve, Devos and Tuytens, 2015). In another study, it was stated that supportive climate in schools positively predicted the perceptions of beginner teachers (Meristo and Eisenschmidt, 2014). From this point of view, school principal and support level of the teachers affect the self-efficacy perceptions of teachers in a positive way (Barnett, 1999). A study in which teachers' personal traits and self-efficacy perceptions were investigated evidenced that teachers generally perceived their levels of self-efficacy high and honesty and openness were significant predictors of self-efficacy (Djigic, Stojiljkovic and Doskovic, 2014). In a study pointing out situational features of self-efficacy, it was emphasized that the fact that self-efficacy is high or low can be linked with unique conditions of the school (Raudenbush, Rowan and Cheong, 1992). According to results of the research, it was found that variables such as teachers' cooperation with other teachers, implementing different teaching programmes, and academic success levels of the students could play an important role on teachers' self-efficacy levels.

During the following years, various approaches and scales were developed to deal with teacher self-efficacy within the frame of multi-dimensional structure of self-efficacy (Guskey and Passaro, 1993). In teacher self- efficacy scale largely used in related literature, there are three dimensions as *student participation, classroom management, and teaching strategies.* Teacher self-efficacy is defined as teachers' being successful in teaching processes and influencing student learning in a positive way (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 2001). Namely, teachers' perception that they can influence student learning in a positive way increases perceived self-efficacy (Çalık et al., 2013). Furthermore, teachers with high-level of self-efficacy make efforts to improve teaching processes, use teaching strategies in a positive way, try to include students more into the lesson, and manage the classroom effectively (Caprara et al., 2006; Ross and Gray, 2006).

This study investigated the relationship between primary school teachers' perceptions of teacher professionalism, trust in school principal, and teacher sense of efficacy. Primary schools form up the basis of preparation for the next training level function. For this reason, according to other levels, primary schools are seen as more important levels. Not only students' having strong basis but also teachers' indicating professional behaviors are important at this level, primary schools are chosen as the sample of this study. This study tried to shed some light on the predictive role of trust in school principal and teacher sense of efficacy on teacher professionalism. The findings of this study may contribute to a better understanding of the predictors of teacher professionalism by helping to understand the relationship between teacher professionalism, which is a valuable construct for increasing student learning and achievement, teacher sense of efficacy and teacher trust in principal. Furthermore, Tschannen-Moran (2009) states that more research is needed to investigate the relationship between teacher professionalism and teacher motivation, teacher sense of efficacy, patterns of interpersonal communication in school, mechanism and norms for conflict management to

facilitate the emergence and development of teachers' professional orientation in schools. Therefore, findings of the present study may well be used by practitioners or policy-makers who exert a great amount of time and effort to increase school capacity to contribute more to student achievement.

1. Is there a significant relationship between teachers' professionalism, trust in school principal and teacher self-efficacy?
2. Are the trust in school principals and teacher self-efficacy significant predictors of teacher professionalism?

Method

Research Design

This study employed correlational research model. The independent variables of the study were teacher trust in principal and the dimensions of teacher self-efficacy whereas the dependent variable was teacher professionalism.

Population and Sample

This study included 282 teachers employed in 20 primary schools located within the borders of the central district of Ankara province in 2013-2014 academic year selected via convenient sampling method. During the data cleaning process, 3 observation were omitted from the data set, out of these 105 male teachers and 174 female teachers, totally 279 teachers were included in this study. Their ages ranged from 23 to 62 ($\overline{X}$ = 39; SD = 8.93). The mean of their total teaching experience changed between 1-39 years ($\overline{X}$ = 15; SD = 8.70).

Measures

Teacher professionalism. Teacher professionalism was measured by Teacher professionalism scale developed by Tschannen-Moran et al. (2006) and adapted into Turkish by Cerit (2013) consisted of 8 items answered on a rating scale from "I Strongly Disagree (1)" to "I Strongly Agree (5)". Cerit (2013) performed the validity and reliability analyses of the Turkish form of the scale. The author indicated that the items associated with teacher professionalism yielded a single-factor structure with factor loadings ranging from .55 and .90 and that a total of 8 items (sample items (a) In this school teachers support and help each other, (b) In this school teachers provide their colleagues with strong social support) explained 61.62% of the total variance in teacher professionalism scores. The author also found out that the internal consistency coefficient of the scale was .90, and item-total correlations varied between .45 and .84. Higher scores on each subscale indicate a higher level of teacher professionalism. In this study, internal consistency coefficient calculated for the reliability of the scale was found to be .90 while item-total correlations varied between .41 and .69.

Teacher Trust in Principal. Teachers' perceptions of trust in school principal were measured using the Teacher Trust in Principal subscale of the Organizational Trust Scale (Yılmaz, 2005). Organizational Trust Scale was originally developed by Daboval, Comish and Swindle and Gaster (1994) and adapted into Turkish to be used in educational institutions by Yılmaz (2005). This Likert-type scale consisted of 40 items (sample items (a) School principal deals with teachers' problems, (b) School principals pay attention to teachers' suggestions) with scored using 6-points varying from definitely disagree (1) to definitely agree (6). Yılmaz (2005) performed the validity and reliability of the scale. Results illustrated that the scale yielded a four-factor structure (sensitivity towards the employees, trust in principal, openness to innovation, and communication environment). These four subscales explained 54% of the total variance in organizational trust scores. In this study internal consistency coefficient calculated for the reliability of the scale was found to be .97 while item-total correlations varied between .53 and .83.

Teachers' Sense of Efficacy . This scale was originally developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) and adapted into Turkish by Çapa et al. (2005). This Likert-type scale answered on a rating scale from included "Nothing (1)" to "A Great Deal (9) consisted of 24 items under three subscales entitled as Efficacy for Student Engagement (sample items (a) How much can you support your students' discretion?, (b) How can you create a proper learning environment for highly skilled students?), Efficacy for Instructional Strategies (sample items (a) How well can you respond students' tough questions?, (b) How much can you make you of different assessment methods?), and Efficacy for Classroom Management (sample items (a) How well can you cope with students who do not respect you?, (b) How clear can you present your expectations related to student behaviors?). Çapa et al. (2005) performed confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and reliability analysis to determine the validity and reliability of the scale. Results revealed that the TLI and CFI of .99 indicated a perfect fit of the oblique three-factor model to the efficacy data and that RMSEA was found to be .065 with a 90% confidence interval of .061-.070, indicating a mediocre fit. Higher scores on each denotes to a higher level of efficacy. In this study, the alpha coefficients of reliability were calculated to be .88 for efficacy for student engagement factor, .90 for efficacy for instructional strategies, and .91 for efficacy for classroom management factor.

Data Analysis

The SPSS 15 was used for data analysis. Mean scores for teacher professionalism, teacher trust in principal and for the dimensions of teacher sense of efficacy were calculated by dividing the sums into the number of items in each scale. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated in order to determine the relationship between study variables. Then, multiple linear regression analysis with enter method was performed to determine whether teacher trust in principal and the dimensions of teacher sense of efficacy predicted teacher professionalism significantly. Beta (β) coefficient and results for t-test were also considered to render the regression analysis results (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu and Büyüköztürk, 2012).

Before analysing the data, incorrected data were removed from the data set and, some assumptions of multiple linear regression analysis such as multicollinearity and autocorrelation were tested. Z scores and Mahalanobis' distance values were calculated in order to determine univariate and multivariate outliers. Results of the analyses suggested that three subjects, which were IzI > 3.29, were removed from the data set. Two subjects which were determined to be outliers according to Mahalanobis' distance values, were extracted from the data set (X^2 = 20.517, *df* = 5, *p* < .001). Furthermore, we tested the measures of central tendency such as mode, median and arithmetic mean. Coefficients of skewness were also examined and the values were seen to be in acceptable levels ranging from +1 and -1 (coefficients of skewness ranged from -.196 to -.482). Scatter graphs were analyzed for linearity relationships among variables.

Results of the analyses also revealed that there were no variables whose VIF value were over than 10 and tolerance value was under .20. However, Condition Index (CI) values ranged from 11.03 and 31.84. A CI value over 30 may refer to a sign of autocorrelation. However, Durbin-Watson test value was calculated 2.007 which indicated that there was not a serious autocorrelation problem. Correlation analysis revealed that the highest correlation (*r* = .78) occurs between efficacy for instructional strategies and efficacy for classroom management. There was also no sign of multicollinearity.

Findings

Correlations between Variables

Table 1 presents the arithmetic mean and standard deviation values related to the dependent and the independent variables of the study as well as the coefficients of correlations between such variables.

Table 1. The Means and Standard Deviations of Subscales, and the Correlations between Variables for All Teachers (n = 279)

Variables	$\overline{X}$	S	1	2	3	4	5
1. Teacher professionalism	3.81	.67	-	.46**	.42**	.38**	.36**
2. Trust in school principal	4.58	1.12		-	.29**	.27**	.28**
3. Student engagement	6.45	1.14			-	.76**	.76**
4. Instructional strategies	6.85	1.12				-	.78**
5. Classroom management	6.90	1.15					-

*p < .05
**p < .01

As the means related to variables in Table 1 are examined, it is clearly seen that the teachers' perceptions towards their professionalism behaviors ($\overline{X}$ = 3.81) and their perceptions of trust in school principal are above medium level ($\overline{X}$ = 4.58). Besides, in this study it is found that the perceptions of primary and secondary school teachers related to the sub dimensions of self-efficacy are higher than their class management skills ($\overline{X}$ = 6.90) but lower than the engagement of students ($\overline{X}$ = 6.45). When the correlational research results that is done for determining the relationship between the teacher professionalism of primary and secondary school teachers, their perceptions of trust in school principal and levels of their self-efficacy are examined, positive and significant relationships between professionalism of primary and secondary school teachers and trust in school principal (r = .46, p < .01), engagement of students (r = .42, p < .01), instructional strategies (r = .38, p < .01) and classroom management (r = .36, p < .01) are found. Additionally, positive and significant relations between trust in school principal and engagement of students (r = .29, p < .01), instructional strategies (r = .27, p < .01, classroom management (r = .28, p < .01) are found.

Results of Regression Analyses for Teacher Professionalism

The results of the multiple regression analysis with enter method performed to determine the degree to which teacher trust in school principal and the dimensions of teacher sense of efficacy predicted teacher professionalism are given in Table 2.

Table 2. The Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis Concerning the Prediction of Teacher Professionalism and Regression Equations

Variables	B	SE$_B$	β	t	p
Constant	1.52	.24	-	6.32	.00
Trust in school principal	.21	.03	.37	6.83	.00
Student engagement	.15	.05	.24	2.82	.01
Instructional strategies	.06	.06	.09	1.01	.31
Classroom management	.00	.05	.00	.02	.99
R = .55 R^2 = .30 F (4-269) = 29.425					

As Table 2 is examined, significant relation is revealed out between professionalism of primary and secondary school teachers and trust in school principal together with levels of their self-efficacy (R = .55, p < .01). These predictor variables explain the total variance's 30% in professionalism of primary and secondary school teachers. When the standardized regression coefficients significance line is examined it is seen as follows; trust in school principal (β = .37), engagement of students (β = .24), instructional strategies (β = .09) and classroom management (β = .00). T test results related to the

significance of regression coefficients indicated that both trust in school principal ($t = 6.83$, $p < .05$) and engagement of students ($t = 2.82$, $p < .05$) are significant predictors of primary and secondary school teachers' professionalism. The instructional strategy ($t = 1.01$, $p > .05$) and classroom management ($t = .02$, $p > .05$) dimensions of teachers self-efficacy do not significantly predict the primary and secondary school teachers' professionalism.

Discussion, Results and Suggestions

In this study the relationships between teacher professionalism of primary and secondary school teachers, their perceptions of trust in school principal and levels of their self-efficacy are examined. The results of the study indicated that both the self-efficacy of teachers and their trust in school principals are positively and significantly related to their professionalism. Besides, the results determined that the trust levels of teachers in school principal and their self-efficacy perceptions are significant variables that predict their professionalism perceptions.

The results of the study indicated that trust level of primary and secondary school teachers are positively correlated with their levels of professionalism. In other words, the more teachers trust in their principals, the more they indicate professionalism behaviors. Trust in school principals significantly and positively predicts the primary and secondary school teachers' professionalism. Namely, trust in school principals is a strong variable that predict the professionalism of teachers. This result is similar to the other studies' results which reveal out that the teachers' professionalism is higher in schools where teachers trust in their principals (Dean, 2011; Tschannen-Moran, 2009). These results which determine the relationships between teacher professionalism and trust in school principal can be explained based on the basic qualities of schools where teachers trust in their school principals and the trust is strong between the school members. Thus, in the basis of trust, belief in not being harmed by others' words or behaviors is found (McKnight et al., 1998). As schools are taken into consideration, it can be said that where trust is in high level, the members of the school have positive perspectives towards each other's words and behaviors. Also, the indicators of high trust are friendly and sincere relations between the individuals in the organization, the emphasis on common values and shared beliefs, effective collaboration and communication processes (Fukuyama, 1998). Bryk and Schneider (2002) assert that where trust level in school principals are high, it is easier for teachers to take risks and conduct their professional developments.

Trust in school principal can be explained in terms of autonomy (Lai and Lo, 2007) which is one of the important variables of teacher professionalism. According to this, teachers in order to develop their trainings and practice more qualified activities in their classes they need more autonomy. Because professional teachers in regard of their knowledge and skills take the responsibility of teaching process and reflect their decisions which have been given individually to their practices in class (Hargreaves, 1994). Professional teachers develop their professional knowledge and skills by communicating and collaborating with the colleagues (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). For this reason, it can be thought that the schools' basic factors where professional teachers need to work are collaboration, effective communication, peer support, instructional sharing, and professional development opportunities. As the current result of this study is examined, it is seen that when teachers trust in their principals and trust is regarded as the common value, the primary and secondary school teachers' professionalism increases. Apart from this, the professional teachers that trust in their school principals perceive their principals as active stakeholders in developing education in micro level in class and macro level in school. Thus, the research results revealed out that the school principals that indicate leader behaviors based on trust is important for schools in developing teachers' professional knowledge and skills, changing themselves into a professional learning environment for the collaboration of teachers and principals (Scribner et al., 2002).

The other result derived from the study is that the sub dimensions of teacher self-efficacy are positively and significantly related to teacher professionalism. The results indicated that although the sub dimensions of teacher self-efficacy is positively and significantly related to teacher professionalism only the student engagement sub dimension of self-efficacy is positive and significant predictor of teacher professionalism. The student engagement sub dimension of teacher self-efficacy emphasized the requirements for teachers to reach the students that are difficult to study with, to provide students with critical thinking skills, to motivate students that have low motivation, to cause students believe in success and provide more effective learning environments for students that have low academic success (Çapa et al., 2005). In other words, students engagement sub dimension of teacher self-efficacy make learning environment more effective in class, provide students with more effective learning practices and support students learning more. At this point, the expressions in the student engagement sub dimension are similar to the expectations from professional teachers in behavior dimension. According to this, it is clear that professional teachers should take the responsibility of student learning and meet the learning needs of students (Timperley, 2008; Tschannen-Moran, 2009). In this context, it can be said that teachers indicate professional behaviors in class for more effective learning environment and motivated students. As literature is examined, it can be seen that some of the results of the study are parallel to the other researches' results. For example, Guskey (1987) indicated that teachers that have high self-efficacy levels spend more time on students that have learning difficulty and help them more. The other research showed that teachers with high level self-efficacy cause students to participate more actively in learning process (Caprara et al., 2006). Besides, although self-efficacy's sub dimensions instructional strategies and class management indicated positive and significant relations with teacher professionalism, they did not significantly predict the teacher professionalism that it can be regarded as an interesting finding of the study. In the instructional strategies sun-dimension of teacher self-efficacy, behaviors such as determining and evaluating the level of student learning, practicing effective measurement and evaluation strategies, practicing different teaching methods and forming effective learning and teaching environments are found. In the class management sub dimension behaviors such as meeting the expectations of students, practicing effective teaching methods in class and creating positive atmosphere are found (Çapa et al., 2005). In the light of this, it can be stated that these two dimensions are closely related with teaching processes and they include behaviors that are important for increasing the teaching qualifications. As the teacher professionalism's basic emphasis is on increasing the qualification of teaching and improving effective teaching practices, these two dimensions' not being significant predictors of teacher professionalism is challenging. On the other hand, the current finding of the study can be predicted as teachers' regarding the behaviors such as dealing with difficult students, helping students for thinking critical, motivating the students, causing them believe in success, increasing student success in the frame of more professionalism.

On the basis of this study's results, it can be suggested that more researches can be done in detail that put forward the relations between teacher professionalism, trust in school principal, teacher self-efficacy. As the national studies about these subjects are limited, need for more researches increase. The results of the study indicate that the trust level of teachers in their school principals and student engagement sub dimension of teacher self-efficacy are strıng predictors of teacher professionalism. As professionalism of teachers is important for increasing the student achievement and learning, for developing trustful relations between school principals and teachers and also developing more effective class environment for teachers, more school based activities must be done in schools. Healthy climate and culture in schools that are formed up with the participation of whole school members and the school principals' positive attitudes towards the school staff are important and can increase the teachers' professionalism.

Teacher professionalism refers to an environment where students learn more effectively (Darling-Hammond, 1990). Theoretically this research emerges out the relationships between variables that are important for effective learning processes of schools. In the context of current study, more different variables that are related to teacher professionalism are needed to be searched. Because teacher professionalism is a concept that gives emphasis on increasing the quality of teaching and meeting the learning needs of students. In other words, teacher professionalism directly focuses on teaching and its improvement. So, investigating some organizational variables such as organizational citizenship, commitment, satisfaction and structure and individual variables such as stress, dealing with stress, psychological resistance, burn out and job integration related to teacher professionalism can prepare a frame for determining the factors that affect the quality of teaching and improving practices and activities that are school centered. In other studies, the relationship between different individual or organizational variables and teacher professionalism can be done through different research techniques such as qualitative studies with different samples and data collection tools. Furthermore, causal researches can be important for teacher professionalism literature. Lastly, in this research an instrument that is adapted from a different culture and language, so it can be suggested that teacher professionalism can be examined through an original data collection tool that is developed for Turkish educational system. Lastly, the significant relations between teacher professionalism and trust in school principal and self-efficacy indicate that organizational trust plays mediation role between these variables. So, structural equation models can be developed that test the mediation role of organizational trust between teacher self-efficacy and teacher professionalism and new researches can be done towards this aim.

References

Arlı, D. (2011). *Öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının örgüt kültürü algıları ve örgütsel güven düzeyleri açısından incelenmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ege University, Institute of Social Science, İzmir.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.

Barnett, R. (1999). Learning to work and working to learn. In D. Baud, & J. Garrick (Eds.), *Understanding learning at work* (pp. 29-44). London: Routledge.

Börü, D. (24-26 May, 2001). Örgütlerde güven ortamının yaratılmasında ilk adım: Güvenilir insan kim? Proceeding of the *IX. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi.* Silivri, İstanbul. Retrieved from http://www.econturk.org/Turkiyeekonomisi/deniz1.pdf

Brewster, C., & Railsback, J. (2003). *Building trusting relationships for school improvement: implications for principals and teachers. Northwest Regional Educational laboratory*. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED 481987).

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational Leadership*, *60*(6), 40-45.

Buluç, B. (2008). Ortaöğretim okullarında örgütsel sağlık ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *6*(4), 571- 602.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teacher self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of school Psychology*, *44*, 473-490.

Cerit, Y. (2013). Okulun bürokratik yapısı ile sınıf öğretmenlerinin profesyonel davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, *18*(4), 497-521.

Çalık, T., Koşar, S., Kılınç, A. Ç., & Er, E. (2013). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin değişime direnme davranışları ile öz yeterlikleri arasındaki ilişki. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 6*(4),1-16.

Çapa, Y., Çakıroğlu, J., & Sarıkaya, H. (2005). Öğretmenlik özyeterlik ölçeği Türkçe uyarlamasının geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *30*(137), 74-81.

Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G., & Büyüköztürk, B. (2012). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik: SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları* (2nd ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Çokluk-Bökeoğlu, Ö., & Yılmaz, K. (2008). İlköğretim okullarında örgütsel güven hakkında öğretmen görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, *54*, 211-233.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Teacher professionalism: Why and how? In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now* (pp. 25-50). New York, NY: The Falmer.

Day, C. (1999). *Developing teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning*. London: Falmer.

Dean, S. D. (2011). *Collegial leadership, teacher professionalısm, faculty trust: Predicting teacher academic optimism in elementary schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis database (UMI No. 3461037).

Demirkasımoğlu, N. (2010). Defining "Teacher Professionalism" from different perspectives. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *9*, 2047-2051.

Djigic, G., Stojiljkovic, S., & Doskovic, M. (2014). Basic personality dimensions and teachers' self-efficacy. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 112*, 593-602.

Doney, P. M., & Cannon J.P. (1997). An examination of the nature of trust in buyer-seller relationships, *Journal of Marketing*, *61*(2), 35-51.

Dowling, F. (2006). Physical education teacher educators' professional identities, continuing professional development and the issue of gender equality. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *11*(3), 247-263.

DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & DuFour, R. (2005). Recurring themes of professional learning communities and the assumptions they challenge. In R. DuFour, R. Eaker, & R. DuFour (eds.), *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities* (pp. 7-29). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Evans, L. (2011). The 'shape' of teacher professionalism in England: Professional standards, performance management, professional development and the changes proposed in the 2010 White Paper. *British Educational Research Journal*, *37*(5), 851-870.

Fukuyama, F. (1998). *Güven: sosyal etmenler ve refahın yaratılması.* A. Buğdaycı (trans.). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası.

Furlong, J. (2001). Reforming teacher education, re-forming teachers: Accountability, professionalism and competence. In R. Philip, & J. Furlong (Eds.), *Education reform and the state: Twenty-five years of politics, policy and practice* (pp. 118-135). London: Routledge/Falmer.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(4), 569-582.

Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. American Educational Research Journal, *37*(2), 479-507.

Griffin, K. L. (2009). *The relationship between self-efficacy of teachers and their perception of the school principal's leadership style*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis database (UMI No. 3374149)

Guskey, T. R. (1987). Context variables that affect measures of teacher efficacy. *Journal of Educational Research*, *81*(1), 41-47.

Guskey, T. R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 4*(1), 63-69.

Guskey, T. R., & Passaro, P. (11-16 April, 1993). Teacher efficacy: A study of construct dimension. Paper presented at *AERA*, Atlanta.

Guskey, T. R., & Passaro, P. (1994). Teacher efficacy: A study of construct dimensions. *American Educational Research Journal, 31*(3), 627-643.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College.

Hargreaves, A. (2000). Four ages of professionalism and professional learning. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *6*(2), 151-182.

Hildebrandt, S. A., & Eom, M. (2011). Teacher professionalization: Motivational factors and the influence of age. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*, 416-423.

Hodkinson, P. (1997). Neo-fordism and teacher professionalism. *Teacher Development: An International Journal of Teachers' Professional Development*, *1*(1), 69-82.

Hord, S. M. (1997). Professional learning communities: What are they and why are they important? *Issues About Change, 6*(1), 1-8.

Hosmer, L. T. (1995). Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *The Academy of Management Review*, *20*(2), 379-403.

Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The omnibus t-scale. In W. K. Hoy, & C. G. Miskel (eds.), *Studies in leading and organizing school* (pp. 181-208). USA: Information Age Publishing.

Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Designing better schools: The meaning and nature of enabling school structure. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *37*, 296-321.

Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Witkoskie, L. (1992). Faculty trust in colleagues: Linking the principal with school effectiveness. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, *26*(1), 38-45.

Jerald, C. D. (2007). *Believing and achieving. The center for comprehensive school reform and improvement.* Retrieved from http://www.centerforcsri.org/files/CenterIssueBriefJan07.pdf

Khmelkov, V. T. (2000). *Developing professionalism: Effects of school workplace organization on novice teachers' sense of responsibility and efficacy* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis database (UMI No. 9967316).

Kılınç, A. Ç. (2014). Öğretmen profesyonelizminin bir yordayıcısı olarak okul kültürü. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *39*(174), 105-118.

Koşar, D. ve Yalçınkaya, M. (2013). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının yordayıcıları olarak örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel güven. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 19*(4), 603-627.

Kurt, T. (2009). *Okul müdürlerinin dönüşümcü ve eylemci liderlik stilleri ile öğretmenlerin kolektif yeterliği ve öz yeterliği arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Lai, M., & Lo, L. N. K. (2007). Teacher professionalism in educational reform: The experiences of Hong Kong and Shanghai. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education, 37*(1), 53-68.

Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. J. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 709-734.

McKnight, D. H., Cummings, L. L., & Chervany, N. L. (1998). Initial trust formation in new organizational relationships. *Academy of Management*, *23*(3), 473-490.

Meristo, M., & Eisenschmidt, E. (2014). Novice teachers' perceptions of school climate and self-efficacy. *International Journal of Educational Research, 67*, 1-10.

Mishra, A. K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In R. M. Kramer, & T. Tyler (eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 114-140). London: Sage.

Neve, D. D., Devos, G., & Tuytens, M. (2015). The importance of job resources and self-efficacy for beginning teachers' professional learning in differentiated instruction. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 47*, 30-41.

Özer, N., Demirtaş, H., Üstüner, M., & Cömert, M. (2006). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel güven algıları. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi, 7*(1), 103–124.

Polat, S. (2007). *Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet algıları, örgütsel güven düzeyleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Kocaeli University, Institute of Social Science, Kocaeli.

Raudenbush, S. W., Rowan, B., & Cheong, Y. F. (1992). Contextual effects on the self-perceived efficacy of high school teachers. *Sociology of Education, 65*(2), 150-167.

Rosen, R. H. (1998). *İnsan yönetimi*. G. Bulut (trans.). İstanbul: MESS.

Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effects of coaching on student achievement. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *17*(1), 51-65.

Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2006). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values: The mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *17*(2), 179-199.

Sachs, J. (1997). Reclaiming the agenda of teacher professionalism: An Australian experience. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, *23*(3), 263-276.

Sashkin, M., & Sashkin, M. G. (1990). *Leadership and culture building in schools: Quantitative and qualitative understandings*. American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Scribner, J. P., Hager, D. R., & Warne, T. R. (2002). The paradox of professional community: Tales from two high schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *38*, 45-76.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2000). *Leadership for the schoolhouse: How is it different? Why is it important?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shain, F., & Gleeson, D. (1999). Under new management: Changing conceptions of teacher professionalism and policy in the further education sector. *Journal of Education Policy*, *14*(4), 445-462.

Timperley, H. (2008). *Teacher professional learning and development*. Retrieved from http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/Educational_Practices/EdPractices_18.pdf

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Trust in schools: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *36*, 334-352.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration, 39*(4), 308-331.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools: The role of leadership orientation and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *45*(2), 217-247.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing and elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783–805.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education, *23*(6), 944-956.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Parish, J., & DiPaola, M. F. (2006). School climate and state standards: How interpersonal relationships influence student achievement. *Journal of School Leadership, 16,* 386-415.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk-Hoy, A., & *Hoy*, W. K. (*1998). Teacher efficacy:* Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, *68*(2), 202-248.

Yılmaz, E. (2005). Okullarda örgütsel güven ölçeğinin geçerlilik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *14*, 567-580.

Yılmaz, E. (2006). *Okullardaki örgütsel güven düzeyinin okul yöneticilerinin etik liderlik özellikleri ve bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Selçuk University, Institute of Social Science, Konya.

Yılmaz, E., & Sünbül, A. M. (2009). Öğretmenlerin yaşam doyumları ve okullardaki örgütsel güven düzeyi. *Journal of Qafqaz University*, *26*, 172-179.

Yücel, C., Yalçın, M., & Ay, B. (2009). Öğretmenlerin öz-yeterlikleri ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı. *Kırgızistan Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *11*(21), 221-235.