Language Teaching and Educational Research

e-ISSN 2636-8102
Volume 7, Issue 1 | 2024

Investigation of distributed leadership level of school administrators

Muhammet İbrahim Akyürek
Murat Akkoyun

To cite this article:

Akyürek, M. İ., & Akkoyun, M. (2024). Investigation of distributed leadership level of school administrators. *Language Teaching and Educational Research (LATER), 7*(1), 24-36. https://doi.org/10.35207/later.1191336

View the journal website

Submit your article to *LATER*

Contact editor

Copyright (c) 2024 *LATER* and the author(s). This is an open access article under CC BY-NC-ND license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

LANGUAGE TEACHING AND EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
e-ISSN: 2636-8102 | LATER, 2024-1, 24-36
http://dergipark.org.tr/later

Investigation of distributed leadership level of school administrators

***Muhammet İbrahim Akyürek**
Associate Professor, Educational Administration Department, Faculty of Education, Selcuk University, Türkiye
Murat Akkoyun
Educational Administration Specialist-Teacher, Ministry of National Education, Türkiye

Article Info

Type: Original research

Received: 18 October 2022
Accepted: 4 January 2023

Keywords:
Leadership
Distributed leadership
School administrator

DOI:
10.35207/later.1191336

***Corresponding author**
m.ibrahimakyurek@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine the distributed leadership level of school administrators. The study is in the cross-sectional survey model to determine the distributed leadership level of school administrators. The sample of the study consists of 325 school administrators (principals and assistant principals) working in schools in the districts of Konya, Türkiye. In the study, the "Distributed leadership scale" developed by Hairon and Goh (2015) and adapted into Turkish by Akyürek (2022) was used to determine the level of distributed leadership. The results show that distributed leadership perceptions of school administrators were high. Moreover, distributed leadership perceptions of school administrators did not show a significant difference according to gender, age, duty, educational status, seniority of administration and school type variables. In this context, cooperation can be made with all education stakeholders, especially school administrators, and their opinions can be sought in order to carry out distributed leadership in schools more effectively on the basis of authorization, participation and sharing.

Suggested APA citation: Akyürek, M. İ., & Akkoyun, M. (2024). Investigation of distributed leadership level of school administrators. *Language Teaching and Educational Research (LATER), 7*(1), 24-36. https://doi.org/10.35207/later.1191336

Ethics statement: We hereby declare that research/publication ethics and citing principles have been considered in all the stages of the study. We take full responsibility for the content of the paper in case of dispute.
Statement of interest: We have no conflict of interest to declare.
Funding: None
Acknowledgements: None

INTRODUCTION

The general purpose of education and training activities at school is to ensure that children who are the future of a country, grow up in a healthy and efficient manner in terms of knowledge, skills, and behaviour. School administrators are primarily responsible for educational activities in the school. The knowledge, skills and behaviours of school administrators have an impact on students and teachers, non-educational staff, and students' parents. Again, schools form the basis of the education system. That's why school administrators, which are so important, must have certain competencies (Töremen & Kolay, 2003).

School administrators must have certain competencies in order to fulfil their duties effectively and efficiently. Since the basic input and output in school organizations is human, the responsibilities of education administrators are more than other organizations (Töremen & Kolay, 2003). Administrators are people who have the responsibility and have to manage the people who come together in groups and who are organized for a certain purpose, in an effective and efficient way, in a harmonious and cooperative manner, in order to achieve the goal (Erdoğan, 2016). An effective school administrator must first be able to provide an optimum learning environment that allows the students to develop in all aspects in terms of cognitive, emotional, psychomotor, social, and aesthetic aspects (Balcı, 1993).

21st century school principals are expected to be leaders who have education and training qualifications, maintain their professional development, constantly update themselves, follow technology, strive for the development of the school in every aspect, establish good relations with the society, environment, and employees, and be responsible (Gürbüz, 2013). Leadership is perhaps one of the most discussed and researched concepts today. Leadership is so important for group success that people have been interested in it since history began. Although the concepts of administrator and leadership seem close to each other, they are not synonymous words. The most important difference emerging in most definitions is that leaders create loyalty while administrators use authority and power by assuming the responsibilities brought by their status (Akyüz, 2002).

Today, societies becoming more complex bring the need for more complex leadership (Fullan, 2001). For this reason, educational leadership had to continue its search for new models (Donaldson, 2006). The academic arena whose leadership has been working for a long time also focuses on a new leadership model depending on the change of societies. It is stated that this new model, which is expressed as distributed leadership, increases student success at school (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999).

The traditional view of school leadership involves having a superhero at the top of the school organization. Distributed leadership has recently gained increasing importance as an alternative to leadership models that deal with the characteristics and behaviours of individual leaders such as situational and transformational leadership theory. This new model separates leadership responsibility from formal organizational roles, extends leadership into the actions and effects of individuals at all levels of the organization, and thus advocates a more taxonomic leadership perspective (Baloğlu, 2011).

When the literature is examined, though it is a relatively new subject, distributed leadership has been defined in different ways. While some theorists limit distributed leadership only to delegation of authority, some have defined it as benefiting from different characteristics of more than one leader, while others have evaluated distributed leadership as a process that occurs through spontaneous cooperation (Akgün, 2019). The most widely accepted definition among these definitions was explained by Spillane (2006) as the interaction of more than one leader in line with a common goal. Distributed leadership is also defined as the redistribution of power and reorganization of authority (Harris & Muijs, 2005). Distributed leadership has more impact than the sum of all leaders in a school and their efforts to achieve a larger-scale leadership behaviour (Spillane, 2006). Distributed leadership is a leadership approach that includes spreading leadership to all components of the organization, regardless of hierarchy and position, and thus increasing the total leadership capacity in the organization. According to this approach, every organization has a

latent leadership potential. The best way to reveal this potential and to be able to work is to distribute the leadership (Baloğlu, 2016).

The distributed leadership model is more concerned with interaction than with actions. Today the importance of social interactions emphasizes the necessity of distributed leadership (Yılmaz & Turan, 2015). Distributed leadership is defined by Firestonen and Martinez (2007) as the different ways in which leadership is distributed while by Harris (2003) it is considered as maximizing human resources in the organization. In summary, when these definitions are examined, it is observed that the "distribution" of leadership behaviour is emphasized. In other words, one of the important points in distributed leadership is how and in what ways this distribution should be made. Gronn (2002) stated that there are three forms of the distribution of leadership. The first is spontaneous cooperation, which is the termination of the association with the end of the task after the employees have come together according to their abilities. The second is the intuitive working situation that is formed by the trust and relationships that individuals come together and establish. The third is the institutionalization process, which is called the formal structure that consists of a less systematic or designed structure.

Many definitions of distributed leadership require a better understanding of its practices (Spillane, 2005). In order to understand this, it would be useful to investigate the ways in which distributed leadership is currently manifesting itself in schools. The most valid way to do this is to explore distributed leadership in schools and support its implementation. However, it can be said that the studies (Baloğlu, 2011; Yıldırım, 2017; Akgün, 2019) carried out are limited. Baloğlu (2011) stated that distributed leadership has rapidly gained importance in the field of school leadership in parallel with the developments in other fields of science. In the study, it is suggested that formal and informal forms of distributed leadership should be taken into account in school administration restructuring studies. A school that adopts a distributed leadership perspective attach importance to students, teachers, and other ancillary staff. In such a school, the leader's duties and responsibilities are distributed, and in this way, individualism is avoided, so success is accepted as the success of the team. In this way, the distribution of leadership among people will cause people to adopt the institution more and make efforts to achieve success (Yıldırım, 2017). While the distributed leadership behaviours differ according to the school type and the age of the teachers, there is no significant difference according to the grade and the age of the teachers. It has been found that there are obstacles such as willingness, regulations and time in the application of distributed leadership. While sharing leadership in schools, variables such as willingness and expertise are prioritized (Akgün, 2019). Studies in the Turkish literature were generally limited to inventory development (Adıgüzelli, 2016). In addition, it is seen that the opinions of teachers are mostly used in studies (Korkmaz, 2011; Akçekoce & Bilgin, 2016; Akan & Kılıç, 2018) on the application of distributed leadership in schools. In this study, seeking the opinions of school administrators who are the focus of distributed leadership will shed light on the situation in schools. Our results will help develop distributed leadership practices in schools and contribute to the current literature. In addition, determining the differences of the distributed leadership practice in schools regarding some demographic variables (gender, age, duty, educational status, seniority of administration and school type) will contribute to the literature and its functionality in schools. Due to these reasons, distributed leadership practices in schools will be developed and the literature will be enriched. In this context, the aim of the study is to determine the distributed leadership level of school administrators. The sub-problems determined in this direction are as follows:

1. What is the level of distributed leadership perceptions of school administrators?
2. Does the level of distributed leadership of school administrators differ according to demographic characteristics

METHODOLOGY

Model of the research

This study is in the cross-sectional survey model to determine the distributed leadership level of school administrators. In the survey model, the person or subject in the research is tried to be described as it is within the framework of the conditions (Karasar, 2015). In the cross-sectional survey model, the features and variables to be described are measured at once.

Population and sample

The population of the study consists of 1360 administrators (principals and assistant principals) working in schools in the districts (Karatay, Meram and Selcuklu) located in the city centre of Konya in Türkiye (Ministry of National Education [MNE], 2022). The lower limit for the sample size of the study in the 95% confidence interval is 306 (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2014). The sample of the study consists of 325 administrators (principals and assistant principals) working in schools in the districts (Karatay, Meram and Selcuklu) located in the city center of Konya in the 2021-2022 academic year. According to the population in this study, the number of samples is sufficient within the 95% confidence interval (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2014). Sampling of administrators was carried out by simple random sampling. Randomness indicates the equal probability of choosing the units based on the sample for the sample (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz and Demirel, 2012). In particular, a list was made and the participants were randomly selected.

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics regarding the demographic characteristics of the participants (gender, age, duty, educational status, seniority of administration and school type).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics on demographic characteristics of the participants

Variables		***N***	***%***
Gender	Female	35	10.8
	Male	290	89.2
Age	21-30	18	5.5
	31-40	135	41.5
	41-50	128	39.4
	51 and older	44	13.5
Duty	Principal	145	44.6
	Assistant principal	180	55.4
Educational Status	Undergraduate	233	71.7
	Postgraduate	92	28.3
Seniority of Administration	1-5 years	128	39.4
	6-10 years	92	28.3
	11-15 years	43	13.2
	16 years and over	62	19.1
School type	Kindergarten	18	5.5
	Primary school	89	27.4
	Secondary school	162	49.8
	High school	56	17.2
Total		325	100

When Table 1 is examined; according to the gender variable, men are more than women with 89.2%. According to the age variable, the highest ratio is 31-40 with 41.5%, the lowest ratio is the administrators in the 21-30 age group with 5.5%. According to the duty variable, assistant principals are more common than principals with 55.4%. According to the educational status variable, those with undergraduate are higher than those with postgraduate, with 71.7%. According to the seniority of administration variable, the highest rate is 39.4% for 1-5 years, the lowest rate is for the administrators in the 11-15 years group with 13.2%. According to the school type variable, the highest rate is the secondary school with 49.8%, the lowest rate is the administrators working in the kindergarten with 5.5%.

Data collection instruments

In the study, the "Distributed leadership scale" developed by Hairon and Goh (2015) and adapted into Turkish by Akyürek (2022) was used to determine the level of distributed leadership. The scale is a five-point Likert type scale. The measurement tool was developed in the form of 17 items and based on 4 theoretical dimensions. These dimensions are limited authorization (1-5 items), improved leadership (6-9 items), shared decisions (10-14 items), and collective participation (15-17 items). In this context, confirmatory factor analysis was performed to confirm the factor design of the instrument. As a result of confirmatory factor analysis, the t values of the latent variables explaining the observed variables were found to be significant at the .01 level. Since significant t values were obtained for all items in the model, all indicators were included in the model. The confirmatory factor analysis results of the distributed leadership scale are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Confirmatory factor analysis results of the distributed leadership scale

Compliance measurements	**Measured value**	**Reference range**
p	.00	> .01
X^2/sd	2.68	≤ 3
RMSEA	.07	≤ .08
SRMR	.03	≤ .05
NNFI - CFI	.95 - .97	≥ .95

When the table is examined, it is seen that the p value is significant at the .01 level. In many confirmatory factor analyses, it is normal for the p value to be significant due to the large sample size. For this reason, alternative fit indices regarding the fit between the two matrices were evaluated. In this context, it can be stated that the X2/sd, SRMR, NNFI and CFI values are excellent, and the fit index of the RMSEA value has a good fit. As a result, it can be stated that the 17-item four-factor structure of the distributed leadership scale (5 items for limited authorization factor, 4 items for improved leadership factor, 5 items for shared decisions factor, and 3 items for collective participation factor) was confirmed as a model.

In this direction, within the scope of reliability analysis, first of all, item analysis was examined by using item-total correlation. In addition, the reliability of the scale was checked by using Cronbach's alpha. The results of the reliability analysis of the distributed leadership scale are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Reliability analysis results of distributed leadership scale

			Alpha value	**Item-total correlation**
Distributed	leadership	scale	.97	.42-.88

The internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) of the distributed leadership scale is .97. In this context, it can be interpreted that the internal consistency coefficient of the distributed leadership scale is sufficient for the reliability of the scale scores. It is observed that the item-total correlations for all items in the scale vary between .42 and .88. When the item-total correlations are examined, it can be interpreted that the items in the scale distinguish individuals well.

Data analysis

The measurement tool used in the research was explained and applied to 325 school administrators in Konya, Türkiye, in May 2022, and data were obtained. The data were transferred to digital media by coding to make them ready for analysis. Firstly, the condition of meeting the normality assumption of the data set was examined. In this context, kurtosis and skewness coefficients and mean, mode and median values were examined. The values of kurtosis, skewness and standard deviation calculated for the scale are as follows; 1.86, -1.58, .66. The kurtosis and skewness values in the study are between ±2. These results are interpreted as the data set has a

normal distribution (George & Mallery, 2010). In addition, in the analyses made, it was determined that the arithmetic mean was 4.13, the mode value was 4.00 and the median was 4.17. The closeness of these values indicates that the data set is normally distributed (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011). In addition to these, the predicted sample size is usually shown as 30 and larger in order to put forward an assumption that the distribution does not deviate excessively from the normal distribution. However, most research in the social sciences is done on smaller groups. In the literature, there are studies showing that the use of a parametric statistic does not cause a significant deviation in the *p* significance level to be calculated in the analysis, if the sizes of each of the subgroups are 15 or higher (Büyüköztürk, 2013). In this context, parametric test techniques were chosen and used to test the sub-problems of the research. Firstly, percentage and frequency analyses were made. In addition, t-test was applied for independent samples in variables with two subcategories, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied for variables with three or more subcategories. In the interpretation of the findings, the significance value was taken as p> .05. The rating range of the distributed leadership scale is as follows; strongly disagree (1.00-1.79), disagree (1.80-2.59), undecided (2.60-3.39), agree (3.40-4.19), strongly agree (4.20-5.00).

FINDINGS

Within the scope of the first sub-problem of the research, distributed leadership level of school administrators was examined. In Table 4, descriptive statistics regarding the distributed leadership level of school administrators are given.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics on distributed leadership level of school administrators

Dimensions	***N***	$\bar{x}$	***SS***
Limited authorization	325	4.01	.67
Improved leadership	325	4.10	.70
Shared decisions	325	4.22	.73
Collective participation	325	4.22	.75
Distributed leadership (General)	325	4.13	.66

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that the distributed leadership perceptions of school administrators are at the level of "agree" ($\bar{x}$ = 4.13). In addition, when the distributed leadership perceptions of school administrators are examined on the basis of dimensions, limited authorization ($\bar{x}$ = 4.01-"agree"), improved leadership ($\bar{x}$ = 4.10-"agree"), shared decisions ($\bar{x}$ = 4.22-"strongly agree"), and collective participation ($\bar{x}$ = 4.22 -"strongly agree" level) dimensions are seen.

When the distributed leadership level of school administrators is examined in terms of dimensions; the highest dimensions were shared decisions and collective participation, and the lowest dimension was limited authorization.

Considering the second sub-problem; distributive leadership level of school administrators was examined according to demographic characteristics (gender, age, duty, educational status, administration seniority and school type). Table 5 shows the findings regarding the distributed leadership level of school administrators according to the gender variable.

Table 5. T-test results of school administrators' distributed leadership level by gender variable

Dimensions	**Gender**	***N***	$\bar{x}$	***SD***	***df***	***t***	***p***
Limited authorization	Female	35	3.97	.49	323	.38	.69
	Male	290	4.02	.69			
Improved leadership	Female	35	4.01	.72	323	.78	.43
	Male	290	4.11	.69			
Shared decisions	Female	35	4.12	.62	323	.88	.37
	Male	290	4.24	.74			

Collective participation	Female	35	4.11	.75	323	.94	.34
	Male	290	4.24	.75			
Distributed leadership (General)	Female	35	4.05	.52	323	.78	.43
	Male	290	4.14	.67			

*p> .05

According to Table 5, the distributed leadership level of school administrators does not show a significant difference in terms of gender (t(323)= .78, p> .05).
Limited authorization (t(323)= .38, p> .05), improved leadership (t(323)= .78, p> .05), shared decisions (t(323)= .88, p> .05) and collective participation (t(323)= .94, p> .05) dimensions of school administrators' distributed leadership level does not show a significant difference according to the gender variable.

The findings regarding the distributed leadership level of school administrators by age variable are given in Table 6.

Table 6. One-way analysis of variance results regarding distributed leadership level of school administrators by age

Dimensions	**Age**	***N***	$\bar{x}$	***SD***	***F***	***p***
Limited authorization	21-30	18	3.81	.63	.85	.46
	31-40	135	4.05	.52		
	41-50	128	3.99	.74		
	51 and older	44	4.06	.84		
Improved leadership	21-30	18	3.91	.61	.45	.71
	31-40	135	4.12	.56		
	41-50	128	4.10	.80		
	51 and older	44	4.10	.77		
Shared decisions	21-30	18	4.11	.56	.25	.85
	31-40	135	4.25	.56		
	41-50	128	4.21	.83		
	51 and older	44	4.26	.94		
Collective participation	21-30	18	4.05	.43	.38	.76
	31-40	135	4.24	.59		
	41-50	128	4.21	.87		
	51 and older	44	4.26	.92		
Distributed leadership (General)	21-30	18	3.96	.47	.51	.67
	31-40	135	4.16	.50		
	41-50	128	4.12	.76		
	51 and older	44	4.16	.83		

*p> .05

According to Table 6, there is no significant difference between the distributed leadership level of school administrators according to the age variable (F= .51, p> .05). In terms of limited authorization (F= .85, p> . 05), improved leadership (F= .45, p> .05), shared decisions (F= .25, p> .05), and collective participation (F= .38, p> .05) dimensions, no significant difference was found according to the age variable.

The findings regarding the distributed leadership level of school administrators according to the duty variable are given in Table 7.

Table 7. T-test results of the distributed leadership level of the school administrators by duty variable

Dimensions	**Duty**	***N***	$\bar{x}$	***SD***	***df***	***t***	***p***
Limited authorization	Principal	145	4.00	.81	323	.42	.67
	Assistant principal	180	4.03	.53			
Improved leadership	Principal	145	4.09	.80	323	.11	.90
	Assistant principal	180	4.10	.60			

Shared decisions	Principal	145	4.21	.88	323	.28	.77
	Assistant principal	180	4.24	.59			
Collective participation	Principal	145	4.22	.89	323	.04	.96
	Assistant principal	180	4.22	.61			
Distributed leadership (General)	Principal	145	4.12	.80	323	.23	.81
	Assistant principal	180	4.14	.52			

*p> .05

According to Table 7, the distributed leadership level of school administrators does not show a significant difference in terms of the duty variable (t(323)= .23, p> .05).

In terms of limited authorization (t(323)= .42, p> .05), improved leadership (t(323)= .11, p> .05), shared decisions (t(323)= .28, p> .05) and collective participation (t(323)= .04, p> .05) dimensions, no significant difference was found according to the duty variable.

The findings regarding the distributed leadership level of school administrators according to the variable of educational status are given in Table 8.

Table 8. T-test results of the distributed leadership level of school administrators by the variable of educational status

Dimensions	**Educational Status**	***N***	$\bar{x}$	***SD***	***df***	***t***	***p***
Limited authorization	Undergraduate	233	4.02	.66	323	.13	.89
	Postgraduate	92	4.01	.70			
Improved leadership	Undergraduate	233	4.11	.68	323	.63	.52
	Postgraduate	92	4.06	.73			
Shared decisions	Undergraduate	233	4.24	.73	323	.42	.67
	Postgraduate	92	4.20	.73			
Collective participation	Undergraduate	233	4.24	.76	323	.58	.55
	Postgraduate	92	4.18	.72			
Distributed leadership (General)	Undergraduate	233	4.14	.65	323	.45	.65
	Postgraduate	92	4.11	.68			

*p> .05

According to Table 8, the level of distributed leadership of school administrators does not show a significant difference in terms of the variable of educational status (t(323)= .45, p> .05). In terms of limited authorization (t(323) = .13, p> .05), improved leadership (t(323)= .63, p> .05), shared decisions (t(323)= .42, p> .05), and collective participation (t(323))= .58, p> .05) dimensions, no significant difference was found according to the variable of educational status.

The findings regarding the distributed leadership level of school administrators according to the seniority of administration variable are given in Table 9.

Table 9. One-way analysis of variance results on distributed leadership level of school administrators by seniority of administration variable

Dimensions	**Seniority of administration**	***N***	$\bar{x}$	***SD***	***F***	***p***
Limited authorization	1-5 years	128	4.02	.60	1.24	.29
	6-10 years	92	4.03	.56		
	11-15 years	43	3.85	.95		
	16 years and over	62	4.10	.71		
Improved leadership	1-5 years	128	4.07	.67	1.71	.16
	6-10 years	92	4.16	.60		
	11-15 years	43	3.91	.89		
	16 years and over	62	4.19	.73		
Shared decisions	1-5 years	128	4.22	.65	1.35	.25
	6-10 years	92	4.25	.66		
	11-15 years	43	4.05	1.03		
	16 years and over	62	4.34	.74		
Collective participation	1-5 years	128	4.24	.71	1.48	.22
	6-10 years	92	4.21	.64		

		11-15 years	43	4.03	1.00		
		16 years and over	62	4.34	.76		
Distributed (General)	leadership	1-5 years	128	4.13	.59	.15	.19
		6-10 years	92	4.16	.56		
		11-15 years	43	3.95	.95		
		16 years and over	62	4.23	.69		

*p> .05

According to Table 9, there is no significant difference between the distributed leadership level of school administrators according to the variable of seniority of administrator (F= .15, p> .05). In terms of limited authorization (F= .29, p> .05), improved leadership (F= .16, p> .05), shared decisions (F= .25, p> .05), and collective participation (F= .22, p> .05) p> .05) dimensions, no significant difference was found according to seniority of administration variable.

The findings related to the distributed leadership level of school administrators according to the school type variable are given in Table 10.

Table 10. One-way analysis of variance results regarding the distributive leadership level of the school administrators by the school type variable

Dimensions	**School Type**	***N***	$\bar{x}$	***SD***	***F***	***p***
Limited authorization	Kindergarten	18	4.12	.49	.15	.92
	Primary school	89	4.01	.67		
	Secondary school	162	4.01	.73		
	High school	56	4.00	.52		
Improved leadership	Kindergarten	18	4.18	.48	.20	.89
	Primary school	89	4.10	.66		
	Secondary school	162	4.10	.75		
	High school	56	4.04	.66		
Shared decisions	Kindergarten	18	4.26	.59	.23	.87
	Primary school	89	4.28	.67		
	Secondary school	162	4.20	.80		
	High school	56	4.20	.66		
Collective participation	Kindergarten	18	4.27	.52	.36	.77
	Primary school	89	4.28	.66		
	Secondary school	162	4.20	.81		
	High school	56	4.16	.77		
leadership (General)	Kindergarten	18	4.20	.48	.18	.90
	Primary school	89	4.16	.61		
	Secondary school	162	4.12	.73		
	High school	56	4.10	.56		

*p> .05

According to Table 10, there is no significant difference between school administrators' distributed leadership level according to the school type variable (F= .18, p> .05).

In terms of limited authorization (F= .15, p> .05), improved leadership (F= .20, p> .05), shared decisions (F= .23, p> .05), and collective participation (F= .36, p> .05) p> .05) dimensions, no significant difference was found according to the school type variable.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Regarding the first sub-problem of the research, the level of distributed leadership perceptions of school administrators was found to be high. This situation is positive for the development and success of schools. The result of the study shows partial similarity with the result of the study conducted by Akgün (2019) on "perceptions of distributed leadership at a high level". It is possible to say that distributed leadership is applied to a large extent in schools participating in the research. In addition, it can be said that teachers have a highly positive perception of the necessity of distributed leadership. In the light of these findings, Akgün (2019) remarks that distributed leadership is applied within the structure of our schools. In similar studies, in today's

changing conditions, it has been revealed that leader-orientedness affects institutions negatively, for example, it causes quitting, instead people-oriented behaviours will be more effective and employees can contribute more with a democratic management style (Şafaklı, 2005; Tengilimoğlu, 2005; Van Vugt, Jepson, Hart and De Cremer, 2004). Unlike these findings, Bozdoğan and Sağnak (2011) revealed that there is a positive relationship between autocratic leadership, cooperation, evaluation and freedom.

According to the current study, when the distributed leadership level of school administrators is examined in terms of dimensions; the highest dimension was shared decisions and collective participation, and the lowest dimension was limited authorization. When considered in the context of the human resource management skills of school administrators, school administrators should create a participatory and strong school culture, define their role definitions more generally and flexible, and obtain teachers' opinions in a dynamic environment (Argon & Demirer, 2015; Çalık & Şehitoğlu, 2006; Gümüşeli, 2001). Effective implementation of the decisions taken in educational organizations requires both the administrator and the teacher to participate in the decision together because the implementation of the decision is ensured by the cooperation of the school administrator and the teacher (Celep, 1990).

Regarding the second sub-problem of the study; distributed leadership level of school administrators was examined according to demographic characteristics (gender, age, duty, education level, seniority of administration and school type). Distributed leadership level of school administrators does not show a significant difference in terms of gender variable. Along with the general average, the gender factor does not have a significant effect on the basis of dimensions. This result is supported by the result obtained in the study by Yılmaz (2013). According to this result, it can be concluded that managers working in different types and levels want to take responsibility at an equal level, regardless of whether they are men or women.

It was concluded that there was no significant difference between the distributed leadership level of school administrators according to the age variable. Along with the general average, the age factor does not have a significant effect in terms of dimensions. There are also some studies in the literature that do not overlap with the results of the current study. According to the results of the study conducted by Akgün (2019); statistical analyses showed that teachers' perceptions of distributed leadership differed significantly according to their ages; younger teachers had higher perceptions of distributed leadership in schools compared to older teachers. The source of the results of this study, which does not coincide with the result of the current study, may be due to the perspective brought by the contemporary management approach.

Distributed leadership level of school administrators does not show a significant difference in terms of duty variable. Along with the general average, the duty variable factor does not have a significant effect on dimensions either. The reason for this may be that principals and assistant principals are more willing to participate in managerial work with performance anxiety. Elmore (2000) built his distributed leadership approach directly on school leadership. The main focus is on how leadership effectiveness affects the organization and how it helps organizational development (Spillane, 2006). The participation and responsibility of all individuals forming the school in the school leadership process is very important for the implementation of distributed leadership. Establishing an environment of trust among employees and providing an environment for teachers to develop themselves are also important components in distributed leadership practice (Heller & Firestone, 1995).

Distributed leadership level of school administrators does not show a significant difference in terms of educational status variable. Along with the general average, the factor of educational status does not have a significant effect in terms of dimensions. In this regard, it can be argued that distributed leadership is considered important in schools, regardless of educational background. However, leadership practices, according to contemporary researchers and school administrators, are too complicated to be described by a single behaviour sequence (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2013). Therefore, according to this leadership approach, school administrators should first develop

themselves and then train teachers as leaders. When the common values of school culture are based more on trusting people and individualism, leadership behaviours will develop in the school environment (Göksoy, 2015).

There is no significant difference between the distributed leadership level of school administrators according to the variable of seniority of administration. Along with the general average, the variable of administration seniority in terms of dimensions does not have a significant effect. This may be due to less experienced administrators seeing experienced administrators as role models for them. Distributed leadership is the guide and leading element for the development of education (Elmore, 2000). In this approach, the new criterion for leaders is to correctly identify their futures, to recognize their own skills and competencies and to maximize them as much as possible (Drucker, 1994).

There is no significant difference between the distributed leadership level of school administrators according to the school type variable. Along with the general average, the variable of administration seniority in terms of dimensions does not have a significant effect. The result of the study shows partial similarity with the findings of the study conducted by Akgün (2019). According to the results of the study conducted by Akgün (2019); in terms of the school type, a difference was observed between the perceptions of distributed leadership. The source of this study result may be sample group differences.

According to the results of the study, the level of distributed leadership perceptions of school administrators is high. Distributed leadership perceptions of school administrators did not show a significant difference according to gender, age, duty, educational status, seniority of administration and school type variables.

SUGGESTIONS

In this framework, cooperation can be made with all education stakeholders, especially school administrators, and their opinions can be sought in order to carry out distributed leadership in schools more effectively on the basis of authorization, participation and sharing. In addition, educational practices and activities can be carried out in schools and classrooms for the operability of distributed leadership. Considering that the current study is based on the quantitative method, similar studies can also be conducted in terms of qualitative and mixed methods in order to see the application situation of distributed leadership in schools.

LIMITATIONS

This study is limited to school administrators and the province of Konya. Conducting studies in different provinces is valuable in terms of seeing the situation of distributed leadership in schools throughout Türkiye. Additionally, using a quantitative model-based scale to conduct the study is one of its drawbacks. Conducting the study based on the qualitative model will contribute to an in-depth and detailed understanding of the situation of distributed leadership in schools.

References

Adıgüzelli, Y. (2016). Examining the relationship between distributed leadership and organizational trust according to opinions of teachers. *Education and Science, 1*(185), 259-289.

Akan, D., & Kılıç, M. E. (2018). Teachers views about distributed leadership. *Turkish Journal of Educational Studies, 5*(3).

Akçekoce, A., & Bilgin, K. U. (2016). The principals' leadership styles and teachers' performance. *Journal of Contemporary Administrative Sciences, 2*(2).

Akgün, Ö. F. (2019). Examinaton of distributed leadership behaviors according to school types and administrators' specific characteristics. Unpublished master's thesis. Maltepe University.

Akyürek, M. İ. (2022). Turkish adaptation of distributed leadership scale: Validity and reliability study. *Journal of National Education, 51*(234), 1553-1566.

Akyüz, M. Y. (2002). Leadership at effective schools. *Ege Journal of Education, 1*(2), 109-119.

Argon, T., & Demirer, S. (2015). Knowledge management and human resources management qualification of school administrators. *Journal of Abant Social Sciences, 15*(3), 221-264.

Balcı, A. (1993). *Etkili okul kuram uygulama ve araştırma.* Erek Ofset. [Effective school theory practice and research]

Baloğlu, N. (2011). Distributed leadership: A leadership approach that should be taken into account in the schools. *Ahi Evran University Journal of Kırşehir Education Faculty, 12*(3), 127-148.

Baloğlu, N. (2016). The relations between distributed leadership behaviors and personality traits of the school principals. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 24*(4), 1858-1866.

Bozdoğan, K. & Sağnak, M. (2011). The relationship between leadership behaviors of elementary school principals and learning climate. *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education, 11*(1), 137-145.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2013). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı.* Pegem A. [Manual of data analysis for social sciences]

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* Pegem A. [Scientific research methods]

Celep, C. (1990). Öğretmenlerin okul yönetiminde karara katılması. *Education and Science, 14*(78), 34-42. [Teachers' participation in decision making in school management]

Drucker, P. F. (1994). *Yeni gerçekler* (Çev. B. Karanakçı), (4. Edition). Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür. [New facts]

Donaldson, G. A. (2006). *Cultivating leadership in schools: Connecting people, purpose, and practice.* Teachers College Press.

Elmore, R. F. (2000). Building a new structure for school leadership. The Albert Shanker Institute.

Erdoğan, İ. (2006). Okul yöneticilerinin genel özellikleri ve yöneticilik tutumlarıyla ilgili bir araştırma. *HAYEF Journal of Education, 1*, 103-118. [An investigation on personal features of school administrators and their administative attitudes]

Firestone, W. A., & Cecilia Martinez, M. (2007). Districts, teacher leaders, and distributed leadership: changing instructional practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 6*(1), 3-35.

Fullan, M. (2001). Leading in a culture of change. Jossey-Bass.

George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*, *17.0 update* (10th ed.). Pearson.

Göksoy, S. (2015). Distributed leadership in educational institutions. *Journal of Education and Training Studies, 3*(4).

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*(4), 423-451.

Gümüşeli, A. İ. (2001). Çağdaş okul müdürünün liderlik alanları. *Educational Management in Theory and Practice, 28*(28), 531-548. [Leadership areas of the contemporary school administrator]

Gürbüz, R., Erdem, E., & Yıldırım, K. (2013). The characteristics of successful school principals. *Dicle University Journal of Ziya Gökalp Faculty of Education, 20*, 167-179.

Gürbüz, S., & Şahin, F. (2014). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri: Felsefe-yöntem-analiz.* Seçkin. [Research methods in social sciences: Philosophy-method-analysis]

Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing, The oryand Practice, 19*(2), 139-152.

Hairon, S., & Goh, J. W. P. (2015). Pursuing the elusive construct of distributed leadership: Is the search over? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 43*(5) 693-718.

Harris, A. (2003). Distributed leadership in schools: leading or misleading? *Management in Education, 16*(5), 10-13.

Harris, A., & Muijs, D. (2005). *Improving schools through teacher leadership.* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Heller, M., & Firestone, W. (1995). Who is in charge here?. *Elementary School Journal*, 65-86.

Karasar, N. (2015). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler.* Nobel. [Scientific research method: Concepts, principles, techniques]

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999). The relative effects of principal and teacher sources of leadership on student engagement with school. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35,* 679-706.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (2013). *Eğitim yönetimi* (Çev. Ed. G. Arastaman), (6. Edition). Nobel. [Education Management]

MoNE (2022). *2021-2022 academic year education statistics.* Accessed from https://konya.meb.gov.tr/.

Spillane, J. P. (2005). Distrubuted leadership. *The Educational Forum,* 143-150.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). Distributed leadership. Jossey-Bass.

Şafaklı, O. V. (2005). A study on the leadership styles adopted in the public banks of TRNC. *Dogus University Journal, 6*(1), 132-143.

Taş, A., Çelik, K., & Tomul, E. (2007). Leadership styles of principals in elementary schools where the new program is implemented in Turkey. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education, 2*(22), 85-98.

Tengilimoğlu, D. (2005). Kamu ve özel sektör örgütlerinde liderlik davranışı özelliklerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir alan çalışması. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences, 14*(14), 1-16. [A field study on determining the characteristics of leadership behaviour in public and private sector organizations]

Töremen, F., & Kolay, Y. (2003). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin sahip olması gereken yeterlikler. *Journal of National Education,* 160. [The competencies that primary school administrators should have]

Van Vugt, M., Jepson, S. F., Hart, C. M., & De Cremer, D. (2004). Autocratic leadership in social dilemmas: a threat to group stability. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 40*(1), 1-13.

Yıldırım, N. (2017). Distributed leadership: A conceptial framework. *International Journal of Field Education, 3*(2), 18-25.

Yılmaz, A. (2013). *Distributed leadership behaviours among elementary school teachers*. Unpublished master's thesis. Dokuz Eylül University.

Yılmaz, D., & Turan, S. (2015). Distributed leadership view in schools: A structural equation modelling study. *Educational Management in Theory and Practice, 21*(1) 93-126.