



THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF LEADERSHIP AND TEACHERS' PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

İlker PALAK

Teacher, Ministry of National Education, Istanbul, Turkey

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1419-6011>

ilkerpalak@gmail.com

Nejat İRA

Prof. Dr. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Education Faculty, Çanakkale, Turkey

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2271-9353>

nejat.ira@gmail.com

Received: May 14, 2022

Accepted: September 02, 2022

Published: December 31, 2022

Suggested Citation:

Palak, İ., & İra, N. (2022). The relationship between self-leadership and teachers' psychological well-being. *Turkish International Journal of Special Education and Guidance & Counselling (TIJSEG)*, 11(2), 122-134.



This is an open access article under the [CC BY 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Abstract

The aim of the study is to examine the relationship between self-leadership and teachers' psychological well-being. Relational screening model was used in the study. The universe of the research is 2465 teachers working at all levels of public schools in Beykoz district of Istanbul. The sample of the study consists of 337 teachers selected from schools in all levels in Beykoz district of Istanbul, using the simple random method. Within the framework of this research model, according to teachers' perceptions; the relationship between teachers' self-leadership characteristics and their psychological well-being was investigated. Data results of "Self Leadership Scale" and "Psychological Well-Being Scale" were analyzed in IBM SPSS 22.0 program. It was found that the teachers showed the most results in the sub-dimension of "self-observation" and the least in the "self-talk" sub-dimension. In addition, a significant and positive effect was determined according to the results of the regression analysis in the sub-dimensions of goal setting, self-observation, and imagining successful performance. It was determined that there was a significant negative effect in the self-punishment sub-dimension.

Keywords: Leadership, self-leadership, psychological well-being.

INTRODUCTION

There have been various influences that have mobilized human societies throughout history (Kılıç Özkaynar, 2017). Many influences such as religion, culture, leader, geographical conditions, meteorological conditions, ecological conditions (Diamond, 2016) have had an impact on human societies and have caused them to progress and sometimes to disappear (Akay Ertürk, 2010). Although it changes according to the conditions, the human factor has always come to the fore. For these reasons, it would be a correct point of view to think that the most important influence is the leaders who will lead the groups and enable them to take action (Sözen & Şar, 2015).

Leaders have also differentiated from each other in terms of management styles. Among the reasons for this differentiation are the industrial revolution, the Second World War, and the prominence of human rights in our recent history (Demiryumruk Dikici, 2020). Today, it is accepted that human rights are prioritized and every human being is valuable. With this research, "Self-Leadership", which is accepted as one of the contemporary leadership types in the literature, will be discussed.

Self-leadership was developed in 1991 by Manz and Sims Jr. brought to the literature. The idea they came up with; that leadership should come mainly from within the person, not from outside. In the case that this does not occur, the external leadership ignites a spark and each person supports this spark within him and has the will to govern himself (Manz & Sims Jr., 1991). This is an action that shows that the leader's leadership characteristics are developed.



The mental world of each leader is different. There are many different elements that feed this mental world. As mentioned before, religion, culture, geographical conditions, meteorological conditions, ecological conditions and even genetic factors are among these factors. With the blending of all these, the psychological state of the leader emerges. If we need to define psychology here, we can express it as “analyzing the parts that make up the consciousness (Bakırtaş, 2020).” Leaders who have different worlds of consciousness and whose management styles are different from each other will result in different results due to the management approach they adopt.

The concept of psychological well-being was first used in the literature by Ryff (1989a). Ryff states that it is not enough to explain psychological well-being with a single concept. There are six sub-dimensions of psychological well-being. These are expressed as maintaining a meaningful life purpose, controlling the environment, establishing positive relationships with individuals, living autonomously, ensuring Personal Growth and self-acceptance (Keyes, Shmotkin, & Ryff, 2002). In life purpose, a person searches for the meaning of life challenges and efforts. Also, being productive, creative and emotional helps to feel that life is important and meaningful. The ability to shape one's environment according to one's needs and wishes is expressed as environmental control. Developing reliable and warm relationships with individuals is considered as positive relations with individuals. The ability to maintain one's individuality within the wider social environment is explained as autonomy. Efforts to develop one's ability and capacity are expressed as Personal Growth. Self-acceptance refers to positive evaluations and good feelings about oneself (Ryff, 1989a, 1989b).

From a general point of view, a person has a potential and it is accepted that if the person reveals that potential, his/her soul will be good. It is emphasized that the person will be happy in this way. Self-leadership also talks about the inner potentials of individuals. The emergence of this potential will cause teachers to be happy and increase their psychological well-being (Yılmaz, 2016). This research was chosen because of the common perspective of the concepts of self-leadership and psychological well-being.

Purpose of the Research

The aim of this study; The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between the self-leadership levels and psychological well-being levels of teachers working in kindergarten, primary, secondary and secondary education levels according to their perceptions. In the study, self-leadership characteristics and psychological well-being according to teacher perceptions; examining whether it changes in terms of gender, age, education, type of school and duty is also included in the research, and it is also aimed to reveal the results and suggestions with the data obtained from the research.

METHOD

In this study, which examines the relationship between self-leadership behaviors and psychological well-being according to the perceptions of teachers working in the public sector at pre-school, primary (primary and secondary school) and high school levels, the relational survey model, one of the quantitative research designs, was preferred. The relational screening model is one of the research models that aims to find the state or level of coexistence between two or more variables in which the research is conducted (Karasar, 2020). The independent variable of the research is "teachers' self-leadership behaviors" and the dependent variable is "teachers' psychological well-being".

Universe and Sample

The universe of the study includes all teachers working in public schools in the Beykoz district of Istanbul in the 2020-2021 academic year. According to the information obtained from the Beykoz Directorate of National Education, the number of teachers is 2465 (Beykoz MEM, 2022).

The sample of the study was determined by the random sample selection method. The sample was formed from teachers working in 99 public schools in Beykoz district and reached by random sample selection. In this context, people were reached online and 337 people returned. The sample consists of 337 people.

**Table 1.** Number of public schools in Beykoz district

Sequence No.	Institution Type	Number of Schools (Universe)
1	Pre-school	5
2	Primary school	38
3	Middle School	35
4	High school	16
5	Special Education Schools	5
	Total	99

Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected online. Google form service was used. The created form was shared in the communication groups of each school. In cases where the school administration could not be reached, it was directly communicated to the teachers. In this way, a total of 337 responses were received. It is stated on the form that the confidentiality of the data will be protected and it is based on volunteerism.

The results collected in the online environment within the scope of the study were transferred to the Microsoft Excel Program, after the necessary controls were made, numerical transformations were carried out and transferred to the IBM SPSS 22.0 version. All statistical analyzes in the study were carried out with SPSS 22.0.

In the research findings section, the demographic and descriptive findings of the participants are included in the first part. In the second part, there are frequency distributions, means and standard deviation results of the scale questions. In the third part, there are descriptive statistics and normal distribution test statistics for the variable values obtained from the mean of the items belonging to the scale and dimensions, after reversing the reverse questions from the scale and dimension items. According to the normal distribution test statistics of the variables, although it was seen that the variables were not normally distributed, it was seen that the skewness coefficients of the variables were not excessively skewed from the normal ($|S| < 1.5$), since it was known that the normal distribution assumption was not faulty, the variables were assumed to be normally distributed (Hair, 2013). In the fourth part of the findings section, parametric hypothesis tests are applied for the research problems that need to be answered by means of hypothesis tests with variables that are distributed close to normal.

Regression analyzes were used to examine the relationships between scale and dimension values, which are continuous variables. During the regression analysis, the relationships between the explanatory variables were examined by correlation analysis, and the problem of nearly complete multicollinearity that could arise if the variables with high degree of correlation were defined as explanatory variables in the same regression model were avoided.

The independent sample t-test was used for the research problems that required testing the differences between two groups in terms of scale and dimension values, and the ANOVA Test was used to examine the differences between more than two groups.

The independent sample t-test was used to test the hypothesis (differences by gender) based on the detection of the difference between the two groups. The null and alternative hypotheses for the independent sample t-test are as follows.

H0: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ (There is no statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups)

H1: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$ (There is a statistical difference between the means of the two groups)

First of all, it is necessary to determine the variance homogeneity of the test. For this purpose, Levene F variance homogeneity test is performed for the independent sample t-test and it will be decided which test statistic will be taken into account according to the results. According to the Levene F test results, if the significance value is $\text{sig.} > .05$, the t-test statistic calculated for the homogeneity of the variance,



and the variance in the opposite case. The t-test results calculated for the heterogeneity condition will be used.

When the t-test statistic found for cases where the variance is homogeneous (t) is significant (Sig.) is compared with the chosen significance status (5%), H0 hypothesis is rejected and H1 hypothesis is accepted when Sig. > .05, whereas H0 hypothesis is accepted in the opposite case. is done. In cases where a statistically significant difference is detected as a result of the analysis, it is decided which group has the higher level as a result of the comparison of the group averages (Karagöz, 2016, p.383-391)

Variance (ANOVA) tests were used during the analysis of the hypothesis based on the difference between two or more groups (differences by grade level). The null and alternative hypotheses for the ANOVA test are presented below.

H0: $\mu_1=\mu_2=\mu_3= \mu_m$ (There is no statistically significant difference between m group averages.)

H1: $\mu_1\neq\mu_2\neq\mu_3\neq\mu_m$ (at least one of the m group averages is statistically significantly different from the others.)

When compared with the chosen significance level (5%) with significance value (Sig.) in the ANOVA test statistic (F) calculated in a similar way with the independent sample t-test, in cases where Sig. > .05, the H0 hypothesis is rejected, the H1 hypothesis is accepted, otherwise the H0 hypothesis is accepted. (Karagöz, 2016, p.419)

In case of ANOVA test, the number of members of the groups to be compared should be higher than 30. For this reason, it was aimed to keep test reliability high by examining the number of members of all groups (Kalaycı, 2006, p.133).

RESULTS

The sub-problem of the research is "According to the teachers' views, is there a significant relationship between teachers' self-leadership characteristics and their psychological well-being?" specified as. In the solution of this sub-problem, the correlation between the self-leadership scale and psychological well-being scale scores was calculated.

Calculation is between self-leadership sub-dimensions and psychological well-being sub-dimensions.

Table 2. Correlation between goal setting sub-dimension and psychological well-being sub-dimensions

	Self-Acceptance	Personal Growth	Purpose in Life	Positive Relationships with Others	Environmental Mastery	Autonomy
Goal Setting	.343**	.391**	.255**	.262**	.261**	.250**
	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

** (1%), * (5%) denotes statistical significance at the level of significance.

.343 (p<.01) between the goal setting dimension score and the self-acceptance dimension score, .391 (p<.01) between the goal setting dimension score and the Personal Growth dimension score, .255 (p<.01) between the goal setting dimension score and the Purpose in Life dimension score, .262 (p<.01) between goal setting dimension score and positive relationships with others dimension score, .261 (p<.01) between goal setting dimension score and environmental dominance dimension score .250 between goal setting dimension score and autonomy dimension score (p<.01) correlations were calculated. When examined on the basis of all dimensions, positive correlations are observed between the goal setting dimension and the dimensions of the psychological well-being scale.



Table 3. Correlation between self-reward sub-dimension and psychological well-being sub-dimensions

	Self-Acceptance	Personal Growth	Purpose in Life	Positive Relationships with Others	Environmental Mastery	Autonomy
Self-Reward	.119**	.256**	.036	.072	.099	.096
	.000	.000	.515	.188	.069	.080

** (1%), *(5%) denotes statistical significance at the level of significance.

Correlation coefficient of .119 ($p < .01$) between the self-reward dimension score and the self-acceptance dimension score and .256 ($p < .01$) between the Personal Growth dimension score was calculated. Other calculated correlation coefficients are meaningless at 5% significance level ($p > .05$). When the correlation coefficients are examined together, it is seen that there is a positive correlation between the self-reward dimension and only the Personal Growth dimension.

Table 2. Correlation between self punishment and psychological well-being subdimensions

	Self-Acceptance	Personal Growth	Purpose in Life	Positive Relationships with Others	Environmental Mastery	Autonomy
Self-Punishment	-.107	.022	.060	-.062	-.154*	-.085
	.059	.691	.273	.257	.005	.120

** (1%), *(5%) denotes statistical significance at the level of significance.

Correlation coefficient of -.154 ($p < .01$) was calculated between the self-punishment dimension score and the Environmental Mastery dimension score. Other calculated correlation coefficients are meaningless at 5% significance level. ($p > .05$). When the correlation coefficients are examined together, it is seen that there is a negative correlation between the self-punishment dimension and only the environmental dominance dimension.

Table 5. Correlation between self-observation sub-dimension and psychological well-being sub-dimensions

	Self-Acceptance	Personal Growth	Purpose in Life	Positive Relationships with Others	Environmental Mastery	Autonomy
Self-Observation	.177**	.200**	.242**	.081	.031	.139*
	.000	.000	.000	.135	.574	.011

** (1%), *(5%) denotes statistical significance at the level of significance.

.177 ($p < .01$) between the self-observation dimension score and the self-acceptance dimension score, .200 ($p < .01$) between the self-observation dimension score and the Personal Growth dimension score, .242 ($p < .01$) between the self-observation dimension score and the Purpose in Life dimension score, .139 ($p < .05$) correlations were calculated between the self-observation dimension score and the autonomy dimension score. When examined on the basis of all dimensions, positive correlations are observed between the self-observation dimension and the psychological well-being scale, positive relations with others, and other dimensions except environmental dominance.

Table 3. Correlation between reminders identifying sub-dimension and psychological well-being sub-dimensions

	Self-Acceptance	Personal Growth	Purpose in Life	Positive Relationships with Others	Environmental Mastery	Autonomy
Self-cueing	.183**	.133*	.056	.094	.052	.071
	.001	.014	.305	.086	.338	.192

** (1%), *(5%) denotes statistical significance at the level of significance.



Correlation of .83 ($p < .01$) between the Self-cueing dimension score and the self-acceptance dimension score, and .133 ($p < .05$) between the reminders setting dimension score and the Personal Growth dimension score was calculated. It is seen that the other calculated correlation coefficients are statistically insignificant.

Table 7. Correlation between focusing reflection on natural rewards and psychological well-being subdimensions

	Self-Acceptance	Personal Growth	Purpose in Life	Positive Relationships with Others	Environmental Mastery	Autonomy
Focusing thought on natural rewards	.087	.079	-.011	.078	.176**	.120*
	.152	.145	.837	.153	.001	.028

** (1%), * (5%) denotes statistical significance at the level of significance.

Correlation of .176 ($p < .01$) between focusing thoughts on natural rewards and environmental dominance dimension score, and .120 ($p < .05$) between focusing thoughts on natural rewards and autonomy dimension score was calculated. It is seen that the other calculated correlation coefficients are statistically insignificant.

Table 8. Correlation between imagination of successful performance and psychological well-being subdimensions

	Self-Acceptance	Personal Growth	Purpose in Life	Positive Relationships with Others	Environmental Mastery	Autonomy
Visualizing successful performance	.229**	.234**	.091	.210**	.215*	.230**
	.000	.000	.096	.000	.000	.000

** (1%), * (5%) denotes statistical significance at the level of significance.

Correlations were calculated .229 ($p < .01$) between the imagining successful performance dimension score and the self-acceptance dimension score, .234 ($p < .01$) between the imagining successful performance dimension score and the Personal Growth dimension score, the imagining successful performance dimension score and the positive relations with others dimension score between .210 ($p < .01$) and between imagining successful performance and environmental dominance dimension .215 ($p < .05$) and .230 ($p < .01$) between imagining successful performance and autonomy dimension score. When examined on the basis of all dimensions, positive correlations are observed between all dimensions except for the dimension of dreaming of successful performance and the dimension of the psychological well-being scale, the Purpose in Life.

Table 9. Correlation between self-talk and psychological well-being subdimensions

	Self-Acceptance	Personal Growth	Purpose in Life	Positive Relationships with Others	Environmental Mastery	Autonomy
Self-Talk	.013	.146**	.040	-.025	-.044	-.040
	.806	.007	.462	.641	.422	.940

** (1%), * (5%) denotes statistical significance at the level of significance.

Correlation coefficient of .146 ($p < .01$) was calculated between the self-talk dimension score and the Personal Growth dimension score. All of the other calculated correlation coefficients are not statistically significant.



Table 10. Correlation between evaluation of thoughts/ideas and psychological well-being subdimensions

	Self-Acceptance	Personal Growth	Purpose in Life	Positive Relationships with Others	Environmental Mastery	Autonomy
Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	.217** .000	.173** .001	.112* .041	.153** .005	.119* .029	.194** .000

** (1%), * (5%) denotes statistical significance at the level of significance.

The Evaluation of Thoughts/Ideas subscale score is .217 (p<.01) for self-acceptance, .173 (p<.01) for Personal Growth, .112 (p<.05) for purpose in life, .153 for positive relationships with others. (p<.01), a correlation coefficient of .119 (p<.05) with the environmental dominance dimension score and .194 (p<.001) with the autonomy dimension score were calculated.

Table 11. Regression analysis between teachers' self-leadership variable and psychological well-being

Variable	B	SH	B	t	p	Double R	partial R
Constant	2,672	.203		13,135	.000		
Well Being	.270	.054	.264	5,000	.000	.264	.264
R=0.264	R2=.069	F=25.004	P=.000				

It is seen that the psychological well-being scale can explain about 6.9% of the variance of the self-leadership scale. When the coefficients are examined, it is seen that the psychological well-being scale has a significant predictor on the self-leadership scale at the 5% significance level.

Correlation table, which was created to determine the correlation relations between the variables before the regression analysis, in which the psychological well-being scale was defined as the dependent (explained) variable and the self-leadership scale sub-dimensions as the independent (explanatory) variable, is as in tables 12, 13 and 14. The regression analysis findings, in which the Behavior-Oriented Strategies dimensions were defined as the dependent variable of the explanatory psychological well-being scale, are given in Table 12.

Table 12. Regression Model 1 Prediction Results

Variable	not standardized		standardized	t	Sig.	VIF
	β	SH ^{NW}	β			
Constant Term	2.297	.197		12,253*	.000	
Goal setting	.335	.051	.426	6.552*	.000	1,586
Self-reward	.022	.022	.057	1,030	.304	1,179
Self-punishment	-.191	.034	-.344	-5.552*	.000	1.683
Self-monitoring	.194	.049	.246	3,947*	.000	1.998
Self-cueing	-.010	.023	-.027	-.447	.655	1,287
Diagnostic Statistics						
F Test			F _(5, 331) =26,912*		Sig. =.000	
Determination			R ² = .289		DR ² =.278	
Breusch Pagan Variance Test			F _(5, 331) =2.376*		Sig. =.039	
Durbin Watson Autocorrelation Test			DW=1.867			
Error Terms		$\bar{\epsilon} \approx 0$	KS ₍₃₃₇₎ =.050	Sig.=.307	S=-.138	K=-.133

*(%5) signifies the rejection of the indifference hypothesis (β=0), H0 at significance level, SH: Standard error, NW: Robust Standard Error, F: F Test Statistic, (Includes Test Freedoms in Brackets (SD1, SD2))

When the diagnostic statistics are examined in the Table 12, it is observed that there is a statistically significant problem of varying variance at the 5% significance level in the model according to the Breusch Pagan Test of Variance (F_(5, 331)=2.376, Sig. < .05). In this case, the model needs to be estimated with the variable variance resistant (Robust) standard errors. On the other hand, it is seen that the Durbin Watson test statistic is close to the value of 2. Therefore, it can be said that there is no autocorrelation



problem in the model. It is seen that the error terms are distributed close to normal with a mean close to zero ($\bar{\epsilon} \approx 0$, $KS_{(337)}=.050$, $Sig. > .05$) It was observed that all variance inflation factor values were smaller than 10. In this case, it can be stated that there is no problem of multicollinearity in the model ($VIF < 10$)

Looking at the results of the model F test estimated with the resistant standard errors, it is seen that the model is a significant model with 5% significance level ($F_{(5, 331)}=26.912$ $Sig. < .05$) On the other hand, it was observed that the dependent variables could explain approximately 27.6% of the changes in the dependent variable ($DR^2=.276$).

When the coefficients estimated in the model are examined;

It was observed that the goal setting variable had a positive and significant effect on psychological well-being at the 5% significance level ($\beta=.426$, $Sig. < .05$) In other words, it can be said that increasing the level of goal setting of teachers causes an increase in psychological well-being levels.

It was observed that the variable of self-reward did not have a significant effect on psychological well-being at the 5% significance level ($\beta=.057$, $Sig. > .05$)

It was found that the variable of self-punishment had a negative and significant effect on psychological well-being at the 5% significance level ($\beta=-.344$ $Sig. < .05$) In other words, it can be said that increasing the level of self-punishment of teachers causes a decrease in psychological well-being levels.

It was observed that the variable of self-observation had a positive and significant effect on psychological well-being at the 5% significance level ($\beta=.246$, $Sig. < .05$) In other words, it can be said that the increase in teachers' self-observation level causes an increase in their psychological well-being.

It is seen that the variable of Self-cueing does not have a significant effect on psychological well-being at the 5% significance level ($\beta=-.016$, $Sig. > .05$)

The results of the regression analysis, in which the Natural Reward Strategies variable was defined as the dependent variable of the explanatory psychological well-being scale, are as in Table 13.

Table 4. Regression Model 2 Estimation Findings

Variable	not standardized		standardized	t	Sig.
	β	SH	β		
Constant Term	3,484	.180		19.310***	.000
Natural Reward Strategies	.101	.041	.133	2,463*	.014
Diagnostic Statistics					
F Test	$F_{(1, 335)}=6.065^*$				Sig .=.014
Determination	$R^2 = .018$				DR2 = .015
Breusch Pagan Test of Variance	$F_{(1, 335)}=.091$				Sig .=.763
Durbin Watson Autocorrelation Test	DW=1.948				
Error Terms	$\bar{\epsilon} \approx 0$	$KS_{(337)}=0.054$	$Sig. =.120$	$S=-.207$	$K=.519$

*(%5) at significance level, H0 denotes the rejection of the indifference hypothesis ($\beta=0$), SH: Standard error, F: F Test Statistic, (Includes Test Freedoms in Parentheses (SD1, SD2))

When the table was analyzed, it was observed that there was no problem of varying variance in the model according to the Breusch Pagan Test of Variance ($F_{(1, 335)}=.091$, $Sig. > .05$) and there was no problem of autocorrelation in the model according to the Durbin Watson Autocorrelation Test . Error terms are distributed close to normal with a mean of zero ($\bar{\epsilon} \approx 0$, $KS_{(337)}=.054$, $Sig. > .05$).

When the estimation model was analyzed, it was seen that the model was a significant model at the 5% significance level ($F_{(1, 335)}=6.065$, $Sig. > .05$). It was observed that the variable of natural reward strategies had a positive and significant effect on psychological well-being at the 5% significance level ($\beta=.113$, $Sig. < .05$)



The results of the regression analysis, in which the independent psychological well-being variable of the Constructive Thinking Model Strategies dimensions was defined as the dependent variable, is as given in Table 14.

Table 5. Regression Model 3 Estimation Findings

Variable	not standardized		standardized	t	Sig.	VIF
	β	SH	β			
Constant Term	2,672	.171		15,581*	.000	
Visualizing successful performance	.171	.035	.274	4,927*	.000	1,183
Self-Talk	-.037	.022	-.092	-1.688	.092	1.130
Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	.140	.043	.182	3.230*	.001	1,215
Diagnostic Statistics						
F Test			$F_{(3, 333)}=16.557^*$		Sig. =.000	
Determination			$R^2 = .130$		$DR^2 = .122$	
Breusch Pagan Test of Variance			$F_{(3, 333)}=.551$		Sig. =.647	
Durbin Watson Autocorrelation Test			DW=1.925			
Error Terms	$\bar{\epsilon} \approx 0$		$KS_{(337)}=.052$	Sig. =.259	S =-.220	K =.262

*(%5) signifies the rejection of the indifference hypothesis ($\beta=0$), H_0 at significance level, SH: Standard error, NW: Robust Standard Error, F: F Test Statistic, (Includes Test Freedoms in Brackets (SD1, SD2))

When the diagnostic statistics are examined in the table, it is seen that there is no statistically significant problem of varying variance in the model at the 5% significance level, according to the Breusch Pagan Test of Variance ($F_{(3, 333)}=.551$, Sig. $>.05$). It is seen that Durbin Watson test statistic is close to the value of 2. Therefore, it can be said that there is no autocorrelation problem in the model. It is seen that the error terms are distributed close to normal with an average close to zero ($\bar{\epsilon} \approx 0$, $KS_{(337)}=.052$, Sig. $>.05$) It is seen that all variance inflation factor values are less than 10. In this case, the problem of all-in-one multicollinearity was not observed in the model. ($VIF < 10$)

When the results of the F test are analyzed, it is seen that the model is a significant model with 5% significance level ($F_{(3, 333)}=16.557$, Sig. $<.05$) The model determination coefficient shows that the dependent variables can explain approximately 12% of the changes in the dependent variable ($DR^2=.122$).

When the coefficients estimated in the model are examined;

It is seen that the variable of imagining successful performance has a significant and positive effect on psychological well-being at the 5% significance level. ($\beta=.274$ Sig. $<.05$) In other words, it can be said that the increase in teachers' imagination of successful performance leads to an increase in psychological well-being levels.

It is seen that the self-talk variable does not have a significant effect on psychological well-being at the 5% significance level ($\beta=-.092$, Sig. $>.05$)

Evaluating Thoughts and Ideas has a significant and positive effect on psychological well-being at the 5% significance level ($\beta=.182$, Sig. $<.05$) In other words, it can be said that the increase in the teachers' level of Evaluation of Thoughts/Ideas causes an increase in their psychological well-being.

DISCUSSION

In line with the answers given by the teachers who participated in the research, teachers' self-leadership characteristics are at a high level. According to the results of the self-leadership scale, it can be said that the teachers' self-leadership characteristics show the most goal setting and the least self-rewarding feature.

In Uğurluoğlu's (2010) study titled "Self-Leadership Strategy", it was seen that behavior-oriented strategies were used at a high level as $\bar{x} = 3.89$, natural reward strategies $\bar{x} = 4.22$, and constructive thinking model strategies as $\bar{x} = 3.88$. This study was carried out with the participation of 145 people.



In the master's thesis prepared by Akkuş (2018) with the participation of 309 teachers, there are findings that teachers' self-leadership perceptions are high, the task type factor does not make a significant difference, and there is a significant difference between the first and last periods of the professional seniority variable. These findings are consistent with this study. In the study titled "The Role of Positive Psychological Capital on Self-Leadership Skills" conducted by Sarı (2021) with 336 participants, in all sub-dimensions according to gender in the self-leadership scale; speaking according to age, rewarding, punishing, observing sub-dimensions; in the sub-dimensions of reminder, natural reward, reward, speaking; significant difference in successful performance sub-dimension according to income status has found. There are points of overlap and divergence with this study.

As a result of the psychological well-being scale of the teachers participating in the research, it can be said that in line with the answers they gave, they showed the feature of "individual development" the most and the feature of "autonomy" the least. Studies on psychological well-being are increasing day by day. In this context, Cemaloğlu and Çoban (2018) stated that there are more relationships with leadership behaviors in other dimensions (individual development, environmental dominance, positive relations with others, purpose of life, self-acceptance) except autonomy.

At the point of comparing the results of the psychological well-being scale with other studies, there was a significant difference in this study according to the variables of gender, education level, professional seniority and school type, while Parvazi (2021) stated that there was a significant difference according to the age variable in the master's thesis study conducted with 328 students. In addition, Bayraktar (2021) found a significant difference in the variables of gender and education level in the master's thesis with 500 teachers. Education level shows similar results in this study. In the study titled "Examination of the Relationship between University Students' Time Perspectives and Psychological Well-Being and Self-efficacy" conducted by Türkdoğan (2021), with the participation of 421 university students, a significant difference was observed in psychological well-being scores only according to the variables of gender and school type.

In this study, a significant difference was found according to the school type variable. In the thesis study conducted by Kepenek (2021) with 497 young adults, while psychological well-being levels differed significantly according to educational status, income status, employment status and marital status, no significant difference was found according to gender. The fact that the gender variable did not show a significant difference in other dimensions except for one dimension and the education level variable showed a significant difference showed similar results with this study. In Erözyürek's (2019) study, it was seen that the psychological well-being level of female teachers was higher than male teachers, and there were no significant differences in terms of marital status, professional seniority, educational status and school type variables. In addition, the psychological well-being of employees of 6 years or more was significantly different. According to these results, while there is no significant difference according to the psychological well-being level of teachers, age and job type variables; A significant difference was observed according to gender, education level, professional seniority and school type variables.

Conclusion and Recommendations

- A positive and low level correlation was obtained between the goal setting sub-dimension of self-leadership and all sub-dimensions of psychological well-being.
- Self-reward and self-acceptance and self-reward and Personal Growth were positively and low-correlated in the sub-dimensions.
- A negative and low level correlation was obtained in the sub-dimensions of self-punishment and environmental dominance.
- A positive and low level correlation was found between the sub-dimension of self-observation and the sub-dimensions of self-acceptance, Personal Growth, purpose in life and autonomy.
- Correlation was found between the sub-dimension of Self-cueing and the sub-dimensions of self-acceptance and Personal Growth.



- A positive and weak correlation was found between the sub-dimension of focusing thought on natural rewards and the sub-dimension of environmental dominance.
- Correlation was found in all sub-dimensions except for the sub-dimension of imagining successful performance and the Purpose in Life.
- A positive and weak correlation was found between the self-talk sub-dimension and the Personal Growth sub-dimension.
- A positive and weak correlation was found between Evaluation of Thoughts/Ideas and all sub-dimensions of psychological well-being.

Self-leadership has a common aspect at the level of .289 between the title of behavior-oriented strategies and psychological well-being. In this case, it can be stated that 28.9% of the total variance regarding behavior-focused strategies is explained by behavior-focused strategies. There is a common aspect of self-leadership at the level of .018 between the title of natural reward strategies and psychological well-being. In this case, it can be stated that 1.8% of the total variance regarding natural reward strategies is explained by natural reward strategies. There is a .13 level commonality between self-leadership's constructive thinking model strategies and psychological well-being. In this case, it can be stated that 13% of the total variance regarding the constructive thinking model strategies is explained.

Since the psychological well-being levels of postgraduate teachers are found to be higher, other teachers should also be encouraged to postgraduate education.

Acknowledgements

The scientific research conducted in this article was supported by Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University Scientific Research Project Unit as Project ID: 3678. We thank the BAP unit for their support.

Ethics and Conflict of Interest

I declare and confirm that we have acted in accordance with ethical rules throughout the entire research and that there is no conflict of interest between authors.

REFERENCES

- Ağaçbacak, P. M. (2019). *Pozitif psikoloji bağlamında sınıf öğretmenlerinin psikolojik iyi oluş düzeyleri ile öz yeterlik inançları ve örgütsel bağlılık davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Examination of the relationships among psychological well-being, self-efficacy beliefs and organizational commitment behaviors of elementary school teachers based on positive psychology] (Unpublished Master Thesis). İstanbul: Marmara University.
- Akay Ertürk, S. (2010). *Kültürel coğrafya: İnsan-kültür-mekan* [in Turkish]. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Açık ve Uzaktan Eğitim Fakültesi.
- Bakırtaş, T. (2020). Modern psikoloji tarihi [A history of modern psychology]. *Journal of Duzce University Faculty of Theology*, 4(1), 88-92.
- Beykoz MEM. (2022, 01 01). *Beykoz ilçe milli eğitim müdürlüğü* [in Turkish]. From Beykoz İlçe Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü: <https://beykoz.meb.gov.tr/>
- Demiryumruk Dikici, B. (2020). Günümüzün dijitalleşen işletmelerinde yeni liderlik ve motivasyon modelleri üzerine karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma [A comparative research on new leadership and motivation models in digitalized companies]. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, 15(26), 4185-4207.
- Diamond, J. (2016). *Tüfek mikrop ve çelik* [in Turkish]. Kaliforniya: Tübitak Yayınları.
- Diener, E., & Lucas, R. (2000). Explaining differences in social levels of happiness: Relative standards, need fulfillment, culture and evaluation theory. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 1, 47-48.
- Diener, E. (2009). The science of well-being: The collected work of ed diener. *Sosyal Indikator Research Series*, 37.
- Greenleaf, R. (1977). *What is servant leadership?* From Greenleaf.org: <https://www.greenleaf.org/what-is-servant-leadership/>
- Hair, F. (2013). *Multivariate data analyses*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Hardy, K. (2007). Self-Reward: An untapped resource for high performance. *The Public Manager Summer*, 36(2), 55-58.



- Houghton, J., & Jinkerson, D. (2007). Constructive thought strategies and job satisfaction: A preliminary examination. *J.Bus. Psychol*(22), 45-53.
- Houghton, J. D., Bonham, T. W., Neck, C. P., & Singh, K. (2004). The relation between self-leadership and personality: a comparison of hierarchical factor structures. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(4), 427-441.
- Houghton, J., & Neck, C. (2002). The revised self-leadership questionnaire: Testing a hierarchical factor structure for self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 672-691.
- Houghton, J., Neck, C., & Manz, C. (2003, Ocak). Self-leadership and superleadership: The heart and art of creating shared leadership in teams. *ResearchGate*, pp. 1-45.
- İra, N., & Gül, M. (2020). Öz liderlik. In K. Yılmaz, *Liderlik: Kuram - Araştırma - Uygulama* [in Turkish] (pp. 571-582). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Kalaycı, Ş. (2006). *SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri* [SPSS applied multivariate statistical techniques]. Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti.
- Karagöz, Y. (2016). *Uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistiksel analizler* [Applied multivariate statistical analyzes]. Ankara: Noberl.
- Karasar, N. (2020). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi kavramlar ilkeler teknikler* [Scientific research method concepts principles techniques]. Ankara: Nobel Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Kılıç Özkaynar, G. (2017). Tarihte öne çıkan türk lider örnekleri üzerine bir inceleme [Prominent Turkish leadership profile in history]. *Journal of Economy, Business, and Management*, 10-31.
- Konan, N., & Atik, S. (2015). Kendi kendine (öz) liderlik ölçeğinin eğitim örgütleri için Türkçeye uyarlanması, geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *e-International Journal of Educational Research*, 6(3), 101-115.
- Konan, N., Demir, H., & Karakuş, M. (2015). A study of Turkish adaptation of executive servant leadership scale into Turkish. *Electronic International Journal of Education, Arts, and Science*, 135-155.
- Kurt, N. (2018). Öğretmenlerin psikolojik sermaye algıları ile psikolojik iyi oluşları ve iş doyumları arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between psychological capital perception, psychological well-being and job satisfaction of teachers]. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Likert, R. (1969). The relationship between management behavior and social structure: Improving human performance; better theory, more accounting. . *Comite International L'Organization Scientifique* (pp. 136-146). Tokyo: 15th International Management Congress.
- Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach, 12th Ed. Mc Graw-Hill Irwin*. New York.
- Manz, C. C. (1986). Self-leadership: Toward an expanded theory of self-influence processing in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), 585-600.
- Manz, C. C., & Neck, C. (2004). *Mastering self-leadership empowering yourself for personal excellence (3. Edition)*. N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Manz, C. C. (1992). *Mastering self-leadership: Empowering yourself for personal excellence*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Manz, C. C., & Sims Jr., H. P. (1991). SuperLeadersh: Beyond the myth of heroic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19(4), 18-35.
- Manz, C. (1983). *The art of self-leadership: Strategies for personal effectiveness in your life and work*. USA: Prentice-Hall.
- Manz, C. (1986). Self-leadership: Toward an expanded theory of self-influence processes in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 585-600.
- Manz, C., & Sims Jr, H. (1989). *Superleadership: Leading others to lead*. N.Y.: Prentice-Hall Trade.
- Manz, C., & Sims Jr, H. (2001). *The new super leadership: Leading Other to Lead Themselves*. USA: Berrett Koehler Publishers.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 370-396.
- Mottaz, C. J. (1985). The relative importance of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards as determinants of work satisfaction. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 26(3), 365-385.



- Neck, C. P. (2006). Self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 270-290.
- Neck, C. P., & Manz, C. C. (1992). Thought Self-leadership: The Impact of Mental Strategies Training on Employee Cognition, Behavior, and Affect. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17(5), 445-467.
- Neck, C., & Houghton, J. (2006). Two decades of self-leadership theory and research past developments, present trends and future possibilities. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(4), 270-295.
- Robbins, S. P. (1998). *Organizational behavior: Eighth Edition*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 54-67.
- Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141-166.
- Ryff, C. (1989b). Happiness is everything or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069-1081.
- Ryff, C. (1989a). Beyond ponce de leon and life satisfaction: New directions in quest of successful ageing. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 12, 35-55.
- Ryff, C. (1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4(4), 99-104.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989b). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069-1081.
- Ryff, C. D., & Heidrich, S. M. (1997). Experience and well-being: Explorations on domains of life and how they matter. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 20(2), 193-206.
- Ryff, C., & Keyes, C. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719-727.
- Ryff, C., & Singer, B. H. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 9, 13-39.
- Seligman, M. (2005). Positive psychology, positive prevention and positive therapy. In S. C.R., & S. Lopez, *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 3-9). New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Seligman, M. (2002). Positive psychology, positive prevention, and positive therapy. In S. Lopez, & C. Snyder, *Handbook of positive psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 3-12). USA: Oxford University Press.
- Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5-14.
- Shah, j., & Ali, B. (2012). Super-leadership: An approach to maximize idea generation and creative potential for creative culture. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(1), 388-401.
- Sheldon, K., & King, L. (2001). Positive psychology and humanistic psychology: A reply to seligman. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 41(1), 13-29.