

## The Effect of School Principals' Social Entrepreneurial Leadership Characteristics on Teachers' Motivation

Hamza Öz\* 

Yozgat Bozok University, Yozgat, Türkiye

Abstract	Article Info
<p><i>Social entrepreneurship is defined as bringing innovative solutions to social problems. In the study conducted by Guzmán et al., (2024), it is emphasized that social entrepreneurship is a developing concept and that studies on social entrepreneurship should be supported by studies conducted in other sectors, especially in the service sector. It is known that the leadership skills of school administrators influence teacher motivation. However, there are no studies in the literature that reveal how effective the social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics of school administrators are on teachers' motivation. This research was planned to fill this gap in the literature and based on the necessity to determine the effect of the social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics of school administrators on teacher motivation. The universe of this research, designed according to the relational model, one of the quantitative research methods, consists of teachers working in schools located in a region of country X in the 2023-2024 academic year. According to official statistics, a total of 1859 teachers work in this region, and the sample of the research consists of 339 teachers determined by the simple random sampling method. In the study, "Social Entrepreneurial Leadership Scale" and "Teacher Motivation Scale" were used as data collection tools. In the study, the perceived social entrepreneurial leadership and motivation levels of teachers working in the relevant schools were determined according to the variables of the unit, gender, marital status, age,</i></p>	<p><b>Article History:</b> <b>Received:</b> March 16, 2025 <b>Accepted:</b> July 17, 2025</p> <p><b>Keywords:</b> Social entrepreneurship, Social entrepreneurial leadership, Motivation, Teacher motivation, Educational management</p>

\*E-mail: [hamza.oz@bozok.edu.tr](mailto:hamza.oz@bozok.edu.tr)

*seniority, branch and status of the participants and the relationships between the variables were revealed. The most important findings of the study are that there is a high level of positive relationship between the social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics of school administrators and teacher motivation, and that the social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics of school administrators predict teacher motivation at a high level, positively and significantly. Various suggestions have been made to researchers and policy makers in line with these findings.*

---

**Cite as:**

Öz, H. (2025). The effect of school principals' social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics on teachers' motivation. *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership* 10(2), 373-411.  
<https://doi.org/10.30828/real.1659031>

## Introduction

Society is faced with social problems that require new approaches to problem solving. When we consider that the needs of society are now far beyond the capacities of governments, all sectors need to cooperate to combat social problems and improve living conditions. This necessity for cooperation evokes the concept of social entrepreneurship, which is defined as bringing innovative solutions to social problems. In the study conducted by Guzmán et al., (2024), it is emphasized that social entrepreneurship is a developing concept and that studies on social entrepreneurship should be supported by studies conducted in other sectors, especially in the service sector. In this context, how the social entrepreneurship approach, which is effective in producing innovative solutions to social problems, intersects with leadership styles, especially in the field of education, and the effect of

this intersection on important outcomes such as teacher motivation should be carefully examined.

Leadership style is the style and approach used to direct people, implement plans and motivate them. The management style and leadership skills of school principals are critical in motivating teachers (Buluç, 2009). Various studies have shown that the leadership qualities of administrators are an important component that contributes to teacher motivation, retention and job satisfaction (Elzahiri, 2010; Finnigan, 2010; Ingersoll, 2001; Lekamge, 2010; Thoonen et al., 2012). How school principals use their leadership affects the organization, culture and working conditions of the school, which in turn affects teacher motivation (Finnigan, 2010; Ghamrawi & Jammal, 2013). Because school administrators are responsible for facilitating and developing collaboration, creating learning opportunities, and helping teachers strengthen their sense of competence in their profession (Korkmaz, 2007; Lekamge, 2010; Lynch, 2012).

Social entrepreneurial leadership is defined as the process of creating social value by bringing innovative solutions to social problems (Öz & Baloglu, 2023). This form of leadership emerges as a dynamic process that requires interaction with a group of people in line with specific goals or tasks. The fact that teachers in educational institutions work in a structure that requires intense interaction necessitates that social entrepreneurial leadership be considered an important concept in this field. Therefore, in this study, the dimension of social entrepreneurial leadership in producing innovative solutions to social problems and creating social value in educational environments will be highlighted. Within the scope of the research, teacher motivation, as defined by Robbins and Judge (2018), will be considered as an internal or external force that directs, mobilizes, and sustains individuals' behaviors over

time and under changing conditions and cannot be directly observed. The findings of studies that emphasize the decisive role of leadership in the social entrepreneurship process (Kimakwa et al., 2023) constitute one of the fundamental bases of this study.

The connection between entrepreneurship and school leadership is increasingly recognized as important for effective school improvement. Entrepreneurship involves creative and innovative value creation, while school leadership focuses on influencing teachers and stakeholders to create an effective learning environment that benefits students, teachers, parents, and society (Frentz et al., 2025). School leaders need to rethink existing resources and seize new opportunities for themselves and their communities, and this has implications for the knowledge and skills expected of principals and others in schools. They draw on the concepts of 'social capital' and 'social entrepreneurship' to identify the tensions and possibilities school leaders experience when seeking resources for school-community change (Anderson & White, 2011). Given the increasing centralization and competitive pressures that schools face, the role of school principals as entrepreneurs is receiving increasing attention in academic and practical contexts (Yemini et al., 2015).

In recent years, studies in the field of educational sciences have focused on teacher motivation due to efforts to improve school climate (Thapa et al., 2013). Although scientific interest in the subject has intensified, it is emphasized that in addition to the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of teachers (Mahler et al., 2018), there may be other school factors that can affect teacher motivation, and more research is recommended (Tehseen & Hadi, 2015). Similarly, more research is called for on teacher motivation in order to determine the strongest factors that will increase both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, such

as school environment and student behavior (Fernet et al., 2016; Shen et al., 2015). Studies aimed at determining the social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics of school leaders are considered important, especially considering that the clear role of leadership in the social value creation process should be determined (ElNaggar & Hammad, 2024).

Teacher motivation is of vital importance for the education system. The leadership of the school principal positively affects the motivation of teachers both directly and indirectly (Köse et al., 2024). Ensuring teacher motivation is essential to promote a healthy and effective educational environment (Rey et al., 2024). There is an important relationship between social entrepreneurial leadership and the concept of motivation. When this relationship is examined, it can be considered as providing positive change, increasing people's sensitivity to the environment, the desire to create social value, helping society, and the determination to develop innovative solutions to a social problem (Türkeş & Özgeldi, 2023). Social entrepreneurial leadership consists of the dimensions of social responsibility, innovation, influence and sustainability (Öz, 2022). It is possible to come across studies in the literature that reveal the relationship between these dimensions of social entrepreneurial leadership and teacher motivation (Chang & Sung, 2024; Kaçar & Şahin, 2023; Kowalski & Johnson, 2024; Mesri et al., 2024; Xiang et al., 2024). Well-motivated teachers are individuals who have clearly defined goals and take action to achieve them. They have developed a strong sense of duty and responsibility (Rey et al., 2024). Leadership in education involves influencing teachers and stakeholders to create effective learning environments that benefit students, teachers, parents, and society (Daniëls et al., 2019). This approach aligns with entrepreneurial thinking and acting in school

leadership, which emphasizes coordinating tasks, allocating resources, and encouraging innovative structures (Brauckmann-Sajkiewicz & Pashiardis, 2020).

Motivated teachers tend to create a more dynamic, inspiring, and effective learning environment (Day & Gu, 2009; Klassen & Durksen, 2018). When assessing their students, this can lead to a more holistic assessment process that focuses on student development and promotes meaningful learning (Black & Wiliam, 1998). This contributes to an educational environment that values the growth and progress of each student. Furthermore, understanding teacher motivation in classroom management not only improves the learning experience of students, but also contributes to the formation of more engaged and motivated citizens (Caprara et al., 2020; Marzano et al., 2003). Motivated teachers create a dynamic and stimulating classroom environment that supports the holistic development of students and tend to choose more inclusive teaching styles, encourage active learning, recognize the specific strengths and weaknesses of each student, use positive and constructive approaches to discipline management, and foster an environment of mutual respect (Leithwood & Sun, 2019; Malinen & Savolainen, 2022; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Therefore, conducting a study to determine the effect of school administrators' social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics on teachers' motivation will contribute to the field. In addition, this study will contribute to the guidance of policy makers by revealing the contribution of school administrators' social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics on teachers' motivation.

The main purpose of this research is to determine the effects of school principals' social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics on teachers' motivation. In this context, answers to the following

questions will be sought in order to achieve the purpose of the research.

1. According to teachers' perceptions, what are the social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics of school administrators and the level of motivation of teachers?

2. What is the relationship between the social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics of school principals and the motivation of teachers?

3. To what extent do the social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics of school administrators predict the motivation of teachers?

## **Literature Review**

### **Social Entrepreneurial Leadership**

Although social entrepreneurship emerged as a sub-branch of entrepreneurship in the 1970s, it was tried to be explained with the concept of "social innovation" put forward by Peter Drucker in the early 1980s (Ron Rohas et al., 2024). Although there are many definitions in the literature on social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship essentially consists of a multi-dimensional structure with a social mission (Sullivan Mort et al., 2003; Akter et al., 2020).

According to Mair and Martí (2006), social entrepreneurship is defined as the process of creating social value by discovering and taking advantage of opportunities through efforts to promote social change or meet social needs, while according to Dacin et al. (2010), it is defined as initiatives focused on the mission of creating social value, whether the results are positive or negative, and according to Bornstein and

Davis (2010), it is defined as the process of organizing problem-solving efforts. It is thought that the concept of social entrepreneurship (Núñez, 2020; Renko et al., 2015), which is defined as creating a social value by using the success strategies of economic markets, will contribute to the solution of these problems.

Social entrepreneurship functions to highlight unresolved societal concerns on a global scale, promote human development worldwide, and increase life expectancy (Alarifi et al., 2019). According to Rey-Martí et al. (2016), social entrepreneurship is considered as a social task process that uses the pooling of resources and creative ideas to help society grow both socially and economically. The unique challenges of social entrepreneurs require specific leadership qualities to influence stakeholders and promote effective outcomes in social endeavors (Brunelli & Cavazotte, 2024). It is seen that social entrepreneurship practices are defined as helping students develop the knowledge and skills to produce sustainable solutions to social needs (Huster et al., 2014). This approach has introduced a new type of leadership in the literature.

Social entrepreneurial leadership is defined as the process of creating social value by bringing innovative solutions to social problems. Social entrepreneurial leadership emerges as a process that requires interaction between a group of people with specific goals or tasks. Prabhu (1999) describes the primary mission of social entrepreneurial leaders as being individuals who create and manage innovative, entrepreneurial organizations or ventures that are social change and development for their group, while Adeagbo (2008) defines the social entrepreneurial leader as a leader with vision and values who creates change while generating self-sufficient or self-sustainable income to pursue the social mission.



Social entrepreneurial leadership consists of the dimensions of social responsibility, innovation, influence and sustainability (Öz & Baloglu, 2023). The social responsibility dimension of social entrepreneurial leadership includes acting with social responsibility awareness in solidarity and providing a social benefit by solving social problems. The innovation dimension includes taking risks, creative thinking skills, acting with foresight and acting outside the box. The influence dimension includes creating a sense of ownership, trust, satisfaction, dedication and increasing the motivation of followers by evaluating feedback, while the sustainability dimension includes managing change, finding sustainable solutions, being able to play the role of a change agent and being in a constant search until permanent solutions are found to social problems (Öz, 2022).

### **Teacher Motivation**

Motivation represents similar beliefs and emotions that affect professional and personal behavior; it is the force that drives a person to do something, such as learning to work productively and reach their potential (Bandura, 1993). Motivation can be generally defined as “an internal state that arouses, directs, and sustains behavior” (Woolfolk, 2007). Motivation is defined by Guay et al (2010) as the underlying reasons for behavior, while according to Ingvarson (2009), it is based on employees' perceptions of how satisfied they are with the functioning of their organization.

Robbins and Judge (2018), teacher motivation is defined as an unobservable force that directs, activates, and sustains behaviors due to internal or external factors over time and in the face of changing conditions. Similarly, According Cuevas to et al. (2018), quality education and academic success depend on teacher performance, and teacher performance also results from teacher motivation.

Framed by emotional, cognitive, and behavioral processes that support individual goals, teacher motivation is determined by multiple factors and results in goal-centered actions aimed at being aligned with the school's goals (Kanfer & Chen, 2016). Canrinus (2012) and Thoonen et al. (2012) found that when teachers internally accept the school's goals as their own, teacher commitment increases, which is an important element for teachers' motivation and commitment to the teaching profession. In this respect, the successful functioning of a school or school system depends on the determining and fundamental variable of teacher motivation (Mintrop & Ordenes, 2017; Viseu et al., 2016).

Understanding the factors that contribute to teachers' demotivation provides insight into the creation of motivating conditions. Such negative outcomes are linked to disruptive student behaviors, negative student attitudes, long work schedules, intense and high workload demands, and stressful relationships in the school environment (Han & Yin, 2016; Viseu et al., 2016). Meeting teachers' intrinsic and extrinsic motivational needs improves the quality of job performance, contributes to student achievement, and helps meet teachers' work-life balance needs (Barrett & Harris, 2015; Clandinin et al., 2015; Deci et al., 2017; Dee & Wyckoff, 2015; Fernet et al., 2016; Mahler et al., 2018). Conversely, both undermining experiences and demotivating events contribute to decreased quality of job performance and increased teacher attrition rates (Brereton, 2019; Han & Yin, 2016; Hassanzadeh & Jafari, 2019).

Studies examining the relationships between social entrepreneurship and transformational leadership (Kırılmaz, 2013), ethical and servant leadership (Bahçebaşı, 2020) reveal the multidimensional structure of social entrepreneurial leadership. In addition, studies examining the relationships between social value creation processes (Türker, 2020;

Katı & Toker, 2021) and social entrepreneurship and individual personality traits (Gül, 2019; Kızılöz et al., 2021) shed light on how social entrepreneurship is shaped in individual and structural dimensions. While Pisapia (2009) emphasizes that school administrators should be structured as entrepreneurial leaders; Brauckmann-Sajkiewicz and Pashiardis (2020) associate the key role that school administrators play in resource creation processes with social entrepreneurial leadership traits. In this context, it is considered an important element in terms of effective leadership practices that social entrepreneurial leaders have intrinsic motivation (Nicholls, 2006; Shaw & Carter, 2007) and the competence to fulfill their self-actualization and personal motivation obligations (Wronka-Pośpiech, 2016). In this sense, social entrepreneurial leadership is considered as a way of creating social value in educational institutions (Öz, 2022).

## **Methodology**

### **Research design and case selection**

This study, which was conducted to determine the effect of school administrators' social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics on teachers' motivation, was designed in accordance with a relational study model from quantitative research methods. The relational model is to reveal the relationship or effect between two different variables (Fraenkel et al., 2012). The main purpose of such studies is to examine whether the variables change together or, if there is a change, in what way (Karasar, 2017).

The universe of this research consists of teachers working in schools located in the central district of Y province in the 2023-2024 academic year. According to the data obtained from the official website of the Y Provincial Directorate of National Education on 26.03.2024, a total of

1859 teachers work in schools located in the central district. The sample of the research consists of 339 teachers determined by the simple random sampling method. Descriptive information about the sample research is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.**

*Descriptive Information of Participants*

Variables	Category	f	%
Gender	Woman	162	47.8
	Man	177	52.2
Marital Status	Single	75	22.1
	Married	264	77.9
Age	25 years old and under	12	3.5
	Between 26-35 years old	108	31.9
	Between 36-45 years old	135	39.8
	Between 46-55 years old	60	17.7
	Ages 56 and over	24	7.1
Seniority	5 years and under	54	15.9
	Between 6-10 years	63	18.6
	Between 11-15 years	48	14.2
	Between 16-20 years	75	22.1
	Between 21-25 years	54	15.9
	26 years and above	45	13.3
Branch	Preschool Teacher	66	19.5
	Class Teacher	165	48.7
	Branch Teacher	108	31.8
Graduation Status	Licence	252	74.3
	Postgraduate	87	25.7
Status	Regular	300	88.5
	Contractual	21	6.2
	Paid	18	5.3
Career Step	Candidate Teacher	18	5.3
	Teacher	111	32.7
	Expert Teacher	177	52.2
	Head teacher	33	9.7

## Data collection tools

In the study, the personal information form, the “*Social Entrepreneurial Leadership Scale (SGLO)*” developed by Öz and Baloğlu (2023), for which the necessary permissions were obtained, and the “*Teacher Motivation Scale*” developed by Yıldız and Taşgın (2020) were used as data collection tools.

The *social entrepreneurial leadership scale* was developed by Öz and Baloğlu (2023) and consists of 24 items in 4 dimensions. The dimensions of the scale are social responsibility (6 items), innovation (7 items), influence (5 items) and sustainability (6 items). The statements in the scale are in the form of an equally spaced scale consisting of the options “None (1), Little (2), Moderate (3), Much (4) and Full (5)”. High scores obtained from the scale indicate that the participants have a high level of participation, while low scores indicate a low level of participation. According to the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) conducted within the scope of this research, the chi-square of the scale ( $\chi^2 = 434.65$ ); ( $sd=243$ ,  $p<.00$ ), ( $\chi^2 /sd$ )=1.78 was calculated. The ratio of the chi-square value to the degree of freedom between 0 and 2 indicates perfect fit (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013). This ratio has a value in the perfect fit range in this research. In order to test the reliability of the scale, Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient was examined and the Cronbach's Alpha values of the sub-dimensions of the scale were found to be .95 in the Social Responsibility dimension; .91 in the Innovation dimension; .94 in the Influence dimension; .94 in the Sustainability dimension. The Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient obtained for the entire scale was found to be .97. This result shows that it is highly reliable for research.

*Teacher motivation scale:* It was developed by Yıldız and Taşgın (2020) and consists of 3 dimensions and 28 items. The dimensions of the scale are school management (11 items), professional satisfaction and personal development (10 items) and teaching process and students (7 items). The statements in the scale were prepared in a 5-point Likert type consisting of the options "I completely agree (1), I disagree (2), I partially agree (3), I agree (4) and I completely agree (5)". High scores obtained from the scale indicate that the participants have a high level of participation, and low scores indicate that they have a low level of participation. As a result of the CFA, the fit index values were found to be  $\chi^2 = 887.75$  ( $sd = 344$ ,  $p = .00$ ),  $\chi^2/sd = 2.35$ . This rate also has a value in the perfect fit range in this study. Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated for the reliability of the scale. The internal consistency coefficient for the "School Management" sub-dimension was calculated as .96, the internal consistency coefficient for the "Professional Satisfaction and Personal Development" sub-dimension as .91, and the internal consistency coefficient for the "Teaching Process and Students" sub-dimension as .86. The internal consistency coefficient for the entire scale was calculated as .94.

### Data collection and analysis

Data were collected via "Google Form" between 01.05.2024 and 01.07.2024. The research began with a comprehensive literature review. The variables of the research were determined according to literature findings. Necessary permissions were obtained for the implementation of the data collection tools. A personal information form developed by researchers was added to the data collection tool. Within the scope of the research, 1743 of the 1859 teachers constituting the study universe were reached via e-mail and WhatsApp application, and feedback was obtained from 339 teachers. The data

collected were analyzed using the SPSS package program. The data were analyzed with the help of pairwise and multiple comparison techniques. Before the analysis, the distribution properties of the data sets were tried to be determined. It was investigated whether the data showed normal distribution according to the variables to be compared. Accordingly, When the descriptive statistics for the social entrepreneurial leadership and teacher motivation scale variables were examined; it was seen that the skewness and kurtosis values of all variables were between +1.5 and -1.5, and the arithmetic mean, mode and median values were close to each other. With this result, it was determined that the variables of social entrepreneurial leadership and teacher motivation had a normal distribution. For this reason, parametric analyses were applied in the comparisons regarding the examination of intergroup differences in the study (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). In the study, the perceived social entrepreneurial leadership and motivation levels of teachers working in the relevant schools were determined in terms of frequency and percentage values. The correlational relationship between social entrepreneurial leadership and teacher motivation was determined by Pearson Product Moment Correlation Analysis and multiple regression analysis was performed in order to determine the level of prediction. The value of  $p < .05$  was accepted for the significance level of statistical tests. In our study, while interpreting the arithmetic means regarding the social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics of school administrators and the motivation levels of teachers, 1.00–1.79 was evaluated as “not at all”, 1.80–2.49 as “little”, 2.50–3.19 as “medium”, 3.20–3.99 as “a lot”, and 4.00–5.00 was evaluated as “full”.

## Findings

In this section, the findings obtained in the context of the research questions are given. The findings are presented and interpreted in tables.

### Findings regarding school administrators' social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics and teachers' motivation levels

The arithmetic means and standard deviation values regarding the social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics of school administrators and the motivation levels of teachers according to teachers' perceptions are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.**

*Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values for Social Entrepreneurial Leadership and Teacher Motivation Levels*

Scales and Sub-dimensions	n	$\bar{X}$	SS
Social Entrepreneurial Leadership	339	3.97	1.00
Social Responsibility	339	4.24	0.99
Innovation	339	3.73	1.05
Influencing	339	4.02	1.08
Sustainability	339	3.96	1.05
Teacher Motivation	339	4.36	0.65
Professional Satisfaction and Personal Development	339	4.31	0.68
School Management	339	4.26	0.83
Teaching Process and Students	339	4.58	0.57

According to Table 2, it is seen that teachers' general perceptions of social entrepreneurial leadership ( $\bar{X}$ =3.97, SD=1.00) are at the "very"



level, in the dimensions of social entrepreneurial leadership, it is at the "very" level in the dimensions of innovation ( $\bar{X}$ =3.73, SD=1.05) and sustainability ( $\bar{X}$ =3.96, SD=1.05), and it is at the "full" level in the dimensions of social responsibility ( $\bar{X}$ =4.24, SD=0.99) and influence ( $\bar{X}$ =4.02, SD=1.08). It is observed that teacher motivation is high at the "full" level in both general teacher motivation ( $\bar{X}$ =4.36, SD=0.65) and professional satisfaction and personal development ( $\bar{X}$ =4.31, SD=0.68), school administration ( $\bar{X}$ =4.26, SD=0.83) and teaching process and students ( $\bar{X}$ =4.58, SD=0.57) dimensions.

### **Social Entrepreneurial Leadership Characteristics of School Administrators and Teachers' Motivation**

In order to determine the relationship between the social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics of school administrators and teachers' motivations according to teachers' perceptions, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Analysis was conducted since our data showed a normal distribution, and the analysis results are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3.**

*Pearson Product Moment Correlation Analysis Conducted to Determine the Relationship Between Social Entrepreneurial Leadership Characteristics of School Administrators and Teachers' Motivation*

Points	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.Social Entrepreneurial Leadership	1	,962 **	,960 **	,972 **	,965 **	,684 **	,632 **	,666 **	,512 **
2. Social Responsibility	,962 **	1	,889 **	,918 **	,914 **	,632 **	,578 **	,610 **	,494 **
3. Innovation	,960 **	,889 **	1	,916 **	,885 **	,665 **	,619 **	,651 **	,482 **
4. Influence	,972 **	,918 **	,916 **	1	,929 **	,658 **	,601 **	,649 **	,487 **
5. Sustainability	,965 **	,914 **	,885 **	,929 **	1	,682 **	,637 **	,658 **	,513 **
6. Teacher Motivation	,684 **	,632 **	,665 **	,658 **	,682 **	1	,916 **	,927 **	,870 **
7. Professional Satisfaction and Personal Development	,632 **	,578 **	,619 **	,601 **	,637 **	,916 **	1	,726 **	,804 **
8. School Administration	,666 **	,610 **	,651 **	,649 **	,658 **	,927 **	,726 **	1	,694 **
9. Educational Process and Students	,512 **	,494 **	,482 **	,487 **	,513 **	,870 **	,804 **	,694 **	1

N:339, \*\* p<0.01

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that there is a generally high level ( $r=0.69$ ;  $p<0.01$ ) positive relationship between social entrepreneurial leadership and teacher motivation. This situation reveals the finding that the increase in social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics of school administrators positively affects teacher motivation.

### **Findings on the Prediction Level of School Administrators' Social Entrepreneurial Leadership Characteristics on Teacher Motivation**

A multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to determine to what extent the social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics of school administrators predict teacher motivation according to teachers' perceptions, and the analysis results are presented in Table 4. The assumptions of the multiple linear regression analysis were checked, and the variance inflation factor (VIF) value of the variables was examined for the problem of multiple linearity, and since this

value was below 5, it was decided that there was no problem of multiple linearity.

**Table 4.**

*Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Showing the Prediction Level of School Administrators' Social Entrepreneurial Leadership Characteristics on Teacher Motivation*

Predictor Variables		Predicted Variables		
		Professional Satisfaction and Personal Development	School Management	Teaching Process and Students
		[R=0.652; R <sup>2</sup> =0.425]	[R=0.677; R <sup>2</sup> =0.458]	[R=0.518; R <sup>2</sup> =0.269]
		F=61.757 p = 0.00 ** VIF= 3.348	F=70.571 p = 0.00 ** VIF= 2.281	F= 30.677 p = 0.00 ** VIF= 3.057
Still	t	21,904	14,878	28,782
	p	0.00 **	0.00 **	0.00 **
Social Responsibility	β	-0.157	-0.154	0.127
	t	-1,330	-1,346	0.953
Innovation	p	0.18	0.18	0.34
	β	0.359	0.313	0.114
Influencing	t	3,279	2,951	0.920
	p	0.00 **	0.00 **	0.35
Sustainability	β	-0.101	0.139	-0.063
	t	-0.722	1,023	-0.397
	p	0.47	0.30	0.69
	β	0.557	0.392	0.355
	t	4,480	3,247	2,529
	p	0.00 **	0.00 **	0.01 **

\*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01

According to Table 4, the dimensions of social entrepreneurial leadership in the model, namely social responsibility, innovation, influence and sustainability, have a high level and significant relationship with teacher motivation, professional satisfaction and personal development (R=0.652; p<0.01). The dimensions of social entrepreneurial leadership explain approximately 43% of the total

variance in professional satisfaction and personal development ( $R^2=0.425$ ). The relative importance order of the predictor variables on professional satisfaction and personal development is social responsibility ( $\beta=-0.157$ ), innovation ( $\beta=0.359$ ), influence ( $\beta=-0.101$ ) and sustainability ( $\beta=0.557$ ). According to the t-test results, social responsibility ( $t=-1.330$ ), innovation ( $t=3.279$ ), influence ( $t=-0.722$ ) and sustainability ( $t=4.480$ ) are seen to be significant predictors of professional satisfaction and personal development.

According to Table 4, the dimensions of social entrepreneurial leadership in the model, namely social responsibility, innovation, influence and sustainability, have a high level and significant relationship with teacher motivation and school management ( $R=0.677$ ;  $p<0.01$ ). The dimensions of social entrepreneurial leadership explain approximately 46% of the total variance in school management ( $R^2=0.458$ ). The relative order of importance of the predictor variables on school management is social responsibility ( $\beta=-0.154$ ), innovation ( $\beta=0.313$ ), influence ( $\beta=-0.139$ ) and sustainability ( $\beta=0.392$ ). According to the t-test results, social responsibility ( $t=-1.346$ ), innovation ( $t=3.951$ ), influence ( $t=1.023$ ) and sustainability ( $t=3.247$ ) are seen to be significant predictors of school management.

According to Table 4, the dimensions of social entrepreneurial leadership in the model, namely social responsibility, innovation, influence and sustainability variables, have a high level and significant relationship with teacher motivation, teaching process and students ( $R=0.518$ ;  $p<0.01$ ). The dimensions of social entrepreneurial leadership explain approximately 27% of the total variance in the teaching process and students ( $R^2=0.269$ ). The relative order of importance of the predictor variables on the teaching process and students is social responsibility ( $\beta=-0.127$ ), innovation ( $\beta=0.114$ ), influence ( $\beta=-0.063$ )

and sustainability ( $\beta=0.355$ ). According to the t-test results, it is seen that social responsibility ( $t=0.953$ ), innovation ( $t=0.920$ ), influence ( $t=-0.397$ ) and sustainability ( $t=2.529$ ) are significant predictors of the teaching process and students.

### **Discussion**

Leadership in today's educational environments requires an understanding that encompasses not only administrative processes but also social change and value creation. In this context, school administrators with social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics play an important role in increasing teachers' motivation. Leaders who are sensitive to social problems and develop inclusive and innovative solutions within the school allow teachers to see themselves as part of a more meaningful structure (Brauckmann-Sajkiewicz & Pashiardis, 2020). This type of leadership approach contributes not only to teachers' professional but also to their individual development. Elements such as intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment are among the positive effects of the social value-oriented leadership approach on teachers (Wronka-Pośpiech, 2016). Therefore, the social entrepreneurial leadership approach should be evaluated among a new leadership paradigm that nourishes teacher motivation.

In the literature, there are studies that find the leadership levels of school principals at a high level (Dasci Sonmez et al., 2024; Köse et al., 2024; Pan & Chen, 2021; Pazarcık, 2016; Uslu, 2018). In the current study, the participants' perceptions of social entrepreneurship leadership, "very" or "full" in all dimensions, indicate that they have a "high" level of social entrepreneurial leadership perception. It is seen that this finding coincides with the studies in literature. In the study

conducted by Cemaloğlu (2007), it was found that school principals exhibited low-level leadership behaviors.

Various studies in the literature reveal that teacher motivation is generally at a high level. For example, in the study conducted by Demir (2023), it is emphasized that teachers' professional autonomy is closely related to high motivation levels. In addition, Köse et al. (2024) state that the leadership styles exhibited by school principals have a decisive effect on teacher motivation, and especially transformational and supportive leadership stand out in this context. These findings show that teacher motivation is shaped not only by individual but also by organizational and administrative factors, and that this interaction results in a strong professional commitment and increased performance (Özdoğru & Aydın, 2016; Yalçınkaya, et al., 2021; Ye et al., 2024).

There are studies showing that the leadership behaviors of school administrators directly affect teachers' motivation (Baloğlu, 2012; Buluç, 2009; Ereş, 2011; Eyal & Roth, 2011; Finnigan, 2010; Kılıç et al., 2023; Köse et al., 2024; Kurt, 2015; Sucuoğlu & Uluğ, 2022; Thoonen et al., 2011; Yalçınkaya et al., 2021). Ada et al. (2014) also emphasizes that strong and trustworthy leadership increases teachers' motivation and the importance of effective administrative support for successful work. Similarly, it was concluded that teachers' motivation to participate in school management increased. This result coincides with studies such as Kılıç (2019) and Bıçakçılar (2021). Kılıç (2019) stated in his research that the proactive and initiative-taking behaviors of school administrators positively affect teacher motivation. In addition, it was determined that the dimensions of social entrepreneurial leadership predict the teaching process and student dimensions of teacher motivation. This finding shows that as the perceived leadership

characteristics of school administrators increase, teachers' motivation regarding the teaching process and students increases. Another study conducted by Demir (2018) reveals that the language used by school administrators in the teaching process significantly affects teacher motivation. In this way, the effects of social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics on teacher motivation are consistently supported by the findings in the literature and show that the strong leadership characteristics of school administrators play an important role in increasing teachers' motivation levels.

### **Conclusion**

The findings of this study revealed that teachers' perceptions of school administrators' social entrepreneurial leadership characteristics are generally high and that these perceptions have a significant and strong relationship with teacher motivation. It was determined that various dimensions of social entrepreneurial leadership, such as social responsibility, innovation, influence and sustainability, are positively related to different areas of teacher motivation. This situation shows that social entrepreneurial leadership can be an effective element in increasing teachers' professional satisfaction, supporting their personal development and strengthening their commitment to the teaching process. In this context, supporting and developing school administrators' social entrepreneurial leadership skills can positively contribute to the overall performance of the school by increasing teacher motivation.

### **Limitations and Recommendations**

Although this study reveals important results regarding the relationship between school principals' social entrepreneurial leadership levels and teacher motivation, there are some limitations

when interpreting the findings. Firstly, the research is limited to the participation of 339 teachers in a province located in the Central Anatolia Region of Türkiye. Although this sample provided rich and in-depth data, the findings may not be generalizable to a wider group of teachers in different regions or countries. Future studies could expand the sample size to include a more diverse group of teachers from various geographical regions, school types, and cultural contexts, thus increasing the generalizability of the results.

Another limitation is that the study only focused on the perception of teachers. Although the views of teachers are important, it would be beneficial to include different perspectives such as the views of students, school administrators and policy makers in future studies. Another limitation can be considered as the fact that this study was conducted using a quantitative research method. Considering the limitations of quantitative data collection methods, it can be suggested to support it with qualitative or even mixed studies. In addition, it can be suggested to conduct research on other types of leadership that are thought to have an effect on teacher motivation. It can be suggested to conduct studies that can reveal the relationship between social entrepreneurial leadership and issues such as job satisfaction, sustainability, student success and workforce efficiency. In addition, training, workshops, conferences or congresses can be organized to increase the social entrepreneurial leadership skills of school administrators and increase teacher motivation.

Social entrepreneurial leadership, in addition to its positive effects, may also contain potential risks such as depletion of material and moral resources in the process of creating social impact, charismatic leadership increasing organizational dependency, pushing employees' personal boundaries, and emergence of profit-loss imbalances in the



name of social benefit. Such results are important in understanding the practical limits of social entrepreneurial leadership. However, more empirical research is needed to reveal whether these effects are systematic and direct results.

### References

- Ada, Ş., Akan, D., Ayık, A., Yıldırım, İ. & Yalçın, S. (2014). Motivation factors of teachers. *Atatürk University Social Sciences Institute Journal*, 17(3), 151-166.
- Adeagbo, A. (2008). *Social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in practice*. (PhD Thesis). Bournemouth University, Available at: [http://eprints.bournemouth.ac.uk/10421/1/Adeagbo%2C\\_Ade\\_Ph.D.\\_2008.pdf](http://eprints.bournemouth.ac.uk/10421/1/Adeagbo%2C_Ade_Ph.D._2008.pdf).
- Akter, S., Jamal, N., Ashraf, M. M., McCarthy, G., & Varsha, P. (2019). The rise of the social business in emerging economies: A new paradigm of development. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 11(3), 282–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2019.1640772>.
- Alarifi, G., Robson, P., & Kromidha, E. (2019). The manifestation of entrepreneurial orientation in the social entrepreneurship context. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 10 (3), 307–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2018.1541015>.
- Anderson, M., & White, S. (2011). Resourcing Change in Small Schools. *Australian Journal of Education*, 55(1), 50-61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000494411105500106>
- Bahçabaşı, H. (2020). *Comparative analysis of ethical and servant leadership behavior of social entrepreneurs in the context of gender*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Marmara University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.

- Baloğlu, N. (2012). Relationships between values-based leadership and distributed leadership: A causal study to evaluate the behavior of the school principal. *Educational Sciences in Theory and Practice*, 12 (2) [Additional Special Issue], Spring, 1367-1378
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117-148.  
[https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2802\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3)
- Barrett, N., & Harris, D. (2015). Significant changes in the New Orleans teacher workforce. Retrieved [January 20, 2025] from *Education Research Alliance for New Orleans*.  
<https://educationresearchalliancenola.org/publications/significant-changes-in-the-neworleans-teacher-workforce>.
- Bıçakçılar, H. (2021). *The relationship between positive school management and teacher motivation*. (Master's Thesis), Istanbul Sebahattin Zaim University, Institute of Graduate Education.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom Learning. *Assessment in eEducation: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5 (1), 7-74.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>
- Bornstein, D. & Davis, S. (2010). *Social entrepreneurship: What everyone needs to know*. Oxford University Press.
- Brauckmann-Sajkiewicz, S., & Pashiardis, P. (2020). Entrepreneurial leadership in schools: linking creativity with accountability. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(5), 787-801.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1804624>
- Brereton, P. (2019). Teacher low points: A qualitative study into experiences of demotivation in ELT. *International Association of Teachers for English Foreign Language (IATEFL) ELT Research*, 34, 29-32.

- Brunelli, M. de Q., & Cavazotte, F. (2024). Effective leadership in social businesses: an integrative framework grounded on experiences in Brazilian social ventures. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1–34.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2024.2326125>
- Buluç, B. (2009). The relationship between leadership styles of school principals and organizational commitment according to the perceptions of classroom teachers. *Educational Administration in Theory and Practice*, 15(57), 5-34.
- Canrinus, ET, Helms-Lorenz, M., Beijaard, D., Jaap Buitink & Adriaan Hofman (2012) Self-efficacy, job satisfaction, motivation and commitment: exploring the relationships between indicators of teachers' professional identity. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 27, 115–132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-011-0069-2>
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2020). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology*, 82, 1–14.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2020.01.002>
- Cemaloglu, N. (2007). The relationship between school administrators' leadership styles and bullying. *Hacettepe University Journal Of Education* , 33,77-87.
- Chang, T.-J., & Sung, Y.-T. (2024). Does teacher motivation really matter? Exploring the mediating role of teachers' self-efficacy in the relationship between motivation and job satisfaction. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 33(6), 1315-1325.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-023-00803-4>
- Clandinin, D.J., Long, J., Schaefer, L., Downey, C.A., Steeves, P., & Pinnegar, E. (2015). Early career teacher attrition: Intentions of

- teachers beginning. *Teaching Education* , 26(1), 1–16.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2014.996746>
- Cuevas, R., Ntoumanis, N., Fernandez-Bustos, J. G., & Bartholomew, K. (2018). Does teacher evaluation based on student performance predict motivation, well-being, and ill-being? *Journal of School Psychology*, 68-162.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2018.03.005>.
- Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A. & Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1203-1213.  
<https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0620>
- Daniëls, E., Hondeghem, A., & Dochy, F. (2019). A review on leadership and leadership development in educational settings. *Educational Research Review*, 27, 110–125.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.02.003>
- Dasçi Sonmez, E., Cemaloglu, N., & Kahraman, G. (2024). Teachers' professional learning: Do instructional leadership and teacher leadership make a difference in Turkey? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* , 17411432241280124.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432241280124>
- Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2009). *Teacher emotions: Wellbeing and effectiveness*. In P. A. Schutz & M. Zembylas (Eds.), *Advances in teacher emotion research* (15–31). Springer.
- Deci, E.L., Olafsen, A.H., & Ryan, R.M. (2017). Self-determination theory in work organizations: The state of a science. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 19–43. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032516-113108>
- Dee, T. S., & Wyckoff, J. (2015). Incentives, selection, and teacher performance: Evidence from IMPACT. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 34(2), 267–297. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.21818>.

- Demir, O. (2023). Investigation of the relationship between teachers' professional autonomy and professional motivations. *Education and Science*, 48 (213). <http://dx.doi.org/10.15390/EB.2023.11700>
- Demir, S. (2018). The relationship between motivational language used by school administrators and teacher motivation. *Anemon Muş Alparslan University Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(5), 633-638. <https://doi.org/10.18506/anemon.395472> .
- ElNaggar, R., & Hammad, R. (2024). Determinants of online social entrepreneurs' brand loyalty: A value creation model. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 21(1), 155-176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-023-00365-7>
- Elzahiri, S.A. (2010). *Impact of principal's leadership style on teacher motivation*. (PhD Thesis). University of Phoenix.
- Ereş, F. (2011). Relationship between teacher motivation and transformational leadership characteristics of school principals. *International Journal of Education*, 3(2), 1-17. <https://doi:10.5296/ije.v3i2.798>.
- Eyal, O. & Roth, G. (2011), "Principals' leadership and teachers' motivation: Self-determination theory analysis", *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(3), 256-275. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111129055>
- Fernet, C., Trepanier, S.G., Austin, S., & Levesque-Côté, J. (2016). Committed, inspiring, and healthy teachers: How do school environment and motivational factors facilitate optimal functioning at career start? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59, 481–491. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.07.019>
- Finnigan, K. S. (2010). Principal leadership and teacher motivation under high-stakes accountability policies. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 9(2), 161–189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760903216174>

- Fraenkel, J.R., Wallen, N.E., & Hyun, H.H. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education (7th Ed.)*. McGraw-Hill.
- Frentz, J., Brauckmann-Sajkiewicz, S., Bellibas, M. Ş., Pashiardis, P., & Pietsch, M. (2025). Revealing Entrepreneurial Acting and Thinking Among School Leaders in the K-12 Setting – A Scoping Review. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2025.2471373>
- Ghamrawi, N., & Jammal, K. (2013). Teacher turnover: Impact of school leadership and other factors. *International Journal of Education Research and Technology*, 4(1), 68-78.
- Göloğlu Demir, C., Demir, C. & Bolat, Y. (2017). The relationship between motivation and personality traits of classroom teachers. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 14(37), 73-87.
- Guay, F., Chanal, J., Ratelle, C.F., Marsh, H.W., Larose, S. & Boivin, M. (2010). Intrinsic, identified, and controlled types of motivation for school subjects in young elementary school children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 711-735. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709910X499084>
- Gul, M. (2019). *A research on the effect of personality and entrepreneur personality traits on social entrepreneurship orientation: the example of university students*. (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Gaziantep University, Institute of Social Sciences, Gaziantep.
- Guzmán, C., Santos, F. J., & Savall, T. (2024). How to explain social innovation in elderly care services: The role of for-profit and non-profit social enterprises. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 20(3), 1849-1877. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-023-00942-6>
- Han, J., & Yin, H. (2016). Teacher motivation: Definition, research development and implications for teachers. *Cogent Education*, 3, 1–18. <https://doi:10.1080/2331186X.2016.1217819>.

- Hassanzadeh, M., & Jafari, M. (2019). Investigating factors underlying Iranian high school English teachers' (de)motivation. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies*, 5(2), 77–100.  
<https://doi.org/10.30479/jmrels.2019.10317.1283>.
- Huster, K., C. Petrillo, G. O'Malley, D. Glassman, J. Rush, & J. Wasserheit. (2017). Global social entrepreneurship competitions: incubators for innovations in global health? *Journal of Management Education*, 41 (2): 249–271.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562916669965>
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: an organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038003499>
- Ingvarson, L. (2009). Developing and rewarding excellent teachers: the Scottish Chartered Teacher Scheme. *Professional Development in Education*, 35(3), 451–468.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19415250903016707>
- Kaçar, T., & Şahin, S. (2023). Views of school principals on entrepreneurial leadership approaches. *Western Anatolian Journal of Educational Sciences*, 14 (1), 453-481.  
<https://doi.org/10.51460/baebd.1285799>
- Kanfer, R., & Chen, G. (2016). Motivation in organizational behavior: History, advances, and prospects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 136, 6–19.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2016.06.002>
- Katı, B. G., & Toker, K. (2021). Social entrepreneurship as a social change catalyst. *Istanbul Commerce University Entrepreneurship Journal*, 5 (10), 145-164.
- Kılıç, G. N., Karabay, A., & Kocabaş, İ. (2023). Examining the relationship between school administrators' leadership styles

and teachers' organizational happiness. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 12(1), 91-112.

- Kılıç, Y. (2019). *The influence of school administrators' taking personal initiative and leadership behaviors on teacher motivation*. (Ph.D. Thesis), Selcuk University, Konya.
- Kırılmaz, K.S. (2013). A research to determine the perceptions of entrepreneurship and transformative leadership of social entrepreneurs. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Development*, 8 (1), 103-128
- Kızılöz, Ö., Günay, G. Y., & Durgut, A. İ. (2021). The relationship between entrepreneurs' leadership behavior with the perpetrators of social capital and entrepreneurial self - competence: A research on the owners of the company in technoparks. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Development*, 16 (2), 116-133.
- Kimakwa, S., Gonzalez, J., & Kaynak, H. (2023). Social entrepreneur servant leadership and social venture performance: How are they related? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 182(1), 95-118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04986-y>
- Klassen, R. M., & Durksen, T. L. (2018). Weekly self-efficacy and work stress during teaching practicum: A mixed methods study. *Learning and Instruction*, 58, 49-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2018.05.005>
- Korkmaz, M. (2007). The effects of leadership styles on organization health. *Education Research Quarterly*, 30(3), 22-55.
- Kowalski, M. J., & Johnson, M. T. (2024). Enhancing novice teacher motivation through professional conferences. *Teachers and Teaching*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2024.2320161>
- Köse, M., Köse, E., & Özdemir, S. (2024). Leadership and teacher motivation: A comparative analysis on different types and



- levels of leadership in schools. *Education and Science*, 49(219), 225-240. <https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2024.12146>
- Kurt, E. (2015). *Examining the motivation of leaders on those led in an educational institution*. (Master's Thesis), Maltepe University Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.
- Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2019). Student engagement and leadership: The role of school leadership in student motivation. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 55(1), 64–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X18769048>
- Lekamge, D. (2010). Leadership roles played by school principals: An analysis of cases. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 1(2), 43-49. <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC135750>
- Lynch, J. M. (2012). Responsibilities of today's principal: Implications for principal preparation programs and principal certification policies. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 31(2), 40-47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875687051203100205>
- Mahler, D., Großschedl, J., & Harms, U. (2018). Does motivation matter? – The relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and enthusiasm and students' performance. *PLoS ONE* 13(11), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0207252>
- Mair, J. & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36-44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.002>
- Malinen, O. P., & Savolainen, H. (2022). Inclusive education and teacher motivation: A study in Finnish and Chinese contexts. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 109, 103570. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103570>

- Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. J. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mesri, G., Sameri, M., & Keyhan, J. (2024). The relationship between active work behaviors, work values, transformational and interactive leadership style, and work engagement: The mediating role of innovation culture and autonomous motivation. *Current Psychology*, 43(28), 23916-23930. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-06088-0>
- Mintrop, R., & Ordenes, M. (2017). Teacher work motivation in the era of extrinsic incentives: Performance goals and pro-social commitments in the service of equity. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 25,1-44. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.25.2482>
- Nicholls, A. (2006). *Social entrepreneursih: New modls of sustainable social change*. Oxford University Press.
- Nunez, M. V. (2020). *Social entrepreneurial leadership: A case study exploring the leadership actions of a social entrepreneurial venture during its start-up phase*. (PhD Thesis). Northeastern University.
- Öz, H. & Baloglu, N. (2023). Validity and reliability study of the social entrepreneurial leadership scale (SGLO). *International Journal of Turkish Educational Sciences*, 11(21), 588-615. <https://doi.org/10.46778/goputeb.1268093>
- Öz, H. (2022). Social interventional leadership: The sustainable way of creating social value in educational institutions. *Journal of National Education*, 51 (236), 3693-3716. <https://doi.org/10.37669/milliegitim.940654>.
- Özdemir, Ş. S. (2007). *Factors affecting the motivation of visual arts (painting) teachers*, (Master Thesis), Konya: Selçuk University.
- Özdoğan, M., & Aydın, B. (2016). The relationship between primary school teachers' decision-making status and willingness and

- motivation levels. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Education Faculty*, 12(2), 357-367.
- Pan, H.-L.W., & Chen, W.-Y. (2021). How principal leadership facilitates teacher learning through teacher leadership: Determining the critical path. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(3), 454-470.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220913553>
- Pazarcık, Y. (2016). Can our universities train entrepreneurs? A conclusive evaluation of studies measuring the entrepreneurship perception/tendency/characteristics of university students. *Journal of Social and Human Sciences Research*, 17 (37 Entrepreneurship Special Issue), 140-169.
- Pisapia, J. (2009). *The strategic leader: new tactics for a globalizing world*. Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing.
- Prabhu, G. (1999). Social entrepreneurial leadership. *Career Development International*, 4, 140-145.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/13620439910262796>.
- Recepoglu, E. (2013). Examining teachers' job motivation in terms of different variables. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 21(2), 575-588.
- Renko, M., El Tarabishy, A., Carsrud, A.L., & Brännback, M. (2015). Understanding and measuring entrepreneurial leadership style. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53 (1), 54-74.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12086>.
- Rey, J., Portela-Pino, I., Domínguez-Alonso, J., & Pino-Juste, M. (2024). Assessment of teacher motivation, psychometric properties of the work tasks motivation scale for teachers (WTMST) in spanish teachers. *Educational Sciences*, 14 (3).  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14030212>
- Rey-Martí, A., Ribeiro-Soriano, D., & Palacios-Marqués, D. (2016). A bibliometric analysis of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of*

*Business Research*, 69(5), 1651–1655.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.10.033>

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2018). *Essential of organizational behavior (14th ed.)*. Pearson Education. Publisher Parson.

Rojas, R., Jaimes, GIB, Gómez, CAP, Ramírez Osorio, D. M., & Rubiano Rios, DC (2024). Assessing Social Entrepreneurship Competencies in Higher Education. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1–18.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2023.2301029>

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54–67.  
<https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020>

Shaw, E. ve Carter, S. (2007). Social entrepreneurship. *Journal of small business and enterprise development*. 14 (3), 418-438.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/14626000710773529>

Shen, B., McCaughtry, N., Martin, J., Garn, A., Kulik, N., & Fahlman, M. (2015). The relationship between teacher burnout and student motivation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85(4), 519–532. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12089>

Sucuoğlu, E., & Uluğ, M. (2022). The effects of leadership behaviors of secondary school administrators on staff job satisfaction in TRNC. *Sustainability*, 14(21), 13989.

Sullivan-Mort, G., Weerawardena, J., & Carnegie, K. (2003). Social entrepreneurship: towards conceptualisation. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*. 8(1), 76–88.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.202>

Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S., (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th Ed.), 497-516. Boston, MA: Pearson.

- Tehseen, S., & Hadi, N.U. (2015). factors influencing teachers' performance and retention. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(1), 233–244.  
<https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n1p233>
- Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school's climate research. *Journal of Sage Pub*, 83(3), 357–385.
- Thoonen, E. E. J., Sleegers, P. J. C., Oort, F. J., & Peetsma, T. T. D. (2012). Building school-wide capacity for improvement: the role of leadership, school organizational conditions, and teacher factors. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 23(4), 441–460.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2012.678867>
- Thoonen, E. E. J., Sleegers, P. J. C., Oort, F. J., Peetsma, T. T. D., & Geijssel, F. P. (2011). How to improve teaching practices: the role of teacher motivation, organizational factors, and leadership practices. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(3), 496-536. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X11400185>
- Türker, A. (2020). *Creating social value in the conceptual dimensions of social entrepreneurship and social responsibility: an application*. (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Istanbul Okan University, Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.
- Türkeş, N., & Özgeldi, M. (2023). What are the motivation factors of social entrepreneurs? Review of studies conducted in different countries. *Doğuş University Journal*, 24(2), 435-456.  
<https://doi.org/10.31671/doujournal.1229786>
- Uslu, T. (2018). *University students' perceptions of leadership, academic self-efficacy and alienation from school (Erzincan University example)*. (PhD Thesis). Inonu University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, Malatya.

- Viseu, J., De Jesus, S.N., Rus, C., & Şansro, J.M. (2016). Teacher motivation, work satisfaction, and positive psychological capital: A literature review. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 14(2), 439–461.  
<https://doi:10.14204/ejrep.39.15102>.
- Woolfolk, A. (2007). *Educational psychology (10th ed.)*. Pearson.
- Wronka-Pośpiech, M. (2016). The identification of skills and competencies for effective management in social enterprises. A managerial perspective. *Management*, 20(1), 40-57.
- Xiang, B., Xin, M., Fan, X., & Xin, Z. (2024). How does career calling influence teacher innovation? The chain mediation roles of organizational identification and work engagement. *Psychology in the Schools*, 61(12), 4672-4687.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.23302>
- Yalçınkaya, S., Dağlı, G., Altınay, F., Altınay, Z. & Kalkan, Ü. (2021). The effect of leadership styles and initiative behaviors of school principals on teacher motivation. *Sustainability*, 13(5), 2711.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052711>
- Ye, W., Ding, Y., Han, X., & Ye, W. (2024). Pre-service teachers' teaching motivation and perceptions of teacher morality in China. *Educational Studies*, 50 (2), 243-260.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2022.2037406>
- Yemini, M., Addi-Racah, A., & Katarivas, K. (2015). I have a dream: School principals as entrepreneurs. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 43(4), 526-540. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214523018>.
- Yıldız, V.A, & Taşgın, A. (2020). Teacher motivation scale: validity and reliability study. *International Turkish Literature Culture Education (TEKE) Journal*, 9 (4), 1741-1754.

**About the author:**

**Hamza Öz** is the Head of the Department of Child Development at the Faculty of Health Sciences, Yozgat Bozok University, Türkiye. He received his Ph.D. in Educational Administration from Kırşehir Ahi Evran University in 2022. His research interests include leadership, educational management, social entrepreneurship, classroom management, higher education, teacher competencies, and motivation.

**E-mail:** [hamza.oz@bozok.edu.tr](mailto:hamza.oz@bozok.edu.tr)