



**T.C.
YALOVA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
LİSANSÜSTÜ EĞİTİM ENSTİTÜSÜ**

**İŞLETME ANABİLİM DALI
İŞLETME BİLİM DALI**

**THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP TYPES ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN
PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SCHOOL MANAGEMENT IN GEMLİK DISTRICT OF
BURSA PROVINCE**

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

AYTÜRK AKSAKAL

DANIŞMAN: DOÇ. DR. GÜLGÖNÜL BOZOĞLU BATI

**YALOVA
TEMMUZ 2024**



T.C.
YALOVA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
LİSANSÜSTÜ EĞİTİM ENSTİTÜSÜ

İŞLETME ANABİLİM/ANASANAT DALI
İŞLETME BİLİM DALI

THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP TYPES ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN PRIVATE
AND PUBLIC SCHOOL MANAGEMENT IN GEMLİK DISTRICT OF BURSA
PROVINCE

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

AYTÜRK AKSAKAL
228127014

DANIŞMAN: DOÇ. DR. GÜLGÖNÜL BOZOĞLU BATI

YALOVA
TEMMUZ 2024

ETİK BEYAN

Yalova Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Tez Yazım Kuralları'na uygun olarak hazırladığım “**The Effects Of Leadership Types On Student Achievement In Private And Public School Management in Gemlik District of Bursa Province**” başlıklı bu tez çalışmada; tez içinde sunduğum verileri, bilgileri ve dokümanları akademik ve etik kurallar çerçevesinde elde ettiğimi, tüm bilgi, belge, değerlendirme ve sonuçları bilimsel etik ve ahlak kurallarına uygun olarak sunduğumu, tez çalışmada yararlandığım eserlerin tümüne uygun atıfta bulunarak kaynak gösterdiğimi, kullanılan verilerde herhangi bir değişiklik yapmadığımı, bu tezde sunduğum çalışmanın özgün olduğunu bildirir, aksinin tespiti halinde doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi taahhüt ve beyan ederim.

İmza

Aytürk AKSAKAL



ÖNSÖZ

Yüksek lisans eğitimim boyunca benden yardımlarını esirgemeyen, akademik anlamda bana her zaman destek olan ve doğru yolu gösteren sayın danışman hocam Doç. Dr. Gülgönül Bozoğlu Batı'ya teşekkür ederim. Her zaman yanımda oldukları ve benden desteklerini hiçbir zaman esirgemedikleri için sevgili eşime ve aileme teşekkür ederim.

Bu tez çalışması desteklenmesine olanak sağlayan Gemlik İlçe Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü'ne ve çalışmada yardımcı olan tüm meslektaşlarıma teşekkür ederim.

Temmuz – 2024

Aytürk AKSAKAL





TABLE OF CONTENT

ETHICAL STATEMENT	i
PREFACE.	iii
TABLE OF CONTENT	iv
LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
SUMMARY.....	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
1. Introduction	1
2. DIFFERENCES IN STUDENT AND PARENT CHARACTERISTICS AT PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS.....	3
2.1. Curriculum Differences	4
2.2. Importance of Education	4
2.3. Private School Roles in Education	4
2.4. Administrative Structure of Private Schools	5
2.5. Expectations and Preferences of Parents.....	6
2.6. Distribution of Schools in Gemlik District.....	7
2.7.Post Research.....	8
3. LEADERSHIP TYPES	10
3.1. Impact on Social and Academic Success	14
3.2. Determining Leadership Typesand Their Efficiency	15
3.3. Effect of Leadership Types on School Success and Teacher/Student Motivation	15
3.4. Differences Between Public and Private Schools.....	16
3.5. Leadership Impact on School Success.....	17
3.6. Principals and Vice Principals in Turkish Schools.....	18
3.7. Principals and Vice Principals in Turkey:	19
3.8. Common Problems at Both Public and Private Schools	20
3.9. Impact of Leadership Types on Achievements of Students and Schools in Turkey	21
3.10. Determination of The Leadership Types of School Principals and Vice Principals ..	22
4. METHOD.....	25
5. FINDINGS	27
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	44
7. REFERENCES.....	46
BIOGRAPHY.....	51



SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS LIST

SYMBOLS

ABBREVIATIONS

SPSS	: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
LGS	: Liselere Geçiş Sınavı (High School Entrance Exam)
NCES	: The National Center for Education Statistics
TALIS	: Teaching and Learning International Survey
OECD	: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
MLQ	: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.1. Distributions Regarding the Descriptive Characteristics of Managers	27
Table 5.2. Distribution of Information on Managers' Leadership Types	28
Table 5.3. Distribution of Administrators' Information on the Number of Teachers and Students in the Schools Where They Work and the Achievements of the Students in the School	29
Table 5.4. Number of Students Who Won Qualified High School/University in the Last 2 Years in the School Where Administrators Work, According to Their Leadership Types	31
Table 5.5. Number of Successes Achieved in National and International Competitions/Projects in the Last 2 Years in the School Where They Work, According to Their Leadership Types of the Administrators.....	33
Table 5.6. Number of Successes Achieved by Students in Individual and Team Sports in the Last 2 Years in the School Where Administrators Work, According to Their Leadership Types	35
Table 5.7. Number of Students Who Received Disciplinary Punishment for Any Reason in the Last 2 Years in the School Where Administrators Work, According to Their Leadership Types	37
Table 5.8. Distribution of Descriptive Characteristics of Administrators According to the School They Work At.....	39
Table 5.9. Distribution of the Number of Teachers and Students and Information on the Success of Students in the School by the Administrators According to the School They Work at.....	39
Table 5.10. Distribution of Information on Leadership Types of Administrators According to the School They Work At.....	41



BURSA İLİ GEMLİK İLÇESİ ÖZEL OKUL VE DEVLET OKUL YÖNETİMLERİNDE LİDERLİK TÜRLERİNİN ÖĞRENCİ BAŞARISI ÜZERİNE ETKİLERİ

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Özel okullar ile Devlet okullarının mevcut durumlarını ve Bursa İli Gemlik İlçesi Özel ve Devlet Okul Yönetiminde Liderlik Türlerinin Öğrenci Başarısına Etkisini incelemek ve karşılaştırmaktır. Devlet Okulları ve Özel Okulların genel tanımları araştırılarak nitelikleri, idari yapıları, öğretmen kalitesi, müfredatları, öğrencilerine sundukları eğitim ve sosyal olanaklar değerlendirildi. Devlet Okulları ve Özel Okulların yapıları, akademik kalitesi, hem akademik hem de sosyal açıdan okul başarısını etkileyen faktörler belirlenmiş, okul yöneticilerinin rolleri, liderlik türleri ve liderlik türlerinin okuldaki başarıyı nasıl etkilediği belirlenmiştir. Bu çalışmada liderlik türlerini belirlemeye yönelik anketlerin yanı sıra okul müdürleri ve müdür yardımcılarıyla yüz yüze görüşmeler de yapılmıştır. Verilerin sonuçları ve analizleri SPSS analiz sistemi ile işlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Okul, Gemlik, Liderlik Türleri, Öğrenci Başarısı



THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP TYPES ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SCHOOL MANAGEMENT IN GEMLIK DISTRICT OF BURSA PROVINCE

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine and compare the current situations of Private schools and Public schools and The Effects of Leadership Types on Student Achievement in Private and Public School Management in Gemlik District of Bursa Province. General definitions of Public Schools and Private Schools were searched, and their quality, administrative structure, quality of teachers, curriculums, and educational and social opportunities they offer to their students were evaluated. Structures of Public Schools and Private Schools, academic quality, and factors that affect the school success in both academic and social ways were determined, role of school directors, their leadership types, and how their leadership types affect achievement at school were determined. In this study besides surveys to determine leadership types, face-to-face interviews with school principals and vice principals were also conducted. The results and analysis of the data were processed by the SPSS analysis system.

Keywords: School, Gemlik, Leadership Types, Student Achievement



1. INTRODUCTION

School years are the most significant period when students receive academic and social benefits that are going to change their future. In this study school types in Turkey and the effects of leadership types of managers both at public and private schools were determined. The quality and effectiveness of public and private schools within the scope of educational sciences, sociology, and economics have been an important topic in Turkey. There are different types of private primary schools, private secondary schools, and private high schools in Turkey which have to compete with qualified public schools in the Turkish education system.

As for the administration of private and public schools; managers in private schools are mostly chosen by the owner of the school according to the social and academic skills of the directors. They can change their position at any time required or anytime upon the decision of the school's owner. However, the administrative board in public schools has a different structure. Principals are assigned to that position and they have a work period of 4 years at least. This situation is also the same for the vice principals and they have the same work period as principals. That is, all director candidates take an assignment test beforehand and according to their exam results, they are taken into an interview before being assigned to a school. When considering using administrative structure both Public and Private schools have differences and similarities however the Leadership Types of Principals and Vice Principals of these schools have a significant role in student achievement and the total success of the schools.

Today, an important number of researches are conducted all around the world in order to reach and obtain the most efficient results in education system by means of school and student achievement (eg. Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Matthewes, 2020; Jarl, Andersson and Blossing, 2020). Everyday new technological developments and inventions are seen which are also easy to adopt into the education system. Especially the researches on student and managers psychology play a significant role. This study initially aims to see the possible effects of managers' leadership types on student and school achievement in Gemlik district. As Gemlik is an industrial and migration-receiving area besides the school types, and number of students and teachers there are also some other factors which are vital in terms of academic success. The situation of school buildings, equipments in public and private schools, their opportunities are

known in details however the managers of both public and private schools who have a critical role in the organization and in order to reach the highest achievement rates in Gemlik district besides all other titles leadership types of managers must be studied as well. In this study we wanted to see their effects on school and student achievement by determining their leadership types. In the first section of the study general information about education system, managers, types of schools, assignment of managers to private schools and public schools, leadership types, advantages and disadvantages of certain leadership types are stated. In second section managers in private schools and public schools are subjected to a survey and face to face interviews in order to determine their leadership types and find out the possible effects of leadership types on school and student achievement. All data obtained from the surveys and face to face interviews are interpreted to determine any kind of potential effects on student achievement.

2. DIFFERENCES IN STUDENT AND PARENT CHARACTERISTICS AT PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS

When comparing private and public schools, the social, economic, and cultural background of the country has a significant role. The social and economic situation of Turkey was more different than it is today. The number of private schools was limited and the quality of public schools was higher. Parents were not expecting to have better education in private schools and private schools were just a luxurious option for some parents. With the economic, social, and political changes within the last 30 years, the expectations of parents and students, the structure of schools, and the education system have changed dramatically and the need for private schools has become evident. As the social and economic background of students and parents will vary the preferences of them will be different as well. In our country, each 8th-grade student takes an evaluation exam at the end of their 8th-grade education year and only %10 of these students can have the right to study in qualified high schools that are physically in good conditions and provide better education to their students (OECD, 2021). Qualified schools are different types of high schools that are included in the Qualified Schools guide published by the Ministry of National Education and accept students by examination. These qualified high schools are among the best schools that can send their successful students to top universities. For this reason, these students and their parents do not need a better school. Every education year after LGS exam Qualified High Schools accept their students according to their exam results. After the High school entrance exam (LGS) students who get lower grades in the exam have two options; going to a private school and paying high amounts of annual tuition or going to a public school which has a lot of problems and high student numbers in a classroom and have limited social activities.

Children whose parents have better financial and social backgrounds mostly prefer private schools because their expectations and purpose are different from others. Children whose parents have lower or limited financial and social backgrounds probably will go to public schools without considering the current problems. As their expectations are lower the aim would be 'the least-worst' for this group.

2.1. Curriculum Differences

The curriculum is the basic point in the education system which enables teachers to follow an officially determined and detailed teaching program. Public and Private schools can differ in the strength of the core curriculum they offer to their students regardless of their personal background or future educational plans. Private schools tend to have a more limited differentiation in their curriculum compared to public schools. This limitation in curricular differentiation can be partly the consequence of the limited resources of private schools due to their limited annual budget

2.2. Importance of Education

The significance of education is beyond doubt. It is through education that an individual can improve and contribute to society. Major contributions to education are as follows (Dag,2015):

- Economic development of individual and society
- Contributes to social stability
- Contributes to technological advancement and effective use of technology
- Contributes to democracy
- Decreases crime rates
- Contributes to population control
- Decreases expenditures on health
- Contributes to raising leaders and entrepreneurship
- Contributes to quality and quantity of service

Considering all the contributions stated above we can say that education has the most significant role in the development of a country.

2.3. Private Schools Roles in Education

Governments have to respond to cultural, economic, and technological changes, security, defense, health systems, and every little detail about the public and country. Expenditures increase every year in parallel with the changes around the World and the increasing number of population. There is generally a gap between public expenditures and income which forces governments to reserve fewer budgets than

required. These fewer budgets directly affect the quality of education in public schools. This is where the private sector steps in (Taytak, 2007).

Approval of the Ministry of National Education is required to open a private school. Responsible authorities for the supervision and inspection of private schools are the Ministry Of National Education and the General Directorate of Private Education Institutions. The aim of a private school cannot be to make a profit solely. They also have to fulfill their responsibilities against their students and relevant authorities.

The need for private schools may be based on three major factors (Bolay, 1996: 205 Cited: Kulaksızoğlu et al. 1999):

- 1- Increases in population and incapacity of public schools
- 2- Decrease in quality of education in public schools.
- 3- Demands from parents for better education.

In the Turkish education system admission to private schools is subject to the same legislations as with public schools. Private primary schools and private elementary schools accept students by candidate registration system. Entrance exams are not required for admission to many sections of private schools. But, for secondary education, students need to attend the central exam LGS which is held by the Ministry of National Education.(Tunç, 2006)

2.4. Administrative Structure of Private Schools

The administrative structure of public schools is formed by the official authorities but the administrative structure of private schools is different. In private schools, the administration is generally composed of a chairman of the board, founding principal, vice principal, academic board, chief financial officer, public relations, heads of departments, advisors, and research and development department. (Akdoğan, 1995, Quoted in Kulaksızoğlu et al. 1999).

All these organizational structures of private schools must be submitted to the Ministry of National Education for approval. Compared with public schools, the administrative structure of private schools has a similar structure with trade companies. This structure of private schools enables them to make urgent decisions easily and release our unnecessary bureaucratic transactions and allowance from authorities at every step. On

the other hand, public schools have a more formal structure and mostly it is difficult to make urgent decisions because of written procedures and bureaucratic systems.

2.5. Expectations and Preferences of Parents

Parents may have various expectations from private schools and therefore private schools try to meet these expectations to register as many students as they can. Some of these expectations are as follows (Çelikten, 2010):

- Foundation year of the school
- Reasonable tuitions
- Location
- The academic quality of teachers
- Originality of curriculum
- Students achievement level at LGS and University Entrance Exam
- Quality of exam preparation classes
- Quality of English language instruction
- Second foreign language
- Quality of counseling services
- International memberships
- Quality of music instruction
- Quality of visual arts instruction
- Quality of sports activities
- Accomplishments of sports teams
- Social responsibility projects
- School's World Vision
- Administrators with good communication skills
- Socio-economic status of the neighborhood
- References from other parents
- Right advertising policy
- Quality of classroom environment
- Quality of classroom infrastructure
- Technological infrastructure
- Social facilities
- Security

- Quality of communication with parents and parents' involvement
- Realistic vision and mission
- Hygiene
- Quality of food
- Transportation
- Student uniforms

Within the current situation of our country when all these important topics are taken into consideration some of them appear to be much more important than others. In particular, tuition, location, security, education quality, social activities, quality of food, and hygiene.

To balance the education quality between public schools and private schools, private school tuition must be under close supervision of the government, public schools must have simpler bureaucratic structures, and teachers must be encouraged to take in-service training regularly or academic field exams can be held. Infrastructures must be improved, required classroom numbers must be provided by governments, and more social activities must be adapted to public school programs. Public school principals must have more authority to take initiative and the inspection mechanism of public schools should be improved.

2.6. Distribution of Schools in Gemlik District

According to the data taken from Bursa Provincial Directorate for National Education, there are 1944 schools, 612.340 students, and 41. 639 teachers in Bursa and its districts. More than 700 private schools take their place in the education system and most of these private schools are founded to meet the needs of elementary and primary school sections. High school numbers are not enough to meet the required quality of education. In Gemlik district there are 15 (fifteen) primary schools, 15 (fifteen) secondary schools, and 11 (eleven) high schools. There are three private schools all of which have primary, secondary, and high school sections. In every type of school structure, there is a principal and two vice principals at schools.

When secondary education starts after the LGS exam, students in this group have limited options and opportunities such as;

- Going to a qualified high school (only %10 and in different types)
- Going to an Anatolian high school or a vocational high school by the score they got from LGS
- Going to a private school which is in their neighborhood

On one hand, the current exam system chooses successful students to qualified schools on the other hand it prevents the majority of students from going to the schools that they desire. And here comes another vital question. Which school to go to for students who do not want to make an academic career, are not smart enough to go to Anatolian high schools, or are talented in other fields? For example, many students are forced to go to high schools and complete their compulsory education in a school where they have social, disciplinary, and academic problems.

2.7. Post Research

Research in the field of educational management and leadership indicates that school leaders can influence student achievement through variables such as teacher collaboration and classroom instruction. The study conducted by Mehmet Tufan Yalçın and Ömür Çoban in 2023, revealed that the leadership behaviors of school principals have an indirect effect on student success through variables such as teacher collaboration, classroom instruction, and parental involvement. This study was carried out across 30 middle schools in Turkey, involving 1925 students and 616 teachers, and analyzed the relationships between variables using two-level structural equation modeling. There are various studies conducted in Turkey on the leadership styles of school principals and school success. For instance Soba, M., Akman, E., and Eroğlu, E. (2018); conducted in public schools in İzmir Karabağlar district, examined the relationship between the leadership styles of school principals and the organizational commitment of teachers in their study. The results showed that transformational leadership style increased teachers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. A study by Karadağ, E., Başaran, A., and Korkmaz, T. 2009; the relationship between the perceived leadership styles of primary school teachers and their job satisfaction. This research examined the relationship between primary school teachers' perceived leadership styles and job satisfaction. The research revealed that effective leadership practices positively affected teachers' job satisfaction. Another study conducted by

Kılınç, A. Ç. 2010, a master's thesis conducted at Gazi University examined the relationship between the ethical leadership behaviors of school principals and teachers' organizational trust and mobbing levels. The study showed that ethical leadership practices increase trust among teachers and improve organizational health. Another example by Ugar, Y. 2019, a master's thesis at Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University investigated the relationship between the leadership practices of school principals and the motivation of teachers. The findings revealed that transformational leadership practices positively affected teacher motivation and performance.

These studies show that school principals' leadership styles have a significant impact on teachers' organizational commitment, job satisfaction and motivation, and therefore contribute to school success. Such research provides important information for educational administrators to improve their leadership skills and increase the quality of education.



3. LEADERSHIP TYPES

Leadership in educational settings can take various forms, and leadership styles are categorized into different types. Some common leadership types include:

Transformational Leadership:

Transformational leaders inspire and motivate followers to achieve beyond their expected capabilities.

Research suggests that transformational leadership positively impacts student outcomes, including academic achievement and overall well-being (Bass, 1985).

The optimal profile is characterized by the presence of certain qualities of transformational leadership. They are the key leaders' qualities contained in appropriate transformational abilities of leaders and in certain attributes which are assumptions for the use of leaders' skills and for successful performance of leader jobs. Although there are different classification given by Bass and Avolio is quoted here. Their classification of skills of transformational leaders is known as "Four I's" and includes the following skills:

- idealized influence,
- inspirational motivation,
- intellectual stimulation,
- individualized consideration.

Idealized influence represents the ability of building confidence in the leader and appreciating the leader by his followers, which forms the basis for accepting radical change in organization. Without such confidence in the leader, that is, in his motives and aims, an attempt to redirect the organization may cause great resistance.

Inspirational motivation is the ability of transformational leadership, which qualifies a leader as a figure, which inspires and motivates the followers to appropriate behaviour. In the conditions when transformational change is being conducted in an organization, the leader has the task of clear and continuous stimulating others to follow a new idea.

In tellectual stimulation, as ability of transformational leaders, has an important role in the transformational process of organization. Transformational leaders stimulate the efforts of their followers as regards innovativeness and creativity, stimulate permanent re-examination of the existent assumptions, stimulate change in the way of thinking about problems, plead the use of analogy and metaphor, etc.

Individualized consideration, as a feature of a transformational leader, is reduced to the ability of individual analysis of followers. Namely, inclusion of followers into the transformational process of an organization implies the need to diagnose their wishes, needs, values and abilities in the right way. (Simic, 1998).

Transactional Leadership:

Transactional leaders focus on the exchange of rewards and punishments to motivate followers.

While transactional leadership may be effective in certain contexts, it might not foster creativity and intrinsic motivation in students (Bass, 1985).

Transactional leadership is also called managerial leadership, and it is a type of leadership that focuses on the role of organization, group performance, and supervision. Transactional leaders focus on assigning specific tasks to their employees and using the reward and punishment system to motivate employees towards achieving their individual and organizational goals. Some characteristics of transactional leadership are focusing on short-term goals, procedures, and policies that are favor-structured, focusing on doing things correctly and rules, inflexibility and opposition to change. (Jaqua, 2021)

Servant Leadership:

Servant leaders prioritize the needs of others, aiming to serve and support their followers.

Servant leadership has been associated with positive school culture and student engagement (Greenleaf, 1977).

The construct of servant leadership is rooted in the work of Robert Greenleaf, who suggested that servant leaders persevere to be “servant first” rather than “leader first” and put their subordinates’ “highest priority needs” before their own (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 14). Servant leaders focus on the need and development of followers (Russell and Stone, 2002; Stone et al., 2004). Spears (1995) identified 10 characteristics of a servant leader:

- (1) listening, emphasizing the significance of communication between leader and follower and seeking to determine the drive of people;
- (2) empathy, understanding followers from their position and accepting them as who and what they are;
- (3) healing, facilitating followers to heal and recover after failure;
- (4) awareness, being knowledgeable about tasks and contexts of performing task;
- (5) persuasion, seeking to influence others via two-way communication and constructive arguments, not through coercive or positional power;
- (6) conceptualization, visualizing possible future and making the environment conducive for followers growth and welfare;
- (7) foresight, foreseeing consequences of different situations and working with intuition;
- (8) stewardship, holding something in trust and serving the needs of others;
- (9) commitment to the growth of people, facilitating the personal and professional development of followers; and
- (10) building community, focusing on the welfare of society and community.

Van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) presented six key behaviors of servant leadership, which includes empowering and developing people, demonstrating humility, showing authenticity, interpersonal acceptance, providing directions and stewardship. Empowering and developing people suggests nurturing proactivity, building self-confidence and giving a sense of personal power to followers. Showing

humility refers to the extent to which a leader is ready to take benefit from the expertise of others, puts the interest of followers first and facilitates the performance of followers. Authenticity aims at expressing the “true-self,” revealing himself/herself in a way that is consistent with inner emotions and thoughts. Interpersonal acceptance refers to the ability to understand followers, being ready to ignore their wrongdoings and building an atmosphere of trust and acceptance. Providing directions Servant leadership aims at giving task guidelines to followers, setting performance standards and proving the right degree of accountability. Finally, stewardship aims at a willingness to take responsibility and go for service instead of power and self-interest.

Distributed Leadership:

This model involves the sharing of leadership responsibilities among various individuals in an organization.

Distributed leadership has been linked to improved student achievement and a more collaborative school environment (Spillane, 2006).

Distributed leadership is primarily concerned with the practice of leadership rather than specific leadership roles or responsibilities. It equates with shared, collective and extended leadership practice that builds the capacity for change and improvement.

Distributed leadership means mobilising leadership expertise at all levels in the school in order to generate more opportunities for change and to build the capacity for improvement. The emphasis is upon interdependent interaction and practice rather than individual and independent actions associated with those with formal leadership roles or responsibilities.

In summary, it is ‘leadership by expertise’ rather than leadership by role or years of experience. Genuine distributed leadership requires high levels of trust, transparency and mutual respect (Harris, 2013).

3.1. Impact on Social and Academic Success

Leadership types play a crucial role in shaping the social and academic success of schools and students. Transformational and servant leadership styles are often associated with positive outcomes, fostering a supportive and motivating environment.

Transactional leadership may be effective in maintaining order but might not stimulate long-term success. Distributed leadership promotes collaboration and shared responsibility, contributing to a more holistic approach to education.

3.2. Determining Leadership Types and Their Efficiency

Determining leadership types often involves a combination of observation, surveys, and interviews with school staff, students, and other stakeholders. Assessments like the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) can help identify leadership styles based on self-reporting and observer feedback (Bass & Avolio, 1995).

The best leadership type for school success depends on various factors, including the school's culture, the needs of the students, and the context. However, research suggests that a combination of transformational and servant leadership, coupled with elements of distributed leadership, tends to have a positive impact on both social and academic outcomes (Leithwood & Sun, 2012).

3.3. Effect of Leadership Types on School Success and Teacher/Student Motivation

In order to understand the effect of leadership types on school success and teacher/student motivation crucial researches have been conducted up to now.

Transformational Leadership and School Success:

The impact of transformational leadership on school success is highlighted in a study by Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008). They found a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and student achievement. Teachers under transformational leaders reported higher job satisfaction and commitment, which can contribute to a positive school culture.

Servant Leadership and Motivation:

A study by Sendjaya, Sarros, and Santora (2008) explores the impact of servant leadership on teacher motivation. Servant leadership was associated with higher levels of teacher job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This leadership style fosters a sense of community and shared purpose, contributing to a motivated and engaged teaching staff.

Transactional Leadership and Student Motivation:

The effects of transactional leadership on student motivation are discussed by Barbuto and Burbach (2006). While transactional leadership may provide structure and clear expectations, it was found to be less effective in promoting intrinsic motivation in students. The focus on rewards and punishments may not be conducive to long-term academic engagement.

Distributed Leadership and School Success:

A meta-analysis by Harris and Spillane (2008) explores the impact of distributed leadership on student outcomes. The study suggests that schools with distributed leadership structures tend to have higher levels of student achievement. This collaborative approach fosters a shared responsibility for success, positively influencing both teachers and students.

3.4. Differences Between Public and Private Schools

There are many differences in structure and organization between public schools and private schools. These differences can significantly affect academic and social success.

Funding and Governance:

Public schools are funded by government resources and are subject to government regulations. Private schools, on the other hand, rely on tuition fees, donations, and endowments. A study by Baker, Akiba, and LeTendre (2001) discusses how these funding differences can impact resource allocation and educational outcomes.

Admissions Criteria:

Public schools typically admit students based on geographic boundaries, ensuring accessibility to all students in a specific area. Private schools, however, often have selective admissions processes. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) provides insights into admission criteria variations between public and private schools.

There are also some administrative differences between public and private schools. We can define the differences as autonomy and decision making structures as well as leadership structures.

A study by Hallinger and Heck (1999) explores administrative autonomy in public and private schools. Private schools often have more flexibility in decision-making due to reduced bureaucratic processes, while public schools may be subject to more regulations.

Research by Keddle (2003) examines leadership structures in public and private schools. Private schools may have more centralized leadership, allowing for quicker decision-making, while public schools often involve more distributed leadership.

The differences between public and private schools creates its own advantages and disadvantages on administration for sure.

The main conventional distinction between public and private schools is based on how they're owned (Rainey et al., 1976). Whereas private schools are owned by entrepreneurs or shareholders, public schools are collectively owned by government officials. This distinction is linked to two other public/private contrasts. Firstly, unlike their private counterparts, public schools are largely funded by taxing rather than by fees paid directly by those served (Boyne, 2002). A study by Lubinski and Lubinski (2014) suggests that public schools may have a broader range of programs and support structures. Second, it is the political rather than the economic system that imposes the main constraints on public schools. Public schools often benefit from more extensive resources, including state funding and support services.

Beside the advantages there are some challenges for public schools. These challenges can include bureaucratic processes and limited autonomy. A report by The Center for Public Education (2004) discusses how bureaucratic constraints may hinder quick decision-making.

When we talk about private schools, they often enjoy greater flexibility in decision-making and curriculum development. The National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) suggests that this autonomy can lead to more innovation and responsiveness to student needs. While administrative challenges in private schools may include financial constraints and a reliance on tuition fees. A study by Gruber (2014) discusses the financial pressures faced by private schools and their potential impact on administrative decisions.

3.5. Leadership Impact on School Success

Improving school success is a multifaceted task that involves various stakeholders, including teachers, administrators, students, and parents. Research and best practices suggest several strategies to enhance school success: European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology, and Education. (2023).

1. Effective Leadership:

Leadership plays a crucial role in shaping a school's success. Principals should adopt transformational leadership styles that inspire and motivate both teachers and students. Research by Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) emphasizes the positive impact of effective leadership on student achievement.

2. Professional Development:

Continuous professional development for teachers and staff is essential. Ongoing training helps educators stay updated with the latest teaching methodologies and educational trends. In a meta-analysis, Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, and Shapley (2007) found a positive correlation between professional development and improved student outcomes.

3. Parental Involvement:

Engaging parents in their child's education contributes significantly to school success. Epstein's framework for parental involvement emphasizes building partnerships between schools, families, and communities. Research by Epstein (2018) underscores the importance of collaborative efforts between educators and parents.

4. Data-Driven Decision Making:

Utilizing data to inform instructional strategies and interventions is crucial. Effective data analysis helps identify areas for improvement and tailor interventions to meet specific student needs. The work by Datnow, Borman, Stringfield, Overman, and Castellano (2003) explores the benefits of data-driven decision-making.

3.6. Principals and Vice Principals in Turkish Schools

In Turkey, the roles of principals and vice principals in both public and private schools share some commonalities (OECD, 2008):

Administrative Roles:

Principals and vice principals in Turkish schools, both public and private, are responsible for the overall administration and management of the school. This includes overseeing academic programs, coordinating staff, and managing resources (OECD, 2008).

Curriculum Oversight:

They are involved in curriculum development and implementation, ensuring that educational programs align with national standards and goals.

Community Engagement:

Principals and vice principals are expected to engage with parents, the local community, and educational authorities. Building positive relationships with stakeholders is crucial for the success of the school.

However, it's important to note that the specific duties and decision-making autonomy may vary between public and private schools in Turkey due to differences in regulations and funding sources.

3.7. Principals and Vice Principals in Turkey:

Principals and vice principals have different approaches for public and private schools in Turkey. Each kind of schools has different selection process, qualifications and decision making procedures.

The appointment of principals in public schools in Turkey typically involves a competitive process. The Ministry of National Education may announce vacant principal positions, and interested candidates, usually, current teachers or administrators within the education system, can apply.

In Turkey, the ability of Principals and Deputy Principals working in private schools to work in an institution and to serve with these titles differs compared to public schools, and they are selected according to a number of different criteria.

The process for selecting principals and vice principals in private schools may vary as private schools often have more autonomy in their administration. The selection process is typically determined by the school's board of directors or the institution's leadership.

Candidates for principal positions are often required to meet certain qualifications, including a minimum level of teaching experience, educational background, and successful completion of relevant exams or interviews.

Private schools may establish their criteria for selecting principals and vice principals, which could include educational qualifications, leadership experience, and a demonstrated commitment to the school's mission and values.

In terms of decision making, public schools have centralized appointment. The Ministry of National Education centrally manages the appointment process for public school principals. Appointments are made based on merit, experience, and the candidate's performance in the selection process (OECD, 2008). In private schools decision is made by a Board. The board of directors or the school's leadership team in private schools generally makes the final decision regarding the appointment of principals and vice principals. This process may involve interviews, assessments, and a consideration of the candidate's alignment with the school's philosophy.

It's important to note that regulations and procedures can change, and the specifics of the selection process for school administrators may be subject to updates by educational authorities.

3.8. Common Problems at Both Public and Private Schools

Problems can be summarised as infrastructure and resource challenges, teacher recruitment and retention, curriculum changes and implementation, standardized testing pressures, parental involvement and communication, inclusion of diverse learners, inclusion of diverse learners, budget constraints, technological integration, technological integration and bureaucratic processes (OECD, 2021).

Infrastructure and Resource Challenges:

Inadequate infrastructure and insufficient resources can pose challenges for schools. This includes issues such as outdated facilities, a lack of modern technology, and insufficient teaching materials (Willms and Tramonte, 2019, p. 35).

Teacher Recruitment and Retention:

Attracting and retaining qualified and motivated teachers is crucial for the success of schools. Issues related to teacher recruitment and retention may include competitive salaries, working conditions, and opportunities for professional development (Sirin, 2005).

Curriculum Changes and Implementation:

Frequent changes to the curriculum and the challenge of effective implementation can create difficulties for school management. Aligning teaching strategies with new educational policies and ensuring that teachers are adequately trained on curriculum changes are ongoing concerns (OECD, 2021).

Standardized Testing Pressures:

The emphasis on standardized testing can lead to a focus on exam preparation at the expense of a more holistic approach to education. School management may face challenges in balancing the need for student assessment with providing a well-rounded education (Sirin, 2005, p.418).

Parental Involvement and Communication:

Establishing effective communication and collaboration with parents is important for a child's educational success. School management may face challenges in promoting parental involvement and maintaining open lines of communication (OECD, 2021).

Inclusion of Diverse Learners:

Meeting the needs of diverse learners, including those with special educational needs, can be challenging. School management may need to invest in professional development for teachers and implement inclusive practices to ensure that all students receive quality education (Sirin, 2005, p.418).

Budget Constraints:

Limited financial resources can constrain the ability of schools to provide quality education and address infrastructure needs. School management may need to find innovative solutions to make the most of available funds (OECD, 2021).

Technological Integration:

Integrating technology into the curriculum and ensuring that both teachers and students have access to modern technology can be a challenge. This includes providing training for educators and ensuring equitable access for all students (Sirin, 2005, p.418).

Bureaucratic Processes:

Bureaucratic processes within the education system may create administrative burdens for school management. Streamlining administrative procedures can improve efficiency and allow schools to focus more on educational priorities (Sirin, 2005, p.418).

3.9. Impact of Leaders and Leadership Types on Achievements of Students and Schools in Turkey.**Transformational Leadership:**

Effect on Student Achievement: Transformational leadership, characterized by inspirational and visionary leadership, has been associated with positive outcomes for students. According to a meta-analysis by Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008), transformational leadership is linked to improved student achievement.

Distributed Leadership:

Impact on School Effectiveness: Distributed leadership, where leadership responsibilities are shared among various individuals in the school, has been linked to increased school effectiveness. A study by Harris (2008) emphasizes the importance of distributed leadership in creating a collaborative and responsive school environment.

Instructional Leadership:

Focus on Teaching and Learning: Instructional leadership, which prioritizes the improvement of teaching and learning, is considered vital for school success. Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2008) argue that effective instructional leadership positively impacts student outcomes.

Strategic Leadership:

Alignment with Goals and Vision: Strategic leadership involves setting clear goals and vision for the school. According to a study by Hallinger (2011), strategic leadership positively influences student achievement by aligning the school's efforts with its goals.

Cultural Leadership:

Building a Positive School Culture: Cultural leadership focuses on creating a positive school culture. In their research, Hallinger and Heck (1996) found that cultural leadership significantly influences student achievement through the establishment of a supportive and collaborative environment.

3.10. Determination of The Leadership Types of School Principals and Vice Principals

Determining the leadership types of school principals and vice principals involves a combination of assessment methods and tools (Desrosier, 2011). Leadership types are often categorized based on various models, such as transformational, transactional, instructional, or situational leadership. Here are some common methods to determine leadership types.

Self-Assessment:

Principals and vice-principals can engage in self-assessment using established leadership models. This involves reflecting on their leadership style, strengths, and areas for improvement. Tools like self-assessment surveys or questionnaires based on leadership frameworks can provide insights (Elmore, 2004).

360-Degree Feedback:

Collect feedback from various stakeholders, including teachers, staff, students, and parents. A 360-degree feedback process gathers perspectives from multiple sources to offer a comprehensive view of leadership behaviors. This method can highlight areas where leadership is perceived as effective or needs improvement (Desrosier, 2011).

Observation and Reflection:

Direct observation of a principal's interactions, decision-making, and communication style can provide valuable insights. Coupled with reflective practices, this method allows educational leaders to assess their actions and consider how they align with different leadership types (Dinham, 2005).

Leadership Style Inventories:

There are various leadership style inventories and assessments available that are specifically designed to identify leadership types. These instruments often use statements or scenarios to elicit responses and categorize leadership styles based on established frameworks (Verywell Mind, 2022).

Professional Development Programs:

Participation in leadership development programs can also aid in identifying leadership types. Workshops, seminars, or courses focused on leadership skills often include self-assessment components and provide leaders with feedback from peers and facilitators (Hollinger, 2005).

Research and Readings:

Principals and vice-principals can engage in continuous learning by reading about different leadership theories and models. Understanding the characteristics of

transformational, transactional, servant, or other leadership styles can help leaders recognize their tendencies.

Consulting with Leadership Experts:

Seeking input from educational consultants, leadership coaches, or experts in school leadership can provide external perspectives on leadership types. These professionals may use assessments, interviews, or observations to offer valuable insights (Dinham, 2007).

Peer Collaboration:

Principals and vice-principals can collaborate with their peers to discuss leadership styles. Peer observations and discussions can provide alternative viewpoints and help leaders understand how their approaches compare to others (Desrosier, 2011).





4. METHOD

This study examines the effects of leadership types on student achievement in private and public school management in the Gemlik district of Bursa. The research is based on a survey and an additional online survey conducted with 32 administrators working in eight different schools.

Questions used in the survey are taken from a study by OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) and some questions in the original form were eliminated and the questions were altered in the most suitable way in order to be used in our new survey. The data obtained in the research will be analyzed with the SPSS 27.0 version package program. Appropriate Chi-Square Tests (Pearson Chi-Square, Fisher Exact Test) will be used to compare categorical variables. The analysis of the data will be examined within the 95% confidence interval ($p = 0.05$).

The study included a total of 32 administrators from four public and four private schools in the Gemlik region. According to the survey results, 40.6% of the participants are female and 59.4% are male. 28.1% of the administrators work in middle school and 71.9% in high school. 56.2% of the participants work in public schools and 43.8% in private schools. The administrative experience of the administrators was determined to be less than 5 years for 28.1%, between 5-10 years for 34.4%, between 11-15 years for 15.6%, and 16 years and above for 21.9%. A survey form prepared to evaluate the relationship between leadership types and student success was distributed to the participants. The survey includes questions assessing the demographic information of the administrators, their leadership styles, and student success in their schools. Creating a comprehensive questionnaire to assess the leadership types of school principals involves considering various dimensions of leadership. Survey and the online survey forms used in this study are attached to appendix part.

To determine the leadership types of school principals and school vice-principals questionnaire given above was applied in different types of schools. Participants were asked to answer the questions as YES/NO. After the questionnaire forms were collected, it was seen that the managers did not only reply as yes or no but also commented in the way they wish. Some of the open ended questions were not answered and some of the questionnaire forms turned back as empty forms. All the answers given in this questionnaire were analyzed by SPSS. Five (5) open-ended questions at the end of this questionnaire were used to understand and come out with an opinion about the behaviors and attitudes of principals in different situations. An online survey including the foundation year of schools, task duration, number of students, number of teachers, ranks by students in international and national competitions or projects, number of students who got disciplinary punishment within last two years, number of students who won the university entrance exam or the exam for qualified high schools for secondary school students, precautions taken by administrations to prevent disciplinary punishments were also conducted among the school principals so that we could get the most accurate and valid results and match the results of questionnaire and the online survey.

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Frequency and percentage distributions related to demographic characteristics such as the gender of the administrators, the type of school they work in, the level of school, and the duration of administrative experience were calculated. In addition, various statistical tests were applied to examine the relationship between leadership types and student success.

5. FINDINGS

32 administrators working in 8 schools were included in the study. The results related to the descriptive characteristics of the administrators in the study were evaluated (Table 5.1). According to the results obtained; It was determined that 40.6% of the administrators were women and 59.4% were men. It was determined that 28.1% of the administrators worked in secondary school and 71.9% worked in high school. It was determined that 56.2% of the administrators worked in public schools and 43.8% worked in private schools. It was determined that the administrative years of the administrators were less than 5 years in 28.1%, 5 - 10 years in 34.4%, 11 - 15 years in 15.6%, and 16 years and above in 21.9%.

Table 5.1. Distributions Regarding the Descriptive Characteristics of Managers

	N	%
Gender		
Female	13	40,6
Male	19	59,4
School Type		
Secondary School	9	28,1
High School	23	71,9
Public//Private		
Public	18	56,2
Private	14	43,8
Year of Administration		
Less than 5 Years	9	28,1
5 - 10 Years	11	34,4
11 - 15 Years	5	15,6
16 years and more	7	21,9
Total	32	100

The distribution of the administrators in the study regarding their leadership types was examined (Table 5.2). The "Inspiration and Vision" subheading of the transformational leadership type of the administrators was stated by 78.1% as "I regularly convey an interesting vision of the future of the school." and 21.9% as "I inspire others to share the vision and mission of the school." It has been determined that. 87.5% of the administrators responded to the "Individualized Assessment" subheading as "I actively try to understand the unique needs and goals of each staff member." and 12.5% responded "I provide individualized support and mentoring to encourage professional development." found to express. The subheading of "Intellectual Stimulation" was answered by 84.4% of the managers as "I encourage creative and innovative thinking among the staff." and 15.6% as "I encourage a culture of continuous learning and intellectual curiosity."

Table 5.2. Distribution of Information on Managers' Leadership Types

	N	%
Transformational Leadership		
Inspiration and Vision		
I regularly convey a compelling vision of the future of the school.	25	78,1
I inspire others to share the school's vision and mission.	7	21,9
Individualized Assessment		
I actively seek to understand each staff member's unique needs and goals.	28	87,5
I provide individualized support and mentoring to encourage professional development.	4	12,5
Intellectual Stimulation		
I encourage creative and innovative thinking among staff.	27	84,4
I foster a culture of continuous learning and intellectual curiosity.	5	15,6
Transactional Leadership		
Conditional Rewards		
I use a reward and recognition system to motivate staff.	17	53,1
I communicate expectations and reward positive performance.	15	46,9
Management by Exception (Enabled)		
I proactively monitor and address potential problems before they escalate.	14	43,8
I intervene and provide guidance when deviations from standards occur.	18	56,2
Management by Exceptions (Passive)		
I only intervene when serious problems arise.	8	25,0
I trust my staff to manage routine tasks without my constant supervision.	24	75,0
Instructional Leadership		
Curriculum Development		
I actively participate in the development and improvement of the school curriculum.	12	37,5
I ensure that the curriculum aligns with educational standards and best practices.	20	62,5
Professional development		
I prioritize and support continuing professional development opportunities for staff.	20	62,5
I evaluate teachers' needs and provide resources for their continuous development.	12	37,5
Situational Leadership		
Flexibility and Adaptability		
I adapt my leadership style to the specific needs of the situation.	22	68,8
I am comfortable adapting my approach to different challenges.	10	31,2
Decision Making		
I involve staff in decision-making processes where appropriate.	29	90,6
I make decisions independently when time is of the essence.	3	9,4

The "Conditional Rewards" subheading of the transactional leadership type of the managers was stated by 53.1% as "I use a reward and recognition system to motivate the staff." and 46.9% as "I communicate expectations and reward positive performance." It has been expressed that the subheading of "Management by Exception (Effective)" was answered by 43.8% of the administrators as "I proactively monitor and handle possible problems before they escalate.", and 56.2% as "I intervene and provide guidance when deviations from standards occur." The subheading of "Management by Exception (Passive)" was answered by 25% of the managers as "I only intervene when serious problems arise.", and 75% as "I trust my staff to manage routine tasks without my constant supervision."

In the "Curriculum Development" subheading of the instructional leadership type of the administrators it was stated by 37.5% "I actively participate in the development and improvement of the school curriculum." and 62.5% as "I ensure that the curriculum is compatible with educational standards and best practices." It has been expressed that 62.5% of the administrators responded to the subheading of "Professional Development" as "I prioritize and support continuous professional development opportunities for the staff." and 37.5% responded as "I evaluate the needs of teachers and provide resources for their continuous development."

The "Flexibility and Adaptability" subheading of the situational leadership type of the managers was stated by 68.8% as "I adjust my leadership style according to the specific needs of the situation." and 31.2% as "I am comfortable adapting my approach to different challenges." It has been determined that, 90.6% of the managers answered the subheading "Decision Making" as "I involve the staff in decision-making processes when appropriate.", 9.4% said, "I make decisions independently when time is important."

Table 5.3. Distribution of Administrators' Information on the Number of Teachers and Students in the Schools Where They Work and the Achievements of the Students in the School

	N	%
Number Of Teachers (M=36)		
Less than 36	1	46,
	5	9
36 and more	1	53,
	7	1
Number of Students (M=400)		
Less than 400	1	46,
	5	9
400 and more	1	53,
	7	1
Number of Students won Qualified High School/University in the Last Two Years (M=45)		
Less than 45	1	50,
	6	0
45 and more	1	50,
	6	0
Number of successes Achieved by your Institution in National and International Competition/Projects in the Last 2 Years (M=3)		
Less than 3	1	50,
	6	0
3 and more	1	50,
	6	0
Number of Successes Achieved by your School's Students in Individual and Team Sports in the Last 2 Years(M=7)		
Less Than 7	1	46,
	5	9
7 and more	1	53,
	7	1
Number of Students Received Disciplinary Punishment for Any Reason in the Last 2 Years (M=4)		
Less than 4	9	28,
		1
4 and more	2	71,
	3	9

The distribution of the number of teachers and students in the schools where the administrators in the study worked and their information about the achievements of the students in the school was evaluated (Table 5.3). According to the results obtained; It was determined that 46.9% of the administrators had fewer than 36 teachers in the school they worked in, and 53.1% had 36 or more teachers in the school they worked in. It was determined that 46.9% of the administrators had fewer than 400 students in the school where they worked, and 53.1% had 400 or more students in the school where they worked. It was determined that 50% of the administrators had fewer than 45 qualified high school students in the school they worked for in the last 2 years, and 50% had 45 or more qualified high school/university students in the last 2 years in the school they worked for. It has been determined that 50% of the administrators have achieved success in less than 3 national and international competitions/projects in the last 2 years, and 50% of the administrators have achieved success in 3 or more national and international competitions/projects in the last 2 years. It was determined that 46.9% of the administrators had success in individual and team sports with a score of 7 or above in the school they worked for in the last 2 years, and 53.1% of the administrators had a score of 7 or above in the last 2 years. It was determined that 28.1% of the administrators received disciplinary punishment for less than 4 students in the last 2 years at the school where they work, and 71.9% of the administrators received disciplinary punishment for 4 or more students in the last 2 years at the school where they work.

Table 5.4. Number of Students Who Won Qualified High School/University in the Last 2 Years in the School Where Administrators Work, According to Their Leadership Types

	Number of Students Won Qualified High School/University in the Last Two Years				X ²	p
	Less than 45		45 and more			
	N	%	N	%		
Transformational Leadership						
Inspiration and Vision						
I regularly convey a compelling vision of the school's future.	10	40,0	15	60,0	4,969 ^b	0,041*
I inspire others to share the school's vision and mission.	6	85,7	1	14,3		
Individualized Assessment						
I actively seek to understand each staff member's unique needs and goals.	14	50,0	14	50,0	0,000 ^b	1,000
I provide individualized support and mentoring to promote professional development.	2	50,0	2	50,0		
Intellectual Stimulation						
I encourage creative and innovative thinking among staff.	14	51,9	13	48,1	0,238 ^b	0,500
I encourage a culture of continuous learning and intellectual curiosity.	2	40,0	3	60,0		
Transactional Leadership						
Conditional Rewards						
I use a reward and recognition system to motivate staff.	11	64,7	6	35,3	3,137 ^a	0,077
I communicate expectations and reward positive performance.	5	33,3	10	66,7		
Management by Exception (Active)						
I proactively monitor and address potential problems before they become bigger.	7	50,0	7	50,0	0,000 ^a	1,000
I intervene and provide guidance when deviations from standards occur.	9	50,0	9	50,0		
Management by Exceptions (Passive)						
I only intervene when serious problems arise.	3	37,5	5	62,5	0,672 ^b	0,343
I trust my staff to manage routine tasks without my constant supervision.	13	54,2	11	45,8		
Instructional Leadership						
Curriculum Development						
I actively participate in the development and improvement of the school curriculum.	6	50,0	6	50,0	0,000 ^a	1,000
I ensure that the curriculum aligns with educational standards and best practices.	10	50,0	10	50,0		
Professional development						
I prioritize and support continuing professional development opportunities for staff.	10	50,0	10	50,0	0,000 ^a	1,000
I evaluate teachers' needs and provide resources for their continuous development.	6	50,0	6	50,0		
Situational Leadership						
Flexibility and Adaptability						
I adapt my leadership style to the specific needs of the situation.	14	63,6	8	36,4	5,236 ^a	0,022*
I am comfortable adapting my approach to different challenges.	2	20,0	8	80,0		
Decision Making						
I involve staff in decision-making processes where appropriate.	16	55,2	13	44,8	4,470 ^b	0,113
I make decisions independently when time is of the essence.	0	0	3	100		

a: Pearson Chi-Square Test, b: Fisher Exact Test, * $p < 0.05$

The number of students who won qualified high school/university in the last 2 years at the school where the administrators worked was evaluated according to their leadership types (Table 5.4). According to the results obtained; at schools where %85,7 of the administrators stated "I regularly convey a compelling vision of the future of the school." under the "Inspiration and Vision" subheading less than 45 students won qualified high school/university within last two years time and at schools where %14,3 of the administrators work 45 and more students won a qualified high school/university in last 2 years. According to the way the administrators expressed the subheading "Inspiration and Vision", a statistically significant difference was found in terms of the number of students who won qualified high school/university at the school where they worked in the last 2 years ($X^2=4.969$; $p<0.05$). Under the subheading "Inspiration and Vision" it is determined that the number of students who won a qualified high school/university in the last 2 years at the schools where the administrators stated, "I regularly convey a compelling vision of the future of the school". is higher than the number of students who won a qualified high school/university in the last two years at schools where the administrators stated "I inspire others to share the vision and mission of the school."

Under the subheading "Flexibility and Vision" at the schools where %63,6 of the administrators stated "I adjust my leadership style to the specific needs of the situation." it was determined that there were fewer than 45 students who won a qualified high school/university and at schools where the %36,4 of the administrators there were 45 or more students who won a qualified high school/university in the last 2 years time. Under the subheading "Flexibility and Vision" at the schools where %20 of the administrators stated "I am comfortable adapting my approach to different challenges." There were less than 45 and at schools where %80 worked, there were 45 and more students who won a qualified high school or university in the last 2 years. According to the way the administrators expressed the subheading of "Flexibility and Adaptability", a statistically significant difference was found in terms of the number of students who graduated from qualified high school/university at the school where they worked in the last 2 years ($X^2=5.236$; $p<0.05$). The percentage of the students who won a qualified high school/university within last 2 years at schools where the administrators stated as "I am comfortable adapting my approach to different challenges" under the subheading "Flexibility and Vision" was higher than the percentage of the students who won a qualified high school/university in the last two years at schools where the administrators stated as "I adapt my leadership style to the specific needs of the situation."

Table 5.5. Number of Successes Achieved in National and International Competitions/Projects in the Last 2 Years in the School Where They Work, According to Their Leadership Types of the Administrators

	Your Institution's Number of Successes Achieved in National and International Competitions/projects in the last 2 years				X ²	p
	Less than 3		3 and more			
	N	%	N	%		
Transformational Leadership						
Inspiration and Vision						
I regularly convey a compelling vision of the school's future.	10	40,0	15	60,0	4,969 ^b	0,041*
I inspire others to share the school's vision and mission.	6	85,7	1	14,3		
Individualized Assessment						
I actively seek to understand each staff member's unique needs and goals.	14	50,0	14	50,0	0,000 ^b	1,000
I provide individualized support and mentoring to promote professional development.	2	50,0	2	50,0		
Intellectual Stimulation						
I encourage creative and innovative thinking among staff.	14	51,9	13	48,1	0,238 ^b	0,500
I encourage a culture of continuous learning and intellectual curiosity.	2	40,0	3	60,0		
Transactional Leadership						
Conditional Rewards						
I use a reward and recognition system to motivate staff.	11	64,7	6	35,3	3,137 ^a	0,077
I communicate expectations and reward positive performance.	5	33,3	10	66,7		
Management by Exception (Active)						
I proactively monitor and address potential problems before they become bigger.	7	50,0	7	50,0	0,000 ^a	1,000
I intervene and provide guidance when deviations from standards occur.	9	50,0	9	50,0		
Management by Exceptions (Passive)						
I only intervene when serious problems arise.	3	37,5	5	62,5	0,672 ^b	0,343
I trust my staff to manage routine tasks without my constant supervision.	13	54,2	11	45,8		
Instructional Leadership						
Curriculum Development						
I actively participate in the development and improvement of the school curriculum.	6	50,0	6	50,0	0,000 ^a	1,000
I ensure that the curriculum aligns with educational standards and best practices.	10	50,0	10	50,0		
Professional development						
I prioritize and support continuing professional development opportunities for staff.	10	50,0	10	50,0	0,000 ^a	1,000
I evaluate teachers' needs and provide resources for their continuous development.	6	50,0	6	50,0		
Situational Leadership						
Flexibility and Adaptability						
I adapt my leadership style to the specific needs of the situation.	14	63,6	8	36,4	5,236 ^a	0,022*
I am comfortable adapting my approach to different challenges.	2	20,0	8	80,0		
Decision Making						
I involve staff in decision-making processes where appropriate.	16	55,2	13	44,8	4,470 ^b	0,113
I make decisions independently when time is of the essence.	0	0	3	100		

*a: Pearson Chi-Square Test, b: Fisher Exact Test, *p<0.05*

The number of successes achieved in national and international competitions/projects in the last 2 years at the school where the administrators worked was evaluated according to their leadership types (Table 5.5). According to the results obtained; at schools where %40 of the administrators stated under the subheading "Inspiration and Vision" as " I regularly convey a compelling vision of the future of the school" less than 3 and at schools where %60 of the administrators work 3 and more successes achieved in national and international competition/projects in last 2 years. It was determined that at schools where %85,7 of the administrators stated under the subheading "Inspiration and Vision" as "I inspire school staff to share the school's vision and mission." less than 3 and at schools where %14,3 of the administrators work 3 and more success was achieved in national or international competition/projects in last 2 years. According to the way administrators expressed the subheading of "Inspiration and Vision", a statistically significant difference was found in terms of success rates in national and international competitions/projects in the last 2 years in the schools where they worked ($X^2=4.969$; $p<0.05$). It was determined that the percentage of achieving 3 or more success in national and international competitions/projects in the last 2 years at schools where the administrators stated under "Inspiration and Vision" subheading as "I regularly convey a compelling vision of the school's future" is higher than the ones who stated as "I inspire others to share the school's vision and mission."

It was determined that at schools where %63,6 of the administrators stated under the subheading "Flexibility and Applicability" as "I adapt my leadership style to the specific needs of the situation." Less than 3, and at schools where %36,4 of the administrators work 3 and more success was achieved in national and international competitions/projects in last 2 years. It was determined that at schools where %20 of the administrators stated under the subheading "Flexibility and Applicability" as "I am comfortable adapting my approach to different challenges." less than 3 in the last 2 years and at schools where %80 of the administrators work 3 and more success was achieved in national or international competitions/projects in last 2 years. According to the way administrators expressed the subheading of "Flexibility and Adaptability", a statistically significant difference was found in terms of success rates in national and international competitions/projects in the last 2 years in the schools where they worked ($X^2=5.236$; $p<0.05$). It was determined that the percentage of achieving 3 and more success in national and international competitions/projects in the last 2 years at schools where the administrators stated under "Flexibility and Applicability" as "I am comfortable adapting my approach to different challenges" is higher than the ones who stated as "I adapt my leadership style to the specific needs of the situation."

Table 5.6. Number of Successes Achieved by Students in Individual and Team Sports in the Last 2 Years in the School Where Administrators Work, According to Their Leadership Types

	Number of successes achieved by your school's students in Individual and team sports in the last 2 years				X ²	p
	Less than 7		7 and more			
	N	%	N	%		
Transformational Leadership						
Inspiration and Vision						
I regularly convey a compelling vision of the school's future.	10	40,0	15	60,0	2,210 ^b	0,149
I inspire others to share the school's vision and mission.	5	71,4	2	28,6		
Individualized Assessment						
I actively seek to understand each staff member's unique needs and goals.	13	46,4	15	53,6	0,018 ^b	0,650
I provide individualized support and mentoring to promote professional development.	2	50,0	2	50,0		
Intellectual Stimulation						
I encourage creative and innovative thinking among staff.	14	51,9	13	48,1	1,839 ^b	0,208
I encourage a culture of continuous learning and intellectual curiosity.	1	20,0	4	80,0		
Transactional Leadership						
Conditional Rewards						
I use a reward and recognition system to motivate staff.	10	58,8	7	41,2	2,079 ^a	0,149
I communicate expectations and reward positive performance.	5	33,3	10	66,7		
Management by Exception (Active)						
I proactively monitor and address potential problems before they become bigger.	7	50,0	7	50,0	0,098 ^a	0,755
I intervene and provide guidance when deviations from standards occur.	8	44,4	10	55,6		
Management by Exceptions (Passive)						
I only intervene when serious problems arise.	3	37,5	5	62,5	0,380 ^b	0,421
I trust my staff to manage routine tasks without my constant supervision.	12	50,0	12	50,0		
Instructional Leadership						
Curriculum Development						
I actively participate in the development and improvement of the school curriculum.	6	50,0	6	50,0	0,075 ^a	0,784
I ensure that the curriculum aligns with educational standards and best practices.	9	45,0	11	55,0		
Professional development						
I prioritize and support continuing professional development opportunities for staff.	12	60,0	8	40,0	3,689 ^a	0,055
I evaluate teachers' needs and provide resources for their continuous development.	3	25,0	9	75,0		
Situational Leadership						
Flexibility and Adaptability						
I adapt my leadership style to the specific needs of the situation.	13	59,1	9	40,9	4,461 ^b	0,046*
I am comfortable adapting my approach to different challenges.	2	20,0	8	80,0		
Decision Making						
I involve staff in decision-making processes where appropriate.	15	51,7	14	48,3	4,068 ^b	0,137
I make decisions independently when time is of the essence.	0	0	3	100		

a: Pearson Chi-Square Test, b: Fisher Exact Test, * $p < 0.05$

The number of successes achieved in individual and team sports in the school where the administrators worked in the last 2 years was evaluated according to their leadership types (Table 5.6). According to the results obtained; at schools where %59,1 administrators stated under the subheading "Flexibility and Applicability" "I adapt my leadership style to the specific needs of the situation." Less than 7 and at schools where %49 of the administrators work and stated the same 7 and more individual and team sports success was achieved in the last 2 years. At schools where %20 of the administrators work and stated under the subheading "Flexibility and Applicability" as "I am comfortable adapting my approach to different challenges" less than 7 and at schools where %80 of the administrators work 7 and more individual and Team Sports success was achieved in the last 2 years. According to the way the administrators expressed the subheading of "Flexibility and Adaptability", a statistically significant difference was found in terms of success rates in individual and team sports in the last 2 years in the schools where they worked ($\chi^2=4.461$; $p<0.05$). The percentage of achieving 7 or more individual and team sports success in the last 2 years at schools where the administrators stated under the subheading "Flexibility and Applicability" as "I am comfortable adopting my approach to different challenges" is higher than the ones who stated as "I adapt my leadership style to the specific needs of the situation".

Table 5.7. Number of Students Who Received Disciplinary Punishment for Any Reason in the Last 2 Years in the School Where Administrators Work, According to Their Leadership Types

	Number of students received disciplinary punishment for any reason in the last 2 years				X ²	p
	Less than 4		4 and more			
	N	%	N	%		
Transformational Leadership						
Inspiration and Vision						
I regularly convey a compelling vision of the school's future.	7	28,0	18	72,0	0,001	0,657
I inspire others to share the school's vision and mission.	2	28,6	5	71,4		
Individualized Assessment						
I actively seek to understand each staff member's unique needs and goals.	8	28,6	20	71,4	0,023	0,689
I provide individualized support and mentoring to promote professional development.	1	25,0	3	75,0		
Intellectual Stimulation						
I encourage creative and innovative thinking among staff.	8	29,6	19	70,4	0,205	0,563
I encourage a culture of continuous learning and intellectual curiosity.	1	20,0	4	80,0		
Transactional Leadership						
Conditional Rewards						
I use a reward and recognition system to motivate staff.	7	41,2	10	58,8	3,209	0,087
I communicate expectations and reward positive performance.	2	13,3	13	86,7		
Management by Exception (Active)						
I proactively monitor and address potential problems before they become bigger.	3	21,4	11	78,6	0,562	0,368
I intervene and provide guidance when deviations from standards occur.	6	33,3	12	66,7		
Management by Exceptions (Passive)						
I only intervene when serious problems arise.	1	12,5	7	87,5	1,443	0,256
I trust my staff to manage routine tasks without my constant supervision.	8	33,3	16	66,7		
Instructional Leadership						
Curriculum Development						
I actively participate in the development and improvement of the school curriculum.	1	8,3	11	91,7	4,220	0,060
I ensure that the curriculum aligns with educational standards and best practices.	8	40,0	12	60,0		
Professional development						
I prioritize and support continuing professional development opportunities for staff.	9	45,0	11	55,0	10,499	0,006*
I evaluate teachers' needs and provide resources for their continuous development.	0	0,0	12	100,0		
Situational Leadership						
Flexibility and Adaptability						
I adapt my leadership style to the specific needs of the situation.	7	31,8	15	68,2	0,495	0,405
I am comfortable adapting my approach to different challenges.	2	20,0	8	80,0		
Decision Making						
I involve staff in decision-making processes where appropriate.	9	31,0	20	69,0	2,100	0,357
I make decisions independently when time is of the essence.	0	0	3	100		

Fisher Exact Test, * $p < 0.05$

The number of students who received disciplinary punishment in the last 2 years at the school where administrators worked was evaluated according to their leadership types (Table 5.7). According to the results obtained from the Subheading "Professional Development" in the schools where 45% of the administrators stated that "I prioritize and support continuing Professional development opportunities for staff" less than 4 students got disciplinary punishment in the last 2 years and 55% of them had 4 or more students who received disciplinary punishment in the last 2 years. It has been determined that all of the administrators who stated the "Professional Development" subheading as " I evaluate the needs of teachers and provide resources for their continuous development" had 4 or more students in their school who received disciplinary punishment in the last two years. A statistically significant difference was found in the way administrators expressed the subheading of "Professional Development" in terms of the proportion of students who received disciplinary punishment at the school where they worked in the last 2 years ($\chi^2=10.499$; $p<0.05$). The percentage of students who received disciplinary punishment in the last 2 years at schools where the administrators stated under "Professional Development" as " I evaluate the needs of teachers and provide resources for their continuous development " is higher than the number of students who received disciplinary punishment at schools where the administrators stated as "I prioritize and support continuing Professional development opportunities for staff".

Table 5.8. Distribution of Descriptive Characteristics of Administrators According to the School They Work At

	School Type				X ²	p
	Public		Private			
	N	%	N	%		
Gender						
Male	5	27,8	8	57,1	2,815 ^a	0,093
Female	13	72,2	6	42,9		
School Type						
Secondary	2	11,1	7	50,0	6,058 ^b	0,021*
High School	16	88,9	7	50,0		
Years of Experience						
Less than 5 Years	5	27,8	4	28,6	4,896 ^c	0,187
5 - 10 Years	5	27,8	6	42,9		
11 - 15 Years	5	27,8	0	0		
16 Years and more	3	16,7	4	28,6		

a: Pearson Chi-Square Test, b: Fisher Exact Test, c: Fisher Freeman Halton Exact Test, * $p < 0.05$

The descriptive characteristics of the administrators were evaluated according to the school they work at. (Table 5.8). It was determined that among the administrators who work in Public Schools; 11.1% of the administrators worked in secondary schools and %88,9 worked in high schools; among the administrators who work in Private schools 50% of the administrators worked in Secondary Schools and %50 worked in High Schools. A statistically significant difference was found between the type of school the administrators work in and the school they work in. ($X^2=6,058$; $p < 0,05$). It has been determined that the rate of administrators working in public schools to work in high schools is higher than that of those working in private schools, and the rate of administrators working in secondary schools is lower than that of those working in private schools.

Table 5.9. Distribution of the Number of Teachers and Students and Information on the Success of Students in the School by the Administrators According to the School They Work in

	School Type				X ²	p
	Public		Private			
	N	%	N	%		
Number of Teachers						
Less than 36	1	5,6	14	100	36,512 ^b	<0,001**
36 and more	17	94,4	0	0		
Number of Students						
Less than 400	1	5,6	14	100	36,512 ^b	<0,001**
400 and more	17	94,4	0	0		
Number of Students won Qualified High School/University in the Last Two Years						
Less than 45	10	55,6	6	42,9	0,508 ^a	0,476
45 and more	8	44,4	8	57,1		
Number of Successes Achieved by your institution in National and International Competitons/Projects in the Last two years						
Less than 3	10	55,6	6	42,9	0,508 ^a	0,476
3 and more	8	44,4	8	57,1		
Number of Successes Achieved by your School's Students in Individual and Team Sports in the last 2 years						
Less than 7	9	50,0	6	42,9	0,141 ^a	0,688
7 and more	9	50,0	8	57,1		
Number of Students Received Disciplinary Punishment for any Reason in the Last 2 Years						
Less than 4	3	16,7	6	42,9	2,683 ^b	0,108
4 and more	15	83,3	8	57,1		

a: Pearson Chi-Square Test, b: Fisher Exact Test, ** $p < 0.001$

Information on the number of teachers and students and the success of the students in the school were evaluated according to the school where the administrators worked. (Table 5.9). According to the results obtained; It was determined that 5.6% of the administrators working in public schools have less than 36 teachers in their schools, 94.4% have 36 or more teachers in their schools; all of the administrators working in private schools have less than 36 teachers in their schools. A statistically significant difference was found between the number of teachers in the schools of the administrators according to the school they work in ($X^2=36,512$; $p<0,001$). It was determined that the rate of having less than 36 teachers in the school of those working in public schools is lower than that of those working in private schools, and the rate of having 36 or more teachers is higher than that of those working in private schools.

It was determined that 5.6% of the administrators working in public schools had less than 100 students in their schools, 94.4% had 100 or more students in their schools, and all of the administrators working in private schools had less than 100 students in their schools. A statistically significant difference was found between the number of students in the schools where the administrators work and the school they work in ($X^2=36,512$; $p<0,001$). It was determined that the rate of having less than 100 students in the school of those working in public schools is lower than that of those working in private schools and the rate of having 100 or more students is higher than that of those working in private schools.

Table 5.10. Distribution of Information on Leadership Types of Administrators According to the School They Work At

	School Type				X ²	p
	Public		Private			
	N	%	N	%		
Transformational Leadership						
Inspiration and Vision						
I regularly convey a compelling vision of the school's future.	13	72,2	12	85,7	0,867	0,318
I inspire others to share the school's vision and mission.	5	27,8	2	14,3		
Individualized Assessment						
I actively seek to understand each staff member's unique needs and goals.	14	77,8	14	100	5,044	0,085
I provide individualized support and mentoring to promote professional development.	4	22,2	0	0		
Intellectual Stimulation						
I encourage creative and innovative thinking among staff.	13	72,2	14	100	6,467	0,043*
I encourage a culture of continuous learning and intellectual curiosity.	5	27,8	0	0		
Transactional Leadership						
Conditional Rewards						
I use a reward and recognition system to motivate staff.	7	38,9	10	71,4	3,348	0,070
I communicate expectations and reward positive performance.	11	61,1	4	28,6		
Management by Exception (Active)						
I proactively monitor and address potential problems before they become bigger.	14	77,8	0	0	24,791	<0,001**
I intervene and provide guidance when deviations from standards occur.	4	22,2	14	100		
Management by Exceptions (Passive)						
I only intervene when serious problems arise.	6	33,3	2	14,3	1,592	0,207
I trust my staff to manage routine tasks without my constant supervision.	12	66,7	12	85,7		
Instructional Leadership						
Curriculum Development						
I actively participate in the development and improvement of the school curriculum.	12	66,7	0	0	19,426	<0,001**
I ensure that the curriculum aligns with educational standards and best practices.	6	33,3	14	100		
Professional development						
I prioritize and support continuing professional development opportunities for staff.	10	55,6	10	71,4	0,858	0,292
I evaluate teachers' needs and provide resources for their continuous development.	8	44,4	4	28,6		
Situational Leadership						
Flexibility and Adaptability						
I adapt my leadership style to the specific needs of the situation.	12	66,7	10	71,4	0,083	0,541
I am comfortable adapting my approach to different challenges.	6	33,3	4	28,6		
Decision Making						
I involve staff in decision-making processes where appropriate.	17	94,4	12	85,7	0,705	0,404
I make decisions independently when time is of the essence.	1	5,6	2	14,3		

*Fisher Exact Test, *p<0,05, **p<0.001*

The number of successes achieved by the administrators in national and international competitions/projects in the last 2 years in the school they work at was evaluated according to the school they work at (Table 5.10). According to the results obtained; it was determined that 72.2% of the administrators working in public schools expressed the subheading of "Intellectual Stimulation" as "I encourage creative and innovative thinking among the staff.", 27.8% of them expressed it as "I encourage a culture of continuous learning and intellectual curiosity."; and all of the administrators working in private schools expressed the subheading of "Intellectual Stimulation" as "I encourage creative and innovative thinking among the staff.". A statistically significant difference was found in the way administrators expressed the subheading of "Intellectual Stimulation" according to the school they worked at ($X^2=6,467$; $p<0,05$). It was determined that the rate of administrators working in public schools expressing the subheading of "Intellectual Stimulation" as "I encourage creative and innovative thinking among staff" is lower than that of administrators working in private schools, while the rate of administrators expressing it as "I encourage a culture of continuous learning and intellectual curiosity" is higher than that of administrators working in private schools.

It was determined that 77.8 % of the administrators working in public schools stated the subheading of "Management by Exception" as "I proactively monitor and address potential problems before they become bigger.", 22.2% stated the subheading of "I intervene and provide guidance when deviations from standards occur."; and all of the administrators working in private schools stated the subheading of "Management by Exception" as "I intervene and provide guidance when deviations from standards occur." A statistically significant difference was found in the way administrators expressed the subheading "Management by Exception" depending on the school they work in ($X^2=24,791$; $p<0,001$). It was determined that the rate of the administrators working in public schools expressing the subheading of "Management by Exception" as "I proactively monitor and address potential problems before they become bigger." is higher than the administrators working in private schools, and the rate of the administrators expressing it as "I intervene and provide guidance when deviations from standards occur." is lower than the administrators working in private schools.

It was determined that 66.7 % of the administrators working in public schools stated the subheading of “Curriculum Development” as “I actively participate in the development and improvement of the school curriculum.”, 33.3% stated the subheading of “I ensure that the curriculum is compatible with educational standards and best practices.”; and all of the administrators working in private schools stated the subheading of “Curriculum Development” as “I ensure that the curriculum is compatible with educational standards and best practices.” A statistically significant difference was found in the way administrators expressed the subheading of "Curriculum Development" depending on the school they work in ($X^2=19,426$; $p<0,001$). It was determined that the rate of the administrators working in public schools expressing the subheading of “Curriculum Development” as “I actively participate in the development and improvement of the school curriculum” was higher than the administrators working in private schools, and the rate of the administrators expressing the subheading as “I ensure that the curriculum is compatible with educational standards and best practices” was lower than the administrators working in private schools.



6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Even the most seemingly insignificant details are of great importance in the education system. It is clear that especially the leadership styles of administrators have significant effects on school and student success, as well as motivation and ability to focus on the goal. In our study, we aimed to determine the effects of leadership types on school and student success, to identify the negativities, and to develop suggestions to eliminate the negative factors arising from leadership types. The fact that the data to be shared with the Gemlik District Directorate of National Education, which supports our study, will be used to increase academic success in private and public schools will enable the schools in the region to play a leading role in this context.

According to the results obtained from questionnaire, survey and face-to-face interviews; it was determined that the Principals and Vice-Principals in Public and Private schools in Gemlik district face different kinds of problems while adapting their leadership types to their schools. Basic problems are stated as; financial problems, budgets of the schools, rapid changes in education system, infrastructure of the schools, exam system, total task duration of Principals in a school, bureaucratic processes, lack of parental involvement and time management. Most of the Principals stated that their task duration in a school is not enough to implement their leadership types to their work environment and since they do not have the power to choose their teammates they want to work with, it is inconvenient for them to show their leadership types and talents in the field. According to the observations at face-to-face interviews with Private School Principals, it was determined that the use of leadership types at schools is uneasy as they have to manage the financial situation of the school and they have to carry out a sustainable financial situation. Also, it is not always possible to organize long-term teams because the teachers and staff change in short intervals. As for the Public School Principals, most of them complain about the strict bureaucratic processes that prevent them to make fast decisions. Besides, they also have to solve financial problems at their schools, teachers at schools change in short intervals because of various reasons, which make it difficult to organize teams for several projects. To improve student achievement, labs, various Project areas, sports facilities are not enough to meet the needs and because of strict bureaucratic processes, principals can not change the situation. Both Private and Public school Principals stated that bureaucratic processes take most of their time. Simple bureaucratic structure must be implemented in order to increase the efficiency of Public School Managers.

They must be authorised to take initiatives. Training programs in certain intervals must be carried out in association with public and private schools. Sample training programs used in Europe and other countries must be searched and the ones seen beneficial must be adopted into our education system so that the managers can develop themselves and learn new strategies to use at schools and improve their leadership skills.

Based on the our analysis comparing leadership styles in private and public schools, the criteria of intellectual stimulation for transformational leadership, management by exception (active) for transactional leadership and curriculum development for instructional leadership were found to be significant. Here we see that all leaders in private schools encourage creative and innovative thinking among their staff, intervene and provide guidance when deviations from standards occur, and ensure that the curriculum is in line with educational standards and best practice.

To improve student achievement in academic and social ways, Principals try to use various new methods, they try to participate in all kinds of National and International competitions, projects and sports competitions. Although there are obstacles that prevent them to show their leadership types and get the benefit from their leadership, they mostly use their skills and experiences to guide teachers and students to improve student achievement rates.

A further study on effects of leadership types of administrators on student achievement must be conducted in Gemlik district. A long term -4 years- study with different Principals having different leadership types must be carried out to obtain more accurate results. A four-year study, since high school period is assamble from 4 years, in different school types would give the opportunity to observe leadership types of Principals, decision making processes, team works, competitions and projects, role of administrators on student achievement.

All statistical data, observation results and recommendations stated in this study will be submitted to Gemlik National Education Directorate and upon their approval a further study on Effects of Leadership Types on Student Achievemnet will be carried out.

REFERENCES

- Baker, D. P., Akiba, M., & LeTendre, G. K. (2001). The world is our field: Globalization and the study of educational leadership and administration. *Educational Researcher*, 30(2), 24-27.
- Barbuto, J. E., & Burbach, M. E. (2006). The impact of transactional and transformational leadership styles on the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of customer contact personnel. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 10(2), 77-90.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Mind Garden.
- Boyne, G. (2002). Public and Private Management: What's the Differences. *Journal of Management Studies*. 39.(1), 97-122.
- Dağ, İ. (2015). An Overview and Comparison of Turkish Public Schools and Private Schools. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 3(6), 191-196.
- Datnow, A., Borman, G. D., Stringfield, S., Overman, L. T., & Castellano, M. (2003). Comprehensive school reform in culturally and linguistically diverse contexts: Implementation and outcomes from a four-year study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(2), 143-170.
- De Talancé, M. (2020). Private and Public Education: Do Parents Care About School Quality? *Annals of Economics and Statistics*, (137), 117-144.
- Desrosier, J. (2011). Leading Assessment: The Triple-A Framework for Educational Leaders. In S. Dinham (Ed.), *Rapid Prototyping Reconsidered* (pp. 135-145). SpringerLink.
- Dinham, S. (2005). Principal leadership for outstanding educational outcomes. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(4), 338-356.
- Dinham, S. (2007). How schools get moving and keep improving: Leadership for teacher learning, student success and school renewal. *Australian Journal of Education*, 51(3), 263-275.
- Dronkers, J., & Robert, P. (2003). The Effectiveness of Public and Private Schools from a Comparative Perspective. *European University Institute Working Paper SPS*, 2003/13.
- Ecler Jqua, Terry Jaqua. Transactional Leadership. *Am J Biomed Sci&Res*. 2021-14 (5).
- Elmore, R. F. (2004). *School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice and performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Press.

- Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Routledge.
- European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology, and Education. (2023). *Factors Contributing to School Effectiveness: A Systematic Literature Review*.
- Gruber, K. J. (2014). The financial challenges of private non-profit higher education institutions. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 22, 1-13.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.
- Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4, 221-240.
- Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125-142.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 5-44.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1999). Can high schools overcome educational inequality? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(2), 195-221.
- Harris, A. (2013) *Distributed Leadership Matters*. Corwin Press.
- Harris, A. (2008). *Distributed school leadership: Developing tomorrow's leaders*. Routledge.
- Harris, A., & Spillane, J. P. (2008). Distributed leadership through the looking glass. *Management in Education*, 22(1), 31-34.
- Ivana Simic. (1998). *Transformational Leadership – The key to successful management of transformational organization changes*. Faculty of Economics, University of Nis.
- Jarl, M., Andersson, K., & Blossing, U. (2021). Organizational characteristics of successful and failing schools: a theoretical framework for explaining variation in student achievement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 32(3), 448–464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2021.1903941>
- Keddie, A. (2003). Struggling for the high moral ground: Framing schooling as a moral project in the public versus private sector. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 18(3), 243-257.

- Kulaksızoğlu, A., Çakar, M., & Dilmaç, B. (1999). Türkiye’de ve Dünyada Özel Okulların Yapısı ve İşleyişi. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 11(11), 219-232.
- Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2012). The Nature and Effects of Transformational School Leadership: A Meta- Analytic Review of Unpublished Research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(3), 387–423.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 28(1), 27-42.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). How leadership influences student learning. The Wallace Foundation.
- Lubienski, C., & Lubienski, S. T. (2014). The public school advantage: Why public schools outperform private schools. University of Chicago Press.
- Matthewes, Sönke Hendrik. (2021). Better Together? Heterogeneous Effects of Tracking on Student Achievement. *The Economic Journal*, Volume 131, Issue 635, 1269–1307, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ej/ueaa106>
- National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS). (2020). Why choose an independent school?
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2019). Characteristics of Private Schools in the United States: Results From the 2017–18 Private School Universe Survey.
- OECD. (2008). Improving School Leadership Volume 1: Policy and Practice. OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2013). Improving School Leadership Volume 1: Policy and Practice. OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2021). PISA 2018 Results (Volume II): Where All Students Can Succeed. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Rainey, H. G., Backoff, R. W., & Levine, C. H. (1976). Comparing Public and Private Organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 36(2), 233–244. <https://doi.org/10.2307/975145>
- Rivkin, S. G., Hanushek, E. A., & Kain, J. F. (2005). Teachers, Schools, and Academic Achievement. *Econometrica*, 73(2), 417-458. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0262.2005.00584.x>
- Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674.

- Russell, R.F. and Stone, A.G. (2002), "A review of servant leadership attributes: developing a practical model", *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 145-157.
- Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(2), 402-424.
- Sirin, S. R. (2005). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), 417-453.
- Spears, L.C. (1995), *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's Theory of Servant-Leadership Influenced Today's Top Management Thinkers*, John Wiley, New York, NY.
- Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. Jossey-Bass.
- Stone, A.G., Russell, R.F. and Patterson, K. (2004), "Transformational versus servant leadership: a difference in leader focus", *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 349-361.
- Taytak, M. (2007). Türkiye'de özel okul öncesi eğitim, ilköğretim ve ortaöğretim kurumlarının vergiler ve vergi teşvikleri karşısındaki konumu (Ege bölgesi uygulama sonuçları). Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyon.
- The Center for Public Education. (2004). *Why bureaucracy hinders school reform*. National School Boards Association.
- University of Minnesota. (2022). *Contemporary Approaches to Leadership*. In *Principles of Management*.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011), "Servant leadership: a review and synthesis", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 1228-1261.
- Verywell Mind. (2022). *How to Lead: 6 Leadership Styles and Frameworks*.
- Willms, J. D., & Tramate, L. (2019). The measure of socio-economic status in PISA: a review and some suggested improvements. *Large-scale Assessments in Education*.
- Yılmaz, D. (2022). *Analyzing the Curriculum: The Relationship Between Rote-Based Education and Laboratory Course Hours in Public Anatolian High Schools in Bursa, Turkey*. *Proceedings of The 5th International Academic Conference on Education*.

Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. L. (2007). Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement. Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033.



ÖZGEÇMİŞ

İlk öğrenimini Artvin, orta öğrenimini Bursa'da tamamladıktan sonra 1997 yılında girdiği Selçuk Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümünden 2002 yılında mezun oldu. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı bünyesinde 22 yıldır İngilizce öğretmeni olarak çalışmakta, 2024 yılı itibariyle Bursa Gemlik ilçesinde aktif görev yapmaktadır.



APPENDIX

APPENDIX 1

ONLINE SCHOOL SUCCESS SURVEY

School name :

Year your school was founded :

Name-surname of your school principal :

Your School Principal's tenure at your school :

Number of teachers in your school :

Number of students in your school :

Number of students who have qualified in high school/university in the last two years:

Number of successes your institution has achieved in national and international competitions/projects in the last two years:

Number of successes achieved by your school's students in individual and team sports in the last two years:

Studies carried out to increase the academic success of students:

Number of students who received disciplinary punishment for any reason in the last two years:

Measures taken to reduce disciplinary punishments:

Open ended questions used at the end of the questionnaire form were used in face to face interviews and all answers given by participants were interpreted.

Open-Ended Questions

1. Describe a situation in which you applied the transformational leadership approach. What was the result?
2. Considering your leadership style, how do you handle conflicts within the school community?
3. In what ways do you encourage a culture of collaboration and teamwork among your staff?
4. How do you ensure that your instructional leadership positively impacts teaching and learning in the school?
5. Please share an example of a difficult decision you had to make as a school principal. How did you approach this?

APPENDIX 2

Leadership Types Questionnaire for School Principals:

Part I: Demographic Information

1. Gender:

Male ☐

Female ☐

Prefer not to say ☐

2. Years of Experience as a School Principal:

Less than 5 years ☐

5-10 years ☐

11-15 years ☐

16 or more years ☐

3. Type of School:

Public ☐

Private ☐

Charter ☐

Part II: Transformational Leadership

4. Inspiration and Vision:

I regularly communicate a compelling vision for the school's future. ☐

I inspire others to share in the vision and mission of the school. ☐

5. Individualized Consideration:

I actively seek to understand the unique needs and goals of each staff member. ☐

I provide individualized support and mentorship to encourage professional growth. ☐

6. Intellectual Stimulation:

I encourage creative and innovative thinking among staff. ☐

I promote a culture of continuous learning and intellectual curiosity. ☐

Part III: Transactional Leadership

7. Contingent Rewards:

I use a system of rewards and recognition to motivate staff. ☐

I communicate expectations and reward positive performance. ☐

8. Management-by-Exception (Active):

I proactively monitor and address potential issues before they escalate. ☐

I intervene and provide guidance when deviations from standards occur. ☐

9. Management-by-Exception (Passive):

I only get involved when serious problems arise. ☐

I trust my staff to manage routine tasks without my constant supervision. ☐

Part IV: Instructional Leadership

10. Curriculum Development:

I actively participate in the development and improvement of the school curriculum. ☐

I ensure that the curriculum aligns with educational standards and best practices. ☐

11. Professional Development:

I prioritize and support ongoing professional development opportunities for staff. ☐

I assess the needs of teachers and provide resources for their continuous growth. ☐

Part V: Situational Leadership

12. Flexibility and Adaptability:

I adjust my leadership style based on the specific needs of the situation. ☐

I am comfortable adapting my approach to different challenges. ☐

13. Decision-Making:

I involve staff in decision-making processes when appropriate. ☐

I make decisions independently when time is of the essence. ☐