



A.D. Bolganbayev¹, K. Myrzabekkyzy², D.N. Kelesbayev³

A. Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Turkestan, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: artur.bolganbayev@gmail.com¹, kundyz.myrzabekkyzy@ayu.edu.kz²,
dinmukhamed.kelesbayev@ayu.edu.kz³)

Evaluation of different styles of leadership at hierarchical levels: by the example of Akhmet Yassawi University

Abstract. *Although there are many studies in the literature on leadership styles and behaviors, few studies have been found that show how leadership behaviors are perceived according to hierarchical levels. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to determine how lower, middle and upper-level managers perceive superior leadership behaviors in educational institutions and whether their perception of leadership behavior differs according to hierarchical levels. In this study, while measuring leadership behaviors, we did not ask managers to evaluate their behavior; but we tried to determine how the employees perceive the behaviors of their closest superior. We have determined our working universe as upper, middle, and lower-level managers working at Akhmet Yassawi University. The research data were collected from 101 managers with the survey technique. Managers were asked questions about vision determination, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to member needs and maintaining the status quo, and analyzes were made based on the responses given by the senior, middle and lower management levels. Besides, all the variables used in the questionnaire were measured with 5-point Likert type scales between 1-Strongly disagree and 5-Strongly agree. To measure the leadership behavior of managers, the CEO Leadership Behavior Measurement Survey developed by Tsui et al. (2006: 120) and Kabacoff (1998: 18-20) and the Leadership Effectiveness Analysis (LEA) study of the Management Research Group were used.*

Keywords: *Leader, Leadership, Leadership Styles, Leadership Behaviors, Leadership Approaches, Manager, Hierarchical Levels.*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32523/2079-620X-2020-3-81-96>

Introduction. Due to the cultural differences of societies [1], leadership definitions vary and a common definition has not yet been developed [2]. Leadership, according to Açıkalın [3], can be defined as establishing strong and targeted teams; guiding these teams, and persuading people to adapt to the goals of the group. In other words, it is possible to evaluate leadership as a process involving many actions such as

influencing individual and group activities, inspiring them, and maintaining the loyalty of the group to achieve the goals of an organization. At the same time, leadership shows some situational characteristics according to the conditions of the organization. In this respect, it is difficult to talk about a general type of leadership suitable for every environment [4]. In this context, leadership can be defined as the process by which a person

can influence and direct others' activities to achieve specific personal or group goals under certain circumstances [5].

Different leadership approaches focus on different types of common characteristics, behaviors, situational actions, differences, and innovativeness of leaders. One of the best ways to reach a synthesis by analyzing these approaches is to take a look at the development stages and history of the concept of leadership. Leaders and followers have been the subject of many scientific studies. There are different leadership approaches. The adopted approach is crucial to the success of businesses and employees. Therefore, this study addresses the general characteristics of leadership and the relationship between these concepts with each other. For this purpose, 101 people working at the upper, middle, and lower levels at Akhmet Yassawi University were surveyed. The managers were asked questions about determining the vision, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to member needs, and maintaining the status quo (5-point Likert Scale). Finally, the responses of upper, middle, and lower-level managers were analyzed.

Literature Review. There is extensive literature on leadership behaviors and perception of leadership behaviors. It is noteworthy that in almost all of these studies, the managers whose behaviors are evaluated are top managers. According to Lowe et al. [6], the main reason for this is the false belief that management levels other than senior managers have little role in achieving organizational success. However, in today's competitive environment, it is necessary to examine the behaviors of managers at all levels to determine whether they can motivate employees to develop necessary behavior patterns for the organizations to achieve success. Again, according to Lowe et al. [6], organizations today have to be more flexible than in the past. This flexibility requires that managers from all levels of the organization make decisions from time to time. This increases the importance of lower and middle-level managers.

When studies on the relationship between leadership behaviors and hierarchical levels are

examined, we can see that while some studies focus on the effect of hierarchy [7, 8, 9, 10, 11], others stress structural factors [12, 13]. In this context, Oshagbemi and Gill [9] found that the leadership styles of upper and lower-level managers differed significantly in their study of 400 managers of businesses operating in the UK. Similar differences could not be found between the leadership styles of middle and upper-level managers and the leadership styles of lower and middle-level managers. Tichy and Ulrich [7] analyzed whether transformational leadership behaviors differ according to their management levels in their study. This research has revealed that the top management level values the transformational leadership understanding more. Avolio and Bass [8] reached similar results in their studies. These researchers stated that it is natural for lower-level managers to show less transformational behavior because their duties are functional. Wang and Satov [13] analyzed leadership behaviors in Sino-Japanese joint ventures and collected data from 151 middle and upper-level managers of 72 enterprises could not find significant differences between leadership behaviors. However, the researchers concluded that upper-level managers are more successful than mid-level managers in the adequacy of functional leadership behaviors are. Mumford et al. [11] have done another interesting and recent study on leadership behavior. This study examined 1000 lower-middle-upper-level managers to determine whether leadership abilities differ from organizational levels. Researchers have examined leadership abilities in four dimensions: cognitive abilities, interpersonal abilities, business skills, and strategic abilities. The research concluded that leadership skills differ according to the status of the work done and the managerial level. Besides, it is emphasized that cognitive abilities are required at all organizational levels, and strategic abilities are more necessary and important for the top management of the organization. Nicholls [12] made the most comprehensive assessment of the relationship between leadership behaviors and hierarchical levels. Although the author states that leadership behaviors differ from time to

time by hierarchical steps, he emphasizes that the behaviors exhibited by managers should not fall below certain standards. Because according to Nicholls [12], it is essential to demonstrate managerial competence and correct leadership behavior at every level to ensure organizational success.

Research Method.

1. The Importance and Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this study is to determine how lower, middle and upper-level managers perceive superior leadership behaviors in educational institutions (Akhmet Yassawi University) and whether their perception of leadership behavior differs according to hierarchical levels. Although there are many studies on the leadership styles and behaviors in the literature, few studies have been found that show how leadership behaviors are perceived according to hierarchical levels. According to Oshagbemi and Gill [9], the reason for this is that the success of the business is generally seen as equivalent to the behavior of the top-level manager and that the leadership-related studies focus on their behavior.

In the literature, most of the leadership behavior researchers generally collected data from the managers themselves [14, 15, 16, 17]. In only a few studies [18], data on leadership behaviors were collected from employees. In this study, while measuring leadership behaviors, we didn't ask managers to evaluate their behavior; but we tried to determine how the employees perceive the behaviors of their closest superior. In other words, while a mid-level manager evaluates the behavior of the top-level manager; lower-level managers evaluated the behavior of mid-level managers, and employees who were not in any managerial position evaluated the behavior of the lower-level management.

2. The Universe and the Sample of the Research.

As the study universe of the research, we selected the top, middle, and lower-level managers working at Akhmet Yassawi University. Research data was collected from 101 managers. The data was collected by questionnaire technique in the last week of May 2019, by reaching the relevant people by e-mail and one-to-one.

3. Collection of Research Data.

Before the research data was collected, the contact information of all managers was received from the Rectorate of Akhmet Yassawi University and their participation status was learned. A total of 150 questionnaire forms were distributed to businesses that agreed to participate in the research. 101 of these questionnaires have returned. According to this figure, the rate of return was 67.3%.

4. Survey Form and Measurement.

The survey questionnaire consists of six parts. The first part includes questions about administrators' determination of vision, the second part with their environmental sensitivity, the third part with their unusual behavior, the fourth part about their risk appetites, the fifth with their sensitivity to member needs, and the sixth about their stand towards status quo. All of the variables used in the questionnaire were measured with scales prepared in the 5-point Likert type between 1-Strongly disagree and 5-Strongly agree. To measure the leadership behavior of managers, we used the CEO Leadership Behavior Measurement Survey developed by Tsui et al. [19] and Kabacoff [20] and the Leadership Effectiveness Analysis (LEA) study of the Management Research Group. The research consists of 20 questions about leadership.

5. Research Hypotheses.

The research tests the following hypotheses:

H1. There is a positive relationship between the leader's vision setting and his/her hierarchical level.

H2. There is a positive relationship between the environmental sensitivity of the leader and his/her hierarchical level.

H3. There is a positive relationship between the leader's exceptional behavior and his/her hierarchical level.

H4. There is a positive relationship between the leader's risk appetite and his/her hierarchical level.

H5. There is a positive relationship between the leader's sensitivity to the needs of members and his/her hierarchical level.

H6. There is a positive relationship between the leader's maintaining the status quo and his/her hierarchical level.

Analysis and Findings. The data obtained from the questions prepared using the scales, all of which are five (5) digits Likert type and their validity and reliability have been proven in different studies were evaluated with the statistical package program named SPSS 22.0 for Windows. The data analysis included frequency tables of the demographic characteristics of the respondents, factor analysis, reliability tests, correlation analysis including the mean and standard deviations of the variables, and regression analysis for testing the research hypotheses.

The following tables include the results of factor analysis. Considering other studies, factor analysis has been applied to independent variables, namely, leaders' vision setting, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to member needs, and

maintaining the current situation. Likewise, factor analysis was conducted for the dependent culture of the dependent variable. In this way, a choice was made among those who are in the same dimension and whose meanings are close to each other with similar expressions. We also tried to determine the variables that the participants were more homogeneous and less unstable in their judgments by considering the average and standard deviation values. Thanks to this analysis, a meaningful factor structure was achieved.

A five-point Likert-type scaled 20-item scale was prepared to determine "Leadership" among employees. The scale was applied to 101 employees. To determine the factorial structure and validity of the scale, exploratory factor analysis was performed on the collected data. The explained variance table regarding factor analysis limited to six factors is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Factor Analysis

Factor	Eigenvalues		
	Total	Explained Variance %	Cumulative Variance %
1	8.437	42.187	42.187
2	2.063	10.315	52.502
3	1.649	8.243	60.745
4	1.353	6.765	67.510
5	1.149	5.744	73.254
6	1.061	5.306	78.560
7	0.827	4.134	82.694
8	0.639	3.196	85.890
9	0.515	2.575	88.464
10	0.485	2.424	90.888
11	0.332	1.661	92.549
12	0.313	1.564	94.113
13	0.239	1.196	95.309
14	0.209	1.044	96.353
15	0.177	0.884	97.237
16	0.157	0.786	98.023
17	0.119	0.594	98.617
18	0.112	0.559	99.175
19	0.093	0.464	99.639
20	0.072	0.361	100
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sample adequacy: 0.806			
Chi-square value of Bartlett's Sphericity test = 1511.575, Sd= 190, p=0.000			

Table 2

Factor Loads of Scale Items

	Factor					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. He/she has a vision and reveals ideas about future possibilities.	0.897	0.112	0.150	0.069	0.067	0.138
5. He/she can set out inspiring strategic and organizational goals.	0.809	0.024	0.209	0.121	0.193	0.133
3. He/she is inspiring and can motivate us by clearly stating what the managers are doing.	0.798	0.260	0.063	0.046	0.025	0.083
2. He/she appears very capable when giving a presentation in front of a group.	0.618	0.466	0.266	0.273	0.101	-0.030
1. He/she can give exciting speeches.	0.577	0.556	0.200	0.198	0.059	-0.124
7. He/she can predict the social and cultural barriers that the organization may encounter in realizing its goals.	0.134	0.826	0.145	0.001	0.156	0.180
6. He/she can produce new ideas on the future of the organization.	0.151	0.809	0.295	0.064	0.105	0.057
9. He/she can foresee new environmental opportunities to help the organization achieve its goals.	0.459	0.555	0.017	0.272	0.379	0.174
8. He/she can see the limits (capacities) of other members of the organization.	0.368	0.519	-0.048	0.375	0.217	0.317
17. He/she affects others by improving mutual liking and respect.	0.217	0.295	0.818	0.195	0.140	0.027
18. He/she often expresses his interest in the needs and feelings of other members of the organization.	0.055	0.140	0.768	0.405	0.165	0.165
16. He/she is sensitive to the needs and feelings of other members of the organization.	0.377	0.110	0.713	0.185	0.168	0.177
11. He/she uses non-traditional methods to achieve the organization's goals.	0.261	0.169	0.249	0.806	0.096	-0.006
12. He/she often engages in unique behavior that surprises other members of the agency.	-0.021	0.017	0.147	0.772	0.176	0.175
10. He/she can act unusually to help the organization achieve its goals.	0.256	0.123	0.406	0.712	0.213	-0.037
14. He/she makes sacrifices for the organization to achieve its goals.	0.165	0.109	0.168	0.071	0.861	0.039
13. It carries out activities to reach the aims of the organization, at significant personal risk.	0.051	0.141	0.028	0.374	0.733	0.160
15. He/she takes important personal risks to help the organization achieve its goals.	0.103	0.259	0.493	0.122	0.707	0.037
19. He/she tries to maintain the current situation and the way things are done normally.	0.066	0.068	0.073	0.182	0.018	0.925
20. He/she advocates non-risky, well-known, and well-accepted actions for the organization to achieve its goals.	0.167	0.166	0.150	-0.035	0.154	0.843

Table 3

Item Total Correlations and Alpha Coefficients

Factors	Items	Item-Total Correlation	Alpha Coefficient	Number of Items
Vision Setting	1. He/she can give exciting speeches.	0.730	0.893	5
	2. He/she appears very capable when giving a presentation in front of a group.	0.779		
	3. He/she is inspiring and can motivate us by clearly stating what the managers are doing.	0.719		
	4. He/she has a vision and reveals ideas about future possibilities.	0.774		
	5. He/she can set out inspiring strategic and organizational goals.	0.708		
Environmental Sensitivity	6. He/she can produce new ideas on the future of the organization.	0.679	0.848	4
	7. He/she can predict the social and cultural barriers that the organization may encounter in realizing its goals.	0.655		
	8. He/she can see the limits (capacities) of other members of the organization.	0.711		
	9. He/she can foresee new environmental opportunities to help the organization achieve its goals.	0.722		
Extraordinary Behaviors	10. He/she can act unusually to help the organization achieve its goals.	0.759	0.826	3
	11. He/she uses non-traditional methods to achieve the organization's goals.	0.772		
	12. He/she often engages in unique behavior that surprises other members of the agency.	0.588		
Taking Personal Risks	13. It carries out activities to reach the aims of the organization, at significant personal risk.	0.612	0.815	3
	14. He/she makes sacrifices for the organization to achieve its goals.	0.693		
	15. He/she takes important personal risks to help the organization achieve its goals.	0.705		
Sensitivity to Member Needs	16. He/she is sensitive to the needs and feelings of other members of the organization.	0.754	0.883	3
	17. He/she affects others by improving mutual liking and respect.	0.794		
	18. He/she often expresses his interest in the needs and feelings of other members of the organization.	0.775		
Maintaining the Status Quo	19. He/she tries to maintain the current situation and the way things are done normally.	0.749	0.857	2
	20. He/she advocates non-risky, well-known, and well-accepted actions for the organization to achieve its goals.	0.749		

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin statistic rising above 0.50 is an indicator that the number of samples is sufficient for the data [21]. In this study, KMO statistics were found to be 0.806. Therefore, the number of samples is sufficient. Bartlett's sphericity test results also test the suitability of the data for factor analysis. Therefore, it is observed that the data is suitable for factor analysis ($p < 0.05$).

When the total variance table explained was examined, it was observed that there were six factors larger than 1.0 eigenvalue on a 20-item scale and the explanatory power of this six-factor measurement tool was 79%. Varimax rotated and ranked factor loads of the scale items are shown in Table 2.

When factor loads were analyzed, it was observed that all items had a factor load higher than 0.45. Five items (1, 2, 3, 4 and 5) are clustered in the first factor; four items (7, 8, 9 and 10) are clustered in the second factor; three items (16, 17 and 18) are clustered in the third factor; three items (10, 11 and 12) are clustered in the fourth factor; three items (16, 17 and 18) are clustered in the fifth factor; and two items (19 and 20) are clustered in the sixth factor.

The reliability of the scale was examined with the Cronbach Alpha coefficient. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the 20-item scale was found to be as high as 0.925. The reliability coefficient varies between 0 and +1. If the reliability coefficient is close to 1, it means that the reliability is high, the internal consistency between the items is high and this is desired. Item-total correlations, also known as the item validity coefficient of the scale items, are shown in Table 3.

The Item-total correlation of all items is observed to be higher than 0.30. Alpha coefficients of vision determination, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, sensitivity to institution members, taking personal risk, and maintaining the status quo were found as 0.889, 0.848, 0.826, 0.815, 0.83, and 0.885, respectively.

What are the opinions of the administrators regarding leadership determination, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks,

showing sensitivity to member needs, and maintaining the status quo?

The average statistics of the managers' opinions regarding leadership behaviors such as vision setting, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to member needs, and maintaining the status quo are shown in Table 4.

Table 4
Average Statistics

	Average	Standard Deviation
Vision setting	3.88	0.98
Environmental Sensitivity	3.96	0.82
Extraordinary Behaviors	3.65	0.95
Taking Personal Risks	3.89	0.88
Sensitivity to Member Needs	3.82	0.95
Maintaining the Status Quo	4.05	1.06

Answers are graded according to the following points: (1) Strongly disagree; (2) Disagree; (3) Neither agree nor disagree; (4) Agree; (5) Strongly agree. Item scores were summed and the total score was divided by the number of items, and attitude scores were evaluated to vary between 1 and 5. Attitude scores are considered to be very low when the calculated average is between 1.0 and 1.8, low when between 1.81 and 2.60, medium when between 2.61 and 3.40, high when between 3.41 and 4.20, and very high when between 4.21 and 5.00. Accordingly, it was found that the opinions of managers regarding vision setting, environmental sensitivity, extraordinary behavior, taking personal risk, sensitivity to member needs, and maintaining the status quo are highly related to the average (respectively =3.88, =3.96, =3.65, =3.89, =3.82, =4.05). The variable that the executives showed the highest participation was the maintenance of the status quo.

What is the relationship between the variables of determining the vision, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to member needs, and maintaining the status quo?

The relationship between the variables of vision setting, environmental sensitivity,

exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to member needs, and maintaining the status quo was calculated with Pearson’s correlation coefficient and the results are shown in Table 5.

It is observed that the correlations between the variables are positive. In other words, the relationships between the two variables are linear. When the correlation coefficients are analyzed, a significant positive correlation was found between the highest correlation, vision determination, and environmental sensitivity, with a level of 0.656. In other words, as the level of positive views of managers on vision setting increases, the level of positive views on environmental sensitivity also increases. The lowest correlation was observed between maintaining the status quo and unusual behavior. This correlation is also positive. In general, the relationship between maintaining the status quo and other variables is low.

Do managers differ in their opinions regarding vision setting, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to

member needs, and maintaining the status quo according to their managerial levels?

Whether there is a significant difference between the opinions of the managers regarding vision setting, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to member needs and maintaining the status quo, according to their managerial level has been tested for independent samples and the results are shown in Table 6.

While the opinions of senior executives regarding vision setting, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks and showing sensitivity to member needs were higher ($=4.38$, $=4.26$, $=4.16$, $=4.22$, and $=4.17$, respectively); middle-level managers have higher scores in maintaining the status quo ($=4.31$). A statistically significant difference was found between the opinions of managers regarding vision determination, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to member needs, and maintaining the status quo ($p < 0.05$).

Table 5

Correlation Coefficients

		Vision Setting	Environ-mental Sensitivity	Extra-ordinary Behaviors	Taking Personal Risks	Sensitivity to Member Needs	Maintaining the Status Quo
Vision Setting	Pearson Correlation	1					
	p						
Environmental Sensitivity	Pearson Correlation	.656(**)	1				
	p	0					
Extraordinary Behaviors	Pearson Correlation	.476(**)	.447(**)	1			
	p	0	0				
Taking Personal Risks	Pearson Correlation	.384(**)	.526(**)	.504(**)	1		
	p	0	0	0			
Sensitivity to Member Needs	Pearson Correlation	.517(**)	.512(**)	.611(**)	.527(**)	1	
	p	0	0	0	0		
Maintaining the Status Quo	Pearson Correlation	.261(**)	.368(**)	.224(*)	.270(**)	.289(**)	1
	p	0.008	0.000	0.025	0.006	0.003	

What is the relationship between the managerial ranks of the managers and their views on vision setting, environmental sensitivity, and exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to member needs, and maintaining the status quo?

The Spearman-Brown correlation coefficient was used to determine whether there is a significant relationship between the administrators' managerial ranks and their views on vision determination, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to member needs and maintaining the status quo, and the results are shown in Table 7.

A moderate (.444) positive relationship was found between the level of the managers and the vision-setting variable ($p < .01$). In other words, higher-level managers have more positive views on vision setting.

A moderately positive (.393) positive relationship was found between the executive hierarchy of managers and environmental

sensitivity ($p < .01$). In other words, higher-level managers have more positive views on environmental sensitivity.

A moderately positive (.495) positive relationship was found between the level of the managers and the extraordinary behavior variable ($p < .01$). In other words, higher-level managers have more positive views on exhibiting extraordinary behaviors.

A moderately positive (.396) positive significant relationship was found between the level of the managers and the personal risk-taking variable ($p < .01$). In other words, higher-level managers have more positive views on risk-taking.

A moderately positive (.473) positive relationship was found between the level of the managers and showing sensitivity to member needs ($p < .01$). In other words, higher-level managers are more sensitive to member needs.

A low level (0.24) positive relationship was found between the level of the managers and maintaining the status quo ($p < .01$). In other

Table 6

F-Test Results by Hierarchical Level

		N	Average	Standard Deviation	F	p
Vision Setting	Upper Level	35	4.38	.40	12.789	0*
	Middle Level	35	3.91	1.10		
	Low Level	31	3.28	.98		
Environmental Sensitivity	Upper Level	35	4.26	.49	10.137	0*
	Middle Level	35	4.11	.94		
	Low Level	31	3.46	.78		
Extraordinary Behaviors	Upper Level	35	4.16	.76	16.644	0*
	Middle Level	35	3.72	.82		
	Low Level	31	2.99	.91		
Taking Personal Risks	Upper Level	35	4.22	.44	13.195	0*
	Middle Level	35	4.10	.98		
	Low Level	31	3.29	.85		
Sensitivity to Member Needs	Upper Level	35	4.17	.90	12.445	0*
	Middle Level	35	4.03	.84		
	Low Level	31	3.18	.84		
Maintaining the Status Quo	Upper Level	35	4.20	1.02	4.550	.013*
	Middle Level	35	4.31	.92		
	Low Level	31	3.60	1.14		

* $p < .05$

Brown Correlation Coefficients

Vision Setting	Environmental Sensitivity	Extraordinary Behaviors	Taking Personal Risks	Sensitivity to Member Needs	Maintaining the Status Quo	
Managerial Level	0.444(**)	0.393(**)	0.495(**)	0.396(**)	0.473(**)	0.244(*)

**p<.01

words, higher-level managers are more prone to maintain the status quo.

Do the opinions of managers regarding vision setting, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to member needs, and maintaining the status quo differ according to their gender?

Whether there is a significant difference in terms of gender among the opinions of the managers regarding vision determination, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to member needs, and maintaining the status quo are tested for independent samples and the results are shown in Table 8.

There was no significant difference between the opinions of the managers regarding the vision setting, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to the members' needs, and maintaining the status quo (p > 0.05).

Do the opinions of managers regarding vision setting, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, being sensitive to member needs, and maintaining the status quo differ according to their income status?

Kruskal Wallis test, which is a non-parametric test, was used to determine whether there is a significant difference between the opinions of the managers regarding vision determination, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risks, showing sensitivity to the members' needs and maintaining the status quo. The results are shown in Table 9.

A significant difference was found between the opinions of the managers regarding vision determination, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking

personal risks, and showing sensitivity to the members' needs (p < 0.05). However, there was no significant difference between the opinions of the managers regarding the status quo according to their income status (p > 0.05).

Do managers differ in their opinions regarding vision setting, environmental sensitivity, exceptional behavior, taking personal risk, showing sensitivity to member needs, and maintaining the status quo according to their professional seniority?

The Kruskal Wallis test was used to determine whether there is a significant difference between the opinions of the managers regarding vision determination, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risk, showing sensitivity to member needs and maintaining the status quo, and the results are shown in Table 10.

A significant difference was found between the opinions of the managers regarding personal risk-taking in leadership according to their income status (p < 0.05). However, there was no significant difference between the opinions of the managers regarding vision determination, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, showing sensitivity to the members' needs, maintaining the status quo according to their income status (p > 0.05).

Conclusion and Recommendations. In this study, it was investigated how lower, middle, and upper-level managers (Akhmet Yassawi University) perceive superior leadership behaviors and whether their perceptions differ according to their position in the hierarchy. Although there are many studies on the leadership styles and behaviors in the literature, few studies have been found that show how leadership behaviors are perceived according to hierarchical levels.

Table 8

T-Test Results by Gender

	Gender	N	Average	Standard Deviation	t	p
Vision Setting	Male	75	3.84	.99	-0.672	.503
	Female	26	3.99	.93		
Environmental Sensitivity	Male	75	4.02	.82	1.310	.193
	Female	26	3.78	.83		
Extraordinary Behaviors	Male	75	3.68	.99	.534	.595
	Female	26	3.56	.84		
Taking Personal Risks	Male	75	3.96	.89	1.343	.182
	Female	26	3.69	.83		
Sensitivity to Member Needs	Male	75	3.89	.94	1.264	.209
	Female	26	3.62	.99		
Maintaining the Status Quo	Male	75	4.11	1.10	.837	.404
	Female	26	3.90	.96		

Table 9

Kruskal Wallis Test Results by Income Levels

		N	Average	Standard Deviation	Kruskal Wallis Test	p
Vision Setting	Low	5	3.72	1.03	11.461	0.009*
	Medium	37	3.68	1.00		
	Good	37	3.84	0.90		
	Very Good	22	4.33	0.98		
Environmental Sensitivity	Low	5	3.55	0.54	13.712	0.003*
	Medium	37	3.63	0.90		
	Good	37	4.14	0.76		
	Very Good	22	4.32	0.61		
Extraordinary Behaviors	Low	5	2.60	0.60	19.346	0*
	Medium	37	3.26	0.94		
	Good	37	3.98	0.82		
	Very Good	22	3.98	0.85		
Taking Personal Risks	Low	5	3.27	0.37	13.548	0.004*
	Medium	37	3.59	1.01		
	Good	37	4.01	0.82		
	Very Good	22	4.33	0.54		
Sensitivity to Member Needs	Low	5	3.47	0.38	9.607	0.022*
	Medium	37	3.52	1.00		
	Good	37	4.07	0.86		
	Very Good	22	3.97	1.00		
	Low	5	4.10	0.55	3.142	0.370
	Medium	37	4.00	0.94		
	Good	37	4.26	1.01		
	Very Good	22	3.80	1.39		

*p<.05

Table 10

Kruskal Wallis Test Results by Professional Seniority

	Seniority (years)	N	Average	Standard Deviation	Kruskal Wallis Test	p
Vision Setting	1-5	52	3.76	0,99	5.164	0.160
	6-10	23	4.04	0,79		
	11-15	19	3.91	0,99		
	16+	7	4.20	1,44		
Environmental Sensitivity	1-5	52	3.90	0,82	5.490	0.139
	6-10	23	3.95	0,86		
	11-15	19	3.91	0,80		
	16+	7	4.57	0,66		
Extraordinary Behaviors	1-5	52	3.58	1,00	2.420	0.490
	6-10	23	3.51	0,94		
	11-15	19	3.88	0,86		
	16+	7	4.00	0,82		
	Total	101	3.65	0,95		
Taking Personal Risks	1-5	52	3.69	0,91	7.995	0.046*
	6-10	23	3.90	0,95		
	11-15	19	4.30	0,68		
	16+	7	4.24	0,32		
Sensitivity to Member Needs	1-5	52	3.81	0,87	2.056	0.561
	6-10	23	3.68	1,05		
	11-15	19	3.93	1,16		
	16+	7	4.05	0,65		
Maintaining the Status Quo	1-5	52	3.90	1,07	5.820	0.121
	6-10	23	4.11	1,14		
	11-15	19	4.26	0,92		
	16+	7	4.43	1,13		

*p<0.0

Questionnaire study and survey data on the personnel working in the relevant units of Akhmet Yassawi University and evaluated in the statistical software program SPSS 22.0 for Windows.

To determine the "Leadership" qualifications among the employees, a five-point Likert-type 20-item scale was prepared. The prepared scale was applied to 101 employees. To determine the factorial structure and validity of the scale, exploratory factor analysis was performed on the collected data. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin statistics exceeding 0.50 is an indicator that the number of samples is sufficient for the data (Kalaycı, 2005:

322). In this study, KMO statistics were found to be 0.806.

When the total variance table explained was examined, it was observed that there were six factors larger than 1.0 eigenvalue on a 20-item scale and the explanatory power of this six-factor measurement tool was 79%.

First, we analyzed demographic information. 74.3% of the participants are male. 33.7% of the participants are between the ages of 20-29. 64.4% of them have a graduate education, 51.5% have professional seniority in the range of 1-5 years. The income level of 36.6% of the participants is medium or good.

The analysis showed that the leadership behavior was observed in the upper, middle and lower levels of Akhmet Yassawi University and the leadership behaviors were influential.

As a result, 6 hypotheses have been established. The results of these are given below:

H1. There is a positive relationship between the leader's vision setting and his/her hierarchical level. This hypothesis is accepted because the F test is 12.789 and the probability level is $*p < .05$.

H2. There is a positive relationship between the environmental sensitivity of the leader and his/her hierarchical level. This hypothesis is accepted because the F test is 10.137 and the probability level is $*p < .05$.

H3. There is a positive relationship between the leader's exceptional behavior and his/her

hierarchical level. This hypothesis is accepted because the F test is 16.644 and the probability level is $*p < .05$.

H4. There is a positive relationship between the leader's risk appetite and his/her hierarchical level. This hypothesis is accepted because the F test is 13.195 and the probability level is $*p < .05$.

H5. There is a positive relationship between the leader's sensitivity to the needs of members and his/her hierarchical level. This hypothesis is accepted because the F test is 12.445 and the probability level is $*p < .05$.

H6. There is a positive relationship between the leader's maintaining the status quo and his/her hierarchical level. This hypothesis is accepted because the F Test is 4.550 and the probability level is $*p < .05$.

References

1. Hodgetts R.M. ve Luthans, F. International Management, Culture, Strategy, and Behavior. -New York: McGraw Hill/Irwin Publish, 2003. -672 p.
2. Bernard M. Bass and Ralph Melvin Stogdill. Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership, Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications (3. Edition). - New York: The Free Press, 1990. -1182p.
3. Açıklım A. İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin dönüşümcü liderlik özellikleri ve empati becerileri arasındaki ilişki (Ankara İli Örneği). (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimler Enstitüsü. -Ankara. Gazi Yayın Dağıtım, 2000. - 118p.
4. Yalınkılıç R. İşletmelerde liderlik anlayışı ve yöneticilerin liderlik özellikleri ve davranışı üzerine bir araştırma. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Hatay. MKÜ Yayın Dağıtım, 2010. - 120p.
5. Bayram Ş. Liderlik kavramı ve liderlik türlerinin inovasyon üzerindeki etkileri. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Strateji Bilimi Anabilim Dalı, Gebze. GYTE Yayın Dağıtım, 2013. -125p.
6. Lowe K.B., Kroeck K.G. ve Sivasubramaniam, N. Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature, Leadership Quarterly. -1996. -Vol. 7(3). - P. 385-425.
7. Tichy, N.M. ve Ulrich, D. The leadership challenge: a call for the transformational leader//Sloan Management Review. -1984. -Vol. 26(1). -P. 59-68.
8. Avolio, B.J. ve Bass, B.M. Transformational leadership, charisma, and beyond, İçinde: Hunt J.G., Baglia B.R., Dachler H.P. and Scriesheim C.A. (Editörler), Emerging Leadership, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA. -1988. -P. 29-50.
9. Oshagbemi, T. ve Gill, R. Differences in leadership styles and behaviour across hierarchical levels in UK organisations// The Leadership & Organization Development Journal. -2004. 25 (1). -P. 93-106.
10. Oshagbemi, T. ve Oholi, S.A. Leadership Styles and Behaviour Profiles of Managers// Journal of Management Development. -2005. -Vol: 25 No: 8, P. 748-762.
11. Mumford T.V., Campion M.A. ve Morgeson, F.P. The leadership skills strataplex: Leadership skill requirements across organizational levels//The Leadership Quarterly. 2007. -Vol.18. -P. 154-166.
12. Nicholls J. The 'heart, headandhands' of transforming leadership// Leadership & Organization Development Journal. -1194. -Vol. 15(6). -P. 8-15.

13. Wang Z. ve Satow T. Leadership styles and organizational effectiveness in Chinese – Japanese joint ventures// Journal of Managerial Psychology. -1994. -Vol. 9(4). -P. 31-36.
14. Brouer R.L. The role of political skill in the leadership process-work outcomes relations. (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). The Florida State University, Collage of Business, USA, 2007. -114p.
15. Çağlar İ. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi ile Mühendislik Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Liderlik Tarzına İlişkin Eğilimlerin Karşılaştırmalı Analizi ve Çorum Örneği, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Sayı:2: 2004, P. 91-108.
16. Çelik C. ve Sünbül, Ö. Liderlik algılamalarında eğitim ve cinsiyet faktörü: Mersin ilinde bir alan araştırması. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi. – 2008. -Vol. 13 (3). -P. 49-66.
17. Taşkıran E. Liderlik tarzının örgütsel sessizlik üzerindeki etkisinde örgütsel adaletin rolü ve bir araştırma. (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi), Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul, MÜ Yayın Dağıtım, 2010. -130p.
18. Groves K.S. Leader Emotional Expressivity Visionary Leadership and Organizational Change// Leadership & Organization Development Journal. -2006. -Vol. 27. -№7. -P. 566-583.
19. Tsui A.S., Wang H., Xin K.R. Organizational Culture in China: An Analysis of Culture Dimensions and Culture Types//Management and Organization Review. -2006. Vol. 2. Is. 3. -P. 345-376.
20. Kabacoff R.I. Gender Differences in Organisational Leadership: a large sample study. Portland, ME, Management Research Group. 1998. -130p.
21. Kalaycı Ş. SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri. -Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım, 2005. -426p.

References

1. Hodgetts R.M. ve Luthans, F. International Management, Culture, Strategy, and Behavior. (New York, McGraw Hill/Irwin Publish, 2003, 672 p.).
2. Bernard M. Bass and Ralph Melvin Stogdill. Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership, Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications (3. Edition). (New York, The Free Press, 1990, 1182 p.).
3. Açıkalın A. İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin dönüşümcü liderlik özellikleri ve empati becerileri arasındaki ilişki (Ankara İli Örneği). (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimler Enstitüsü. (Ankara, Gazi Yayın Dağıtım, 2000, 118 p.). [in Turkish]
4. Yalınkılıç R. İşletmelerde liderlik anlayışı ve yöneticilerin liderlik özellikleri ve davranışı üzerine bir araştırma. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), (Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Hatay, MKÜ Yayın Dağıtım, 2010, 120 p.). [in Turkish]
5. Bayram Ş. Liderlik kavramı ve liderlik türlerinin inovasyon üzerindeki etkileri. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), (Gebze, Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Strateji Bilimi Anabilim Dalı, GYTE Yayın Dağıtım, 2013, 125 p.). [in Turkish]
6. Lowe K.B., Kroeck K.G. ve Sivasubramaniam N. Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature, Leadership Quarterly, 7(3), 385-425(1996).
7. Tichy N.M. ve Ulrich, D. The leadership challenge: a call for the transformational leader, Sloan Management Review, 26(1), 59-68(1984).
8. Avolio B.J. ve Bass, B.M. Transformational leadership, charisma, and beyond, İçinde: Hunt J.G., Baglia B.R., Dachler H.P. and Scriesheim C.A. (Editörler), Emerging Leadership, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA, 1988, P. 29-50.
9. Oshagbemi T. ve Gill, R. Differences in leadership styles and behaviour across hierarchical levels in UK organisations, The Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 25 (1), 93-106(2004).
10. Oshagbemi T. ve Ocholi S.A. Leadership Styles and Behaviour Profiles of Managers, Journal of Management Development, 25(8), 748-762(2005).
11. Mumford T.V., Campion M.A. ve Morgeson, F.P. The leadership skills strataplex: Leadership skill requirements across organizational levels. The Leadership Quarterly, 18, 154-166(2007).
12. Nicholls J. The 'heart, headandhands' of transforming leadership, Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 15(6), 8-15(1994).

13. Wang Z. ve Satow, T. Leadership styles and organizational effectiveness in Chinese – Japanese joint ventures, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 9(4), 31-36(1994).
14. Brouer R.L. The role of political skill in the leadership process-work outcomes relations. (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). (The Florida State University, Collage of Business, USA, 2007, 114p.).
15. Çağlar İ. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi ile Mühendislik Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Liderlik Tarzına İlişkin Eğilimlerin Karşılaştırmalı Analizi ve Çorum Örneği, *Gazi Üniversitesi, Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Sayı: 2. 2004, P. 91-108. [in Turkish]
16. Çelik C. ve Sünbül, Ö. Liderlik algılamalarında eğitim ve cinsiyet faktörü: Mersin ilinde bir alan araştırması. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13(3), 49-66(2008). [in Turkish]
17. Taşkıran E. Liderlik tarzının örgütsel sessizlik üzerindeki etkisinde örgütsel adaletin rolü ve bir araştırma. (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi), (İstanbul, Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, MÜ Yayın Dağıtım, 2010, 130 p.)[in Turkish]
18. Groves K.S. Leader Emotional Expressivity Visionary Leadership and Organizational Change, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27(7), 566-583(2006).
19. Tsui A.S., Wang, H., Xin, K.R. Organizational Culture in China: An Analysis of Culture Dimensions and Culture Types. *Management and Organization Review*, 2(3), 345-376(2006).
20. Kabacoff R.I. Gender Differences in Organisational Leadership: a large sample study. (Portland, ME, Management Research Group, 1998, 130 p.).
21. Kalaycı Ş. SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri. (Ankara, Asil Yayın Dağıtım, 2005, p.426). [in Turkish]

А.Д. Болғанбаев, Қ. Мырзабекқызы, Д.Н. Келесбаев

Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті, Түркістан, Қазақстан

**Иерархиялық деңгейлердегі көшбасшылық стильдерінің айырмашылығын бағалау:
Ахмет Ясауи университеті мысалында**

Аңдатпа. Әдебиеттерде көшбасшылық стилдер мен мінез-құлықтар туралы көптеген зерттеулер болса да, көшбасшылық мінез-құлықтардың иерархиялық сатыларға немесе деңгейлерге сәйкес қалай қабылданатындығын көрсететін зерттеулер өте аз. Сондықтан зерттеу жұмысының мақсаты төменгі, орта және жоғарғы деңгейдегі менеджерлердің білім беру ұйымдарындағы жоғары басшылық мінез-құлықтарын қалай қабылдайтынын және олардың көшбасшылық мінез-құлықтарды қабылдауы иерархиялық сатыларға немесе деңгейлерге сәйкес өзгеретінін анықтау болып табылады. Зерттеу барысында көшбасшылық мінез-құлықты өлшеу кезінде менеджерлерден өздерінің мінез-құлқын бағалау көзделмеді; қызметкер мен менеджердің өздерінің ең жақсы мінез-құлқын қалай қабылдайтынын анықтауға әрекет жасалды. Зерттеу жұмысының кеңістігі ретінде Ахмет Ясауи университетінде жұмыс жасайтын жоғарғы, орта және төменгі деңгейдегі менеджерлер алынды. Зерттеу деректері сауалнама әдісін қолдану арқылы 101 менеджерден жиналды. Сауалнамаға қатысқан менеджерлерге: келешек бағытты айқындау, қоршаған ортаға сезімталдық, ерекше мінез-құлықты көрсету, тәуекелшілдік, ұйым мүшелерінің қажеттіліктеріне жауап беру және мәртебені сақтау туралы сұрақтар қойылды және тиісті талдаулар да осы сұрақтарға жоғарғы, орта және төменгі деңгейдегі басшылардың берген жауаптары бойынша жасалды. Сонымен қатар, сауалнамада қолданылатын барлық айнымалы мәндер 1-толық келістеймін және 5-толық келісемін арасындағы 5 балдық Ликерт типті шкалалармен өлшенді. Менеджерлердің көшбасшылық әрекеттерін өлшеу үшін Цуй және оның әріптестері (2006: 120) жасаған Топ-менеджерлердің көшбасшылық мінез-құлықтарын өлшеу сауалнамасы және Кабакофф (1998: 18-20) және Басқаруды зерттеу тобы жасаған Көшбасшылық тиімділікті талдау (LEA) жұмыстарынан пайдаланылды.

Түйін сөздер: көшбасшы, көшбасшылық, көшбасшылық стильдер, көшбасшылық мінез-құлық, көшбасшылық тәсілдер, менеджер, иерархиялық деңгейлер.

А.Д. Болганбаев, К. Мырзабекқызы, Д.Н. Келесбаев

Международный казахско-турецкий университет имени Ходжи Ахмеда Ясави, Туркестан, Казахстан

**Оценка различных стилей лидерства на иерархических уровнях:
на примере университета Ахмеда Ясави**

Аннотация. В современной литературе существует много исследований о стилях и поведении лидеров, но очень мало исследований о том, как поведение лидеров воспринимается в соответствии с иерархическими уровнями. Таким образом, цель исследования состояла в том, чтобы определить, как менеджеры низшего, среднего и высшего уровней воспринимают поведение высших руководителей в образовательных организациях и изменяются ли их представления о лидерском поведении в соответствии с иерархическими уровнями. В исследовании менеджеры не ставили целью оценивание своего поведения при измерении лидерского поведения; была предпринята попытка определить, как работник и менеджер воспринимают свое лучшее поведение. В исследовательское пространство были включены менеджеры высшего, среднего и низшего звена, работающие в университете Ахмета Ясави. Данные были получены от 101 менеджера посредством метода опроса. Руководителям задавались вопросы: о будущем направлении, чувствительности к окружающей среде, конкретном поведении, риске, удовлетворении потребностей членов и поддержании статуса, а соответствующий анализ основывался на ответах руководителей высшего, среднего и нижнего уровней. Кроме того, все переменные, использованные в вопросе, были измерены по 5-балльной шкале Лайкерта между 1, полностью не согласен, и 5, полностью согласен. Для измерения управленческого лидерства использовались вопросник для оценки поведения топ-менеджеров Цуй и его коллег (2006:120), анализ Кабакофф (1998:18-20) и работа «Анализ эффективности лидерства» (LEA), разработанная группой управленческих исследований.

Ключевые слова: лидер, лидерство, стили лидерства, лидерское поведение, лидерские подходы, менеджер, иерархические уровни.

Information about author:

Bolganbayev Artur – main author, PhD, Senior Lecturer of Management and Leadership Development Programme, A. Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Turkestan, Kazakhstan.

Myrzabekkyzy Kyndyz – PhD, Senior Lecturer of Finance and Accounting Programme, A. Yassawi International Kazakh – Turkish University, Turkestan, Kazakhstan.

Kelesbayev Dinmukhamed – PhD, Associate Professor of Management and Leadership Development Programme, A. Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Turkestan, Kazakhstan.

Болганбаев Артур – негізгі автор, PhD, аға оқытушы, Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті, Түркістан, Қазақстан.

Мырзабекқызы Күндыз – PhD, аға оқытушы, Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті, Түркістан, Қазақстан.

Келесбаев Дінмұхамед – PhD, доцент, Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті, Түркістан, Қазақстан.