



| Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi |

The Correlation Between Ethical Leadership Behaviors of School Principals and Teacher Motivation

Okul Müdürlerinin Etik Liderlik Davranışlarının Öğretmen Motivasyonu ile İlişkisinin İncelenmesi

Erdener Arısoy¹, Melike Cömert²

Keywords

1. Ethical leadership
2. Teacher motivation
3. Leadership

Anahtar Kelimeler

1. Etik liderlik
2. Öğretmen motivasyonu
3. Liderlik

Başvuru Tarihi/Received
17.06.2020

Kabul Tarihi /Accepted
13.11.2021

Abstract

Purpose: The present study aimed to determine the correlation between the ethical leadership attitudes of school principals and teacher motivation.

Design/Methodology/Approach: The study was conducted with the relational screening approach. The ethical leadership attitudes of school principals were determined with the School Administrators' Ethical Leadership Scale developed by Uğurlu and Sincar (2012). Teacher motivation was measured with the Teacher Motivation Scale developed by Kılıç and Yılmaz (2019). The study sample included 298 teachers assigned with the stratified sampling method. Kruskal Wallis, Mann Whitney U and Pearson's Rho tests were employed in data analysis.

Findings: The analysis revealed a positive and medium correlation between the perceptions of the teachers about ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation. Furthermore, a moderate positive correlation was determined between ethical leadership and teacher motivation scale internal, external and administrative factors sub-dimensions.

Highlights: The present and similar study findings could be presented in meetings, training activities, official circulars, and the data on the ethical leadership attitudes adopted by school administration would help motivate the teachers could be presented in these activities. Thus, this could lead to higher levels of ethical leadership among school principals, leading to higher teacher motivation.

Öz

Çalışmanın amacı: Bu çalışmada, okul müdürlerinin etik liderlik davranışları ile öğretmen motivasyonu arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi amaçlanmıştır.

Materyal ve Yöntem: Araştırma, ilişkisel tarama modelinde tasarlanmıştır. Okul müdürlerinin etik liderlik davranışları hakkında öğretmen algıları Uğurlu ve Sincar (2012)'in geliştirdikleri Yönetici Etik Liderlik Ölçeği, öğretmen motivasyonu ise Kılıç ve Yılmaz (2019) tarafından geliştirilen Öğretmen Motivasyon Ölçeği ile belirlenmeye çalışılmıştır. Araştırmanın örneklemini tabakalı örnekleme yöntemi ile seçilen 298 öğretmenden oluşmuştur. Verilerin analizinde Kruskal Wallis, Mann Whitney U ve Pearson's Rho testleri kullanılmıştır.

Bulgular: Yapılan analizlerde okul müdürlerinin etik liderlik davranışları hakkında öğretmenlerin algıları ile öğretmen motivasyonu arasında pozitif yönde, orta düzeyli ilişki saptanmıştır. Ayrıca etik liderlik ve öğretmenlerin motivasyonlarının içsel, dışsal, yönetsel faktörler boyutları arasında orta düzeyde, pozitif yönlü ilişki bulunmuştur.

Önemli Vurgular: Bu ve benzeri araştırmalara ilişkin sonuçlar okul müdürleri ile toplantı, eğitim, resmi yazı gibi yollarla paylaşarak, okul yönetiminde etik liderlik davranışları göstermelerinin öğretmenleri motive edebileceği bilgisi iletilebilir. Böylece okul müdürlerinin etik liderlik davranışları gösterme düzeylerinde, dolaylı olarak da öğretmenlerin motivasyonunda artış sağlanabilir.

¹ Corresponding Author, Ministry of Education, Kurucaova Primary School, Malatya, TURKEY; erdenerariso@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8031-3335>

² Assoc. Prof. at İnönü University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Administration, Malatya, TURKEY; <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5406-6943>

INTRODUCTION

Education is as old as human history. The concept of education, which was quite simple initially, has become complex over time and adopted various functions (Mialaret, 1999). Including acquiring high-level and straightforward intellectual skills, humans experience learning processes at every stage of their lives. It would be wrong to associate the history of such a profound phenomenon only with schools. However, despite various educational institutions providing vocational and lifelong education, education with the schools has been widely accepted since schools have been the most critical and active educational institutions (Fidan, 2012). The vital role that schools play in education includes the function of the school and increasing the significance of the individuals responsible for fulfilling this function.

School is an organization developed to achieve predetermined goals and a social system with inputs and outputs that interact with the environment. In this system, the individual's duties include working to realize organizational goals, similar to any organization (Hoy & Miskel, 2015). The teacher is an individual member of this structure. Another member of this structure, the school principal, is responsible for educational planning and the teachers who organize instructional resources and directly conduct the instruction.

The concept of leadership has been an essential attribute of administration since ancient times. A leader is an individual who mobilizes a group and the group members towards a particular goal, develops an organizational vision, gains the trust of the members of the organization, and acts decisively to achieve the organizational goals (Bakan and Doğan, 2013:3; Lunenburg and Ornstein, 2013:102; Güney). , 2012:26). Based on the organizational culture and conditions, leaders could adopt different values, exhibit different attitudes and behaviors (Mihelic, Lipicnik, & Tekavcic, 2010). The school administrator could be a leader of both the teachers and the organization. Thus, as mentioned by Çelik (2015), the leader employs some or all of the 5 effects or power sources. These sources include legal power, reward power, coercive power, expert power, and charismatic power. The teachers, who are unique individuals, would develop internal and external reactions based on the methods adopted by the school administrator. Thus, the school administrator or the organizational leader should adopt consistent decisions and accurate and timely leadership tools when leading the teachers to fulfill their duties.

The teacher should train individuals who work for society's interests and self-interests, allowing them to set self-goals and understand the world. However, teachers also exist outside of their profession, and to fulfill educational missions; they should be personally ready and motivated for these tasks (Kocabaş & Karaköse, 2005). It is challenging to motivate the employees of an organization to work for the organizational goals. It is imperative to develop a system that would facilitate the responsibilities of the employees and reward them. Institutions with best practices are inspiring, trustworthy, fair organizations that create favorable conditions (Öztürk & Dündar, 2003).

It is the leader's responsibility to develop ethical principles in an organization. Influential leaders should establish ethical principles (Alev Sökmen, 2019). An ethical school culture includes trust, justice, commitment to ethical values and freedom. If a leader establishes these principles in the school culture by carefully exhibiting ethical behavior, these ethical principles could be adopted by the teachers and students (Aydın, 2016: 83). In a school environment where there is no doubt about the leader's character and establishment of trust, others comply with the ethical principles. Another issue about school culture and ethical values are the new teachers. When a new teacher is informed that her or his professional future depends on the adoption of ethical values, this teacher will exhibit a higher level of consciousness and ethical behavior (Çelik, 2015). In institutions without an ethical leader, it would be challenging to achieve organizational goals and success (Eser, 2018).

The review of the studies on ethical leadership revealed that the studies conducted by Aykanat and Yıldırım (2012), Mataş Sancak (2014), Yıldırım (2010) reported a significant correlation between ethical leadership and organizational justice. Demirdağ and Ekmekçioğlu (2015), Uğurlu, Sincar and Çınar (2013), and Madenoğlu, Uysal, Sarier and Banoğlu (2014) investigated ethical leadership and organizational commitment and reported that there was a significant correlation between these variables. Furthermore, other studies reported significant correlations between ethical leadership and job performance and satisfaction (Bıyık, Şimşek, & Erden, 2017; Alev Sökmen, 2019), ethical leadership and job integration (Eser, 2018), ethical leadership and organizational creativity (Uğurlu & Ceylan, 2014), and ethical leadership and ethical climate (Akdoğan & Demirtaş, 2014).

Emirbey (2017) investigated the correlation between the ethical leadership behavior of primary school administrators and teacher motivation in the study "The Correlation Between Ethical Leadership Behavior of School Administrators and Teacher Motivation." A significant correlation was reported between the ethical leadership behavior of school administrators and teacher motivation in that study. Ayan (2015) investigated the impact of ethical leadership on internal motivation, job performance and depersonalization. In the study, it was observed that ethical leadership behavior significantly affected internal motivation. The review of the studies on ethical leadership revealed that the correlations between ethical leadership and organizational justice, organizational cynicism, organizational performance, organizational creativity, and internal motivation were investigated. However, since the number of studies on the correlation between ethical leadership and teacher motivation was relatively low, it could be suggested that the present study would fill the gap in the literature.

Ethical Leadership

The term ethics was derived from the Greek ethos, which entails the traditions that distinguish the societies. Today, the concept of ethics is described as socially approved attributes, trends and behavior, while professional ethics is defined as

vocational principles and values (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2011: 11; McHugh, 1991: 8-11). Professional ethics is developed by the individuals in a specific profession and pressures the professional members to behave in a certain way and avoid specific trends (Pehlivan Aydın, 2002: 4).

Ethical violations have been common in business in recent years, leading to a universal crisis. Furthermore, due to the significance of democracy, the ethical orientation of the leaders became more critical, and undemocratic attitudes and ignorance of universal ethical rules have been disassociated with the concept of leadership (Gümüşeli, 2001). All these developments exacerbated the debate and research on ethical leadership. After these developments, the concept of ethical leadership has been emphasized, revealing the need for taking ethical issues more seriously in leadership (Palalar Alkan, 2015).

Ethical leadership was also described in the literature as moral leadership. Trevino, Hartman, and Brown (2000) discussed ethical leadership based on two dimensions: ethical individual and ethical administrator. Brown, Trevino, and Harrison (2005) described ethical leadership as normative personal and interpersonal behavior and the transfer of this behavior to group members. Furthermore, the encouragement of corruption and unethical behavior by a leader in an organization and the personal unethical behavior of that leader is considered unethical leadership (Brown & Mitchell, 2010).

Ethical leadership theory discusses the extent to which the leader adopts ethical behavior in social relationships and individual activities and the leader's contribution to the ethical behavior of individuals in the organization (Ayan, 2015). The ethical leader combines personal ethical behavior and leadership skills, leading to a particular attitude. The assessment of the ethical behavior of the employees is also an essential task of an ethical leader (Aykanat & Yıldırım, 2012). Necessary ethical leadership behavior is the personal ethical behavior of the leader. A leader becomes a role model when she or he adopts highly ethical criteria, which in turn has a significant impact on the ethical behavior of the employees. As long as the leaders adopt ethical values, they acquire the right to expect others to exhibit ethical behavior (Çelik, 2015; Sezgül, 2010). An ethical leader should also observe the group members and employee reward and punishment methods when necessary to force the followers to adopt the desired behavior, and these rewards and punishments should be transparent and fair (Mayer, Kuenzi, Greenbaum, Bardes, & Salvador, 2009; Akbaş, 2019). Certain members or leaders of a group or all groups in society could deviate from ethical principles. The responsibility of the ethical leader is to reconcile the conflicts among the members when there are differences between the values due to differences in ethnic origins, religious beliefs, Etc. (Çelik, 2015)

For example, a universal moral norm, the concept of justice, is also associated with ethical leadership behavior. Ethical leaders should avoid behavior that would harm others or not be approved by others and exhibit virtuous behavior that would benefit others (Kanungo, 2001). These behaviors could include sacrificial, merciful, just, and honest behavior (Yukl, Mahsud, Hassan, & Prussia, 2011). Different reactions of a leader vis a similar vis behavior of two members of the organization would damage the confidence in the leader and leader's reputation as an ethical model.

De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2008) discussed ethical leadership in 3 sub-dimensions. The ethics and justice dimension includes normative behavior of the ethical leader such as honesty, fairness, trustworthiness (Brown et al., 2005). The dimension of clear duties/roles includes clear announcement of the ethical leader's expectations from the followers, rewarding ethical behavior, and clear communications between the leader and followers. The distribution of power dimension entails including group members and their ideas in the decision-making process (Palalar Alkan, 2016: 45).

Motivation

Maslow (1954) described motivation as the efforts spent by humans to meet their basic needs. According to Maslow, physiological, security, social, respect and self-actualization needs determine the conscious behavior of individuals. Hanks (1999) similarly defined the foundation of motivation as fulfilling the needs. Thus, motivation is a process that aims the fulfillment needs. An individual with psychological or physiological needs strives to fulfill these needs. When they are fulfilled, humans can quickly adopt specific sustainable behavior. Herzberg (1987) focused on hygiene and motivating factors in his description. Herzberg argued that hygienic factors such as occupational safety and wages could not lead to complete satisfaction, and the main motivating factors for the employees are work environment conditions such as self-development and acceptance. Robbins and Coulter (2012: 452) described motivation as a process where individuals continuously achieve specific goals on which their efforts are focused. Eren (2001: 490) discussed motivation based on purposive individual behavior and the continuity of motivation towards the same goal. Alptekin Sökmen (2013: 86) summarized the concept of motivation as the employee behavior towards specific goals under the influence of certain stimuli.

Motivation improves employee and organizational performance. Thus, employee motivation has been a sensitive issue in all lines of business (Ağırbaş, Çelik, & Büyükkayıkçı, 2005). Managers and employees in an organization have desires, needs and expectations. Managers should balance organizational goals and employee needs (Alptekin Sökmen, 2013: 85). Good management entails fulfilling the physiological, psychological and social needs of an employee. The skills of the managers to fulfill these requirements determine employee commitment and motivation. Commitment and motivation are significant for the organization to achieve its goals. The efforts and loyalty of the employees to achieve these goals increase only when the employees accept the manager and the organizational climate is satisfactory. Managers who contradict the mentality and values of the employees would not be accepted, and the management would not be successful (Ergül, 2005).

Teacher Motivation

The performance-enhancing effect of motivation is also actual for teachers who are also employees. For the school as a formal organization to accomplish its goals, teachers should employ all their knowledge and skills (Kocabaş & Karaköse, 2005). Only then could high productivity be expected from the teachers. Teacher motivation would directly affect the quality of the services in educational institutions (Yavuz & Karadeniz, 2009). The fulfillment of the tasks with high motivation by the teachers would significantly impact the motivation and learning of the students and the quality of education (Öztürk & Uzunkol, 2013; Demir, 2018). Teacher motivation not only changes the school's productivity but also plays a decisive role in general education policies. Teachers with a high motivation would be very effective both on future progressive legislation and the new educational policies (De Jesus & Lens, 2005).

One of the essential factors that affect teacher motivation is trustworthy school administrators. Furthermore, factors such as the teacher's conscience and love of the profession, the interest of students and parents, good interpersonal relations at school, and the appreciation of the teacher by the principal also significantly affect teacher motivation (Ada, Akan, Ayık, Yıldırım, & Yalçın, 2013). Alam and Farid (2011) defined the factors that affect teacher motivation as wages, social prestige, self-confidence, and encouragement and rewards. To improve teacher motivation, there should be a career development path, teachers' belief in the education system and the school should be improved, and their achievements should be rewarded (Kurt, 2005).

Kılıç and Yılmaz (2019) analyzed teacher motivation in three sub-dimensions: internal, external and administrative factors. Internal motivation includes teacher attitudes towards self-development, the profession, professional achievements, and acceptance of the institution. External motivation includes the external factors to the individuals that increase their motivation. Administrative factors include the attitudes of school administrators towards the teachers and their leadership traits.

The Aim of the Study

The present study aimed to determine the correlation between the ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation. Thus, the following research problems were determined:

1. What are the ethical leadership behavior levels of school principals and the motivation levels of the teachers based on teacher perceptions?
2. Is there a significance between the perceptions of the teachers about ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation based on gender?
3. Is there a significance between the perceptions of the teachers about ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation based on education level?
4. Is there a significance between the perceptions of the teachers about ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation based on the school type?
5. Is there a significance between the perceptions of the teachers about ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation based on seniority?
6. Is there a correlation between the ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation?

METHOD

The Research Model

The present study was conducted with the relational screening method, a general screening model. In studies conducted with the relational screening method, the data are collected for more than one variable. The correlations between these variables and their effect size are determined (Karasar, 2012; Can, 2016). In the study, the perceptions of teachers about the ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher demographics were considered as independent variables, and teacher motivation was considered as the dependent variable.

Data Collection Instruments

Data collection instruments included a Personal Information Form, School Administrators' Ethical Leadership Scale and Teacher Motivation Scale. Personal Information Form included questions about the gender, education level, school type, and teacher seniority.

In the study, the School Administrators' Ethical Leadership Scale developed by Uğurlu and Sincar (2012) was employed to determine the ethical leadership behavior of school principals. It was determined that the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the scale was .973, and the validity and reliability of the scale were high. The scale is a unidimensional, 5-point Likert-type scale that included 24 items and scored as strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), partially agree (3), agree (4), and completely agree (5) (Uğurlu & Sincar, 2012).

The Teacher Motivation Scale developed by Kılıç and Yılmaz (2019) was employed to measure the teacher motivation. The 5-point Likert-type scale includes 18 items and 3 sub-dimensions (internal motivation, external motivation and administrative motivation). The item is answered with 5 options between strongly disagree (1) and strongly agree (5). The scale developers initially created a question pool based on a literature review. The item count was reduced to 18 based on expert feedback. Exploratory

and confirmatory factor analysis revealed 3 factors (internal, external and administrative factors). The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient was .74 for the whole scale.

Population and Sample

The study population included 4548 teachers employed in public primary, middle and high schools in the Battalgazi district of the Malatya province during the 2019 - 2020 academic year. The study sample was assigned with the stratified sampling method. Thus, 3 layers were determined (primary schools, middle schools and high schools). The sample selection aimed to assign a similar number of teachers in each stratum. The measurement tool was applied to the sample, and 311 teachers completed the measurement instrument. Inaccurate and incomplete scales were excluded, and 298 teachers were included in the sample.

Out of the 298 teachers included in the sample, 144 (48.3%) were female and 154 (51.7%) were male. Based on the education level variable, 257 (86.2%) teachers had undergraduate degrees, and 41 (13.8%) had graduate degrees. 119 (39.9%) teachers were employed in primary schools, 90 (30.2%) in middle schools, and 89 (29.9%) in high schools. Based on the seniority variable, 23 teachers (7.7%) had been working for 1-5 years, 45 teachers (15.1%) had been working for 6-10 years, 54 teachers (18.1%) had been working for 11-15 years, 51 teachers (17.1%) had been working for 16-20 years, and 125 teachers (41.9%) had been working for 21 years or longer.

Data Analysis

The data analysis was conducted on the SPSS 25.0 software. Normality analysis revealed that the data were not distributed normally. Thus, non-parametric tests were employed in data analysis. Mann Whitney U test and Kruskal Wallis test were employed to determine the differences between teacher perceptions about ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation based on gender, education level, school type and seniority variables. The Spearman's Rho test was employed to determine the correlation between the ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation. In the analysis of the mean scores, the 1.00 - 1.80 interval was interpreted as "very low," the 1.81 - 2.60 interval was interpreted as "low," the 2.61 - 3.40 interval was interpreted as "moderate," the 3.41 - 4.20 interval was interpreted as "high," and the 4.21 - 5.00 interval was interpreted as "very high."

FINDINGS

The first sub-problem of the study was "What are ethical leadership behavior levels of school principals and the motivation levels of the teachers based on teacher perceptions?" Thus, descriptive statistics were determined and the results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics on the teacher perceptions on ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation levels

Scale	N	\bar{X}	SD
Ethical Leadership Scale	298	3,84	,70
Motivation Scale			
Internal Motivation	298	3,74	,63
External Motivation	298	3,72	,67
Administrative Motivation	298	3,98	,65

As seen in Table 1, teacher perceptions about the ethical leadership behavior of school principals ($\bar{X}=3.84$) were high. Similarly, it was observed that the internal ($\bar{X}=3.74$), external ($\bar{X}=3.72$) and managerial motivation ($\bar{X}=3.98$) sub-dimensions and overall teacher motivation scale ($\bar{X}=3.80$) scores were high.

The second sub-problem was "Is there a significance between the perceptions of the teachers about ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation based on gender?" Since the data did not exhibit normal distribution, the Mann Whitney U test was conducted to determine the differences between the ethical leadership perceptions and motivation levels of the teachers based on the gender variable, and the results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The analysis of the differences between the ethical leadership perceptions and motivation levels of the teachers based on the gender variable

Scale	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Rank Total	U	p
Ethical Leadership	Female	144	156,79	22577,50	10038,500	.158
	Male	154	142,69	21973,50		
Teacher Motivation						
Internal Motivation	Female	144	155,41	22379,50	10236,500	.251
	Male	154	143,97	22171,50		
External Motivation	Female	144	149,31	21501,00	11061,000	.971
	Male	154	149,68	23050,00		
Administrative Motivation	Female	144	160,75	23148,50	9467,500	.028
	Male	154	138,98	21402,50		

Scale	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Rank Total	U	p
Motivation (Total)	Female	144	154.94	22311.00	10305.000	.292
	Male	154	144.42	22240.00		

Based on the data presented in Table 2, there was no significant difference between the perceptions of teachers about ethical leadership behavior of school principals based on the gender variable ($p > .05$). General analysis of the Teacher Motivation Scale scores revealed that the motivation levels of the teachers did not differ based on the gender variable ($p > .05$).

There were no significant differences between the internal and external motivation scores based on the gender variable ($p > .05$). However, there was a significant difference between the administrative motivation sub-dimension scores based on gender ($p < .05$). The mean rank revealed that the perception scores of the female teachers in the sub-dimension of administrative motivation were higher when compared to the male teachers.

The third sub-problem was "Is there a significance between the perceptions of the teachers about ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation based on education level?" in the study. The Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted and the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The analysis of the differences between the ethical leadership perceptions and motivation levels of the teachers based on the education level variable

Scale	Education Level	N	Mean Rank	χ^2	p
Ethical Leadership	Undergraduate	257	149,35	.006	.939
	Graduate	41	150,46		
Teacher Motivation					
Internal Motivation	Undergraduate	257	149,06	.234	.629
	Graduate	41	152,24		
External Motivation	Undergraduate	257	152,96	.048	.826
	Graduate	41	127,80		
Administrative Motivation	Undergraduate	257	149,97	3.041	.081
	Graduate	41	146,52		
Motivation (Total)	Undergraduate	257	150,46	.057	.811
	Graduate	41	143,46		

As seen in Table 3, there was no significant difference between the perceptions of teachers about ethical leadership behavior of school principals based on the education level variable ($p > .05$). There was no significant difference between the motivation dimension scores based on the education level ($p > .05$).

The fourth sub-problem was "Is there a significance between the perceptions of the teachers about ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation based on the school type?" in the study. The Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted and the results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. The analysis of the differences between the ethical leadership perceptions and motivation levels of the teachers based on the school type variable

Scale	School Type	N	Mean Rank	χ^2	p
Ethical Leadership	Primary	119	148,40	2.564	.278
	Middle	90	140,04		
	High	89	160,53		
Teacher Motivation					
Internal Motivation	Primary	119	140,92	2.728	.256
	Middle	90	149,64		
	High	89	160,82		
External Motivation	Primary	119	132,53	14.426	.001
	Middle	90	144,32		
	High	89	177,43		
Administrative Motivation	Primary	119	147,57	.611	.737
	Middle	90	146,23		
	High	89	155,39		
Motivation (Total)	Primary	119	138,95	4.979	.083
	Middle	90	147,45		
	High	89	165,68		

As seen in Table 4, there was no significant difference between the perceptions of teachers about ethical leadership behavior of school principals based on the school type variable ($p > .05$). Similarly, there was no significant differences between the overall teacher motivation, internal and administrative motivation sub-dimension scores based on the school type variable ($p > .05$). However, there was a significant difference between the external motivation scores based on the school type ($p < .05$).

The Kruskal Wallis test compares the mean scores of more than two groups and determines whether there is a significant difference between these scores. However, the test does not reveal the groups between which there is a significant difference. Thus, the source of the difference could be determined with the Mann Whitney U test in pairwise combinations (Büyüköztürk,2016:171). Mann Whitney U test was conducted to determine the group external motivation scores that contributed to the significant difference based on the school type (primary, middle and high schools). The findings are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Mann Whitney U Test results conducted on external motivation sub-dimension and the school type variable

School Type	N	Mean Rank	Total Rank	U	p
Primary	119	91,17	10849,50	3709,500	.000
High	89	122,32	10886,50		
Middle	90	80,00	7200,00	3105,000	.009
High	89	100,11	8910,00		
Primary	119	101,35	12061,00	4921,000	.314
Middle	90	109,82	9884,00		

The review of the Table 5 demonstrated that there was no significant difference between the external motivation levels of the primary and middle school teachers ($p>.05$). It was determined that the significant difference between the external motivation sub-dimension was between primary and high school teachers, and middle and high school teachers ($p<.05$). The mean ranks demonstrated that the external motivation levels of the high school teachers were higher when compared to those of the primary and middle school teachers.

The fifth sub-problem was “Is there a significance between the perceptions of the teachers about ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation based on seniority?” in the study. The Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted on the Ethical Leadership Scale and the Teacher Motivation Scale data, and the results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. The analysis of the differences between the ethical leadership perceptions and motivation levels of the teachers based on the seniority variable

Scale	Seniority	N	Mean Rank	χ^2	p
Ethical Leadership	1 - 5 years	23	154,48	4,124	.390
	6 - 10 years	45	130,40		
	11 - 15 years	54	143,19		
	16 - 20 years	51	163,81		
	21 years and over	125	152,35		
Teacher Motivation					
Internal Motivation	1 - 5 years	23	146,52	17,724	.001
	6 - 10 years	45	109,72		
	11 - 15 years	54	138,53		
	16 - 20 years	51	179,66		
	21 years and over	125	156,80		
External Motivation	1 - 5 years	23	123,74	23,955	.000
	6 - 10 years	45	121,84		
	11 - 15 years	54	118,31		
	16 - 20 years	51	176,55		
	21 years and over	125	166,64		
Administrative Motivation	1 - 5 years	23	147,07	4,390	.356
	6 - 10 years	45	127,73		
	11 - 15 years	54	151,35		
	16 - 20 years	51	163,69		
	21 years and over	125	151,20		
Motivation (Total)	1 - 5 years	23	139,83	15,399	.004
	6 - 10 years	45	117,58		
	11 - 15 years	54	132,39		
	16 - 20 years	51	177,35		
	21 years and over	125	158,80		

The analysis results presented in Table 6 demonstrated that there was no significant difference between the perceptions of the teachers about ethical leadership behavior of school principals based on the seniority variable ($p>.05$). There was no significant difference between the administrative motivation sub-dimension scores based on seniority ($p>.05$). However, there was a significant difference between the general motivation scores of the teachers and internal and external motivation scores based

on teacher seniority ($p < .05$). Since the Kruskal-Wallis test could not identify the source of this difference, Mann Whitney U test were conducted on paired groups.

The Mann Whitney U test demonstrated that the motivation scores of teachers with 16-20 years of seniority and 21 years and over were higher when compared to the teachers with 6-10 years and 11-15 years of seniority. In the internal and external motivation sub-dimensions, it was observed that teachers with 16 -20 years and 21 years or more seniority had higher motivation levels when compared to teachers with 1 -5 years, 6 -10 years and 11 -15 years of seniority.

Jonckheere-Terpstra test was also employed to analyze the seniority variable. The Jonckheere-Terpstra test could be used when ranks include categorical data (Kilmen, 2015). It aimed to determine whether the teacher perception about ethical leadership, teacher motivation and motivation sub-dimension scores increased with an increase in seniority. The Jonckheere-Terpstra test results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. The Jonckheere-Terpstra Test analysis results for the seniority variable

Scale	Seniority	N	Mean J-T Statistics	Standard J-T Statistics	p
Ethical Leadership Scale	5	298	16277,000	.996	.319
Motivation Scale					
Internal Motivation	5	298	16277,000	2.451	.014
External Motivation	5	298	16277,000	3.922	.000
Administrative Motivation	5	298	16277,000	.962	.336
Motivation (Total)	5	298	16277,000	2.632	.008

The Jonckheere-Terpstra test results presented in Table 7 demonstrated that the Standard J-T Statistics was positive for teacher motivation ($p < .05$). Thus, it could be concluded that the increase in teacher seniority led to an increase in teacher motivation. Furthermore, the internal and external motivation dimension scores were also significant in the Jonckheere-Terpstra test ($p < .05$). Thus, it could be suggested that the increase in seniority led to increases in internal and external motivation.

The sixth sub-problem was "Is there a correlation between ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation?" in the study. Since the data did not exhibit normal distribution, the correlation between ethical leadership perceptions and teacher motivation was analyzed with the Spearman's Rank-Difference correlation coefficient. The results of the Spearman's Rho test are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Spearman's Rank-Difference correlation analysis results for the correlation between ethical leadership perception and teacher motivation

	Teacher Motivation		
	N	r	p
Ethical Leadership	298	.587	.000

* $p < .01$

As seen in Table 8, there was a positive, moderate and significant correlation between teacher motivation and ethical leadership behavior of school principals ($r = .587$, $p < .05$). Thus, it could be argued that an increase in ethical leadership behavior of school principals leads to an increase in teacher motivation.

Spearman Rank-Difference correlation analysis was conducted to determine the correlations between ethical leadership and internal, external and administrative teacher motivation dimensions. The results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Spearman's Rank-Difference correlation analysis results for the correlation between ethical leadership perception and teacher motivation sub-dimensions

	Ethical Leadership		
	N	r	p
Internal Motivation	298	.486	.000
External Motivation	298	.454	.000
Administrative Motivation	298	.618	.000

* $p < .01$

The analysis results on the correlations between the ethical leadership behavior of school principals based on teacher perceptions and the teacher motivation sub-dimensions are presented in Table 9. Thus, it was observed that there was a positive, moderate and significant correlation between ethical leadership and internal ($r = .486$), external ($r = .454$) and administrative motivation ($r = .618$) ($p < .05$). It was determined that the highest correlation was between ethical leadership and administrative motivation sub-dimension.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present study aimed to determine the correlation between teacher perceptions about the ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation. The study findings demonstrated that the teachers' overall teacher motivation and internal, external and managerial motivation sub-dimension scores were high. The studies conducted by Çevik and Köse (2017) and Demirtaş, Aksoy, Balı, and Çağlar (2019) reported that teacher motivation levels were high. In a study conducted by Kılıç and Yılmaz (2019), it was determined that internal and external teacher motivation scores were high, while administrative motivation scores were very high. The study conducted by Ertürk (2016) determined that teacher motivation level was moderate, internal motivation was high, and external motivation was moderate. A study conducted by Aksel and Elma (2018) reported that general teacher motivation was high, internal motivation levels were high, and external motivation levels were moderate. In the study, teacher perceptions about the ethical leadership behavior of school principals were high. This finding was consistent with the findings reported by Sağır and Tutkun (2017), Toytok (2014), and Emirbey (2017).

There was no difference between the teachers' perceptions about the principals' ethical leadership behavior based on the gender variable. Gülcan, Kılınç, and Çepni (2012) also reported similar findings. The analyses revealed no differences between the internal and external teacher motivation scores based on the gender variable. The findings showed that the administrative motivation of the female teachers was higher when compared to male teachers. In a study conducted by Kılıç and Yılmaz (2019), it was concluded that external motivation sub-dimension scores differed based on gender; however, there was no difference between the administrative and internal motivation scores based on gender. Bastick (2000) reported that the motivation of the female teachers was higher when compared to the male teachers. Other studies reported no significant differences between teacher motivation levels based on the gender variable (Urhan, 2018; Yıldırım, 2015).

The study findings revealed no significant difference between the ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation based on the education level variable. In a study conducted by Gültekin (2008), it was concluded that there was no significant difference between the ethical leadership behavior levels of school principals based on the education level variable. Ugar (2019) reported no significant difference between teacher motivation levels based on education.

As mentioned in the findings section, there was no significant difference between school principals' ethical leadership behavior and the internal and administrative motivation sub-dimensions based on the school type variable. However, it was determined that the external motivation of the high school teachers was higher when compared to that of the primary and middle school teachers. It could be suggested that the higher external motivation levels among the high school teachers were due to the higher level of facilities available in high schools, such as the professional prestige, availability of field experts, and physical facilities. Furthermore, the lower external motivation of primary and middle school teachers, who establish closer relations with student parents, could be explained by their perceptions about social prestige.

The analysis of the variables based on the seniority variable revealed no significant differences between the teachers' perceptions about the ethical leadership behavior of school principals and administrative motivation sub-dimension based on seniority. In the internal and external motivation sub-dimensions, it was observed that teachers with a seniority of 16 - 20 years and 21 years or more scored higher when compared to teachers with seniority of 1 - 5, 6 - 10, and 11 - 15 years. However, the motivations of the teachers with 16 - 20 years of seniority and teachers with 21 years or more seniority were higher than those with 6 - 10 years and 11 - 15 years of seniority. Furthermore, it was concluded that as seniority increased, motivation and internal and external motivation scores increased.

Thus, the increase in internal motivation with seniority could be due to the high commitment of teachers with more than 16 years of seniority to their profession and institutions. It could be suggested that the increase in external motivation with seniority was due to the increase in concerns of senior teachers about providing for their home, their children's education expenses, or retirement. Furthermore, it could be suggested that the external motivation of the junior teachers was lower when compared to the teacher with over 21 years of seniority due to the social amenities of the profession.

Similar motivation and seniority findings were reported in the studies conducted by Ertürk (2016) and Ugar (2019). However, in studies conducted by Yıldırım (2019), and Çevik and Köse (2017), it was determined that there was no significant difference between teacher motivation levels based on seniority. Kılıç and Yılmaz (2019) determined that the internal motivation scores of the teachers with 1-5 years of seniority were higher when compared to teachers with 16-20 years of seniority, and external and administrative motivation scores of the same group were higher when compared to teachers with 6 - 10 and 11 - 15 years of seniority. This difference could be due to the colleges where these studies were conducted.

In conclusion, a positive and moderate correlation was determined between teacher perceptions about the ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation. It was observed that ethical leadership perception was positively and moderately correlated with all teacher motivation scale sub-dimensions. It was determined that the strongest correlation was between the ethical leadership perception and administrative motivation dimension. Thus, it could be suggested that there is a correlation between the ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation levels. In a study conducted by Emirbey (2017), a moderate, positive and significant correlation was determined between teacher perceptions about ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation. Ayan (2015) reported a moderate and positive correlation between ethical leadership style and job performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study findings revealed that the administrative motivation levels of female teachers were higher when compared to male teachers. The reasons behind this finding could be determined in a qualitative study to discuss the low impact of organizational factors on the motivation of male teachers, and further measures could be determined to alleviate this trend.

In the study, it was determined that the external motivation of the high school teachers was higher when compared to primary and middle school teachers. Thus, future studies could be conducted to improve the physical conditions in primary and middle schools and the approval of these teachers by the parents and the society, to achieve higher external motivation levels across the teachers employed in these schools.

The fact that internal and external teacher motivation increased with an increase in seniority could be considered by practitioners. Thus, social activities could be organized to increase the motivation of junior teachers. New regulations could be adopted to encourage teachers to develop their proficiency and skills and to set career goals to improve internal teacher motivation.

It was determined in the study that there was a moderate and positive correlation between teacher perceptions about the ethical leadership behavior of school principals and teacher motivation. The findings reported in similar studies could be communicated to school principals in meetings, courses, circulars, Etc., to inform them that teachers could be motivated by the ethical leadership behavior of the school administration. Thus, the level of ethical leadership behavior of school principals and the teacher motivation could be increased.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, author-ship, and/or publication of this article.

Statements of publication ethics

We hereby declare that the study has not unethical issues and that research and publication ethics have been observed carefully.

Researchers' contribution rate

The study was conducted and reported with equal collaboration of the researchers.

Ethics Committee Approval

The present study was approved by İnönü University Social and Human Sciences Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee (12.06.2020 no: 2020/10-11).

REFERENCES

- Ada, Ş., Akan, D., Ayık, A., Yıldırım, İ., & Yalçın, S. (2013). Öğretmenlerin motivasyon etkenleri. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17(3), 151-166.
- Ağırbaş, İ., Çelik, Y., & Büyükkayıkçı, H. (2005). Motivasyon araçları ve iş tatmini: Sosyal Sigortalar Kurumu başkanlığı hastane başhekim yardımcılarını üzerinde bir araştırma. *Hacettepe Sağlık İdaresi Dergisi*, 8(3), 326-351.
- Akbaş, M. (2019). *Öğretmen görüşlerine göre yaygın eğitim yöneticilerinin etik liderlik davranışlarının incelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Harran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Şanlıurfa.
- Akdoğan, A., & Demirtaş, Ö. (2014). Etik liderlik davranışlarının etik iklim üzerindeki etkisi: Örgütsel politik algılamaların aracı rolü. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(1), 107-123.
- Aksel, N., & Elma, C. (2018). Ortaokul müdürlerinin dönüşümcü liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin motivasyonu arasındaki ilişki. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(3), 1252-1268.
- Aksoy, H. (2006). *Örgüt ikliminin motivasyon üzerine etkisi*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Alam, M. T., & Farid, S. (2011). Factors affecting teachers motivation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(1), 298-304.
- Ayan, A. (2015). Etik liderlik tarzının iş performansı, içsel motivasyon ve duyarsızlaşma üzerine etkisi: Kamu kuruluşunda bir uygulama. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi* 10(3), 117- 141.
- Aydın, İ. (2016). *Eğitim ve öğretimde etik* (8th edition). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Aykanat, Z., & Yıldırım, A. (2012). Etik liderlik ve örgütsel adalet ilişkisi: teorik ve uygulamalı bir araştırma. *Firat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (22)2, 260-274.
- Bakan, İ., & Doğan, İ. F. (2013). *Liderlik: Güncel konular ve yaklaşımlar*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.

- Bastick, T. (2000). *The measurement of teacher motivation: Cross-cultural and gender comparisons*. Annual Meeting of the Society for Cross-Cultural Research'te sunulan bildiri, New Orleans.
- Bıyık, Y., Şimşek, T., & Erden, P. (2017). Etik liderliğin çalışanların iş performansı ve iş tatminine etkisi. *Gazi İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi*, 3(1), 59-70.
- Brown, M. E., & Mitchell, M. S. (2010). Ethical and unethical leadership: *Exploring new avenues for future research*. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20(4), 583-616. doi:10.5840/beq201020439
- Brown, M. E., Trevino, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97, 117-134.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2016). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı* (22nd edition). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Can, A. (2016). *Spss ile bilimsel araştırma sürecinde veri analizi* (4th edition). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Çelik, V. (2015). *Eğitimsel Liderlik* (8th edition). Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Çevik, A., & Köse, A. (2017). Öğretmenlerin okul kültürü algıları ile motivasyonları arasındaki ilişkinin incelemesi. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(2), 996-1014.
- De Jesus, S. N., & Lens, W. (2005). An integrated model for the study of teacher motivation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54(1), 119-134.
- De Hoogh, A. H. B., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates optimism: A multi-method study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 297-311. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.03.002
- Demir, S. (2018). Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları motivasyonel dil ile öğretmen motivasyonu arasındaki ilişki. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(5) 633-638.
- Demirdağ, G. E., & Ekmekçiöğlü, E. B. (2015). Etik iklim ve etik liderliğin örgütsel bağlılık üzerine etkisi: Görgül bir araştırma. *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(1), 197-216.
- Demirtaş, H., Aksoy, M., Balı, O., & Çağlar, Ç. (2019). İlkokullarda örgüt kültürünün sınıf öğretmenlerinin motivasyonuna etkisi. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11(31), 1-39.
- Dündar, H., & Öztürk, Z. (2003). Örgütsel motivasyon ve kamu çalışanlarını motive eden faktörler. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(2), 57-67.
- Dündar, S., Özutku, H., & Taşpınar, F. (2007). İçsel ve dışsal motivasyon araçlarının işgörenlerin motivasyonu üzerindeki etkisi: ampirik bir inceleme. *Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2, 1-18.
- Emirbey, A. R. (2017). *Okul yöneticilerinin etik liderlik davranışları ile öğretmen motivasyonu arasındaki ilişki*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Uşak.
- Eren, E. (2001). *Örgütsel davranış ve yönetim psikolojisi* (7th edition). İstanbul: BETA Basım Yayım Dağıtım.
- Ergül, H. F. (2005). Motivasyon ve motivasyon teknikleri. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (4)14, 67-79.
- Ertürk, R. (2016). Öğretmenlerin iş motivasyonları. *Eğitim Kuram ve Uygulama Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(3), 1-15.
- Eser, İ. (2018). *Öğretmenlerin etik liderlik algısının işle bütünlüğe ile olan ilişkisinde pozitif psikolojik sermayenin aracılık etkisi*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Gaziantep Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Gaziantep.
- Fidan, N. (2012). *Okulda öğrenme ve öğretme* (3rd edition). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Gülcan, M. G., Kılınc, A. Ç., & Çepni, O. (2012). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin etik liderlik davranışları gösterme düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10(1), 123-142.
- Gültekin, M. (2008). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin etik liderlik davranışı gösterme düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Gümüşeli, A. İ. (2001). Çağdaş okul müdürünün liderlik alanları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 28, 531-548.
- Güney, S. (2012). *Liderlik*. Ankara: Nobel Akademik.
- Hanks, K. (1999). İnsanları motive etme sanatı. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.
- Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 46(1), 53-62.
- Hoy, W. K. (2015). *Eğitim yönetimi teori, araştırma ve uygulama* (7th edition). (Çev.: S. Turan). Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Kanbur, A., Örucü, E. (2008). Örgütsel-yönetimsel motivasyon faktörlerinin çalışanların performans, ve verimliliğine etkilerini incelemeye yönelik ampirik bir çalışma: Hizmet ve endüstri işletmesi örneği. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Dergisi*, (15)1, 85-97.
- Kanungo, R. N. (2001). Ethical values of transactional and transformational leaders. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 18(4), 251-265.
- Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* (23th edition). Ankara: Nobel Akademik.
- Kilmen, S. (2015). *Eğitim araştırmacıları için SPSS uygulamalı istatistik*. Ankara: Edge Akademi.
- Kılıç, Y., & Yılmaz, E. (2019). İçsel, dışsal ve yönetsel faktörler bağlamında öğretmen motivasyon ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Eğitim Kuram ve Uygulama Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(1), 77-91.
- Kocabaş, İ., Karaköse, T. (2005). Okul müdürlerinin tutum ve davranışlarının öğretmenlerin motivasyonuna etkisi: Özel ve devlet okulu örneği. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(1), 79-91.
- Kurt, T. (2005). Herzberg'in çift faktörlü güdüleme kuramının öğretmenlerin motivasyonu açısından çözümlenmesi. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (25)1, 285-299.

- Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (2013). *Eğitim yönetimi* (Çev. Ed.: G. Arastaman). Ankara: Nobel Akademik.
- Madenoğlu, C., Uysal, Ş., Sarier, Y., & Banoğlu, K. (2014). Okul müdürlerinin etik liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin iş doyumlarının örgütsel bağlılıkla ilişkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 20(1), 47-69.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Mataş Sancak, Y. (2014). *Etik liderlik örgütsel adalet ve örgütsel sinizm üzerine bir uygulama*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Haliç Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R. B. (2009). How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108(1), 1–13. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.04.002
- McHugh, F. P. (1991). *Ethics*. London: Macmillan Education.
- Mialaret, G. (1999). Eğitim bilimlerinin epistemolojik ve metodolojik temelleri (Çev: S. Özsoy). *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32(1), 317-330. doi:10.1501/Egifak_0000001167
- Mihelic, K. K., Lipicnik, B., & Tekavcic, M. (2010). Ethical Leadership. *International Journal of Management and Information Systems*, 14(5), 31-42.
- Öztürk, E., & Uzunkol, E. (2013). İlkokul öğretmeni motivasyon ölçeğinin psikometrik özellikleri. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 9(4), 421-435.
- Öztürk, Z., & Dündar, H. (2003). Örgütsel motivasyon ve kamu çalışanlarını motive eden faktörler. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(2), 57-67.
- Palalar Alkan, D. (2015). Etik liderlik ölçeğinin Türkçe formunun güvenilirlik ve geçerlilik çalışması. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 38, 109-121.
- Palalar Alkan, D. (2016). *Etik liderlik*. İstanbul: Derin Yayınları.
- Pehlivan Aydın, İ. (2002). *Yönetimsel mesleki ve örgütsel etik* (3th edition). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2012). *Management* (11th edition). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Sağır, M., & Tutkun, B. (2017). Okul müdürlerinin etik liderlik davranışları ile öğretmen öz yeterliği arasındaki ilişki. *Düzce Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 7(2), 44-68.
- Sezgül, İ. (2010). Liderlik ve etik: Geleneksel, modern ve postmodern liderlik tanımları bağlamında bir değerlendirme. *Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(7), 239-251.
- Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2011). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education* (3rd edition). New York: Routledge.
- Sökmen, A. [Alptekin]. (2013). *Örgütsel davranış*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Sökmen, A. [Alev]. (2019). Etik liderlik, örgütsel güven, iş tatmini ve işten ayrılma niyeti ilişkisi: Bir hastane işletmesinde araştırma. *Üçüncü Sektör Sosyal Ekonomi Dergisi*, 54(2), 917-934.
- Tanrıverdi, S. (2007). *Katılımcı okul kültürünün yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin iş motivasyonu ile ilişkisine yönelik örnek bir çalışma*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Toytok, E. H. (2014). *Öğretmen algılarına göre okul yöneticilerinin etik liderlik davranışlarının örgüt kültürü üzerine etkisi (Düzce ili örneği)*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bolu.
- Trevino, L. K., Hartman, L. P., & Brown, M. (2000). Moral person and moral manager: How executives develop a reputation for ethical leadership. *California Management Review*, 42(4), 128-142.
- Ugar, Y. (2019). *Okul müdürlerinin liderlik uygulamaları ile öğretmenlerin motivasyonu arasındaki ilişki*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Uğurlu, C. T., & Ceylan, N. (2014). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel yaratıcılık ve etik liderlik algılarının incelenmesi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(2), 96-112.
- Uğurlu, C. T., & Sincar, M. (2012). Okul yöneticilerinin etik liderlik ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9(19), 191-204.
- Uğurlu, C. T., Sincar, M., & Çınar, K. (2013). Ortaöğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerine yöneticilerinin etik liderlik davranışlarının etkisi. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(1), 266-281.
- Urhan, F. (2018). *Öğretmenlerin motivasyon düzeylerine etki eden değişkenlerin analizi*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Yavuz, C., Karadeniz, C. B. (2009). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin motivasyonunun iş tatmini üzerine etkisi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2(9), 507-519.
- Yıldırım, A. (2010). *Etik liderlik ve örgütsel adalet ilişkisi üzerine bir uygulama*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Karamanoğlu Mehmet Bey Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Karaman.
- Yıldırım, H. (2019). *Şanlıurfa'daki ilköğretim okullarının yöneticilerinin liderlik tipleri ile öğretmenlerin motivasyonu arasındaki ilişki*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Harran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Şanlıurfa.
- Yıldırım, O. (2015). *Okul müdürlerinin mesleki yeterlikleri ile öğretmen motivasyonu arasındaki ilişki*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Yukl, G., Mahsud, R., Hassan, S., & Prussia, G. E. (2011). An improved measure of ethical leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(1), 38-48. doi:10.1177/1548051811429352