

## **An Examination of Primary School Students' Academic Achievements and Motivation In Terms of Parents' Attitudes, Teacher Motivation, Teacher Self-efficacy and Leadership Approach**

**Gizem Engin**<sup>i</sup>  
Ege University

### **Abstract**

This study aims to examine primary school students' academic achievement and motivation in terms of parental attitudes, teacher motivation, teacher self-efficacy and leadership perception. Research model of the study is designed as descriptive research model and the data are collected from 60 primary school teachers teaching 4th grade students in 2017-2018 academic year and from 1476 4th grade primary school students. The findings of the study show that fathers' having a high level of education, teachers' having a high level of motivation, a democratic attitude in family are some factors positively affecting student achievement. The findings also indicate that democratic parental attitude and a high level of teacher motivation increase student motivation. It is also concluded that neglectful parental attitude negatively affects student achievement and motivation. Accepted or distributed leadership approach in the school influences teacher motivation. The findings show that teachers with high self-efficacy also have high level of motivation. It is also concluded that teachers at the first years of their career have lower level of motivation. The study is believed to be a guiding example for other studies analyzing similar topics.

**Keywords:** Academic Achievement, Parents' Attitudes, Motivation, Leadership Approach, Self-efficacy

**DOI:** 10.29329/ijpe.2020.228.18

---

<sup>i</sup> **Gizem Engin**, Assist. Prof. Dr., Faculty of Education, Primary School Education, Ege University, ORCID: 0000-0003-2532-8136

**Correspondence:** gizemozen@hotmail.com

## INTRODUCTION

Increasing academic achievement and motivation of children is a common desire and expectation of parents, administrators, teachers and children. In order to meet these expectations, it is necessary that all mentioned stakeholders behave cooperatively and consistently towards the aimed target (Akkök, 2004; Bos & Vaughn, 2002; Dam, 2008). As achievement, self-efficacy, parental attitude and leadership approach are concepts highly affecting each other, it is primarily important to define these concepts.

Dam (2008) expresses achievement as a broad concept and approaches it from a general viewpoint. According to Dam (p. 81) achievement is “*human beings' ability to reach aimed targets and obtain desired outcomes in their lives in harmony with their environment and at peace with themselves*”. The term achievement is used to refer to academic achievement in this study as in many other studies. Academic achievement is a performance indicator which precedes educational activities in the process of school evaluation. The performance indicator in this case can be considered as grades students get at the end of assessment activities (Cunningham, 2003; Fan & Chen, 2001).

Self-efficacy is a concept which refers to individuals' belief in their capacity to execute a certain behaviour or carry out a certain task (Bandura, 1986, 1997). Bandura (1986, 1997) also states that self-efficacy effects individuals' behaviours as well as their thinking processes and motivation. It is believed that teacher motivation has great impact both on teaching processes and educational outcomes. Additionally, various factors affect teacher self efficacy. There are some studies expressing that dominant leadership approach at school (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993; Taşkın & Hacıömeroğlu, 2010), and students' academic achievement (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca, & Malone, 2006) affect teacher self-efficacy.

Motivation can be described as one of the factors stimulating, directing and strengthening certain behaviour, ensuring its repetition and continuity. It is known that a high level of motivation is a strong force directing people to act in a more determined manner to reach aimed targets (Öztürk & Uzunkol, 2013). When teachers feel competent about themselves and have high level of motivation towards their mission, they will care about their students more and will be more enthusiastic to make maximum effort for them (Riley, 2013). Teachers' high level of motivation is of utmost importance as it is one of the factors enabling them to efficiently carry out their educational duties. Motivated teachers are: willing to contribute well-functioning of school and communicate and cooperate with their colleagues and other stakeholders (Özdoğru & Aydın, 2012); determined to support and continue supporting healthy development (cognitive, affective and kinaesthetic) of students (Aypay, 2011; Evans, 1998; Öztürk & Uzunkol, 2013; Sapkale, 2009); capable of increasing student achievement as well as motivation (Atkinson, 2000). Öqvist and Malmström (2016) also state that teachers have substantial effect on student motivation. Teacher leadership may positively or negatively affect student motivation and performance. According to Öqvist and Malmström (2016), teachers with a high developmental leadership profile can create an atmosphere which positively strengthens educational motivation among students, reach high levels of performance and have a positive perception of their studies. On the other hand, teachers with a low developmental leadership profile may create an atmosphere which is unsuitable for educational motivation, performance and welfare of school studies. Ada, Akan, Ayık and Yalçın (2013) emphasize the importance of administrators' attitude on the increasing teacher motivation.

There are studies expressing that leadership approach adopted by school organization affects teacher motivation and performance. In this sense, it is necessary for a good school administrator to take all stakeholders' ideas, feelings and expectations into consideration (Izmirli, 2000; as cited in Ağırbaş, Çelik, & Büyükkaşıkçı, 2005). To reach the aimed targets of an organization, all stakeholders in the organization are expected to voluntarily cooperate and communicate with others and be ready to take responsibility. This modern understanding of leadership is explained with the concept of “*distributed leadership*” by Aslan and Ağiroğlu-Bakır (2015, 1). According to Beycioğlu and Aslan (2010), it is not possible for a school administration to carry out all their duties alone and thus it is

necessary to distribute responsibilities to ensure well functioning of the organization. Leadership approaches which prioritize distribution of responsibilities increase commitment of teachers to their institutions (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Uslu & Beycioğlu, 2013) and create positive effects on administrators' perceptions (Sarıçiçek, 2014; Yılmaz, 2000) and teachers' self-efficacy (Uslu & Beycioğlu, 2013). These positive changes experienced by teachers will be positively reflected on students increasing their achievement and motivation and thus will increase success of school organization (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000; Sarıçiçek, 2014).

Family is one of the major factors affecting student motivation and achievement. Various variables, such as parental attitudes adopted by parents (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Grolnick & Ryan, 1989; Paulson, Marchant, & Rothlisberg, 1998; Yılmaz, 2000), their living together or being separated (Lee & Kushner, 2008; Şengül, Zhang, & Leroux, 2019), environment and opportunities they provide to their children (Gottfried, Fleming, & Gottfried, 1998) affect children's motivation and achievement.

The concept known as parental attitude or parenting attitude in the literature generally contains attitudes, behaviours and expectations directed towards children being raised (Yılmaz, 2000). Types of parental attitudes covered in this study are democratic, authoritarian, neglectful permissive and tolerant permissive which are defined by Maccoby and Martin (Yılmaz, 2000 as cited in Maccoby & Martin 1983) by analyzing parental attitudes in terms of demandingness and sensitivity. Democratic parents are demanding but at the same time they have a high level of acceptance. Authoritarian families are demanding but they also have a low level of acceptance. In other words, democratic parents have more concentrated attention to their children than authoritarian parents. Tolerant permissive families have low level of demands from their children and a high level of acceptance whereas neglectful permissive families have low level of demands and acceptance. It is possible to say that tolerant families are more caring, warm and sincere to their children (Yılmaz, 2000, 161).

In democratic families children are viewed as individuals and parents are more understanding and moderate to their children. Children are given duties and responsibilities suitable to their development. Parents explain their children what they expect from them and what they don't by giving sound reasons. Children are given love in the family environment and their independence is encouraged (Arı, Bayhan, & Artan, 1997; Hale, 2008; Yılmaz, 2000). In authoritarian families children are expected to unconditionally obey their parents' rules. Parents believe that they know what is good and right for their children. Children are punished in cases of disobedience (Arı, Bayhan, & Artan, 1997; Yılmaz, 2000). In neglectful families parents cannot control or make necessary guidance to their children as they don't allocate enough time for their children (Cüceloğlu, 1993; Yılmaz, 2000). On the other hand, excessively tolerant or permissive parents show a high level of acceptance but they are incapable of establishing rules or making necessary guidance (Haktanır, 2002). These parental attitudes affect children's comfort at home, self confidence, motivation and achievement.

This study, examining achievement and motivation which are among the most important outcomes of education, aims to analyze the topic from a wide range of variables which are parental attitude, teacher motivation, teacher self-efficacy and leadership approach. All these variables are included in this study as they all have important effects on student motivation and achievement. Review of related literature showed that there is no study which includes these variables altogether.

With this purpose, this study aims to answer the following questions:

- 1) Do students' achievement levels differentiate with respect to their mothers' and fathers' educational levels and parental attitudes factors?
- 2) Do students' achievement levels differentiate with respect to students' motivation, teachers' motivation and teachers' self-efficacy factors?

- 3) Does students' motivation differentiate with respect to parental attitude, teachers' motivation and teachers' self-efficacy factors?
- 4) Does teachers' motivation differentiate with respect to their length of service, self-efficacy, leadership approach and type of school they graduated factors?
- 5) Do students' achievement levels differentiate at each level of teachers' motivation factor with respect to parental attitude factor?
- 6) Does students' motivation differentiate at each level of teachers' motivation factor with respect to parental attitude factor?
- 7) Does achievement levels differentiate at each level of teachers' self-efficacy factor with respect to parental attitude factor?
- 8) Do teachers' leadership approaches differentiate with respect to the type of school they graduated factor?
- 9) Do students' achievement levels differentiate with respect to a distributed leadership approach factor?
- 10) Does students' motivation differentiate with respect to a distributed leadership approach factor?

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

The current study analyzes student academic achievement and motivation in terms of parental attitude, teacher motivation, teacher self-efficacy, and leadership approach. For this reason, it is designed as descriptive research which is a survey research method enabling explanation of previously lived and ongoing situations (Karasar, 1999).

### **Setting and Sample Group/ Workgroup/ Participants**

Since it is not possible to reach the entire universe, sampling was made. The teachers and students in Bornova district of İzmir were reached by considering ease of access. Therefore, it can be said that a convenience sampling technique was used (Creswell, 2012). 4th grade teachers from these schools were contacted (only 4th grades have formal assessment in primary schools) and parent consent forms were sent to teachers who accepted to participate in the study. The study was carried out with these 60 teachers who accepted to participate in the study and 1476 students attending their classes.

883 of the teachers participating in the study are education faculty graduates, 80 of them are graduates of teachers college and 513 of them are graduates of other departments. As for work experience, 80 of them have 0-5 years of experience, 168 have 6-10 years, 366 have 11-15 years and 872 of the teachers have 16 years or more teaching experience.

Among 1476 4th grade students participating in the study 1335 live with both of their parents, 104 live with their mothers, 18 live with their fathers and 8 of the students live with other relatives. 1234 of these students have suitable study environment whereas 238 of them don't have such an environment. 275 of students' fathers are primary school graduates, 318 are secondary school graduates, 278 are high school graduates, 316 have bachelor's degree and 55 of them have master's degree. When we examine their mothers' educational levels, 384 of their mothers are primary school

graduates, 300 are secondary school graduates, 275 are high school graduates, 246 have bachelor's degree and 53 of their mothers have master's degree. According to children's statements, 423 of these families have democratic, 401 have neglectful, 329 have authoritarian and 323 have tolerant attitudes.

### Data Collection Tools

A total of 6 data collection tools and a student achievement grades list were used in the study.

**Academic Motivation Scale for First Stage of Primary Education:** This 12 item scale was developed by Vallerand, Blais, Brière, & Pelletier (1989) and it was translated into Turkish by Kara (2008) after conforming its validity and reliability. The scale is a 3 point Likert scale and its Cronbach Alpha coefficient is calculated as .84.

**Teacher Self-Efficacy Belief Scale:** This scale was translated into Turkish and adapted by Taşkın & Hacıömeroğlu (2010) and consists of 5 factors and 31 items in total. The scale has high validity and reliability and its reliability coefficient is calculated as .95.

**Parental Attitude Scale:** This scale was adapted by Yılmaz (2000). The original scale belongs to Lamborn et al. (1991). Primary school (4th 5th grades) version of the scale was used in this study. The scale has 3 dimensions which are acceptance/care, autonomy, and supervision. Yılmaz (2000:165) presents the table regarding identification of parental attitudes suggested by Lambert as follows:

**Table1 Lambord's Parental Attitudes Categorization Table**

	Acceptance/Care		Supervision	
	High	Low	High	Low
Democratic	*		*	
Neglectful		*		*
Authoritarian		*	*	
Tolerant	*			*

This study utilizes the above table to identify parental attitude types.

**Primary School Teacher Motivation Scale:** It is developed by Öztürk and Uzunkol (2013) and consists of 30 items. It is a 5 point Likert scale and Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the scale is calculated as .87.

**School Organizations Distributed Leadership Scale:** The scale consists of 5 factors and 55 items. The overall Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the scale was calculated as .98 by Aslan and Ağiroğlu-Bakır (2015).

**Personal Information Form:** The form was prepared by researcher by consulting 3 experts in the field. It consists of 5 items. In this form, general arithmetic averages, mother's education status, father's education status, the child's living together and the study area contains items related to the study environment.

**Student Academic Achievement Lists:** The lists of students' academic achievement were requested from school administrations.

### Data Collection

The data of the study were collected from 4th-grade students and their classroom teachers in sample group schools during 2017-2018 spring semester. Information about the research was given to the selected schools. After obtaining the necessary permissions, the data collection tools were

distributed to teachers and students. The researcher was present during the data collection period in order to answer possible questions of students and teachers.

### Data Analysis:

In the process of data analysis, One Way ANOVA was used in order to see whether a dependent variable changes according to a categorical variable. In situations of One Way ANOVA has more than one variables Two Way ANOVA was used. If null hypothesis was accepted as a result of Levene Test, LDS was used, and if it was rejected Dunnett C test was used. Data concerning teacher motivation, distributed leadership approach and teacher self-efficacy was categorized as it was necessary to be in groups in order to compare with Post hoc tests. When creating categories, Z score was taken as basis. In the Z score calculations, the upper 25% slice was considered high, the middle 26% -75% slice medium and the lower 25% slice low. Skewness and kurtosis coefficients of categorically used groups were between [-2, 2] which indicated a normal distribution (George & Mallery, 2010).

## FINDINGS

This section contains findings related to research questions.

### 1) Findings Related to First Research Question

The first research question “Does students' achievement levels differentiate with respect to their mothers' and fathers' educational levels and parental attitudes factors? ” analyzes main and common effects of three factors on a single dependent variable. Related findings of Two Way ANOVA test are given in Table 2.

**Table 2 ANOVA Results Related to students' academic achievement with respect to their mothers' and fathers' educational levels and parental attitudes.**

Sources of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	$\eta^2$
MEL	1248,574	4	312,143	1,650	0,006
FEL	3124,327	4	781,082	4,130**	0,015
MELFELATT	1267,208	3	422,403	2,233	0,006
MEL * FEL	3037,476	14	216,963	1,147	0,014
MEL * MELFELATT	2521,238	12	210,103	1,111	0,012
FEL * MELFELATT	1704,866	12	142,072	0,751	0,008
MEL * FEL * MELFELATT	6293,200	34	185,094	0,979	0,029

\*\*p<0,01

Note. MEL=Mother Educational Level; FEL=Fathers' Educational Level; ATT=Attitude

According to Table 2, there is a statistically significant difference at 99% confidence level in achievement variable with respect to fathers' education level factor. In order to find which groups of fathers' educational level factor does this difference stem from, taking into consideration that Levene test variables are not equal ( $F_{83}= 3,421$ ;  $P < 0,05$ ), Dunnett C test was applied and results are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3 Dunnet C Test Results for Fathers' Educational Level Factor ( Academic Achievement Dependent Variable)**

	Primary School	Secondary School	High School	University
Master's Degree	12,3745*	11,1729*	5,2095*	2,7410
Bachelor's Degree	9,6336*	8,4319*	2,46858	
High School	7,1650*	5,9634*		
Secondary School	1,2016			

\*p<0,05

- i. Comparisons of academic achievement of students with respect to their fathers' educational levels showed that there is statistically significant difference between fathers with masters' degree education and fathers with primary school, secondary school and high school education in favour of fathers with master's degree education.
- ii. There is a statistically significant difference between students whose fathers have bachelor's degree education and primary school, secondary school and high school education in favour of fathers with bachelor's degree education.
- iii. There is a statistically significant difference between students whose fathers have high school education and primary school, secondary school education in favour of fathers with high school education.

## 2) Findings Related to Second Research Question

The findings of Two Way ANOVA test results related to second research question “*Does students' academic achievement levels differentiate with respect to students' motivation, teachers' motivation and teachers' self efficacy factors?* ” are presented in table 4.

**Table 4 ANOVA Results for academic achievement with respect to students' motivation teachers' motivation and teachers' self-efficacy**

Sources of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	$\eta^2$
SMO	11536,829	18	640,935	3,521**	0,045
TMO	2027,838	2	1013,919	5,570**	0,008
TSE	4181,265	2	2090,633	11,485**	0,017
SMO * TMO	7319,787	30	243,993	1,340	0,029
SMO * TSE	6427,070	30	214,236	1,177	0,026
TMO *x TSE	3173,559	4	793,390	4,358**	0,013
SMO * TMO * TSE	11478,984	41	279,975	1,538*	0,045

\*\*p<0,01

\*p<0,05

Note. SMO=Student Motivation; TMO=Teacher Motivation; TSE= Teacher Self-Efficacy

According to Table 4, there is a statistically significant difference in academic achievement variable at 99% confidence level with respect to student motivation, teacher motivation and teacher self-efficacy factors. Also, there is a statistically significant difference in academic achievement at 99% confidence level with respect to joint effect of teacher motivation and teacher self-efficacy and at 95% confidence level joint effect of all three factors. In order to find which groups does this difference between teacher motivation and teacher self-efficacy stem from, taking into consideration that Levene test results are not equal ( $F_{127}= 1,289$ ;  $P < 0,05$ ), Dunnett C test was applied and the results are presented in Table 7 and Table 8.

**Table 5 Dunnett C Test Results for Teacher Motivation Factor (Academic Achievement Dependent Variable)**

	Low	Medium
High	8,1399*	4,6088*
Medium	3,5311*	

\*p<0,05

- i. Comparisons show that there is a statistically significant difference between academic achievement averages with respect to high teacher motivation, low teacher motivation and medium teacher motivation factors in favor of high teacher motivation.

- ii. There is a statistically significant difference in academic achievement averages between medium teacher motivation and low teacher motivation in favor of medium teacher motivation.

**Tablo 6 Dunnett C Test Results for Teacher Self-Efficacy Factor (Academic Achievement Dependent Variable)**

	Low	Medium
High	4,04345*	-1,8269
Medium	5,87035*	

- i. Comparisons show that there is a statistically significant difference between academic achievements of students who have teachers with high self-efficacy and students who have teachers with low self-efficacy in favor of students who have teachers with high self-efficacy.
- ii. There is a statistically significant difference between academic achievements of students who have teachers with medium self-efficacy and students who have teachers with low self-efficacy in favor of students who have teachers with medium self-efficacy.

**Findings Related to Third Research Question**

The findings of Two Way ANOVA test results related to second research question “Does students' motivation differentiate with respect to parental attitude, teachers' motivation and teachers' self efficacy factors? ” are presented in table 7.

**Table 7 ANOVA Results Related to student motivation with respect to parental attitudes, teachers' motivation and teachers' self efficacy factors**

Sources of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	η <sup>2</sup>
PATT	77,449	3	25,816	3,716**	0,008
TMO	44,302	2	22,151	3,189*	0,004
TSE	7,633	2	3,816	0,549	0,001
PATT * TMO	49,489	6	8,248	1,187	0,005
PATT * TSE	59,599	6	9,933	1,430	0,006
TMO * TSE	54,078	4	13,519	1,946	0,005
PATT * TMO * TSE	149,537	12	12,461	1,794*	0,015

\*\*p<0,01

\*p<0,05

Note. PATT= Parental Attitude; TMO=Teacher Motivation; TSE=Teacher Self-Efficacy

According to Table 7, there is a statistically significant difference in student motivation variable at 99% confidence level with respect to parental attitude factor and at 95% confidence level with respect to teacher motivation factor and joint effect of all factors. . In order to find which groups does these difference between parental attitude and teacher motivation stem from, taking into consideration that Levene test results variations are not equal ( $F_{35}= 2,853; P < 0,05$ ), Dunnett C test was applied and the results are presented in Table 8 and Table 9.

**Table 8 Dunnett C Test Results for Parental Attitude Factor (Student Motivation Dependant Variable)**

	Neglectful	Authoritarian	Tolerant
Democratic	0,8218*	0,5292*	0,6006*
Tolerant	0,22125	-0,0714	
Authoritarian	0,29263		

\*p<0,05

- i. Comparisons show that there is a statistically significant difference between motivational levels of children from democratic families, neglectful families, authoritarian families and tolerant families in favour of democratic families.

**Table 9 Dunnett C Test Results for Teacher Motivation Variable (Student Motivation Dependent Variable)**

	Low	Medium
High	-0,2324	-0,0478
Medium	-0,1846	

\*p<0,05

Comparisons showed that although student motivation differentiates with respect to teacher motivation ( $F_2= 3,189$ ;  $P < 0,05$ ), there was no observed differentiations in teacher motivation factor levels.

### Findings Related to Fourth Research Question

The findings of Two Way ANOVA test results related to fourth research question “Does teachers' motivation differentiate with respect to their length of service, self -efficacy, leadership approach and type of school they graduated factors? ” are presented in Table 10.

**Table 10 ANOVA results related to teacher motivation with respect to leadership approach, length of service, and type of school they graduated.**

Sources of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	$\eta^2$
LA	14031,265	2	7015,633	206,015**	0,222
TSE	9588,351	2	4794,176	140,782**	0,164
LOS	6671,344	3	2223,781	65,302**	0,120
GST	462,562	2	231,281	6,792**	0,009
LA * TSE	18476,843	4	4619,211	135,644**	0,274
LA * LOS	2985,691	4	746,423	21,919**	0,057
LA * GST	16,984	1	16,984	0,499**	0,000
TSE * LOS	6605,824	5	1321,165	38,796**	0,119
TSE * GST	2858,787	3	952,929	27,983**	0,055
LOS * GST	2386,708	1	2386,708	70,086**	0,046
LA * TSE * LOS	142,531	1	142,531	4,185**	0,003
LA * TSE * GST	3416,063	1	3416,063	100,313**	0,065
LA * LOS * GST	153,466	1	153,466	4,507**	0,003

\*\*p<0,01

Note. LA= Leadership Approach; TSE= Teacher Self-Efficacy; LOS=Length of Service; GST= Graduated School Type

According to Table 10, , there is a statistically significant difference in teacher motivation variable at 99% confidence level with respect to leadership approach, teacher self-efficacy, length of service and type of graduated school. Also, there is a significant difference for the joint effect of all these factors at 99% confidence level. In order to find which groups does these difference stem from, taking into consideration that Levene test results variations are not equal ( $F_{35}= 185,004$ ;  $P < 0,05$ ), Dunnett C test was applied and the results are presented in Table 11, Table 12, Table 13 and Table 14.

**Table 11 Dunnett C Test Results for Leadership Approach (Teacher Motivation Dependent Variable)**

	Low	Medium
High	12,8159*	5,8049*
Medium	7,0110*	

\*p<0,05

- i. The results of comparisons show that there is a statistically significant difference between motivation level averages of teachers with high leadership approach scores and teachers with medium leadership approach scores in favour of teachers with high scores.
- ii. There is a statistically significant difference between motivation level averages teachers with medium leadership scores and low leadership approach scores in favour of teachers with medium leadership approach scores.

**Table 12 Dunnett C Test Results for Teacher Self-Efficacy Factor (Teacher Motivation Dependent Variable)**

	Low	Medium
High	15,8077*	2,3024*
Medium	13,5053*	

\*p<0,05

- i. Comparisons show that there is a statistically significant difference between motivation level averages of teachers with high self-efficacy and teachers with medium self-efficacy in favor of teachers with high self-efficacy.
- ii. There is a statistically significant difference between motivation level averages of teachers with medium self-efficacy and teachers with low self-efficacy in favor of teachers with medium self-efficacy.

**Table 13 Dunnett C Test Results for Length of Service Factor (Teacher Motivation Dependent Variable)**

	0-5 years	5-10 years	10-15 years
16+ years	10,5685*	-0,1779	-1,5073
11-15 years	12,0758*	1,32939	
6-10 years	10,7464*		

\*p<0,05

- i. Comparisons show that there is statistically significant difference between motivation level averages of teachers who have more than 15 years of service length and teachers who have less than 6 years of service length in favour of teachers who have more than 15 years of service length.
- ii. There is statistically significant difference between motivation level averages of teachers who have 11-15 years of service length and teachers who have less than 6 years of service length in favour of teachers who have 11-15 years of service length.
- iii. There is statistically significant difference between motivation level averages of teachers who have 6-10 years of service length and teachers who have less than 6 years of service length in favour of teachers who have 6-10 years of service length.

**Table 14 Dunnett C Test Results for Graduated School Type Factor (Teacher Motivation Dependent Variable)**

	Education Faculty	Teachers College
Other	1,06825	-0,3013
Teachers College	1,36956	

The results of dual comparisons show that although teacher motivation differentiates according to type of school graduated ( $F = 6,792; P < 0,01$ ), there is no observable differentiation at school type factor level.

### Findings Related to Fifth Research Question

For the fifth research question “Does students' achievement levels differentiate at each degree of teachers' motivation factor with respect to parental attitude factor?” One Way ANOVA test was applied to analyze the effects of a single factor on a single dependent variable.

#### “Low” Level of Teacher Motivation

Results of One Way ANOVA test showed that academic achievement variable differentiates with respect to parental attitude factor  $F_3 = 8,065; P < 0,01$ . As a result of non-equivalent variances ( $F_3 = 8,065; P < 0,01$ ) from Levene test results, Dunnett C test was chosen for dual comparisons and its results are given in Table 15.

**Table 15 Dunnett C Test Results for Parental Attitude (Academic Achievement Dependent Variable) - Low Level of Teacher Motivation Factor**

	Neglectful	Tolerant	Democratic
Authoritarian	9,65465*	4,88769	1,16331
Democratic	8,49134*	3,72438	
Tolerant	4,76696		

\* $p < 0,05$

- i. In the case of low level of teacher motivation, comparisons show that there is a statistically significant difference in students' academic achievement levels between authoritarian parental attitude and neglectful parental attitude in favor of authoritarian parental attitude.
- ii. In the case of low level of teacher motivation comparisons, show that there is a statistically significant difference in students' academic achievement levels between democratic parental attitude and neglectful parental attitude in favor of democratic parental attitude.

#### “Medium” Level of Teacher Motivation Factor

Results of One Way ANOVA test showed that academic achievement variable differentiates with respect to parental attitude factor,  $F_3 = 7,19; P < 0,01$ . As a result of non-equivalent variances ( $F_3 = 4,958; P < 0,01$ ) from Levene test results, Dunnett C test was chosen for dual comparisons and its results are given in Table 16.

**Table 16 Dunnett C Test Results for Parental Attitude Factor (Academic Achievement Dependent Variable) - Medium Level of Teacher Motivation Factor**

	Neglectful	Authoritarian	Tolerant
Democratic	6,48702*	2,72959	2,29834
Tolerant	4,18868*	0,43125	
Authoritarian	3,75743		

\* $p < 0,05$

- i. In the case of medium level of teacher motivation, comparisons show that there is statistically significant difference in students' academic achievement levels between democratic parental attitude and neglectful parental attitude in favor of democratic parental attitude.
- ii. In the case of medium level of teacher motivation, comparisons show that there is statistically significant difference in students' academic achievement levels between tolerant parental attitude and neglectful parental attitude in favor of tolerant parental attitude.

#### “High” Level of Teacher Motivation Factor

Results of One Way ANOVA test showed that academic achievement variable differentiates with respect to parental attitude factor,  $F_3 = 2,94$ ;  $P < 0,05$ . As a result of non-equivalent variances ( $F_3 = 5,829$ ;  $P < 0,01$ ) from Levene test results, Dunnett C test was chosen for dual comparisons and its results are given in Table 17.

**Table 17 Dunnett C Test Results for Parental Attitude Factor (Academic Achievement Dependent Variable) - High Level of Teacher Motivation Factor**

	Neglectful	Tolerant	Authoritarian
Democratic	5,13992*	3,20912	1,56804
Authoritarian	3,57189	1,64108	
Tolerant	1,9308		

\* $p < 0,05$

- i. In the case of high level of teacher motivation, comparisons show that there is statistically significant difference in students' academic achievement levels between democratic parental attitude and neglectful parental attitude in favor of democratic parental attitude.

#### Findings Related to Sixth Research Question

One Way ANOVA was used to analyze the sixth research question “Does students' motivation differentiate at each level of teachers' motivation factor with respect to parental attitude factor?” The results of low, medium and high levels of teacher motivation are as follows:

#### “Low” Level of Teacher Motivation Factor

The results of One Way ANOVA test indicate that student motivation variable does not differentiate with respect to parental attitude factor,  $F_3 = 2,33$ ;  $P > 0,05$ .

#### “Medium” Level of Teacher Motivation Factor

The results of One Way ANOVA test indicate that student motivation variable differentiates with respect to parental attitude factor,  $F_3 = 5,091$ ;  $P < 0,01$ . As a result of non-equivalent variances ( $F_3 = 10,686$ ;  $P < 0,01$ ) from Levene test, Dunnett C test was applied for dual comparisons and its results are presented in Table 18.

**Table 18 Dunnett C Test Results for Parental Attitude Factor (Student Motivation Dependent Variable)- Medium Level of Teacher Motivation**

	Neglectful	Tolerant	Authoritarian
Democratic	0,99717*	0,77768*	0,47024
Authoritarian	0,52693	0,30744	
Tolerant	0,21949		

\* $p < 0,05$

- i. The results of comparisons indicate that at medium levels of teacher motivation there is a statistically significant difference between democratic parental attitude, neglectful parental attitude and tolerant parental attitude in favour of democratic parental attitude.

#### “High” Level of Teacher Motivation Factor

There was no observable differentiation in student motivation variable with respect to parental attitude factor,  $F_3 = 2,534$ ;  $P = 0,057$ . As P value was close to expected value, LCD test was chosen as a result of Levene test ( $F_3 = 1,166$ ;  $P > 0,05$ ) to see whether there is a significant difference in dual comparisons and the results of LCD test are presented in Table 19.

**Table 19 LCD Test Results for Parental Attitude Factor (Student Motivation Dependent Variable)- High Level of Teacher Motivation**

	Authoritarian	Neglectful	Tolerant
Democratic	0,96287*	0,35194	0,14913
Tolerant	0,81374*	0,2028	
Neglectful	0,61093		

\* $p < 0,05$

- i. The results of comparisons indicate that at high level of teacher motivation there is a statistically significant difference in student motivation level averages between democratic parental attitude and authoritarian parental attitude in favour of democratic parental attitude.
- ii. At high level of teacher motivation there is a statistically significant difference in student motivation level averages of students between tolerant parental attitude and authoritarian parental attitude in favour of tolerant parental attitude.

#### Findings Related to Seventh Research Question

For the seventh research question “ *Does achievement levels differentiate at each level of teachers' self-efficacy factor with respect to parental attitude factor?* ” One Way ANOVA test was applied to analyze the effects of a single factor on a single dependent variable. Also, to observe the effects on each level of teacher self-efficacy “Split File” command was used.

The results of One Way ANOVA indicated that academic achievement variable differentiates with respect to parental attitude factor ,  $F_3 = 4,443$ ;  $P < 0,01$ . As a result of equal variances among groups from Levene test ( $F_{2, 11} = 3,752$ ;  $P > 0,05$ ), LCD test was applied and its results are presented in Table 20.

**Table 20 LCD Test Results for Parental Attitude Factor (Academic Achievement Dependent Variable) - Low Level of Teacher Self-Efficacy**

	Neglectful	Authoritarian	Tolerant
Democratic	8,36550*	5,70677	3,8655
Tolerant	4,5	1,84127*	
Authoritarian	2,65873*		

\* $p < 0,05$

- i. The results of comparisons indicate that at low level of teacher self-efficacy there is a statistically significant difference in student academic achievement level averages between democratic parental attitude and neglectful parental attitude in favour of democratic parental attitude.

- ii. At low level of teacher self-efficacy there is a statistically significant difference in student academic achievement level averages between tolerant parental attitude and authoritarian parental attitude in favour of tolerant parental attitude.
- iii. At low level of teacher self-efficacy, there is a statistically significant difference in student academic achievement level averages between neglectful parental attitude and authoritarian parental attitude in favour of authoritarian parental attitude.

#### “Medium” Level of Teacher Self-Efficacy Factor

The results of One Way ANOVA did not indicate a significant difference for academic achievement variable with respect to parental attitude factor ,  $F_3 = 2,451$ ;  $P > 0,05$ .

#### “High” Level of Teacher Self Efficacy Factor

The results of One Way ANOVA did not indicate a significant difference for academic achievement variable with respect to parental attitude factor ,  $F_3 = 1,128$ ;  $P > 0,05$ ..

#### Findings Related to Eighth Research Question

For the eighth research question “ *Does teachers' leadership approaches differentiate with respect to type of school they graduated factor?* ” One Way ANOVA test was applied to analyze the effects of a single factor on a single dependant variable and it was observed that leadership approach variable differentiates with respect to type of graduated school factor ,  $F_2 = 18,248$ ;  $P < 0,01$ . As a result of non-equivalent variances ( $F_2 = 14,084$ ;  $P < 0,01$ ) from Levene test results, Dunnett C test was chosen for dual comparisons and its results are given in Table 21.

**Table 21 Dunnett C Test Results for Type of Graduated School Factor ( Leadership Approach Dependent Variable)**

	Education Faculty	Other
Teachers College	21,430309*	17,529410*
Other	3,9008983	

\* $p < 0,05$

- i. The results of comparisons indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between distributed leadership approach averages of teachers college graduates, education faculty graduates and graduates of other schools in favor of teachers' college graduates.

#### Findings Related to Ninth Research Question

For the ninth research question “ *Does students' achievement levels differentiate with respect to distributed leadership approach factor?* ” One Way ANOVA test was applied to analyze the effects of a single factor on a single dependant variable and it was observed that academic achievement variable differentiates with respect to leadership approach factor ,  $F_2 = 8,683$ ;  $P < 0,01$ . As a result of non-equivalent variances ( $F_2 = 5,027$ ;  $P < 0,01$ ) from Levene test results, Dunnett C test was applied for dual comparisons and its results are given in Table 22.

**Table 22 Dunnett C Test Results for Distributed Leadership Approach Factor (Academic Achievement Dependent Variable)**

	Low	Medium
High	2,66209*	-1,22501
Medium	3,88710*	

\* $p < 0,05$

- i. Comparison of high level of distributed leadership approach and low level of distributed leadership approach indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between students' academic achievement averages in favor of high level of distributed leadership approach.
- ii. Comparison of medium level of distributed leadership approach and low level of distributed leadership approach indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between students' academic achievement averages in favor of medium level of distributed leadership approach.

### Findings Related to Tenth Research Question

For the tenth research question “Does students' motivation differentiate with respect to distributed factor?” One Way ANOVA test was applied to analyze the effects of a single leadership approach factor on a single dependent variable.

**Table 23 ANOVA Results for Student Motivation with Respect to Leadership Approach Factor**

Sources of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	$\eta^2$
Leadership	10,1750	2	5,0875	0,716	0,001

Table 23 indicates that student motivation variable doesn't differentiate with respect to leadership approach levels.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the study indicate that fathers' educational level have effects on students' academic achievements. There is no statistically significant difference between students whose fathers have graduate degree and undergraduate degree. However, there is a statistically significant difference between academic achievement levels of students whose fathers have graduate-undergraduate degree and students whose fathers are high school, middle school, elementary school graduates in favor of graduate-undergraduate degree fathers. Additionally, children of high school graduate fathers have higher academic achievement levels than middle school and elementary school graduate fathers. This situation can be a result of higher family interest in their children's educational life as their own high level of education. This finding of the study is in line with other studies (Epstein, 1996; Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994; McBride, Schoppe-Sullivan, & Ho, 2004) supporting that participation of families have important effects on students' academic achievement. Grolnick and Slowiaczek (1994) defined three ways of parental involvement that behavioral, cognitive/intellectual and personal. Behavioral involvement includes parents taking part in school activities or home activities. In Cognitive/Intellectual involvement parents may discuss current issues with their children or plan intellectual activities, such as a library visit. In Personal involvement parents make effort to learn about what their children experience in school environment. Additionally, the results of this study support Erol and Turhan (2018) study which indicates that as parents' educational level increases, so does their efforts to make their children love their schools.

Another result of the study is that students' academic achievement increase as their teachers' motivational levels increase. Similarly, students' academic achievement increase with their teachers' self-efficacy levels. Research indicates that student academic achievement correlates with teacher motivation (Hayden, 2011; McKinney, 2000). Teachers with a high level of motivation can plan, implement and pursue their educational duties more consistently which brings out higher academic achievement as an expected outcome. Although high teacher motivation increases student motivation, there is no differentiation in teacher motivation levels factor.

Another result of the study indicates that students whose parents have a democratic parental attitude have a higher level of motivation than students whose parents have neglectful, authoritarian

and tolerant attitudes. Also, at low level of teacher motivation students whose parents have democratic or authoritarian attitude have higher academic achievement than students with neglectful parents, and at medium level of teacher motivation students whose parents have democratic or tolerant attitude have higher academic achievement than students with neglectful parental attitude. At high level of teacher motivation, students whose parents have democratic attitude have higher academic achievement than students with neglectful parents. Analysis of motivational levels of students indicate that at medium level teacher motivation, students whose parents have democratic parental attitude have higher motivation level than students with neglectful or tolerant parental attitude, and at high level of teacher motivation students whose parents have democratic or tolerant parental attitude have higher motivation than students with authoritarian parental attitude. Additionally, when we analyze students of teachers with low self-efficacy, we can see that students with democratic and authoritarian parents have higher academic achievement levels than students with neglectful parents and students with tolerant parental attitude have higher academic achievement levels than students with authoritarian parents. When we examine the related literature, results of other studies support the findings of this study. Yılmaz (2000) concluded that students whose parents have democratic parental attitude have higher academic achievement than students with other parental attitude types which supports the findings of this study. There are various studies supporting that families having an open and accepting attitude with warm relations to their children increase children's academic achievement (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Grolnick & Ryan, 1989; Paulson, Marchant, & Rothlisberg, 1998). The main reason for this situation can be considered as children's being in an affectionate, accepting and safe environment where they are given responsibilities and appreciated. Similarly, tolerant families are known to have a high level of acceptance but lack necessary control mechanism and thus have lower effect than democratic families. Strict control and low acceptance given to children by authoritarian families decreases motivation but children try to avoid punishment and as a result their academic achievement doesn't seem to be very low. On the other hand, neglectful families lack control and have a low level of acceptance thus causing low motivation and low academic achievement for their children. The study also intended to reveal whether the people students live with has an effect on their academic achievement or not. However, the difference between group sizes was too big to take it into account. 1335 of the students in the study live with both parents, 104 live with their mothers, 18 live with their fathers and 8 of them lives with some other relatives. Lee & Kushner (2008) concluded in their study that children living with same gender parents have higher academic achievement than children living with opposite gender parents. In single parent families living with same gender parent doesn't make a difference but girls living with their fathers were found to have higher academic achievement. The results of Şengül, Zhang, & Leroux (2019) study indicate that children living with both biologic parents have higher academic achievement in mathematics. The related literature on the effects of parental attitudes on children's academic achievement and motivation indicate that cooperation of mother and father and a loving environment at home has positive influences.

Additionally, teachers who believe that there is a high level of distributed leadership approach in the school organization are more motivated than teachers who believe that the amount of distributed leadership approach is medium or low, and teachers who believe that there is a medium level of distributed leadership approach are more motivate than teachers who believe that there is a low level of distributed leadership approach. Similarly, teachers with high self-efficacy have higher levels of motivation than teachers with low or medium self-efficacy, and teachers with medium self-efficacy have higher motivation than teachers with low self-efficacy. Additionally, students of teachers who believe that there is high level of distributed leadership approach in the school organization have higher academic achievement than students of teachers who believe that there is medium level of distributed leadership approach in the school, and it is higher for medium level than that is for low level. The level of distributed leadership approach adopted in the school organization and communication skills of administrators influence both students' (Marchant, Paulson, & Rothlisberg, 2001) and teachers' (Bektaş, 2010; Çiftçi, 2008; Doğan & Koçak, 2014; Torbacıoğlu, 2007) performance. Taking important decisions together, sharing duties and responsibilities increases all stakeholders' sense of belonging to the school organization thus increasing achievement level and the results can be attributed to this situation. When we analyze teacher motivation with respect to length of service, teachers with 0-5 years of teaching experience are less motivated than teachers with 6-10,

11-15 and 16+ years of experience. This finding of the study is parallel to findings of Doğan and Koçak (2014). The reason for this situation can be lack of experience for teachers in their first years of teaching. It was also found that teachers college graduates have higher distributed leadership approach than education faculty graduates and other faculty (engineering, etc.) graduates. Teachers colleges, by their very nature, are places where every individual take responsibility in all kinds of duties and this is thought to be the main reason for such an outcome.

Another observed result of the study is that various variables together have significant effect on some variables. Marchant, Paulson, & Rothlisberg (2001) confirm the role of influence of parents, teachers and peers supportive relationship on academic achievement. Additionally, according to Marchant, Paulson and Rothlisberg (2001) joint influence of school settings on academic achievement is greater than a single context. However, specific characteristics of family and school seem to be more important than the others and these social contexts have indirect influences which become meaningful with students' perceived motivation and academic self-efficacy. When the aim is increasing student motivation and achievement, it is much more beneficial to take all stakeholders together into consideration.

This study is a descriptive research designed on quantitative data. Diversifying data sources can be a positive preference for further research. More detailed data can be collected through longitudinal research. Intercultural comparisons are also a possible choice. Educational curricula aiming school, teacher and parents cooperation can be prepared and their effectiveness can be evaluated.

## 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 İş Tatmini. *Hacettepe Sağlık İdaresi Dergisi*, 8(3), 326-350.
- Akkök, F. (2004). Ailelerin Eğitim Sürecine Katılımı. Yıldız Kuzgun (Editör), *İlköğretimde Rehberlik* (s.257), Ankara: Atlas Yayıncılık
- Arı, M., Bayhan, P, & Artan, İ. (1997). Farklı Ana-Baba Tutumlarının 4-11 Yaş Grubu Çocuklarında Görülen Problem Durumlarına Etkisinin Araştırılması, 10. Ya-Pa Okul Öncesi Eğitimi ve Yaygınlaştırılması Semineri, İstanbul: Ya-Pa Yayınları.
- Aslan, M., & Ağiroğlu-Bakır, A. (2015). Okul Örgütlerinde Paylaşılan Liderlik Ölçeği: Geçerlik Ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 21(1), 1-24. doi: 10.14527/kuey.2015.001
- Atkinson, E. S. (2000). An Investigation into The Relationship Between Teacher Motivation and Pupil Motivation. *Educational Psychology*, 20 (1), 45-57.
- Aypay, A. (2011). İlk ve Ortaöğretim Öğretmenlerinin Davranış Alışkanlıkları ve “İyi Öğretmen” Özelliklerine İlişkin Algıları. *İlköğretim Online*, 10 (2), 620-645.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company

- Bektaş, A. (2010). İlköğretim Okulları Yöneticilerinin Sosyal İletişim Becerileri ile Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Motivasyonu Arasındaki İlişki. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Beycioğlu, K., & Aslan, B. (2010). Öğretmen Liderliği Ölçeği: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *İlköğretim Online*, 9(2), 764-775.
- Bos, C. S. & Vaughn, S. (2002). *Strategies for Teaching Students with Learning And Behavior Problems*. (5th ed.). USA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C, Steca, P., & Malone, P. S. (2006). Teachers' Self-Efficacy Beliefs as Determinants of Job Satisfaction and Students' Academic Achievement: A Study At The School Level. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44, 473-490.
- Cunningham, G. K. (2003). *Can Education Schools Be Saved?*. Erişim Tarihi: Ağustos, 7, 2019, [http://www.vestibular.uerj.br/vest2004/files/2004ef\\_d1\\_ing.pdf](http://www.vestibular.uerj.br/vest2004/files/2004ef_d1_ing.pdf)
- Cüceloğlu, D. (1993). *İyi Düşün Doğru Karar Ver*. İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.
- Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Çiftçi, Ü. (2008). İlköğretim Öğretmenleri Arasındaki İletişim Sorunları. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Beykent Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Dam, H. (2008). Öğrencinin Okul Başarısında Aile Faktörü. *Hitit Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(14), 75-99.
- Doğan, S., & Koçak, O. (2014). Okul Yöneticilerinin Sosyal İletişim Becerileri ile Öğretmenlerin Motivasyon Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi [Educational Administration: Theory and Practice]*, 20(2), 191-216.
- Dornbusch, S.M., Ritter, P.L., Leiderman, P.H., Roberts, D.F., & Fraleigh, M.J. (1987). The Relation of Parenting Style to Adolescent School Performance. *Child Development*, 58, 1244-1257.
- Epstein, J. L. (1996). Advances in Family, Community, and School Partnerships. *New Schools, New Communities*, 12, 5-13.
- Erol, Y. C., & Turhan, M. (2018). The Relationship Between Parental Involvement to Education of Students and Student's Engagement to School. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(5), 260-281.
- Evans, L. (1998). *Teacher Morale, Job Satisfaction and Motivation*. London: Paul Chapman/Sage.
- Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental Involvement and Students' Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13 (1), 1-22.
- George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference, 17.0 update* (10a ed.) Boston: Pearson.
- Gottfried, A. E., Fleming, J. S., & Gottfried, A. W. (1998). Role of Cognitively Stimulating Home Environment in Children's Academic Intrinsic Motivation: A longitudinal study. *Child Development*, 69, 1148-1460.

- Grolnick, W. S., & Slowiaczek, M. L. (1994). Parents' Involvement in Children's Schooling: A Multidimensional Conceptualization and Motivational Model. *Child Development*, 65, 237–252.
- Grolnick, W.S., & Ryan, R.M. (1989). Parent Styles Associated with Children's Self-Regulation and Competence in School. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81, 143–154.
- Haktanır, G. (2002). Sağlıklı Ana-Baba Tutumları. A.Ü. *Geliştirme Vakfı Özel İlköğretim Okulu Kardelen Dergisi*, 4(4), 3-6.
- Hale, R. (2008). Baumrind's Parenting Styles and Their Relationship to The Parent Developmental Theory, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pace University, New York.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1998). Exploring The Principal's Contribution to School Effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9(2), 157-191.
- Hayden, S. (2011). Teacher Motivation and Student Achievement in Middle School Students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Walden University.
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers Sense of Efficacy and the Organizational Health of Schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 93, 356–372.
- Kara, A.(2008). İlköğretim Birinci Kademedeki Eğitimde Motivasyon Ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye Uyarlanması, *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, (9) 2, 59-78.
- Karasar, N. (1999), Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Lee, S.M., & Kushner, J. (2008). Single-Parent Families: The Role of Parent's and Child's Gender on Academic Achievement. *Gender and Education*,20(6), 607–621.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The Effects of Transformational Leadership on Organisational Conditions and Student Engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 112–129.
- Marchant, G. J., Paulson, S. E., & Rothlisberg, B. A. (2001). Relations of Middle School Students' Perceptions of Family and School Contexts with Academic Achievement. *Psychology in the Schools*, 38 (6), 505-519.
- McBride, B. A.; Schoppe-Sullivan,S.J, & Ho, M.(2004). The Mediating Role of Fathers' School Involvement on Student Achievement. *Developmental Psychology*,26,201-2016.
- McKinney, P. A. (2000). A Study to Assess the Relationships Among Student Achievement, Teacher Motivation, and Incentive Pay. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.
- Öqvist, A., & Malmström, M. (2016) Teachers' Leadership: A Maker or a Breaker of Students' Educational Motivation, *School Leadership & Management*, 36 (4), 365-380.
- Özdoğru, M., & Aydın, B. (2012). İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin Karara Katılma Durumları ve İstekleri İle Motivasyon Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12 (2), 357-367.
- Öztürk, E., & Uzunkol, E. (2013). İlkokul Öğretmeni Motivasyon Ölçeğinin Psikometrik Özellikleri. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 9(4): 421-435.

- Paulson, S.E., Marchant, G.J., & Rothlisberg, B.A. (1998). Early Adolescents' Perceptions of Patterns of Parenting, Teaching, and School Atmosphere: Implications For Achievement. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 18, 5–26.
- Riley, P. (2013) Attachment theory, teacher motivation & pastoral care: A Challenge for Teachers and Academics. *Pastoral Care in Education: An International Journal of Personal, Social and Emotional Development*, 3 (2), 112-129.
- Sapkale, A. P. (2009). A Study of Relationship of Work Motivation and Jobsatisfaction Towards Teaching Attitude of Secondary School Teachers of DhuleCity. *International Referred Research Journal*, 2 (22).
- Sarıççek, L. (2014). Gaziantep İli Şehitkamil İlçesi'ndeki İlkokullarda Öğretmen Görüşlerine Göre Paylaşılan Liderlik ve Okul İklimi. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Zirve Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Gaziantep.
- Sengul, O., Zhang, X., & Leroux, A. J. (2019). A Multi-Level Analysis of Students' Teacher and Family Relationships on Academic Achievement in Schools. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 5(1), 117-133. doi: 10.12973/ijem.5.1.131
- Taşkın,Ç,Ş., & Hacıömeroğlu,G. (2010). Öğretmen Öz Yeterlik İnanç Ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye Uyarlanması ve Sınıf Öğretmeni Adaylarının Öz Yeterlik İnançları. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*,27,63-75.
- Torbacıoğlu, D. (2007). İlköğretim Okulu Yöneticilerinin İletişim Yöntemleri ve Güdüleme Derecelerine İlişkin Öğretmen Algıları. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Uslu, B., & Beycioğlu, K. (2013). İlköğretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin Örgütsel Bağlılıkları ile Müdürlerin Paylaşılan Liderlik Rollerini Arasındaki İlişki. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32(2), 323-345.
- Yılmaz, A.(2000). Anne-Baba Tutum Ölçeğinin Güvenirlik ve Geçerlik Çalışması, *Çocuk ve Gençlik Ruh Sağlığı Dergisi*, 7(3), 160-173.