Bureaucratic Leadership Style and Teachers' Professionalism: A Case Study of Public Sector Universities

GRR
Global Regional Review

CrossMark C1te Us

Umair Arshad	Former Research Scholar, Department of Education, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Pakistan.
Obaid Ullah	Lecturer, Department of Education, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: obaid@numl.edu.pk
Uzma Malik	Lecturer, Department of Pakistan Studies, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Abstract: *This research aims at examining the role of bureaucratic leadership style on teachers' professionalism in public sector universities and the difference between bureaucracy and professionalism, with a special reference to legal-rational authority. A validated self–structured closed-ended questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale was designed for data collection from a sample of 40 teachers of Public Sector Universities. An Ordinal Regression Analysis (ORA) was used to analyze the data. The findings of the study show no significant difference between the role of bureaucratic leadership and teachers' professionalism in university as they are interrelated, having a direct link of professionalism with individuals' approaches, behaviors and performance. The results also revealed that the Bureaucratic Leadership style is a more suitable style that enables individuals to work with more dedication and honesty. Bureaucratic leadership is more effective than many others styles of leadership. Hence, the study recommends that it is practised that every style of leadership is not suitable for every organization or institution so, leaders must be competent enough to use the best style according to the situation.*

Key Words: Bureaucratic Leadership, Professionalism, Legal-Rational, Interrelated, Ordinal Regression

Introduction

There are different forms of leadership that any government or different organizations follow. Bureaucracy is of those. Max Weber is the advocate of this leadership style. Bureaucracy is considered the most effective form of management in organizations to acquire rationality as well as to avoid ambiguity (Aydın, 2010). Some features of bureaucratic structure specifically with reference to the universities can be described below:

i)   Establishment of labor division; according to competencies to share the official duties (Specializations)
ii) Responsibilities of teachers towards university administrators
iii) The obligation of rules and regulations
iv) Demonstration of impartiality and coherence by university staff.

The term bureaucracy refers to a sociological phenomenon. It is evolved for the achievement of desired goals. As a matter of fact, bureaucracy may have some negative aspects with reference to change. In this way, the decision taken under strict rules, regulations and generalities may blunt the creativity; in another way, the hierarchy constitutes hurdles for change and innovation (Sapre, 2000). It is said that professionalism is directly linked with the attitudes as well as behaviors that any individual adopts with regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of a task (Güven, 2010). Whereas, the best practice in making teaching-learning more effective and professional is the teachers should adopt a collaborative environment to generate productive outcomes. (Day, 2002).

An argument says that there is a strong correlation between the critical discourse analysis of the field and professionalism. It helps in acting with the service ethics. It is also helpful to meet the requirement of related spectators in the service industry; it develops a durable dedication to an individual's career. While fulfilling the occupational requirements, it has been able to behave autonomously (Cerit, 2012).

Hoy and Miskel (2010) said if the bureaucratic structure of the university works effectively, the teachers will be able to display professional autonomy. It is also said that professional behaviors may not necessarily be restricted by some strict rules.

The effectiveness of bureaucratic university structures makes teachers feel empowered. They can communicate with their colleagues. They will also have a sense of differentiation (Kepenekçi, 1998). On the other hand, Bayhan (2011) pointed out that an effective university structure can help to provide positive cooperation among different teachers. During professional practice, they can help as well as support each other to solve work-related problems they are encountered with.

Hoy and Sweetland (2001) further described that in spite of a negative opinion about bureaucracy in accordance with the employees of the organization, there is a positive side as well.

In the present system, it has been observed that, particularly in universities, the interaction between bureaucracy and professionalism turned into issues at all levels of the organization. Such issues involve planning, programming and implementation.

While taking it into consideration, the impact of centralized as well as decentralized systems can be checked and evaluated.

But the flaw is that bureaucracy and professionalism are not working properly and according to the set priorities. In this way, they are producing not desired outcomes in an improper manner. It is required for all the management systems or approaches should be revised according to the need of the situation as well as the interests of individuals. The present study honestly tried to highlight the attitudes of professional teachers about the concept of bureaucratic leadership style. It also studied the effects of bureaucratic leadership on professional staff development. Besides, it focused on highlighting the pros and cons of the bureaucratic leadership style.

Statement of The Problem

Bureaucracy and professionalism are not working in a sequential form as the set priorities are not corrected, due to which they are unable to produce the qualitative and desired outcomes. So, all the management systems and approaches need to be revised as per the situation and interests of individuals. In this study, bureaucratic leadership style is an independent variable whereas, teachers' professionalism is a dependent variable.

Research Objectives

The study objectives were to:

1- Identify the effect of bureaucratic structure on the professionalism of teachers based on the centralization at NUML, Islamabad.
2- Investigate the characteristics of teacher's professionalism with respect to their personality.
3- Explore the strengths and weaknesses of bureaucratic structure and professionalism.

Research Hypotheses

The study is based on the following research hypotheses:

Ho: Bureaucratic leadership styles do not affect the behaviors of professional teachers in the university.

H1: Bureaucratic leadership style affects the behaviors of professional teachers in the university.

Ho: There is no significant difference between the role of bureaucratic leadership and teacher's professionalism in university.

H1: Ho: There is a significant difference between the role of bureaucratic leadership and teacher's professionalism in universities.

Significance of Study

The significance of this study is that as per the bureaucratic model, the organization was operated in a rational manner rather than relying on current systems. Also, all the professionals who are working in a bureaucratic management style were considering the important characteristics, i.e. job specialization, formal rules and procedures, impersonality, hierarchy and career advancement.

Literature Review

Academic researchers considering universities as bureaucratic institutions reason being the application of formal structure, rules, and regulations of an organization or institution define life not only for teachers and students but also for the administrators in a university. Similarly, the universities are also characterized by controlling rules, give direction to the behavior of students and teachers. It also provides

the standard protocols for determining organizational behavior (McGuigan, 2005; McGuigan & Hoy, 2006).

The organizational structure in bureaucratic university reveals authority related to top management, which also shows the flow of information in the same manner. It encourages focused culture within a university with reference to command and control, where supervision of operational processes are executed under conservative management.

Bureaucratic university structures and organizational citizenship have positive and significant relationships (Messick, 2012). It helps in enhancing teachers' professionalism (Cerit, 2013), develops teachers' academic optimism (Anderson, 2012; Beard, 2008; Beard, Hoy, & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2010; McGuigan, 2005; McGuigan & Hoy, 2006; Messick, 2012). The work done in this field has also revealed that the collaboration among the teachers was weak. They had minimum collaborative and low self-efficacy; hence, for this reason, it was challenging for a traditional teaching and learning environment (with bureaucratic structures) to emerge in universities (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001).

Formalization

Real formalization is directly linked with the managerial system of an organization that involves a set of formal rules, procedures and policies (Hoy & Miskel, 2004/2010). Formalization can be divided into two aspects:

Coercive Formalization

The coercive nature is related to strict rules and regulations. These rules control the employee for displaying compliance behaviors. It also involves punishing the employees who fail to follow the set rules (Adler & Borys, 1996). As per Hoy (2003), in bureaucratic organizations, the rule of coercive power and procedures may leave an inappropriate and negative effect on reporting, collaboration, teamwork, motivation as well as organizational faith.

Thus, it is argued that to have unity and constructive behavior, the employees may get reinforced by the organizational command in coercive formalization, and certain individuals who do not obey rules might get punished; hence it can relatively control employees' behavior (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Bureaucratic structure in universities has been criticized by Kimbrough and Todd (1967). He has

defined nine ways to claims in a manner that why universities should not be bureaucratic organizations. These are as follows;

1. Difference of opinion between staff members affects the new innovations
2. Generation of emerging concepts from different personals might be subjective to the authorities; especially when the concepts are conflicting for the rationalization of perceived teaching behavior;
3. Another argument is that bureaucracy may not allow personal growth. It is a great hurdle in the development of mature and healthy personalities;
4. Organizations with a Bureaucratic leadership style do not have a mechanism for the revision of decisions and has no acceptance of novelty;
5. Bureaucratic organizations lag behind in accommodating the diverse external inputs that are needed for the democratic university systems;
6. Here is an extrinsic reward system that stimulates conformity instead of innovation;
7. Within the organization, the priority of organizational resources is a commitment of subunits. In catering for new problems; it is somewhat difficult to develop innovative solutions;
8. Another comment is that the bureaucratic system may not take into account the informal organization;
9. Weak communication; because of hierarchical divisions

Enabling Formalization

It is involved in the formation of regulations, procedures, and regulations in a manner that whenever they encounter any problem, it enables employees to find a better solution. It helps in taking the initiative for organizational processes. It also helps in continuous professional development (Adler & Borys, 1996). Hoy and Miskel (2010) stated that in this formalization, administrations rules and regulations are comparatively adaptable where the employees' demands are being considered. Enabling formalization helps to encourage employee collaboration within an organization. It creates a healthy working milieu that is purely based on mutual trust and respect as well. (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001)

Centralization

In bureaucratic organizations, the term centralization explains that how the decisions are being made in an organization. It encourages employees' suggestions while making decisions. There are two categories of centralization. In an intense centralization system, only top-level management (Administrators) are engaged in accountability and decision-making procedures, while in a less centralized organization system, decisions are based on a participatory manner. It gives the shared importance for such judgmental decisions (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Bureaucratic organizations mainly emphasize that all individuals should report to their designated superior. Here, in this case, the command is reduced at the higher level of the hierarchy; however, it comes under a flexible chain of command (Hoy, 2003). If we talk about the bureaucratic organizational structure, the term centralization is further divided into two categories. The first is Hindering, and the second is Enabling.

Hindering Centralization

In an organizational structure, if any employee's behavior is innovative, it is considered a hinder. In this case, to control the employee's behavior, the administrators ensure and guide each and every single employee that unreliability, argument and clashes will not be accepted at any cost under the organizational structure, and harmony among the employees is at the forefront (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Organizations having deterring structures put a stop to their employee's constructive growth, due to which their performance is not effective and are unable to resolve problems (Hoy & Miskel, 2010).

Enabling Centralization

On the other hand, this form of organizational administration is more flexible and allows the employees to take part in the decision-making process. This sort of management is always there to help their employees in solving several disputes complications. The employees take part in decision-making procedures and perform more effectively with their fellow workers (Hoy, 2003; Hoy & Sweetland, 2001; Sinden et al., 2004).

As long as universities are observed as bureaucratic organizations, the key elements of such organizational structures are a set of formal rules, ordinance, plan of action, and chain of command.

(Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). The organizational behavior and overall functioning of a university have a strong collision with the environmental system of the university. To enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the task by instructors, in hindering structure, the institution should allow them to work in a constructive and flexible environment whereas they are supposed to obey the rules strictly. (Hoy, 2003).

Hoy and Sweetland (2001) claimed that hindering school structures do not welcome new ideas, teamwork and intercommunications, which results in a negative effect on the overall progress of the university. On the other side of the coin, in enabling structure teachers to work collaboratively using collaborative professional development techniques, this leaves a positive impact on the overall quality and student achievements as well as this is proved as the most effective and best teaching practice. (Hoy, 2003). Additionally, in such structures, university administrators provide facilities to their teachers and other staff members to enhance their professional skills, which will result in productive outcomes for both the individual and its organization. Also, teachers are involved in several decision-making processes. (Anderson, 2012).

Max Weber has presented the following two concepts of rationality:

Formal rationality: it refers not only to the means-end relationship but also the fulfilment of practical ends through a precise calculation adapted for the attainment of those objectives.

Real rationality: it primarily concerns the increase of theoretical dominance of reality by means of abstract as well as precise concepts (Clegg, 1990 endorsed by Serpa Ferreira, 2019).

To accomplish the anticipated goals, bureaucracy has been measured as one of the best sociological phenomena. It is a scheme that accomplishes social actions in the history of societies. We spend most of our time at universities, so, in this manner, the university can also be the one form of bureaucracy. (Yücel, 1999). There are some people who face the bureaucratic nature of the institute. They say that bureaucratic institutes are a great hurdle in different ways (Bursalıoğlu, 2012). Major functions of bureaucracy include the protection of their own structure. As it might disclose some complications, major complications are for executives who are

measured to be the source of causes. In this way, the superiors are supposed to obey the manager. Keeping in view the literature, bureaucracy can have a negative impact on decision making based on the standard operating procedures. It can further be exposed as the bureaucracy can be an uncooperative or active feature of organizational culture.

According to Craig (1995), bureaucracy supports innovation in Japan, which provides quick, tangible outcomes. Similarly, Adler and Borys (1996) have mentioned that in some types of organizations, the bureaucrats can either be uncooperative or useful.

In general, bureaucratic leaders always obey the rule of the book and ensure its implementation in letter and spirit. This style of leadership is appropriate for involving serious safety risks tasks (i.e., while working with machinery, poisonous ingredients, and/or at unsafe altitudes). It is also workable where monitory is involved. This leadership style seems productive during routine matters (Shaefer, 2005).

Factors That Determine Leadership Style

Ibara (2010) mentioned that there is a number of factors that helps and explain effective leadership styles as under:

Organizational Strength

Most organizations have the inclination to flourish. As they expand, they further get divided into small groups, and decision-making power has been transferred. While organizations grow, many problems evolved. In this manner, reporting to the senior management level becomes more difficult; likewise, the time comes when the organizational structure grows larger and become more composite than the decision-making power might get centralized (Naylor, 1999). In such conditions, the employees get limited participation.

Extent of Collaboration

Collaboration within an organization mentions an interpersonal approach among individuals based on their social and organizational structures, which indicates their focus and aim toward the achievement of goals (Ololube, 2012). This will make the leaders well equipped about the key outcomes. It ensures organizational knowledge that is taking place. In order to complete the tasks, organizational management styles will have a clear impact on the quantity and

quality of collaboration. According to Naylor (1999), the effectiveness of organizations will have the following aspects:

1. Constantly sharing of information by the managers
2. Managers should have different communication channels
3. Face-to-face In order to streamline composite data to make possible assumptions and action plans, detailed discussions with staff are required. (1999, p. 825).

Different organizations can activate systems on both open-end or closed-end. Open systems collect data and information and process that to interact enthusiastically within its domain. It uses it to interact dynamically with its environment. Openness helps in increasing the probability of healthier reporting that in turn improves the working of an organization and ensures its existence (Ololube, 2012).

Personality of Members

The style of organizational leadership is based on the traits of its employees, managers or leaders. As all individuals have individual differences so, some people are inclined to respond more to some specific leadership style than others. Employees who rely on others generally have low contributions in organizational affairs with the least effective and could be termed as *passive contributors* (Ibara, 2010).

Methodology
Nature of the study
It was a quantitative research study focusing on a longitudinal survey, which was conducted as the main focus of our study to find out teachers' perceptions regarding bureaucratic leadership style. The sample of the study holds only teachers; that is why a longitudinal survey was opted instead of Cross-Sectional Survey. Quantitative research helps to describe any phenomenon by gathering numerical data and generalizing it over a large population.

Population and sample of the study
The population of the study constitutes 160 teachers of public sector universities of Islamabad, i.e. NUML, AIOU, and IIUI. From the population, 30% of teachers were selected as samples of study following standardized sample size determination techniques through random sampling (Krejcie & Morgon, 1970).

Research Instrument

A close-ended questionnaire with a 5-points Likert scale was used for the study. The research instrument was empirically designed with the help of a literature review and personal experiences. This questionnaire includes 27 items keeping in view the objectives of the study. It was further divided into three categories; Effects of Bureaucracy on Professionalism of Teachers, Characteristics of Teacher's Professionalism with respect to their personality and Strengths and Weaknesses of (Bureaucracy and Professionalism), consisting 9 items each.

Validity of the Instrument

Face validity of the instrument was done by experts from relevant fields. Construct validity of the instrument was assessed by the teachers who teach the course of leadership as a subject.

Q – Sorting Technique was used to organize all the items in a logical and sequential order.

T – Sorting Techniques was used to organize all the themes in a logical and sequential order. The average Extract Variance (AEV) of the instrument using SPSS is 0.445 whereas, composite reliability is 0.751

Pilot Study

Prior to conduct the data for the actual study, a pilot study was conducted aimed to check the questionnaire in terms of suitability of the content and easily understandable by the stakeholders. The adaptive trial design was opted to conduct the pilot study. The sample for the pilot study was selected on the rule of thumb, and only 15% of the sample of selected from the population. The sample selected for the pilot study was not included in the actual study. The Cronbach alpha for the questionnaire was 0.9 having 27 items. Hence, the reliability of the questionnaire was good.

Questionnaire Administration

A total design approach was used in administering the questionnaire to collect the data from the respondents. The rate of return of the questionnaire was 100%.

Data Collection

Data was collected from the teachers by the researchers. A descriptive letter was also attached with the questionnaire. Participants were briefly explained the purpose of the study.

Data Analysis

The collected data was analyzed using SPSS. Ordinal Regression Analysis was used to check the relationship of dependent and independent variables, and the results are presented in tabular form.

Table 1

Statement	N	Marginal Percentage
In Bureaucratic leadership, employees follow specific rules formulated by the authority.	14	35%
	22	55%
	3	7.5%
	1	2.5%
Bureaucracy helps to control the conflicts among the teachers.	5	12.5%
	16	40%
	6	15%
	12	30%
	1	2.5%
Bureaucratic leadership allows training programs to increase the awareness among teachers regarding new trends.	4	10%
	17	42.5%
	12	30%
	5	12.5%
	2	5%
Bureaucratic leadership provides a vibrant context to the employees to support its functions.	9	22%
	22	55%
	6	15%
	1	2.5%
	2	5%
Bureaucratic leaders form professional relationships that are impersonal.	11	27.5%

Statement	N	Marginal Percentage
	15	37.5%
	8	20%
	4	10%
	2	5%
Bureaucratic leadership focus on rules which keep abreast the employees aware of the organization.	10	25%
	18	45%
	9	22.5%
	3	7.5%
The most significant predictor of teachers' self-efficacy is bureaucratic structure.	5	12.5%
	16	40%
	11	27.5%
	5	12.5%
	3	7.5%
Bureaucratic leaders follow the rule of the book to keep the team in the right direction.	10	25%
	17	42.5%
	8	20%
	2	5%
	3	7.5%
The teacher is a licensed professional with a high reputation and dignity with an exhibition of moral values and professional competency.	13	32.5%
	19	47.5%
	4	10%
	2	5%
	2	5%
Teacher leadership is the capability to improve the quality related to education, training and to exhibit occupational behaviors.	16	40%
	19	47.5%
	2	5%
	2	5%
	1	2.5%
Higher the self-efficacy of a teacher, maximum will be the utilization of knowledge and skills to enhance students' academic achievement.	19	47.5%
	17	42.5%
	3	7.5%
	1	2.5%
Professional educators maintain an environment that is conducive to learning.	16	40%
	17	42.5%
	3	7.5%
	2	5%
	2	5%
Professional teachers give constructive feedback to their students.	20	50%
	18	45%
	1	2.5%
	1	2.5%
Professional teachers encourage students toward class participation.	23	57.5%
	16	40%
	1	2.5%
Professional teachers communicate in a manner that can easily enhance students learning process.	18	45%
	19	47.5%
	2	5%
	1	2.5%
Professional teachers provide citations regarding current situations and the real world while others teach as per the textbook.	16	40%
	21	52.5%
	2	5%
	1	2.5%
Bureaucracy and system both have a combined impact on the professional practice of the teacher.	11	27.5%
	17	42.5%
	8	20%

Statement	N	Marginal Percentage
	2	5%
	2	5%
Bureaucratic leadership pattern focuses on the administrative needs of an organization.	11	27.5%
	22	55%
	4	10%
	2	5%
	1	2.5%
Bureaucratic leadership style streamlines the procedures for new leaders.	5	12.5%
	21	52.5%
	6	15%
	5	12.5%
	3	7.5%
Experiences associated with negative impacts on professional practice referenced general workload.	7	17.5%
	14	35%
	14	35%
	1	2.5%
	4	10%
Bureaucratic leaders also tend to prefer rigid rules and regulations.	15	37.5%
	15	37.5%
	5	12.5%
	3	7.5%
	2	5%
Bureaucratic leaders work within a style that allows for scalability on an almost infinite level.	9	22.5%
	16	40%
	9	22.5%
	4	10%
	2	5%
Bureaucratic administration means fundamental domination through knowledge.	5	12.5%
	16	40%
	7	17.5%
	10	25%
	2	5%
Bureaucratization is an integral part of the legal-rational authority.	7	17.5%
	21	52.5%
	5	12.5%
	4	10%
	3	7.5%
Bureaucratic leaders flourish in a milieu prevailing certainty.	8	20%
	15	37.5%
	12	30%
	3	7.5%
	2	5%
In bureaucratic leadership style the focus tends to be on specialization and consolidation	10	25%
	15	37.5%
	6	15%
	6	15%
	3	7.5%

The highest and lowest marginal percentage for the following statements;

i) In Bureaucratic leadership, employees follow specific rules formulated by the authority i.e. 55% (agree) and 2.5% (strongly disagree).

ii) Bureaucracy helps to control the conflicts among the teachers i.e. 40% (agree) and 2.5% (strongly disagree).

iii) Bureaucratic leadership allows training programs to increase the awareness among teachers regarding new trends, i.e. 42.5% (agree) and 5% (strongly disagree).

iv) Bureaucratic leadership provides a vibrant context to the employees to support its functions, i.e. 55% (agree) and 5 % (strongly disagree).

v) Bureaucratic leaders form professional relationships that are impersonal, i.e. 37.5% (agree) and 5 % (strongly disagree)

vi) Bureaucratic leadership focus on rules which keep abreast the employees aware in the organization, i.e. 45% (agree) and 7.5 % (disagree)

vii) The most significant predictor of teachers' self-efficacy is bureaucratic structure, i.e. 40% (agree) and 7.5 % (disagree).

viii) Bureaucratic leaders follow the rule of the book to keep the team in the right direction, i.e. 42.5% (agree) and 7.5 % (disagree)

ix) The teacher is a licensed professional with a high reputation and dignity with an exhibition of moral values and professional competency, i.e. 47.5% (agree) and 5 % (strongly disagree)

x) Teacher leadership is the capability to improve the quality related to education, training and to exhibit occupational behaviors, i.e. 47.5% (agree) and 5 % (strongly disagree).

xi) Higher the self-efficacy of a teacher, maximum will be the utilization of knowledge and skills to enhance students' academic achievement, i.e. 47.5% (strongly agree) and 2.5 % (strongly disagree).

xii) Professional educators maintain an environment that is conducive to learning, i.e. 42.5%
(agree) and 5 % (strongly disagree).

xiii) Professional teachers give constructive feedback to their students, i.e. 50% (Strongly agree) and 2.5 % (strongly disagree)

xiv) Professional teachers encourage students toward class participation i.e. 57.5% (strongly agree) and 5 % (neutral).

xv) Professional teachers communicate in a manner that can easily enhance students learning process, i.e. 47.5% (agree) and 2.5 % (strongly disagree).

xvi) Professional teachers provide citations regarding current situations and the real world while others teach as per the textbook, i.e. 52.5% (agree) and 2.5 % (strongly disagree).

xvii) Bureaucracy and system both have a combined impact on the professional practice of teachers, i.e. 42.5% (agree) and 5 % (strongly disagree).

xviii) Bureaucratic leadership pattern focuses on the administrative needs of an organization, i.e. 55% (agree) and 2.5% (strongly disagree).

xix) Bureaucratic leadership style streamlines the procedures for new leaders i.e. 52.5% (agree) and 7.5 % (strongly disagree).

xx) Experiences associated with negative impacts on professional practice referenced general workload, i.e. 35% each for (agree and neutral) and 5 % (strongly disagree).

xxi) Bureaucratic leaders also tend to prefer rigid rules and regulations, i.e. 35% each for (strongly agree and agree) and 5 % (strongly disagree).

xxii) Bureaucratic leaders work within a style that allows for scalability on an almost infinite level, i.e. 40% (agree) and 5 % (strongly disagree)

xxiii) Bureaucratic administration means fundamental domination through knowledge, i.e. 40% (agree) and 5 % (strongly disagree).

xxiv) Bureaucratization is an integral part of the legal-rational authority, i.e. 52.5% (agree) and 5 % (strongly disagree).

xxv) Bureaucratic leaders flourish in a milieu prevailing certainty, i.e. 37.5% (agree) and 7.5 % (strongly disagree).

xxvi) In bureaucratic leadership style, the focus tends to be on specialization and consolidation, i.e. 37.5% (agree) and 7.5 % (strongly disagree).

Table 2. Model Fitting Information

Model	–2 Log Likelihood	Chi–Square	Df	Sig.
Intercept Only	78.619			
Final	.000	78.619	39	.000

The above table indicates that the calculated value is greater than the tabulated value of chi-square due to which both the null hypothesis "bureaucratic leadership style does not affect the behaviors of professional teachers in university" and "there is no significant difference between the role of bureaucratic leadership and teacher's professionalism in university" were rejected.

Table 3. Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi–Square	Df	Sig.
Pearson	.016	78	1.000
Deviance	.032	78	1.000

A model fit test was also applied to check the nature of variables regarding fitness, and the above table reveals that this model is fit for the variables.

Table 4. Pseudo R-Square

Pseudo R-Square	
Cox and Snell	.860
Nagelkerke	1.000
McFadden	1.000

For post-hoc treatment, pseudo-R-Square tests were applied, which reveals that rejection of the Null hypothesis is accepted as the majority of results are in favor of accepting the alternative hypothesis.

Conclusion

The conclusion has a complete reflection of the objectives of the study and is drawn in the light of results. Teachers are agreed with the effectiveness of bureaucratic leadership style within an organization. They believe that rules and regulations in any organization/institution are made to follow. It makes the environment more effective and healthier.

It is proved that the Bureaucratic Leadership style affects the behaviors of professional teachers in the university. It is also proved that there is no significant difference between the role of bureaucratic leadership and teachers' professionalism in university. Both are interrelated, and there is a direct link of professionalism with individuals' approaches, behaviors and performances.

It is also proved that the Bureaucratic Leadership style is a more suitable style that enables individuals to work with more dedication and honesty. Sometimes it becomes more intense, but nevertheless, it is more effective than many other styles of leadership.

Recommendations

In the light of the conclusion, the following recommendations were drawn. The researcher has just taken 3 public sector universities for the study.

System Approach

It is practised that every style of leadership is not suitable for every organization or institution.

Contingency Approach

On the basis of the above discussions, it is recommended that the leader must be competent enough to use the best style according to the situation.

Bureaucratic Leadership

Laws, rules and regulations should be equally applicable to all indiscriminately.

Application of Rules

All laws and rules are to be implemented in their true spirit and words by the head. Everyone should be considered equal.

References

Adler, P. S., & Borys, B. (1996). Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41*(1), 61-89.

Anderson, K. (2012). Examining relationships between enabling structures, academic optimism and student achievement (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis database.

Aydın, M. (2010). EğitimYönetimi. Ankara: HatipoğluBasım

Bayhan, G. (2011). Öğretmenlerin profesyonelliğinin incelenmesi. (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul

Beard, K. L. S. (2008). An exploratory study of academic optimism and flow of elementary school teachers (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis database. (UMI No. 3325728)

Beard, K. S., Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2010). Academic optimism of individual teachers. Confirming a new construct. Teaching and Teacher Education, *26*, 1136-1144.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2012). Okulyönetimindeyeniyapıvedavranış. Ankara: PegemYayıncılık.

Caramela, S. (2018). The Management Theory of Max Weber: www.business.com › Human Resources › Managing

Cerit, Y. (2012). Okulun bürokratik yapısı ile sınıf öğretmenlerinin profesyonel davranışları arasındaki ilişki. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, *4*(8), 497-521.

Craig, T. (1995). Achieving innovation through bureaucracy: lessons from the Japanese brewing industry California Management Review, *38*(1), 8-36.

Day, G. (2002). The State of Dracula: Bureaucracy and the Vampire. In Rereading Victorian Fiction (Eds. Alice Jenkins and Juliet John) (pp. 81-95). England: *Palgrave Macmillan*

Güven, D. (2010). Profesyonel bir meslek olarak Türkiye'de öğretmenlik. Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Eğitim Dergisi, *27*(2), 13-21

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2010). Eğitimyönetimi. (S. Turan, Çev.).Ankara: Nobel YayınDağıtım

Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Designing better schools: the meaning and measure of enabling school structures. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(3), 296-321.

Ibara, E. C. (2010). Perspectives in Educational Administration: Port Harcourt, Nigeria: *Rodi Printing and Publishing.*

Kepenekçi Karaman, Y. (1998). Bürokrasi kavramı ve Türkiye eğitim sisteminde bürokrasi, İstanbul: Kültür Koleji Eğitim Vakfı Yayınları.

McGuigan, L. (2005). The role of enabling bureaucracy and academic optimism in academic achievement growth (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3179683)

McGuigan, L., & Hoy, W. K. (2006). Principal leadership: Creating a culture of academic optimism to improve achievement for all students. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 5*(3), 203-229

Messick, P. P. (2012). Examining relationships among enabling school structures, academic optimism and organizational citizenship behaviors (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and These database. (UMI No. 3520487)

Naylor, J. (1999). Management: Harlow, England: *Prentice Hall.*

Ololube, N. P., Egbezor, D. E., Kpolovie, P. J., & Amaele, S. (2012). Theoretical debates on school effectiveness research: lessons for Third World education development agendas: In N. P. Ololube& P. J. Kpolovie (Eds.), Educational management in developing economies: Cases 'n' school effectiveness and quality improvement, (pp. 1-18). Saarbucken: Lambert Academic Publishers

Sapre, P. M. (2000). Realizing the potential of management and leadership: toward a synthesis of Western and indigenous perspectives in the modernization of non-Western societies. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 3*(3), 293-305.

Schaefer, R. T. (2005). Sociology (9th Ed): New York, NY: McGraw-Hill. [33]

Schoderbek, P. P., Cosier, R. A., & Aplin, J. C (1988) Management. San Diego, USA: *Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.*

Sinden, J. E., Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2004). An analysis of enabling school structure. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*(4), 462-478.

Yücel, C. (1999). Bureaucracy and teachers' sense of power, (Unpublished doctoral dissertation): Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; USA