Views of Primary School and Secondary School Teachers Regarding Favouritism (The Case of Van Province)

Ahmet AKBABA, Mesut YALÇIN
[1]Yrd.Doç. Dr. Yüzüncü Yıl University Education Faculty, Van-Turkey
[2]Master Student, Yüzüncü Yıl University, Education Faculty, Van-Turkey

*Corresponding Author:
Ahmet AKBABA
Email: ahmetakbaba13@gmail.com

Abstract: The aim of this research is to find answer to the question "according to the teachers in primary and secondary schools, do the school administrators show favouritism?" For this purpose, teacher's opinion scale was used to decide whether administrators show favouritism or not. Population of the research consisted of teachers working at 76 primary and secondary schools (3276), in 2013- 2014 academic year in Van. Sample teachers were specified through casting lots among 18 schools and it consisted of 202 teachers, 85 of whom were women, 117 were men, 114 were primary and 88 were secondary school teachers. At the end of the research, it was concluded that administrators are not capable of applying the principles and rules, and show favouritism in such issues as teachers' breaking rules, taking parts in celebrations, authorising and giving additional duties.
Keywords: Favouritism, Administrator, Teacher, Teacher Perceptions, Management Ethics

INTRODUCTION

Justice in management is an important attitude and behaviour which affects organizational success as well as enabling the administrator to be successful. Teachers working at schools never show a positive point of view or manner to the teachers subject to favouritism. Even if the school administrators 'favouring attitudes and behaviours in management are secretly done, this causes disturbance among teachers against administration. Justice is the basis of the state as well as it is the basis of management.

Management is the knowledge and art of using all existing sources and opportunities in the best way to help the organization reach its target. In other words, it is the art and science of success by group effort. Starting from any of the two definitions, we may qualify management as a science and art[1]. According to this definition, management is a group activity carried out to achieve to the goals which cannot be succeeded individually and separately.

Duties of management are to help people succeed, to enable their strengths to be effective, and to remove the importance of weaknesses[2]. While fulfilling these duties, management has to follow the social changes continuously and achieve its goals according to changing social demands[3].It is impossible to be successful for an educational organization which does not integrate with a good management[4].Accordingly, selection, appointment and promotion of administrators affect the whole productivity of the education system to its foundations[3]. As in all fields, management also has a sense of ethics.

Administrative ethics is defined as principles and rules of conduct required to be followed in administrative actions[5]. With this aspect, administrative ethics enables individuals in the organization to take ethical decisions and intending ethical decisions. Consequently, ethics undertakes the duty of distinguishing right and wrong and lead to choose the right one in decision processes[5]. Behaviours to be avoided in decisions, practices, actions and operations during the management process are evaluated as unethical. These behaviours are listed as favouring, discrimination, bribe, intimidation, threatening, negligence, abuse, selfishness, corruption, persecution, subservience adulation, violence-suppression, aggression, using policy in business relations, insult and swearing, physical and sexual harassment, bad habits, abuse and misconduct duties and powers, peculation and bigotry. Some of these behaviours shall be examined below[7].

Schools are socially open systems. In social organizations, human relations play an important role in the effectivity of organizations as well as organizational structure. One of the reasons for duties and operations

in school environment to be done unethically is favouring attitudes and behaviours. Favouring attitudes and behaviours stand out as a variable affecting the employees' perception of justice[8]. While administrators who consider the subject concepts when carrying out administrative activities and support their practices by these concepts are usually appreciated, those who do not consider objective criteria as qualification and competence in their practices are criticized for showing favouritism[5].

Favouritism is used as "protecting/bestowing a privilege upon" in the dictionary and "string-pulling" as slang word. There are also names in favouritism defined according to the favoured: Nepotism, Cronyism, citizenship, etc. Also there is political favouritism which is known as partisanship.

Favouring is bestowing a privilege by people engaged in public services upon some people during carrying out public procedures by using effective instruments as family, relationship, friendship and similar connections[9].Favouritism, as a type of corruption, may be expressed as the status of putting forward some criteria as "being from the same school, being from the same city, sharing the same political ideas" in public institutions or in relations between these institutions and social environment, and pushing universal assessment into background [10].Favouritism causes justice principle to be damaged because it makes some people unjustly advantageous. When a person is appointed to a position by different connections despite he does not have the required qualifications of that work, the service he offers may not be qualified. For this reason, favouritism also affects the public interest negatively[11].

Favouritism has been a concept having a significant influence on political behaviours throughout the history. Although democracy is a widespread life style and polity in today's societies, favouring management and understanding manner are not lost. Unfortunately, resist to favouring management is very risky and difficult [12].It is possible to see unethical manners more or less in the world and in printed and visual media. One of these unethical manners is favouritism[13].Regrettably, favouritism is a prevalent social phenomenon in our country[14].

Favouritism comes out when the administrator bestow a privilege upon some of the employees with whom he has social connection, without regarding the general efficiency of the organization or the other employees (Referencing from Ramachandra:[8].Favouritism causes injustice for providing benefits to some people although they do not deserve. When a position is granted to someone for different connections rather than for the reason of having the qualifications and experience the position requires, the service this person offers to public may be

unqualified[15].Accordingly, favouritism also causes injustices at public institutions and organizations rather than protecting public interest.

Knowing administrative science well shall provide advantage to the administrators in overcoming injustices. Management action for human as a social creature is as old as the history of humanity. Accordingly, it is a clear fact that management was born along with social life in the world[16].

Favouring manners and behaviours of the administrators cause perception of injustice among employees[17].In case there are doubts about honesty and objectivity of the administrators, it shall be unavoidable for the educational staff to be demoralized[18].

Organizational justice contributes to creating more reliance, loyalty and customer satisfaction both for the organizations and their employees. Besides, it provides an increase in organizational citizenshepatitis decant work performance and decrease in conflicts (Referencing from Cropanzano, Bowen and Gilliland:[8]). If employees believe that they are administered fairly, they will conclude that they may rely on the decision making methods of the authority and by this way, they will be motivated in terms of displaying loyalty to the organization and cooperating with it. On the other hand, when they think that they are administered unfairly, confidence to the organization shall be low, and employees shall probably display low loyalty and low cooperation (Referencing from Cremers:[8]). Injustice threatens organizational permanence and growth which is the inevitable purpose of organizational life. Injustice is the basic reason for all organizational damages, deviations and crimes. In short, injustice is a significant barrier for employee development and organizational development (Referencing from Chegini:[8]).

Damaged organizational justice perceptions of the teachers cause losing confidence in administrators, and consequently organizational citizenship perception of the teacher and his commitment to school to be affected negatively[19].As it is seen, organizational justice and injustice affect many organizational and individual outputs. High organizational justice perception shall increase the creation of positive organizational and individual outputs while reducing the formation of negative organizational and individual outputs [8].

Citizens who want to reach central and local governments to solve their problems apply to solution seeking ways by friends, familiar people and relatives[20].However, the habit of favouring familiar people for love and feelings under the effects of feudal relations causes some dilemmas as obeying strong

people and overpowering weak ones ,incapacity of empathy, failure in perpetuating ethical values and public distrust[21].Despite all these, when looked from the point of the favoured person or favouring person, it is seen that people think as "I want my relative and friends to benefit instead of others" and by these ways, they can settle their affairs easily.

Specifically from the beginning of 2000's, it is possible to say that public personnel recruitment on the basis of central exams in Turkey has decreased favouritism. However, "delivering the questions to some people before the examination" at a level that can lead to the cancellation of the educational sciences section of the public personnel selection examination in 2010 is an indicator that favouritism is still in place [8].Favour in the organizations can be made by different ways and under different names. These are:

*Relative favouritism (*Nepotism*):* Although merit system is the basis in public personnel recruitment, employments due to relationship by affinity regardless of knowledge, skills and competences may be realised most of the time[22].In Nepotism, relationship by affinity of the people with politicians, bureaucrats and other public officers come into prominence instead of competences as knowledge, skills, abilities, success and educational level in assigning a personnel or in the process of recruitment[23].

Employees with this favour manner shows favouritism to their relatives under the effects of emotional bonds [14]. Nepotism gets less reaction compared to other forms of corruption[25]. However, nepotism is confronted as the most common form of corruption crimes not based on material benefits[14].

*Friend favouritism (*Cronyism*):* Cronyism expresses the status of favouring close friends and familiar people in hiring or recruitment process instead of competences as knowledge, skills, abilities, success and educational level of a person [26]."Fellow countrymen favouritism" prevalently seen in Turkey may be evaluated as a specific type of cronyism[23].

*Political Favouritism (*Partisanship*):* In Turkey, specifically the representatives of the ruling party create a significant pressure on public institutions. Accordingly, as a result of politicization of the administrator, a political atmosphere is seen in the organization s/he works and the administrator tries to perform political purposes instead of organizational purposes. And as a result of this, political relation, benefit and favour may be valued more than competencies[27].

Political favouritism is an important indicator of corruption in administration and this fact is experienced more in developing countries. As a result of political favouritism, politicization of the administration is seen and political factors take the first place in the assignments for public services [28].This favouritism, political parties show to their followers after they are elected, causes the institutions to digress from their own functions and confidence loss of public in the state and government.

Sexual Favouritism: Sexual favouritism appears among the administrators providing privileges to individuals they live a sexual or romantic relation with, which they do not show to common personnel. Sexual favouritism may cause personnel to have the opinion that sexuality may be valid to gain privileges in the institution and to be appreciated rather than hard working and creativity (Referencing from Sheridan:[8]).

In fulfilling services for school personnel, justice and clarity principles should be considered in every stage and services should be handled objectively and transparently on the basis of scientific data[29].By this way, school administrators shall be in the same distance to school personnel and display attitudes and manners far from favouritism, and at the same time, confidence of all personnel to the administrators and administration shall increase.

Favouritism in School Administration
Favouritism is among decisions the administrators make and the practices they perform while fulfilling their duties and unethical manners they have to avoid in their relations with people. Administration process requires taking decisions which is closely related with others and affects them, implementing decisions and policies in a way to protect everyone's interests, objective evaluation of employee's and using sources of the organizations to achieve organizational purposes, not for a person or a group[6].

Justice is an important factor in educational administration, school administration and class administration. Favouring attitudes and manners in administration causes disturbance in teachers toward administration even if it is secretly done. Injustice-favouring attitudes and manners influence administration, education and organizational success and accordingly the quality, efficiency and productivity negatively. This study shall also contribute to administrators to be more careful by putting forth the significance of favouritism in administration.

Importance of the Research
By this study, it is aimed to set forth on the basis of the opinions of the teachers working in the same schools whether administrators working in Primary and Secondary Schools show favouritism in their practices. It is important to determine on the basis of the perceptions of the teachers whether administrators show favouritism in their practices, if so,

in which fields it is showed. With this research, the opinions of teachers who are in the position of the implementers of our educational system on favouritism which gives disturbance to other people are determined and suggestions are offered to educational environment and the administrators.

Purpose

The purpose of this researchis to set forth on the basis of the opinions of the teachers working in the same schools whether administrators (school principal and vice principals) working in the official Primary and Secondary Schools connected to the Ministry of National Education, in the centrum of Van Province show favouritism in their practices. Answers to the following questions are sought in the research to achieve this goal:

1. According to the opinions of the teachers working in Primary and Secondary Schools, do school administrators show favouritism in their practices?
2. According to the opinions of the teachers working in Primary and Secondary Schools; do their opinions on "do school administrators show favouritism in their practices" change according to gender, branch, being a member of a union or not, professional seniority and being a fellow townsman or not?

METHOD

In this research, general screening model is used among the screening models. General screening model is the screening arrangements performed on the whole population or one group selected from the population for the purpose of making a general judgment on the population which is constituted of a great number of elements[30-31].

Population and Sample

Population of the study is constituted by 3276 teachers working at 76 official Primary and Secondary Schools in the municipality boundaries of Van Province in the school year of 2013-2014. Sample is constituted by 85 female and 117 male, 202 teachers in total, 114 from Primary and 88 from Secondary Schools, who are working at 18 different schools determined by Random Sampling method among the schools in the Centrum of Van Province. The study is limited to the teachers working only in the Centrum of Van Province in the school year of 2013-2014.

Data Collection and Analysis

The scale "opinions of teachers on whether administrators show favouritism in their practices" developed by[8].is used in the study. SPSS 15.0 statistics program is used for the analysis of the research. For the demographic features of the

participants in the research frequency analysis; favouritism scale, descriptive statistics for sub-dimensions and items; Cronbach Alpha techniques for the reliability analysis of the questionnaire form were used; and principal components factor analysis for the validity of scale were used.

Favouritism in School Administration Scale; is constituted of four factors as Planning, Organizing, Coordination and Assessment. There are twenty-five items in total under these factors constituting the scale as; Planning (4), Organizing (7), Coordination (5) and Assessment (9). Validity and reliability analyses of the scale are made and the value of Cronbach's Alpha analysis, which is the reliability test, is found 0.96. Besides, the variance which all the factors in the scale together define is 73.06%. In other words, the scale describes favouritism in the rate of 73%. It is seen that the load values of the scale items are seen as minimum 0.41 and maximum 0.85.

When validity and reliability analyses of the scale are repeated over the existing data, a result parallel to the study of [8].Is obtained. According to this, the scale is determined as four dimensional and the variance which all the factors define together is found 76.5%.It is found that while the first factor explains 27.8% of the total variance, the second factor explains 18.8%, the third factor explains 15% and the fourth factor explains 14.9% of the variance. It is seen that scale items have minimum 0.20 and maximum 0.79 load value. Cronbach's Alpha value of the scale is found as 0.97 in total. When looking at Cronbach's Alpha value separately over the existing scale sizes, it is found 0.93 for Planning Sub-Dimension; 0.95 for Organizing Sub-Dimension; and 0.92 for Assessment Sub-Dimension.

In the relations of demographic variables and favouritism scale anditz sub-dimensions, normality test is performed for parametric or non-parametric test selection. In the normality test performed with Kolmogorov Smirnov test, as p value of Kolmogorov Smirnov statistics for all groups in comparison variable is not greater than 0.05, non-parametric tests are decided (Annex-1). Mann Whitney U test is used to examine the relation between the scale and sub-dimensions with gender, branch and union membership variables; and Kruskal Wallis H test is used to review the relation with term of office variable.

The lowest score in the scale is 1 (never) and the highest score is 5 (always) and the levels of the scores are calculated as the following:
5-1=4/5=0.80, 1-1.80: Never, 1.81-2.60: Rarely, 2.61-3.40: Sometimes, 3.41-4.20: Usually, 4.21-5.00: Always

Table-1: Demographic Features of the Participants

Demographic Feature		N	%
Gender	Female	85	42.1
	Male	117	57.9
Branch	Class teacher	116	57.4
	Branch teacher	86	42.6
Term of Office	Less than 5 years	92	45.5
	5-9 years	60	29.7
	10-14 years	32	15.8
	15 year and over	18	8.9
Union membership	Member	94	46.5
	Not a member	108	53.5

85 of the participants(42.1%) are females and 117(57.9%) are males. 116 of the participants (57.4%) are class teacher and 86(42.6%) are branch teachers. 92 of the participants (45.5%) have less than 5 years of term of office, 60(29.7%) have 5-9 years, 32(15.8%) have 10-14 years and 18 have (8.9%) 15 years and over terms of office. 94 of the attendants (46.5%) are members of service unions and 108(53.5%) are members of none of the service unions.

FINDINGS

As seen in Table 2, according to the teachers 'perception, school administrators ($\bar{\chi}$ = 2.30) "Rarely "show favouritism in their applications in planning size. Teachers think that school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism at the most in "preparing weekly schedule" ($\bar{\chi}$ = 2.37), and at the least in "planning lesson distribution" (X = 2.19).

Table 2.Descriptive Statistics on the Planning Size of Favouritism

No	Item	$\bar{\chi}$	SD
1	In preparation of weekly schedules of the teachers	2.37	1.33
2	In preparation of watch lists of teachers	2.23	1.26
3	In planning of class distribution	2.35	1.34
4	In planning of lesson distribution	2.19	1.27
Planning		2.30	1.18

Table 3.Descriptive Statistics on the Organization size of Favouritism

No	Item	$\bar{\chi}$	SD
5	In assigning teachers to social club studies	2.02	1.18
6	In assigning teachers in relation with specific days and weeks	2.06	1.21
7	In assigning teachers to boards established at schools (purchasing, control and receiving, etc.)	1.95	1.16
8	In division of labour among teachers	2.35	1.28
9	In giving additional duties to teachers on education	2.52	1.39
10	In assigning teachers who shall attend the activities and events at school	2.40	1.36
11	In division of labour in school (in terms of work load)	2.43	1.35
Organizing		2.25	1.12

As seen in Table 3, according to the teachers' perceptions, school administrators ($\bar{\chi}$ = 2.25) "Rarely "show favouritism in their applications in organizing size. Teachers think that school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism at the most in "giving additional duties related to education" ($\bar{\chi}$ = 2.52), and at the least in "assigning teachers to committees established in schools (purchasing, examining and receiving, etc.)" (X = 1.95).

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics on the Coordination size of Favouritism

No	Item	$\bar{\chi}$	SD
12	In teachers' violation of rules (appearance, failing to attend ceremonies, etc.)	2.53	1.36
13	Teachers' entrance and exit to/from the class on time	2.48	1.30
14	Among teachers who fail to fulfil their duties duly	2.50	1.28
15	In giving permission to teachers	2.52	1.40
16	In considering teachers' complaints	2.43	1.38
Coordination		2.50	1.18

As seen in Table 4, according to the teachers' perceptions, school administrators ($\bar{\chi}$ = 2.50) "Rarely "show favouritism in their applications in coordination size. Teachers think that school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism at the most in "teachers breaching the rules (appearance, failure in attending the ceremonies, etc.)" ($\bar{\chi}$ = 2.53), and at the least in "considering teachers' complaints" (X = 2.43).

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics on the Assessment Aspect of Favouritism

No	Item	$\bar{\chi}$	SD
17	About unions the teachers are members of	2.21	1.42
18	About genders of teachers	2.14	1.25
19	About political views of teachers	2.21	1.33
20	According to Professional seniority among teachers	2.20	1.23
21	According to countries among teachers	1.99	1.28
22	About teachers' branches	1.89	1.17
23	In offering teachers to award	2.24	1.39
24	In punishing teachers hindering	2.36	1.39
Assessment		2.16	1.07

As seen in Table 5, according to the teachers' perceptions, school administrators ($\bar{\chi}$ = 2.16) "Rarely "show favouritism in their applications in Assessment size. Teachers think that school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism at the most in "punishment of teachers hindering their duties"

($\bar{\chi}$ = 2.36), and at the least in "teachers 'branches" (X = 1.89).

Table 6. Mann Whitney U Test Results on the Relation between Favouritism Scale and Sub-Dimensions and Gender Variable

Sub-Dimension	Gender	n	Mean Rank	Rank Sum	U	p
Planning	Female	84	85.23	7159.50	3589.50	**0.001**
	Male	117	112.32	13141.50		
Organizing	Female	85	92.71	7880.00	4225.00	0.066
	Male	117	107.89	12623.00		
Coordination	Female	85	92.98	7903.00	4248.00	0.076
	Male	117	107.69	12600.00		
Assessment	Female	85	89.76	7629.50	3974.50	**0.014**
	Male	117	110.03	12873.50		
SCALE GENERAL	Female	85	90.15	7662.50	4007.50	**0.019**
	Male	117	109.75	12840.50		

As seen in Table 6, perceptions of teachers on school administrators showing favouritism in "Planning" applications show meaningful differences according to gender (U=3589.50; p<0.05). Perception of male teachers on school administrators showing favouritism in "Planning" size is higher than the female teachers at a meaningful level (p<0.05).

As seen in Table 6, perceptions of teachers on school administrators showing favouritism in "Organizing" applications does not show meaningful differences according to gender (U=4225.00; p>0.05). As seen in Table 6, perceptions of teachers on school administrators showing favouritism in "Coordination"

applications does not show meaningful differences according to gender (U=4248.00; p>0.05).

As seen in Table 6, perceptions of teachers on school administrators showing favouritism in "Assessment" applications show meaningful differences according to gender(U=3974.50; p<0.05). Perception of male teachers on school administrators showing favouritism in "Assessment" size is higher than the

perceptions of female teachers at a meaningful level (p<0.05).

As seen in Table 6, perceptions of teachers on school administrators showing favouritism in applications show meaningful differences according to teacher genders(U=4007.50; p<0.05). Perception of male teachers on school administrators showing favouritism is higher than the perceptions of female teachers at a meaningful level (p<0.05).

Table 7. **Results of Mann Whitney U Test on the Relation between Favouritism Scale and Sub-Dimensions and Branch Variable**

Sub-Dimension	Branch	n	Mean Rank	Rank Sum	U	p
Planning	Class teacher	115	97.04	11159.50	4489.50	0.260
	Branch teacher	86	106.30	9141.50		
Organizing	Class teacher	116	98.75	11455.00	4669.00	0.434
	Branch teacher	86	105.21	9048.00		
Coordination	Class teacher	116	100.32	11637.00	4851.00	0.738
	Branch teacher	86	103.09	8866.00		
Assessment	Class teacher	116	103.67	12026.00	4736.00	0.537
	Branch teacher	86	98.57	8477.00		
SCALE GENERAL	Class teacher	116	100.47	11655.00	4869.00	0.772
	Branch teacher	86	102.88	8848.00		

As seen in Table 7, perceptions of teachers on school administrators showing favouritism in "Planning" applications (U=4489.50; p>0.05), in "Organizing" applications (U=4669.00; p>0.05); in "Coordination" applications (U=4851.00; p>0.05); in

"Assessment" applications (U=4736.00; p>0.05) and in favouritism applications in general (U=4869.00; p>0.05) do not show meaningful differences according to branch.

Table 8.Results of Kruskal Wallis H Test on the Relation between Favouritism Scale and Sub-Dimensions and Term of Office Variable.

Sub-Dimensions	Term of Office	n	Mean Rank	sd	X^2	p
Planning	Less than 5 years	91	102.88	3	1.564	0.668
	5-9 years	60	103.77			
	10-14 years	32	89.34			
	15 years and over	18	102.97			
Organizing	Less than 5 years	92	104.77	3	0.821	0.845
	5-9 years	60	101.45			
	10-14 years	32	95.56			
	15 years and over	18	95.50			
Coordination	Less than 5 years	92	106.30	3	2.419	0.490
	5-9 years	60	103.19			
	10-14 years	32	90.28			
	15 years and over	18	91.25			
Assessment	Less than 5 years	92	104.54	3	1.999	0.573
	5-9 years	60	104.78			
	10-14 years	32	94.80			
	15 years and over	18	86.94			
SCALE GENERAL	Less than 5 years	92	105.37	3	2.207	0.531
	5-9 years	60	104.42			
	10-14 years	32	91.08			
	15 years and over	18	90.53			

As seen in Table 8, perceptions of teachers on school administrators showing favouritism in "Planning" applications (X2=1.564; p>0.05), in "Organizing" applications (X2=0.821; p>0.05); in "Coordination" applications (X2=2.419; p>0.05); in "Assessment" applications (X2=1.999;; p>0.05) and in favouritism applications in general (X2=2.207; p>0.05) do not show meaningful differences according to Term of Office.

Table 9.Results of Mann Whitney U Test on the Relation between Favouritism Scale and Sub-Dimensions and Union membership Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Union membership	n	Mean Rank	Rank Sum	U	p
Planning	Member	94	105.37	9905.00	4618.00	0.314
	Union membership	107	97.16	10396.00		
Organizing	Member	94	104.62	9834.00	4783.00	0.476
	Union membership	108	98.79	10669.00		
Coordination	Member	94	104.71	9842.50	4774.50	0.466
	Union membership	108	98.71	10660.50		
Assessment	Member	94	104.24	9799.00	4818.00	0.531
	Union membership	108	99.11	10704.00		
SCALE GENERAL	Member	94	104.75	9846.50	4770.50	0.461
	Union membership	108	98.67	10656.50		

As seen in Table 9, perceptions of teachers on school administrators showing favouritism in "Planning" applications (U=4618.00; p>0.05), in "Organizing" applications (U=4783.00; p>0.05); in "Coordination" applications (U=4774.50; p>0.05); in "Assessment" applications (U=4818.00; p>0.05) and in favouritism applications in general (U=4770.50; p>0.05) do not show meaningful differences according to Union membership.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSIONS

When research results are reviewed, according to the opinions of the teachers, school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism in general. According to the results of the research performed by [8].it is seen that favouritism is at "Rarely" level. Similarly, according to the results of the research performed by[32].It is seen that the teachers agreed with the expression "school administrators show favouritism" at "sometimes" level.

Teachers think that school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism at the most in "teachers breaching the rules (appearance, failure in attending the ceremonies, etc.)". Teachers think that school administrators show favouritism at "Rarely" level in "giving permissions to teachers" in the second place and "assigning additional duties to teachers on education" in the third place. As this result is also seen at "Rarely" level according to the results of the research performed by [8].There is a parallelism between the researches. Teachers think that school administrators show the least "Rarely" level of favouritism respectively in "about the branches of the teachers "in the first place, "assigning teachers to committees (purchasing, examination and receiving, etc.) established at school" in the second place and "among teachers according to their towns" in the third place. According to the research results, when opinions of teachers have been examined according to independent variables on whether the school administrators show favouritism or not according to gender; it is seen that conception of male teachers for administrator's showing favouritism on "Planning" and "Assessment "sub-dimensions is higher than female teachers' conceptions at a meaningful level.

According to the result of the research performed by [8], perception of the female teachers working in primary education on school administrators showing favouritism is found higher than male teachers' perceptions at a meaningful level. This result at the end of the research does not correspond to the study of [8].According to the result of the research performed by [33].On considering school administrators as ethical leaders, female teachers think more positively than male teachers on school administrators acting in compliance with ethical codes. In "Coordination" and "Assessment "sub-dimensions a meaningful difference is not seen according to gender.

According to the teachers 'thought son whether the school administrators show favouritism in their practices, a meaningful difference is not seen in "Planning", "Coordination", "Organizing" and "Assessment" sub-dimensions according to branch, being a member of a professional organization and term of office. When looking at the result of the research, it is seen that there is a parallelism with the results of the researches performed previously by.[34, 35, 8]. Even if the professional term of office of the teachers increases, it is seen that their perceptions on whether the administrators show favouritism in their practices are not changed.

According to the opinions of the teachers, school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism in "Planning"

sub-dimension. In this sub-dimension, teachers think that school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism in "teachers' preparing weekly schedules" at the most. Teachers think that school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism in this sub-dimensions on "Planning lesson distribution" at the least.

Teachers have the opinion that school administrators "Rarely "show favouritismin "Organizing" sub-dimension. In this sub-dimension, according to teachers, school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism in "giving additional duties to the teachers on education" at the most and in "Assigning teachers in committees established in schools (purchasing, examining and receiving, etc.)" at the least.

According to teachers, school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism in "Coordination "sub-dimension. In this sub-dimension, school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism in "teachers breaching the rules (appearance, failure in attending the ceremonies, etc.)" at the most and in "considering teachers' complaints" at the least. Results show similarities with the research of [36].According to the research performed by [36].İt is seen that teachers think that school administrators do not act so favouring in considering teacheers' complaints and petitions. The same situation is seen as "Rarely" in the study performed by [8].

According to teachers, school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism in "Assessment" sub-dimensions. According to teachers, school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism in "punishment of teachers hindering their duties" at the most in this sub-dimension, and in "teachers' branches" at the least.

According to the result of the study performed by [8].Opinion on school administrators showing favouritism on teachers 'branches are seen as "Never". In the research of [36].Teachers have expressed their opinion as "I do not agree" to the item "School administrators" attitudes toward teachers show differences according to branches."

According to the answers of the teachers working in Primary and Secondary Schools to "Planning", "Organizing", "Coordination", "Assessment "sub-dimensions and the items in these sub-dimensions, the teachers have the opinion that school administrators showing favouritism in "Coordination" sub-dimension at the most, "Planning" sub-dimension in the second place, "Organizing" sub-dimension in the third place and "Assessment" sub-dimension in the fourth place. As a result of the research, when all sub-dimensions are reviewed, it is seen that school administrators "Rarely "show favouritism. Result of this study shows similarity with the result of the study performed by [8].

SUGGESTIONS

School administrators should attend seminars and have in-service training as there is an intention of showing favouritism in practicing functions and principles of administration. In-service training should be given to the school administrators on the importance of justice in administration and primarily on administration ethics. The study should be applied also in high schools and universities.

REFERENCES

1. Özkan Y ve Akbaba, A. İlköğretim Okulu Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerinin Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nın E-Okul Uygulamasına Yönelik Algıları. Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 2013;17(3):181-204.
2. Çağlar A, Yakut Ö, Karadağ E; İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinin, Öğretmenler Tarafından Algılanan Kişilik Özellikleri ve Liderlik Davranışları Arasındaki İlişkinin Değerlendirilmesi. Ege Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2005; 6(1): 61-80.
3. Başaran İE; Yönetim, Ankara: Gül Yayınevi. 1989.
4. Eren MA; Türk Eğitim Sisteminde Yönetim Teşkilatındaki Yenileşmeler ve Yönetici Yetiştirme Politikasının İncelenmesi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara. 1991. Eğitim.ege.edu.tr.
5. Saçlı H, Kızıldağ D; Yönetsel Etik Ve Yönetsel Etiğin Oluşmasında İnsan Kaynakları Yönetiminin Rolünü Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Analiz" Afyonkarahisar Üniversitesi.Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 2008;47:179–95. Afyonkarahisar.
6. Aydın İ; Yönetsel Mesleki Ve Örgütsel Etik. Ankara: Pegem A.Yayıncılık. 2002.
7. Meriç E, Erdem M; Okul Yönetiminde Kayırmacılığa İlişkin Ölçek Geliştirme Çalışması, Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2002; 2(2):75.
8. Meriç E, Erdem M; İlköğretim Okullarında Görev Yapan Öğretmenlerin Algılarına Göre Okul Yönetiminde Kayırmacılık. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi, 2013; 19(3):467-498.
9. Kara Y; Okullardaki Örgütsel Kültürün Okul Yöneticilerinin Etik Davranışları Üzerindeki Etkisi. 2006. İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
10. Oktay C; Yükselen İstemler Karsısında Türk Siyasal Sistemi Ve Kamu Bürokrasisi. İstanbul Üniversitesi, Siyasal Bilimler Fakültesi Yayını (13) 260, İstanbul, 1983.
11. Loewe M, Blume J, Speer J; How favoritism affects the business climate: Empirical evidence from Jordan. The Middle East Journal, 2008; 62(2):259-276.

12. Liu JH, Wilson MS, McClure J, Higgins TR; Social identity and the perception of history: Cultural representations of Aotearoa/New Zealand. European Journal of Social Psychology, 1999; 29(8):1021-1047.

13. Aydoğan İ; Theexistence of favouritism in organizations. AfricanJournal of Business Management, 2012; 6(12): 4577-4586.

14. Heidenheimer AJ, Johnston M. (Eds.); Political corruption: Concepts and contexts (Vol. 1). Transaction Publishers. 2011.

15. Nadler J, Schulman M; Favouritism, cronyism, and nepotizm. 2006. http://www.scu.edu/ ethics/practicing/focusareas/government_ethics/intr oduction/cronyism.html.

16. Sevinç A; Yönetim Biliminin Gelişim Süreci İçindeki Sibernetik Yaklaşım ve Örgütsel Sibernetikler, 2006. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.

17. Karacağoğlu K, ve Yörük D; Çalışanların Nepotizm Ve Örgütsel Adalet Algılamaları: Orta Anadolu bölgesinde bir aile işletmesi uygulaması. "İş, Güç" Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, 2012; 14(3): 43–64.

18. Küçükkaraduman E; İlköğretim Okul Müdürlerinin Etik Davranışlarının İncelenmesi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Ankara. 2006.

19. Baş G, ve Şentürk C; İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin Örgütsel Adalet, Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Ve Örgütsel Güven Algıları. Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi, 2011; 17(1):29–62.

20. Adaman F, Carkoğlu A, ve Senatalar B; Hane Halkı Gözünden Türkiye'de Yolsuzluğun Nedenleri Ve Önlenmesine İlişkin Öneriler. Türkiye Ekonomik ve Sosyal Etütler Vakfı (TESEV), 2001; 143.

21. Koçöz R; Aydınlarımız, Toplumsal Çelişkilerimiz Ve Duyarlılıklarımız. Çağın Polisi Dergisi, (34). 2004; Retrieved from http://www.caginpolisi.com.tr/34/index.htm on 11.04.2014.

22. Turgut K; Politik Yozlaşmanın İnsan Davranışları Üzerindeki Etkisi. Retrievedformhttp://www.stratejikboyut.com/haber /politik-yozlasmanin-insanuzerindeki etkisi--28067. 2007. html on 12.04.201

23. Özsemerci K; Türk Kamu Yönetiminde Yolsuzluklar, Nedenleri, Zararları Ve Çözüm Önerileri. Sayıştay Dergisi, 2003; 49:129–138.

24. Akalan AR; Türk Kamu Hizmetinde İyi Yönetim ve Yolsuzlukla Mücadele.UnpublishedDoktoralThesis, 2006. Selçuk Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya

25. Karakaş M, ve Çak M; Yolsuzlukla Mücadelede Uluslararası Kuruluşların Rolü. Maliye Dergisi, 2007; 153:74-101. Ankara.

26. Coco G, Lagravinese R; Cronyism and education performance. Economic Modelling, 2014;38:443-450.

27. Yiğit B, ve Bayrakdar M; Okul-Çevre İlişkileri. Ankara: Pegem A. Yayıncılık. 2006.

28. Eryılmaz B; Kamu Yönetimi. İstanbul: Erkam yayınevi. 2002.

29. Tunç B; Okul Yönetiminde Çalışan Hizmetleri. Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi. (Edt: H. B. Memduhoğlu& K. Yılmaz. 2008; 225-246).

30. Ramsey ME; Self concept among selected Iowa school teachers and administrators as measured by a self report. 1971.

31. Karasar N; Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi (20.Baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi. 2009.

32. Kazancı N; İlköğretim Okullarındaki Yöneticilerin Liderlik Stilleri Ile Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Adalet Algıları Arasındaki İlişki Düzeyi. UnpublishedPostgraduateThesis. Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Sakarya, 2013.

33. Acar G; Okul Yöneticilerinin, Etik Liderlik Davranışlarının Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerinin Örgütsel Adalet Ve Motivasyon Düzeyleriyle İlişkisi UnPublisher PostgraduateThesis,Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, .Ankara., 2011.

34. Blase JJ; The politics of favoritism: A qualitative analysis of the teachers' perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1988; 24(2):152-177.

35. İmamoğlu G; İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin Örgütsel Bağlılık Düzeyleri Ve Örgütsel Adalet Algıları Arasındaki İlişki. UnpublishedPostgraduateThesis, Gazi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Ankara. 2011.

36. Tan Ç; İlköğretim Okullarında Görev Yapan Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Adalet Konusundaki Algıları (Elazığ İl Örneği). UnPublisher PostgraduateThesis, Fırat Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elazığ. 2006.