

## Summary

### Purpose

The purpose of the study is to examine whether the servant leadership behaviors of school administrators differ with regard to the variable of education stage (i.e. elementary, middle, and high school).

### Theoretical Framework

Many fields such as psychology, education, economics, sociology have been very interested in leadership and research has been done on this field (Greenleaf, 1970; Spears, 1995; Black, 2010; Brown, 2010; Yukl, 2010) because leadership is an interdisciplinary subject (Fındıkçı, 2012). The history of leadership definition dates back to Plato's time (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2013). Therefore, it should not be surprising that the concept of leadership is as diverse as the people involved in the work (Hoy & Miskel, 2015).

While restrictions, control, and authority are preferred during traditional leadership approach, open policies, trust-based relationships, helpful and sharing of knowledge are the features of modern types of leadership. In addition, the goal of life is to serve others directly or indirectly in all educational and non-educational organizations, which will move benefits, commerce and services into action and enable ideals to be realized at the highest level (Casson, 2006). Even though the words of "leader" and "servant" seem to have opposite meanings, with combining them in a creative and meaningful way, a paradox emerges, and servant leadership is occurred (Yılmaz, 2013). Servant leadership is a leadership understanding that values people, develops them, helps them to act originally, leads people's well-being, and encourages the sharing of power and status for each individual's good (Laub, 1999). According to Fındıkçı (2012), the servant leader is a heartfelt person who is the passenger of the love path. Besides, huge and sudden development in many areas in the modern world has brought many needs along with it. People affected by this situation are especially administrators working in educational settings.

## Methods

The descriptive research design was adopted in the study. Descriptive models aim to describe a past or present situation as it is (Karasar, 2008). The servant leadership skills of school administrators were evaluated in terms of teacher observations (perceptions).

### Data Sources and Data Collection Tools

The universe of the data source was 14.135 teachers working in schools in the province and districts of Denizli, a city in Turkey, in the academic year of 2016–2017. As a data source, 327 teachers were selected by the convenient easy sampling method (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013, p.121). 214 (65.4%) of the participants were female while 113 (34.6%) were male. In terms of educational stages, 112 (34,3%) of participants were working in an elementary school, 124 (37,9%) in a middle school, and 91 (27,8%) in a high school.

The Servant Leadership Scale developed by Reed, Vidaver-Cohen and Colwell in 2011 and adapted to Turkish by Demir, Konan and Karakus (2015) was used. After performing explicit factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis for construct validity, the scale, which is a 5-likert scale (1-always, 2-often, 3-sometimes, 4-rarely, 5-never), consisted of the same number of factors (five) and fewer items (20 items) in Turkish culture. The sub-factors and items included the following dimensions: Interpersonal Support, Building Community, Altruism, Egalitarianism, and Moral Integrity.

## Results

*Table 1.* Mean, Median Scores and Standard Deviations for The Variable of Educational Stage

<b>Educational stages (Groups)</b>	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
Elementary School	2,05	1,80	,97241
Middle School	2,38	2,15	,97026
High School	2,43	2,35	,80478
Total	2,28	2,05	,94061

Table 2. The Results of the Kruskal Wallis-H Test Performed to Determine Whether the Total Scores of Servant Leadership Scale (SLS) Differentiated According to the Variable of Educational stages

Score	Groups	<i>N</i>	$\bar{x}_{sira}$	$\chi^2$	<i>sd</i>	<i>p</i>
SLS Total Score	Elementary School	112	136,93	14,674	2	,001
	Middle School	124	173,48			
	High School	91	184,40			
	Total	327				

Table 3. The Results of the Mann Whitney-U Test Conducted to Determine Between Which Groups Total Scores of Servant Leadership Scale (SLS) Differentiated According to the Variable of Education stages

Score	Groups	Elementary	Middle	High
SLS Total Score	Elementary School	$\bar{x} = 105,14$	<b>p&lt;,05</b>	<b>p&lt;,01</b>
	Middle School		$\bar{x} = 130,57$	p>,05
	High School			$\bar{x} = 118,87$

The mean score of group of elementary school was lower than corresponding values of groups of middle and high school (Table 1). The difference between group elementary, middle, and high schools were statistically significant (Table 2). It was determined that the difference occurred in favor of elementary school between middle school and elementary school ( $p < .05$ ), and again in favor of elementary school between high school and elementary school ( $p < .01$ ). The differences between the mean ranking of the other groups were not found to be significant (Table 3).

## Conclusion

Within the limitation of the study, school administrators working in elementary schools exhibited more servant leadership behaviours than middle and high schools. The difference between the servant leadership behaviours of administrators of middle school and high school was not to be found significant. All result indicated that educational stage variable plays a crucial role in servant leadership behaviors of school administrators.

## Educational importance of the study

Servant leadership approach and its assessment related to educational stages enriches our understanding of in which educational stages need to be raised awareness about this leadership style, and in which school stages administrators have used this approach more.

## References

- Black, G. L. (2010). Correlational Analysis of Servant Leadership and School Climate. *Journal of Catholic Education*, 13(4). doi:10.15365/joce.1304032013
- Brown, G. A. (2010). *Teachers' perceptions of the importance of identified servant leadership characteristics for high school principals in two diverse communities* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. State University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute Institutional Review Board.
- Casson, H. N. (2006). *Human management*. Istanbul, Turkey: Bilge Press.
- Fındıkcı, İ. (2012). *A heartfelt journey, servant leadership*. Istanbul, Turkey: Alfa Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The Servant as Leader. Business Leadership*. Jossey Bass: pp. 117-136.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2015). *Educational management theory, research and practice*. Ankara: Nobel Press.
- Karasar, N. (2008). *Scientific research method, concepts, principles, techniques*. Ankara, Turkey: Nobel Press.
- Konan, N., Demir, H., & Karakuş, M. (2015). A study of Turkish adaptation of executive servant leadership scale into Turkish. *Electronic International Journal of Education, Arts and Science*, 1(1), 135-155.
- Laub, J. A. (1999). Assessing the servant organization: development of the servant organizational leadership. *Assessment (Sola) Instrument, Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(2), 992-1922.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein A. C. (2013). *Education Management*. Ankara, Turkey: Nobel Press.
- Spears, L. C. (1995). *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's Theory of Servant Leadership Influenced Today's Top Management Thinkers*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Qualitative research methods in the social sciences*. Ankara, Turkey: Seçkin Press.
- Yılmaz, C. (2013). The Relationship between servant leadership and organizational commitment [Unpublished master dissertation]. Gebze Advanced Technology Institute, Institute of Social Sciences, Gebze.
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in Organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.