School Leadership and Communication: A Systematic Review [1]

Volkan Canatan[2] (iD), Neslihan Hatipoğlu[3] (iD) Halil Kibar[4] (iD), Hasan Kizilkaya[5] (iD) Mehmet Erkan Aksay[6] (iD)

Abstract

In recent years, there has been a significant increase in the awareness of communication and interaction among the vast majority of people from all over the world. The increase in this awareness has also caused a change in the understanding of management and leadership. Since ancient philosophers, 'leadership' has been regarded as one of the most important, perhaps even the most important, factor affecting the success or failure of an organization. For this reason, understanding the executive leadership styles will have the potential to contribute to business life in general, as well as providing new intuitions to researchers interested in management science. Leaders are people who can increase the organizational commitment of employees with their characteristics, management and direction skills and methods. In order for today's organizations to be successful and to continue their existence, the necessity of adopting contemporary leadership approaches as well as classical leadership approaches has emerged. In this direction, the aim of this study is to introduce the leadership styles by scanning the literature and to contribute to the specific areas of knowledge that are missing. This study presents leadership and its definitions, historical review of leadership, leadership theory, leadership styles and general theoretical framework.

Keywords: school leadership, communication, leadership styles

Okul Liderliği ve İletişim: Sistematik Derleme

Özet

Son yıllarda dünyanın her yerinden insanların büyük bir çoğunluğunda iletişim ve etkileşim farkındalığında önemli bir artış olmuştur. Bu farkındalığın artması yöneticilik ve liderlik anlayışında da değişikliğe neden olmuştur. Antik çağ felsefecilerinden beri 'liderlik' bir örgütün başarısını veyahut başarısızlığını etkileyen en önemli faktörlerden biri, hatta belki de en önemlisi olarak kabul edilmiştir. Bu nedenle yönetici liderlik tarzlarını kavramak genel olarak iş hayatına pratik yönlendirici katkıları olma potansiyeli yanında yönetim bilimi ile ilgilenen araştırmacılara da yeni sezgiler sunma imkânı verebilecektir. Liderler, sahip oldukları özellikleri, yönetme ve yöneltme becerileri ve yöntemleri ile çalışanların örgütsel bağlılığını artırabilecek kişilerdir. Günümüz örgütlerinin başarılı olabilmesi ve varlığını devam ettirebilmesi için klasik liderlik yaklaşımlarının yanı sıra çağdaş liderlik yaklaşımlarının benimsenmesi gerekliliği ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu doğrultuda bu çalışmanın amacı literatür taraması yaparak liderlik tarzlarının tanıtılması ve eksik olan belirli bilgi alanlarına katkıda bulunmayı amaçlamıştır. Bu çalışma, liderlik ve tanımları, liderliğin tarihsel olarak gözden geçirilmesi, liderlik teorisi, liderlik tarzları ve genel teorik çerçeve şeklinde sunulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: okul liderliği, iletişim, liderlik tarzları

Introduction

The Role of Communication

Interaction, as defined by Malamah-Thomas (1987), is a process in which both the addressee and the addressee act in reciprocity to elicit a response, resulting in an action taken by the addressee in return. As the above definition suggests, interaction actually involves more than communication. In other words, the roles performed by different participants in a given setting are constantly subject to change. In a sense, if there is an interaction between the two, they can immediately change the roles of both the addressee and the addressee. As Ellis (2008) argues, effective teaching can be promoted through

interaction, and students can find the opportunity to develop their own language skills either by actively practicing or by actively applying them in the society in which they live.

Regarding the interactional hypothesis, Long (1996) suggests that effective language acquisition occurs when students actively communicate in the target language. He also continues between the interactional hypothesis and the experiential learning theory by stating that students are more likely to learn how to perform a task by doing or experiencing a task.

One of the important points highlighted by the interaction hypothesis is that if students are provided with a classroom environment where they are given the opportunity to interact with each other, they will be able to perform more efficiently in the tasks assigned to them. To this end, the acquisition process will be improved as the tasks they undertake require them to perform beyond their current competencies. Given this, there is no doubt that a two-way communication is more important than a one-way communication to support the second language acquisition process. Similarly, it is argued by Ellis (2008) that verbal interaction is very important in interactionist theories in the language learning process. In addition, it argues that effective interaction is assumed to provide students with comprehensible inputs with data to encourage further acquisition.

Willingness to Communicate and Its Theoretical Basis

The willingness to communicate (TWO) was described by MacIntyre et al. (1998) "intention or preference to engage in or initiate communication when given the choice" (p. 5). TWO in a second or foreign language has become one of the most specialized research areas of recent times in terms of contemporary language education. One of the earliest attempts to explore the nature of communication dates back to 1958 and 1959, when psycho-sociologist Theodore Clevenger began investigating the relationship between public speaking and stage fright. In this sense, a paper by Clevenger published in 1959 inspired further research on approach and avoidance in communication and is therefore considered groundbreaking in this area of research (McCroskey, 1982).

As a continuation of research in this area, Phillips (1965) investigated communication anxiety and silence in communication. Silence was evaluated as a personality-based anxiety disorder, as suggested by the researcher. Initially, the researcher hypothesized that anxiety might be the primary cause of silence in speech communication. However, in his later work (1984, 1986 and 1997), he began to reject his earlier argument about silence, noting that the main cause of reticence was indeed a lack of communication skills. Phillips (1984) also suggested that people who are seen as reticent in communication may not have inadequate social skills, but actually tend to think so.

Thanks to the work and efforts of Clevenger and Phillip in this area, subsequent researchers willing to delve deeper into communication then began to conceptualize the desire to communicate, as well as two well-studied communication factors: Communication Anxiety (CA) and Self-Perceived Communication Competence. (SPCC) (McCroskey, 1997). Related to this, a number of eminent scholars and linguists began to explore various fields of research related to communication. As an example, McCroskey (1970) investigated communication anxiety and its main factors, Burgoon (1976) focused on reluctance to communicate, and McCroskey and Richmond (1982) examined shyness as an affective factor that could affect the language learning process of individuals.

Leadership

The word leader is often used synonymously with the word manager. Actually, these two words have different meanings. A person in a managerial position is not required to have leadership abilities. However, in order to be a good manager, it is imperative to have leadership qualities. Accordingly, leadership is a person's ability to direct others and influence their behavior positively (Koçel, 2001). So why do people accept the influence of the leader? In other words, what is the leader's source of influence? The answer to this question must be sought in the power of the leader. Power is the ability to influence the behavior of others. The word power here should not be confused with the word authority, which expresses the opportunities and privileges given to a person due to being in a position. Authority is given, and power arises from one's own abilities (Çalışkan, 2009). It is necessary to collect the types of power in six groups. These are (Çalışkan, 2009);

1. Formal power: It arises from representing a certain office in the organizational hierarchy and using the powers provided by that office. As powers increase, so does formal power.

2. Reward power: It derives from the leader's ability to provide rewards (increase in pay, bonuses, better place to work, recognition, vacation leave, raises, etc.) and control the people he leads or members of the follower group. The greater the leader's power to control or provide valuable rewards, the greater his rewarding power.

3. The power of intimidation: the leader punishes the group members in different ways when they do not display the desired behavior; criticism can be in the form of temporary dismissal, reprimand or warning (assigning a job task to a lower level task). The greater the leader's freedom to punish, the greater the power of intimidation.

4. Expert power: It results from the group's respect for the special knowledge, skills and experience that the leader has, in short, expertise.

5. Informing power: It arises from the leader's possession of important information about the work, operations, plans and programs in the organization and the dissemination and distribution of this information. Managers generally access this information more easily than subordinates and hold the initiative to disseminate it within the organization.

6. Power based on liking: This power arises from the leader's personal qualities or charisma, such as being admirable in the eyes of the group members, attractiveness, sympathy, likability. By using one or more of these powers, the leader influences the behavior of the group to a certain extent. Although the members of the group depend on their personal qualities, they generally have expertise and power of appreciation; while the formal, informing and rewarding powers are respected when done in a reasoned and appropriate manner; the power to punish is often not obeyed when it is met with backlash.

Many studies have been carried out in order to determine different types of leaders according to their behavior patterns. Among them, the most important ones are; Iowa Studies, Tannenbaum and Schmidt Studies, and Michigan Studies. X and Y theories can also be used to explain the behavior patterns of leaders. On the other hand, a lot of research has been done taking into account the situation of the leader and different leadership theories have been put forward. The most popular among these is Fiedler's contingency theory (Çalışkan, 2009). It is possible to collect leadership types in three different categories. These are (Çetin and Mutlu, 2010): The period of trait and attribute theories (between 450-1940s

BC), the period of behavioral theories (1940-1960s) and the period of contingency theories (from the 1960s to the present).

1. Trait and attribute theories; In the early 1900s, many studies were conducted to seek answers to the questions of "who becomes a leader in an organization or group, or which leader or leadership style is successful". For this reason, leadership studies first developed in line with the investigation of the personality traits of the leader.

2. Behavioral theories: According to behavioral scientists, leadership is formed through a process of interaction based on the role played by an individual in a group and how this role shapes the expectations of other members. According to the behavioral theories, the leader should support the efforts of the group members, exhibit their personal values and show the organizational processes clearly.

3. Contingency theories: These approaches are based on the view that there will be no universal leadership behavior. Leadership effectiveness will be gained by exhibiting appropriate behavior for the situation. This approach argued that participatory leadership would be appropriate when there are well-educated, responsible and committed employees, and in the opposite case, autocratic leadership would be appropriate.

1.4. Purpose of the Study: This research was carried out in order to emphasize the importance of leadership that should be formed at school in order to provide quality education to students, to emphasize how to communicate with parents and teachers, and to clarify the problems experienced in communication with parents.

 1.5. Importance of Research: It is possible to mention many in-school and out-of-school factors that affect students' school success. Leadership approaches of school administrators towards teachers and parents are very important in terms of ensuring work peace.

Method

The systematic review method was used in this study, which aims to examine the researches on school leadership and communication from the structuring to the conclusion. A systematic review is a review of a clearly defined problem using systematic and clear methods to identify, select, and critically evaluate relevant research, and to collect and analyze data from studies included in the review (Torgerson, 2003; Millar, 2004; Littell, Corcoran, & Pillai, 2008). In this research, it is aimed to determine and evaluate the studies on 'School leadership and communication'. Millar (2004) emphasized that certain steps should be followed in systematic review studies. Accordingly, in the systematic review; It is necessary to determine the purpose clearly, to select the articles included in the research according to the determined criteria, to determine the main features of the selected articles and to make inferences with the information obtained from the articles. In this context, the structure of this research was formed by paying attention to the specified rules.

In the systematic compilation process carried out within the framework of the determined research questions, the studies conducted between 2002 and 2022 were examined. Studies published between these specified dates; Obtained from ERIC, ULAKBIM, Academic Google databases. While searching, the keywords 'School leadership and communication' in the Turkish search and 'School Leadership and Communication' in the English search were primarily preferred. While deciding on the studies included in the evaluation, attention was paid to the fact that the studies were only related to school

leadership and communication. While making the evaluation, only the sections related to school leadership and communication were taken into consideration. On the other hand, the published research in the study consisted of only articles. Theses, papers and books were not included in the research. While selecting the determined articles; As stated in the rule of systematic review, the aim and questions of the research were the main determinants.

In this framework, in this study, which was designed according to the systematic review method, the researches;

- It was published between 2002-2022,
- An article on school leadership and communication,
- It has been taken into account that it includes stakeholders in the conduct of school leadership and communication.

The studies included in the review were conducted between 1996 and 2012. The samples included in the studies included in the study consisted of school administrators. In the studies, it was observed that the sample consisted of at most 756 (Ergin, 2012) and at least 113 (Artan, 1996) people.

Results

Leadershıp Styles

In today's competitive environment brought by globalization, the expectations and wishes of managers and employees have led to the emergence of new approaches in the field of leadership. There are basically eleven different leadership approaches.

Democratic Leadership: In democratic leadership; the leader consults with his subordinates and encourages them to participate in planning, decision-making and organizing activities. In other words, the leader encourages his subordinates to be a part of the decision making process. In addition, employees are informed about the situations affecting their work, and they are encouraged by the leader to express their ideas and make suggestions.

*Autocratic Leadership***:** Autocratic leadership is a leadership style suitable for people who have grown up in bureaucratic societies and have received this education and have a certain background. Since leaders or managers do not take the feelings and thoughts of employees or subordinates into consideration, job dissatisfaction is maximum and commitment to the organization is minimal. In autocratic leader behavior, the decision-making process is very fast because authority is concentrated in the center. In other words, autocratic leaders take all the decisions themselves without transferring their authority and responsibilities, and do not allow subordinates to participate in the decision-making process (Tunçay, 2013).

*Leadership Allowing Full Freedom***:** In leadership that allows full freedom; The leader is based on subordinates making their own decisions, allowing subordinates to set their own goals and make goals, plans and programs for each follower within the resources given to him. This type of leadership can be applied in professional expertise, in the work of scientists, and in the development of creative and innovative ideas by employees with high knowledge, experience and expertise working in research and development departments of enterprises (Tunçay, 2013).

*Supportive Leadership***:** In supportive leadership; the behavior of the leader is accepted as a sympathetic, friendly behavior aimed at meeting the needs of the subordinates (Tunçay,

2013). The leader does not make decisions together with the group members. However, it takes decisions based on their opinions and suggestions. It applies participation and reward systems. It is open to two-way information flow, bottom-up and top-down. Organizational goals are determined after consulting the members of the organization and delivered to the members with orders (Tunçay, 2013).

Visionary Leadership: A visionary leader is someone who acts in a visionary manner. Leaders of this style are people who have the power to think that allows them to successfully analyze uncertain data to be effective, and who can create ideas that can overcome problems and increase opportunities. However, visionary leaders are expected to be people who consistently seek alternative approaches around them ((Tunçay, 2013).

*Humanist Leadership***:** The most distinctive feature of the humanist leader is that he has paternal (patrimonial) behaviors, that is, he plays a protective role. In this approach, the leader occasionally seeks the opinion of those at the middle level. Motivates with emotional guidance. It mainly uses the reward system and does not punish unless it is necessary (Tunçay, 2013).

Authentic Leadership: Authentic leaders know who they are, what they believe in, and they act in line with these values and beliefs. Their supporters see their leaders as ethical people. Therefore, the main result of authentic leadership is trust. Authentic leaders share information, encourage open communication, and adhere strictly to their ideals (Tunçay, 2013).

Servant Leadership: Robert Greenleaf introduced the concept of "servant leadership" in 1970 and became the title of his book published in 1977. According to Greenleaf, the essence and primary responsibility of servant leadership is to serve subordinates and the organization. What is meant by the concept of "serving" here is the development, defense, and empowerment of subordinates. A serving leader should be more sensitive to the needs of his subordinates and help them to become healthier, wiser, and more willing to take responsibility. Such a leader should represent good and righteousness, even if it is not in the financial interest of the organization, and should be able to stand up to social injustice and inequality when necessary (Yukl, 2010).

Charismatic Leadership: Charismatic leaders are people who are highly self-confident, sensitive to their followers, foresight, express their vision clearly and have the impressive power needed in their environment. What makes charismatic leader different from others; It is the foresight, vision, ability to evaluate the situation clearly and multidimensionally, to adopt the values that one believes in, to lead people to their goals and to mobilize them for radical changes. Such leaders often emerge in times of transition or crisis. Because in this leadership, authority is gained automatically (Tunçay, 2013).

Transformational Leadership: Transformational leadership is a leadership style that aims to develop immediate and effective change in the organization. It is a combination of abilities that enable the leader to effectively initiate change, create the foresight to guide that change, and identify the need for that change. In another definition, transformational leadership is defined as a person who sets a definable vision for the organization by emphasizing the importance of the leader's need to be accepted as reliable by employees (Bass, 1990 as cited in Tunçay, 2013). Transformational leaders exhibit five different

management styles: "Ideal Influence/charisma, Ideal Behaviors, Suggestive Motivation, Interest at the Individual Level, and Mental Encouragement" (Tunçay, 2013).

Transactional Leadership: In transactional leadership, the leader considers the needs of his subordinates rather than making an effort to improve the personal values of his subordinates or to make them trust him, and tries to satisfy those needs when the subordinates reach the predetermined performance level (Tunçay, 2013). Transactional leadership is based on an exchange process in which the leader offers rewards to his subordinates and in return receives the performances and efforts of his subordinates (Tunçay, 2013). In other words, transactional leadership is an approach in which managers motivate their employees with clearly defined job descriptions and reward employees according to their efforts to reach goals (Doğan, 2007: 75). Transactional leaders exhibit three different management styles: "conditional rewarding, active management with exceptions, and passive management with exceptions" (Tunçay, 2013).

The literature has described a wide variety of leadership styles and structures that correspond to specific organizational or business conditions. The set of leadership styles has specific actions, structures, and perspectives and expectations of the leader, each with different strengths and weaknesses. It is not, however, that any of the profiled leadership styles are weak, but rather that they are useful in different contexts.

Leadership style refers to the approach that leaders prefer to use to influence their subordinates (Tunçay, 2013). While many leadership styles depend on the work environment, so far different styles have succeeded or failed between the leader and the employees.

The two leadership styles most commonly identified in the educational context are discussed, including tools used to measure leadership behaviors. Effective attributes and characteristics of each style are identified to form the basis for the leadership style component of the conceptual framework. These two leadership styles are transformational and transactional. According to Thrash (2012), transformational and transactional leadership are the most popular management styles in the current literature, assuming they produce desired results. For example, in the educational environment, transformational leadership causes a systematic change in schools and many administrators stated that this leadership is one of the preferred methods of leadership styles (Cited by Tunçay, 2013).

Laissez-faire Leadership Style: Laissez-faire leadership style, which is sometimes considered as a sub-dimension of the operational leadership style in the literature, is the behavior of the leader who avoids taking responsibility and showing his power to the followers (Çağlar, 2011).

It is the behavior of the leader that shows passive indifference to the task and subordinates. Ignoring problems or ignoring secondary needs are typical examples of the laissez-faire leadership style. This category of behavior is best described as the absence of effective leadership (Yukl, 2010). As the leader relinquishes responsibility, delays decisions, lacks feedback, and makes some effort to help the followers meet their needs, there is no exchange with followers or any attempt to help them grow.

*Servant Leadership Style***:** Servant leadership relies on leaders communicating one-on-one to understand the talents, needs, desires, goals, and potential of these individuals in order to

bring out the best in their followers. With the knowledge of each follower's unique characteristics and interests, leaders help followers reach their potential. This encouragement is done by building self-confidence, serving as a role model, giving confidence, and providing information, feedback, and resources (Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008).

Tunçay (2013) defined five dimensions of servant leadership style as altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping and organizational management. They all seem conceptually and empirically different.

The altruistic call describes a leader's deep-rooted desire to make a positive difference in the lives of others. It is the generosity of spirit that is consistent with a charitable purpose in life. Since the ultimate goal is to serve, leaders high in altruistic call will put the interests of others before their own and will diligently work to meet the needs of their followers. Emotional healing describes the leader's commitment and ability to promote spiritual healing from adversity or trauma. Leaders who use emotional healing are highly empathetic and excellent listeners, making them adept at facilitating the healing process. Leaders create safe environments for employees to raise personal and professional issues. Followers who experience personal traumas will turn to high leaders in emotional recovery (from Barbuto and Wheeler, 2006 as cited in Tunçay, 2013).

Wisdom can be understood as a combination of awareness of the environment and foresight of consequences. When these two traits are combined, leaders are adept at taking cues from the environment and understanding their impact. It is the perfect and practical ideal that combines the height of wisdom, knowledge and utility. Persuasive mapping describes the extent to which leaders use sound reasoning and mental frameworks. Leaders high in persuasive mapping have the ability to map and conceptualize greater possibilities and are persuasive when articulating these opportunities. They encourage others to visualize the future of the organization and are persuasive and provide compelling reasons to get others to do something. Organizational management describes the degree to which leaders prepare an organization to make a positive contribution to society. Organizational management describes the degree to which leaders prepare a community to make a positive contribution to society through community development, programs, and outreach. Organizational management includes an ethic or value to take responsibility for the welfare of society and to make sure that the strategies and decisions made reflect a commitment to give things back and leave better than they found it. They also work to develop a community spirit that is prepared to leave a positive legacy in the workplace (from Barbuto and Wheeler, 2006 as cited in Tunçay, 2013).

Servant leaders have a 'natural' feeling that they want to serve. They consciously choose to lead. Servant leaders have simultaneous goals that help others grow as individuals, become wiser, healthier, freer, more autonomous, and more likely to become servant leaders. When servant leaders succeed, those less privileged benefit. A servant leader is successful when followers reach and achieve the above-mentioned goals (Bass, 2006 as cited in Tunçay, 2013).

Supernatural Leadership Style: Tunçay (2013) identified four main cultural dimensions. The first dimension is called "individuality-collectivism". In individualist cultures, the individual is perceived as an "independent entity", while in collectivist cultures, he/she is perceived as an "interdependent entity". As a result, in individualistic cultures decision making is based on

individuals' own wishes and desires, whereas in collectivist cultures decisions are made jointly with 'in-group' (e.g. family, relatives, friends) and the main goal is to optimize. The second dimension is power distance. In remote cultures with high power, power inequality is accepted. Uncertainty avoidance, the third dimension, indicates the extent to which uncertainty is tolerated in society. It is less tolerated in high uncertainty avoiding cultures and more tolerated in low uncertainty avoiding cultures.

Finally, the masculinity and femininity dimension is about valid values and priorities. In masculine cultures, the achievement and accumulation of wealth is valued and strongly encouraged; maintaining good interpersonal relationships is a priority in feminine cultures (Aycan & Fikret-Paşa, 2003).

The paternalistic leadership style comes from paternalism, which is a cultural trait. There are some cultural assumptions that are compatible with paternity. These are collectivism, high power distance, high uncertainty avoidance, masculinity, assertiveness and pervasive culture. According to the research conducted by Aycan and Fikret-Paşa (2003) among 10 countries, paternalistic features are mostly seen in India, Pakistan, China and Turkey. In addition, according to the same research, it was found that power distance and collectivism are common cultural assumptions in these countries (Aycan and Kanungo, 2000 as cited in Tunçay, 2013).

The socio-cultural environment is changing. Since Hofstede's research (1980), Turkey has somehow become less collectivist (Aycan and Fikret-Paşa, 2003). According to the findings of the GLOBE project, Turkey is below the world average in terms of performance and future direction. Another outstanding cultural feature is paternalism. Aycan and Fikret-Paşa (2003) conceptualized and functionalized the paternalism structure in a recent study. Accordingly, paternalism has been defined as a subordinate-superior relationship, whereby people's authority assumes the role of a parent and is considered an obligation to provide support and protection to those under their care. Accordingly, subordinates respond to such care, support and protection of paternal authority by delaying loyalty and conforming to it (Aycan & Fikret-Paşa, 2003).

After briefly mentioning the definitions of the concept of leadership and clarifying the concepts of management and leadership, it is now useful to briefly discuss the leadership theories that have been developed in the literature until today.

A Brıef Overvıew Of Theorıes And Approaches To Leadershıp: When we look at the studies on leadership in management and business science, we see the characteristics approach between 1900 and 1940, behavioral approaches in the 1950s and 1960s, and contingency and conditional dependence approaches from the late 1960s to the 1980s (Çalışkan, 2009). After the 1980s, we see that new and contemporary leadership models such as charismatic and transformative leadership and attribution theory have begun to emerge.

Features Approach

The oldest of the theories developed about leadership in the management literature is the "traits approach". In the first half of the 20th century, studies on leadership focused on defining the universal leadership characteristics that make the leader a leader. It has been tried to prove that leaders have different personality traits from other people, that they are

born with these traits, and that people with these specific traits will be good and effective leaders (Çalışkan, 2009).

In order to define the ideal leader, the universal characteristics that distinguish the leader from the others were examined; As a result, leaders were examined in terms of physical appearance (such as height, appearance, age), skills (such as intelligence, speaking skills and knowledge level), and personality characteristics (such as dominance, emotional control, ability to express oneself, introversion and extroversion) (Caliskan, 2009).

In the trait theory, the characteristics of the leader are accepted as the most important factor that determines the effectiveness of the leadership process. A leader is a person who stands out from other group members with his characteristics. The theory of traits was not sufficient because it tried to examine the leadership process by only considering the leader variable. One of the most important difficulties encountered in research on this theory has been the difficulty of defining the characteristics of the leader in a way that can measure them, and the perception of a particular feature in different ways by different people (Koçel, 2001). Until the 1950s, when these studies could not consistently reveal the ideal universal leadership characteristics, the validity of the studies in this field was questioned and the studies gradually decreased.

However, in recent years, with the introduction of new personality factors and measurements with high consistency and validity in the field of industrial and organizational psychology, personality traits have started to resurface in determining leadership styles. As will be discussed in more detail in the future, one of the most studied theories along with leadership styles is the ranking of personality traits called the "Big Five". This and many studies that will be discussed in the personality and leadership section hereafter have shown that it is not possible to completely ignore the personality traits when examining the formation of leadership. In this study, the personality factor in the formation of leadership styles will not be ignored, and the effects of some recently developed personality traits and competencies will be examined. These variables are motivation to be a leader, one's self-worth, political ability, and the need for power, which we assume will strongly affect the leadership style, although it is based on a relatively old theory (Çalışkan, 2009).

Perhaps the most important point we will mention about the traits approach is that the view that leadership is innate and that the traits that make the leader a leader cannot be changed later, are replaced by traits and competencies that can be acquired later for an effective and educable leadership. This view, which combines the theory of features with the contingency approach, which will be discussed later, also reveals the current meaning and interpretation of the features approach (Çalışkan, 2009).

Behavioral Leadership Theories:

The main idea of the behavioral theory, which dominates the leadership literature after the trait theory, is that "what makes leaders successful and effective is the behavior of the leader rather than the characteristics of the leader" (Koçel, 2001).

The way the leader communicates with his subordinates, whether he delegates authority, how he plans and controls, how he sets goals, etc. Behaviors such as these are considered as important factors determining leader effectiveness. Various empirical studies have contributed to the development of behavioral leadership theory. The first of these

studies is leadership studies conducted by Ohio State and Michigan Universities and distinguishing business-oriented and relationship-oriented leaders from each other in the Western literature (Çalışkan, 2009).

The Ohio State University leadership studies began in 1945. The aim of this study, which investigated many managers with military and civilian samples, was to determine how the leader was defined. In the factor analysis, it was determined that two important independent variables played a role in defining leadership behavior. These two factors are personal consideration and initiative. The factor of considering the person refers to the behavior of the leader to create trust and respect on his followers and to develop friendship and friendship with them. This factor, beyond the classical understanding of human relations, means that the leader pays close attention to the needs and desires of the group members and acts accordingly. In short, this factor is based on the leader giving weight to his followers in his behavior.

The factor of initiative or focus on work refers to the behavior of the leader to set goals, organize the group members, determine the communication system, set deadlines for the work and give instructions in this direction, in order to complete the work related to the aim to be accomplished on time (Daft, 1994). In short, this factor expresses the weight that the leader gives to the work and the completion of the work in his behavior. The main findings of the Ohio State studies are that as the leader's personal behaviors increase, staff turnover and absenteeism decrease; group members' performance increases as the leader's initiative-based behaviors increase (Koçel, 2001).

University of Michigan leadership studies are a series of studies conducted in 1947 under the management of Rensis Likert. The aim of this study was to determine the factors that contribute to the satisfaction of the group members and the productivity of the group (Koçel, 2001). In these studies, criteria such as productivity, job satisfaction, staff turnover, complaints, absenteeism, cost and motivation were used. As a result of the research of employees in various industries and at various levels, as in the Ohio State study, it was seen that leadership behaviors were gathered under two factors. These two factors are person-oriented behavior and work-oriented behavior. According to this study, the work-oriented leader exhibits behavior that uses his formal authority largely based on punishment and position, closely checking whether group members work according to predetermined principles and methods. On the other hand, a person-oriented leader shows a behavior that is based on delegation of authority, is closely interested in the personal development and progress of his followers and employees in the development of working conditions that will increase the satisfaction of the group members. The general conclusion reached by this study is that an individual-oriented leadership behavior is more effective (Koçel, 2001).

In addition to Ohio State and Michigan University research, X and Y Theories developed by Douglas McGregor also present two different styles of leadership behaviors within the scope of behavioral leadership approach. According to McGregor, one of the most important factors determining the behavior of managers is their assumptions about human behavior (McGregor, 1957 as cited in Koçel, 2001).

According to McGregor's (1957) theory, an X-style manager behaves with the following assumptions: the average person does not like to work and tries to avoid work as much as possible, the average person does not want to take on responsibility, is not overly enthusiastic, and prefers security over anything else. Because of these characteristics, it

should force people to work, control them closely and punish them to achieve their goals. On the other hand, the assumptions gathered under the name of theory Y are as follows: work is as natural as play and rest for the person, the person is not innately lazy, it is the experiences that make him like this, the person works by controlling himself in line with the goals he has determined. Every person has potential and under favorable conditions one develops them and learns to take on more responsibilities. Therefore, what the manager needs to do is to create a suitable environment for people to develop themselves and to use the energy they have for their purposes (Koçel, 2001).

Accordingly, while the managers who believe in the X theory will show more authoritarian and intrusive behavior, those who adopt the assumptions of the Y theory will show a more democratic and participatory behavior.

Another of the most well-known behavioral theories about leadership is the System 4 (1961, 1967) approach developed by Likert. According to the model in Likert's study, which is a continuation of the University of Michigan research, managers' behaviors are grouped into 4 types according to the criteria of trust in subordinates, perceived freedom by subordinates, and relationship with superiors. These leadership styles are: abusive autocratic, benevolent autocratic, participatory and democratic leadership styles. For example, in an abusive autocratic leadership style, the leader does not trust his subordinates, they never feel free to discuss work-related issues, and the leader seldom seeks subordinates' opinions in solving work-related questions. In the benevolent autocratic leadership style, there is a sense of trust between the servant and the master, the subordinates do not feel very free, and the leader sometimes asks for the opinions of the subordinates. In participatory leadership style, the leader partially trusts his subordinates but wants to have control over the decisions, the subordinates feel quite free, generally he takes the subordinates' ideas and tries to use them. Finally, in the democratic leadership style, the leader fully trusts his subordinates in all matters, the subordinates feel completely free, he always takes the ideas of his subordinates and uses them. Likert's research shows that highly productive groups are under participatory and democratic type of management; showed that groups with low productivity are under abusive autocratic and benevolent autocratic management (Koçel, 2001).

Among the leadership styles mentioned above and others, the most debated issue is which is better. However, the most accepted view by management scientists is that organizational environment, structure of management and tasks, conditions and characteristics of the leader determine the type of leadership. A successful manager is a person who can apply different types of leadership according to the needs and conditions of the organization (Tengelimoğlu, 2005). Behavioral theories have generally assumed that democratic leadership behavior is effective. However, under different conditions, leadership behaviors that focus on work and production can be at least as effective as leadership behaviors that give importance to people. A third theory of leadership, based on these approaches, is called the contingency approach.

Contingency Approach:

Contingency theories are theories that examine the conditions in which the leadership process occurs and its effects. The basic assumption of these theories is that different conditions require different leadership styles. Behaviors of leaders are affected by many factors such as the nature of the goal to be achieved, the leader's personality and

experiences, organizational climate and policies, expectations and behaviors of followers or subordinates, expectations and behaviors of superiors (Koçel, 2001).

According to the Fiedler (1967) model, which is one of the most well-known and oldest contingency theories, there are three basic conditions that determine the behavior of leaders: "relationships between the leader and the followers", "the nature of the work to be accomplished" and "the degree of the leader's authority based on the position. In Fiedler's model, these three situations determine the leadership behavior that should be shown by creating favorable and unfovarable environments. For example, according to Fiedler, a situation where the leader has good relations with the followers, the work is planned, and he/she has a high degree of authority (position power) is the most feasible situation, and these conditions make the "work-oriented" leadership style more effective. Because in the most positive situation, the group is ready to be led and waiting for the leader to say what needs to be done. On the other hand, he states that the leader's following a work-oriented style will give the best results in the conditions where the most negative situation is that the jobs are not planned, the position power of the leader is low and the relations of the leader with his subordinates are weak. Because in this case, if the leader focuses on relations, he will not get any results in this uncertainty environment. Fiedler argues that in situations that he evaluates as relatively positive and relatively negative, personal behaviors will be the best leadership style. For example, in conditions where the leader has good relations with his subordinates, the quality of the job cannot be planned, but the leader's degree of authority is low (Koçel, 2001).

As a result, the contingency theory, which is identified with Fiedler and his model, differs from the behavioral theories that argue that the most appropriate leadership behavior will change according to the conditions and situations, and that there is "one and the best" management style in management. As mentioned above, the behavioral theory stated that the leader would show work and relationship-oriented behaviors, but it did not reveal which of these leadership styles would be effective under what conditions. Therefore, in a comprehensive leadership theory, it is of great importance to take into account the conditions in which the leadership process occurs and trigger effective leadership.

Current Approaches to Leadership

In addition to the above-mentioned classical theories of leadership, new leadership styles and approaches have begun to be produced, especially after the 1990s. The conditions that led to the emergence of modern management concepts such as total quality management, organizational change and management, and personnel empowerment contributed to the formation of new views in the explanation of the leadership process.

The most popular leadership theories, especially in western literature, are charismatic, operational and transformative leadership theories in this context. So much so that recently, in research models that include the concept of leadership, it is seen that there are articles in which leadership styles are measured with scales containing these styles and the relationship of these leadership styles with many management models and organizational behavior variables is tested (Koçel, 2001).

In this research, it is tried to reveal a leadership model that combines and encompasses all the leadership theories briefly mentioned above. So much so that among the research variables that will be explained in detail in the future, leadership competencies,

traits theory; the paternalistic leadership style, the behavioral approach as a leadership style, and finally the cultural assumptions that create the conditional variable effect in the research model are within the scope of the basic assumptions of the contingency theories.

The first emphasis in this research model is that the "property theory" is still valid. However, the effect of "competencies" on leadership styles is included in the research, rather than the characteristics that cannot be changed and are believed to be innate in the individual. In other words, the arguments that "leadership potential in individuals can be revealed through education and development and they have a significant effect on the formation of leadership styles together with intrinsic motivation" are also examined within the scope of the research.

As mentioned in the introduction of the research, today's conditions make it necessary to reveal the personal competencies that will make the leadership and management process effective and what the leaders should have. In the next section, under the title of leadership competencies, leadership motivation, self-worth, need for strength and political ability variables, which we think are important for the success of the leadership process today, will be defined.

References

Atkin-Plunk, C. A., Armstrong, G. S. (2013). 'Transformational leadership skills and correlates of Prison Warden job stress'. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 40, 551.

Aycan, Z., 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).

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., Harrison, D. A. (2005). 'Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing'. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes. 97,* 117–134.

Çağlar, E. S., (2011). *The impact of empowerment on work engagement mediated through psychological empowerment: Moderating roles of leadership styles and work goals*. Published Doctoral Thesis. Marmara University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration in English, Department of Organizational Behavior, Istanbul.

Çalışkan, S. C. (2009). Toward a linkage between leadership competencies, paternalistic leadership styles and cultural assumptions on leader-member exchange perceptions of managers. Yayınlanmış Doktora Tezi. Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İngilizce İşletme Anabilim Dalı, Örgütsel Davranış Bilim Dalı, İstanbul.

Çetin, C., ve Mutlu, E. C. (2010). *Temel İşletmeciliğe Giriş*, Beta Yayınevi, 4.

Koçel, T. (2001). *İşletme Yöneticiliği, Yönetim Organizasyon, Organizasyonlarda Davranış, Klasik-Modern-Çağdaş ve Güncel Yaklaşımlar*, Beta Basın Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş. Cağaloğlu, İstanbul.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., Henderson, D. (2008). 'Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly. 19*,161– 177.

Robbins, S.P. (2003), *Organizational Behavior, Concepts, Controversies, Applications*, Prentice Hall International Inc., New Jersey.

Tengilimoğlu, D.(2005). A Field Study on the Determination of Leadership Behavior Characteristics in Public and Private Sector Organizations, *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences, 4,*S.14, s. 1-16.

Tunçay, E. (2013). The role of leadership style in the relationship between organizational climate and burnout. *Ataturk University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 24* (4), 113-135

Yukl, G. (2008). *Leadership in organizations* (5.basım) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.