



Determining the Types of Human Nature That Primary School Teachers Have Intensively in the Eyes of the School Administrators

Yönetici Gözünde İlkokul Öğretmenlerinin Yoğunlukla Sahip Oldukları İnsan Doğası Türlerinin Belirlenmesi

ABSTRACT

When we look at the organizations, it is seen that they are human communities where individuals with many different characteristics come together. Schools are social systems where teachers with different human nature structures come together. In order for this system to continue in a successful cycle, administrators should have detailed information about the teachers who created the system. It is a result supported by researches that administrators, who have knowledge about the structure of human nature, use their management skills more effectively. From this point of view, this research aims to determine the human nature structures of teachers working in primary schools affiliated to the Ministry of National Education in the TRNC through the eyes of school administrators. For this purpose, the "human nature assumptions scale" was applied to the school administrators. The theoretical structure of the research consists of studies on management, human nature and human nature types. In the research conducted based on the quantitative research approach, a group of 155 school administrators working in primary schools affiliated to the Ministry of National Education of Northern Cyprus in the 2021-2022 academic year was formed. In order to obtain the data, survey application studies were carried out at predetermined places and times. The applied questionnaire was applied with the permission of the owner via e-mail. During the analysis of the data obtained as a result of the research, the "SPSS 24" program was used. In the findings obtained from the research, it was found that primary school teachers mostly have optimistic human nature and the most intense human nature is social human nature. It is thought that the results of the research will shed light on the researchers doing research in this field and the TRNC Ministry of National Education.

Keywords: School management, human nature, types of human nature

ÖZET

Örgütlere bakıldığı zaman, Birçok farklı özelliğe sahip olan bireylerin bir araya geldiği insan toplulukları oldukları görülmektedir. Okullar; farklı insan doğası yapısına sahip olan, birçok öğretmenin bir araya geldiği toplumsal sistemlerdir. Yöneticiler bu sistemin başarılı bir döngü içerisinde devam edebilmesi için sistemi oluşturan öğretmenler hakkında detaylı bilgilere sahip olmalıdırlar. Öğretmenlerin insan doğası yapısı hakkında bilgi sahibi olan yöneticilerin, yönetim becerilerini daha etkili bir biçimde kullandıkları, yapılan araştırmalarla desteklenmiş bir sonuçtur. Bu noktadan hareketle, yapılan bu araştırma, KKTC'deki Milli Eğitim Bakanlığına bağlı ilkokullarda görev yapan öğretmenlerin, okul yöneticileri gözü ile sahip oldukları insan doğası yapılarını belirleme amacı taşımaktadır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda yöneticilere "insan doğası varsayımları ölçeği" uygulanmıştır. Araştırmanın kuramsal yapısını; yönetim, insan doğası ve insan doğası türleri ile ilgili yapılan araştırmalar oluşturmaktadır. Nicel araştırma yaklaşımı temel alınarak yürütülen araştırmada, 2021-2022 öğretim yılında Kuzey Kıbrıs Milli Eğitim Bakanlığına bağlı ilkokullarda görev yapan 155 kişilik okul yöneticisi grubu oluşturulmuştur. Verileri elde etmek için önceden belirlenen yerlerde ve zamanlarda, anket uygulama çalışmaları yapılmıştır. Uygulanan anket, sahibinden mail yolu ile izin alınarak uygulanmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda elde edilen verilerin çözümlenmesi sırasında, "SPSS 24" programı kullanılmıştır. Araştırmadan elde edilen bulgulara; ilkokul öğretmenlerinin yoğunlukla olarak iyimser insan doğasına sahip oldukları ve en yoğun insan doğasının sosyal insan doğası olduğu bulunmuştur. Araştırma sonuçlarının, bu alanda araştırma yapan araştırmacılara ve KKTC Milli Eğitim Bakanlığına ışık tutacağı ve konu ile ilgili yapılacak olan araştırmaları da destekler niteliğe sahip oldukları düşünülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Okul yönetimi, insan doğası, insan doğası türleri

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

When we think of management as the act of realizing a certain purpose or accomplishing a job by using human and material resources (Aydın, 2014), we realize that management is essentially human and it is important to know the nature of people in order to manage people.

The basis of the views on the concept of human nature BC. III. century and IV. century stretches. During these periods, many different views on human nature were put forward. According to the view put forward by the thinkers in the sophist movement at that time, there is a natural impulse in human nature in which the strong rule and dominate the weak (Sahakian, 1997). In the first theories that started with this view of the sophists and tried to explain human

Tolga Gürçimen¹
Orçun Ayda²

How to Cite This Article

Gürçimen, T. & Ayda, O. (2025). "Determining the Types of Human Nature That Primary School Teachers Have Intensively in the Eyes of the School Administrators", Journal of Social, Humanities and Administrative Sciences, 11(3): 196-208. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15553843>

Arrival: 14 September 2024
Published: 30 May 2025

International Journal of Social, Humanities and Administrative Sciences is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

This journal is an open access, peer-reviewed international journal.

¹ MSc Tolga Gürçimen, Kıbrıs Sağlık ve Toplum Bilimleri Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Yönetimi ve Denetimi Güzelyurt, KKTC

² MSc Orçun Ayda, Kıbrıs Sağlık ve Toplum Bilimleri Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Yönetimi ve Denetimi, Güzelyurt, KKTC

nature, anthropologists defined human beings as a being with the power to construct their own world with meaningful symbols and think (Cited by Şişman, 1994), while those who believe in the understanding of metaphysics defined human nature as innate qualities (Çağlayan, 2001). In another definition, Wrightsman (1974) expressed human nature as the general attitudes of the individual towards other people.

According to Fromm (1993), there are different views on "what" human nature is. Throughout history, researchers have tried to define human nature and identify the features that make humans different from other living things. Aydın (2004) has shown that the reason why it is difficult to understand human is that there are different views on human nature. For this reason, it is possible to say that human nature studies emerged with the effort to understand human and continue with the difficulty of understanding human (Asar, 2021). According to Sahlins (2012), the definition of human nature differs according to societies and cultures, and the reasons for the differentiation of human behavior are due to cultural differences. Wilson (2017) also has similar views with Sahlins and argues that most of the behaviors that reflect human beings in human nature studies are transmitted from generation to generation through culture or developed instinctively.

All the views put forward about human nature are basically divided into two. When the views of the researchers are examined, the views on human nature are divided into two as "optimistic" or "pessimistic" human nature.

Researchers who support the pessimistic view indicate that human beings are inclined to see themselves as superior to other individuals (Adler, 2004), to think that they have a superior image about themselves than other people (Keller, 2006), to bring themselves to the forefront by persecuting other living things (Schopenhauer, 2017).

Against the researchers who argue that human nature is pessimistic, there are also researchers who argue that there is optimism in human nature and oppose the pessimistic understanding. Researchers who support the optimistic view state that people are born as good individuals from birth, but people get worse when they are insufficient to use their capacity (Asar, 2021). Sahlins (2012) argues that the understanding that people are inherently bad is not correct and argues that the pessimistic approach is a mistake. Similarly, McGregor (1960) stated that the pessimistic understanding of human nature is a misconception and that people who are described as pessimistic actually take shape depending on the conditions and environment.

Sahlins (2012) stated that the view that people are born pessimistic from birth is dominant in Western countries, and he defended the opposite of this view and criticized the pessimistic view. Fromm (1993), on the other hand, brought a different perspective to the pessimistic and optimistic human nature approaches, emphasizing that human nature is changeable, and stated that the nature of a person who can behave well and badly changes depending on the conditions. According to Winnicott (2017), it continues to change as it continues to grow and develop throughout human life. The fact that human nature is suitable for change allows for pessimistic or optimistic definitions by looking at it from different perspectives (Hanoğlu, 2014). For this reason, when determining the nature of people, making a definition only according to their distinctive features will make it more difficult to understand and define human nature. According to Morin (2012), in order not to make such a mistake and not to judge people with their distinctive features, it is necessary to talk about the human being as a complex creature and to take this into account when evaluating human nature, and to evaluate the human as a whole according to the events in which he lives and his environment.

According to Aydın (2014), a good administrator should have knowledge about the assumptions about human nature while revealing how to manage the individual. For this reason, administrators who aim to realize the organizational goals in an efficient way should have knowledge about the nature of the individuals and human beings in the organization and should develop management understandings suitable for this diversity of nature. There are studies showing that in organizations, people respond to them the way they are treated (Keskin et al., 2016) and as a result of adopting a pessimistic approach towards people in organizational management, organizational employees also think about their interests and behave in line with their own interests (Morgan, 1998). However, Armstrong (2016) reveals that people contribute more to the organization in organizational environments where they are valued and sincere. In summary, it can be said that the understanding of human nature is of vital importance in organizational management.

Statement of the Problem

This research is based on the importance of knowing human nature in management. Studies have shown that it is easier and more effective to achieve organizational goals in organizations with management that values people (Bursalioğlu, 2010). He emphasizes that in order to talk about good management, knowing people well leads the organization to success (Aydın, 2014), knowing the human nature in the organization and determining management behaviors appropriate to this nature are important for peace in the organization (Schopenhauer, 2017). From this

point of view, the problem statement of this study was formed as "Determining which human nature most teachers working in primary schools in TRNC have, in line with the determinations of school administrators".

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of this research is to enable administrators to define human nature and to understand people's behavior and to identify teachers' human nature. In the research, it is aimed to determine the human nature of the teachers working in the primary schools in Northern Cyprus. The research is a quantitative study and is based on primary school principals' determination of the nature of their teachers in their schools. It is thought that the findings to be obtained in the research gain importance in the subjects of "the importance of the administrator's knowledge of human nature in management" and "determination of management approaches suitable for human nature". In parallel with the types of human nature determined in the later stages of the research, different research topics can be raised by asking school principals "the sources of management power they have chosen according to human nature".

Based on the findings of this research in Northern Cyprus, it is thought that people who will become administrators can be informed about human nature and trained in determining management strategies suitable for human nature.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Development of the Concept of Human Nature and Basic Views

When we look at the development of human nature, it can be said that in the early periods, individuals could not separate themselves from their environment and could not think about other individuals, and a belief was accepted by all individuals in the tribes. Later, as a result of the transition to settled life and the development of the individual-environment relationship, individuals learned to separate themselves from the communities they belong to (Çağlayan, 2001). According to Hoobes, during the formation of human nature, people's passions gained weight in their actions before the settled life. In settled life, moral and social aspects have gained weight in their actions (Russel, 1997).

"Human nature", which is an important concept in terms of social and psychological aspects, is explained with four basic perspectives in the studies of social psychologists (Küçükkaragöz, 1992). The first of these perspectives is the "Hedonistic View", which has been known for the longest time on human nature. This view argues that the determinant of human behavior is the effort to gain pleasure and satisfaction (Bilgin, 1988). The second view on this issue is the "Rationalist View". In the view known as rationalism, it is argued that human behavior is selfish and antisocial and is guided by individual motives. According to Hobbes, in this view, the determinant of behavior is motivation and thought (Kılıçbay, 1983). The "Machiavellist View" is another view on this subject. This view argues that human purpose is dependent on the instinct to live and shows parallelism with the nature. According to this view, the determinant of human behavior is shaped by the state of gaining interest (Stepura, 2016). The last of the basic views on human nature is the "Existential View". According to this view, people are unique in making life choices (Kochler, 1985). In this view, human behavior develops according to the understanding of freedom and self-development.

Management Theories and Human Nature

The first important contribution to the administration was the keeping of written records by the Sumerians, and then the development of the "planning, organizing and controlling" steps, which were accepted as important milestones by the Egyptians, and the introduction of concepts such as decentralization, honest administration, and written petition. This beginning related to organization and management, which dates back to BC, continued with the development of management science as "science" after the Industrial Revolution (20th century) (Şişman, 2000).

In the history of management science, there are three basic theories called "Classical Management Theory", "Neo-Classical Management Theory" and "Contemporary Theory". These theories have been formed as the reflections of the emerging and changing views according to the differences in human nature and their perspectives towards human nature.

The defenders of Classical Management Theory viewed people in terms of efficiency and saw them as "economic and rational" beings (Şişman, 1994). In this theory, rules are kept in the foreground and objectivity is avoided (Aydın, 2014). Neo-Classical Management Theory, on the other hand, was formed as a reaction to the Classical Management Theory and developed within the framework of concepts such as human relations, cooperation, social system, and harmony with the organization (Bursalioglu, 1994). In this theory, not the economic factors, but the social and psychological structure of the human element. In the theory, the understanding of "organic human" has been adopted instead of the "mechanical human" approach (Aydın, 2014). Contemporary Theory, which was put forward last, developed as a synthesis of the two previous theories. This theory focused not only on the working individual, but

also on the individual-organization-management component. Representatives of this theory argued that the interests of the individual and the organization are a whole and that the work should be done in cooperation (Aydın, 2014).

When we look at the definitions here, it can be said that the human nature, which plays a leading role in the development of the organization and the formation of the organizational culture, is an important determinant on the basis of the theories. All theories of organization and management are based mainly on assumptions about human nature. While the "pessimistic" view is dominant in Classical Management Theory, there is an "optimistic" view in Neo-classical Theory and a balanced situation in Contemporary Theory. When the theories about organization and management are examined, some concepts such as human factor and motivation, effectiveness, rationality and management come to the fore (Şişman, 1994).

In the accumulation of research on human nature, researchers have considered human nature in four basic models (Wrightsmen, 1974, Schein, 1978). Accordingly, human nature is divided into Intellectual-Economic human, social human, self-actualizing human, and complex human.

Intellectual-Economic human: The most basic statement about the explanation of this human model is Taylor's (1981) statement that employees are fully motivated with the help of economic incentives. Therefore, it is stated that the way to motivate people with this nature is to use wages as rewards and punishments (Act. Aydın, 2014). According to rational economic man theory, since people are primarily motivated by money, the task of the leader is to maximize employee productivity by using the wage weapon (Schein, 1965).

This human nature is reminiscent of McGregor's theory X, or what he calls the classical viewpoints of businesses on employees. According to McGregor's theory of X, people in general are passive, lazy, stupid and cannot discipline themselves (Wrightsmen, 1974). Aydın (2014) states that in this situation, people cannot keep themselves under control because of their basically irrational feelings, therefore, a power that keeps people under control, motivates them and directs them in line with the goals of the organization is required. According to rational economic human nature, this power is wages.

Social Human: According to Mayo (1945), the need to be accepted and loved by colleagues in an organizational environment is more important than the economic incentives provided by the management. Therefore, it is argued that individuals with this human nature are basically motivated by their social needs.

As a result of the Industrial Revolution, with the development of the scope of work, it became difficult for people to do all the work alone and the need for division of labor became inevitable. As a result of this collaborative work, people have developed a social bonding relationship with the work environment and socialization has come to the fore (Özçelik, 2002). It can be said that the development of this nature in humans accelerated during these periods.

While explaining this human nature, Schein (1965) argued that working people try to fulfill the demands of the management to the extent that they are socially accepted, while Mayo (1945) argued that in this nature, people are more sensitive to social pressure than to material incentives from the management.

Self-actualizing human: It is a model that argues that human needs have a hierarchical structure and that it is in human nature to rise to higher-level needs as the lower-level needs are met in this structure (Aydın, 2014). According to this model, people want to be competent, autonomous and independent in their work. Individuals with this human nature have the ability to motivate and control themselves.

Complex Human: The tendency of people to change from time to time or from situation to situation has enabled complex human nature to be included among human models. People of this nature are not only complex in themselves, but also changeable.

According to Aydın (2014), human beings contain many motives with a certain hierarchical structure in order of importance. These motives may vary in different organizations or at different sub-levels of the same organization. When people's changing motives come together with their primary needs and organizational experiences, new motivational elements can occur.

Administrators who believe in human complexity must also be sensitive to the personal differences, fears and abilities of employees. Instead of seeing the differences of individuals as undesirable facts, administrators should give importance to determining the reasons for the emergence of these differences and how to manage them (Çağlayan, 2001).

These types of nature, which are considered as human nature and classified under four models, are classified by McGregor (1960) with two contradictory assumptions as "X and Y Theory". According to this classification, human nature, which consists of individuals who do not like work and avoid responsibility, requires punishment, requires external control power, in short, based on punishment and fear, and pessimistic view is dominant, it is called "X

Theory". The human nature, which consists of individuals with self-control, ambitious and creative individuals, and an optimistic view that accepts their responsibilities, is called "Theory Y". Many researchers have made lists about the characteristics of the human types described in these theories and have classified these people (Fromm, 1996 Wrihstman, 1972 Ouchi, 1987 Nephan, 1989 Aydın, 2000 Eren, 1989 Şişman, 1994). In this classification made by McGregor about human nature, "Theory Y" is supported by Lock (1690), Hume (1776), Voltaire (1778), Rousseau (1778) in historical development (Cited by Aydın, 2001). In addition, Froom (1996) and Rainer (2000) also carried out studies supporting this theory.

Efil (1996), who investigated the four models of human nature and X-Y Theory in the eyes of the administrators, found that the administrators who adopted the X Theory were authoritarian and intrusive, and the administrators who adopted the Y Theory exhibited democratic and participatory behaviors.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This research was prepared with the screening model, which is one of the quantitative research methods. In scanning models, current situations and conditions are tried to be revealed exactly. Situations usually occur in the natural environment. In this type of research, it is not possible to adjust the variables experimentally and physically, and to control the occurrence or non-occurrence of events (Kaptan, 1998). According to Karasar (2007), survey models are research models made on a group of samples to be taken from the population in order to obtain general information about the population. In this type of approach, the variables of the situation of interest are tried to be described separately.

Population and Sample/Study Group/Participants

The sample in the study was determined by purposive sampling method. Purposeful sampling can be defined as an in-depth examination of situations that are thought to yield rich data (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013). In accordance with the purposeful sampling, the school administrators selected in the study are the people who are suitable for the easily accessible situation sampling.

The sample of the research consists of a total of 155 school administrators working in private and public primary schools affiliated to the TRNC Ministry of National Education in the 2021-2022 academic years. Demographic information of the sample is given in the table below.

Table 1: Demographic Information of the Sample

Information		f	%
Gender	Woman	80	51,6
	Men	75	48,4
Age	31-35	1	0,6
	36-40	39	25,2
	41-45	59	38,1
	46 and over	56	36,1
Educational Status	AÖA /AÖK	111	71,6
	Faculty of Education Primary School Teaching	18	11,6
	2 Years Bachelor	2	1,3
	4 Years Bachelor	20	12,9
	Distance Education	4	2,6
Post Graduate	Yes	68	43,9
	No	87	56,1
Administration Time	0-5	88	56,8
	6-10	50	32,3
	11-15	17	11,0
TOTAL		155	100

As seen in Table 1, the sample of the study is a group of 155 administrators. The number of male and female administrators among the administrators participating in the research is very close to each other. When we examine the administrators in terms of age, it is seen that the majority of the administrators (74.2%) are over the age of forty. When the education level of the participants is examined, it is seen that most of them (71.6%) are graduates of Atatürk Teacher Academy. Again, as can be seen in the table, the number of administrators (43.9%) who have a master's

degree is less than those who do not (56.1%). More than half (56.8%) of the administrators participating in the research have been administrators in the last five years.

Data Collection Tools

"School Administrators' Human Nature Assumption Scale for Teachers" developed by Asar (2021) was used to obtain data in the study. Prior permission was obtained for the use of the scale and demographic information was added in front of it and it was put into a form to be applied to school administrators. While demographic information is asked in the first part of the scale used, in the second part there are 32 items for the determination of human nature. 11 of the items are about Intellectual-Economic human nature and the Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient is .92. Six of the items are related to social human nature and the Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient is .77. Ten of the items are for self-actualization human nature and the Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient is .91. Five of the items are for complex human nature and the Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient is .70.

During the implementation of the scale, the administrators were reached and the questionnaires were distributed by hand. A short presentation on "Human Nature" was made by meeting with school administrators at the schools where the questionnaires were distributed. The administrators were given 1 week to answer the questionnaires, and they were asked to respond by considering the all of the teachers in their schools while filling out the questionnaire. At the end of one week, the questionnaires were collected back by the researchers.

Data Analysis

SPSS 24 program was used to analyze the data in this research, which was conducted to determine the types of human nature that teachers in primary schools have. The data obtained from the questionnaires were processed into the database prepared in the SPSS 24 program and then Anova test, t-test, averages, std. deviation tests were carried out.

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

In line with the findings of the school administrators, the findings of this study, which was conducted with the aim of determining which human nature most teachers working in public primary schools in the TRNC have, are as follows:

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics on Human Nature Assumptions of Administrators Regarding Teachers

Human Nature Types	Min	Max	mean	N	Sd	Level
Intellectual-Economic human	1,00	4,18	2,19	155	0,62	Strongly oppose
Social human	1,83	4,83	3,93	155	0,68	Strongly favor
Self-actualizing human	1,80	4,90	3,71	155	0,54	Strongly favor
Complex human	2,20	4,20	3,34	155	0,49	No opinion

When Table 2 is examined, the assumptions of the administrators who participated in the research about the human nature of the teachers are seen. Accordingly, we see that when the administrators evaluate the teachers in their schools, they mostly state that they have "social human" and "self-actualizing human" natures. Again, according to Table-2, we can say that the the school administrators do not think that they have a " Intellectual-Economic human nature", but school administrators are also "indecisive" in the case of teachers being "complex" human beings regarding human nature.

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation Values for the Intellectual-Economic Human Nature

Items	\bar{X}	Sd
1. Teachers' personal interests take priority in their behavior, not the school's goals.	1,90	0,81
2. Teachers need direction to do work.	2,63	1,04
3. The behavior of teachers in working life is for show.	1,99	0,84
4. Teachers always want more, no matter what is done.	2,15	0,96
5. Teachers do not like to work very much.	2,01	0,89
7. Teachers avoid taking responsibility.	2,11	0,83
8. Teachers do not fulfill their duties fully if they are not strictly controlled.	2,28	0,93

9. The force that binds teachers to work is the fear of punishment.	2,06	0,91
10. Most teachers are not capable of solving work-related problems.	2,35	0,97
11. Teachers do not pay attention to the work they do if the economic benefit they will gain is not great.	2,38	0,93
13. Teachers will not do their duties properly if they are not noticed.	2,18	0,96

In Table 3, item mean and standard deviation values of the Intellectual-Economic human are given. When we examined the table, it was seen that the administrators gave the answer " Strongly oppose" to the questions in the Intellectual-Economic human aspect, except for the second question. They gave "No opinion" answer to the second question.

When we examine the table, it is seen that in the eyes of the administrators, the teachers "keep the school goals above their own interests, they do not do their jobs for show, they don't ask so much, they are people who like to work, they do not avoid taking responsibility, they do not need strict control to fulfill their duties, the power that binds them to their work is not punishment, they are sufficient in solving problems, they do not act according to the high level of economic benefit, and they do their duties properly even when they are not noticed. It is seen that the administrators have "no opinion" when answering the item "teachers need to be guided to do their job".

Table 4: Item Mean and Standard Deviation Values for the Social Human Nature

Items	\bar{X}	Sd
14. Improving working conditions enables teachers to put more effort into school.	4,09	0,89
15. Teachers' participation in the decision-making process enables them to contribute more to the achievement of the school's goals.	4,05	0,89
16. If the teachers are happy, the school's goals will be achieved more easily.	4,05	0,98
17. Teachers act according to the mentality of "treat people the way you want to be treated"	3,23	1,04
19. Teachers enjoy developing social relationships with each other.	4,03	0,79
20. Teachers enjoy working when a suitable environment is provided.	4,15	0,85

Table 4 contains data on the social human nature aspect. According to these data, the administrators gave the answer "No opinion" to item 17, and " Strongly favor" to all the remaining items.

In the light of these data, in the eyes of the administrators, "as the working conditions are improved, the teachers make more effort for the school, their participation in the decision-making process enables them to contribute more to the achievement of the school's goals, when they are happy, they work harder to achieve the school's goals, they have social relations with each other.

Table 5: Item Means and Standard Deviation Values for Self-Realization Human Nature

Items	\bar{X}	Sd
21. Most teachers have the power to stand up for what they believe.	3,88	0,90
22. Teachers enjoy working.	3,92	0,80
23. Teachers engage in behaviors that make sense to them.	3,88	0,76
25. Teachers make decisions without being influenced by others.	3,38	0,92
26. Teachers have realistic ideas about their strengths and weaknesses.	3,62	0,88
27. Teachers can motivate themselves to achieve the school's goals.	3,50	0,88
28. Teachers have self-control.	3,81	0,85
29. Teachers perform their duties not because they feel obliged, but because it makes sense to them.	3,67	0,96

31. Teachers work to show their merits, don't expect benefit from others.	3,69	0,79
32. Teachers do not avoid taking responsibility.	3,75	0,91

In Table 5, item mean and standard deviation values regarding the human nature aspect for Self-Realization are given. In the table, it was seen that the administrators expressed the opinion that "Strongly favor" with all the items. In this case, according to the administrators, teachers have the power to defend what they believe in, enjoy working, behaving meaningfully, can make decisions without being influenced by others, know their own strengths and weaknesses and express realistic ideas, are self-motivated, have the ability of self-control, they perform their duties not because they feel obliged, but because it makes sense to them, teachers work to show their merits, don't expect benefit from others and they do not avoid taking responsibility.

Table 6: Item Mean and Standard Deviation Values for the Complex Human Nature

Items	\bar{X}	Sd
6. Teachers, like every human being, have a changeable personality.	3,55	0,99
12. It is difficult to predict how teachers will behave.	2,38	0,91
18. It is not possible to manage all teachers by treating them the same.	3,41	1,23
24. Teachers do not perform the same in every task.	3,75	0,78
30. The different aspects of teachers are more than their common features.	3,59	0,69

In Table 6, item mean and standard deviation values related to complex human nature are given. In the table, it is seen that the administrators expressed the opinion of "I Strongly oppose" on the 12th item, and the opinion of "I Somewhat favor" with the remaining items. According to this, in the eyes of the administrators, "they have a variable personality, they can be managed with different administrator behaviors, they cannot show the same performance in different tasks, and their differences are more than their similarities". The administrators stated that they did not agree with the item that it is difficult to predict the behavior of teachers.

Table 7: T-test Results of Administrators' Human Nature Assumptions Scores Regarding Teachers by Gender

Human Nature Types	Gender	N	\bar{X}	Sd	df	t	p
Intellectual-Economic human	Female	80	2,21	0,67	153	0,455	0,65
	Male	75	2,16	0,57			
Social human	Female	80	4,03	0,69	153	1,772	0,79
	Male	75	3,83	0,65			
Self-actualizing human	Female	80	3,64	0,60	153	-1,726	0,09
	Male	75	3,79	0,46			
Complex human	Female	80	3,35	0,42	153	0,181	0,86
	Male	75	3,33	0,46			

Table-7 shows the t-test results of the administrators' human nature assumptions scale scores regarding teachers by gender. Accordingly, there was no significant gender difference in the human nature assumptions of male and female administrators in all four aspects.

Table 8: ANOVA Results of Administrators' Human Nature Assumptions Scores Regarding Teachers by Age

Human Nature Types	Gender	N	\bar{X}	Sd	df	t	p
Intellectual-Economic human	31-40	40	2,28	0,68	2-152	1,108	0,333
	41-45	59	2,21	0,67			
	45-over	56	2,10	0,51			
Social human	31-40	40	4,22	0,49	2-152	5,000	0,008
	41-45	59	3,84	0,70			
	45-over	56	3,83	0,72			
Self-actualizing human	31-40	40	3,77	0,55	2-152	0,602	0,549
	41-45	59	3,65	0,66			
	45-over	56	3,73	0,38			
Complex human	31-40	40	3,35	0,42	2-152	1,277	0,282
	41-45	59	3,41	0,45			
	45-üstü	56	3,26	0,57			

According to the administrators, whether there is a significant difference in human nature assumptions according to age groups was tested using ANOVA analysis of variance since there were more than two independent variables. The test results are given in Table 8. Since there is only one school administrator in the 31-35 age range, the test results were evaluated as "31-40" age range by combining the 36-40 age group, which is the next group, with the 31-35 age group.

As seen in Table 8, there is no significant difference in the dimensions of "Intellectual-Economic human nature, self-actualizing human nature and complex human nature" according to age groups. However, there was a significant difference between the views of the administrators in the aspect of "Social human nature" and the age groups of the administrators ($p < ,05$).

Table 9: ANOVA Results of Administrators' Human Nature Assumptions Scores Regarding Teachers by Length of Service

Human Nature Types	Length of Service	N	\bar{X}	Sd	df	t	p
Intellectual-Economic human	0-5	88	2,30	0,54	2-152	3,466	0,034
	6-10	50	2,04	0,72			
	11-15	17	2,04	0,58			
Social human	0-5	88	3,80	0,73	2-152	4,080	0,019
	6-10	50	4,11	0,52			
	11-15	17	4,11	0,66			
Self-actualizing human	0-5	88	3,65	0,57	2-152	1,868	0,158
	6-10	50	3,75	0,55			
	11-15	17	3,91	0,22			
Complex human	0-5	88	3,35	0,53	2-152	0,051	0,950
	6-10	50	3,32	0,32			
	11-15	17	3,35	0,69			

Table 9 shows the results of the ANOVA test of the human nature assumptions of the administrators regarding the teachers, according to length of service. When we look at the results of the research, when the assumptions of the school administrators about human nature are examined according to length of service, it is seen that there is a significant difference in the dimensions of "Intellectual-Economic human" and "Social human" according to the length of service of the administrator ($p < ,05$). There was no significant difference in the aspects of "Self-Actualizing human" and "Complex human".

Table 10: T-test Results of Administrators' Human Nature Assumptions Scores Regarding Teachers According to Educational Status

Human Nature Types	Educational Status	N	\bar{X}	Sd	df	t	p
Intellectual-Economic human	Graduate	68	2,18	0,60	153	-0,46	0,963
	Post-graduate	87	2,19	0,63			
Social human	Graduate	68	4,00	0,66	153	1,021	0,309
	Post-graduate	87	3,88	0,69			
Self-actualizing human	Graduate	68	3,73	0,54	153	0,341	0,734
	Post-graduate	87	3,70	0,54			
Complex human	Graduate	68	3,45	0,47	153	2,620	0,010
	Post-graduate	87	3,25	0,49			

In Table 10, the t-test results of the administrators' human nature assumptions about teachers' scale scores are given according to their educational status. According to the school administrators, there was no significant difference in the aspects of "Intellectual-Economic human", "social human" and "self-actualization human" according to the variables. However, a significant difference was found between school administrators who received postgraduate education and those who did not ($p < ,05$) in the assumptions of the aspect of "complex human nature".

DISCUSSION

In this study, which aimed to determine the types of human nature of primary school teachers according to the assumptions received from the administrators, the administrators mostly evaluated the teachers in their schools as having "social human" and "self-actualizing human" natures. On the other hand, the administrators said that the teachers in their schools don't have a "Intellectual-Economic human" nature, while the administrators said that they were not sure in the aspect of being a "complex" human nature. In a study conducted by Asar in 2021, similar to this finding, it is seen that school administrators express an opinion that teachers are predominantly social human beings in their assumptions about human nature. However, in the same study, contrary to the findings here, it is seen that school administrators evaluated school teachers as having the same intensity of Intellectual-Economic human nature in addition to the social human nature. In the study conducted by Latemore (2017), it was also found that teachers mostly have a social human nature.

In the research, it was also found that teachers, as social partners, are oriented towards self-actualization in administrative assumptions about human nature. This finding is supported by the finding of Belousova and Fastovtseva (2014) that successful teachers have a human nature towards self-actualization.

In the finding that the teachers were evaluated in the eyes of the administrators in the Intellectual-Economic human aspect, it was found that the teachers had characteristics such as "they keep the school goals above their own interests they don't ask so much, they are people who like to work, they do not avoid taking responsibility, and they can control themselves". Research findings show that administrators have positive feelings about teachers. This finding is supported by the findings obtained by Özçelik in 2000.

In the administrators' views on the social human nature dimension, it was concluded that teachers made more effort for the school with the improvement of their working conditions, and their participation in the decision-making process caused them to adopt the school more. This situation is supported by the research findings made by Asar (2021), and it coincides with the view that valued teachers adopt more to school.

In the aspect of human nature for self-actualization, teachers have the power to defend what they believe, enjoy working, behave meaningfully, can make decisions without being influenced by others, know their own strengths and weaknesses and express realistic ideas, are self-motivated, have the ability of self-control, It has been seen that they are individuals who perform their duties not because they feel obliged, but because it makes sense to them, work to show their merits, don't expect benefit from others. and do not avoid taking responsibility. This finding is similar to the research findings of Ertürk (2016) and Çiftçi (2017) on teachers' self-motivation.

On the other hand, in the administrators' views on complex human nature, the opinions of the administrators as "they have a variable personality, they can be managed with different administrator behaviors, they cannot show the same performance in different tasks, and their differences are more than their similarities" are found.

It was observed that the administrators' human nature assumptions scale scores of teachers did not make a significant difference according to gender, but the administrators' age variables affected human nature assumptions. In the research, there was a significant difference between the administrators' views in the aspect of social human nature and the age groups of the administrators. Birinci (2016) found that people's beliefs about the development of socialization activities decrease as they age, which is similar to this result.

When examining the assumptions of administrators about human nature according to length of service, it is seen that there is a significant difference in Intellectual-Economic human and social human aspects according to administrator's length of service.

Finally, in the study, it was observed that the scores of the administrators' human nature assumptions about teachers changed according to their educational status. In this case, it is possible to say that administrators who have postgraduate education in the field of management can analyze the human nature assumptions of teachers more carefully.

CONCLUSION

In this study, in which the human nature of the teachers was determined by the findings obtained from the administrators, it was concluded that primary school teachers had the most social human nature. In the following, it was found that teachers, in turn, have self-actualization, complex and Intellectual-Economic human natures.

In addition to optimistic features, it was revealed that primary school teachers are individuals with variable personalities, according to the research findings.

Depending on the results of the research, the following recommendations can be made:

- ✓ Researchers can carry out qualitative studies to determine the human nature in the eyes of school administrators in depth.
- ✓ Studies can be conducted on how human nature is reflected in the behavior of school administrators.
- ✓ Researches can be conducted to determine the effect of the human nature of the teachers on the power sources used by the school administrators.
- ✓ People who will be appointed as administrators by the Ministry of National Education may be given trainings to determine human nature and to apply management styles in accordance with human nature.
- ✓ Reward systems can be developed by the Ministry of National Education to motivate and encourage teachers who have optimistic behaviors.

KAYNAKÇA

Aktepe, V. (2005). Eğitimde bireyi tanımanın önemi. Gazi Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 6(2), 15–24.

Aykaç, B. (1999). İnsan kaynakları yönetimi ve insan kaynaklarının stratejik planlaması. Nobel Yayınevi.

Aydın, M. (2014). Eğitim yönetimi. Ankara: Hatiboğlu Yayınevi.

Balcı, A. (2004). Türkiye’de eğitim yöneticisi ve eğitim müfettişi yetiştirme uygulamaları: Sorunlar ve öneriler. Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi, 29(307).

Baltaş, A. (2013). Türk kültüründe yönetmek. Remzi Kitabevi.

Bilgin, N. (1988). Sosyal psikolojiye giriş. Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.

Burger, J. M. (2006). Kişilik: Psikoloji biliminin insan doğasına dair söyledikleri (Çev. İnan Deniz Erguvan Sarioğlu). İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (1994). New structures and behaviors in school management. Ankara: Pegem.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2000). Eğitim yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış. Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.

Çağlayan, E. (2001). İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan yöneticilerin insan doğasına ilişkin algıları (Bursa ili örneği) [Yüksek lisans tezi, Yayınlanmamış].

- Çalık, T. (2003). Öğrenen örgütler olarak eğitim kurumları. *Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(2), 115–130.
- Demirtaş, H., & Güneş, H. (2002). Eğitim yönetimi ve denetimi sözlüğü. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Dilthey, W. (1999). Hermeneutik ve tin bilimleri (Çev. Doğan Özlem). İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları.
- Durukan, H. (2003). Yönetimde insan ilişkileri. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 11(2), 277–284.
- Efil, İ. (1996). İşletmelerde yönetim ve organizasyon. Uludağ Üniversitesi Güçlendirme Vakfı.
- Eren, E. (1989). Yönetim psikolojisi. İstanbul Üniversitesi.
- Everard, K. B., Morris, G., & Wilson, I. (2004). *Effective school management*. Sage.
- Ekşi, H. (2004). Kişilik ve başa çıkma: Başa çıkma tarzlarının durumsal ve eğilimsel boyutları üzerine çok yönlü bir araştırma. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 4(1), 81–98.
- Funk, R. (2000). Erich Fromm: His life and ideas, an illustrated biography. A&C Black.
- Fromm, E. (1998). İnsan bilgisi ve hümanist planlama (Çev. Acar Doğanğün). İstanbul: Arıtan Yayınevi.
- Gelsthorpe, T., & West-Burnham, J. (2003). *Educational leadership and the community: Strategies for school improvement through community engagement*. Pearson Education.
- Hartman, R. O., & Betz, N. E. (2007). The five-factor model and career self-efficacy general and domain-specific relationships. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 15(2), 145–161.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). Cultural dimensions in management and planning. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 1(2), 81–99.
- İlgar, L. (1996). Eğitim yönetimi, okul yönetimi, sınıf yönetimi. İstanbul: Beta Basım.
- Ju, X. T., Xing, G. X., Chen, X. P., Zhang, S. L., Zhang, L. J., Liu, X. J., ... & Zhang, F. S. (2009). Reducing environmental risk by improving N management in intensive Chinese agricultural systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(9), 3041–3046.
- Kalafat, S. (2012). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin kişilik özelliklerinin öğretmen yeterliliklerine etkisinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Yüksek lisans tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü].
- Kaptan, S. (1998). Bilimsel araştırma teknikleri ve istatistik yöntemleri. Tekişik Matbaası.
- Karasar, N. (2007). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi (17. baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Kılıçbay, A. (1983). Uygulamalı ekonometri. İstanbul: Filiz Kitapevi.
- Kochler, H. (1985). The relation of man and world: Existential and phenomenological perspectives. *Philosophy of the social sciences*, 15(3), 275–286.
- Küçükkaragöz, H. (1992). Sosyal bir ünite olarak okul içi etkileşimi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8(8).
- MacGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise* (Vol. 21). New York.
- Mayo, E. (1945). *The social problems of an industrial civilization*. Boston: Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration.
- Mete, C. (2006). İlköğretim okullarında çalışan öğretmenlerin kişilik özellikleri ile iş tatminleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [Yüksek lisans tezi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü].
- Miles, H. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. California: Sage.
- Nephan, S. (1989). Antropoloji. İstanbul: İnkılap Yayınevi.
- OECD. (2009). *Higher education to 2030: Volume I-II*. [Link unavailable in print citation]
- Ouchi, W. G. (1987). Teori Z: Japonların yönetim tarzı nasıl işliyor? (Çev. Yakut Güneri). İstanbul: İlgı Yayıncılık.
- Özçelik, F. (2002). Yöneticilerin insan doğasına ilişkin görüşleri ve yönetsel yaklaşımlar [Yüksek lisans tezi, Osmangazi Üniversitesi].
- Özgüven, İ. E. (1998). Bireyi tanıma teknikleri. Ankara: Pdrem Yayınları.

- Palmer, M., & Winters, K. T. (1993). İnsan kaynakları. İstanbul: Rota Yayınları.
- Russell, B. (1997). Din ile bilim (Çev. Akşit Göktürk). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Saussois, J. M. (2006). Scenarios, international comparisons, and key variables for educational scenario analysis. In Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (Ed.), Think scenarios, rethink education (pp. 53–69).
- Schein, E. (1978). Örgüt psikolojisi (Çev. Mustafa Tosun). Ankara: Doğan Basımevi.
- Schoemaker, P. J. (1995). Scenario planning: A tool for strategic thinking. Sloan Management Review, 36(2), 25.
- Stepura, E. V. (2016). Value aspects of Machiavellism. American Journal of Fundamental, Applied & Experimental Research, 3(3), 99-104.
- Sürgevil, O., & Budak, G. (2008). İşletmelerin farklılıkların yönetimi anlayışına yaklaşım tarzlarının saptanmasına yönelik bir araştırma. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 10(4), 65–96.
- Şişman, M. (1994). Örgüt kültürü. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Şişman, M. (2002). Öğretim liderliği. Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Taymaz, H. (2009). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim okul müdürleri için okul yönetimi. Pegem Akademi.
- Taylor-Gooby, P. (1981). Part I: Approaches to welfare state, social theory and social welfare. London: Edward Arnold.
- Tikici, M., & Türk, M. (2003). İnsan odaklı yönetim ve müşteri memnuniyeti: Malatya ilinde bir uygulama. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 8(3).
- Tunçer, P. (2012). Değişen insan kaynakları yönetimi anlayışında kariyer yönetimi. Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 31(1).
- Turan, S. (2014). Eğitim yönetimi: Teori, araştırma ve uygulama. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Turan, S., & Şişman, M. (2000). Okul yöneticileri için standartlar: Eğitim yöneticilerinin bilgi temelleri üzerine düşünceler. Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 3(4), 68–87.
- Williams, J. A., & McNeil, K. R. (2010). Using scenario analysis to build university faculty and student travel competencies. Retrieved from <http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/09395.pdf>
- Wrightsmann, L. S., & Wuescher, M. L. (1974). Assumptions about human nature: A social-psychological approach. Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Yeşilyaprak, B., Güngör, A., & Kurç, G. (1996). Eğitsel ve mesleki rehberlik. Ankara: Varan Yayınları.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri (8. baskı). Ankara: Seçkin.