

Society, Organisations, and Leadership in Turkey

Selda Fikret Paşa, Hayat Kabasakal* and Muzaffer Bodur

Department of Management, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey

Cette étude examine la culture organisationnelle, les comportements de direction, et les perceptions face aux attributs efficaces et très efficaces des dirigeants dans la société turque. Les données utilisées dans cette étude proviennent à la fois d'une recherche indépendante et de la base de données GLOBE. Dans le projet indépendant de recherche, les données ont été recueillies auprès de 92 personnes employées par deux compagnies manufacturières et deux de services. Les données qualitatives de GLOBE proviennent de deux groupes de discussion et de six entrevues en profondeur. Les valeurs organisationnelles dominantes dans les entreprises turques ont été identifiées comme étant, en ordre d'importance, le collectivisme, une orientation performance, l'évitement de l'incertitude, le sacrifice de soi, l'intégrité, distance hiérarchique, la qualité, la considération, et l'orientation vers le futur. Les comportements de direction les plus fréquemment observés ont été les suivants: hiérarchique—autocratique, suivi par paternaliste—considérant, transactionnel—orienté vers l'équipe, et laisser-faire. Les résultats démontrent que tous les comportements de direction ont été influencés par les valeurs organisationnelles. Les attributs efficaces des dirigeants ont été perçus comme incluant les qualités suivantes: orienté vers les personnes (intégrateurs d'équipe et paternaliste), orienté vers la tâche, participatif, et charismatique—transformationnel. En général, cette étude démontre l'importance du collectivisme dans la culture organisationnelle tout comme dans les attributs très efficaces des dirigeants dans un contexte turque.

INTRODUCTION

For a considerable time, the dominance of American management theory led to the belief that a “good” manager in the US will also be a good manager in other countries. This view is now being displaced with the knowledge that managerial attitudes, values, behaviors, and efficacy differ across national cultures (e.g. Boyacigiller & Adler, 1991; Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohavy, and Sanders, 1990). Differences in national culture call for differences in management practices, as well as expectations from leaders,

* Address for correspondence: Hayat Kabasakal, Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Boğaziçi University, Bebek, Istanbul 80815, Turkey. Email: kabasaka@boun.edu.tr

what leaders may and may not do. Additionally, the influence effectiveness of leaders varies considerably as a result of the cultural forces in which the leaders function. Four major cultural value dimensions of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity-femininity, and collectivism-individualism were first identified by Hofstede (1980) and received considerable support from other researchers (e.g. Dorfman & Howell, 1988; James, 1993; Smith & Bond, 1993). Cultural dimensions are argued to be crucial to the regulation of social systems and individual behavior.

In addition to societal culture values, another force that affects leadership behavior is organisational culture. The values and assumptions shared by members of the organisation about what is right, what is good, and what is important provide expressive bonding of the members. An organisational culture affects its leadership as much as its leadership affects the culture (Bass, 1996). Contrarily, the current drive toward globalisation, which leads to a substantial amount of cross-national convergence of management practices somewhat perpetuates universalism of leader behavior in organisations. This convergence is a result of the organisations engaging cross-border trading as well as education and training practices which lead to standardisation of management practices in and across organisations (House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997).

In this respect, actual leadership behavior practiced in a culture as well as the members' beliefs about ideal leader behavior is a complex demeanor influenced by a variety of variables including societal culture and organisational culture. House and his colleagues (1997) described an integrated theoretical framework in which cultural variables, leader behavior, and organisational practices interact to influence organisational effectiveness.

The purpose of this research is to study leadership behaviors that are usually accepted and enacted in Turkey. For this purpose, we will study the dominant values in Turkish organisations, the type of leadership behaviors observed in these organisational cultures, and emic manifestations of universal leadership behaviors in the Turkish context.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Culture

Even though there are several definitions, in the most general sense culture is defined in terms of a number of commonly shared processes: shared ways of thinking, feeling, and reacting; shared meanings and identities; shared socially constructed environments; common ways in which technologies are used and commonly experienced events including the history, language, and religion of their members. It is the norms, roles, belief systems, laws, and values that form meaningful wholes and that are interrelated in meaningful

ways (Schein, 1992; Triandis, 1972). Hofstede (1980) defines culture as the collective mental programming of the people in an environment, claiming that national culture has the greatest impact on organisational behavior.

Culture can be defined as an important contextual factor that moderates the effects of managerial practices and motivational techniques on employees' behavior (Erez, 1994). Cross-cultural researchers tend to describe culture in terms of value dimensions, in which values are global beliefs about desirable end-states not tied to any specific object or situation. Values are thought to be capable of broad influences on emotions, thinking, and behavior as well as standards that guide and determine action, attitudes toward objects and situations, and ideology (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1989).

Societal Culture. Several pioneering research projects have aimed directly at identifying and confirming cultural dimensions of values (Bond, 1988; Hofstede, 1980, 1983, 1991; Hofstede et al., 1990; Schwartz, 1990, 1994; Smith, Dugan, & Trompenaars, 1996). In his most frequently cited projects, Hofstede (1980, 1983) derived four factors that seemed to distinguish among the cultures of the 53 independent nations he studied. The power distance dimension is defined in terms of the prevailing norms of inequality within a culture. Uncertainty avoidance indicates the extent to which individuals feel threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and the extent they try to avoid them. The bipolar dimension of individualism/collectivism refers to the extent to which the identity of members of a given culture is shaped primarily by personal choices and achievements or by the groups to which they belong. Masculinity emphasises assertiveness, focus on competition success and performance, and limited emotional involvement with others. These four dimensions seem to be basic cultural values whose descriptive and predictive utility have been replicated independently more than once (e.g. Hofstede & Bond, 1984; Ng et al., 1982).

The findings of Bond (1988) and Schwartz (1994) showed impressive convergence with the Hofstede (1983) dimensions yet adding a fifth dimension called Confucian Work Dynamism, which relates to time perspective (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987; Smith et al., 1996). Furthermore, based on studies of management practices in several Asian countries, paternalism has been added recently to the four widely accepted cultural value dimensions (James, Chen, & Cropanzano, 1996). Paternalism indicates that managers take a personal interest in workers' off-the-job lives and personal problems and attempt to promote workers' personal welfare and help them achieve personal goals. Glenn and Glenn (1981) and Kedia and Bhagat (1988) introduced an additional dimension of "abstractive versus associative thinking". In associative thinking cultures, associations among events are not based on a logical basis whereas in abstractive thinking cultures cause-effects relationships are dominant.

Additionally, a differentiation has been made between developed and developing countries in terms of geographical, economic, demographic, and sociocultural environments (Adler & Boyacigiller, 1995; Hofstede & Bond, 1988; Kanungo & Jeager, 1990; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996; Jorgensen, 1995). Developing countries tend to be located in specific parts of the world, i.e. East and West Africa, Central and Latin America, the Middle East and some parts of Eastern Europe. They can be characterised by weak infrastructure, abundance of unskilled labor, low technological developments, political instability, rigid social structures, distinct gender roles, and strong religious influences. Furthermore, in terms of sociocultural characteristics the developing countries can be identified as carrying low individualism, high uncertainty avoidance, low masculinity, high power distance, and high associative thinking. However, it should be acknowledged that developing countries vary on these cultural dimensions and what is suggested in the literature represents the modal events (Mendonca & Kanungo, 1994).

Organisational Culture. One of the definitions of culture proposes that it is a select set of variables experienced by members of a collective that provides compelling individual and group member orientations (e.g. Hofstede, 1980; House et al., 1997; Schein, 1992). Structure and the underlying values and attitudes of organisations produce contrasts between different organisations in the same part of the world thus creating a different culture for different organisations (Ronen & Shenkar, 1985; Schein, 1992; Tayeb, 1994).

Organisational structure can be regarded as a framework for decision making and the decision implementation process. The understanding of structure requires reference not only to such dimensions as centralisation, specialisation, and formalisation, but also to the relationships, processes, and actions that lie behind these dimensions. These relationships and processes are power and authority relationships, coping with uncertainty and risk-taking, interpersonal trust, loyalty and commitment, motivation, control and discipline, coordination and integration, communication, consultation and participation (Tayeb, 1994). These are based on the members' work-related values and attitudes, the organisational culture.

Schein (1992) emphasises the shared, taken-for-granted basic assumptions held by the members of the group as an indication of organisational culture. He stresses that any group with a stable membership and a history of shared learning would have developed some level of culture. Therefore, an organisation, with a culture of its own based on the values, beliefs, and behaviors perpetuated by its structure and shared by its members, would represent a collective. Additionally, these values and attitudes have a strong association with the employees' cultural, occupational, educational, and social backgrounds which, in turn, are rooted in their societies (House et al., 1997; Tayeb, 1994).

Cultural continuity and coherence between organisations and the society within which they operate is another aspect which has only been addressed by a few researchers (e.g. Aycan, Kanungo, & Sinha, 1999; Kanungo & Jaeger, 1990; Mendonca & Kanungo, 1994). The model of cultural fit proposed by Kanungo and his associates asserts that societal values influence organisational practices through the mediation of internal work culture. The model distinguishes between societal and organisational culture, in that the organisational culture is influenced by societal culture.

Hofstede and his colleagues (Hofstede et al., 1990) tried to address the issue of organisational versus national culture with a sample of organisations in Holland and Denmark. Their results led them to distinguish between the shared values and the shared perceptions of daily practices that are defined as customs, habits, and traditions of organisations. Members' beliefs were found to differ on the basis of their nationality. Practices which differed on organisational bases were influenced by the founders' or leaders' values. Tayeb (1988), in her study of the Indian and English cultures and organisations, reported differences and similarities between the two groups on the work attitude surveys. It was suggested that, in modern industrial societies, business organisations tend to develop similar structural configurations in response to similar task-environments. However, the means by which they achieve these configurations are different depending on the particular sociocultural characteristics of their respective society and from which most of their employees come. Similarly, Ronen and Shenkar (1985) concluded that industrialisation leads to uniformity of values among societies. In developing countries, managers are more likely to assume that their employees: have an external locus of control; have limited and fixed potential; operate from a time perspective that is past and present orientated; and have a short time focus (Kanungo & Jaeger, 1990). Furthermore, managers from developing countries are more likely to: encourage a passive or reactive stance to task performance; judge success on moralism derived from tradition and religion; favor an authoritarian or paternalistic orientation; and accept that consideration of the context overrides principles and rules.

Leadership

Leadership has been one of the most studied organisational issues; however, the lack of a consensually agreed-upon definition of leadership particularly in the cross-cultural setting still remains among scholars. Definitions vary in terms of emphasis on leader abilities, personality traits, influence relationships, cognitive versus emotional orientation, individual versus group orientation, and appeal to self versus collective interests (e.g. Bass, 1990, 1996; Yukl, 1998). A recent definition proposed by House and his colleagues

(1997) states that leadership is the ability of individuals to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organisations of which they are members.

A review of the different leadership styles to date is beyond the scope of this paper and the reader is referred to Yukl (1998) and Bass (1990) for a thorough treatment of the subject. Through the years, research on leadership has taken different approaches. Leadership behavior has been linked to situations, in which aspects of the situation determine the importance of leadership. A considerable amount of work has been done on leadership behavior that can improve the performance of a group or organisation. Lately emphasis has been moving away from the transactional nature of leadership to transformational leadership in which the leaders seek to raise the consciousness of followers by appealing to higher ideals and moral values as well as empowering them (Bass, 1996; House et al., 1997). Several taxonomies have been offered to describe leadership behavior: Yukl (1998) proposes three broad categories as “task behaviors”, “relationship behaviors”, and “transformational and change behaviors”. Task behaviors are concerned with improving or maintaining internal efficiency and coordination in a team or organisation whereas relationship behaviors are concerned with establishing and maintaining corporate relationships characterised by high levels of loyalty and trust. Transformational and change behaviors are related to increasing commitment to objectives and strategies and formulating new vision and strategy. In addition to these three broad categories, “participation” has been proposed as a fourth dimension of leaders’ behavior by various researchers (House et al., 1997; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996; Sinha, 1990).

Culture-Specific and Universal Leader Behaviors. Relative to the leadership research in general, there has been considerably less direct research on how cultural values influence leadership activities with opposing results. In one of the first studies of this type with a substantial contribution, Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter (1966) reported some universal characteristics of managers. Across all of the 14 countries studied, managers favored democratic styles of management and endorsed egalitarian organisational structures. At the same time, however, they indicated that it is better to direct than to persuade. Both Bass (1997) and House and colleagues (1999) assert that charismatic/transformational leadership may be effective universally. Bass (1997) bases his assertion on the finding that transformational leadership correlates more positively with positive outcomes than transactional leadership in a variety of countries including the United States, Japan, Taiwan, New Zealand, Austria, the Netherlands, and Canada. Supporting Bass’s argument, based on a recent analysis of 62 cultures as part of the GLOBE data, Den Hartog and associates (1999) found specific aspects of charismatic/transformational leadership to be universally endorsed across cultures.

The question of whether effective leadership processes reflect the culture in which they are found has received mixed support from researchers. Several researchers support a “culture specific” view of leadership indicating that unique cultural characteristics such as language, religion, and values necessitate distinct leadership approaches in different societies (e.g. Hofstede, 1993; Ronen & Shenkar, 1985; Triandis, 1993). Rodrigues (1990) has described possible relationships among Hofstede’s four dimensions and House and Mitchell’s (1974) four situation-linked leadership styles, namely directive, supportive, achievement, and participative. According to his theory, a directive leadership style (i.e. specification of assignments, specification of procedures to use, high use of legitimate and coercive influence) will be more effective in those societies with relatively high power distance, collectivism, and uncertainty avoidance. A supportive style (e.g. direct supervisory support, role clarification) is suitable for societies with moderate power distance and collectivism, while an achievement style (contingent reward, charisma, and use of expert power) can work well in societies with weak-to-moderate uncertainty avoidance. Finally, a participative style can work well everywhere except in those societies with a combination of relatively high power distance, strong collectivism, and high uncertainty avoidance. In addition to the enacted leader behaviors, Gerstner and Day’s (1994) results indicated that beliefs about ideal business leaders vary systematically as a function of a particular country.

Subsequent cross-cultural leadership studies also showed more cross-cultural differences in leadership than similarities among them. The strong influence of national citizenship on leadership behavior was evidenced in several studies (Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett, 1979; Gerstner & Day, 1994; Rodrigues, 1990; Schmidt & Yeh, 1992; Shackleton & Ali, 1990; Smith & Peterson, 1994; Smith, Mitsumi, Tayeb, Peterson, & Bond, 1989). While Smith and colleagues (1989) indicated both similarities and differences in general leadership styles across nations, Smith and Peterson (1994) reported that leaders’ event-management processes were consistently related to the differences in national cultures identified by Hofstede.

Others point out that universal leader behaviors also exist, advocating the “culture universal” view (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Dorfman & Ronen, 1991). Integrating these viewpoints, Bass (1990) and Dorfman and his colleagues (Dorfman, Howell, Hibino, Lee, Tate, & Bautista, 1997) have shown that both culture specific/emic and culture universal/etic positions have validity. Dorfman and colleagues (1997) found that leader behaviors of supportiveness, contingent reward, and charisma showed universally positive impacts in all five cultures (Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Mexico, and the US) that they investigated. On the other hand, leader behaviors of participativeness, directiveness, and contingent punishment had positive impacts in only two cultures. Investigating the leadership from the influence perspective, Rao,

Hashimoto, and Rao (1997) found that Japanese managers used some influence tactics and strategies previously reported by North American managers such as assertiveness, sanctions, and appeals to higher authority. On the other hand, they also used other tactics that are unique to Japanese managers such as socialising or personal development.

Den Hartog and associates (1999) propose that universal endorsement of an attribute does not preclude cultural differences in the enactment of the attribute. In other words, while the concepts such as transformational or transactional leadership may be universal, there can be significant differences in the expression of these attributes across cultures.

Leadership Behavior in Developing Countries. A distinction parallel to that seen in the societal and organisational values also appears across developed and developing countries in leadership practices. For example, an interesting leadership behavior profile emerges in developing countries. Misumi and Peterson (1985), based on 30 years of research in Japan which corresponds to the developing years of Japan, have found that interaction of performance oriented and maintenance oriented behaviors (PM) is the most effective leadership behavior. Parallel with Misumi and Peterson's findings, Sinha (1980, 1990) proposes that the nurturant task leader characterises an effective leader behavior in India. The nurturant task leader exhibits concern for both task and relationships simultaneously that may turn into a participative behavior after the participant/follower gains experience/independence over time. The dynamics of the leader–follower relationship in a developing country would operate along a continuum where the relationship starts as total dependence of the follower on the leader and proceeds to be an autonomous individual. Leader behavior starts out as being directive, proceeds to nurturant-task oriented, and to participative along this continuum. A further argument has been proposed by Kanungo and Mendonca (1996) who state that due to the instability and uncertainty that prevails in the organisational environment in developing countries, charismatic leaders who by definition are more proactive and change oriented would seem to be more effective compared to leaders who are more inclined to maintain the status quo.

Another leader behavior seen in developing countries is paternalism. Paternalism includes elements of both autocratic and nurturant behaviors where the leader acts like a father to the followers (Kabasakal & Bodur, 1998; Kim, 1994). Kim (1994) distinguishes between two forms of paternalism: authoritative and benevolent paternalism. Authoritative paternalism includes emphasis on duty and lacks sincere generosity on the part of the superior. On the other hand, benevolent paternalism emphasises the subordinate's loyalty and the superior's generous concern for that subordinate. Additionally, benevolent paternalistic leaders show concern for the well-

being of employees and their families such as providing gifts for employees' marriages and the marriages of the employees' siblings, and tuition for their children (Kabasakal & Bodur, 1998; Kim, 1994). While the Korean industry is described as being more close to authoritarian paternalism (Kim, 1994), similarly Dilber (1967) describes Turkish industrial leaders as authoritarian and offers benevolent paternalistic behavior as a more effective alternative. Similarly, in a study investigating influence behavior of leaders in Turkey, Fikret-Pasa (1999) found that culture-specific leader behaviors of "granted authority" (tacit influence that leader has due to the large power distance characteristics of the culture) and "sharing of responsibility" of the followers were more dominant relative to the universal influence behaviors of rationalising, legitimising, pressure-control, and exchange. It should be noted that the behaviors of "granted authority" and "sharing of responsibility" imply an implicit benevolent paternalistic leadership on the part of the leader.

Summary of Theoretical Background

Given the above discussion on cross-cultural leadership and culture, House and his colleagues (1997) assert that there are many universal leader behaviors common across cultures in addition to the cultural forces that affect the kind of leader behavior that is usually accepted, enacted, and effective within a collective. Correspondingly, attributes that are consistent with collective behavior will be more acceptable and effective than behavior that represents conflicting values. Accordingly, one would expect that in nations with high power distance, paternalism, and collectivism scores, individuals experience a tendency toward behaviors that are consistent with these high national scores. Highly collectively oriented cultures place high value on group maintenance, paternalism, in-group loyalty, and harmony (House et al., 1997).

The Turkish Context

Turkish culture has long been described as being high on collectivism and power distance (Hofstede, 1980). According to Schwartz (1994), in culture-level value dimensions in a survey of 34 cultures, Turkey ranked above the average in values of conservatism (12th), hierarchy (5th), egalitarian commitment (13th), and harmony (16th). In their seven country study of paternalism as one of the four sociocultural dimensions of societies, Kanungo and Aycan (1997) found Turkey to carry more paternalistic values alongside China, India, and Pakistan, as opposed to the relatively less paternalistic cluster of Romania, Canada, and the US. A more recent and extensive study on the Turkish culture was conducted as a part of the GLOBE study. Findings of the GLOBE study revealed two predominant

characteristics of Turkey to be in-group collectivism and power distance among 62 cultures as seen in Table 1 (Kabasakal & Bodur, 1998). According to the inter-country societal culture rankings of the GLOBE study, Turkey is below average on gender egalitarianism (56th), uncertainty avoidance (49th), performance orientation (45th), societal collectivism (42nd), humane orientation (37th), and future orientation (36th), whereas it is higher in terms of in-group collectivism (4th), power distance (10th), and assertiveness (12th) (Kabasakal & Bodur, 1998).

Business life in Turkey is dominated by private holding companies that are run by family members as well as state economic enterprises. Family members still hold prominent positions in organisations and continue to be responsible for the relationship with state officials. Relationships with the state are important since companies remain highly dependent on the state for financial incentives and the state often intervenes by frequent and unpredictable policy changes (Kabasakal & Bodur, 1998).

Turkish organisations are distinguished by centralised decision making, highly personalised, strong leadership, and limited delegation (Ronen, 1986). Similarly, among 38 nations, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) found Turkey to have the steepest hierarchy in its organisation, indicating

TABLE 1
Societal Culture "Is Now" Values* for Turkey and Inter-Country Rankings
(Kabasakal & Bodur, 1998)

	<i>Turkey (Rank)</i>	<i>Highest (Country)</i>	<i>Lowest (Country)</i>	<i>World Mean</i>
Performance Orientation	3.83 (45)	4.94 (Switzerland)	3.20 (Greece)	4.07
Future Orientation	3.74 (36)	5.07 (Singapore)	2.88 (Russia)	3.83
Assertiveness	4.53 (12)	4.80 (Albania)	3.38 (Sweden)	4.13
Collectivism I: Societal Emphasis	4.03 (42)	5.22 (Sweden)	3.25 (Greece)	4.23
Gender Egalitarianism	2.89 (56)	4.08 (Hungary)	2.50 (South Korea)	3.38
Humane Orientation	3.94 (37)	5.23 (Zambia)	3.18 (Germany-W)	4.07
Power Distance	5.57 (10)	5.80 (Morocco)	3.89 (Denmark)	5.10
Collectivism II: In-Group Coll.	5.88 (4)	6.36 (Philippines)	3.53 (Denmark)	5.08
Uncertainty Avoidance	3.63 (49)	5.37 (Switzerland)	2.88 (Russia)	4.16

* Means range from 1 to 7 where 1 = Low and 7 = High.

the subordination of employees to their leaders. Turkish organisations are also described to be of the family-type (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). As mentioned in the earlier discussion, Turkish leaders are characterised by paternalistic attributes in that Turkish managers and leaders show parental consideration towards their subordinates (Kanungo & Aycan, 1997; Fikret-Pasa, 1999).

Objective of the Study

In this study, a relationship will be investigated between the observed leadership behaviors and the organisational values. Both a universalist and culture-specific approach has been adopted in the study of leadership behavior and the organisational values in the Turkish context. Given the fact that very few studies were conducted on culture-specific attributes in Turkey, the contributions of this paper will be threefold: one aim is to draw a picture of Turkish organisations in terms of values and observed leadership behavior. A second purpose is to analyze which type of organisational cultures foster certain leader behaviors in Turkish organisations. Considering the probability that a gap might exist between the perceptions of ideal and realised leader behavior, a final purpose is to investigate the ideal leadership attributes in terms of emic manifestations of the universal leadership behaviors as well as culture-specific behaviors on the Turkish culture.

METHODOLOGY

Measures, Data Collection, and Samples

Universal Leadership Behaviors. In order to measure the pattern and frequency of genetic leadership behaviors that are observed in Turkish organisations, a questionnaire was developed based on previous research on leadership. Respondents were asked to think of their direct manager and judge the frequency with which they observe the behavior indicated by the statement. Twenty-three statements representing commonly recognised leadership styles that were validated by different authors were used: Autocratic, Task-oriented, Nurturing, Participative, Using Contingent Reward and Punishment, Paternalistic, Achievement-oriented, Specification of Procedures, and Role Clarification (Blake & Mouton, 1982; Fleishman, 1953; Heller & Yukl, 1969; House & Mitchell, 1974; Keller & Szilagyi, 1976; Kim & Yukl, 1995; Sims, 1977; Stogdill, Goode, & Day, 1962; Strauss, 1977; Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958; Vroom & Yetton, 1973; Yukl, 1987, 1997; Yukl, Wall, & Lepsinger, 1990). The respondents indicated their opinions about the frequency with which each behavior was observed on a five-point Likert Scale ranging from “1 = never” to “5 = always”.

Response choices for each item in our questionnaire indicated the frequency of perception for the type of leadership behavior described by the item. Responses were obtained from 92 respondents (49 men and 43 women) in four different organisations, two in manufacturing and two in service industries, by a self-administered questionnaire. Participants were all full-time employees, holding a variety of jobs. The average age of the respondents was 40.2 years. Thirty-four of the participants were currently supervisors themselves and the rest were employees with no supervisory duties. Respondents were asked to use the questionnaire items to describe the leadership behavior of their immediate boss.

Organisational Values. In order to measure organisational values, respondents were asked to indicate the dominant norms and practices that are prevalent in their workplaces. The same subjects who reported on their supervisors' leadership styles were also asked to list the four most prominent organisational values they observe in their place of work. The cited values were content analyzed by three independent judges for whom agreement of at least two judges was required for assignment of an item into a category. As a result, the response items were culminated to nine major categories, each representing a different organisational value.

Ideal Leader Behaviors. A separate group of respondents participated in the assessment of perceived ideal leader behaviors in Turkish culture. For this purpose, qualitative data were collected from two focus group interviews and five in-depth interviews. The focus group interviews included five and seven individuals, respectively. All focus group participants had full-time work experience as middle level managers, supervisory level managers, or full-time research assistants, whereas the in-depth interviews were conducted with middle managers. Although focus groups and in-depth interviews were conducted on a separate group of respondents from the respondents to the questionnaire, both groups were selected from the manufacturing and service sectors.

All interviews were recorded on a tape and later were transcribed verbatim. Ethnographic analysis was conducted on the text to reveal emic leader behaviors specific to the Turkish culture.

FINDINGS

Observed Universal Leadership Behaviors and Organisational Culture

Observed Universal Leadership Behaviors. The questionnaire responses consisting of 23 statements describing genetic leadership behaviors were

subjected to factor analyses in order to determine the dimensions of observed leadership behavior. After subjecting the data to Varimax rotation and removing the items with communalities and loadings smaller than 0.5, four factors emerged. Table 2 portrays the factor analysis results and the items that load on each item. Eight items loaded on Factor 1, three items loaded on Factors 2 and 3 respectively, and two items loaded on Factor 4.

In order to form the scales and compute the most frequently observed behavior, three items with the highest loadings were taken for Factor 1, and all of the items, which loaded to Factors 2, 3, and 4 were used. Reliabilities of the scales, measured by Cronbach's alpha, were reasonably good, ranging from 0.68 to 0.89.

Factor analysis results show that four types of leadership behaviors were observed in Turkish organisations. The first factor indicates the presence of "transactional and team-oriented" leaders who consult and collaborate with their staff, and use contingent rewards and punishment. The second factor describes "paternalistic and considerate" leaders who support and care for their employees, help out with their family problems, and want to be loved and respected by them. The third factor points to "laissez-faire" leaders who do not exert any control and let the staff do the job the way they know. The fourth factor describes "autocratic and hierarchical" leaders who control their subordinates closely to make sure that the job is done well and who try to keep the hierarchy in the organisation.

Mean responses for each factor were calculated and are also shown in Table 2. One-way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) results show that the mean responses for the four leadership styles were perceived to be significantly different from each other ($F = 49.19, P < 0.000$). Scheffé Range Test was used as a post-hoc multiple comparison test which revealed that means of the four behaviors were significantly different from each other at the $P < 0.05$ level. "Autocratic-hierarchical" leadership style in which the leader kept the hierarchy of the organisation and controlled the work to make sure it was done well was perceived significantly more often ($X = 4.20$) compared to the other three leadership styles. The leadership style with the second highest mean response ($X = 3.51$) was the "paternalistic and considerate" type who cares for the subordinates, helps out with their problems, and wants to be popular among them. Less frequently observed was "transactional and team-oriented" style ($X = 3.10$), followed by "laissez-faire" leaders ($X = 2.63$).

Organisational Culture. The dominant organisational norms and practices that were listed by respondents were categorised into groups by three independent judges. This categorisation revealed nine organisational values which were labeled as collectivism, performance orientation, uncertainty avoidance, self-sacrificing, integrity, power distance, quality, consideration,

TABLE 2
Factor Analysis Results of Universal Leader Behaviors

<i>Factor/Item</i>	<i>Factor Loadings</i>			
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>
Factor 1: Transactional–Team Oriented				
Reward/punish according to productivity of workers	0.81			
Discusses everything with his/her staff	0.72			
Consults his staff in everything	0.58			
Non-monetary rewards are important for motivation	0.63			
Prefers collaborating with his staff when problem solving	0.62			
Believes in rewards and targets in increasing motivation	0.76			
Feelings and thoughts of his staff are important for him	0.57			
Decides on solutions collaborating with his staff	0.65			
Factor 2: Paternalistic–Considerate				
Being loved and respected by his staff has top priority		0.85		
Supports his staff and shows that he cares for them		0.64		
Helps out with the family problems		0.58		
Factor 3: Laissez-faire				
His staff know their responsibility, he does not need to control what is being done			0.81	
Delegates fully, lets his staff do the job the way they know			0.71	
Acts in support of the notion that his staff need to be checked up on and controlled in order to do a good job			–0.68	
Factor 4: Autocratic–Hierarchical				
Controls to make sure that the job is done well				0.74
Likes to keep the hierarchical organisation in the company				0.86
Per cent of variance explained	38.2%	14%	8.4%	6.6%
Cronbach's alpha	0.89	0.72	0.71	0.69
Factor Mean*	3.10	3.51	2.63	4.20

* *F* Statistic = 49.190, $P < 0.000$, all four means differed on the Scheffe Range Test.

and future orientation. Table 3 shows the nine organisational value categories and their corresponding items as well as their relative frequencies. Results of the Kruskal-Wallis test revealed that the nine organisational culture dimensions differed in their percentage reports (Chi Square = 86.69, $P < 0.05$). Pairwise percentage comparisons at the $P < 0.05$ level revealed that several of the organisational values differed at a statistically significant level in degree of prevalence.

Collectivism (24%), performance orientation (17%), and uncertainty avoidance (16%) were reported to be the most prevalent organisational

TABLE 3
Reported Organisational Values

<i>Company Values</i>		<i>No. of times reported</i>	
<i>Category</i>	<i>Corresponding Items</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>Percentage*</i>
Collectivism	Love and respect	22	24 ^a
	Maintaining harmony	14	
	Helping each other	7	
	Relatedness	3	
	Sharing everything	3	
	Good relations and politeness	4	
	Being friendly	1	
Performance Orientation	Doing the job well	28	38 17 ^{a,b}
	Working hard for success	3	
	Responsibility	7	
Uncertainty Avoidance	Discipline regulations	12	35 16 ^{a,b,c}
	Behaving according to work rules	21	
	Regulations for clothing	2	
Self-Sacrificial	Self-sacrificing, being devoted	23	25 11 ^{b,c,d}
	Tolerance	2	
Integrity	Honesty	13	19 9 ^{c,d,e}
	Policy of clarity and honesty	6	
Power Distance	Behaving according to hierarchial system	9	16 7 ^{d,e}
	Superior-subordinate relations: respect to agents	6	
	Letting superior know everything that goes wrong	1	
	Quality	13	
Quality	Quality	10	5 ^{d,e}
	Good service to customers	3	
Team Integrator	Teamwork	6	12 5 ^{d,e}
	Exchange of ideas	1	
	Good communication	5	
Future Orientation	Behaving according to aims of organisations	7	9 4 ^e
	Working hard to reach the decided goals	2	

* Percentages with different superscripts differ from each other at $P < 0.05$ in Test for Significance of Difference Between Two Proportions.

values. Even though the values of collectivism, performance orientation, and uncertainty avoidance were equally prevalent, collectivism stood out as the most dominant organisational value being perceived significantly more frequently than self-sacrificial, integrity, power distance, quality, team integrator, and future orientation. Performance orientation, uncertainty avoidance, and self-sacrificial were perceived as organisational values of equal dominance in the organisations which participated in this study. The organisational values of self-sacrificial, integrity, power distance, quality, and team-integrator were all perceived with statistically similar dominance.

Interaction between Universal Leader Behaviors and Organisational Values. Another purpose of the study was to analyze the relationship between “genetic leader behaviors” and “organisational values”. For this purpose, a series of hierarchical regression analyses were conducted in order to find out if leader behaviors are influenced by organisational values. Regression analyses treating perceived leadership behavior as the dependent variable and reported organisational values as independent variables revealed significant findings for all four different leadership behaviors. A significant positive relation was obtained between “transactional-team oriented” leadership style and organisational values of “quality” and “self-sacrificial”; between “paternalistic-considerate” behavior and “collectivism”. “Laissez-faire leadership” style showed a negative relation with the organisational values of “integrity”, “power distance”, and a positive relation with “collectivism”. Finally a positive relation was obtained between leadership behavior of “autocratic-hierarchical” and the organisational value of “power distance”. The findings, shown Table 4, indicate a fit between the organisational values and the observed leadership behavior.

TABLE 4
Relationship between Perceived Leadership Behavior and Organisational Values

<i>Perceived Leader Beh.</i>	<i>Org. Value</i>	<i>Beta Statistic</i>	<i>R²</i>	<i>F*</i>
Hierarchical-Autocratic	Power distance	0.234*	0.04	4.036
Paternalistic-Considerate	Collectivism	0.303*	0.09	7.31
Transactional-Team oriented	Quality	0.277*		
	Self-sacrificial	0.234*	0.12	4.94
Laissez-faire	Integrity	-0.263*		
	Power distance	-0.273*		
	Collectivism	0.249*	0.21	6.15

* All reported *F* values are significant at $P < 0.05$.

Ideal Leader Behaviors

Focus group and in-depth interviews revealed the attributes of ideal leaders as perceived by Turkish respondents. Table 5 represents a summary of the ideal leader characteristics in Turkish society. The attributes were categorised based on ethnographic analysis by researchers. Because focus group interviews are not conducive to counting the number of mentions for a particular attribute, it was not possible to rank order the attributes in terms of their frequencies. Qualitative results indicate that ideal leader attributes in Turkish society can further be grouped under the four basic universal leader behaviors of relationship-orientation, task-orientation, participative, and charismatic/transformational leadership.

Relationship-orientation. Turkish respondents indicated that ideal leader behaviors that are considered to be relationship-oriented are described as team integrators and paternalistic. Respondents indicated that as team integrators, outstanding leaders communicate and share information, create an environment where people can tell their ideas to each other openly, are able to share and are accessible to followers, are empathetic, have good human relations, and listen to people. As part of their team integrator role effective leaders conduct maintenance roles, communicate with team members, and provide them with the opportunity to share their ideas.

Paternalistic qualities that contribute to outstanding leadership include being concerned with the private problems of followers, taking the initiative in deciding for the employees with regard to their problems, attending social events such as wedding ceremonies of employees' children, acting like one of the employees in social events, and creating a family-like atmosphere in the organisation. A paternalistic leader is like a father and takes care of the followers like a parent would. Although "relationship-orientation" is a universal leader attribute, some emic manifestations of this construct which are paternalistic may not be acceptable in many Western societies. The leader interferes in a sphere which might be considered "private". For example, taking the initiative in deciding for an employee, like a father would for his children, may not be an acceptable behavior in some other parts of the world.

In the Turkish context, being concerned with the private problems of employees seems to be an important aspect of effective leadership. For example, one respondent indicated that their general manager accompanied a worker's child who was receiving cancer treatment in England because the family did not speak English. Such behavior may be considered to be neglecting work in some societies and an invasion of privacy in others. It is also common that paternalistic leaders would cover the tuition and other school expenses of employees' children who are in need, either from their personal incomes or the company budget.

TABLE 5
Ideal Leader Behaviors in Turkey

	<i>Value Dimensions</i>	<i>Value Items</i>
Relationship-orientation	Consideration	<p>Communicates and shares information Creates an environment where people can tell their ideas to each other openly Is able to share Is accessible to followers Is empathetic Is good in human relations Listens to people</p>
	Paternalistic	<p>Is able to say “no” in the right place if the need arises Shows/directs people about what needs to be done Is concerned with the private problems of followers Would take initiative in deciding for the employees with regard to their problems Attends social events of employees Would act like one of the employees in social events Creates a family-like atmosphere in organisation</p>
Task-orientation	Administrative attributes	<p>Knows what is going on around; what is taking place; does not learn from others When delegates work, does not interfere until there is a mistake</p>
	Collaborative team orientation	<p>Puts forward his/her own ambitions, ideas, and beliefs but would not go against the benefit of the group Encourages participation</p>
Participation		<p>Instills corporate/team culture in followers</p>

Visionary

Seeks acceptance and tries to increase acceptance of decisions
Listens and really takes into account the ideas of people who do not carry the legitimacy/formal position/status to speak up publicly
Seriously takes into account all spoken ideas or at least seems to do so
Has to keep people in extremes equally happy in a manipulative way

Recognises change and senses the opportunities that come with change
Is open to change and welcomes change
Is imaginative
Is creative and curious
Has vision
Is anticipating
Is innovative
Encourages innovations and new ideas
Balances rationality with emotions in the decision process; not too scientific or rational
Is emotional; is after a dream which may never come true
Flexible-minded, evaluates from multiple perspectives
Gives importance to the subjective and qualitative side of the decision
Does not like to work with details and routine things; likes to deal with more conceptual overviews

Inspirational

Interprets rules and regulations with a flexible mind
Decision making is constrained only by what the followers demand/expect
Behaves and thinks in extremes
Is ahead of others in recognising what should be the goals and how to achieve them
His/her objectives have repercussions on society
Is curious

Gets people to overcome their fear of failure
Tolerates failure
Gives room to people to fail and learn from mistakes

Table 5 (contd)

<i>Value Dimensions</i>	<i>Value Items</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gives people as much independence as possible Develops people, increases their commitment and development through delegating Makes people feel secure under conditions of change and uncertainty Gives credit to followers Empowers followers by viewing them as colleagues, seeing them as a resource, letting them decide, showing respect, providing recognition, recognising their potential Is dynamic
Integrity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is a person whom people can trust; tells the truth Is trustworthy Is believable Always meets promises Is fair
Nonprocedural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoids bureaucracy Challenges status quo Is a risk-taker
Diplomatic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is skillful in convincing others
Equanimity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rewards and punishes by non-monetary means Is mentally and emotionally mature Does not compete with anyone Is not afraid of working with people better than themselves Is sensitive and has cultural awareness Does not criticise publicly

Self-confident
and development
oriented

Is open to self-development
Is open to criticism
Receives feedback
Is self-confident
Accepts own mistakes

Decisive

In case of conflict, does not give in on own ideas
Decides fast without hesitation
Implements decisions with confidence
Pursues own objectives and goals even if they are contradictory
Asks for opinions but makes own decisions

Action-Oriented
and Assertive

Is assertive
Is ambitious
Has an aggressive but controlled approach to life
Need not be well educated; education is not a necessary attribute
Is intelligent
Is dynamic
Speaks well
Likes challenges
Uses both body language and nonverbal communication; shakes hands frequently and has direct eye contact
When they die, common cause may fade away
Are recalled by their names, rather than their ideas
Has hands on approach to solving problems

As part of their paternalistic role, leaders fulfill social duties, such as attending the wedding ceremonies of the employees and their children, share the same table with them at department dinners, sing and dance with them, are a team member at the company football tournament, or have a vacation with the families of all the personnel for a week. While fulfilling such social roles, leaders in a way diminish the social distance between themselves and the followers and act like the head of a family. However, the social distance would creep back at work.

Task-orientation. As part of their task-oriented behaviors, outstanding Turkish leaders are perceived to carry administrative qualities. Administrative attributes contribute to the task-related roles of a leader. An effective leader knows what is going on and what is taking place at first hand. An effective leader is expected to be informed about the details of the tasks. Furthermore, they are effective delegators of tasks and do not interfere in the job until there is a mistake.

Participation. Outstanding leaders are perceived to have collaborative team-orientation. Although they put forward their own ambitions, ideas, and benefits, they would not go against the benefit of the group. They encourage participation, instill a corporate/team culture in followers, seek acceptance and try to increase acceptance of decisions. These leaders also listen and seriously take into account the ideas of people even if the owners of these ideas do not carry the legitimacy/formal position/status to speak up publicly. They keep people with extreme opinions equally happy in a manipulative way. In the Turkish context, collaborative team-orientation is geared to creating a participative environment that promotes feelings of belongingness and being part of the group.

Participative roles of leaders in Turkey have a different meaning than in some other parts of the world. Participation is used more to make followers feel part of the group than incorporating their ideas into the decision making process or seeking consensus. Respondents indicated that outstanding leaders used consultation and participation very frequently. However, they described leaders using consultation and participation with the purpose of showing the followers that “they are valued” rather than improving decision making. For example, when CEOs see a security guard at the gate of the plant, they might ask what he thinks should be done to improve the environment of the building. While the security guard gives his ideas, he doesn’t expect them to be implemented, yet he feels satisfied that the CEO talked to him and asked his viewpoint. The security guard feels that he is valued and is part of the family.

Outstanding leaders in the Turkish context are perceived to be decisive and make decisions on their own rather than seeking consensus. On the

other hand, they are expected to involve everybody in the team in a collaborative way, and participation serves this purpose.

Charismatic/Transformational. Turkish respondents described outstanding leaders as carrying many charismatic and transformational attributes. These attributions included characteristics such as being action-oriented, assertive, and nonprocedural; carrying qualities of equanimity and integrity, being diplomatic, self-confident; and development-oriented, inspirational, and visionary.

Being decisive seems to be an important attribute that contributes to effectiveness in the Turkish context. Outstanding leaders are perceived not to waver from their own ideas and objectives in case of conflict, to make quick decisions without hesitation, and to implement decisions with confidence. Ideal leaders are perceived to pursue their own objectives and goals even if they are contradictory, and to make the final decision themselves even if they consult others. This description shows that effective leadership is associated with confident decision making that is fast, and independent. A leader may ask the ideas of others but is not expected to conform to others' ideas nor to seek consensus.

As part of the leader image that is strong and dominant, outstanding leaders are expected to be action-oriented and assertive. They are ambitious, have a controlled aggressive approach with a tendency to take risks and challenge situations, are intelligent and dynamic. They are also described as good speakers who use body language and nonverbal communication effectively; shake hands frequently and have direct eye contact with people. After they pass on, the common cause may fade away, and they are recalled by their names more than their ideas.

They are nonprocedural in the sense that they avoid bureaucracy, challenge the status quo, and are risk-takers. Outstanding leaders are expected to change the system and challenge existing ways of doing things, yet not to go against established beliefs and values that are shared in society. Outstanding leaders are perceived to be both traditional and change-oriented simultaneously, pointing to a paradox regarding the concept of leadership in the Turkish context.

They are perceived to carry qualities that are considered to be of equanimity. They are mentally and emotionally mature, do not compete with anyone, are not afraid of working with people better than themselves, are sensitive and have cultural awareness, and do not criticise others publicly. Furthermore, they are considered to be self-confident and development-oriented. They are open to criticism and feedback, and accept their mistakes. In addition, integrity seems to be an important characteristic of effective leaders. Leaders are expected to tell the truth, be trustworthy, believable, fair, and meet their promises. They are perceived to be diplomatic in the

sense that they are skillful in convincing others and are able to use non-monetary rewards and punishment.

As part of their charismatic/transformational roles, outstanding leaders are expected to inspire their followers. They are perceived to help people overcome their fear of failure, tolerate failure, give room to people to fail and learn from mistakes, and give them as much independence as possible. They are transformational leaders in that they try to increase followers' commitment and development through delegation, make people feel secure under conditions of change and uncertainty, give credit to followers and empower them by viewing them as colleagues. They see followers as a resource, showing them respect, and recognition. An outstanding leader increases the morale of the group and elevates their self-confidence and belief that they will be successful.

Finally, visionary qualities are considered to be indispensable attributes of outstanding leadership in Turkey. Leaders are expected to have vision, recognise opportunities for change, be open to change, imaginative, creative, anticipating, innovative, curious, and to encourage innovations and new ideas among followers. On the other hand, in forming their vision and decision making process, leaders are expected to go beyond a technician's viewpoint. They are expected not to be purely technical but to balance rationality with emotions; not to be too scientific or too rational but to give importance to the subjective and qualitative side of the decisions; to be emotional and even to run after a dream which may not come true. They are expected to be flexible-minded and evaluate issues from multiple perspectives, interpret rules and regulations with a flexible mind, and give more importance to conceptual overviews rather than to details and routine issues. Furthermore, they behave and think in extremes, their decision making is constrained only by what the followers demand or expect, they are ahead of others in recognising what should be the goals and how to achieve them, and their objectives have repercussions on society.

DISCUSSION

Previous investigations of Turkish organisational culture have been rather scarce and one of the contributions of this study was to explore the dominant values and practices in Turkish organisations. We have found collectivism to be the most dominant organisational value in Turkey. Collectivist values are found to influence leadership behaviors of "paternalistic-considerate" and "laissez-faire". As the culture of Turkish organisations becomes more collectivist, leader behaviors that are observed in those organisations show more paternalistic-considerate and laissez-faire characteristics. The second dominant organisational values of performance orientation and uncertainty avoidance were found not to influence any of the

observed leadership behaviors. Values of self-sacrificial, integrity, power distance and quality, which were also salient in Turkish organisations, were found to influence three of the four observed leadership behaviors (i.e. hierarchical-autocratic, transactional-team oriented, and laissez-faire). This analysis shows that organisational values have an impact on the type of leadership observed in Turkish organisations. This finding is in line with the organisational influence proposition introduced by House and his colleagues (1999).

Hierarchical-autocratic leadership behavior is found to be the most frequently observed leadership behavior, followed by paternalistic-considerate, transactional-team oriented, and laissez-faire leadership behavior in Turkey. All four leadership behaviors were influenced by organisational values. The most prominent organisational value, collectivism, was found to impact on the paternalistic-considerate and laissez-faire leadership behaviors positively. Even though power distance is not the most predominant organisational value, its presence positively influenced the hierarchical-autocratic leadership behavior and negatively impacted the laissez-faire leadership behavior. Individuals perceived more control and induced hierarchy from their leaders, and they were left less on their own to do their jobs as power distance increased in organisations. The organisational values of self-sacrificial and quality affected the transactional-team oriented leadership behavior positively, in that when the organisation emphasised devotion on the part of the employees and quality, a more rewarding and team oriented leadership style was perceived.

When one looks at the ideal leadership attributes in the Turkish context, these characteristics can be categorised into the four universal leadership behaviors. Relationship orientation as a leadership behavior is manifested as team integration and paternalism. Task orientation is perceived as carrying administrative qualities such as supervision and control and as being fully informed about the tasks. Participation is seen as collaboration and involvement. Charismatic/transformational attributes include action-orientation and assertiveness, being decisive, diplomatic, development oriented, inspirational, visionary, and nonprocedural, as well as carrying qualities of equanimity and integrity, and self-confidence.

A comparison of universal leadership attributes with ideal leader characteristics showed that ideal leader attributes cover a wider range of characteristics compared to the former set of attributes. On the other hand, there are many overlaps between the two sets of attributes. In line with the first factor, an ideal leader is frequently mentioned to be team oriented. Leaders are expected to instill a team culture in their followers, not to go against the benefit of the group, and to listen and take into account the ideas of all team members. Qualitative analyses indicated that leaders encourage participation as a means of involving people in the collective or group rather than consensus building.

In line with the second factor, an ideal leader is described as a person who is considerate and paternalistic. A leader is expected to create an environment where open communication is possible, be empathetic, and listen to people. In addition, many emic manifestations of paternalism were mentioned, including taking the initiative in deciding for the employees with regard to their personal problems, attending social events of employees, acting like one of the employees in social events, and creating a family-like atmosphere in the organisation.

“Autocratic” characteristics that were described in the fourth factor were also defined as desired attributes in Turkish society. In describing ideal leader attributes, respondents frequently mentioned being informed of all the details of the job, and a hands-on approach to problems.

It is interesting to note that ideal leader attributes did not include the transactional characteristics, which loaded on the first factor. None of the respondents mentioned using performance contingent rewards and punishment among desired leader attributes. Similarly, laissez-faire leadership that was described in factor 3 was not mentioned among the desired leader behaviors.

Furthermore, this study provides some evidence for the etic-emic discussions on leadership attributes. In the Turkish culture one can say that the four proposed universal leadership behaviors of relationship orientation, task orientation, charismatic-transformational, and participation are apparent in leadership behaviors. In this study, we found out some emic manifestations of these etic leadership attributes. For example, paternalism seems to be an important way of showing consideration to subordinates and followers. Another emic manifestation of leader behavior is participation, which is used as an inclusion mechanism in teams and involving followers in the group.

When one looks at the ideal leadership attributes, a relatively more mixed leadership style emerges. Ideal leadership behaviors include “action-oriented and assertive” characteristics, which are analogous to the observed “hierarchical-autocratic” style. An ideal leader is described as a decisive, ambitious, assertive person who is somewhat aggressive but controlled at the same time, and has a hands-on approach to problems. This image of an ideal leader is in line with high power distance and highly assertive characteristics of Turkish society.

CONCLUSION

The current study revealed some interesting preliminary results, which point toward several issues that need to be investigated in future research. Cultural influences on leadership and the effectiveness of leadership behaviors need to be addressed since they have potential applied implications for the

management of cross-cultural workgroups. Overall, collectivism seems to be an important characteristic of the Turkish culture at multiple levels of analysis. Several studies on societal culture point out that the most striking attribute of the Turkish societal culture is in-group collectivism (Hofstede, 1980; Kabasakal & Bodur, 1998). At the organisational level, this study also has found out that the most dominant characteristic of organisational culture is collectivism. Furthermore, analysis of observed and ideal leader behaviors in this study points to many leadership attributes that indicate that enhancing the team approach satisfies the needs of belongingness. A leader in the Turkish context emerges as a parent who takes care of the followers' feelings of belonging to the family.

REFERENCES

- Adler, N.J., & Boyacıgiller, N. (1995). Going beyond traditional HRM scholarship. In R.N. Kanungo (Ed.), *New approaches to employee management*, Vol. 3, *Employee management in developing countries* (pp. 1-13). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R.N., & Sinha, J.B.P. (1999). Organizational culture and human resource management practices: The model of culture fit. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30(4), 501-526.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass and Stodgill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications* (3rd edn.). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1996). *A new paradigm of leadership: An inquiry into transformational leadership*. Alexandria, VA: US Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Bass, B.M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52(2), 130-139.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M.M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research* (pp. 49-80). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Bass, B.M., Burger, P.C., Doctor, R., & Barrett, G.V. (1979). *Assessment of managers: An international comparison*. New York: Free Press.
- Blake, R.R., & Mutton, J.S. (1982). Management by grid principles or situation-alism: Which? *Group and Organizational Studies*, 7, 207-210.
- Bond, M.H. (1988). Finding universal dimensions of individual variation in multi-cultural studies of values. The Rokeach and Chinese value surveys. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 1009-1015.
- Boyacıgiller, N., & Adler, N.J. (1991). The parochial dinosaur: Organizational science in a global context. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 262-290.
- Chinese Culture Connection (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 18(2), 143-164.
- Den Hartog, N.D., House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S.A., & Dorfman, P.W. (1999). Culture specific and cross culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 219-256.

- Dilber, M. (1967). *Management in the Turkish private sector industry*. University Microfilms Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Dorfman, P.W., & Howell, J.P. (1988). Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns: Hofstede revisited. In R.N. Farmer & E.G. McGoun (Eds.), *Advances in international comparative management: A research annual* (Vol. 3, pp. 127–150). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Dorfman, P.W., Howell, J.P., Hibino, S., Lee, J.K., Tate, U., & Bautista, A. (1997). Leadership in western and Asian countries: Commonalties and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8(3), 233–274.
- Dorfman, P.W., & Ronen, S. (1991). The universality of leadership theories: Challenges and paradoxes. Paper presented at the National Academy of Management annual meeting, Miami, FL.
- Erez, M. (1994). Toward a model of cross-cultural industrial and organizational psychology. In *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, 2nd edition. USA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Fikret-Pasa, S. (1999). Leadership influence in Turkey: The case of a high power distance and collectivist culture. Unpublished manuscript.
- Fleishman, E.A. (1953). The description of supervisory behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 37, 1–6.
- Gerstner, C.R., & Day, D.V. (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5(2), 121–134.
- Glenn, E.S., & Glenn, C.G. (1981). *Man and mankind: Conflict and communication between cultures*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Haire, M., Ghiselli, E.E., & Porter, L.W. (1966). *Managerial thinking: An international study*. New York: Wiley.
- Heller, F., & Yukl, G. (1969). Participation, managerial decision making and situational variables. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 227–241.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1983). Dimensions of national cultures in fifty countries and three regions. In J. Derogowski, S. Dzuirawiec, & R. Annis (Eds.), *Episcations in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 335–355). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7(1), 81–84.
- Hofstede, G., & Bond, M.H. (1984). Hofstede's cultural dimensions: An independent validation using Roceach's value survey. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 15, 417–433.
- Hofstede, G., & Bond, M.H. (1988). Confucius and economic growth: New trends in culture's consequences. *Organizational Dynamics*, 16(4), 4–21.
- Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Ohayv, D.D., & Sanders, G. (1990). Measuring organizational cultures: A quantitative and qualitative study across twenty cases. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 286–316.
- House, R., Hanges, P.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S.A., Dorfman, P.W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M., & Gupta, V. (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 1, 171–233.

- House, R., & Mitchell, T.R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Contemporary Business*, 3 (Fall), 81–98.
- House, R., Wright, N.S., & Aditya, R.N. (1997). Cross-cultural research on organizational leadership. A critical analysis and a proposed theory. In P.C. Early & M. Erez (Eds.), *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology*. San Francisco, CA: Lexington Press.
- James, K. (1993). The social context of organizational justice: Cultural, intergroup and structural effects on justice perceptions and behaviors. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 21–50). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- James, K., Chen, D-L., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Culture and leadership among Taiwanese and US workers: Do values influence leadership ideals? In M.N. Ruderman, M.W. Hughes-James, & S.E. Jackson (Eds.), *Selected research on work team diversity*. Center for Creative Leadership. American Psychological Association Press.
- Jorgensen, J. (1995). Restructuring public enterprise in East Africa: The human resource management dimension. In R.N. Kanungo (Ed.), *New approaches to employee management*, Vol. 3, *Employee management in developing countries* (pp. 35–36). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Kabasakal, H., & Bodur, M. (1998). Leadership, values and institutions: The case of Turkey. Research Papers. Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Kanungo, R.N., & Aycan, Z. (1997). Organizational cultures and human resource practices from a cross cultural perspective. Paper presented in a symposium conducted at the Canadian Psychological Association Annual Conference, Toronto.
- Kanungo, R.N., & Jaeger, A.M. (1990). Introduction: The need for indigenous management in developing countries. In A.M. Jaeger & R.N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Management in developing countries*. London: Routledge.
- Kanungo, R.N., & Mendonca, M. (1996). Cultural contingencies and leadership in developing countries. *Sociology of Organizations*, 14, 263–295.
- Kedia, B.L., & Bhagat, R.S. (1988). Cultural constraints on transfer of technology across nations: Implications for research in international and comparative management. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(4), 559–571.
- Keller, R.T., & Szilagyi, A.D. (1976). Employee reactions to leader reward behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 19, 619–627.
- Kim, H., & Yukl, G. (1995). Relationships of self-reported and subordinate reported leadership behaviors to managerial effectiveness and advancement. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 361–377.
- Kim, U.M. (1994). Significance of paternalism and communalism in the occupational welfare system of Korean firms: A national survey. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications (Cross-cultural research and methodology*, No. 18, 251–266). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mendonca, M., & Kanungo, R.N. (1994). Managing human resources: The issue of cultural fit. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 3(2), 189–205.
- Misumi, J. (1985). *The behavioral science of leadership*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Misumi, J., & Peterson, M.F. (1985). The performance-maintenance (PM) theory of leadership: Review of a Japanese research program. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, June, 198–223.
- Ng, S.H., Hossain, A.B., Ball, P., Bond, M.H., Hayashi, K., Lim, S.P., O'Driscoll, M.P., Sinha, D., & Yang, K.S. (1982). Human values in nine countries. In R. Rath, H.S. Asthana, D. Sinha, & J.B.H. Sinha (Eds.), *Diversity and unity in cross-cultural psychology*. Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Rao, A., Hashimoto, K., & Rao, A. (1997). Universal and culturally specific aspects of managerial influence: A study of Japanese managers. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8(3), 295–312.
- Rodrigues, C.A. (1990). The situation and national culture as contingencies for leadership behavior: Two conceptual models. In S.B. Prasad (Ed.), *Advances in international comparative management: A research annual* (Vol. 5, pp. 51–68). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Ronen, S. (1986). *Comparative and multinational management*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ronen, S., & Shenkar, O. (1985). Clustering countries on attitudinal dimensions: A review and synthesis. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(3), 435–454.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Schein, E.H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd edn.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schmidt, S.M., & Yeh, R.H. (1992). The structure of leader influence: A cross national comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 23(2), 251–262.
- Schwartz, S.H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21, 139–157.
- Schwartz, S.H. (1994). Cultural dimensions of values: Towards an understanding of national differences. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S.C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism. Theoretical and methodological issues* (pp. 85–119). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shackleton, V.-J., & Ali, A.-H. (1990). Work-related values of managers: A test of the Hofstede model. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21(1), 109–118.
- Sims, H.P. (1977). The leader as a manager of reinforcement contingencies: An empirical example of a model. In J.G. Hun & L.L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Sinha, J.B.P. (1980). *The nurturant task leader*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing House.
- Sinha, J.B.P. (1990). A model of effective leadership styles in India. In A.M. Jaeger & R.N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Management in developing countries*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, P., Dugan, S., & Trompenaars, F. (1996). National culture and the values of organizational employees. A dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27(2), 231–264.
- Smith, P.B., & Bond, M.H. (1993). *Social psychology across cultures: Analysis and perspectives*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Smith, P.B., Misumi, J., Tayep, M., Peterson, M.F., & Bond, M.H. (1989). On the generality of leadership styles across cultures. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 62, 97–109.

- Smith, P.B., & Peterson, M.F. (1994). Leadership as event management: A cross-cultural survey based on managers from 25 nations. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Congress of Psychology, Madrid.
- Stodgill, R.M., Goode, O.S., & Day, D.R. (1962). New leader behavior description subscales. *Journal of Psychology*, *54*, 259–269.
- Strauss, G. (1977). Managerial practices. In J.R. Hackman & J.L. Suttle (Eds.), *Improving life at work*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.
- Tannebaum, R., & Schmidt, W.H. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review*, *36*, March–April, 95–101.
- Tayeb, M. (1988). *Organizations and national culture: A comparative analysis*. London: Sage.
- Tayeb, M. (1994). Organizations and national culture: Methodology considered. *Organizational Studies*, *15*, 429–446.
- Triandis, H.C. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York: John Wiley.
- Triandis, H.C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, *96*, 506–520.
- Triandis, H.C. (1993). The contingency model in cross-cultural perspective. In M.M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in global business* (2nd edn.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Vroom, V.H., & Yetton, P.W. (1973). *Leadership and decision making*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Yukl, G. (1987). A new taxonomy for integrating diverse perspectives on managerial behavior. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Meeting, New York.
- Yukl, G. (1997). Effective leadership behavior: A new taxonomy and model. Paper presented at the Eastern Academy of Management International Conference, Dublin, Ireland, June.
- Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations* (4th edn.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Yukl, G., Wall, S., & Lepsinger, R. (1990). Preliminary report on validation of the managerial practices survey. In K.E. Clark & M.B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 223–238). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Copyright of *Applied Psychology: An International Review* is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.