¹ Faculdade de Ciências do Esporte, Universidade Aydin Adnan Menderes, Aydin, Turquia.

² Faculdade de Ciências do Esporte, Universidade Aydin Adnan Menderes, Aydin, Turquia (Autor Correspondente).

³ Faculdade de Ciências do Esporte, Universidade de Mersin, Mersin, Turquia.

⁴ Faculdade de Ciências do Esporte, Universidade de Mersin, Mersin, Turquia.

⁵ Faculdade de Ciências do Esporte, Universidade Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam, Kahramanmaraş, Turquia.

⁶ Escola de Educação Física e Esportes, Universidade de Sirnak, Sirnak, Turquia.

VISIONARY LEADERSHIP AND CRISIS MANAGEMENT IN EDUCATION: SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVE

LIDERANÇA VISIONÁRIA E GESTÃO DE CRISES NA EDUCAÇÃO: A PERSPECTIVA DE PROFESSORES DO ENSINO MÉDIO

LIDERAZGO VISIONARIO Y GESTIÓN DE CRISIS EN EDUCACIÓN: LA PERSPECTIVA DE LOS DOCENTES DE SECUNDARIA

Sermin Agrali ERMIS¹
s.agrali.ermis@adu.edu.tr

Ebru DERECELI²
edereceli@adu.edu.tr

Turhan TOROS³
turhantoros@yahoo.com

Emre SERIN⁴
emreserin@mersin.edu.tr

Tayfun KARA⁵
tayfunkara@ksu.edu.tr

Meliha UZUN⁶
melihauzun@sirnak.edu.tr

ABSTRACT: This study examines the visionary leadership and crisis management skills of teachers, key figures in students' lives, across three groups: Verbal (Turkish, Social Studies, Foreign Languages), Numerical (Mathematics, Science), and Social (Physical Education, Music, Art). The aim was to assess their levels of visionary leadership and crisis management, analyze the relationship between them, and identify differences based on specific variables. Using a survey model, data were collected from 303 teachers (151 male, 152 female) selected through stratified sampling. The participants' average age and years of service were homogeneously distributed. Two instruments were applied: the Visionary Leadership Scale (Sashkin, 1996; adapted by Tanrıbil, 2015) and the Crisis Management Scale (Çalışkan, 2020). Data analysis involved Kolmogorov-Smirnov, t-test, two-way ANOVA, and Pearson correlation tests. Results showed low levels of visionary leadership and crisis management. However, a strong, positive correlation was found between these two competencies, indicating mutual influence.

Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional (RPGE), Araraquara, v. 29(esp.1), n. 00, e025026, 2025.

e-ISSN: 1519-9029

1

KEYWORDS: Leader. Visionary Leadership. Crisis Management. Crisis Leadership. Teacher.

RESUMO: *Este estudo analisa as habilidades de liderança visionária e gerenciamento de crise de professores, figuras-chave na vida dos alunos, distribuídos em três grupos: Verbal (Turco, Estudos Sociais e Línguas Estrangeiras), Numérico (Matemática e Ciências) e Social (Educação Física, Música e Arte). O objetivo é avaliar os níveis de liderança visionária e gerenciamento de crise, analisar a relação entre essas competências e identificar diferenças com base em variáveis específicas. Utilizando um modelo de pesquisa por levantamento, foram coletados dados de 303 professores (151 homens e 152 mulheres), selecionados por amostragem estratificada. A média de idade e o tempo de serviço dos participantes apresentaram distribuição homogênea. Foram aplicados dois instrumentos: a Escala de Liderança Visionária (Sashkin, 1996; adaptada por Tanrıbil, 2015) e a Escala de Gerenciamento de Crise (Çalışkan, 2020). As análises incluíram os testes Kolmogorov-Smirnov, teste t, ANOVA bidirecional e correlação de Pearson. Os resultados mostraram níveis baixos em ambas as competências, mas evidenciaram uma correlação positiva e forte entre elas, indicando influência mútua.*

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Líder. Liderança Visionária. Gestão de Crise. Liderança de Crise. Professor.*

RESUMEN: *Este estudio analiza las habilidades de liderazgo visionario y gestión de crisis de los docentes, figuras clave en la vida de los estudiantes, agrupados en tres categorías: Verbal (Turco, Estudios Sociales y Lenguas Extranjeras), Numérica (Matemáticas y Ciencias) y Social (Educación Física, Música y Arte). El objetivo fue evaluar sus niveles de liderazgo visionario y gestión de crisis, analizar la relación entre ambas competencias e identificar diferencias según variables específicas. Utilizando un modelo de encuesta, se recopilaron datos de 303 docentes (151 hombres y 152 mujeres) seleccionados mediante muestreo estratificado. La edad promedio y los años de servicio de los participantes presentaron una distribución homogénea. Se aplicaron dos instrumentos: la Escala de Liderazgo Visionario (Sashkin, 1996; adaptada por Tanrıbil, 2015) y la Escala de Gestión de Crisis (Çalışkan, 2020). Los análisis incluyeron pruebas de Kolmogorov-Smirnov, t de Student, ANOVA bidireccional y correlación de Pearson. Los resultados mostraron niveles bajos en ambas competencias, pero una correlación positiva y fuerte entre ellas, indicando influencia mutua.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Líder. Liderazgo visionario. Gestión de crisis. Liderazgo en crisis. Profesor.*

INTRODUCTION

Human beings sustain their lives through educational processes. This education begins with the preschool stage and continues through primary, secondary, and high school, as well as university education, followed by continuous in-service training in the workplace. The rapid advancement of technology has naturally led to various transformations in the educational system. The current era, referred to as the Fourth Industrial Revolution (disruptive innovation), particularly addresses the changes in individual thinking and comprehension processes. In Industry 4.0, individuals are expected to enhance their professional lives by integrating communication technologies and knowledge. This shift has led to increased expectations from educational institutions and educators (Prestiadi et al., 2019).

A crisis is generally considered a troubling and painful process resulting from the disruption of routine operations and the emergence of negative circumstances within institutions (Navarro, 2024; Stoker et al., 2019). In the school environment, there are also internal and external factors that develop in parallel with these concepts. While some problems can be solved conventionally, for issues that institutional procedures cannot resolve, educators are expected to demonstrate strong leadership and manage potential crises.

In recent years, a lot of research has been done in the field of health (Kaya & Algın, 2022; Algin & Sarvan, 2024; Pekgor et al., 2024; Algin et al., 2024; Algin, 2024; Sekeroglu et al., 2025). However, several issues have emerged in the educational field, including substance abuse, carrying sharp objects, peer bullying, all forms of abuse, earthquakes, transportation problems, and psychological mood disorders. In fact, in the long term, the financial cost to the state becomes inevitable. The scientific and only way to ensure and sustain the safe and peaceful environment targeted in education is to detect crisis signals, conduct school risk analyses, develop crisis plans based on crisis scenarios, carry out drills, keep plans up to date, and establish a trained crisis management team (Navarro, 2024; Stavroulia et al., 2021; Debes, 2021; Saitis & Saiti, 2018).

In crisis management, three key dimensions are recognized: the pre-crisis period: This is the phase before the crisis emerges, during which the situation gradually worsens. Crisis period: This is the phase when uncertainty, both inside and outside the organization, reaches its peak. Post-crisis period: Also referred to as the solution or recovery phase, this process involves the organization seeking internal and external support to recover from the crisis and implement appropriate responses to resolve the issue (Sasan & Kilag, 2023; Chatzipanagiotou & Katsarou, 2023). In the field of education, it is also crucial for teachers, who lead young individuals, to effectively manage and guide them through such crisis situations. During crises, it is particularly expected that teachers' leadership qualities emerge. The leadership characteristics of teachers—including their personality traits, emotional intelligence, cognitive styles, and

RPGE

actions—will activate in interaction with all individuals they engage with, enabling students to place unquestionable trust in their teachers as guides during the crisis process. Leadership is essential in determining and achieving goals for the group, establishing effective communication within the group, providing direction, and fostering collaboration and harmony. Therefore, teachers must be open to innovation, motivational, critical, and competent enough to collaborate with their students. Effective leadership can only be achieved by clearly defining a vision. Through this vision, a leader can manage decision-making processes, achieve success in communication, and take the right steps for innovative modeling (Marzuki & Maulana, 2023).

Visionary leaders are recognized for having a unique perspective, which allows them to analyze situations more effectively, communicate their vision to everyone they work with, make decisions that guide the direction of their organizations, and possess innovative, comprehensive leadership and coaching skills (Buss & Kearney, 2024; Jongen, 2024; Dereceli et al., 2023). Through this ability, the leader holds significant power, both as a role model and an inspiration. Visionary leadership is explained through four key dimensions (Kadhum et al., 2023). These are: visionary thinking, the picture of the future, openness to change, and being action-oriented.

In the literature, it is stated that visionary leadership, when applied with effective crisis management policies, increases positive behaviors and reduces negative behaviors (Derin et al., 2020). Bundy et al. (2017) and Barasa et al. (2018) in their studies emphasize that leadership, knowledge management, and learning are key factors for organizational alignment in crisis management.

Based on this, the study is designed primarily to investigate the best practices for leadership in education by focusing on increasing students' success, creating and sustaining a positive school culture, and enhancing institutional effectiveness. In an era where technology is rapidly advancing and the importance of keeping up with the times is not only for individuals but also for teachers—whose slightest contribution can make a significant difference for their students—the importance of teachers possessing or developing the appropriate vision during the pre-crisis, crisis, and post-crisis periods is evident. This study is significant in terms of identifying these competencies for teachers, determining their levels, and developing a roadmap for improvement. Therefore, the study aims to define the relationship and impact between middle school teachers' levels of visionary leadership and crisis management, as well as clarify their awareness levels regarding the target area in relation to various demographic variables.

METHODOLOGY

This research is a descriptive study using a survey model. The population of the study consists of public and private school teachers working at the middle school level in three

RPGE

4

cities (Aydın, İzmir, & Manisa) in the Aegean Region during the 2023-2024 academic year. The sample of the study consists of 303 teachers working at the middle school level. The stratified sampling method has been used in the study. The sample is found to have representative characteristics of the population (DeVellis, 2003; Nunnally, 1978). Participation in the study was facilitated through Google Forms on a voluntary basis.

In the study, the "Crisis Management Scale," developed by Çalışkan (2020), was used. The measurement tool consists of 23 items and three sub-dimensions. A 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) was applied, and there were no reverse-scored items. The validity and reliability of the scale were tested, with the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the Crisis Management Scale calculated as .97.

The second scale used is the "Visionary Leadership Scale." This scale was developed based on the model created by Sashkin (1996) and used in Tanrıbil's (2015) study. The Visionary Leadership Scale consists of 5 dimensions and 25 items. A 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) was used, and there were no reverse-scored items. The Cronbach's Alpha for the Visionary Leadership Scale was calculated as .97. In the data analysis, assumptions that need to be met for determining which tests (parametric/nonparametric tests) should be applied were first tested. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to assess the normality of the distribution, and the skewness and kurtosis values were considered to evaluate other assumptions of normal distribution. Independent group comparisons were conducted using the independent samples t-test, and comparisons of more than two groups were performed using one-way ANOVA. The relationship between numerical variables was examined using Pearson's correlation coefficient. The significance of the obtained values was evaluated at a significance level of 0.05.

FINDINGS

Findings on the Reliability of the Scales

To test the reliability of the Crisis Management and Visionary Leadership Scale scores used in the study, Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency test was applied. The alpha coefficient method, developed by Cronbach (1951), is a technique for estimating the internal consistency of survey items. The alpha coefficient is defined as the ratio of the total variances of specific items in the scale to the general variance, expressed as the weighted average of the standard deviations (Ercan & İsmet, 2004).

Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is measured on a scale from 0 to 1, and reliability is considered as follows (İslamoğlu & Alnıaçık, 2009, p. 291-292):

RPGE

- If $0.01 \leq \alpha < 0.40$, the scale is unreliable;
- If $0.40 \leq \alpha < 0.60$, the scale's reliability is low;
- If $0.60 \leq \alpha < 0.80$, the scale's reliability is acceptable;
- If $0.80 \leq \alpha < 1.00$, the scale's reliability is high.

Table 1. Reliability Analysis of Scale Scores

	Cronbach's Alpha
Crisis Management Scale	0,97
Visionary Leadership Scale	0,97

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Upon examining Table 1, it has been determined that both the Crisis Management Scale and the Visionary Leadership Scale have high reliability.

Table 2. Participants' Crisis Management and Visionary Leadership Levels

Ölçek ve Boyutlar	Düzey	n	%
Crisis Management Scale	Very low level	67	22,11
	Low level	130	42,90
	Medium level	77	25,41
	High level	24	7,92
	Very high level	5	1,65
Visionary Leadership Scale	Very low level	94	31,02
	Low level	143	47,19
	Medium level	46	15,18
	High level	18	5,94
	Very high level	2	0,66

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Table 2 presents the identification of participants' crisis management and visionary leadership levels. According to the results, it is observed that teachers are at a low level in terms of both crisis management and visionary leadership.

RPGE

6

Table 3. Distributions of Demographic Characteristics

Group	Group	n	%
Gender	Male	151	49,83
	Female	152	50,17
Age	22-26	45	14,85
	27-31	41	13,53
	32-36	37	12,21
	37-41	54	17,82
	42-46	56	18,48
	47 and above	70	23,10
Field of Teaching	Verbal sciences	116	38,28
	Numerical sciences	95	31,35
	Social sciences	92	30,36
Marital Status	Married	199	65,68
	Single	104	34,32
Years of Service	1-5 years	53	17,49
	6-10 years	58	19,14
	11-15 years	49	16,17
	16-20 years	53	17,49
	21-24 years	34	11,22
	25 and above	56	18,48
Educational Level	Bachelor' degree	228	75,25
	Postgraduate	75	24,75
Type of the School	Public school	202	66,67
	Private school	101	33,33

Source: Prepared by the authors.

The gender distribution is fairly balanced, with males representing 49.83% (n:151) and females representing 50.17% (n:152). In terms of teaching fields, the majority of teachers work in the verbal branch (38.28%, n:116), while the other fields are also represented in similar proportions (31.35% numerical, n:95; 30.36% social sciences, n:92). This indicates a diverse range of subject areas among the participants, with slightly more teachers from the verbal field. Regarding marital status, the majority of participants are married (65.68%, n:199), while 34.32% (n:104) are single. The distribution of years of service is quite balanced, with participants evenly spread across different service year categories: 1-5 years (n:53), 6-10 years (n:58), 11-15 years (n:49), 16-20 years (n:53), 21-24 years (n:34), and 25 years and above (n:56). In terms of education level, the majority hold a Bachelor's degree (75.25%, n:228), while 24.75% (n:75) have postgraduate education. Finally, regarding the type of school, most participants

work in public schools (66.67%, n:202), while 33.33% (n:101) work in private schools.

Table 4. Findings on the Normal Distribution Appropriateness of Scale Scores

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		Skewness	Kurtosis	Mean	SD
	Statistics	p				
Pre-crisis activities	0,09	0,01	0,55	0,42	2,28	0,81
During crisis activities	0,10	0,01	0,57	0,33	2,38	0,87
Post-crisis activities	0,14	0,01	0,53	0,08	2,29	0,83
Crisis Management Scale	0,09	0,01	0,51	0,25	2,33	0,80
Communication	0,16	0,01	0,65	0,24	2,11	0,82
Reliability	0,18	0,01	0,93	0,96	2,13	0,87
Risk	0,13	0,01	0,61	0,38	2,24	0,82
Respect	0,16	0,01	0,65	0,42	2,07	0,77
Focus	0,18	0,01	0,77	0,82	2,04	0,77
Visionary Leadership Scale	0,12	0,01	0,77	0,77	2,12	0,74

Fonte: elaborado pelos autores.

The normal distribution of the crisis management scale, visionary leadership scale, and their subscale scores was assessed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and skewness-kurtosis values. In the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the variables that were found to be statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) were evaluated, and the skewness and kurtosis values were examined. As per George and Mallery (2010), if the skewness and kurtosis values fall within the range of ±2.0, they are considered not to show significant deviations from normal distribution. Based on this evaluation, the analysis was conducted using parametric tests as the data did not deviate significantly from normality.

RPGE

8

Table 5. Findings on the Comparison of Scale Scores by Demographic Characteristics-I

Variables	Scales	Groups	n	X̄±Ss	t	Sd	p
Gender	Pre-crisis activities	Male	151	2,26±0,80	-0,37	301	0,71
		Female	152	2,30±0,82			
	During crisis activities	Male	151	2,33±0,81	-0,96	301	0,34
		Female	152	2,43±0,92			
	Post-crisis activities	Male	151	2,24±0,80	-1,07	301	0,29
		Female	152	2,34±0,87			
	Crisis Management Scale	Male	151	2,29±0,77	-0,80	301	0,43
		Female	152	2,36±0,83			
	Communication	Male	151	2,14±0,83	0,57	301	0,57
		Female	152	2,08±0,81			
	Reliability	Male	151	2,13±0,87	-0,02	301	0,99
		Female	152	2,13±0,88			
	Risk	Male	151	2,22±0,81	-0,47	301	0,64
		Female	152	2,26±0,83			
	Respect	Male	151	2,13±0,78	1,19	301	0,24
		Female	152	2,02±0,75			
	Focus	Male	151	2,07±0,77	0,70	301	0,48
		Female	152	2,01±0,78			
	Visionary Leadership Scale	Male	151	2,14±0,74	0,41	301	0,68
		Female	152	2,10±0,74			
Marital Status	Pre-crisis activities	Married	199	2,30±0,82	0,59	301	0,55
		Single	104	2,24±0,79			
	During crisis activities	Married	199	2,42±0,87	1,02	301	0,31
		Single	104	2,31±0,85			
	Post-crisis activities	Married	199	2,32±0,85	0,86	301	0,39
		Single	104	2,23±0,79			
	Crisis Management Scale	Married	199	2,36±0,81	0,88	301	0,38
		Single	104	2,27±0,77			
	Communication	Married	199	2,16±0,83	1,50	301	0,13
		Single	104	2,01±0,79			
	Reliability	Married	199	2,14±0,88	0,19	301	0,85
		Single	104	2,12±0,86			
	Risk	Married	199	2,26±0,81	0,66	301	0,51
		Single	104	2,20±083			
	Respect	Married	199	2,08±0,76	0,32	301	0,75
		Single	104	2,05±0,78			

RPGE

	Married	199	2,05±0,78			
Focus				0,32	301	0,75
	Single	104	2,02±0,76			
	Married	199	2,14±0,74			
Visionary Leadership Scale				0,66	301	0,51
	Single	104	2.08±0.73			

Source: Prepared by the authors.

The scale scores and subscale scores do not show a statistically significant difference based on participants' gender and marital status (p > 0.05).

Table 6. Findings on the Comparison of Scale Scores by Demographic Characteristics-II

Variables	Scales	Groups	n	$\overline{X}±Ss$	t*	Sd	p
Education Level	Pre-crisis activities	Bachelor' degree	228	2,23±0,80	-1,75	301	0,08
		Postgraduate	75	2,42±0,84			
	During crisis activities	Bachelor' degree	228	2,32±0,80	-2,35	301	0,02
		Postgraduate	75	2,58±1,02			
	Post-crisis activities	Bachelor' degree	228	2,26±0,83	-0,98	301	0,33
		Postgraduate	75	2,37±0,84			
	Crisis Management Scale	Bachelor' degree	228	2,27±0,77	-1,98	301	0,04
		Postgraduate	75	2,48±0,86			
	Communication	Bachelor' degree	228	2,11±0,80	-0,21	301	0,84
		Postgraduate	75	2,13±0,89			
	Reliability	Bachelor' degree	228	2,12±0,85	-0,52	301	0,60
		Postgraduate	75	2,18±0,95			
	Risk	Bachelor' degree	228	2,21±0,78	-1,26	301	0,21
		Postgraduate	75	2,34±0,92			
	Respect	Bachelor' degree	228	2,04±0,72	-1,20	301	0,23
		Postgraduate	75	2,17±0,90			
	Focus	Bachelor' degree	228	2,03±0,76	-0,69	301	0,49
		Postgraduate	75	2,10±0,82			
	Visionary Leadership Scale	Bachelor' degree	228	2,10±0,71	-0,84	301	0,40
		Postgraduate	75	2,18±0,80			
Type of the School	Pre-crisis activities	Public School	202	2,39±0,83	3,23	301	0,01
		Private School	101	2,07±0,72			
	During crisis activities	Public School	202	2,50±0,91	3,34	301	0,01
		Private School	101	2,15±0,73			
	Post-crisis activities	Public School	202	2,39±0,85	3,09	301	0,01
		Private School	101	2,08±0,76			

Type of the School							
	Crisis Management Scale	Public School	202	2,44±0,82	3,43	301	0,01
		Private School	101	2,11±0,70			
	Communication	Public School	202	2,19±0,86	2,40	301	0,02
		Private School	101	1,95±0,71			
	Reliability	Public School	202	2,21±0,90	2,14	301	0,03
		Private School	101	1,98±0,80			
	Risk	Public School	202	2,32±0,81	2,46	301	0,01
		Private School	101	2,08±0,80			
	Respect	Public School	202	2,13±0,79	1,98	301	0,04
		Private School	101	1,95±0,72			
	Focus	Public School	202	2,10±0,79	1,73	301	0,08
		Private School	101	1,93±0,72			
	Visionary Leadership Scale	Public School	202	2,19±0,76	2,36	301	0,02
		Private School	101	1,98±0,66			

t: Independent Samples t-Test
Source: Prepared by the authors.

The crisis management scale scores and crisis activities during the crisis show a statistically significant difference based on the participants' education level (p < 0.05). Looking at the mean values, it was found that individuals with a bachelor's degree had lower scores on crisis activities during the crisis and on the overall crisis management scale compared to individuals with a higher education degree. Other scale scores do not show a statistically significant difference based on the participants' education level (p > 0.05). Crisis activities before the crisis, crisis activities during the crisis, crisis activities after the crisis, crisis management scale, communication, reliability, risk, respect, and visionary leadership scale scores show a statistically significant difference based on the type of school where the participants work (p < 0.05). Looking at the mean values, it was found that individuals working in public schools had higher scores in crisis activities before, during, and after the crisis, crisis management, communication, reliability, risk, respect, and visionary leadership compared to individuals working in private schools. Focus scores do not show a statistically significant difference based on the type of school where the participants work (p > 0.05) (Table 7).

Table 7. Findings on the Comparison of Scale Scores by Subject Area

Scales	Groups	n	X̄±Ss	F	p
Pre-crisis activities	Verbal (Humanities)	116	2,25±0,87	0,26	0,77
	Numerical	95	2,33±0,75		
	Social	92	2,27±0,80		
During crisis activities	Verbal (Humanities)	116	2,35±0,89	0,20	0,82
	Numerical	95	2,43±0,81		
	Social	92	2,37±0,90		
Post-crisis activities	Verbal (Humanities)	116	2,30±0,88	0,05	0,96
	Numerical	95	2,29±0,80		
	Social	92	2,27±0,82		
Crisis Management Scale	Verbal (Humanities)	116	2,30±0,85	0,18	0,84
	Numerical	95	2,37±0,74		
	Social	92	2,31±0,80		
Communication	Verbal (Humanities)	116	2,06±0,87	0,42	0,66
	Numerical	95	2,16±0,75		
	Social	92	2,13±0,83		
Reliability	Verbal (Humanities)	116	2,15±0,96	0,06	0,94
	Numerical	95	2,14±0,79		
	Social	92	2,10±0,84		
Risk	Verbal (Humanities)	116	2,27±0,86	0,12	0,88
	Numerical	95	2,24±0,77		
	Social	92	2,21±0,82		
Respect	Verbal (Humanities)	116	2,09±0,81	0,15	0,86
	Numerical	95	2,04±0,71		
	Social	92	2,08±0,77		
Focus	Verbal (Humanities)	116	2,05±0,84	0,07	0,93
	Numerical	95	2,06±0,73		
	Social	92	2,02±0,73		
Visionary Leadership Scale	Verbal (Humanities)	116	2,12±0,80	0,01	0,99
	Numerical	95	2,13±0,68		
	Social	92	2,11±0,72		

F: One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).
Source: Prepared by the authors.

The scale scores (Table 8) do not show a statistically significant difference according to the participants' fields of study (p > 0.05).

RPGE

Table 8. Findings on the Comparison of Scale Scores by Age

Scales	Groups	n	X̄±SD	F	p
Pre-crisis activities	22-26	45	2,33±0,77	0,59	0,70
	27-31	41	2,10±0,64		
	32-36	37	2,26±0,76		
	37-41	54	2,37±0,86		
	42-46	56	2,29±0,81		
	47 or older	70	2,30±0,92		
During crisis activities	22-26	45	2,40±0,80	0,70	0,63
	27-31	41	2,17±0,63		
	32-36	37	2,34±0,85		
	37-41	54	2,40±0,89		
	42-46	56	2,43±1,00		
	47 or older	70	2,47±0,91		
Post-crisis activities	22-26	45	2,33±0,75	0,52	0,76
	27-31	41	2,16±0,79		
	32-36	37	2,24±0,82		
	37-41	54	2,37±0,87		
	42-46	56	2,21±0,87		
	47 or older	70	2,36±0,87		
Crisis Management Scale	22-26	45	2,36±0,74	0,61	0,70
	27-31	41	2,14±0,62		
	32-36	37	2,29±0,78		
	37-41	54	2,39±0,82		
	42-46	56	2,33±0,86		
	47 or older	70	2,38±0,86		
Communication	22-26	45	2,08±0,85	0,85	0,51
	27-31	41	1,90±0,69		
	32-36	37	2,09±0,84		
	37-41	54	2,23±0,85		
	42-46	56	2,15±0,79		
	47 or older	70	2,14±0,87		
Reliability	22-26	45	2,30±0,93	1,67	0,14
	27-31	41	1,82±0,63		
	32-36	37	2,17±0,93		
	37-41	54	2,26±0,92		
	42-46	56	2,12±0,91		
	47 or older	70	2,09±0,82		

RPGE

				F	p
Risk	22-26	45	2,33±0,93		
	27-31	41	1,92±0,61		
	32-36	37	2,28±0,87	1,60	0,16
	37-41	54	2,33±0,73		
	42-46	56	2,22±0,89		
	47 or older	70	2,29±0,80		
Respect	22-26	45	2,18±0,83		
	27-31	41	1,90±0,63		
	32-36	37	2,14±0,81	0,74	0,59
	37-41	54	2,09±0,76		
	42-46	56	2,01±0,80		
	47 or older	70	2,11±0,77		
Focus	22-26	45	2,12±0,86		
	27-31	41	1,94±0,67		
	32-36	37	2,17±0,82	0,78	0,57
	37-41	54	2,07±0,72		
	42-46	56	1,91±0,75		
	47 or older	70	2,08±0,80		
Visionary Leadership Scale	22-26	45	2,20±0,80		
	27-31	41	1,90±0,53		
	32-36	37	2,17±0,80	1,06	0,38
	37-41	54	2,20±0,74		
	42-46	56	2,08±0,75		
	47 or older	70	2,14±0,75		

F: One-way Analysis of Variance.
Source: Prepared by the authors.

The scale scores (Table 9) do not show a statistically significant difference according to participants' age groups ($p > 0.05$).

Table 9. Findings of the Relationship Between Scale Scores

Scales		Communication	Reliability	Risk	Respect	Focus	Escala de Liderança Visionária
Pre-crisis activities	r	0,68	0,67	0,65	0,63	0,65	0,72
	p	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**
During crisis activities	r	0,67	0,68	0,66	0,62	0,62	0,72
	p	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**

RPGE

14

Post-crisis activities	r	0,72	0,68	0,70	0,67	0,67	0,76
	p	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**
Crisis Management Scale	r	0,72	0,71	0,70	0,67	0,68	0,76
	p	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**	**0,01**

*r:*Pearson korelasyon katsayısı.
Source: Prepared by the authors.

There is a statistically significant positive moderate-level relationship between the *Pre-Crisis Activities* score and the following variables: *Communication* score (r: 0.68; p < 0.05), *Reliability* score (r: 0.67; p < 0.05), *Risk* score (r: 0.65; p < 0.05), *Respect* score (r: 0.63; p < 0.05), *Focus* score (r: 0.65; p < 0.05). Additionally, a strong positive relationship is found between the *Pre-Crisis Activities* score and the *Visionary Leadership Scale total score* (r: 0.72; p < 0.05). Similarly, for the *During-Crisis Activities* score, there is a statistically significant positive moderate-level relationship with the *Communication* score (r: 0.67; p < 0.05), *Reliability* score (r: 0.68; p < 0.05), *Risk* score (r: 0.66; p < 0.05), *Respect* score (r: 0.62; p < 0.05), and *Focus* score (r: 0.62; p < 0.05). A strong positive correlation is also observed with the *Visionary Leadership Scale total score* (r: 0.72; p < 0.05). In terms of the *Post-Crisis Activities* score, there is a strong positive correlation with the *Communication* score (r: 0.72; p < 0.05) and *Risk* score (r: 0.70; p < 0.05), as well as a moderate positive relationship with the *Reliability* score (r: 0.68; p < 0.05), *Respect* score (r: 0.67; p < 0.05), and *Focus* score (r: 0.67; p < 0.05). The *Post-Crisis Activities* score also shows a very strong positive relationship with the *Visionary Leadership Scale total score* (r: 0.76; p < 0.05). Finally, the *Crisis Management Scale total score* demonstrates a strong positive relationship with the *Communication* score (r: 0.72; p < 0.05), *Reliability* score (r: 0.71; p < 0.05), and *Risk* score (r: 0.70; p < 0.05). It also shows a moderate positive relationship with the *Respect* score (r: 0.67; p < 0.05) and *Focus* score (r: 0.68; p < 0.05). The *Crisis Management Scale total score* has a very strong positive correlation with the *Visionary Leadership Scale total score* (r: 0.76; p < 0.05).

DISCUSSION

The average scores for crisis management and visionary leadership among teachers working at the secondary school level across different subject areas have been found to be at a low level. However, managing the middle school period, which covers one of the most critical stages of education, in a correct and goal-oriented manner is indispensable for both parties involved. Therefore, it is essential to provide in-service and external training to enhance teachers' competencies and contributions, and to ensure that the necessary support, both

RPGE

15

material and moral, is available when needed. This is not only important for teachers but also for our children, who are the future of our society.

When considering the participants' gender, age, marital status, and teaching disciplines, it has been observed that there are no significant differences in terms of crisis management and its sub-dimensions, nor in terms of visionary leadership and its sub-dimensions. In the literature, some studies conducted in the field of education on visionary leadership and crisis management found no significant differences (Rosadi et al., 2024; Kadhum et al., 2023; Sarıkaya, 2023; Demiray et al., 2023), while other studies identified significant differences (Lamu, 2023; Birel, 2024). This discrepancy may be attributed to the geographical locations of the studies, the different backgrounds and cultures of the participants, or the diverse norms of upbringing in family environments. At every stage of life, societal and family cultures directly influence the development of an individual's competencies. This leads to a situation characterized by varying personality traits and perspectives.

Therefore, while some individuals may demonstrate strong leadership qualities and make a significant difference in crisis situations, others may exhibit lower levels of these qualities. In a profession as important as teaching, developing these competencies and guiding students in the best and most effective way will directly influence their development and cultural background. When examining the activity levels based on education level, it is observed that the scores for crisis activities during the crisis and the general scores of the crisis management scale show statistically significant differences based on the participants' education level.

The finding that individuals with a bachelor's degree have lower scores for crisis activities during the crisis and the general crisis management scale compared to those with higher education levels suggests the need to support the development of teachers' competencies. Studies in the literature align with these findings (Chatzipanagiotou & Katsarou, 2023; Elo & Uljens, 2024). This highlights the importance of creating more effective plans to ensure continuous learning within and outside institutions, utilizing technology, and increasing online distance learning opportunities. Crisis-prevention activities, crisis activities, post-crisis activities, the crisis management scale, communication, reliability, risk, respect, and visionary leadership scale scores show statistically significant differences based on the type of school where the participants work. When examining the average scores, it was found that participants working in public schools scored higher on the crisis management scale and all sub-dimensions (except for visionary leadership and focus) compared to those working in private schools. This suggests that teachers in public schools may be more effective in managing all processes without the fear of losing their jobs.

Considering the anxiety experienced by private school teachers with annual contracts, it can be inferred that they may adopt a more passive and secure approach, striving not to be in a position where they could face conflict with management. This might lead them to behave

Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional (RPGE), Araraquara, v. 29(esp.1), n. 00, e025026, 2025.   e-ISSN: 1519-9029

10.22633/rpge.v29iesp1.20457

RPGE

16

more cautiously and reservedly during crises or in leadership situations. This issue could be addressed through support and binding guidelines from the official institutions with which they are affiliated, which would enable private school teachers to perform their tasks more effectively without the fear of job loss. Numerous studies in the literature support this finding (Atıgan & Özkan, 2023; Akyürek & Göktaş, 2023; Chatzipanagiotou & Katsarou, 2023). A moderate positive correlation was found between the crisis-prevention activities score, crisis activities score, and the scores for communication, reliability, focus, respect, and risk. A strong positive correlation was observed between the crisis-prevention activities score and the general score of the visionary leadership scale, which was statistically significant. In his study, Oplatka (2023) stated that one of the most important tasks for teachers before a crisis is to master early warning systems, which help prevent crises, be proactive, and minimize the potential effects of a crisis in the future, ultimately gaining optimal benefit from it. He emphasized that the effective management of crises, along with positive relationships and communication within the school and leadership characteristics, plays a crucial role (Birel, 2024; Debes, 2021). This point strongly supports the findings of our study. The moderate correlation observed in the sub-dimensions and the high correlation in the general score of visionary leadership suggest that, in situations requiring leadership, teachers are able to bring out their strengths, thus creating more effective leadership and a synergistic impact.

A strong positive correlation was found between the crisis post-activities score and the scores for communication and risk, while a moderate positive correlation was observed between the crisis post-activities score and the scores for reliability, respect, and focus. Furthermore, a strong positive, statistically significant correlation was found between the crisis post-activities score and the general score of the Visionary Leadership Scale. The post--crisis period is generally seen as the final stage of the crisis, during which new strategies and initiatives are developed.

In this context, the importance of communication and taking risks becomes evident. When this process is managed correctly and new objectives are implemented in a way that involves everyone, trust, respect, and focus will naturally follow. Candrasari et al. (2023) also obtained findings that support these results in their study. While the experience gained after a crisis is invaluable, identifying the potential effects of the crisis, preparing plans, and managing risks with new strategies are equally important. When all of these processes are carried out with effective communication, success becomes inevitable (Kurniadi et al., 2020; Shanti et al., 2020).

A strong positive correlation was found between the general score of the Crisis Management Scale and the scores for communication, reliability, and risk, while a moderate positive correlation was observed between the general score and the scores for respect and focus. The importance of communication, its contribution to reliability, and its sensitivity in

RPGE

17

managing risks in both visionary leadership and crisis management are correlated with similar findings in the literature (Martinez et al., 2023; Madugu & Manaf, 2019). A person can build trust, manage risks effectively, and turn crises into opportunities through the language they use. This underscores that these are essential qualities for role-model teachers, especially in how they approach their students and set milestones.

A strong positive, statistically significant correlation was found between the general score of the Crisis Management Scale and the general score of the Visionary Leadership Scale. The synergistic effect of these two traits suggests that teachers with a high level of vision are also capable of managing crises effectively and providing maximum support to their students (Martinez, 2023; Chen & Yuan, 2021). Despite their potentially destructive outcomes, crises also present opportunities to identify new and better ways of working. Furthermore, this highlights that strategic planning will lead to more effective development for students and the critical role of the leadership spirit that teachers bring to all these processes.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In conclusion, the data we need to focus on in this study highlight that visionary leadership and crisis management levels synergistically affect each other, and it is essential for leaders to possess a strong vision in order to effectively manage crises. It is evident that there is a need for teacher-leaders who can predict potential crises, manage them during and after they occur, and chart a roadmap for both the institution and students, thereby rebuilding the future. These leaders will be those who can adapt to the ever-changing conditions of today, have a vision for shaping children's futures, guide them during crises, respond swiftly to the need for rapid change and transformation, and concretize the abstract future vision for their students.

Another crucial point raised in the study is that education should not be limited to just a bachelor's degree. It is important for teachers to continually engage in educational development to stay up to date and fulfill their responsibilities to the best of their ability. Teachers who develop their vision through each crisis should continue with a positive attitude, keep an open mind, learn from mistakes, and support continuous learning processes, being aware that defensive thinking hinders learning. Similarly, the type of school in which teachers work seems to make a significant difference, emphasizing the need for support in fostering their creativity, intervention skills, and overall effectiveness. Teachers must be empowered to pursue their beliefs freely and without fear, ensuring they are always on the path to what is right. This can only be achieved if the institutions with which they are affiliated take measures to support them and provide assistance on all platforms.

Looking at practical applications, there are examples from abroad that we can refer to. For instance, in France, the engineering degree is structured as a 3-year undergraduate program followed by 2 mandatory years of master's education, graduating students in 5 years. This model could be implemented in education faculties as well. By doing so, we could graduate more qualified teachers and simultaneously create a framework in which personal development programs within institutions help prepare students not only for academic success but also for life. In addition to the seminars already conducted, teachers' personal development should be considered an investment in the future.

REFERENCES

Akyürek, M. İ., & Göktaş, E. (2023). İnovatif okul liderliği ve girişimci öğretmen davranışlarının okul mutluluğu üzerindeki etkisi: Özel okullar örneği. *Anadolu Eğitim Liderliği ve Öğretim Dergisi, 11*(1), 29–47.

Algın, A., & Sarvan, F. (2024). The effects of environmentally sensitive business practices on competitive advantage: A study on Antalya organised industrial zone companies. *International Journal of Sports Technology and Science, 2*(1), 66–81.

Algın, A., Yesilbaş, H., & Kantek, F. (2024). The relationship between missed nursing care and nurse job satisfaction: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 46*(12), 980–988. https://doi.org/10.1177/01939459241292038

Atıgan, F., & Özkan, P. (2023). Okul müdürlerinin vizyoner liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Uluslararası Liderlik Çalışmaları Dergisi: Kuram ve Uygulama*.

Barasa, E., Mbau, R., & Gilson, L. (2018). What is resilience and how can it be nurtured? A systematic review of empirical literature on organizational resilience. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management, 7*(6), 491–503.

Birel, F. K. (2024). Crisis management skills of primary school administrators. *International Journal of Education, Technology and Science, 4*(4), 2285–2297.

Bundy, J., Pfarrer, M. D., Short, C. E., & Coombs, W. T. (2017). Crises and crisis management: Integration, interpretation, and research development. *Journal of Management, 43*(6), 1661–1692.

Buss, M., & Kearney, E. (2024). Navigating the unknown: Uncertainty moderates the link between visionary leadership, perceived meaningfulness, and turnover intentions. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology.*

Candrasari, R., Yorman, Y., Mayasari, N., Yulia, R., & Lake, F. (2023). Visionary leadership in education management: Leading toward optimal achievement in the era of independent learning. *Indonesian Journal of Education (INJOE), 3*(3), 451–467.

Chatzipanagiotou, P., & Katsarou, E. (2023). Crisis management, school leadership in disruptive times and the recovery of schools in the post COVID-19 era: A systematic literature review. *Education Sciences, 13*(2), 118.

Chen, H. H., & Yuan, Y. H. (2021). The study of the relationships of teacher's creative teaching, imagination, and principal's visionary leadership. *SAGE Open, 11*(3), 21582440211029932.

Debes, G. (2021). Teachers' perception of crisis management in schools. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching, 8*(2), 638–652.

Demiray, S., Arslan, A., Kuru, K. U., Yalçınkaya, S., Güzeller, F., Demiroğlu, H. İ., ... & Öztürk, T. (2023). Examining the crisis management levels of school administrators. *Journal of Social Development, 1*(1), 63–68.

Dereceli, Ç., Dereceli, E., & Yıldız, T. (2023). Comparison of personal adaptation levels and leadership orientation of sports sciences faculty students who do sports and those who do not. *International Mountaineering and Climbing Journal, 6*(2), 38–51.

Derin, N., Demirtaş, Ö., & Baynal Doğan, T. G. (2020). Vizyoner liderlik davranışlarının örgütsel destek aracılığıyla örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları üzerindeki etkisi: Psikolojik rahatlığın düzenleyici rolü. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 41*, Denizli.

Elo, J., & Uljens, M. (2024). Levels of pedagogical leadership in higher education: An overview. In *Multilevel pedagogical leadership in higher education: A non-affirmative approach* (pp. 45–64). Springer.

Jongen, H. (2024). Beyond the numbers on women's representation: Recognition of women's leadership in global governance. *Review of International Studies, 50*(2), 312–332.

Kadhum, A. H., Muttar, L. A., & Khait, A. A. (2023). The role of visionary leadership in achieving strategic change through strategic improvisation. *South Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 4*(4), 12–50.

Kaya, N., & Algın, A. (2022). Technical efficiency in public hospitals: A meta-regression analysis. *Eskişehir Osmangazi University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 17*(3), 810–821. https://doi.org/10.17153/oguiibf.1094736

Kurniadi, R., Lian, B., & Wahidy, A. (2020). Visionary leadership and organizational culture on teacher's performance. *Journal of Social Work and Science Education, 1*(3), 249–256.

Lamu, R. (2023). Visionary leadership in modern organizations: Exploring charismatic and transformational approaches. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences, 23*, 654–657.

Madugu, U., & Manaf, H. A. (2019). Visionary leadership and individual academic staff performance: The mediating influence of knowledge sharing. *Management Research Spectrum, 9*(2), 60–66.

Martinez, N., Kilag, O. K., & Macario, R. (2023). The impact of organizational culture on leadership strategies in crisis management. *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education (2994-9521), 1*(5), 454–466.

Marzuki, M., & Maulana, O. (2023). Visionary leadership strategy in increasing the quality of education services. *Al Fatih*, 1–9.

RPGE

Navarro, C. N. (2024). The impact of crisis management on teacher professional development in post-COVID educational systems. *Smartify: Journal of Smart Education and Pedagogy, 1*(1), 143–154.

Oplatka, I. (2023). Toward a practical model of crisis management in our schools. In *Educational leadership in times of crisis: Insights from great figures in history* (pp. 183–192). Springer International Publishing.

Pekgor, M., Algin, A., Toros, T., Serin, E., Kulak, A., & Tek, T. (2024). Wearable sensor technology in health monitoring and sport psychology education. *Cadernos de Educação, Tecnologia e Sociedade, 17*(se5), 202–218. https://doi.org/10.14571/brajets.v17.nse5.202-218

Prestiadi, D., Zulkarnain, W., & Sumarsono, R. B. (2019, December). Visionary leadership in total quality management: Efforts to improve the quality of education in the industrial revolution 4.0. In *The 4th International Conference on Education and Management* (COEMA 2019) (pp. 202–206). Atlantis Press.

Rosadi, I., Setyaningsih, S., & Suhardi, E. (2024). The influence of visionary leadership, organizational culture, self-efficacy, and work motivation on teacher creativity. *Journal of Educational Administration, 41*(1), 30–55.

Saitis, C., & Saiti, A. (2018). *Initiation of educators into educational management secrets.* Springer International Publishing.

Sarıkaya, Ü. (2023). Okul yöneticilerinin vizyoner liderlik özellikleri ve öğretmenlerin iletişim becerilerinin incelenmesi. *Çağdaş Uygulamalı Bilimler Dergisi, 1*(1), 32–43.

Sasan, J. M., & Kit Kilag, O. (2023). From teacher to school founder: A practicum journal on Dr. Francisca T. Uy's educational journey. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 13*(2), 159–165.

Sashkin, M. (1996). *The visionary leader: The leader behavior questionnaire trainer guide.* Human Resource Development Press.

Sekeroglu, M. O., Pekgor, M., Algin, A., Toros, T., Serin, E., Uzun, M., Cerit, G., Onat, T., & Ermis, S. A. (2025). Transdisciplinary innovations in athlete health: 3D-printable wearable sensors for health monitoring and sports psychology. *Sensors, 25*(5), 1453. https://doi.org/10.3390/s25051453

Stavroulia, K. E., Aedo, I., Díaz, P., & Lanitis, A. (2021, September). Virtual-reality-based crisis management training for teachers: An overview of the VRTEACHER project. In 2021 *International Symposium on Computers in Education* (SIIE) (pp. 1–4). IEEE.

Stoker, J. I., Garretsen, H., & Soudis, D. (2019). Tightening the leash after a threat: A multi-level event study on leadership behavior following the financial crisis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 30*(2), 199–214.

RPGE

22

CRediT Author Statement

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação

Proofreading, formatting, normalization and translation

Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional (RPGE), Araraquara, v. 29(esp.1), n. 00, e025026, 2025.   e-ISSN: 1519-9029

10.22633/rpge.v29iesp1.20457

RPGE

23