



Article Info/Makale Bilgisi

✓Received/Geliş:13.06.2022 ✓Accepted/Kabul:31.08.2022

DOI:10.30794/pausbed.1130228

Research Article/Araştırma Makalesi

Başar, U. (2023). "An Emic Research on The Ideal Leadership Style of Turkic People", *Pamukkale Social Sciences Institute Journal*, Issue 54, Denizli, pp. 403-414.

AN EMIC RESEARCH ON THE IDEAL LEADERSHIP STYLE OF TURKIC PEOPLE

UFUK BAŞAR*

Abstract

The aim of this emic research was to identify the ideal leadership prototype of Turkic people. For this purpose, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a total of 224 participants from Turkic countries. Of the participants, 40 were from Azerbaijan, 38 were from Kazakhstan, 33 were from Kyrgyzstan, 40 were from Turkey, 34 were from Turkmenistan, and 39 were from Uzbekistan. The data were analyzed through the content analysis technique. Findings indicated that the ideal leadership prototype of Turkic people consisted of two main components: charismatic and paternalistic. The charismatic component comprised five themes or dimensions: visionary, stimulating, smart, brave, and charming. The paternalistic component comprised three themes or dimensions: virtuous, caring, and authoritative. Each theme or dimension consisted of several leadership qualities/codes. In this way, as far as is known, for the first time, the common ideal leadership style of Turkic people has been identified.

Keywords: *Leadership, Ideal leadership, Leadership prototype, Turkic people, Turkic states.*

TÜRK HALKLARININ İDEAL LİDERLİK TARZI ÜZERİNE EMİK BİR ARAŞTIRMA

Öz

Bu araştırmanın amacı, Türk halklarının ideal liderlik prototipini belirlemektir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda Türk ülkelerinden toplam 224 katılımcı ile yarı yapılandırılmış mülakatlar yapılmıştır. Katılımcıların 40'ı Azerbaycan'dan, 38'i Kazakistan'dan, 33'ü Kırgızistan'dan, 40'ı Türkiye'den, 34'ü Türkmenistan'dan ve 39'u Özbekistan'dandır. Araştırmanın verisi içerik analizi tekniği ile analiz edilmiştir. Bulgular, Türklerin ideal liderlik prototipinin karizmatik ve babacan olmak üzere iki ana bileşenden oluştuğunu göstermiştir. Karizmatik bileşen, vizyoner, teşvik edici, akıllı, cesur ve çekici olmak üzere beş temadan veya boyuttan oluşmaktadır. Babacan bileşen ise erdemli, ilgili ve otoriter olmak üzere üç temadan veya boyuttan oluşmaktadır. Her tema veya boyut, çeşitli liderlik niteliklerinden/kodlarından oluşmaktadır. Bu suretle Türk halklarının ortak ideal liderlik tarzı bilindiği kadarıyla ilk kez tanımlanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Liderlik, İdeal liderlik, Liderlik prototipi, Türk halkları, Türk devletleri.*

*Asst. Prof., İstanbul Ticaret University, Faculty of Management, ISTANBUL.
e-posta: ubasar@ticaret.edu.tr, (<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0008-5131>)

1. INTRODUCTION

It is one of the well-known facts that organizations cannot function without leaders. Therefore, leadership always attracted the attention of researchers. Leadership simply refers to a process in which a group of people (i.e., team, unit, and/or organization) is influenced and motivated in a way to spend their efforts and resources synergistically to accomplish some common objectives and make real a believed vision (Yukl, 1989: 252-253). So far, several studies were conducted on leadership. Many of them had a limited scope and appealed to specific, usually western cultures, such as North America (i.e., Canada and the United States) and Europe. Because leadership theories were developed mostly by Western scholars, for a long time, people believed that what was favorable and/or unfavorable about leadership in western societies should also be applied to other societies. However, the impact of culture on leadership perceptions, expectations, and attributions of individuals is evident (Paşa et al., 2001: 560; Ensari and Murphy, 2003: 55; Aycan, 2008: 220; Kabasakal et al., 2012: 520). Boyacıgiller and Adler (1991: 275-276) also underscored the significance of cultural influences on managerial and organizational phenomena, including leadership. Likewise, it has been empirically proved that despite some similarities, certain differences exist between cultures in terms of acceptable and unacceptable leadership styles (Den Hartog et al., 1999: 241; Ensari and Murphy, 2003: 58-61; Dorfman et al., 2012: 507-508; Kabasakal et al., 2012: 525-527).

In previous studies, in which the leadership perceptions, expectations, and attributions of Turks were investigated and discussed, the scope was limited to the people who were living only in Turkey (Paşa et al., 2001: 570; Aycan and Fikret-Paşa, 2003: 133; Kostik et al., 2005: 248; Yörük, et al., 2011: 106; Karakitapoğlu-Aygün and Gümüşlüoğlu, 2013: 108; Pagda et al., 2021: 6). On the other hand, in some cross-cultural studies, in which Turks are considered too, not all Turkic societies were included. In such studies, frequently, either only Turkey was included as a Turkic country or she was clustered together with some Western, Arabic, North African, and/or Middle Eastern countries instead of other Turkic countries (Den Hartog et al., 1999: 234; Brodbeck et al., 2000: 15; Arslan, 2001: 341; Kabasakal and Bodur, 2002: 40; Ensari and Murphy, 2003: 56; Dorfman et al., 2012: 508; Kabasakal et al., 2012: 519). However, the term “Turk or Turkic” refers to a large group of people who currently live not only in Turkey, but also in other countries, including Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan, as well as in some other regions of the world (Garibova, 2011: 268). Özbilgin (2011: 278) also pointed out this problem and stated that culturally, clustering Turkey with Arabic and/or Middle Eastern countries would be controversial. This fact necessitates new studies to be carried out on Turks with a broader perspective to better understand what kind of leadership style is favored by Turkic societies. As far as is known, until now, no study has been conducted on the people of Turkic countries to uncover and identify their shared, ideal, and effective leadership style. Such an understanding can help establish a common theoretical ground. Drawing on this theoretical ground, an ideal leader profile for people living in Turkic countries can be identified and developed. In this regard, this research aimed to find out the prototypical attributes of leaders who are accepted, expected, recognized, and idealized by people living in Turkic countries. In line with this objective, first, leadership and culture concepts are defined and the relationship between them is explained. Then, building on this theoretical ground and findings obtained from the analysis of data collected from people of Turkic countries, an ideal leadership style for the overall Turkic society is identified.

2. CULTURE AND LEADERSHIP

At the crossroad of several definitions of leadership, there are some qualities, such as influence, initiative, charisma, intelligence, trustworthiness, perseverance, belief, passion, courage, vision, and power. Previous research indicated that similarities and differences in leadership conceptualizations and perceptions across different societies derive from their cultures (Dorfman et al., 1997: 249-262; Den Hartog et al., 1999: 237-250; Brodbeck et al., 2000: 11-23; Kabasakal et al., 2012: 523-528). Culture simply refers to a common understanding, way of life, meaning-making, attributions, identities, and reactions of a society that help them to be differentiated from other people through shared beliefs, assumptions, values, and norms (Aycan et al., 2000: 194-196; Hofstede, 2001: 9-10). Culture has indispensable importance in understanding social phenomena. Such that, there is a constant and dynamic interaction between culture, environment, and individuals. Every individual is a contributor and so, a part of a certain culture. Also, culture influences how people perceive, make of, and interpret their

social environment. The dimensionality of culture (i.e., high versus low power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity versus femininity, and collectivism versus individualism) was uncovered and conceptualized for the first time by Hofstede (1980: 65-210). Subsequently, some new dimensions of culture were identified, such as Confucian work dynamism or long-term versus short-term orientation (Hofstede and Bond, 1988: 16). Moreover, apart from Hofstede's framework, other cultural frameworks have been developed by several researchers, such as Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1976), Hall and Hall (1990), Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), Schwartz (1999), and House et al. (2001).

Leaders are influencers and organizers of groups of people at various levels and important formatives and enactors of cultures. Generally, two distinct processes are followed by individuals to perceive and accept someone as a leader. In the first type, which is called the inference-based process, leadership is attributed to a specific person by considering his or her successes and/or achievements (Meindl et al., 1985: 81-99). However, in the second type, which is called the recognition-based process, someone is recognized and accepted as a leader as a result of a comparison of his or her characteristics and behaviors with that of an implicit leadership prototype (Lord et al., 1986: 403). In this research, the recognition-based process is taken into account. A prototype refers to a collection of several attributes and behavior patterns. Culture makes way for the emergence and development of a prototype of effective leadership in a certain society through shared beliefs, values, and norms. Accordingly, prototypes of effective leadership differ from culture to culture. For example, while in some cultures, the authoritarian leadership style is favorable, in others, it may be something that should be avoided (Den Hartog et al., 1999: 228). This view indicates the fact that leadership prototypes are outcomes of the expectations of people who are members and part of a specific culture. This is a condition that was also explained by the implicit leadership theory (Shondrick et al., 2010: 959). Namely, when someone displays certain behaviors, attitudes, and qualities that match with the leadership prototype of an individual, leadership is attributed to this person by him or her (Kenney et al., 1994: 411). Hence, culture is expected to have an impact on leadership conceptualizations and expectations of societies (Shaw, 1990: 635; Gerstner and Day, 1994: 121).

Likewise, the findings and theoretical implications of previous studies (Dorfman et al., 1997: 249-262; Brodbeck et al., 2000: 11-23; Arslan, 2001: 342-344; Ensari and Murphy, 2003: 58-61; Dorfman et al., 2012: 507-510; Kabasakal et al., 2012: 527), including the GLOBE research, showed that culture was one of the determinants of leadership within a certain society. In every society, leaders whose behaviors, attitudes, and characteristics match with expectations of the people, perform better and can be more effective than those who don't (Jackofsky et al., 1988: 48). This fact is explained by the culturally endorsed theory of leadership. According to this theory, when the ideal leadership style of a society is known, what type of leaders is expected can be figured out, so that their deeds can be predicted. It occurs through a process in which first, culture influences leadership expectations of people. Then, leadership expectations of people determine ideal and effective leadership style within a certain society (Dorfman et al., 2012: 506). In line with this view, approaching the leadership phenomenon as a set of personal attributes and behaviors identified as outcomes of shared beliefs, values, norms, and expectations of a society will not be incorrect.

When it comes to leadership among Turks, some studies conducted in Turkey draw attention. For instance, Paşa et al. (2001: 575-582) identified attributes of ideal leaders in Turkey as relationship orientation (i.e., team integrating and paternalistic behaviors), task orientation (i.e., administrative skills), participative (i.e., consultation, team orientation, and valuing others), and charismatic/transformational (i.e., being decisive, inspirational, and visionary). In another study, Kabasakal et al. (2012: 526) uncovered that in Turkey, an ideal leader should be decisive, team integrator, visionary, honest, competent, inspirational, performance-oriented, diplomatic, collaborative, participative, self-sacrificing, and humane. According to the findings of Karakitapoğlu-Aygün and Gümüşlüoğlu (2013: 126), transformational leadership was perceived slightly differently by Turks in that it was identified through emic dimensions, such as considerate-paternalistic, inspiring charismatic, and active-stimulating. Moreover, Pagda et al. (2021: 8-10) found in Turkey that leadership qualities, such as participative, team-oriented, humane-oriented, and charismatic are expected and favored. Although these findings contributed significantly to the literature and understanding related to the leadership among Turks, because not all Turkic countries were included in those studies, it is not possible to generalize their findings to other Turkic societies.

As for the large-scale and multi-cultural studies on leadership including Turks, Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (i.e., GLOBE) research stands out. Although significant contributions were made through GLOBE research as to the conceptualization and understanding of the leadership phenomenon, it can be argued that there were some missing aspects regarding the leadership perceptions and attributions of Turks. For example, the fact that several societies of Turks (i.e., Azerbaijani, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Turk, Turkmen, and Uzbek) are culturally related to each other and heirs of the same historical heritage was ignored. Such that, the regions where Turks live and inhabit were not scrutinized in a unified way. Instead, these regions were separated as Eastern Europe, Southern Asia, Confucian Asia, and the Middle East without considering the cultural ties between Turkic societies (Dorfman et al., 2012: 507). In addition, except for Turkey and Kazakhstan, other Turkic countries were not included in the research. Nevertheless, the very close scores of Turkey and Kazakhstan on the leadership dimensions, such as charisma, self-protective, humane, team-oriented, participative, and autonomous, could be considered as an indicator of the fact that they are culturally related and so, can have identical leadership prototypes (Den Hartog et al., 1999: 238-239). Besides, frequently, Turkey was grouped with Arabic and Northern African countries, such as Egypt, Morocco, Kuwait, and Qatar. Moreover, other Turkic countries were not considered in any region with regard to the cultural associations between them (Kabasakal and Bodur, 2002: 40; Kabasakal et al., 2012: 520). However, people of Turkey (i.e., Turks) are culturally closer to other Turkic societies than those living in North African and Arabic countries, because Turkic people have many common historical, ethnic, linguistic, spiritual, religious, and cultural attributes (Golden, 1992: 379-416). For example, Turkic people share a background dating back to prehistorical ages, they tell the same sagas to their children for centuries, they all speak dialects of Turkic language some of which are mutually intelligible, almost all of them are Muslims, they live in integrated geography, and to a large extent, they have similar beliefs, values, norms, traditions, and expectations (Golden, 1998: 16-29). It was also evident that integrated geography, common language, and religion can help convey beliefs, values, and norms across groups of people, such as tribes (Brodbeck et al., 2000: 5; Kabasakal and Dastmalchian, 2001: 481). Indeed, the fact that Turkish society is different from Arabic and North African societies in terms of culture and leadership expectations despite some similarities, was admitted by also GLOBE researchers as they obtained new findings and made progress in their studies (Kabasakal et al., 2012: 526-527). Accordingly, assessing the leadership expectations and thoughts of Turks by grouping them with north African and Arabic countries may result in misleading consequences, especially when the purpose was to identify the ideal leadership prototype among Turks. Likewise, in another leadership research where Turkey was included, leadership prototypes of twenty-two European countries were identified and compared among country clusters (Brodbeck et al., 2000: 15). However, again, since other Turkic states were not included in the analysis, it would be misleading to generalize the findings regarding Turkey to other Turkic communities. From this perspective, clustering Turkic societies as a whole and then, evaluating their leadership expectations and ideas together can make more sense. Hence, it is a necessity to conduct research in a way to cover not only Turkey but also other Turkic countries to identify their common ideal leadership prototype. Accordingly, in the following sections, in light of the shared cultural characteristics of Turkic states (i.e., Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan), an ideal leadership style is uncovered.

3. METHOD

3.1. Research Design and Participants

In this emic, exploratory, cross-sectional, and phenomenological research, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a total of 224 participants from Turkic countries, including Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan to identify a common, ideal leadership style for Turkic society. Information about participants is given in Table 1 (See Appendix 1).

3.2. Data Collection Procedure

The data were collected through semi-structured interviews between January 17 and April 1, 2022, from a total of 224 participants who have a Turkic origin. Purposive and snowball sampling techniques were used to access participants. The first participants from each country were people known to the researcher. The next

participants were those who were directed and recommended by an interviewed participant. For example, the first participant from Azerbaijan was one of the contacts of the researcher. After interviewing the first interviewee, he was asked to recommend and direct other likely participants. In this way, every recommended individual (i.e., a total of 312 people) was contacted and invited to participate in this research. However, only 224 agreed to be interviewed. Interviews were conducted with participants from Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, and Turkey respectively. When the interviews of the participants from a country were completed, the interviews of the participants from another country started. Face-to-face interviews were held with a total of 191 participants in Istanbul, at the most convenient location for the participants, such as a university library, office of the participant, and/or office of the researcher. Care was taken to ensure that the interview location was quiet enough and that the participant was not disturbed by external influences. Online interviews were held with the rest of the participants on the Zoom software. Interviews were conducted in English by the author to ensure a common understanding. During the interviews, one specific, open-ended question was asked to each participant. This was: *Which qualities do you expect an ideal leader to have?* With the permission of the participants, face-to-face interviews were recorded using a smart mobile phone and online interviews were recorded using the recording feature of the Zoom software. An ethical approval, numbered E-65836846-044-235801, regarding the conduct of the study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the university where the author works.

3.3. Data Analysis Strategy

The data were analyzed through the content analysis technique (Krippendorff, 1980). In this process, various procedures were applied in a sequence within 7 stages. In the first stage, every participant was given a code name to ensure their confidentiality. Code A1 was given to the first participant from Azerbaijan, code Ka1 was given to the first participant from Kazakhstan, code Ky1 was given to the first participant from Kyrgyzstan, code U1 was given to the first participant from Uzbekistan, code T1 was given to the first participant from Turkmenistan and code Tr1 was given to the first participant from Turkey. In the second stage, recordings of face-to-face and online interviews were transcribed on a Microsoft Word document. In the third stage, the answers of participants were read and checked thoroughly to identify codes and establish associations between them. In the fourth stage, themes were determined by grouping theoretically and semantically associated codes. In the fifth stage, themes were defined by referring to the leadership literature and addressing the statements of participants. In the sixth stage, components were determined by grouping theoretically and semantically associated themes. And, in the last stage, the prototypical leadership construct was defined and explained around identified components.

4. FINDINGS

By reading the answers of participants several times and referring to the leadership literature, initially, a total of 78 codes were identified. However, after eliminating the codes that were almost synonymous and were not addressed by every group of participants from countries included in the study, 66 codes remained. In accordance with the purpose of the research, each code represented a specific quality that an ideal, prototypical leader is expected to have according to Turkic participants. The list of codes was presented in Table 2 (See Appendix 2). After determining the final list of codes, in line with the content analysis procedure, how many times (i.e., frequencies) each code was mentioned by the interviewees was uncovered. Then, each code was grouped with other codes that could be theoretically and semantically related. In this way, 8 themes were identified. These themes were named *visionary, stimulating, smart, brave, charming, virtuous, caring, and authoritative* in line with the extant definitions within leadership literature.

If codes are considered to be first-order qualities, then, the themes can be thought of as dimensions or second-order qualities of the prototypical leadership construct of Turkic people. Accordingly, findings indicated that a *visionary* leader is concerned with the future, tends to change the status quo, and uses his or her intuitions to make decisions when necessary. This definition was supported by participant A2 as follows: *In unstable conditions, a true leader should be able to trust in his or her intuition to make challenging decisions. A stimulating leader is energetic, never gives up, and encourages others to challenge their limits and go beyond expectations.* Participant Ka12 addressed it as follows: *Real success can be achieved only by enthusiastic leaders who believe in*

their cause. A smart leader takes accurate and creative decisions and solves issues dexterously and practically by making use of his or her intelligence and knowledge. As participant Ky23 pointed out as follows: When everything we knew is useless, an ideal leader should appear with creative solutions. A brave leader is psychologically resilient, knows how to take risks, takes responsibility for failure, takes initiative when necessary, and sacrifices his or her interests. This was expressed by participant U14 as follows: An ideal leader should guide the way by taking risks and initiatives. A charming leader is sociable, has a wide network of reliable relationships, is emulated by others, and attracts people extraordinarily through influential and strong eloquence, simple but elegant clothing, and a sense of humor. Participant T27 highlighted this as follows: I expect a leader to be extraordinary almost in every sense and fascinate others with unusual demeanor, words, and actions. A virtuous leader is someone who is respected and followed by others not because of positional power, but due to several virtues, such as honesty, fairness, patience, generosity, and morality. Participant Tr32 drew attention to this quality as follows: A leader's rank in the organizational hierarchy does not mean much to me. What matters to me is how honest, reliable, moral, mature, and conscientious the leader is. A caring leader protects, helps, supports, and listens to followers, and has a constructive, friendly, sensitive, empathetic, polite, and nurturing manner toward them. Participant A19 addressed this quality as follows: An ideal leader should look after followers, act like their father, be concerned with their problems, and spare time to interact with them. An authoritative leader is a disciplined, willful, and strong-minded person who doesn't change his or her mind easily and organizes people and resources quickly in a way to implement planned actions. Participant U7 gave insight into this as follows: I am a disciplined person. Therefore, I expect to work with an orderly and planned leader, who is capable of dealing with compelling situations by virtue of his willfulness.

When these themes were examined and evaluated with regard to the leadership literature, it was noticed that it was possible to group them into two categories, such as *charismatic* and *paternalistic*. In the leadership literature, there are several definitions of charismatic leadership. For example, Weber (1978: 241) defined charisma as a gift bestowed by God which comprises superhuman and fascinating qualities and extraordinary power that arouses admiration and liking in others. And, Conger et al. (2000: 748-749) defined charismatic leadership as the possession of strategic vision and discourse, sensitivity to the environment and followers' needs, courage to take personal risks, and display of extraordinary behaviors. Accordingly, in this research, the *charismatic* component consisted of themes, such as *visionary, stimulating, smart, brave, and charming* which overlapped the extant definitions of charismatic leadership. Similarly, within the leadership literature, paternalism refers to treating people just like how a father treats his children. Such a relationship is expected to be hierarchical in which care and protection of the superior were exchanged with loyalty and deference of the subordinate (Ayca, 2006: 446). Likewise, paternalistic leadership was defined as a set of fatherly behaviors and attitudes including benevolence, authority, morality, formation of a working environment similar to a family, the establishment of trust-based relations with employees, and the expectation of employees to be obedient and respectful (Pellegrini and Scandura, 2008: 568-570; Ayca, 2014: 1). Accordingly, in this research, the *paternalistic* component consisted of themes, such as *virtuous, caring, and authoritative* which is consistent with the extant literature on paternalistic leadership. Ultimately, it was clear that participants concurringly expected and idealized their leaders to be *charismatic* and *paternalistic*. As far as is known, for the first time, this finding reflected the common prototypical leadership style among Turkic people. The codes, their frequencies, themes, and components are presented in Table 2 (See Appendix 2).

5. DISCUSSION

Findings indicated that the ideal leadership style of Turkic people comprised several qualities in three orders. The first-order qualities were a total of 66 codes that were derived from and looked for within the answers of participants. The second-order qualities were a total of 8 themes (i.e., *visionary, stimulating, smart, brave, charming, virtuous, caring, and authoritative*) which were identified by grouping theoretically and semantically related codes. The third-order qualities were a total of 2 components (i.e., *charismatic* and *paternalistic*) which were identified by grouping theoretically and semantically related themes. In this way, the prototypical, ideal leadership construct of Turkic people was uncovered. As far as is known, this emic research was the first to investigate and identify the ideal leadership style among Turkic people. Therefore, it is believed that significant theoretical contributions were made not only to the national leadership literature of Turkic countries but also to

the global leadership literature. As such, previously, Dorfman et al. (1997: 261-262) found that some leadership qualities, such as supportiveness, rewarding on a contingent basis, and charisma were universal. Den Hartog et al. (1999: 239) also found that universally accepted leadership attributes included several qualities of charismatic and transformational leadership. The findings of this research contributed to such kind of previous cross-cultural studies in that what they discovered was confirmed for the first time in a sample that comprised participants from Turkic countries. Moreover, new understandings were brought to the emic leadership research, previously conducted only in Turkey, especially in a way to generalize their findings to other Turkic countries. For example, Paşa et al. (2001: 575) contributed to the emic leadership literature in Turkey by identifying the attributes of ideal leaders. They uncovered that relationship orientation (i.e., team integrating and paternalistic behaviors), task orientation, participation (i.e., consultation, team orientation, and valuing others), and charisma (i.e., being decisive, inspirational, and visionary) were attributes of ideal leaders in Turkey. The findings of Kabasakal et al. (2012: 526) were also supportive of previous leadership studies in Turkey. According to them, an ideal leader in Turkey should possess several qualities, such as being decisive, team integrator, visionary, honest, competent, inspirational, performance-oriented, diplomatic, collaborative, participative, self-sacrificing, and humane. Although they adopted a different approach, the findings of Karakitapoğlu-Aygün and Gümüşlüoğlu (2013: 118-120) also overlapped to a certain extent with the findings of previous emic studies. However, as distinct from others, they revealed an emic version of transformational leadership consisting of dimensions, such as considerate-paternalistic, inspiring-charismatic, and active-stimulating. Finally, in a recent emic study by Pagda et al. (2021: 10), findings revealed that since the first GLOBE research in Turkey, there were minor changes in the scores of outstanding leadership attributes, such as participative, team-oriented, humane-oriented, and charismatic. When the findings of these studies are taken together, it can be realized that the leadership characteristics uncovered in previous, separate research, overlap with each other to some extent in that they refer to charismatic, transformational, and paternalistic qualities in general. However, the most important limitation and shortcoming of previous emic studies could be the fact that when referring to the people, they only took into account those in Turkey. Thence, other Turkic contexts were not investigated. It is believed that this important limitation and shortcoming have been eliminated with this study. When the findings of previous emic studies and the findings of this study are evaluated together, it can be realized that except for some minor differences, the idealized leadership qualities of the people of Turkey can be generalized partially to other Turkic people. Although the differences between the leadership qualities identified in this study and those uncovered in previous emic studies are called minor, they are important as well. For example, as far as is known, as distinct from previous emic studies, in this research, some first-order leadership qualities, such as intuitive, agile, mediator, psychologically strong, orator, humoristic, moral, spiritual, tolerant, and willful, and some second-order leadership qualities, such as smart, brave, charming, and virtuous were identified for the first time. Another important difference from previous studies was that it has been shown that the identified ideal leadership qualities were valid not only in Turkey but also in all Turkic communities. Therefore, it is believed that the findings of this study made a significant theoretical contribution to both the international leadership literature and the leadership literature of Turkic countries.

In addition to these theoretical contributions, some significant practical inferences can also be made. For example, identifying the ideal leadership style of Turkic people can help prospective expatriate managers who will work in Turkic countries to fit themselves into the leadership expectancies of Turkic people. In this way, leaders of any type of organization in Turkic countries can not only achieve organizational objectives efficiently but also win the hearts and minds of their followers. Further, findings can help faculty of business schools and/or political schools to improve their undergraduate and postgraduate curriculum in a way to make their students and/or trainees aware of the leadership expectancies and prototype of Turkic society. In this way, prospective business, public, and/or political leaders who will graduate from these programs and who have an interest in the Turkic people can learn the framework of ideal leadership through the eyes of Turkic society. It can be expected that such a contribution will enable the establishment of healthier and longer-term relations with Turkic countries in the future. Moreover, defining the ideal leadership style of the Turkic people can enhance the ongoing efforts toward the development of commercial, political, and cultural cooperation, integration, and coordination between the Turkic states and the other states of the world.

Despite these significant contributions, however, there are some limitations of this study. Although as many participants as possible were tried to be reached, the number of participants might not have been large enough. This situation can threaten the generalizability of the findings. Nevertheless, due to the saturated responses and their significant frequencies, it could be assumed that the findings had an acceptable level of validity and reliability. However, since such a study was conducted for the first time, collecting data from a larger sample would have enhanced its validity and reliability. In this regard, in the future, researchers can repeat this research on a larger number of participants from Turkic countries to test the generalizability and accuracy of the findings. Another limitation could be that national cultural characteristics were not included within the scope of the research. To put it more clearly, since the cultural characteristics of the participants were not investigated in this study, the relationship between participants' expectations of cultural values, and their expectations of an ideal leader prototype were not revealed. Hence, in the future, the expectations of participants from Turkic countries about cultural values can be investigated. In line with the approach used in this study, shared cultural values between Turkic states can be revealed in the light of historical facts and extant literature. In addition, how the shared cultural values of Turkic people relate to their ideal leadership prototype can be investigated. Moreover, a Turkic ideal leadership style scale can be developed to measure the effectiveness of leaders operating in any type of organization in Turkic states.

6. CONCLUSION

In this research, as far as is known, for the first time, the *Turkic ideal leadership style* has been identified. By this means, it is believed that an important practical need has been met and a significant theoretical gap has been filled. Also, in line with an emic approach, it was emphasized that in terms of leadership expectations, it would be more accurate to evaluate the Turks living in Turkey together with the people of other Turkic states rather than Arabic countries. As a matter of fact, the results showed that there was a great deal of overlap among Turkic people in terms of ideal leadership expectations. This fact can be considered proof of the cultural affinity of the Turkic people. In this respect, it is believed that this emic study has opened new avenues for new research to be made in the future and has contributed significantly to the extant leadership literature.

REFERENCES

- Arslan, M. (2001). "A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Achievement and Power Orientation as Leadership Dimensions in Three European Countries: Britain, Ireland, and Turkey", *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 10/4, 340-345.
- Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller J., Stahl, G., Kurshid, A. (2000). "Impact of Culture on Human Resource Management Practices: A 10-Country Comparison", *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49/1, 192-221.
- Aycan, Z. and Fikret-Paşa, S. (2003). "Career Choices, Job Selection Criteria, and Leadership Preferences in a Transitional Nation: The Case of Turkey", *Journal of Career Development*, 30/2, 129-144.
- Aycan, Z. (2006). "Paternalism: Towards Conceptual Refinement and Operationalization", *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology: Understanding People in Context*, (Ed: Kim, U. et al.), Springer, Boston.
- Aycan, Z. (2008). "Cross-Cultural Approaches to Leadership", *The Handbook of Cross-Cultural Management Research*, (Ed: Smith, P. B. et al.), Sage.
- Aycan, Z. (2014). "Paternalistic Leadership", *Encyclopedia of Management Vol. 6.*, (Ed: Cooper, C.), Wiley & Sons.
- Boyacigiller, N. A. and Adler, N. J. (1991). "The Parochial Dinosaur: Organizational Science in a Global Context", *Academy of Management Review*, 16/2, 262-290.
- Brodbeck, F. C. et al. (2000). "Cultural Variation of Leadership Prototypes Across 22 European Countries", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73/1, 1-29.
- Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., and Menon, S. T. (2000). "Charismatic Leadership and Follower Effects", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21/7, 747-767.
- Den Hartog, D. N. et al. (1999). Culture Specific and Cross-Culturally Generalizable Implicit Leadership Theories: Are Attributes of Charismatic/Transformational Leadership Universally Endorsed?", *Leadership Quarterly*, 10/2, 219-256.

- Dorfman, P. W., Hibino, S., Lee, J. K., Tate, U., and Bautista, A. (1997). "Leadership in Western and Asian Countries: Commonalities and Differences in Effective Leadership Processes Across Cultures", *Leadership Quarterly*, 8/3, 233–274.
- Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., Dastmalchian, A., and House, R. (2012). "GLOBE: A Twenty Year Journey into The Intriguing World of Culture and Leadership", *Journal of World Business*, 47/4, 504-518.
- Ensari, N. and Murphy, S. E. (2003). Cross-Cultural Variations in Leadership Perceptions and Attribution of Charisma to The Leader", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 92/1-2, 52–66.
- Garibova, J. (2011). "A Pan-Turkic Dream: Language Unification of Turks", *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity: The Success-Failure Continuum in Language and Ethnic Identity Efforts Volume 2*, (Ed: Fishman, J. A. and Garcia, O.), Oxford University Press.
- Gerstner, C. R. and Day, D. D. (1994). "Cross-Cultural Comparison of Leadership Prototypes", *Leadership Quarterly*, 5/2, 121–134.
- Golden, P. B. (1992). *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples*, Otto Harrassowitz.
- Golden, P. B. (1998). "Turkic Peoples: A Historical Sketch", *The Turkic Languages*, (Ed: Johanson, L. and Csato, E. A.), Routledge.
- Hall, E. T. and Hall, M. R. (1990). *Understanding Cultural Differences*, Intercultural Press.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*, Sage.
- Hofstede, G. and Bond, M. H. (1988). "The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth", *Organizational Dynamics*, 16/4, 5–21.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*, Sage.
- House, R., Javidan, M., and Dorfman, P. (2001). "Project GLOBE: An introduction", *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50/4, 489-505.
- Jackofsky, E. F., Slocum, J. W., and McQuaid, S. J. (1988). "Cultural Values and the CEO: Alluring Companions?", *Academy of Management Executive*, 2/1, 39-49.
- Kabasakal, H. and Dastmalchian, A. (2001). "Introduction to The Special Issue on Leadership and Culture in The Middle East", *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50/4, 479-488.
- Kabasakal, H. and Bodur, M. (2002). "Arabic Cluster: A Bridge between East and West", *Journal of World Business*, 37/1, 40–54.
- Kabasakal, H., Dastmalchian, A., Karaçay, G., and Bayraktar, S. (2012). "Leadership and Culture in The MENA Region: An Analysis of The GLOBE Project", *Journal of World Business*, 47/4, 519-529.
- Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z. and Gümüslüoğlu, L. (2013). "Dönüştürücü Liderliğin Türkiye Bağlamında Yeniden Kavramsallaştırılması", *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 28/72, 105-124.
- Kenney, R. A., Blascovich, J., and Shaver, P. R. (1994). "Implicit Leadership Theories: Prototypes for New Leaders", *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 15/4, 409–437.
- Kluckhohn, F. R. and Strodtbeck, F. L. (1976). *Variations in Value Orientations*, Greenwood Press.
- Kostik, Z., Şahin, B., Demir, C., Kavuncubaşı, Ş., and Şen, D. (2005). "An Evaluation of the Leadership Attitudes of Managers in Turkish Armed Forces' Hospitals", *Military Medicine*, 170/3, 247-250.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*, Sage Publications.
- Lord, R. G., de Vader, C. L., and Alliger, G. M. (1986). "A Meta-Analysis of the Relation between Personality Traits and Leadership Perceptions: An Application of Validity Generalization Procedures", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71/3, 402–410.
- Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., and Dukerich, J. M. (1985). "The Romance of Leadership", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30/1, 78–102.
- Özbilgin, M. F. (2011). Leadership in Turkey: Towards an Evidence Based and Contextual Approach", *Leadership Development in The Middle East*, (Ed: Metcalfe, B. D. and Mimouni, F.), Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Pagda, Z., Bayraktar, S., and Jimenez, A. (2021). "Exploring Culture and Leadership After 23 years: A Replication of GLOBE Project in Turkey", *Journal of International Management*, 27/1, 1-17.
- Paşa, S. F., Kabasakal, H., and Bodur, M. (2001). "Society, Organisations, and Leadership in Turkey", *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50/4, 559-589.
- Pellegrini, E. K. and Scandura, T. A. (2008). "Paternalistic Leadership: A Review and Agenda for Future Research", *Journal of Management*, 34/3, 566-593.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1999). "A Theory of Cultural Values and Some Implications for Work", *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48/1, 23-47.
- Shaw, J. B. (1990). "A Cognitive Categorization Model for The Study of Intercultural Management", *Academy of Management Review*, 15/4, 626-645.
- Shondrick, S. J., Dinh, J. E., and Lord, R. G. (2010). "Developments in Implicit Leadership Theory and Cognitive Science: Applications to Improving Measurement and Understanding Alternatives to Hierarchical Leadership", *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21/6, 959-978.
- Trompenaars, F. and Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*, McGraw-Hill.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society. An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, (Ed: Roth, G. and Wittich, C.), University of California Press.
- Yörük, D., DüNDAR, S., and Topçu, B. (2011). "Türkiye'deki Belediye Başkanlarının Liderlik Tarzı ve Liderlik Tarzını Etkileyen Faktörler", *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 11/1, 103-109.
- Yukl, G. (1989). "Managerial Leadership: A Review of Theory and Research", *Journal of Management*, 15/2, 251-289.

Appendix-1

Table 1: Participants

Criteria	Azerbaijan		Kazakhstan		Kyrgyzstan		Uzbekistan		Turkmenistan		Turkey		Total		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Gender	Male	17	42,50	21	55,26	17	51,52	22	56,41	20	58,82	19	47,5	116	51,79
	Female	23	57,50	17	44,74	16	48,48	17	43,59	14	41,18	21	52,5	108	48,21
	Total	40	100,00	38	100,00	33	100,00	39	100,00	34	100,00	40	100	224	100,00
Education level	Highschool	7	17,50	4	10,53	5	15,15	7	17,95	3	8,82	6	15	32	14,29
	Bachelor's degree	17	42,50	18	47,37	15	45,45	15	38,46	16	47,06	16	40	97	43,30
	Master's degree	12	30,00	10	26,32	9	27,27	11	28,21	10	29,41	11	27,5	63	28,13
	Doctoral degree	4	10,00	6	15,79	4	12,12	6	15,38	5	14,71	7	17,5	32	14,29
Total	40	100,00	38	100,00	33	100,00	39	100,00	34	100,00	40	100	224	100,00	
Profession	engineer	1	2,50	2	5,26	0	0,00	1	2,56	0	0,00	2	5	6	2,68
	teacher	6	15,00	5	13,16	3	9,09	4	10,26	5	14,71	3	7,5	26	11,61
	graduate student	9	22,50	8	21,05	7	21,21	5	12,82	7	20,59	10	25	46	20,54
	doctoral student	5	12,50	4	10,53	2	6,06	5	12,82	3	8,82	6	15	25	11,16
	nurse	2	5,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	0	0,00	1	2,94	3	7,5	6	2,68
	medical doctor	3	7,50	0	0,00	1	3,03	3	7,69	4	11,76	4	10	15	6,70
	academician	4	10,00	6	15,79	4	12,12	6	15,38	5	14,71	7	17,5	32	14,29
	business person/specialist	5	12,50	6	15,79	8	24,24	7	17,95	6	17,65	5	12,5	37	16,52
	translator	5	12,50	7	18,42	8	24,24	8	20,51	3	8,82	0	0	31	13,84
	Total	40	100,00	38	100,00	33	100,00	39	100,00	34	100,00	40	100	224	100,00
Marital status	Single	23	57,50	24	63,16	21	63,64	23	58,97	20	58,82	23	57,5	134	59,82
	Married	17	42,50	14	36,84	12	36,36	16	41,03	14	41,18	17	42,5	90	40,18
	Total	40	100,00	38	100,00	33	100,00	39	100,00	34	100,00	40	100	224	100,00
Age	Min-Max	M(SD)	Min-Max	M(SD)	Min-Max	M(SD)	Min-Max	M(SD)	Min-Max	M(SD)	Min-Max	M(SD)	Min-Max	M(SD)	
	25-56	37,35(7,39)	26-48	37(5,86)	28-50	37,79(6,22)	24-49	39,64(6,63)	26-49	35,59(7,34)	25-48	37,45(6,93)	24-56	37,50(6,79)	

Appendix-2

Table 2: Construct of Ideal Leadership Style among Turkic People

Components	Themes	Codes	Azerbaijan		Kazakhstan		Kyrgyzstan		Uzbekistan		Turkmenistan		Turkey		Total	
			Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
charismatic	visionary	future-oriented	24	60,0	27	71,1	11	33,3	15	38,5	21	61,8	25	62,5	123	54,9
		foresighted	11	27,5	14	36,8	19	57,6	16	41,0	15	44,1	21	52,5	96	42,9
		change agent	6	15,0	16	42,1	14	42,4	17	43,6	30	88,2	23	57,5	106	47,3
		transformative	12	30,0	13	34,2	9	27,3	20	51,3	24	70,6	12	30	90	40,2
		intuitive	15	37,5	15	39,5	7	21,2	24	61,5	21	61,8	14	35	96	42,9
	stimulating	proactive	23	57,5	17	44,7	24	72,7	37	94,9	22	64,7	15	37,5	138	61,6
		energetic	32	80,0	19	50,0	22	66,7	24	61,5	26	76,5	9	22,5	132	58,9
		encouraging	33	82,5	21	55,3	23	69,7	28	71,8	27	79,4	11	27,5	143	63,8
		agile	7	17,5	20	52,6	18	54,5	26	66,7	31	91,2	4	10	106	47,3
		ambitious	10	25,0	29	76,3	19	57,6	24	61,5	21	61,8	9	22,5	112	50,0
		enthusiastic	4	10,0	27	71,1	21	63,6	24	61,5	15	44,1	21	52,5	112	50,0
		assertive	26	65,0	31	81,6	29	87,9	21	53,8	11	32,4	10	25	128	57,1
		determined	28	70,0	34	89,5	19	57,6	16	41,0	9	26,5	7	17,5	113	50,4
	smart	logical	16	40,0	30	78,9	20	60,6	14	35,9	10	29,4	9	22,5	99	44,2
		literate	24	60,0	37	97,4	21	63,6	16	41,0	25	73,5	11	27,5	134	59,8
creative		34	85,0	35	92,1	22	66,7	14	35,9	27	79,4	13	32,5	145	64,7	
mediator		3	7,5	24	63,2	26	78,8	9	23,1	3	8,8	15	37,5	80	35,7	
knowledgable		24	60,0	29	76,3	23	69,7	11	28,2	24	70,6	21	52,5	132	58,9	
problem solver		24	60,0	27	71,1	27	81,8	12	30,8	13	38,2	17	42,5	120	53,6	
intelligent		28	70,0	26	68,4	29	87,9	13	33,3	26	76,5	15	37,5	137	61,2	
self-sacrificial		27	67,5	27	71,1	18	54,5	15	38,5	21	61,8	13	32,5	121	54,0	
brave	iniate taker	35	87,5	31	81,6	17	51,5	16	41,0	12	35,3	12	30	123	54,9	
	responsible	26	65,0	30	78,9	30	90,9	27	69,2	29	85,3	23	57,5	165	73,7	
	psychologically strong	6	15,0	12	31,6	19	57,6	7	17,9	2	5,9	8	20	54	24,1	
	risk bearer	19	47,5	19	50,0	24	72,7	18	46,2	17	50,0	14	35	111	49,6	
charming	orator	22	55,0	27	71,1	26	78,8	21	53,8	23	67,6	26	65	145	64,7	
	good looking	14	35,0	15	39,5	15	45,5	14	35,9	22	64,7	16	40	96	42,9	
	well-dressed	20	50,0	19	50,0	16	48,5	13	33,3	10	29,4	7	17,5	85	37,9	
	attractive	16	40,0	30	78,9	17	51,5	18	46,2	9	26,5	3	7,5	93	41,5	
	extraordinary	17	42,5	31	81,6	13	39,4	17	43,6	4	11,8	12	30	94	42,0	
	sociable	23	57,5	28	73,7	14	42,4	16	41,0	11	32,4	19	47,5	111	49,6	
	humoristic	6	15,0	26	68,4	12	36,4	8	20,5	1	2,9	5	12,5	58	25,9	
	imitatee	3	7,5	21	55,3	10	30,3	9	23,1	8	23,5	16	40	67	29,9	
	emulated	4	10,0	16	42,1	11	33,3	5	12,8	2	5,9	6	15	44	19,6	
paternalistic	virtuous	cultivated	24	60,0	19	50,0	18	54,5	11	28,2	16	47,1	13	32,5	101	45,1
		decent	21	52,5	14	36,8	19	57,6	14	35,9	17	50,0	20	50	105	46,9
		ethical	16	40,0	19	50,0	20	60,6	34	87,2	28	82,4	24	60	141	62,9
		moral	14	35,0	16	42,1	21	63,6	24	61,5	7	20,6	26	65	108	48,2
		believer	12	30,0	13	34,2	23	69,7	13	33,3	11	32,4	27	67,5	99	44,2
		honest	19	47,5	25	65,8	27	81,8	19	48,7	19	55,9	31	77,5	140	62,5
		dependable	25	62,5	26	68,4	26	78,8	12	30,8	27	79,4	24	60	140	62,5
		fair	27	67,5	30	78,9	24	72,7	16	41,0	30	88,2	35	87,5	162	72,3
		generous	34	85,0	34	89,5	23	69,7	24	61,5	33	97,1	27	67,5	175	78,1
		spiritual	9	22,5	26	68,4	26	78,8	7	17,9	12	35,3	12	30	92	41,1
	patient	11	27,5	24	63,2	12	36,4	14	35,9	24	70,6	6	15	91	40,6	
	mature	16	40,0	29	76,3	10	30,3	16	41,0	16	47,1	12	30	99	44,2	
	caring	positive	27	67,5	12	31,6	12	36,4	23	59,0	10	29,4	18	45	102	45,5
		supportive	25	62,5	9	23,7	13	39,4	27	69,2	17	50,0	14	35	105	46,9
		listener	29	72,5	8	21,1	10	30,3	12	30,8	4	11,8	9	22,5	72	32,1
participative		30	75,0	11	28,9	14	42,4	16	41,0	12	35,3	13	32,5	96	42,9	
constructive		32	80,0	3	7,9	16	48,5	24	61,5	17	50,0	12	30	104	46,4	
protector		37	92,5	35	92,1	28	84,8	31	79,5	32	94,1	28	70	191	85,3	
mentor		26	65,0	7	18,4	14	42,4	12	30,8	7	20,6	9	22,5	75	33,5	
friendly		18	45,0	11	28,9	16	48,5	16	41,0	6	17,6	15	37,5	82	36,6	
polite		16	40,0	15	39,5	14	42,4	8	20,5	5	14,7	7	17,5	65	29,0	
compassionate		20	50,0	16	42,1	12	36,4	19	48,7	13	38,2	6	15	86	38,4	
authoritative	helpful	26	65,0	24	63,2	13	39,4	12	30,8	16	47,1	11	27,5	102	45,5	
	tolerant	24	60,0	27	71,1	16	48,5	12	30,8	13	38,2	15	37,5	107	47,8	
	empathetic	28	70,0	23	60,5	18	54,5	13	33,3	19	55,9	4	10	105	46,9	
	sensitive	28	70,0	18	47,4	21	63,6	4	10,3	7	20,6	10	25	88	39,3	
	willful	34	85,0	27	71,1	29	87,9	18	46,2	20	58,8	13	32,5	141	62,9	
	orderly	25	62,5	29	76,3	24	72,7	16	41,0	27	79,4	14	35	135	60,3	
	organizer	18	45,0	28	73,7	22	66,7	27	69,2	25	73,5	12	30	132	58,9	
	disciplined	29	72,5	31	81,6	21	63,6	25	64,1	28	82,4	16	40	150	67,0	
planned	37	92,5	30	78,9	26	78,8	31	79,5	30	88,2	8	20	162	72,3		
strong-minded	30	75,0	28	73,7	27	81,8	34	87,2	24	70,6	14	35	157	70,1		

Beyan ve Açıklamalar (Disclosure Statements)

1. Bu çalışmanın yazarları, araştırma ve yayın etiği ilkelerine uyduklarını kabul etmektedirler (The authors of this article confirm that their work complies with the principles of research and publication ethics).
2. Yazarlar tarafından herhangi bir çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir (No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors).
3. Bu çalışma, intihal tarama programı kullanılarak intihal taramasından geçirilmiştir (This article was screened for potential plagiarism using a plagiarism screening program).