

A RESEARCH CONCERNING THE IMPACT OF THE LEADER MANAGER BEHAVIOR ON THE BUSINESS

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ayhan SEYFULLAHOĞULLARI

Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksekokulu

Abstract

In recent times, global economic crisis increasingly affects the world with almost all its violence, thus leaders or managers in leadership concept has begun to gain more importance. Leadership and management are often confused. But the two are very different concepts. For example, management can be attained through training and education. On the other hand, leadership comes from person's nature and it is intrinsic. Management training can be taken, you can go to school and eventually the person with training and experience may be a good manager. However, many other features are required for leadership. Today, there are important differences between managers and business leaders in terms of contributing to business. Managers sometimes experience significant problems in very large enterprises. Even most selected managers may not have good relations with employees and thereby they are not adopted as leaders. The purpose of the study, as concerned with the working of a business, is to introduce the profile of a leader manager as thought to be more effective than classical manager and, as concerned the functioning of the business, to determine the leader manager behaviour thought to be affecting the factors "Customer Relations", "Market Process", "Financial Dimensions", "New Dimension." For this purpose, the descriptive analysis of leadership behaviour of administrators, the differentiation status depending on demographic characteristics, t test out of parametric tests, one-way analysis of variance, cause and result relation, and multiple regression analysis have been conducted. It has been determined that administrators, either single or married, have shown similar leadership behavior, that managers largely do not accept to take decisions centrally, that, women managers are more oppressive than male manager for overtime and that the managers who their own business put more pressure on subordinates than other managers.

Key Words: Governance, Leadership, Parametric Tests.

LİDER YÖNETİCİ DAVRANIŞININ İŞLETMEYE ETKİSİNE İLİŞKİN BİR ARAŞTIRMA

Özet

Küresel ekonomik krizin giderek artan bir şiddette neredeyse tüm dünyayı etkilediği bugünlerde, lider yönetici yada liderlik kavramı da giderek daha çok önem kazanmaya başladı. Çoğu kez liderlik ile yöneticilik birbirleri ile karıştırılırlar. Ancak ikisi çok farklı kavramlardır. Örneğin yöneticilik öğrenilen, eğitimi alınabilen bir konudur. Liderlik ise insanların kendi doğal yapısından ve içten gelen bir kavramdır. Yöneticilik için eğitim alınabilir, okula gidilebilir ve neticede aldığı eğitim ve tecrübelerle kişi iyi bir yönetici olabilir. Ancak liderlik için daha birçok özelliğe ihtiyaç vardır. Bugün yönetici ve lider arasında işletmeye katkı boyutunda önemli farklılıklar görülür. Çok büyük işletmelerde yöneticiler bazen önemli sorunlar yaşarlar. En seçme yöneticiler kendileri ile çalışanlarla geçinemeyebilir ve bu durumda lider olarak benimsenmezler. Çalışmanın amacı, bir işletmenin işleyişiyle ilgili olmak üzere, klasik yönetici davranışına göre daha etkin olduğu düşünülen lider yönetici profilini ortaya koymak ve işletmenin işleyişiyle ilgili olmak üzere "Müşteri İlişkileri", "Pazar Süreci", "Mali Boyut", "Yenilik Boyutu" gibi çeşitli faktörleri etkilediği düşünülen lider-yönetici davranışlarını belirlemektir. Bu amaçla, yöneticilerin göstermiş oldukları liderlik davranışlarının tanımlayıcı analizi, demografik özelliklerine bağlı olarak farklılaşma durumu, parametrik testlerden t testi, tek yönlü varyans analizi ve neden-sonuç ilişkisi, çoklu regresyon analizi ile incelenmiştir. Yöneticilerin göstermiş oldukları liderlik davranışlarının, bekâr ya da evli olmaları fark etmeksizin benzer davranışları gösterdikleri, yöneticilerin kararların merkezi olarak alınmasını büyük ölçüde kabul etmedikleri, kadın yöneticilerin erkek yöneticilere göre fazla mesai için daha baskıcı olduklarını, kendi işyerlerinin başındaki yöneticilerin aslarına daha fazla mesai için diğer yöneticilere oranla daha fazla baskı yaptıkları saptanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yönetişim, Liderlik, Parametrik Testler.

Introduction

Manager's most important job is to organize and coordinate employees. The most important issue here is to provide efficiency. Efficiency is working every second for the company and for the benefit of the company. First, managers must organize themselves, too (Edgett, p. 123).

In the process of rapid change and transformation, distance is no longer, set in the relations between people as a parameter. People are involved in a wide variety of networks with a single identity, but they have plural identities (Tekeli, 1996, p. 50). Naturally, this environment has an impact on the management discipline. With the rapid changes experienced in recent times, governance has started to dominate the milieu (Dunshire, 1995, p. 34). Governance, as distinct from management, is the combination of administration, communication and interaction and it means to manage together.

Corporate governance in companies has been taken up as the evaluation of power and responsibility for the independence of the business (Puffer & McCarty, 2003). Companies with good corporate governance are institutions which provide confidence to financial markets, employees, suppliers, customers and the community.

Management in companies is representing more companies, controlling group efforts and purposes and directing and orienting personnel action. Administrative leadership is the leadership from the manager's power and capabilities and at the same time the ability to influence their subordinates through their hearts. Leadership, in the shortest, is the art of influencing people. Today, every manager, to be successful, must have leadership characteristics. Leader is not the only man, but is a team player having a team. Leaders are people-focused, participant, sharing, creative, lean, light, flexible, and they are the leading persons (Peker & Aytürk, 2000, p. 48).

Researchers denote that leadership capable managers show advanced empathy-building skills. Between leadership characteristics that come first are people can express themselves well, establish good relations with others, and they have features such as high social awareness. For all these features, people need skills to empathise, or empathy skills bring out these features (Tutar, Yilmaz et al, 2003, p. 55).

Leader is the owner of the mission. Mission owners focus on improving his /her skills (Andreas & Faulkner, 2001, p. 77). Beliefs, actions, values form a person's self in the top of a roof. One of the distinctive features of the people who reach a high degree are making their lives purposeful and directing it towards a mission.

Leaders should have the following four main features (Goleman, 2001, p. 153):

- To organize groups,
- Discuss to find a solution,
- Personal contact,
- Social analysis.

Managers have leadership skills as much as they influence people (Blank, 1995). As long as the significance of the workers to contribute to the success of the company is irreplaceably revealed, the concepts such as 360 degree performance management system and the participant management have started managers to be aware of their employees more and, to face criticism when required. Now that managers see others walk around their own backyard, managers, though they have difficulty in it, the real problem has not been associated with their ego, but with the need to acquire new management tactics. So just to give orders and to direct could not lead the business to success. Other methods to support and to be helpful to leaders are to put their employees' potential in force that must be used (Mickletvait & Wooldridge, 1998). The best example for this conflict of new leadership approach can be the words of Tommy Lasorda who is Los Angeles Dodgers' coach for long years: "To manage people is like to keep a pigeon in hands. If you squeeze it too much, you kill it, but if you squeeze it loose, it runs away."

In our country, when "Leader" is pronounced, the leaders of political parties immediately come to mind. In Western countries, however, this concept is generally perceived as business life leaders. In order to meet rapidly changing needs in business life, to persevere in ruthless competitive environment and to keep developing, to provide and install basic living essentials for business continuity and to improve performance through reaching the potential of the employees, the manager of today must be "Leader Manager."

According to writings about leadership, a leader has the following features:

- To know his/her personal characteristics and the capacity,
- To know which way to improve his / her capacity and features,
- To have an original idea about the needs to be done in the future,
- To have future plans that are committed and willing to be realised,
- To see in himself the capacity and power to do all these things,
- To have the ability in taking responsibility, teamwork, problem solving, strategic thinking, analytical thought and new ideas,
- To be cautious to take risks,
- To continue to quest for the better,
- To be able to motivate himself/herself and around,

- To be a model for the organization.

In the application of the first section, descriptive statistics is given to evaluate manager behaviour, in the second section the differentiation of managers according to demographic characteristics has been studied, in the third section the manager behaviour which is thought to affect the operation of businesses in terms of "Customer Relations", "Marketing Process," Financial Dimensions "," Innovation " factors has been tried to determine.

Research and Methods

Research Methodology

Objectives of the survey: Survey of the effects of leadership behaviour within the dimensions of "Customer Relations", "Market Process", "Financial Dimension", and "Innovation" has been covered. Moreover, the differentiation in the leadership behavior of managers, depending on the demographic characteristics has been investigated.

Scope of the survey: The middle and upper level managers of small and medium-size companies in our country are the mass of our research. In determining the sampling representing the mass comprising of approximately 1,500,000 managers has been used. The mass is not homogeneous. Obtained in this framework, the survey questions have been sent as a questionnaire randomly to 387 managers. However, only 275 surveys have come back, and only 252 surveys have been used for the research.

Data Collection Methods: The research is a scanning model. Research data were collected from the available administrators with the assistance of surveyors trained beforehand and with the questionnaire form prepared by the researcher. Other forms within the scope of the research have been sent to administrators in the sample group by mail or distributed by hand.

Preparation of the Survey Questions: In the first part of the questionnaire, managers demographic characteristics related questions are included, in the second part managers' leadership behaviour is measured through relevant questions, in the third section the managers' company perspectives are examined under the headings of "Customer Relations", "Market Process," "Financial Dimension," "Innovation."

Customer Relations: "the number of customer complaints is less," "the rate of re-buying of the customers is high," "Market Process: "when compared with competitors of our company's market share is higher", "product quality is high," " the number of incorrect the products is less" " introduced the new product is a leader in the market", "market gives more positive responds to the product changes and improvements," Financial Dimensions: " prices are competitive," "company

investment return is higher, "products of new products/services sales in the industry is well positioned, "Innovation Dimension: "new products are offered to market before their competitors,""the developed methods concerning internal processes are very innovative","developed many new products are numerically high" definitions are in the context of the four dimensions.

Five-Likert-scale was used in the evaluation questions. For the leadership behaviours (1) Many, (2) Frequently, (3) Less, (4) Rarely, (5) Never, options have been used. For "Customer Relations", "Marketing Period", "Financial Dimensions", "Innovation," "Definitely Agree", "Agree", "Undecided", "Disagree", "Definitely Disagree" options are used. In this context, as long as the average score from the leadership part increased, it has been understood, the managers display leadership behaviour more. The increase in the points received from the third section must be interpreted as the sign of failure in the relevant dimension.

The Data Analysis and Statistical Methods: In the research, the analysis of the data obtained from data gathering methods has been conducted through using SPSS 15 package program in computer environment. In the identification of variables, the data group comprised of variables numerical as type and numerical scale as scale.

The Validity and Reliability of the Research

The reliability of the survey has been tested through the Alpha coefficient (Cronbach Alpha). In order determine to what extent and to which direction the questions affect the Alpha coefficient, "If the Variable is Deleted Alpha Coefficient" values have been calculated for the survey. The values, if any variable is deleted, show the internal consistency of the remaining variables. Through reliability analysis, those questions which do not contribute to the internal consistency have been removed of the scale. The data obtained from analysis of the 252 participants have been used.

Out of reliability analysis of the results which show internal consistency, the Leadership Scale Reliability Coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) is $\alpha = 0.825$. However, when items were erased from the Cronbach Alpha column in Table 1, through the deletions of the questions 1,3,4,5,6,7,10,12,14,15,16,22,24,26,28,29,31,32,33,34 out of the scale, the internal consistency of the scale increased to $\alpha = 0.926$.

Table 1: Leadership Scale Reliability Statistics

Cronbach Alpha	Item Number
,926	18

It is understood that when item is deleted, deletion of any of the rest of 18 questions would not help the reliability of the scale, but would reduce reliability.

Method

t test: t distribution is a zero average and the single-mode is symmetrical distribution. The shape of this distribution is similar to the shape of the normal distribution, but the variability is greater. When the sample size (n) increases, while the standard deviation is smaller, the t distribution is closer to the standard normal distribution (Hamburg, 1987).

t test, is the most widely used method in hypothesis testing. Through t test comparison of the two groups is conducted and the difference in between is decided whether random or statistically meaningful. There are three types of the tests. These are one-sample t test, independent samples t test, paired-samples t test. Independent two-sample t test is the difference of two independent sample groups. Paired-sample t test is between two paired groups (Altunışık et al., 2002). Independent two sample t test compares the averages of two sample groups. The members of the groups are different from each other. There should not be any common member between the groups. For this analysis, the data must be measured at least at the level of the interval.

One-Way Analysis of Variance: Through "t" test, it is only possible to examine the differences between two groups. However, often a lot more than two group comparison study is needed. When more than two groups are compared with each other, the "t" test is inadequate. However, when comparison of the group has more than two cases, two with t test to compare the two averages would be possible, but this method might lead to 1st types of mistakes in increasing rates, too. The more tests are done, the more type 1 error rate will arise (Altunışık et al., 2002). Variance analysis is a test for the comparison of the two groups without increasing type 1 error. In variance analysis, Ho hypothesis shows that the average of all the groups expressed is either equal or there is no difference.

$$H_0 = \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = \dots = \mu_n$$

Ha= there is significant difference between the average of at least two groups.

Ho hypothesis will be tested by comparing two variance estimates. The first is the variances in groups (Mean square error MSE). Whether MSE Ho Hypothesis is true or not, it is the estimate of the variance (Kalaycı, 2008). The second estimate is based on the average of the groups' variances. (Mean square between MSB). MSB is the estimate of variance only if the hypothesis Ho is correct. If the Ho hypothesis is wrong, MSB estimates larger than σ^2 . As a result, the hypothesis testing in variance analysis can be written as follows:

If MSE is approximately equal with the MSB, Ho hypothesis is correct
If MSB, is greater than MSE, the Ho hypothesis is wrong

As it could be understood here in the analysis of variance, primary target is to understand whether there is difference between averages. To reach the result, as the process is used to compare two variances, it is called as variance analysis. In order to understand whether there is significant difference between the variance between groups and the one obtained from the groups, the hypothesis test is performed.

In variance analysis, F value is used to test the hypothesis.

$$F = \frac{MSB}{MSE}$$

If F value is smaller than the table value in terms of relevant significance level, Ho hypothesis is not rejected. That is the result that there is no significant difference between the averages (Kalayci, 2008). If the F value is bigger than the table value, Ho hypothesis is rejected. In this case, it is judged that there is a significant difference between the averages.

The most known and most widely used is "one-way analysis of variance" among the tests developed to compare more than two groups (Altunişik et al., 2002). The expression of one-way group separates the groups, it means, the groups are separated with one variable's value.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is the simplest analysis of variance. There are two variables. One variable is independent which shows categorical feature and the other is dependent variable which shows metric properties. Within independent variable, there may be two or more groups. ANOVA is used to test, according to these groups, whether there is difference between the averages with dependent variable.

Regression Analysis

Regression in statistical sense is understood as the relationship between two variables, and there is dependence between mutual changes in their values. If while the value of X (independent) variable changes, the value of Y variable changes, it can be said there is a relationship between two variables (Yüzer et al., 2008). In fact, the relationship between variables is the cause and result relationship. Here the reason-result relationship is expressed with a mathematical function, which is the subject of regression analysis. If, in regression analysis, the number of independent (explanatory) variables is one, it is a simple regression model, and when two or more, it is a multiple regression model, While the relationship between the inflation rate and money supply is the subject of a simple regression analysis, the relationship between inflation rate and money supply and the relationship between inflation rate and public spending are the subjects of multiple regression analysis. If the relationship is linear, simple regression analysis model

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i + e_i \quad i=1, 2, \dots, N$$

Multiple linear regression model is;

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_i + \beta_2 X_i + \dots + \beta_N X_N + e_i$$

While in multiple linear regression model hypothesis H_0 is established equal to zero in all regression coefficients, at least one variable H_a hypothesis (β) is established as different from zero. T test is used for statistical significance of the parameters one by one and F test is used to test whether the whole model is significant.

Determinable coefficient (R^2) shows what percent the dependent variable is explained by independent variables included in the model. On the other hand, one point that must be emphasised in multiple regression model is that determinable coefficient increases as much as the number of variables included in the model. In such cases, adjusted determinable coefficient must be focused.

Results and Interpretation

Findings Concerning the Leadership Behavior the Managers Demonstrate

This section includes the descriptive statistics of the managers' leadership behavior and leader-manager's behaviour can be put under 5 headings.

F1: Central Decision Making Behaviour

F2: Pressure Behaviour for OvertimeWork

F3: One-Way Communication Behaviour

F4: Pressure Behaviour For More Diligence

F5: Making Spokesman of Subordinates Behaviour.

When managers' "Central Decision-making" behaviour corresponds to the statements "1" option, "Definitely Agree", "2" option, "Agree", "3" option, "Indecisive", "4" option, "Disagree", "5" option, "Definitely Disagree," and is examined by taking into consideration the corresponds, it is understood, managers do not accept central decision making and do not use it much.

Table 2: *Central Decision-Making Behaviour*

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Central decision-making behaviour	252	1,00	5,00	3,6604	,70892

Considering an average value in Table2 and assessment is made, it can be said that, though managers take decisions centrally from time to time, they avoid this central decision-making method.

When managers "Pressure for Overtime " behaviour is examined taking into account the corresponding statements "1" option, "Definitely Agree", "2" option, "Agree", "3" option, "Indecisive", "4" option, "Disagree", "5" option "Definitely Disagree," it is understood that managers are indecisive whether they build up pressure over their subordinates.

Tablo 3: *Pressure for Overtime Behaviour*

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Enforcement For Overtime Behaviour	252	1,25	5,00	3,0771	,77437

Taking into consideration the average value in Table 3, it can be said that managers from time to time put pressure on their subordinates to work overtime.

Examining managers "One-Way Communication" behaviour according to corresponding statements "1" option, "Definitely Agree", "2" option, "Agree", "3" option, "Indecisive", "4" option, "Disagree", "5" option, "Definitely Disagree" statements, it is understood that there is one-way communication between managers and their subordinates.

Tablo 4: *One-Way Communication Behaviour*

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
One-Way Communication	252	1,83	5,00	3,54	,64128

Looking at the average value in Table 4, it can be said that managers try to avoid this type of communication, but they have applied it from time to time.

Examining managers' "Pressure for More Diligence " behaviour taking into account the statements "1" option, "Definitely Agree", "2" option, "Agree", "3" option, "Indecisive", "4" option, "Disagree", "5" option, "Definitely Disagree," it is understood that, managers do not agree with the statement to press subordinates for more efforts.

Tablo 5: *Pressure for More Diligence Behaviour*

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Pressure for More Diligence Behaviour	252	1,00	5,00	3,83	,80052

By considering the average value in Table 5, it can be said that managers largely avoid pressing their subordinates for more efforts.

When managers' "Making their Subordinates' Spokesman" behavior is examined according to the statements corresponding "1" option, "Definitely Agree", "2" option, "Agree", "3" option, "Indecisive", "4" option, "Disagree", "5" option, "Definitely Disagree," it is understood that they are indecisive on speaking on behalf of their subordinates.

Table 6: *The Spokesman of Subordinates Behaviour*

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
The Spokesman Subord. Done Behaviour	252	1,00	5,00	3,2886	,95201

Considering the average value in Table 6, it can be said that they talk from time to time on behalf of their subordinates, but they avoid this behavior as much as possible.

Results of t Test and Variance Analysis

In this section, the differentiation in the managers' behaviour in the sample according to demographic characteristics is tested according to the above-mentioned theory, t-test and One-Way Variance Analysis techniques.

Examining executives' behaviour according to sex differentiation (Table 7), it is seen that there is meaningful difference only in the relationship between gender and leadership behaviour and for the variable F2 (pressure for over-time), and there is no statistically meaningful relationship between other variables. Looking at the difference between F2 women average (2.83) and male average (3.12), woman managers are more oppressive than male managers for over-time. Regardless of whether manager is male or female, in Central for Behavioral Decision Making, One-Way Communication Behaviour, Pressure for More Diligence Behaviour, and the Advocacy of Subordinates are independent, in other words, there is no statistically meaningful relationship between gender and these variables.

Table 7: *The Difference by Sex of Executive Leadership Behaviour*

	Sex	N	Mean	Standart Deviation	Std. Error	t	Sig.
F1	Woman	64	3,5781	,81147	,10143	-,914	,362
	Man	188	3,6715	,66734	,04867		
F2	Woman	64	2,8320	,67708	,08464	-2,651	,009
	Man	188	3,1250	,79078	,05767		
F3	Woman	64	3,4948	,63271	,07909	-,337	,736
	Man	188	3,5266	,65783	,04798		
F4	Woman	64	3,7891	,80082	,10010	-,676	,499
	Man	188	3,8670	,79486	,05798		
F5	Woman	64	3,3672	,87397	,10925	,768	,443
	Man	188	3,2633	,95407	,06958		

Examining the differentiation in administrators' leadership behaviour, according to the age (Table 8), the relationship between leadership behaviour and the age for the variable F2 (pressure for overtime) is statistically meaningful, however, for there is no statistically meaningful relationship between other variables and age. Especially 25-34 age group is pressing for overtime, while other age groups, we can say that, are more moderate. Regardless of differences in managers' age, Central for Behavioral Decision Making, One-Way Communication Behaviour, Pressure for More Diligence Behaviour, and the Advocacy of Subordinates are independent, in other words, it is concluded that there is no statistically meaningful difference between age and other variables.

Table 8: *The Difference by Age of Executive Leadership Behaviour*

	Age	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	F	Sig.
F1	25-34	104	3,6731	,61935	,06073	,138	,937
	35-44	80	3,6531	,71655	,08011		
	45-54	55	3,6000	,83139	,11210		
	55 +	13	3,6154	,79569	,22039		
	Total	252	3,6478	,70621	,04449		
F2	25-34	104	2,8726	,71478	,07009	3,675	,013
	35-44	80	3,2313	,71132	,07953		
	45-54	55	3,0818	,87936	,11857		
	55 +	13	3,2308	,87477	,24262		
	Total	252	3,0506	,77284	,04868		
F3	25-34	104	3,5465	,60804	,05962	1,719	,164
	35-44	80	3,5875	,69556	,07777		
	45-54	55	3,4424	,68510	,09238		
	55 +	13	3,1923	,44538	,12353		
	Total	252	3,5185	,65044	,04097		
F4	25-34	104	3,8125	,86795	,08511	2,518	,059
	35-44	80	3,9750	,57863	,06469		
	45-54	55	3,8455	,79557	,10768		
	55 +	13	3,3462	1,14354	,31716		
	Total	252	3,8472	,79558	,05012		
F5	25-34	104	3,2885	,98949	,09703	1,813	,145
	35-44	80	3,4313	,89210	,09774		
	45-54	55	3,1909	,80789	,10894		
	55 +	13	2,8462	1,12518	,31207		
	Total	252	3,2885	,98949	,09703		

When the differentiation in administrators' leadership behaviour is examined according to marital status in Table 9, the relationship between leadership behavior and marital status is not statistically significant.

Table 9: *The Difference by Marital Status of Executive Leadership Behaviour*

	Marital Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	t	Significance
F1	Single	71	3,6479	,72405	,08593	,001	,999
	Married	181	3,6478	,70113	,05211		
F2	Single	71	2,8908	,69402	,08237	-2,069	,040
	Married	181	3,1133	,79470	,05907		
F3	Single	71	3,5681	,60197	,07144	,757	,450
	Married	181	3,4991	,66909	,04973		
F4	Single	71	3,8521	,78556	,09323	,061	,951
	Married	181	3,8453	,80163	,05958		
F5	Single	71	3,4014	,96592	,11463	1,191	,235
	Married	181	3,2459	,91987	,06837		

These findings show that administrators' leadership behaviour with all its aspects is independent from marital status and it is concluded that administrators, whether single or married, show similar behaviour.

When the differentiation of administrators' leadership behaviour in accordance with their educational level is examined (Table 10), it is seen that between level of education and "Central Decision-Making" and "Making Spokesman of Subordinates" there is $p < 0.01$, between level of education and "Pressure for More Diligent Behaviour" there is $p < 0,05$ statistically significant difference. It can be seen that between education level and "One-Way Communication" and "Pressure for Over-time" there is not statistically significant difference.

Table 10: *The Difference by Education Level of Executive Leadership Behaviour*

	Education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	F	Sig.
F1	Primary School	4	4,0625	,65749	,32874	4,353	,001
	Secondary School	6	4,0000	,96177	,39264		
	High School	29	4,0517	,82748	,15366		
	Vocational	13	3,8462	,42743	,11855		
	Licence	152	3,6118	,69992	,05677		
	Graduate	48	3,3854	,54078	,07805		
	Total	252	3,6478	,70621	,04449		
F2	Primary School	4	3,7500	1,06066	,53033	6,423	,000
	Secondary School	6	3,8333	1,08012	,44096		
	High School	29	3,5673	,82758	,15368		
	Vocational	13	3,0769	,84400	,23408		
	Licence	152	2,9539	,73884	,05993		
	Graduate	48	2,8646	,53085	,07662		
	Total	252	3,0506	,77284	,04868		
F3	Primary School	4	3,3333	1,13039	,56519	1,328	,253
	Secondary School	6	3,5833	,98742	,40311		
	High School	29	3,7414	,76582	,14221		
	Vocational	13	3,7308	,50707	,14064		
	Licence	152	3,4923	,65619	,05322		
	Graduate	48	3,4167	,46509	,06713		
	Total	252	3,5185	,65044	,04097		
F4	Primary School	4	4,2500	,28868	,14434	,746	,590
	Secondary Scho.	6	3,6667	,81650	,33333		
	High School	29	3,8448	,88745	,16479		
	Vocational	13	3,5769	,57177	,15858		
	Licence	152	3,8914	,81768	,06632		
	Graduate	48	3,7708	,74347	,10731		
	Total	252	3,8472	,79558	,05012		
F5	Primary School	4	4,8750	,25000	,12500	4,057	,001
	Secondary Scho.	6	3,1667	1,16905	,47726		
	High School	29	3,5172	,96809	,17977		
	Vocational	13	3,3462	,55470	,15385		
	Licence	152	3,3059	,88783	,07201		
	Graduate	48	3,9688	,99149	,14311		
	Total	252	3,2897	,93377	,05882		

As this finding demonstrates, it is concluded that as long as managers' education level increases, they start to move away from central decision making, they speak on behalf of their subordinates less and they prefer pressure method to promote for more efforts less.

Examining the differentiation in the leadership behaviour that administrators show according to their proprietary status (Table 11), between "Pressure for Overtime" and proprietary status there is $p < 0.01$ level statistically significant difference, and between other leadership behaviour and ownership status there is no statistically significant difference.

Table 11: *The Difference by Ownership Status of Executive Leadership Behaviour*

	Ownership Status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	t	Sig.
F1	No	173	3,6026	,70758	,05380	-1,508	,133
	Yes	79	3,7468	,69740	,07846		
F2	No	173	2,9104	,73970	,05624	-4,415	,000
	Yes	79	3,3576	,75922	,08542		
F3	No	173	3,4961	,61970	,04711	-,807	,420
	Yes	79	3,5675	,71488	,08043		
F4	No	173	3,7977	,76409	,05809	-1,466	,144
	Yes	79	3,9557	,85556	,09626		
F5	No	173	3,2428	,89833	,06830	-1,181	,239
	Yes	79	3,3924	1,00534	,11311		

This finding concludes that those managers who run their own business do more pressure on their subordinates for overtime work than other managers, and apart from that there is no statistically significant relationship between leadership behaviour and property ownership.

The Findings Concerning the Impacts of Leadership

Behaviour Managers Demonstrate

In this section, the impacts of leadership behaviour managers demonstrate on "Customer Relations", "Marketing Process," Financial Dimension "," Innovation Dimension" are tried to determine.

The relationship between managers' leadership behaviour and the Customer Relations is examined by using multiple regression analysis and the results of the analysis are presented Table 12. Accordingly, it is understood that independent variables explain dependent variables that belong the variance approximately 13 %. In other words, leadership behaviour identifies 13% of the Customer Relations.

Table 12: *The Model Summary of the Impact of Leadership Behaviour in Customer Relations*

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standart Error of Estimates
,362	,131	,113	,58283

As seen in Table 13, the effects of Central Decision-Making, Pressure for Overtime, One-Way Communication, Pressure for the more Diligence, and Spokesman for Subordinates' Behaviour which are positioned as independent variables are examined separately one by one. Accordingly, it can be said that there is a significant relationship between Central Decision Making and One-Way Communication and the Customer Relations in $p < 0.01$ level and that these two factors can be said to be effective in the values of the Customer Relations.

The value of Customer Relations out of the data in Table 13 can be formulated as follows.

Customer Relations Score = 2.908 + 0.192 Central for Decision Score -0.051 for More Diligence Overtime Score + 0.257 One-Way Communication Score -0.024 pressure for More Diligence -0.117 Spokesman for Subordinates Score.

Table 13: *The Coefficients concerning the Impacts of Leadership Behaviour on Customer Relations*

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Significance
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2,908	,244		11,926	,000
F1	,192	,068	,219	2,807	,005
F2	-,051	,060	-,063	-,847	,398
F3	,257	,070	,270	3,648	,000
F4	-,024	,054	-,031	,450	,653
F5	-,117	,045	-,177	-2,624	,009

The relationship between the leadership behaviour of managers and Market Process has been examined by using multiple regression analysis and the results of the analysis have been presented in Table 14. Accordingly, independent variables explain the variance of dependent variables at a rate of 9%, in other words the leadership behaviour identifies 9 % Market Process.

Table 14: *The Model Summary of the Impact of Leadership Behaviour on Market Process*

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standart Error of estimates
,288	,083	,064	,73001

The impacts of independent variables, as seen in Table 15, Central Decision-Making, and Pressure for Overtime, One-Way Communication, and Pressure for more Diligence, and Spokesman for Subordinates behaviour on Market Process have been examined separately. Accordingly, it can be said that there is significant relationship between One-Way Communication and Pressure for Overtime and Market Process in $p < 0.01$ level, in other words, in the value of the customer relations, these two factors can be said to be effective.

Table 15: *The Coefficients concerning the Impacts of Leadership Behaviour on The Market Process*

	Untandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Significance
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	3,648	,305		11,944	,000
F1	,068	,086	,064	,797	,426
F2	-,307	,075	-,315	-4,105	,000
F3	,274	,088	,236	3,104	,002
F4	,064	,067	,068	,962	,337
F5	-,065	,056	-,080	-1,158	,248

Out of the data in Tables of 15 the value that market process can receive can be formulated as follows:

Market Process Score = 3.648 + 0.068 Central for Decision-Making Score - 0.307 Pressure for Overtime Score + 0.274 One-Way Communication Score + 0.064 Pressure for More Diligence score -0.065 Spokesman for Subordinates Score

It is understood that the relationship between managers' leadership behaviour and Financial Dimension has been examined by using multiple regression analysis and the analysis results are presented in Table 16. Accordingly, the independent variables explain the variance which belongs to the dependent variable at a rate of approximately 10% and, in the other words; leadership behaviour identifies 10% of the Financial Perspective.

Table 16: *The Model Summary of the Impact of Leadership on Financial Dimension*

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standart Error of estimates
,305	,093	,075	,66235

As seen in Table 17, the impacts of the independent variables Central Decision, Pressure for Overtime, One-Way Communication, Pressure for more Diligence, and Spokesman for Subordinates on the Financial Dimension are examined one by one. Accordingly, between pressure for overtime and One-Way Communication Financial Dimension there is $p < 0.01$ level is a significant relationship, and in other words, the value of the financial perspective, these two factors can be said to be effective.

Table 17: *The Coefficients concerning the Impact of Leadership Behaviour on Financial Dimension*

	Untandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Significance
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant	3,243	,277		11,701	,000
F1	,104	,078	,107	1,338	,182
F2	-,266	,068	-,299	-3,925	,000
F3	,309	,080	,292	3,864	,000
F4	,000	,061	,000	,002	,998
F5	-,012	,051	-,016	-,227	,820

The value the Financial Dimension can receive can be formulated out of the data in Tables of 17 as follows:

Financial Dimension Score = 3.243 + 0.104 Central for Decision-Making Score - 0.266 Pressure for Overtime Score+ 0.309 One-Way Communication Score + 0.000 Pressure for more Diligence Score -0.012 Spokesman for Subordinates Score

The relationship between managers' leadership behaviour and Innovation Dimension has been examined by using multiple regression analysis and the results of analysis presented in Table 18. Accordingly, it is understood that independent variables explain the variance belonging to dependent variables at a rate of 7%, in other words, leadership behaviour identifies 7% of New Perspectives.

Table 18: *The Model Summary on the Impacts of Leadership Behaviour on the Innovation Dimension*

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standart Error of estimates
,264	,070	,051	,67392

As seen in Table 19, the effects of independent variables Central Decision, Pressure for Overtime, One-Way Communication, and Pressure for more Diligence and, Spokesman for Subordinates behaviour on the Innovation have been examined separately. Accordingly, it can be said that there is meaningful relationship between One-Way Communication and Innovation Dimension in $p < 0.01$ level, and between Pressure for more Diligence and New Perspective in $p < 0.05$ level and, in other words, in the value of Innovation these two factors can be said to be effective. The value the New Perspectives value can receive out of the data in Table 19 can be formulated as follows:

Innovation Dimension score: 3.027 Decision Making Score -0.098 Central Decision -0.099 Pressure for Overtime $+ 0.260$ One-Way Communication $+ 145$ Pressure for more Diligence -0.027 Spokesman for Subordinates

Table 19: *The Coefficients concerning the Effect of Leadership Behaviour on Innovation Dimension*

	Untandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Significance
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant	3,027	,282		10,735	,000
F1	-,098	,079	-,100	-1,240	,216
F2	-,099	,069	-,111	-1,437	,152
F3	,260	,081	,244	3,186	,002
F4	,145	,062	,167	2,343	,020
F5	-,027	,052	-,037	-,531	,596

Results

In the Implications part, it can be said that, when the questions which measure managers' leadership behaviour are taken into consideration; managers largely do not accept central decision making and do not use central decision-making much and put pressure on their subordinates to work overtime from time to time. Between managers and subordinates there is sometimes one way communication, avoid putting pressure on their subordinates to show more efforts and and they talk on

behalf of their subordinates from time to time, but try to avoid this behaviour by as much as possible.

It is seen that in the relationship between leadership behaviour and gender, there is just a significant difference in F2 (Pressure for Overtime) variable, there is not a statistically significant difference in other variables. Also keeping in mind the average values, it can be said that, woman managers are more oppressive than male managers in working overtime. For administrators, regardless of gender, Central Decision Making Behaviour, One-Way Communication Behaviour, Pressure for More Diligence Behaviour, and the Spokesman for Subordinates variables are independent; in other words, there is no statistically significant difference between gender and these variables. When the differentiation of administrators' leadership behaviour and age is examined, the relationship between leadership behaviour and age shows a significant difference for F2 (pressure for overtime) variable and, there is no statistically significant difference for other variables. It can be said that 25-34 age group particularly is pressing for overtime, while other age groups are more moderate. Regardless of managers' age interval, the variables Central Decision Making Behaviour, One-Way Communication Behaviour, Pressure for More Diligence Behaviour, and the Spokesman for Subordinates are independent, in other words, it is concluded that there is no statistically significant difference between age and these variables. When the differentiation between the leadership behaviour administrators have shown and educational level is examined, it is seen that between "Central Decision" and "Spokesman for Subordinates" there is $p < 0.01$ statistically significant difference, and that between level of education and "Pressure for Overtime" there is $p < 0.05$ statistically significant difference. It is seen that between educational level and "One-Way Communication" and "Pressure for more Diligence" there is no statistically significant difference. It is concluded that the higher the education levels of managers the more they start to move away from central decision-making, the less they speak on behalf of subordinates and the less they prefer pressure for overtime. When the differentiation between the leadership behaviour administrators have shown, and their property status is examined, it is seen that there is statistically meaningful difference between "Pressure for Overtime" and proprietary status and that there is no statistically significant variation between other variables and leadership behaviour. It is concluded that the managers who run their own businesses put more pressure on subordinates for overtime than other managers and that other leadership dimensions are independent from property status.

Looking at the analysis of the relationship between leadership behaviour of managers and Customer Relations, there is meaningful relationship between Central Decision Making and One-Way Communication and Customer Relations and these two factors are effective in the value Customer Relations receive. When the relationship between leadership behaviour of managers and Market Process is

examined, it is seen that there is meaningful relationship between Pressure for Overtime and One-Way Communication and Market Process. In the analysis of the relationship between leadership behaviour of managers and Financial Dimension, it can be said that there is meaningful relationship between Pressure for Overtime and One-Way Communication and the Financial Dimension, in other words in the values Financial Dimensions receives these two factors can be said to be effective. When the analysis of the relationship between leadership behaviour of managers and innovation is examined, the factors One-Way Communication and Pressure for More Diligence are effective on innovation dimension.

Working life is the environment where not charismatic geniuses are searched but where the professionals who conduct the requirements of work are rewarded. Leadership training develops the capabilities which people can improve; thereby, they can create working environments which are helpful and positive for other people. Sociological cases differentiate people (leader-nonleader), thereby they create unease and suspicion, and they require multi-dimensional approaches. And, the solution cannot be applied in the absence of social and technical order, so it should not lead to neglect of these issues. Observing the leadership phenomenon where it, itself is required creates positive contributions in solving human problems and crises. In environments where leaders are needed no leader as required can be created. Who will be the needed leader cannot be determined, either. So training people as potential leaders when required, thereby taking the required responsibilities will become a positive contribution which societies can make for their future.

References

- Alder, H., (2002). *Thinking Like a Leader, Carrier Developer*, Trans.:Halime Misge Kurşun, İstanbul.
- Altunışık, R., Coşkun, R., Yıldırım, E. & Bayraktaroğlu, S.,(2002). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri* (Research Methods in Social Sciences). Sakarya Kitabevi.
- Andreas, S. & C.Faulkner, (1994). *NLP-The New Technology of Achievement*. William Morrow. NJ.
- Blank, W., (1995).*Liderliğin Dokuz Doğal Kanunu* (Nine Natural Laws for Leadership). New York:AMACOM.
- Dunsire, A. *Administrative Theory in the 1980's: A viewpoint*, Public Administration,73:25-35.
- Edgett, J.D., (1994). *Yönetme Sanatı* (The Art of Managing). Ankara: Öteki Yayınevi,
- Glass, G. V. & Hopkins K. (1984). *Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology*, Prentice Hall, NJ.
- Goleman, D.,(2001). *İş Başında Duygusal Zeka*, (Trans..Handan Balkara) (Emotional Intelligence When Managing). 2. Edition. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.
- Hamburg, M. (1987). *Statistical Analysis for Decision Making*, Harcourt Brave Jovanovich, 4.Edition.
- Kalaycı, Ş., (2008). *SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri* (Multivariate Statistical Techniques Including SPSS Applications. Asil Yayın Dağıtım. 3. Edition.
- Koçel, T., (1999).*İşletme Yöneticiliği* (Managing Businesses). İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.
- Mickletvait, John, & Wooldridge Adrian (1998). *The Witch Doctors.*, Heinamann Pres. London:
- Mills, T.W., (1987). *Statistics for Applied Economics and Business*. Tokyo: McGraw- Hill Company.
- Özsalmanlı, A. Y., (2005). "Türkiye'de Kamu Yönetiminde Liderlik ve Lider Yöneticilik (Leadership and Leader Manager)". *Journal of Manas University Social Sciences* ,13, 137-146.
- Özgen, E., (2003)."İletişim ve Liderlik (Communications and Leadership)". *İletişim*, 18, 99-119.
- Pehlivan, İ. A., (2002). *İş Yaşamında Stres* (Stres in Business Life). Ankara:Yargı Publishing House.
- Puffer, S. M. & McCarthy, D. J., (2003). "The Emergence of Corporate Governance in Russia", *Journal of World Business*, 38(4), 284-298.
- Tekeli, İ., (1996). "Yönetim Kavramının Yanısıra Yönetişim Kavramının Gelişmesinin Nedenleri Üzerine (On the Reasons of the Development of Governing as well as Governance)", *Sosyal Demokrat Değişim*, 3: 4554.
- Tutar, H., Yılmaz, M. K. & Erdönmez, C., (2003). *Genel ve Teknik İletişim* (General and Technical Communications). 1. Baskı. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Tüter, B., (2004). *Tarihe Yön Verenlerin Karakter Analizi* (The Character Analyses who Lead History). Ankara: Elma Yayınevi.