

# Educational Management Administration & Leadership

<http://ema.sagepub.com>

---

## **The Effects of Servant Leadership Behaviours of School Principals on Teachers' Job Satisfaction**

Yusuf Cerit

*Educational Management Administration Leadership* 2009; 37; 600

DOI: 10.1177/1741143209339650

The online version of this article can be found at:  
<http://ema.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/37/5/600>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[British Educational Leadership, Management & Administration Society](#)

**Additional services and information for *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://ema.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://ema.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations** <http://ema.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/37/5/600>

# The Effects of Servant Leadership Behaviours of School Principals on Teachers' Job Satisfaction

Yusuf Cerit

## ABSTRACT

This article examines the effects of servant leadership behaviours of primary school principals on teacher job satisfaction. The population of this study is 29 primary schools in Düzce, Turkey. Data were collected from 595 teachers working in primary schools in Düzce province of Turkey. Servant leadership behaviours of principals were determined with the servant leadership scale developed by Laub (1999) while teacher job satisfaction was determined using the job satisfaction scale developed by Mohrman et al. (1977). Mean, standard deviation, correlation and multi-regression test was used in data analysis. Strong positive relationship was revealed between servant leadership behaviours of school principals and teachers' job satisfaction and servant leadership was a significant predictor of teacher job satisfaction.

KEYWORDS *job satisfaction, principal, servant leadership*

## Introduction

Principals and teachers are the main determining factors of the quality of education (Hallinger and Heck, 1996; Sisman, 2004). Teachers who carry out educational activities in the class and who spend more time with students have an important effect on student achievement (Rowan et al., 2002). In this respect, if we take into consideration the fact that employees with a high job satisfaction contribute to working more effectively and attaining a high performance, the importance of improving teacher job satisfaction in terms of school success and to improve education can easily be understood (Ostroff, 1992). Satisfied teachers are likely to be more enthusiastic to spend more time and energy for educating students (Nguni et al., 2006). Thus, understanding factors that contribute to teacher satisfaction is essential for improving the information base needed to support a successful educational system (Perie et al., 1997). That is why studies have been carried out to define the factors influencing teacher job satisfaction. Since leadership behaviours of principals are

one of the factors positively affecting job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001; Miers, 2004), the effect of different leadership approaches on job satisfaction has been researched (Akdoğan, 2002; Griffith, 2004; Stockard and Lehman, 2004). Also, as stated by Wheaton (1999), one of these leadership approaches affecting job satisfaction is servant leadership, which has the potential to improve the entire school environment in which educators live and serve, and provides an opportunity to educate students. Although there are some studies in the literature about the effect of servant leadership on job satisfaction (Hebert, 2003; Drury, 2004; Miers, 2004), no studies on this subject have been carried out in Turkey. For this reason, this study focuses on the effect of servant leadership behaviours of primary school principals on teachers' job satisfaction.

## Servant Leadership

Servant leadership is one of the leadership approaches that have emerged in studies conducted in leadership literature. Servant leadership became popularized by Greenleaf (1977). According to Greenleaf, servant leadership begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first, then learn to lead as a servant (cited in Patterson, 2003). The ideas of serving, helping and effectiveness permeate the servant leadership concept (Whetstone, 2002). Servant leadership puts primary emphasis on the needs and desires of the followers before the needs of the leader and emphasizes personal development and empowerment of followers (Greenleaf, 1977 cited in Spears, 1995; Laub, 1999; Russell and Stone, 2002; Stone and Patterson, 2005). According to Greenleaf (1977), servant leaders are not initially motivated to be leaders, but assume this position in response to the need for group success (cited in Patterson, 2003).

Servant leadership is defined as an attitude of leading others from a perspective of placing the organizational purpose, the needs of the organization, and the needs of people over the needs and desire of the leader (Woodruff, 2004). Servant leadership often focuses on follower development with the intention of increasing follower capacity to exercise creative approaches and take on greater responsibilities at work (Stone and Patterson, 2005). However, these efforts may be viewed as effective primarily in settings where the ability and willingness of followers to exercise initiative and direct their own activities is viewed as desirable (Fields et al., 2006). According to Yukl (2002), servant leaders listen to people, praise and support them, and allege that they care about their needs. Servant leadership is a belief that organizational goals will be achieved on a long-term basis only by first facilitating the growth, development and general well-being of the individuals who comprise the organization (Stone et al., 2004).

According to the definition by Laub (1999: 83), this is widely used in the literature and also constitutes the basis of this study:

Servant leadership is an understanding and practice of leadership that places the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader. Servant leadership promotes the valuing and development of people, the building of community, the practice of authenticity, the providing of leadership for the good of those led, and the sharing of power and status for the common good of each individual, the total organization, and those served by the organization.

Laub (1999) identified six characteristics of servant leaders:

- (1) valuing people (listening respectfully, serving the needs of others first and believing in people);
- (2) developing people (providing opportunities for learning, modelling appropriate behaviour and building up others through encouragement);
- (3) building community (building strong relationships, working collaboratively and valuing individual differences);
- (4) displaying authenticity (integrity and trust, openness and accountability, and a willingness to learn from others);
- (5) providing leadership (envisioning the future, taking the initiative and clarifying goals);
- (6) sharing leadership (creating a shared vision, sharing decision making power and sharing status and privilege with all levels of the organization).

Servant leadership as behaviours or leader characteristics include humility, relational power, service-orientation, follower development, encouragement of follower autonomy, altruistic calling, emotional healing, persuasive mapping, wisdom and organizational stewardship (Barbuto and Wheeler, 2006).

According to Johnson (2001), the advantages of the servant leadership model are its altruism, simplicity and self-awareness. It emphasizes the moral sense of concern for others, reducing the complexity engendered by putting personal desires in conflict with those of followers (Johnson, 2001). Servant leaders have an unselfish concern for others, which often involves personal sacrifice. Servant leaders' behaviours are directed toward the benefit of other even when those behaviours are against their own personal interests (Laub, 1999; Patterson, 2003; Miers, 2004). Also, servant leadership has an effect on employees' self-efficacy (Nixson, 2005). A principal as servant leader can set the stage for the development of self-efficacy in followers through three main forms of influence: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences and verbal persuasion (Bandura, 1997). Placing a mastery experience, the role of the servant leader would be to establish a vision of the teacher's role in the school (Patterson, 2003), show trust in the teacher or provide the teacher with a chance to earn trust, and empowerment of teachers (Farling et al., 1999). A servant leader will also employ vicarious experiences (modelling) to help a teacher increase self-efficacy (Nixson, 2005). Modelling is crucial to servant leadership, and it reinforces the leader's verbal commitment to serving the follower (Russell, 2001).

When principal modeled appropriate behaviour and provided rewards are contingent on performance, teachers' self-efficacy tended to be higher (Lee et al., 1991). Verbal persuasion may entail specific performance feedback from a supervisor or a colleague or it may involve the general chatter in the teachers' lounge or in the media about the ability of teachers to influence students (Woolfolk Hoy, 2000). Verbal persuasion points to the altruism dimension of servant leadership as the leader may offer positive appraisal for the benefit of the individual follower, even at potential costs to the leader (Patterson, 2003). When a servant leader helps a teacher improve self-efficacy through verbal persuasion (Nixson, 2005), teachers seem to strengthen their beliefs on the capabilities they have to achieve their tasks (Chacon, 2005). Also, the principal as servant leader ensures teachers' participation in decisions that affect their work lives, because servant leadership suggests collaboration between leader and follower (Laub, 1999). Teachers who perceived they had a greater impact in decision making had a stronger self-efficacy (Moore and Esselman, 1992). Thus, a principal who exhibits behaviours of servant leadership might contribute to increasing teachers' self-efficacy.

However, servant leadership is sometimes criticized for seeming unrealistic, encouraging passivity, not working in every context, sometimes serving the wrong cause and being associated with the negative connotation of the term servant (or slave) (Johnson, 2001). Servant leadership has also been labelled as being naive, passive, weak and unrealistic (Bowie, 2000).

Another criticism of servant leadership is that this model is not a distinct leadership approach and is comprised in transformational leadership (Stone et al., 2004). According to Graham (1991), servant leadership is different from transformational leadership in two important areas. First, servant leadership requires the leader to become responsible for more than simply achieving organizational goals. Second, servant leadership gives directionality to the moral dimension (cited in Humphreys, 2005). The transformational leader's primary focus is on the organization, with follower development and empowerment being secondary to the accomplishment of organizational objectives (Yukl, 2002; Leithwood and Jantzi, 2006). In contrast, the servant leader is one who focuses on his or her followers, and done who is a servant first (Greenleaf, 1977 cited in Spears, 1995). In addition, servant leaders would be more focused on the emotional welfare of followers than transformational leaders (Smith et al., 2004). Smith et al. (2004) suggested the differing motivational bases of servant and transformational leader. While a servant leader begins with a feeling of altruism and egalitarianism, transformational leaders are more motivated by organizational success (Smith et al., 2004). Additionally, a servant leadership culture plainly focuses on the needs of followers over organizational success (Smith et al., 2004). Conversely, in a transformational leadership culture, follower development is not insignificant but must be connected to ultimate organizational achievement (Smith et al., 2004). In addition, in an empirical research conducted by Parolini (2007), it was found that there are

distinctions between transformational and servant leadership. Parolini's results shown that the five distinctions between transformational and servant leaders include a leader moral, focus, motive and mission, development, and influence distinction.

In addition, one of the leadership approaches that is compared with servant leadership is distributed leadership. According to Woods (2004: 6), 'distributed leadership places emphasis on distribution of leadership according to the market or organizational value of people's expertise, skills and motivation', whereas the emphasis of servant leadership is on the desire to serve others (Miears, 2004). According to these definitions, servant leadership is different from distributed leadership because of the underlying primary motivation of the leader. When viewed at the level of the theoretical dimensions, two of the six dimensions of servant leadership exhibit a substantial match with the components of distributed leadership. Both servant and distributed leadership place emphasis on collaboration and role sharing or institutionalized means of working together (Laub, 1999; Woods, 2004). However, distributed leadership does not account for valuing people, helping people develop themselves and displaying authenticity components of servant leadership (Laub, 1999). Servant leadership has a leadership style that is more concerned about developing employees' potential and facilitating their personal growth than distributed leadership (Hardin, 2003; Patterson, 2003). In distributed leadership, leadership roles, structures, routines and functions are an important consideration, whereas servant leadership focuses more on the leader's personality (e.g. trust and humility) than distributed leadership does (Dennis and Bocarnea, 2005). Servant leadership has also more moral and ethical rationalities than distributed leadership (Patterson et al., 2004). Several studies suggest the applicability of distributed leadership in schools in the literature (MacBeath, 2005; Ritchie and Woods 2007). However, because education is essentially a moral enterprise (Woods, 2004), and educational leadership is in the service of moral purpose (Fullan, 2003), servant leadership, which is based upon moral principles, is much more comprehensive than distributed leadership, may be the approach which is more preferable in administering schools.

Although criticisms such as these have been pronounced for the servant leadership, the servant leadership has received growing attention and recognition in recent years (Patterson, 2003; Dennis, 2004; Miears, 2004; Stone and Patterson, 2005; Dingman and Stone, 2006; Irving and Longbotham, 2007; Parolini, 2007). Various studies have also examined servant leadership as a valid theory of organizational leadership (Drury, 2004; Laub, 1999; Russell and Stone, 2002; Patterson, 2003; Wong and Davey, 2007).

In the context of these characteristics, servant leadership affects individuals and requires caring for the individual beyond individual egoism and needs (Taylor et al., 2007). In this respect, servant leadership can be seen as a leadership approach characterized by its ability to be used in managing educational institutions whose main function is to develop people (Taylor et al., 2007). As

stated by Hardin (2003) and Sergiovanni (1994), in servant leadership, great passion to improve individually and enhance school development has a primary place over all other needs within the organization. Spending the school day dealing with unnecessary issues is prevented by fostering an environment in which individuals volunteer to give rather than an environment in which egoism is accepted, and efforts towards dealing with desired educational issues are encouraged. Thus, teacher and students can develop their potential more fully.

## **Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is one of the subjects commonly studied in organizational behaviour studies since it has a positive effect on organizational effectiveness and efficiency (Saari and Judge, 2004). Job satisfaction is an attitude developed by an individual towards the job and job conditions (Luthans, 1994). Job satisfaction is a personal evaluation of job conditions (the job itself, attitude of the administrator) or the results of the job (wage, job security) (Cetinkanat, 2000). Job satisfaction consists of internal reaction developed against the perceptions about the job and job conditions occurring through a system of norms, values and expectations of an individual (Schneider and Snyder, 1975 cited in Cekmecelioglu, 2005). According to Davis (1981), job satisfaction occurs when the features of the job and the desires of those performing the job meet one another. Locke (1969) has defined the concept as the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values (cited in Nguni et al., 2006).

Teacher job satisfaction refers to a teacher's affective relation to his or her teaching role and is a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from teaching and what one perceives it offers to a teacher (Zembylas and Papanastasiou, 2004). The factors affecting teacher job satisfaction can be categorized under two headings, intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic satisfaction for teachers can come from classroom activities with children (Papanastasiou and Papanastasiou, 1998). Additional factors include the desire to create positive difference in children's lives, personal relationships with children, the intellectual challenge of teaching and high levels of teacher autonomy, strong leadership and administrative support (Bursalioglu 1991; Shann, 1998; Houtte, 2006; Noddings, 2006). In contrast, teachers view job dissatisfaction as principally associated with work overload, poor pay, poor job status and perceptions of how teachers are viewed by society (Papanastasiou and Zembylas, 2005). In addition, studies have found variations in the job satisfaction levels of teachers, depending on certain individual, student and school characteristics (Perie et al., 1997). In general, intrinsic factors seem to play a paramount role in motivating individuals to enter and remain in the teaching profession (Quaglia et al., 2001; Zembylas and Papanastasiou, 2006), because they enjoy working with young people (Shen, 1997). Very few teachers seem to enter the profession because

of extrinsic rewards such as salary, benefits or status (Dinham and Scott, 2000; Azar and Henden, 2003). However, while intrinsic factors may primarily motivate people to become teachers, extrinsic conditions can influence their satisfaction and their desire to remain in teaching (Lee et al., 1991; Perie et al., 1997). Extrinsic factors have also been associated with teacher satisfaction, including salary, perceived support from principals, availability of resources, work conditions, school policies, and problems related to teacher load and expectations for assuming extra-curricular assignments (Mathieu, 1991; Thompson et al., 1997; Cetinkanat, 2000; Sarpkaya, 2000).

Since teachers with more job satisfaction perform better, it directly influences the performance of children, and the social, emotional and cognitive development of students and their academic success (Blandford, 2000). In this respect, it can be said that it is necessary to ensure a high level of teacher job satisfaction because job satisfaction has a positive effect on the quality of education.

## **Relationship between Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction**

Teachers job satisfaction is affected by several factors including the desire to help students achieve, the desire to make a difference in society, autonomy, pay, perceived support from principals, leadership and work conditions (Thompson et al. 1997; Shann, 1998; Dinham and Scott, 2000; Houtte, 2006). One of these factors is the leadership behaviours of principals (Bogler, 2001). Various studies carried out in educational settings revealed that leadership behaviours of principals had an effect on job satisfaction of teachers (Kabadayı, 1982; Schulz and Teddlie, 1986; Rahim and Afza, 1993; Dinham and Scott, 2000; Bogler, 2001; Griffith, 2004; Miers, 2004; Stockard and Lehman, 2004). One of the leadership styles affecting teachers' job satisfaction is servant leadership (Miers, 2004). Likewise various studies have indicated the existence of a relationship between implementing behaviours of servant leadership and job satisfaction (Laub, 1999; Girard, 2000; Hebert, 2003; Thompson, 2003; Miers 2004; Irving, 2005). Hebert (2003) examined the relationship of perceived servant leadership and job satisfaction from follower's perspective. Hebert found that there was a significant relationship between perceptions of servant leadership and job satisfaction. Miers (2004) reported that the more a teacher perceives the behaviours of servant leadership being implemented in the school, the higher the level of individual teacher job satisfaction. The research conducted by Thompson (2003) revealed that there is a statistically significant positive correlation between participants' perceptions of servant leadership characteristics and their level of job satisfaction. Anderson (2005) found that Laub's each of the six constructs of servant leadership positively correlated with teacher job satisfaction.

Furthermore, this article attempts to explain the relationship between servant leadership and job satisfaction by examining factors that affect teachers' job satisfaction and characteristics of servant leadership. Hoy and Miskel (1982)



reported that teachers' participation in decision making enhanced their job satisfaction. In a study conducted by Dinham and Scott (2000), it was found that school leadership consisting of teachers' perception about administrative and educational support affected teachers' job satisfaction. In addition, various studies revealed that administrative support to teachers and positive school climate, open communication between teachers and principals, and respectful attitude of principals towards teachers had effect on teachers' job satisfaction (Lee, 1983 cited Evans and Johnson, 1990; Perie et al., 1997; Ma and MacMillan, 1999). Also, some studies indicated that teacher autonomy and involvement in decision making about education were associated with teacher job satisfaction, and teacher autonomy is important in improving teacher satisfaction in their jobs (Perie et al., 1997; Evans, 2001; Lawson, 2004; Pearson and Moomaw, 2005). These mentioned factors above are associated with characteristics of servant leadership such as meeting the needs of employees, valuing employees, developing employees and a caring leadership (Laub, 1999; Stone et al., 2003; Drury, 2004). As based on these results, it can be said that servant leadership may have effect on teacher job satisfaction. Therefore the present study will attempt to explore whether replicate results of previous studies on the relationship between teachers' perceptions of servant leadership and their job satisfaction in a different country, Turkey.

## **The Structure of Turkish Education**

The Turkish educational system consists of two parts: formal and non-formal education. The structure of formal education system consists of preschool education, elementary education, secondary education and higher education. The Ministry of National Education has the overall responsibility for preschool, elementary and secondary education. The responsibility for higher education is rests with the Higher Education Council. Except for higher education, formal education is provided free of charge in the public schools event though private schools exist at all levels of education. Elementary education is a compulsory eight-year programme for all children beginning at the age of six. Schools of elementary education use centralized curriculum suggested by the Ministry of National Education throughout the country. Secondary education encompasses general high schools and vocational/technical high schools where, depending on the type of high school, an additional three or four years of training take place after elementary education. Higher education takes place at universities in four-year or two-year programmes (Saban, 2003; Gencer and Cakiroğlu, 2007).

## Method

### Sample

The study was carried out in public primary schools in Turkey. The participants for this study consisted of 700 primary school teachers at 29 schools located in the province of Düzce, in Turkey. A total of 595 teachers, representing a response rate of 85%, responded to the questionnaire. Of the teachers, 56.3% were female and 43.7% were male. Of teachers 21.2% had a bachelor's degree, 67.9% a college degree and 10.9% a master's degree. With regard to experience, 21% of teachers had been working for 1–5 years, 29.4% for 6–10 years, 17.3% for 11–15 years, 13.6% for 16–20 years and 18.7% for 21 years or more.

### Data Collection

The questionnaire consisted of 68 items: 60 items in the questionnaire aimed to determine servant leadership behaviours of primary school principals and 8 items aimed to determine the level of teachers' job satisfaction. In the following section, the measurement of these two themes will be explained.

## Measurement of Servant Leadership

In the research, the level at which school principals exhibited servant leadership behaviours was measured using the servant leadership scale (OLA) developed by Laub (1999). Six factors of servant leadership are distinguished (see above): (1) valuing people (10 items); (2) development of people (9 items); (3) building community (10 items); (4) displaying authenticity (12 items); (5) providing leadership (9 items); and (6) sharing leadership (10 items).

In this study, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with the statement using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

OLA has been validated through a number of servant leadership research studies (Herbst, 2003; Drury, 2004; Hebert, 2003; Mears, 2004; Irving 2005). The adaptation process of the OLA scale to Turkish included translation, validity and reliability studies. Factor analysis was carried out to find out whether the factors were coherent with the ones mentioned in the Laub (1999) scale due to the fact that this study was carried out in an environment with a different cultural structure. The compliance of the data with the factor analysis was ascertained with Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) and Barlett Sphericity test. KMO was 0.97 and Barlett Sphericity test ( $X^2 = 30500.180$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ) was found to be meaningful. These results indicate that the scale is in compliance with the factor analysis. Based on these results, the factor analysis was reapplied to the servant leadership scale for structure validity and the six factors were determined in compliance with the OLA. As a result of the factor analysis with

varimax rotation, the factors were set as follows: the first one as valuing of people (e.g. I am listened to by my principal in the school, and I feel appreciated by my principal for what I contribute), the second as development of people (e.g. my principal creates an environment that encourages learning, and my principal provides opportunities for all teachers to develop to their full potential), the third as building of community (e.g. my principal works to maintain positive working relationships, and my principal encourages teachers to work *together* rather than competing against each other), the fourth as displaying of authenticity (e.g. my principal opens to receiving criticism and challenge from teachers, and my principal is accountable and responsible to teachers), the fifth as providing of leadership (e.g. my principal is clear on the key goals of the school, and my principal provides support and resources needed to help teachers meet their goals), and sixth as sharing of leadership (e.g. I are encouraged by my principal to share in making important decisions, and my principal allows teachers to help determine where this school is headed). Load values of the items of the valuing of people factor ranged from 0.521 to 0.795, that of development of people factor from 0.581 to 0.732, that of building community factor from 0.541 to 0.697, that of displaying authenticity factor from 0.506 to 0.721, that of providing leadership from 0.557 to 0.743, and that of sharing leadership factor from 0.512 to 0.718. The variances explained by the factors for the scale was found to be 64.66%.

Internal reliability was measured by using Cronbach alpha coefficient resulting in 0.89 for valuing people, 0.92 for people development, 0.94 for building community, 0.88 for displaying authenticity, 0.93 for providing leadership, 0.92 for sharing leadership, and 0.94 for the whole questionnaire. Laub (1999) and Miers (2004) reported that the OLA had Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the six subscales of 0.90 or above. The present study's finding confirmed the reliability of OLA subscales. According to the result, the OLA is a reliable instrument for measuring servant leadership.

## Measurement of Job Satisfaction

Teachers' job satisfaction was measured using Mohrman–Cooke–Mohrman (1977) job satisfaction questionnaire (cited in Hebert, 2003), which consisted of eight items. Participants used a five-point Likert scale to indicate their degree of satisfaction ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied).

The compliance of the data with the factor analysis was ascertained with KMO and Barlett Sphericity test. KMO was 0.88 and Barlett Sphericity test ( $X^2$ : 2363.049;  $p = 0.000$ ) was found to be meaningful. These results indicate that the scale is appropriate to the factor analysis. Factor analysis was applied to the job satisfaction questionnaire for structure validity based on these results and it was taken into consideration under two dimensions. As a result of the factor analysis with varimax rotation, the factors were set as follows: the first one as intrinsic satisfaction (e.g. the feeling of self-esteem or self-respect you get from

being in your job and the feeling of worthwhile accomplishment in your job), and the second as extrinsic satisfaction (e.g. the amount of respect and fair treatment you receive from your principal, and the feeling of being informed in your job). Load values of the items of intrinsic satisfaction factor ranged from 0.721 to 0.773 and that of extrinsic satisfaction factor from 0.764 to 0.775. The variation explained by the factor for the scale was found to be 57.46%.

Internal consistency was measured by using Cronbach alpha coefficient and the alpha was 0.83 for intrinsic satisfaction, 0.84 for extrinsic satisfaction and 0.89 for the whole questionnaire. It was also found that the item-total correlation of the job satisfaction questionnaire ranged from 0.62 to 0.69. Therefore, the internal consistency of the survey instrument was reliable at an acceptable level.

## Data Analysis

SPSS was used for the data analysis. Mean and standard deviation values were used to determine the level that primary school principals performed servant leadership behaviours and the job satisfaction level. Pearson correlations were carried out to explore whether a relationship exists between servant leadership and job satisfaction. The effects of servant leadership on teachers' job satisfaction were tested by utilizing multiple regression analysis.

## Results

Mean and standard deviation values of the levels that school principals perform servant leadership behaviours and teachers' job satisfaction are presented in Table 1. From Table 1, it can be seen that the mean scores of valuing teachers (mean: 3.58), developing teachers (mean: 3.55), building community (mean: 3.61), displaying authenticity (mean: 3.61), providing leadership (mean: 3.72), sharing leadership (mean: 3.60), and servant leadership as a whole (Mean: 3.61) was above the midpoint of 3.0 on the rating scale. Table 1 shows that the level of teachers' intrinsic job satisfaction (mean: 3.65) was higher than extrinsic job satisfaction (mean: 3.32) and the level of total job satisfaction of teachers (mean: 3.49) was over the midpoint.

The correlation matrix in Table 2 shows that servant leadership subscales were positive and significant correlated with the intrinsic job satisfaction of teachers (ranging from  $r = 0.372$  to  $0.542$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). It was found that there was significant relationship between the factors of valuing teachers, developing teachers, building community, displaying authenticity, providing leadership, sharing leadership together and the intrinsic job satisfaction of teachers ( $R = 0.724$ ;  $R^2 = 0.523$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). These factors together explained 52.3% of the variance in teachers' intrinsic job satisfaction (see Table 3). According to the standardized regression coefficients ( $\beta$ ), they revealed that teachers' intrinsic job satisfaction was more affected by displaying of authenticity, while it was

**Table 1** Descriptive statistics for variables

Factors	Mean	Stand. error
Valuing of people	3.58	0.59
Development of people	3.55	0.67
Building of community	3.61	0.62
Displaying of authenticity	3.61	0.69
Providing of leadership	3.72	0.56
Sharing of leadership	3.60	0.75
Total servant leadership	3.61	0.48
Intrinsic satisfaction	3.65	0.56
Extrinsic satisfaction	3.32	0.71
Job satisfaction	3.49	0.55

**Table 2** Correlations among variables

Variables	Intrinsic satisfaction	Extrinsic satisfaction	Job satisfaction
1. Valuing of people	0.429**	0.342**	0.424**
2. Development of people	0.413**	0.361**	0.448**
3. Building of community	0.458**	0.443**	0.524**
4. Displaying of authenticity	0.373**	0.427**	0.469**
5. Providing of leadership	0.542**	0.454**	0.572**
6. Sharing of leadership	0.406**	0.472**	0.512**
7. Total servant leadership	0.589**	0.569**	0.669**

Notes: \*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

**Table 3** Regression analysis of servant leadership factors on intrinsic job satisfaction

Variables	B	Stand. error	$\beta$	T	P	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	0.761	0.116	—	6.562	0.000		
Valuing of people	0.217	0.080	0.211	2.705	0.007	.798	1.252
Development of people	0.253	0.087	0.246	2.902	0.004	.470	2.130
Building of community	0.155	0.074	0.148	2.100	0.036	.411	2.436
Displaying of authenticity	0.259	0.089	0.261	2.925	0.004	.327	3.060
Providing of leadership	0.234	0.082	0.218	2.876	0.004	.377	2.654
Sharing of leadership	0.004	0.074	0.044	0.564	0.573	.421	2.375

Notes:  $R = 0.724$ ;  $R^2 = 0.523$ ;  $F_{(6,588)} = 107.662$ ;  $p < .000$ .

less affected by sharing of leadership factor (see Table 3). When *t*-test results on the significance of regression coefficients were examined, it could be seen that all other factors except for sharing leadership had a significant effect on teachers' intrinsic job satisfaction (Table 3).

The results of correlation analysis revealed a positive and significant relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction of teachers and factors of servant leadership (ranging from  $r = 0.342$  to  $0.472$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ) (see Table 2). It was also found that there was a significant relationship between the factors of valuing teachers, developing teachers, building community, displaying authenticity, providing

leadership, sharing leadership and the extrinsic job satisfaction of teachers ( $R = 0.675$ ;  $R^2 = 0.455$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). These factors together explained 45.5% of the variance in teachers' extrinsic job satisfaction (see Table 4). According to the standardized regression coefficients ( $\beta$ ), it was revealed that displaying of authenticity had more effect on teachers' extrinsic job satisfaction, while it had less impact on intrinsic job satisfaction (see Table 4). According to  $t$ -test results on significance of regression coefficients, it can be seen that all other factors, except for providing of leadership, had a significant effect on teachers' extrinsic job satisfaction (see Table 4).

The correlation matrix in Table 2 shows that servant leadership subscales were positive and significantly correlated with total job satisfaction of teachers (ranging from  $r = 0.424$  to  $0.572$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ) (see Table 2). It was also found that there was a significant relationship between the factors of valuing of teachers, developing of teachers, building of community, displaying of authenticity, providing of leadership, sharing of leadership and total job satisfaction of teachers ( $R = 0.768$ ;  $R^2 = 0.590$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). These factors together explained 59% of the variance in total job satisfaction of teachers (see Table 5). Standardized regression coefficients ( $\beta$ ) revealed that the total job satisfaction of teachers was more affected by displaying of authenticity, while it was less affected by the factor of building of community (see Table 5). When  $t$ -test results on significance of regression coefficients are examined, it can be seen that all

**Table 4** Regression analysis of servant leadership factors on extrinsic job satisfaction

Variables	<i>B</i>	Stand. error	$\beta$	<i>T</i>	<i>P</i>	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	0.713	0.132	—	5.401	0.000		
Valuing of people	0.202	0.091	0.184	2.213	0.027	0.798	1.252
Development of people	0.229	0.052	0.214	4.385	0.000	0.470	2.130
Building of community	0.195	0.060	0.199	3.090	0.002	0.411	2.436
Displaying of authenticity	0.249	0.101	0.235	2.471	0.014	0.327	3.060
Providing of leadership	0.002	0.903	0.003	0.032	0.974	0.377	2.654
Sharing of leadership	0.175	0.064	0.153	2.705	0.006	0.421	2.375

Notes:  $R = 0.675$ ;  $R^2 = 0.455$ ;  $F_{(6,588)} = 81.861$ ;  $p < .000$ .

**Table 5** Regression analysis of servant leadership factors on total job satisfaction

Variables	<i>B</i>	Stand. error	$\beta$	<i>T</i>	<i>P</i>	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	0.737	0.100	—	7.334	0.000		
Valuing of people	0.210	0.070	0.218	3.014	0.003	0.798	1.252
Development of people	0.169	0.076	0.179	2,229	0.026	0.470	2.130
Building of community	0.245	0.054	0.237	4.423	0.000	0.411	2.436
Displaying of authenticity	0.254	0.077	0.274	3.310	0.001	0.327	3.060
Providing of leadership	0.216	0.056	0.211	2.681	0.008	0.377	2.654
Sharing of leadership	0.005	0.064	0.061	0.843	0.339	0.421	2.375

Notes:  $R = 0.678$ ;  $R^2 = 0.590$ ;  $F_{(6,588)} = 141.150$ ;  $p < .000$ .

**Table 6** Regression analysis of servant leadership on total job satisfaction

Variables	<i>B</i>	Stand. error	$\beta$	<i>T</i>	<i>P</i>
Constant	0.715	0.097	—	7.378	0.000
Servant Leadership	0.766	0.027	0.764	28.800	0.000

Notes:  $R = 0.764$ ;  $R^2 = 0.583$ ;  $F_{(1,593)} = 0.829.446$ ;  $p = 0.000$ .¶

other factors except for sharing of leadership had a significant effect on teachers' internal job satisfaction (see Table 5).

The results of regression analysis revealed that servant leadership was a significant predictor for teachers' job satisfaction ( $R = 0.764$ ;  $R^2 = 0.583$ ;  $F = 829.446$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). It can be said that 58.3% of the variance related to teachers' job satisfaction is explained by servant leadership.

To avoid the multicollinearity between predictors and interaction terms containing the predictors, it was decided to employ variance inflation factors (VIF) and tolerance in intrinsic, extrinsic and total job satisfaction regression analyses. According to values of VIF and tolerance, no multicollinearity in intrinsic, extrinsic and total job satisfaction was seen (see Tables 3–6)

## Discussion

The results of this study revealed that there was a positive and significant relationship between servant leadership behaviours of principals and teachers' job satisfaction, and that servant leadership behaviours of principals had a significant effect on job satisfaction. The effects of servant leadership factors on teachers' job satisfaction vary in terms of magnitude. The factors of valuing of teachers, displaying of authenticity, building of community, and development of teachers have a positive and significant effect on intrinsic, extrinsic and total job satisfaction. Sharing leadership has no significant effect on intrinsic, and total job satisfaction while providing of leadership has no significant effect on external job satisfaction. In addition, servant leadership has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction.

The fact that valuing of teachers and displaying of authenticity are positively and strongly related with intrinsic, extrinsic and total job satisfaction of teachers and have a positive, meaningful and strong effect on job satisfaction. This result may indicate that teachers give importance to human characteristics such as feelings as being more valuable than the job and working in a reliable environment. Supporting these results, the study conducted by Hebert (2003) reveals that these two factors affect job satisfaction positively. Also, it was found that teachers expected principals to be trustable (Oplatka, 2004), effective school principals were ones who cared about and recognized others (Gordon and Patterson, 2006), respected individuals and showed understanding (Knoop, 1994; Oplatka, 2004). School principals' leadership showing consideration of

people have a more positive effect on teachers' job satisfaction compared to principals' leadership in respect to the duties, as stated in a study carried out by Everett (1987) (cited Akdoğan, 2002). Additionally, this result corroborates the result of the study carried out by Chapman and Lowther (1982) revealing that recognition of teachers by principals had a positive effect on teachers' job satisfaction. The displaying authenticity dimension of servant leadership comprising esteem toward their followers can lead to more interaction with the followers of the servant leader. Besides, servant leaders care for others in that they are listeners, understanding, accepting and emphatic (Greenleaf, 1977). These behaviours can reveal the esteem of the principals demonstrating servant leadership toward the teachers. Accordingly, principals should respect teachers, have a close interest in them, listen and pay attention to teachers, esteem and try to build a trustable school atmosphere in order to improve teachers' job satisfaction.

School principals' efforts to develop teachers have a significant effect on the intrinsic, extrinsic and total job satisfaction of teachers. It may be postulated that teachers need to have knowledge, skills and abilities related to teaching profession to organize teaching activities and to ensure student learning. For this reason, since teachers' intrinsic job satisfaction is more oriented towards performing teaching activities and desiring to help students achieve, teachers' intrinsic job satisfaction relies on their capabilities of profession (Shann, 1998; Houtte, 2006). As based this results, it can be suggested that principals who contribute professional development of teachers may provide to increase teachers job satisfaction. In addition, results of some studies support this finding. For example, various studies revealed that teachers' positive contribution through performing effective educational activities improved their job satisfaction (Bogler, 2001; Dinham and Scott, 1998; Ruhl-Smith, 1991). Some research revealed that professionally efficient teachers will be successful in educational activities and attain job satisfaction at a high level (Lee v.d., 1991; Taylor and Tashakkari, 1995; Ma and MacMillan, 1999; Bogler, 2001). As based on these results, it can be said that one of the ways to improve teachers' job satisfaction is to encourage principals in efforts to develop teachers and provide an environment where teachers can easily communicate with each other. Based on servant leadership, it can be said that since school principals' activities to develop teachers have a positive effect on teachers' job satisfaction, school principals' being servant leaders is a significant factor that increase job satisfaction.

One of the striking results of this study is that there were no significant effects on intrinsic, extrinsic, and total job satisfaction, according to regression analysis results. This result may indicate that teachers are not encouraged autonomy and participate in decisions related to both teaching activities and manage in schools by principals. Whereas, this result is inconsistent the findings of previous studies indicating that principals and teachers in effective schools share authority and decision-making (Dragon-Severson and Pinto, 2006), distributed leadership had effect on performing effective learning (Blase



and Blase, 1999; Neuman and Simmons, 2000), and teachers with autonomy and authority is an appropriate way of solving the problems of schools (Short, 1994). Also, some studies revealed that autonomy and participation in decisions perceived by teachers is indicative of their job satisfaction (Kreis and Brockoff, 1986; Dinham and Scott, 2000; Brunetti, 2001; Evans, 2001; Pearson and Moomaw, 2005). However, this result was supported by the findings of some studies in Turkey indicating that principals exhibit administrative behaviours that affect teachers autonomy negatively (Uras, 2000), and principals stressed that decisions regarding education have been made by Ministry of Education (Bucak, 2000). This result may arise from the excessive bureaucratic structure of the Turkish education system. Turkey has a centralized educational system. The Ministry of National Education is responsible for the administration of education and the enforcement of educational laws. The appointment of teachers is made by the Ministry of Education. The curricula are exactly the same in both public and private schools. All students are taught the same subjects and use the exact same textbooks in primary and secondary schools. The budgets and the financial resources of the schools are mostly allocated by the Ministry of Education. Therefore, except for routine work (e.g. enrolling students), principals have no effect on schools. Teachers may possibly not value undertaking leadership at school, for they work under such a bureaucratic system. Thus, sharing leadership may not have an impact on their job satisfaction.

There is positive and significant relation between servant leadership and teachers' job satisfaction and servant leadership has significant effect on job satisfaction. Teacher' job satisfaction had effect on their performance (Judge et al., 2001). This will positively affect the acquisition of knowledge and skills by students and thus will contribute to school success. In this respect, improving teachers' job satisfaction is important in terms of the quality of education. It can be said that, to achieve this and to improve teachers' job satisfaction, school principals are required to perform activities of servant leadership such as supporting and developing employees, respecting employees, providing a trustable, moral and respectful environment, caring for employees. This result supports the findings of previous studies indicating that there was a positive relation between servant leadership and job satisfaction (Laub, 1999; Girard, 2000; Thompson, 2003; Drury, 2004; Miears, 2004). As based on these results, it can be said that principals who exhibits servant leadership may be considered as a source of job satisfaction from the point of view of teachers.

## **Conclusion and Implications**

Meeting the needs of employees to improve work performance has been an aspect of leadership, which has been researched since the Hawthorne studies (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1999). The understanding of servant leadership may contribute to improving teachers' job satisfaction due to its characteristics such

as developing, supporting, helping and providing service to employees. Taking into consideration the findings in this study that servant leadership has a positive effect on job satisfaction, it can be said that school principals should aim to be servant leaders in order to improve teachers' job satisfaction.

While job satisfaction contributes to ensuring the effective work of employees by improving job satisfaction (Schleicher et al., 2004), job dissatisfaction causes negative situations in organizations and individuals such as resignation, irregular work attendance, disappointment, outbursts and a decrease in performance (Evans and Jonhson, 1990; Rahim and Afza, 1993; Igarria and Guimaraes, 1999; Cetinkanat, 2002). For this reason, school principals should make an effort to improve teachers' job satisfaction so that teachers endeavour to provide effective education in class and facilitate students' acquisition of targeted behaviours, and thus to ensure that teachers carry out educational activities more effectively and thereby improve intrinsic job satisfaction. Principals may improve teachers' job satisfaction through allowing teachers to take part in decision-making, giving autonomy, respecting them, creating a trustable environment and esteeming teachers. It can be observed that the features that improve teachers' job satisfaction are consistent with the factors of servant leadership, such as esteeming employees, showing sincerity and sharing leadership. In this respect, it can be said that school principals should be servant leaders to improve job satisfaction, which in turn contributes to the effective work of teachers.

Moreover, schools are intensely human institutions because the ones providing educational services and benefiting from them are human (Greenfield, 2004). That is why principals and teachers have a very important function in school effectiveness. Since teachers face students who benefit from educational services more often, and they are the dominant planners and executors of in-class educational activities, high job satisfaction can be considered important in that it provides ambitious and enthusiastic effort to attain school objectives and increase in work performance. In this respect, the finding that servant leadership affects both internal and external satisfaction of teachers may be an indication of the importance of school principals' being servant leaders.

The results of this study may also be evaluated in terms of developing school principals and educational policies. In the Turkish education system, school principals are selected following an examination based the result of which and augmented by qualifications such as professional seniority, awards, and so on, they are appointed by the central authority. However, when the questions in the examination are reviewed, it is observed that the number of questions regarding administrative science is quite low. Taking into consideration the fact that school principal candidates do not have any education on administration, it can be said that school principals perform administrative activities with their teaching qualifications. Yet, being a school principal requires qualifications other than teaching qualifications. When the results of this study are examined, it is observed that behaviours of school principals, such as esteeming and

developing teachers, and showing sincerity, result in improvement in job satisfaction that positively affects teachers' performance. For this reason, school principals should be educated in a way to facilitate teachers' professional development and to acquire the ability to establish interpersonal communication and efficiency to help teachers.

The results of this study are limited to the opinions of teachers in primary schools in Düzce province where the research data were obtained. Although this study reveals evidence that shows the relation between servant leadership and job satisfaction, the results reflect the characteristics and perceptions of the individuals working in schools where the research was conducted. For this reason, studies carried out in different places are needed for a generalization of the results obtained in this research. Hence, it is recommended that research on the effects of servant leadership on job satisfaction should also be carried out in different places.

## References

- Akdoğan, E. (2002) 'Öğretim Elemanlarının Algıladıkları Liderlik Stilleri ile İş Doyumları Arasındaki İlişki' ('The Relationship between Academics' Job Satisfaction Levels of Lecturers and their Perceived Leadership Styles'), MA thesis, University of Marmara. Istanbul.
- Anderson, K.P. (2005) 'A Correlational Analysis of Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction in a Religious Educational Organization', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 66(01), 3162292.
- Azar, A. and Henden, R. (2003) 'Alan Dışından Atanmanın İş Doyumuna Etkileri; Sınıf Öğretmenliği Örneği' ('Job Satisfaction of Non-education Majoring Teachers: The Case of Primary School Teachers'), *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri* 3(2): 323-49.
- Bandura, A. (1997) *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W.H Freeman and Company.
- Barbuto, J. and Wheeler, D. (2006) 'Scale Development and Construct Clarification of Servant Leadership', *Group and Organization Management* 31(3): 300-26.
- Blandford, S. (2000) *Managing Professional Development in Schools*. London: Routledge.
- Blase, J. and Blase, J. (1999) 'Shared Governance Principals: The Inner Experience', *NASSP Bulletin* 83(606): 81-90.
- Bogler, R. (2001) 'The Influence of Leadership Style on Teacher Job Satisfaction', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 37(5): 662-83.
- Bowie, N. (2000) 'Business Ethics, Philosophy, and the Next 25 Years', *Business Ethics Quarterly* 10(1): 7-20.
- Brunetti, G.J. (2001) 'Why Do They Teach? A Study of Job Satisfaction among Long-Term High School Teachers', *Teacher Education Quarterly* 28(3): 49-74.
- Bucak, E. (2000) *Eğitimde Yerelleşme (Decentralisation of Education)*. Ankara: Detay Publications.
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (1991) *Okul Yönetiminde Yeni Yapı Ve Davranış (School Management New Construct and Behaviour)*. Ankara: Pegem Publication.
- Cekmecelioglu, H.G. (2005) 'Örgüt İkliminin İş Tatmini Ve İşten Ayrılma Niyeti Üzerindeki Etkisi: Bir Araştırma' ('The Effects of Organizational Climate on Job Satisfaction and Intention to Leave: A Research'), *Journal of University of Cumhuriyet Economic and Administrative Sciences* 6(2): 23-39.
- Chacon, C.T. (2005) 'Teachers' Perceived Efficacy among English as a Foreign Language Teacher in Middle Schools in Venezuela', *Teaching and Teacher Education* 21: 257-72.

- Chapman, D.W. and Lowther, M.A. (1982) 'Teachers' Satisfaction with Teaching', *Journal of Educational Research* 75(4): 241–47.
- Cetinkanat, C. (2000) *Örgütlerde Gündüleme ve İş Doyumu (Motivation and Job Satisfaction in Organizations)* Ankara: Anı Publication.
- Cetinkanat, C. (2002) 'İş Doyumu ve Tükenmişlik' ('Job Satisfaction and Burnout'), *Journal of Educational Researches* 9: 186–93.
- Davis, K. (1981) *Human Behavior at Work, Organization Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dennis, R.S. (2004) 'Servant Leadership Theory: Development of the Servant Leadership Assessment Instrument', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 65(5): 3133544.
- Dennis, R.S. and Bocernea, M. (2005) 'Development of the Servant Leadership an Assessment Instrument', *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 26(8): 600–15.
- Dingman, W.W. and Stone, A.G. (2006) 'Servant Leadership's Role in the Succession Planning Process: A Case Study', *International Journal of Leadership Studies* 2(2): 98–113.
- Dinham, S. and Scott, C. (1998) 'A Three Domain Model of Teacher and School Executive Career Satisfaction', *Journal of Educational Administration* 36(4): 362–78.
- Dinham, S. and Scott, C. (2000) 'Moving into the Third, Outer Domain of Teacher Satisfaction', *Journal of Educational Administration* 38(4): 379–96.
- Dragon-Severson, E. and Pinto, K.C. (2006) 'School Leadership for Reducing Teacher Isolation: Drawing from Well of Human Resources', *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 9(2): 129–55.
- Drury, S. (2004) 'Employee Perceptions of Servant Leadership: Comparisons by Level and with Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 65(9): 3146724.
- Evans, V. and Johnson, D.J. (1990) 'The Relationship of Principals' Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Job-Related Stress', *Journal of Instructional Psychology* 17(1): 11–19.
- Evans, L. (2001) 'Delving Deeper into Morale, Job Satisfaction and Motivation among Education Professionals: Re-Examining the Leadership Dimension', *Educational Management & Administration* 29: 291–306.
- Everett, G. (1987) 'A Study of the Relationship between the Principal's Leadership Style and the Level of Motivation of the Teaching Staff', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Tennessee State University.
- Farling, M.L., Stone, A.G. and Winston, B.E. (1999) 'Servant Leadership: Setting the Stage for Empirical Research', *The Journal of Leadership Studies* 6: 49–72.
- Fields, D., Chan, A., Akhtar, S. and Blum, T. (2006) 'Human Resource Management Strategies Under Uncertainty: How do American and Hong Kong Chinese Companies Differ?', *Cross Culture Management: An International Journal* 13(2): 171–86.
- Fullan, M. (2003) *The Moral Imperative of School Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Gencer, A.S. and Cakiroglu, J. (2007) 'Turkish Preservice Science Teachers' Efficacy Beliefs Regarding Science Teaching and Their Beliefs about Classroom Management', *Teaching and Teacher Education* 23: 664–75.
- Girard, S.H. (2000) 'Servant Leadership Qualities Exhibited by Illinois Public School District Superintendents', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 61(5): 9973347.
- Gordon, J. and Patterson, J.A. (2006) 'School Leadership in Context: Narratives of Practice and Possibility', *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 9(3): 205–28.
- Graham, J.W. (1991) 'Servant Leadership in Organizations: Inspirational and Moral', *Leadership Quarterly* 2(2): 105–19.

- Greenfield, W.D. (2004) 'Moral Leadership in Schools', *Journal of Educational Administration* 42(2): 174–96.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1977) *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Griffith, J. (2004) 'Relation of Principal Transformational Leadership to School Staff Job Satisfaction, Staff Turnover, and School Performance', *Journal of Educational Administration* 42(3): 333–56.
- Hallinger, P. and Heck, R.H. (1996) 'Reassessing the Principal's Role in School Effectiveness: A Review of the Empirical Research', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 32(1): 27–31.
- Hardin, F. (2003) 'Impacting Texas Public Schools Through a Student Servant Leader Model: A Case Study', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 64(3): 3033365.
- Hebert, S.C. (2003) 'The Relationship of Perceived Servant Leadership and Job Satisfaction from the Follower's Perspective', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 64(11): 3112981.
- Herbst, J.D. (2003) 'Organizational Servant Leadership and its Relationship to Secondary School Effectiveness', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 64(11): 3110574.
- Hoy, W.K. and Miskel, C.G. (1982) *Educational Administration: Theory, Research, Practice*. New York: Random House.
- Houtte, M.V. (2006) 'Tracking and Teacher Satisfaction: Role of Study Culture and Trust', *The Journal of Educational Research* 99(4): 247–54.
- Humphreys, J.H. (2005) 'Contextual Implications for Transformational and Servant Leadership', *Management Decision* 43(10): 1410–31.
- Igarria, M. and Guimaraes, T. (1999) 'Exploring Differences in Employee Turnover Intentions and Its Determinants among Telecommuters and Non-telecommuters', *Journal of Management Information Systems* 16(1): 147–64.
- Irving, J.A. (2005) 'Servant Leadership and the Effectiveness of Teams', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 66(4), 3173207.
- Irving, J.A. and Longbotham, G.J. (2007) 'Team Effectiveness and six Essential Servant Leadership Themes: A Regression Model based on Items in the Organizational Leadership Assessment', *International Journal of Leadership Studies* 2(2): 98–113.
- Ivancevich, J.M. and Matteson, M.T. (1999) *Organizational Behavior and Management*. Boston, MA: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Johnson, C. (2001) *Meeting The Ethical Challenges of Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Jones, L. (2000) 'Supervisory Beliefs and Behaviors Associated with Veteran Teacher Motivation', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 61(2): 9962960.
- Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Thoresen, C.J. and Patton, G.K. (2001) 'The Job Satisfaction-Job Performance Relationship: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review', *Psychological Bulletin* 127(3): 376–407.
- Kabadayı, R. (1982) 'Okul Müdürlerinin Liderlik Davranışları İle Öğretmenlerin Güdülenmesi' ('School Principals' Leadership Behavior and Teachers' Motivation'), unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hacettepe.
- Knoop, R. (1994) 'Work Values and Job Satisfaction', *Journal of Psychology* 128(6): 683–90.
- Kreis, K. and Brockoff, D.Y. (1986) 'Autonomy: A Component of Teacher Job Satisfaction', *Education* 107(1): 110–15.
- Laub, J.A. (1999) 'Assessing the Servant Organization: Development of the Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA) Instrument', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 60(2): 9921922.
- Lawson, T. (2004) 'Teacher Autonomy: Power or Control?', *Education* 3–13, 32(3): 3–18.

- Lee, R.K. (1983) 'An Analysis of the Relationship of Principals Leadership Style to Teacher Stress and Job-Related Outcome', doctoral dissertation, Washington State University.
- Lee, V.E., Dedrick, R.F. and Smith, J.B. (1991) 'The Effect of the Social Organization of Schools on Teachers' Efficacy and Satisfaction', *Sociology of Education* 64: 190–208.
- Leithwood, K. and Jantzi, D. (2006) 'Transformational School Leadership for Large-Scale Reform: Effects on Students, Teachers, and Their Classroom Practices', *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 17(2): 201–27.
- Luthans, F. (1994) *Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ma, X. and MacMillan, R.B. (1999) 'Influences of Workplace Conditions on Teachers' Job Satisfaction', *The Journal of Educational Research* 93(1): 39–47.
- MacBeath, J. (2005) 'Leadership as Distributed: A Matter of Practice', *School Leadership and Management* 25(4): 349–66.
- Mathieu, J.E. (1991) 'A Cross-Level Nonrecursive Model of the Antecedents of Organizational Commitment and Satisfaction', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76: 607–18.
- Miears, L.D. (2004) 'Servant-Leadership and Job Satisfaction: A Correlational Study in Texas Education Agency Region X Public Schools', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 65(9): 3148083.
- Mohrman, A.M., Cooke, R.A., Mohrman, S.A., Duncan, R.B. and Zaltman, G. (1977) *An Assessment of a Structural Task Approach to Organizational Development of a School System*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- Moore, W. and Esselman, M. (1992) 'Teacher Efficacy, Power, School Climate and Achievement: A Desegregating District's Experience'. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Neuman, M. and Simmons, W. (2000) 'Leadership for Student Learning', *Phi Delta Kappan* 82(1): 9–12.
- Nguni, S., Slegers, P. and Denessen, E. (2006) 'Transformational and Transactional Leadership Effects on Teachers' Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Primary Schools: The Tanzanian Case', *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 17(2): 145–77.
- Nixon, M.M. (2005) 'The Servant Leadership: Followership Continuum from a Social Psychology Cognitive Perspective', *Servant Leadership Roundtable*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University. Available at: <http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/ServantLeadershipRoundtable>. Accessed 8 October 2006.
- Noddings, N. (2006) 'Educational Leaders as Caring Teachers', *School Leadership and Management* 26(4): 339–45.
- Oplatka, I. (2004) 'Prospective Teachers' Constructions of Leadership: In Search of an "Androgynous" Style?', *Leadership and Policy in Schools* 3(1): 37–57.
- Ostroff, C. (1992) 'The Relationship Between Satisfaction, Attitudes, and Performance: An Organizational Level Analysis', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 77: 963–74.
- Papanastasiou, C. and Papanastasiou, E.C. (1998) 'What Influences Students to Choose The Elementary Education Major: The Case of Cyprus', *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies* 3(1): 35–45.
- Papanastasiou, E.C. and Zembylas, M. (2005) 'Job Satisfaction Variance among Public and Private Kindergarten School Teachers in Cyprus', *International Journal of Educational Research* 43: 147–67.
- Parolini, J.L. (2007) 'Investigating the Distinctions between Transformational and Servant Leadership', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 68(4): 3264263.
- Patterson, K.A. (2003) 'Servant Leadership: A Theoretical Model', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 64(2): 3082719.
- Pearson, L.C. and Moomaw, W. (2005) 'The Relationship between Teacher Autonomy

- and Stress, Work Satisfaction, Empowerment, and Professionalism', *Educational Research Quarterly* 29(1): 37–53.
- Perie, M., Baker, D. and Whitener, S. (1997) 'Job Satisfaction Among America's Teachers: Effects of Workplace Conditions, Background Characteristics, and Teacher Compensation', *NCES 97-XXX*, US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Quaglia, R., Marian, S. and McIntire, W. (2001) 'The Relationship of Teacher Satisfaction to Perceptions of School Organization, Teacher Empowerment, Work Conditions, and Community Status', *Education* 112(2): 206–16.
- Rahim, M.A. and Afza, M. (1993) 'Leader Power, Commitment, Satisfaction, Compliance and Propensity to Leave a Job among U.S. Accountants', *Journal of Social Psychology* 133(5): 611–25.
- Ritchie, R. and Woods, P.A. (2007) 'Degrees of Distribution: Towards an Understanding of Variations in The Nature of Distributed Leadership in Schools', *School Leadership and Management* 27(4): 363–81.
- Rowan, B., Correnti, R. and Miller, R.J. (2002) 'What Large-Scale, Survey Research Tells us About Teacher Effects on Student Achievement: Insights From the Prospects Study of Elementary Schools', *Teachers College Record* 104(8): 1525–67.
- Ruhl-Smith, C.D. (1991) 'Teacher Attitudes Toward Students: Implications for Job Satisfaction in a Sample of Elementary Teachers From Suburban Schools', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Miami University.
- Russell, R.F. (2001) 'The Role of Values in Servant Leadership', *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 22(2): 76–83.
- Russell, R.F. and Stone, A.G. (2002) 'A Review of Servant Leadership Attributes: Developing a Practical Model', *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 12(3): 145–57.
- Saari, L. and Judge, T. (2004) 'Employee Attitudes and Job Satisfaction', *Human Resource Management* 43(4): 395–407.
- Saban, A. (2003) 'A Turkish Profile of Prospective Elementary School Teachers and their Views of Teaching', *Teaching and Teacher Education* 19(8): 829–46.
- Sarpkaya, R. (2000) 'Liselerde Çalışan Öğretmenlerin İş Doyumu: Manisa İli Örneği' ('Teachers' Job Satisfaction in High Schools'), *Amme İdaresi Dergisi* 33(1): 111–24.
- Schleicher, D.J., Watt, J.D. and Greguras, G.J. (2004) 'Re-examining the Job Satisfaction-Performance Relationship the Complexity of Attitudes', *The Journal of Applied Psychology* 89(1): 165–77.
- Schneider, B. and Snyder, R. (1975) 'Some Relationships between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Climate', *Journal of Applied Psychology* 60(3): 318–28.
- Schulz, I.L. and Teddlie, C. (1986) 'The Relationship between Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Their Perceptions of Principals' Use of Power and School Effectiveness', *Education* 109(4): 461–68.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1994) *Building Community in Schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shann, M. (1998) 'Professional Commitment and Satisfaction among Teachers in Urban Middle Schools', *The Journal of Educational Research* 92: 67–73.
- Shen, J. (1997) 'Teacher Retention and Attrition in Public Schools', *The Journal of Educational Research* 91: 81–88.
- Short, P.M. (1994) 'Defining Teacher Empowerment', *Education* 114(4): 488–93.
- Sisman, M. (2004) *Öğretim Liderliği (Instructional Leadership)*. Ankara: PegemA Publication.
- Smith, B.N., Montagno, R.V. and Kuzmenko, T.N. (2004) 'Transformational and Servant Leadership: Content and Contextual Comparisons', *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies* 10(4): 80–91.
- Spears, L.C. (1995) *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's Theory of Servant Leadership Influenced Today's Top Management Thinkers*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Spillane, J.P., Halverson, R. and Diamond, J.B. (2004) 'Towards a Theory of Leadership Practice: A Distributed Perspective', *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 36(1): 3–34.
- Stockard, J. and Lehman, M.B. (2004) 'Influences on the Satisfaction and Retention of 1st-Year Teachers: The Importance of Effective School Management', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 40(5): 742–71.
- Stone, A.G., Russell, R.F. and Patterson, K. (2003) 'Transformational versus Servant Leadership—A Difference in Leader Focus'. Paper presented at the Servant Leadership Roundtable at Regent University, October, Virginia Beach, VA, 16 October. Available at: [http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl\\_proceedings/2003/stone\\_transformation\\_versus.pdf](http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2003/stone_transformation_versus.pdf). Accessed 13 December 2005.
- Stone, A.G., Russell, F.R. and Patterson, K. (2004) 'Transformational Versus Servant Leadership: A Difference in Leadership Focus', *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 25(4): 349–61.
- Stone, A.G. and Patterson, K. (2005) 'The History of Leadership Focus', *Servant Leadership Roundtable*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University. Available at: <http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/ServantLeadershipRoundtable>. Accessed 12 October 2006.
- Taylor, D. and Tashakkori, A. (1995) 'Decision Participation and School Climates as Predictors of Job Satisfaction and Teachers' Sense of Efficacy', *The Journal of Experimental Education* 63: 217–30.
- Taylor, T., Martin, B.N., Hutchinson, S. and Jinks, M. (2007) 'Examination of Leadership Practices of Principals Identified as Servant Leaders', *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 10(4): 401–19.
- Thompson, C.H. (2003) 'The Public School Superintendent and Servant Leadership', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 66(9): 3190501.
- Thompson, D.P., McNamara, J.F. and Hoyle, J.R. (1997) 'Job Satisfaction in Educational Organizations: A Synthesis of Research Findings', *Educational Administration Quarterly* 33: 7–37.
- Uras, M. (2000) 'Lise Öğretmenlerinin Örgüt Sağlığının Moral, Yenilikçilik, Özerklik, Uyum ve Problem Çözme Yeterliliği Boyutlarına İlişkin Algıları (Perceptions of the Secondary Teachers Regarding Levels of Organizational Health Dimensions of Moral, Innovativeness, Autonomy, Adaptation, Problem-Solving Adequacy)', *Journal of Pamukkale University Educational Faculty* 7: 1–8.
- Wheaton, C.E. (1999) 'Servant Leadership and the Public School Superintendent', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 60(5): 9931545.
- Whetstone, J.T. (2002) 'Personalism and Moral Leadership: The Servant Leaders with Transforming Vision', *Business Ethics: A European Review* 11(4): 385–92.
- Wong, P.T. and Davey, D. (July 2007) *Best Practices in Servant Leadership*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University. Available at: <http://www.regent.edu/acad/sls/ServantLeadershipRoundtable>. Accessed 5 November 2007.
- Woods, P.A. (2004) 'Democratic Leadership: Drawing Distinctions with Distributed Leadership', *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 7(1): 3–26.
- Woodruff, T.R. (2004) 'Executive Pastors' Perception of Leadership and Management Competencies Needed for Local Church Administration', *Dissertation Abstracts International* 3128851.
- Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2000) 'Changes in Teacher Efficacy During the Early Years of Teaching'. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Yukl, G. (2002) *Leadership in Organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zembylas, M. and Papanastasiou, E. (2004) 'Job Satisfaction among School Teachers in Cyprus', *Journal of Educational Administration* 42: 357–74.
- Zembylas, M. and Papanastasiou, E. (2006) 'Sources of Teacher Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in Cyprus', *Compare* 36: 229–47.



### **Biographical Note**

YUSUF CERIT is an assistant professor of Educational Faculty at Abant Izzet Baysal University. He is interested in the principals' roles and leadership, teacher' self-efficacy, and classroom management.

### **Correspondence to:**

YUSUF CERIT, Izzet Baysal University, Bolu 14280, Turkey. [email: cerit\_y@ibu.edu.tr]