MARMARA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS
MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION SCIENCE

THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON THE JOB SATISFACTION OF THE EMPLOYEES IN FAMILY COMPANIES THAT SERVICE THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

MASTER THESIS

Seray ZENGİN

ISTANBUL, 2020

MARMARA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS
MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION SCIENCE

THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON THE JOB SATISFACTION OF THE EMPLOYEES IN FAMILY COMPANIES THAT SERVICE THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

MASTER THESIS

Seray ZENGİN

SUPERVISOR: Prof. Dr. Fatma Gülruh Gürbüz

ISTANBUL, 2020

GENEL BİLGİLER

İsim ve Soyadı	:	Seray ZENGİN
Anabilim Dalı	:	İşletme
Programı	:	Yönetim ve Organizasyon
Tez Danışmanı	:	Prof. Dr. Fatma Gülruh Gürbüz
Tez Türü ve Tarihi	:	Yüksek Lisans tezi- Eylül 2020
Anahtar Kelimeler	:	Aile Şirketi, iş tatmini,

ÖZET

İNŞAAT SEKTÖRÜNDE HİZMET VEREN AİLE ŞİRKETLERİNDE, LİDERLİK TARZLARININ ÇALIŞANLARIN İŞ TATMİNİ ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİLERİ

Geçmişin geleneksel lider ve yönetim modelleri ile örgütleri ve kurumları idare etmek, çalışanlarının iş tatminini sağlamak, bu kurumların, hızla değişen karmaşık yapıdaki piyasaya cevap verebilmesi pek te mümkün görülmemektedir. Günümüzde dikkatler liderler üzerinde yoğunlaşmakta ve lider, başarının asıl aktörü, değişimin mimarı, geleceği planlayan, vizyon oluşturan ve bunu kişiliğinin bir parçası haline getiren kişi olarak değerlendirilmektedir. Günümüzde pek çok liderlik tarzlarından söz edilmektedir. Liderlik tarzları, takipçileri motive etmek için kullanılan yaklaşımlardır. Liderlik "tek beden herkese uyar" fenomeni değildir. Liderlik tarzları, organizasyonlara, durumlara, gruplara ve bireylere uyacak şekilde seçilmeli ve uyarlanmalıdır. Böylelikle, bilginin etkili bir şekilde yönetilmesi için kullanılan araçlar ve kalitesi de artacaktır.

Yönetim, özellikle liderliğin vizyon ile özdeşleştiği günümüzde, liderlik tanımları liderin özellikleri, vizyon oluşturma ve sürdürebilme konuları ile özdeşleştirilmektedir. Yirmi birinci yüzyıl, vizyon ve vizyoner liderliğin yönetime hâkim olduğu bir dönem olarak

karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Çalışanların iş tatmini ve buna bağlı olarak performanslarını artırmaya yönelik çalışmalar liderlerin bu konuda çok önemli bir yere sahip olduklarını göstermektedir.

Bu çalışmada inşaat sektöründe faaliyet gösteren aile şirketlerindeki farklı liderlik biçimlerinin, çalışanların iş tatminlerini ne şekilde etkilediği incelenmiştir. Çalışmanın teorik kısmında aile şirketleri, liderlik ve iş tatmini kavramları üzerinde durulmuş, bu kavramların birbiriyle olan ilişkileri ele alınmıştır. Çalışmanın ampirik kısmında ise, aile şirketlerindeki çalışanları kapsayan, ankete dayalı veri toplama işlemi gerçekleştirilecek ve verilerin istatistiksel analizleri yapılmıştır. Veri toplama aracı olarak anketlerde Kişisel Bilgiler Ölçeği, Liderlik Ölçeği ve Minnesota İş Tatmini Ölçeği temel alınmıştır. Bu araştırmanın sonucunda elde edilen bilgiler doğrultusunda, aile şirketlerindeki farklı liderlik biçimlerinin çalışanların iş tatmin düzeylerine etkisi belirlenmiştir.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Name and Surname	:	Seray ZENGİN
Field	:	Business
Programme	:	Management and Organization
Supervisor	:	Prof. Dr. Fatma Gülruh Gürbüz
Degree Awarded and Date	:	Master Theses
Keywords	:	Family Business, job satisfaction,

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLES ON THE JOB SATISFACTION OF THE EMPLOYEES IN FAMILY COMPANIES THAT SERVICE THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

It does not seem possible to manage organizations and institutions with the traditional leader and management models of the past, to ensure the job satisfaction of their employees, and to respond to the rapidly changing and complex market. Today, attention is focused on the leaders and the leader is considered as the main actor of success, the architect of change, the person who plans the future, creates a vision and makes it a part of his personality. Today, many leadership styles are mentioned. Leadership styles are approaches used to motivate followers. Leadership is not a "one size fits all" phenomenon. Leadership styles should be chosen and adapted to suit organizations, situations, groups and individuals. Thus, the tools and quality used for effective management of information will increase.

In today's world, where management, especially leadership, is identified with vision, the definitions of leadership are associated with the characteristics of the leader, vision formation and sustainability. The twenty-first century emerges as a period in which vision and visionary leadership dominate the administration. Studies aimed at increasing employees' job satisfaction and, consequently, their performance show that leaders have a very important place in this regard.

In this study, it was examined how different leadership styles in family companies operating in the construction sector affect the job satisfaction of employees. In the theoretical part of the study, the concepts of family companies, leadership and job satisfaction are emphasized, and the relationships between these concepts are discussed. In the empirical part of the study, data collection based on a questionnaire, which includes employees in family companies, will be carried out and statistical analysis of the data has been made. Personal Information Scale, Leadership Scale and Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale were used as data collection tools. In line with the information obtained as a result of this research, the effect of different leadership styles in family companies on job satisfaction levels of employees was determined.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

Page

ÖZET.....iii

ABSTRACT..... v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... vii

CONTENTS.....viii

LIST OF TABLES..... xiii

INTRODUCTION..... 1

CHAPTER I.....2

PURPOSE, IMPORTANCE.....2

1.1. PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH..... 2

1.2. THE IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH.....3

1.3. HYPOTHESES OF THE RESEARCH..... 4

1.4. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH.....5

CHAPTER II..... 6

PREVIOUS STUDIES..... 6

2.1. FAMILY BUSINESS CONCEPT..... 6

2.2. THE MAIN FEATURES OF FAMILY COMPANIES..... 7

2.3. ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF FAMILY COMPANIES..... 8

2.4. MANAGEMENT IN FAMILY COMPANIES.....10

2.4.1. Centralized Management..... 10

2.4.2. Participatory Management.....11

2.5. MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS IN FAMILY COMPANIES.....12

2.5.1. Planning Issues..... 13

2.5.2. Organization Issues.....13

2.5.3. Coordination Issues..... 14
2.5.4. Control and Audit Issues..... 14
2.5.5. Employee and Employment Issues.....15
2.5.6. Financing Issues.....15
2.5.6. Execution Issues..... 16
CHAPTER III.....17
THE LEADERSHIP CONCEPT AND RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP AND BUSINESS SATISFACTION..... 17
3.1. LEADERSHIP CONCEPT AND THEORIES.....17
3.1.1. Definition of Leadership.....17
3.1.2. Differences and Similarities Between Leadership and Management..... 18
3.1.3. Reasons to Need Leadership.....19
3.1.4. Leadership Theories.....19
3.1.4.1. "Great Man" Theory..... 20
3.1.4.2. Personality Traits Theory..... 20
3.1.4.3. Contingency Theories.....21
3.1.4.4. Situational Theory..... 21
3.1.4.5. Behavioral Theory..... 21
3.1.4.6. Participative Theory..... 22
3.1.4.7. Interactive/Management Theory.....22
3.1.4.8. Transformational Theory.....23
3.1.4.9. Paternalist Leadership.....23
3.2. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP AND JOB SATISFACTION..... 24
3.2.1. Definition of Job Satisfaction..... 25
3.2.2. The first job satisfaction Studies.....25
3.2.3. Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction.....26

3.2.3.1. Personal Issues....26
3.2.3.1.1. Age....27
3.2.3.1.2. Gender....27
3.2.3.1.3. Education Level....27
3.2.3.1.4. Culture....28
3.2.3.1.5. Intelligence Level....28
3.2.3.1.6. Career....29
3.2.3.1.7. Job Experience....29
3.2.3.2. Organizational Factors....29
3.2.3.2.1. General View of the Job (Job Level)....29
3.2.3.2.2. Structural Feature of the Work....30
3.2.3.2.3. Difficulty Level of The Job....30
3.2.3.2.4. Internal Feature of the Work....30
3.2.3.2.5. Salary-Wage....30
3.2.3.2.6. Promotion....30
3.2.3.2.7. Human Relations....31
3.2.3.2.8. Communication....31
3.2.3.2.9. Group of Employees....31
3.2.3.2.10. Social View of the Business....31
3.2.3.2.11. Working Conditions....32
3.2.3.2.12. Work safety....32
3.2.3.3. Social and Environmental Factors....32
3.3. THEORIES ON JOB SATISFACTION AND MOTIVATION RELATIONSHIP....32
3.3.1. Content Theories....33
3.3.1.1. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs....33
3.3.1.2. Alderfer's ERG Theory....34

3.3.1.3. Herzberg's Double Factor Theory....34
3.3.1.4. Job Features Model....35
3.3.1.5. Success-Power Theory....35
3.3.2. Process Theories....35
3.3.2.1. Vroom's Expectation Theory....36
3.3.2.2. Lawler and Porter's Enhanced Expectation Theory....36
3.3.2.3. Reward Justice (Equality)Theory....36
3.3.2.4. Purpose Theory....37
3.3.2.5. Conditioning and Reinforcement Theory....37
3.4. LEADERSHIP AND JOB SATISFACTION....37
3.4.1. Leadership-Organizational Justice Perception Relationship....38
3.4.2. Leadership-Organizational Commitment Relationship....39
3.4.3. The Relationship between Leadership and Job Satisfaction....40
3.4.4. Leadership-Organizational Citizenship Behavior Relationship....40
3.4.5. Distributive Justice Perception-Organizational Citizenship Behavior Relationship....41
3.4.6. Distributive Justice Perception-Job Satisfaction Relationship....41
3.4.7. Job Satisfaction-Organizational Commitment Relationship....41
CHAPTER IV....43
MATERIAL AND METHOD....43
4.1. THE MODEL OF THE RESEARCH....43
4.2. UNIVERSE AND SAMPLING OF THE STUDY....43
4.3. DATA COLLECTION METHOD AND TOOL....43
4.4. DATA ANALYSIS....44
4.4.1. Data Collecting Method....45
4.4.2. Factor Analyses....45

4.4.2.1. Relability Analyses (Leadership Scale).....56
4.4.2.2. Minnesota Scale.....60
4.4.2.3. Reliability Analysis (Leadership Scale)..... 71
CHAPTER V..... 76
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....76
5.1. ANOVA.....76
5.2. CORRELATION COEFFICIENT..... 85
5.3. LIKERT ANALYZES.....90
5.4. REGRESSION ANALYSIS.....92
5.4.1. Leadership.....92
5.4.2. Minnesota.....96
CONCLUSION.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**
ANNEXES..... 108
ANNEX 1: ANKET FORMU.....108
REFERENCES..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Demographic Information of the Participants.....44
Table 2: Reliability Analysis Results Regarding Scale Factors.....72
Table 3: Skewness and Kurtosis Values.....72
Table 4: Skewness and Kurtosis Statistic.....72
Table 5: Descriptive Statistics on Sub-Dimension Scores of the Scale for Determining the Leadership Skills of Participants.....76
Table 6: ANOVA by provinces.....77
Table 7: ANOVA by Gender.....77
Table 8: According to the Educational Status of the Participants.....78
Table 9: ANOVA by working time at the current workplace.....79
Table 10: Working time in the current workplace.....80
Table 11: ANOVA by working time in the sector.....80
Table 12: ANOVA by gender of manager.....81
Table 13: ANOVA by education of manager.....82
Table 14: Investigation of the Relationship Between Participants' Leadership Skills Scale Sub-Dimension Scores.....85
Table 15: Correlation Between Scales, Subscales, and Dependent / Independent Variables..87
Table 16: Frequency Analysis of Leadership Likert Questions.....90
Table 17: Minnesota Likert.....91

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

HighSc : High School

OpenEd : Open Education Undergraduate

PriEd : Primer Education

Univ-Posgrad : University-Postgraduate

INTRODUCTION

When today examined the business world and in Turkey, economic life of the most established family businesses which have been operating as a family business initially is or appears to be a continuation of the company.

It is seen that the willingness and efforts of family businesses to ensure their continuity in the economic system make institutionalization inevitable on the one hand, and bring about the problem of who or who will manage the business on the other. In family businesses, the person or persons involved in all levels of the business, whether they are a family member or not, are called power centers. There are four power centers that are fundamental to family businesses. These; family members, shareholders, employees and professional managers. Sometimes, having more than one power focus in a family business can cause problems. Difficulty in decision making, problems in transferring management, and problems in the remuneration policy may appear at the beginning of these problems. In order for a management event to exist, there are essential functions that must be executed. These functions; planning, organizing, directing, coordination and supervision. Managers and entrepreneurs may face some problems in these matters. In addition, decision-making, resource use, motivation of employees, solving problems, bringing talented people to the business and employing them efficiently are managerial issues that are vital for the future of the business. The relations between the manager and the entrepreneur are very important in the execution of these managerial activities. Another problem in family companies is the lack of qualified personnel. Due to the inadequacies in organization, the number of personnel with the knowledge and skills appropriate for the task is less than it should be. The members participating in the organization are examined by blood ties, and qualifications such as knowledge, talent, adaptability and diligence are ignored. It is preferred to employ relatives with the thought that it will protect the job and be reliable. If family values are more important than business values, bringing a member of the family to important management levels regardless of their education and abilities, in other words, the field of application of the business principle according to the man, not the man for the job, by bringing blood ties to the forefront. It is a very common situation to find.

CHAPTER I

PURPOSE, IMPORTANCE

1.1. PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

Today's business approach is an understanding that supports teamwork, attaches importance to research and development activities, is innovative and flexible, customer-oriented and at the same time acknowledges that business activities should not be limited to the local market. Adapting to this understanding that focuses on change is essential for all businesses. This requirement is even more important, especially for the so-called family business, which has many unique features

For the most part of companies, both in the world and in our country, are managed by a family or family relationship. This form of management generally reveals a centralist understanding that is contrary to today's understanding of business administration. Even if this management approach is successful during the times when the competition is less and targets are the only the local market, it is increasingly difficult to achieve the same success.

Leadership has emerged since the existence of mankind and has been seen as a positive or negative factor in the job satisfaction of employees. Leaders who take part in the functioning of organizations, persuade and motivate employees, communicate effectively with them and prepare them for change can provide effectiveness in their organizations, increase job satisfaction and create synergy. In order for the employees to be productive and job satisfaction to be realized in the organization, the leadership styles that the managers have shown are very important. This study is considered important in terms of providing an insight into how effective the leadership styles are in employee satisfaction. In this period, when the most important element is the human being, it is very important for the employees to get the greatest satisfaction from their work in terms of their feelings and thoughts, their desires and the physical and psychological.

Today, it is understood that the human element is the most important factor of the institutions and it is tried to be utilized at the highest level. One of the most important features of a human beings is leadership. Especially in the recruitment of new personnel to the institutions, leadership skills are more prominent in the managers and it can be said that especially the people with high leadership strength significantly increase the productivity of the organization and thus contribute positively to the organization.

In this study focuses on the effects of leadership styles in family businesses on the job satisfaction of employees, leadership styles in family companies are considered as transformational, interactionist and paternalist leadership behaviors and the effects of these three dimensions on the internal and external dimensions of job satisfaction are aimed. The aim of this study is to determine whether the relationships between these variables and the different leadership styles in terms of various demographic variables differ on the effects of job satisfaction on employees. The research covers ... the number of employees working in ... the number of different family businesses in the construction sector in Gaziantep and Istanbul.

In the first part of the study, information about leadership, job satisfaction of family companies and employees will be given. The data obtained from the surveys will be classified and processed and analyzed with the help of SPSS program. analysis results will be evaluated and finalized in the light of literature.

1.2. THE IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH

It is possible to come across many studies about family businesses in the literature. This study is a statistical-based study planned for job satisfaction of family and non-family managers and employees working in family companies. Local and international studies will be scanned and new information will be collected and the researchers will work in local universities. The results of the surveys will be evaluated and interpreted with the statistical

analysis of the data obtained from the surveys and will contribute to the studies carried out on the family companies. The study is thought to provide important statistical data to the literature as it is a study that will be conducted on job satisfaction of managers and employees in family companies which have an important place in economic life throughout the world and throughout our country. In addition, the study is considered as too important the fact that sampling from both the Southeastern Anatolia Region and the Marmara region was selected in order to compare different profile properties. The study will reveal the results of the management profiles of the family companies operating in the provinces of Istanbul and Gaziantep which serve as locomotives in two different regions of our country and the important results for the job satisfaction of the employees.

1.3. HYPOTHESES OF THE RESEARCH

The main hypothesis and the sub-hypotheses formed depending on the main hypothesis that will be tested in line with the specified purposes are as follows;

- Main Hypothesis: There is an influence between leadership traits and job satisfaction.
- Sub Hypotheses:
- H1: There is a difference between Interactive leadership behavior and job satisfaction.
- H2: There is no difference between Interactive leadership behavior and job satisfaction.
- H3: There is a difference between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction.
- H4: There is no difference between transformational leadership behavior and job satisfaction.
- H5: There is a difference between paternalistic leadership behavior and job satisfaction.

- H6: There is no difference between paternalistic leadership behavior and job satisfaction.

A questionnaire was applied to the employees. In determining the sample size to represent the population in question;

n = N t2 p q / d2 (N-1) + t2pq (Salant, 1994)

N: Number of individuals in the target audience

n: Number of individuals to be sampled

p: Frequency of occurrence of the event under investigation (probability of occurrence)

q: Frequency of occurrence of the event under investigation (probability of not occurring)

t: The theoretical value found according to the t table at a certain level of significance

d: ± sampling error accepted according to the incidence of the event.

The required sample size was calculated as n = 96 with ± 10% sampling error at 95% confidence interval for this non-homogeneous population. Since research opportunities are limited, the highest confidence interval and sampling error that can be accepted for a scientific research were taken as a basis

1.4. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

The research is limited to the answers given to the survey questions by the employees and employees of a certain number of companies operating in the construction sector in Istanbul and Gaziantep provinces.

CHAPTER II

PREVIOUS STUDIES

2.1. FAMILY BUSINESS CONCEPT

It is seen that family businesses have an extremely important place in the economies of the country, and when the economies of many countries are examined, family businesses are actively involved.

It is difficult to define the concept of family business due to the existence of family businesses with different structures. Family businesses differ depending on the family's involvement in the business. In addition to family companies in which the family is actively involved in the business and manages the ownership and management together, it is seen that family companies are not directly involved in the business, but only control the strategic direction of the business. (Erdoğmuş, 2004)

Family businesses are businesses that are created in order to provide the family's livelihood or to prevent the dispersal of the inheritance, are managed by the individual who provide the livelihood of the family members. (Yelkikalan, 2006)

Family businesses are businesses that are established to meet the needs of the family or to prevent the inheritance from leaving the family, managed by the individual providing economic input to the family, consisting mainly of family members, where the family members are predominant in the decisions taken and where at least two generations from the family are employed.(Aslan, 2010)

Some common points in the definitions of family companies are as follows (Özkaya, 2006):

- A family business is a family business that starts a business.
- A family business is a corporate structure initiated by an entrepreneur from the family and later the family is mostly involved.

- A family business is a social structure where the family's unique culture and tradition are reflected in the business.
- A family business is a union that can consist of versions of various family members such as the sole entrepreneurial family leader, leader and leader's wife, leader and leader's children, leader, leader's wife and children, leader and leader's siblings, only brothers and cousins, the leader's children, grooms and brides.
- In family businesses, the concept of ownership is important and ownership belongs to the family.
- In family businesses, it is the family's job, that the job affects the family.

There are four main factors that show that a business is a family business(Özkaya, 2006):

- Family ties determine who will be responsible for management, among other factors.
- Children of the current or previous manager take part in the management of the business.
- The reputation of the business develops with the family.
- The position of a family member in the business affects his / her position in the family.

2.2. THE MAIN FEATURES OF FAMILY COMPANIES

According to Ateş, (2003), the name and prestige of the business develops with the name and dignity of the family. The position of family members in the society also affects the position of the business. In this direction, it is not that family members are actively doing business in the business, but the pedigree they have. The prestige of the business develops with the dignity of the family. (Ateş, 2003)

In family businesses, there are two main options on behalf of managers, the first of which is to work towards making the business long-lasting in order to ensure the successful

transfer of the business to the next generations, and the second is to leave the existence of the business not only for themselves but also for their children. (Uslu, 2011)

Family businesses have some common features of their own.(Akdoğan, 2012; Başkurt, 2016; Tuncel, 2011);

- Business shareholders always want to control all initiatives within the business.
- Activities are shaped by the individual evaluation of the business boss.
- Business shareholders think that they know predominantly the best in their field and do not lean towards external support.
- Business shareholders tend to get information from people they see close to them rather than using existing information systems in internal reporting and information retrieval processes.
- The administrative and operational powers and liabilities of the business are predominantly unclear.
- Possible competition between the business shareholder, family members and administrative problems directly affect the routine activities of reporting.
- The values of the family and family beliefs remain valid within the business.

2.3. ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF FAMILY COMPANIES

In family businesses; Values come to the fore even more because family, administration and ownership are maintained together. Due to the nature of family businesses, dominant family norms integrated with the family are also reflected in the business. For this reason, the norms of the family and the norms of businesses are predominantly similar (Akdoğan, 2012). Besides the advantages of being a family business, there are also disadvantages (Yelkikalan, 2006).

It is possible to say that family businesses have certain advantages that make family businesses stand out when comparing them with other companies. According to Ebru Karpuzoğlu, the advantages of family companies can be listed as follows (Dilbaz, 2005);

- Family businesses in developing countries can mostly benefit from family securities, real estate and cash in raising funds.

- In a financially difficult period of the company, its partners can easily give up their income as the company is presumed to be the child of that family.
- The reputation of the family can create a positive image towards the competitors, customers and suppliers of the business.
- Employees in family businesses can achieve success by creating synergy with the advantage of having the same culture. In case of any problem, all employees can support each other.
- In family businesses, decisions can be made faster. In this way, easier adaptation to changes can be achieved.
- Plans are made for the future, as family businesses work on creating a better environment for their future generations.
- It never gives up its entrepreneurial struggle in family businesses and can make the program of the future with the same determination.
- Working hours, services etc. in family businesses. there is flexibility in matters.

It is possible to say that family businesses have some disadvantages as well as advantages. It is known that the priorities of families in family businesses generally take precedence over business rules. Managers can ignore weak points by recruiting regardless of the family members' abilities and characteristics. In particular, it can be said that a situation that poses a problem for individuals who have to work under the command of managers who are brought to important positions, which are called as key points, without considering any skills or experience, and who are not from the family. Harmony and harmony, which is an important feature of family businesses, can cause harm to the company by having the opposite effect due to the competition that may occur between individuals. According to Sağlam, the biggest disadvantage of family businesses is that talented and professional managers do not take responsibility and are in search of new jobs due to the lack of opportunities to make a career in the family business (Coşkun, 2016; Sorgun, 2007).

Entrepreneurial manager can harm the company he is by closing the door of professional managers and innovations. In family businesses, the transfer of authority manifests itself as a very difficult situation, and the delegation of authority transactions that are not done in time cause confusion in the company in the ongoing process (Ateş, 2005).

It is possible to mention about the disadvantages in many areas from the formation of the staff working in the family companies to the company management, the structure of the employees being from within or outside the family, from the transfer of authority to the future plans. It can be said that the importance given to family members rather than the talent distribution of employees in family businesses will pose a problem in the transfer of the company to future generations. Because the growth of a company that is closed to innovation and professionalism seems very difficult. In addition to these problems, if the delegation decision in management in a successful family business is not determined in advance, this may cause competition within the family and, at best, a downsizing. According to Alayoğlu, the transferring problem is one of the most important problems in family companies. Failure to make the transfer plans early and the question of who will take part in the management in case of an individual's death or a situation that prevents him from working may cause discussion among family members and cause the company to be negatively affected (Atlı, 2007.).

2.4. MANAGEMENT IN FAMILY COMPANIES

Management differs in family businesses compared to other businesses. Because the sentimentality present in the family institution is reflected in the management. In other words, while the personal problems of family members who are members of family businesses can be seen as a company problem, every personal opinion can be reflected in the management. On the other hand, family businesses may differ in management because they grow more slowly, have the idea of passing on from generation to generation, and tend to reveal their own missions and visions (Erdil, Ciğerim, & Gök, 2004). In this context, management in family businesses is affected by culture and one of the centralized management or participatory management approaches may be preferred (Uzunlular, 2018).

2.4.1. Centralized Management

In centralized management, the owner of the company also becomes a manager. In this management style, management continues as being transferred from father to son. The more centralization, the stronger and more successful the family and therefore the family

business will be. The top manager of the company, the oldest member of the public, knows all the details about the company and is the final decision maker (Karayormuk & Köseoğlu, 2006).

In the centralized management approach, company employees are protected by the manager, but they do not give them the right to speak. As the owner of the company tends to interfere with all details, it gets bogged down in details and some important points may be overlooked. Managers, who shape the company in line with their own wishes and desires, act traditionally and do not allow innovation and a segregated structure. In these structures, the authorities and responsibilities are shaped according to the family ties rather than skills, education and efforts. In addition, people in managerial positions can sometimes be ignored and the founder's dealing with problems related to the business can damage the power of sanction in managerial positions (Uzunlular, 2018).

In the centralized management approach, managers focus on the past, making it difficult for the organizational structure to develop itself. Because company executives are not open to change and are seen as the legacy of the founding member of the company. Centralized administration, also known as the monarchic style of administration, is also dominated by patriarchy. The management of the company is completely under the monopoly of family members and foreign employees are never trusted. Managers of this type, who have a short-term perspective in terms of their field of activity, believe that traditional methods are more successful and they are short-term and market-oriented (Taşkın, 2014).

2.4.2. Participatory Management

Participatory management is a form of management based on egalitarian foundations, in which joint decision-making mechanisms operate and family power and influence are minimized. If this management is adopted in family businesses, the founding member is not the only decision-maker, and foreigners working in a trust-based company are allowed to participate in the decision-making process. Here, all employees are audited regardless of whether they are family members (Taşkın, 2014).

In participatory management, although family members are involved in the management, professional people are used when there is a lack of it. Authority and responsibility are fully determined. Although the fact that people who are not family members but are professionals in the management sometimes cause hierarchy conflicts, it generally ensures that the company makes less mistakes and operates more efficiently (Erben, 2004).

The fact that the participatory management approach values the opinions of individuals who work in the business but are not family members, and paving the way for these individuals to participate in the management actually means that not only family values but also the aim of being successful, efficiency and quality. In this management style, besides family traditions, work efficiency and principles are also valued, together with the definition of powers and responsibilities, these are the precautions taken for possible problems. However, the predominance of family members in the management can be difficult to impose sanctions in accordance with company rules (Uzunlular, 2018).

2.5. MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS IN FAMILY COMPANIES

Family business managements can be centralized and participatory. However, since human beings are the main element of company management, it is normal to experience some problems in both managements. Family businesses experience more management problems than other companies, as they are affected by family culture. While these problems can be solved by eliminating the family culture, which constitutes the main problem in the company, sometimes it is not possible to resolve without radical changes (Atılgan, 2011).

The management ensures that the activities of an institution or organization are carried out regularly and consciously and the needs of individuals are met. Fulfilling the functions of the management, such as looking ahead, controlling and ensuring coordination, can only be achieved with a professional management approach. As long as family businesses do not progress towards professionalism, it will not be easy for managers to adapt to rapid environmental changes and to identify and implement today's appropriate strategies. Some management problems may arise in family businesses that do not progress in professionalization. This experienced management problems; planning problems,

organizational problems, executive problems, coordination problems, control problems, personnel problems, financing problems (Yakupoğulları, 2001).

2.5.1. Planning Issues

A management practice based on intuition or experience causes the future of the family business to be endangered by ignoring the planning element that is important for businesses (Yakupoğulları, 2001).

One of the problems seen in the planning part in family businesses is that company managers are reluctant to leave the job or responsibilities to someone else while they are at the beginning and they do not realize the plans to transfer the company to the next generation. The fact that family business managers are not willing to determine the person who will manage the company in the future can endanger the existence of the company in the long term (Sorgun, 2007).

2.5.2. Organization Issues

Organizing is formed by finding manpower, tools, equipment and similar resources to achieve the planned goals and determining their relations with each other in an orderly manner. The focus of the organization is the shaping of the organizational structure and the distribution of tasks in accordance with common goals. However, because of an authoritarian structure in family businesses, division of labor, authority and responsibility cannot be made. The absence of organizational chart or handbooks indicates that there is uncertainty in divisions of labor and tasks. Generally, family companies try to solve this organizational problem by employing consultants and the business owner can be successful if he can apply the recommendations of the counseling (Yakupoğulları, 2001).

One of the most important problems faced by family businesses is the preference of family members and the behavior called nepotism. In family businesses, an organizational structure is generally tried to be developed by bringing one of the family members rather than professional managers or employees to important positions within the business. However, this type of behavior disturbs the employees who are not family members and causes distrust

towards the business and a decrease in their commitment to the business in a short time if their efforts, performance and contribution to the business are not compensated (Koyuncu, 2015).

2.5.3. Coordination Issues

Coordination enables individuals to combine their efforts, to arrange them in terms of time, to come behind each other to achieve a common goal and to form a whole by interlocking. Coordination; The priority of coordination, as a combination of elements such as planning, organizing, directing, training the employee and control, is the separate and complete fulfillment of these elements.

Problems arise in coordination when family members working in family businesses only consider the success of their departments and proceed in this direction in order to appear successful. In order to ensure a good coordination, middle management level should be formed and top management should be supported. In this way, the intensity of the relationship between the employees and the top management will be reduced, and an institutionalized and organized structure will be revealed. Otherwise, consensus cannot be reached between departments and problems occur in planning, program and budget preparations (Yakupoğulları, 2001).

2.5.4. Control and Audit Issues

The success of an enterprise is measured by the extent to which the planned targets are achieved. The control made in order to compare the activities performed with predetermined standards consists of four stages. First of all, the expectations of the activities are determined along with the standards and the justification of the results within the framework of objectives, plans and policies. It is necessary to measure the activities carried out in the second stage. In the third stage, the results of existing activities are measured with previously determined standards. In the last stage, it is decided for which of the activities that are out of the standard and how the correction will be made. In order to carry out these mentioned transactions, company information should be shared with managers and their comments should be taken (Başkurt, 2016; Yakupoğulları, 2001).

An informal control system is preferred for audit processes in family companies. In this informal audit process, estimates come to the fore rather than professionalism. There is a high probability of false detections in such an audit. Audit awareness does not develop due to the fact that family members working in family businesses are relied on more than they should be. Audits are generally not over time, but are carried out in the form of accounting audits when the input forms the output. Registration processes do not give clear information about the financial and outgoing of the company since it is based on observation whether it is in compliance with tax procedural laws (Doğan, 2014).

2.5.5. Employee and Employment Issues

One of the main problems in family businesses is not giving equal training opportunities to family members or not, not being given financial and moral wages and awards, and not training leaders to work in the company. As long as individuals are satisfied with their workplace, they provide more willing and highly productive work. Providing this efficiency is only possible by motivating the employees. In family businesses, the manager has to lead in order to motivate the sub-unit employees in line with the organization plans. In this context, it is necessary to pay attention to the fairness of the wages to be paid to the personnel in family businesses and the overtime (Koyuncu, 2015).

2.5.6. Financing Issues

Providing the financial resources that businesses need is very important for family businesses. Because family businesses get their capital from their family members. In family businesses, the business owner usually has a sole say in financial management. Establishing a financial structure in accordance with the legal structure of the family business, ensuring the integrity of financial resources and protecting their security, and the fact that businesses are in a position to realize this when the time comes to make payments can only be provided by an expert financial manager (Yakupoğulları, 2001).

2.5.6. Execution Issues

The reason why executive activities do not occur in family businesses can be shown as privileged treatment of family members within the company. Because, executive activity can be considered as the activation of the employees with various management techniques and a sense of authority and responsibility. For this reason, the presence of nepotism within the family business may appear as a clear indication that employees will not be willing to start operating (Kaya, 2009).

CHAPTER III

THE LEADERSHIP CONCEPT AND RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP AND BUSINESS SATISFACTION

3.1. LEADERSHIP CONCEPT AND THEORIES

3.1.1. Definition of Leadership

The Concept of Leader was first used in the 1755 dictionary prepared by the English linguist Samuel Johnson. According to Johnson, the leader is "the captain, the commander, the person who goes ahead" (Işık, 2014). For the leader, which is also expressed with the word leader in Turkish, in the Dictionary of Social Sciences of the Turkish Language Association (TDK); It is defined as a person who leads, initiates social behavior, directs, organizes or supervises the efforts of others because of his reputation, power or social place (Öztürk, 2016).

In its simplest definition, the leader person has personality traits that change and change by affecting the result (Baltaş, 2013).

Many definitions have been made about the concept of leadership. It can be expressed as the power to influence other people and it can be defined as a management concept and process that includes activities performed by people with special abilities who give instructions, make important decisions, and manage groups (Okakin & Tinaz, 1997).

Leadership is the process of influencing and motivating people to achieve their goals, work enthusiastically, and use their capacities and capabilities at the highest level. Leadership is also defined as a unifying element that brings together the common goals and objectives of its followers by reminding them and guiding them to these goals and objectives in appropriate ways (Diker, 2017).

3.1.2. Differences and Similarities Between Leadership and Management

While the manager is asked to fulfill the planning and organizational functions, the leaders are expected to influence people only to monitor him. Based on the studies on leadership and administratorship, the following approaches can be mentioned (Öztürk, 2016).

- Every leader has more or less one managerial side. But not every manager can have leadership qualities.
- Leadership cannot be done by pressure; it is done with conviction. Management, on the other hand, can get the job done by acting repressive with the powers (legal authorities) given to it.
- Leaders draw their current strength from more personality traits and their own team. Managers take their power from laws and regulations.
- In order for a person to be a leader, it is necessary to have people who are dependent on him (follower). There is no such obligation for managers.
- While the leader is selected by a team that believes in him and is brought to the leadership position, the manager is often appointed by appointment.
- The most basic task of the Leader-Leader is to influence the team, and the task of the manager is to reach the organizational goal by using management functions and techniques.
- As the most important member, the leader may tend to establish close, private relationships with other members of the group.
- The manager can establish friendly relationships with employees, but cannot be with you. The manager tends to be more distant in this direction.
- The duties assigned to the manager are more than those assigned to the leader. The manager is responsible for all processes of the company he works for.
- While the leader is mostly geared towards employees, the manager works towards production functions.
- If the leader is a manager, he uses his personal power.
- From a very broad perspective, the leader ensures the creation of big plans and projects. The manager is responsible for the realization of the plans and projects.

- The leader is only responsible to the group of which he is the leader, while the manager is responsible to both the group he leads and to the superiors who make him the manager.
- In leadership, group members willingly obey the leader's order, in management there is no such circumstance.
- Leader makes innovation, manager manages.
- Leader develops, manager preserves.
- Leader focuses on people, manager on system and structure.
- Leader inspires trust, manager trusts in control.
- The leader has a long perspective, the manager is short-sighted.
- The leader does the right job, the manager does the job right.
- Leader asks what and why, manager asks how and when

3.1.3. Reasons to Need Leadership

Humans are social beings by nature. For this reason, they continue their lives in the form of communities and they need leaders and managers who will unite and manage the communities they have formed, keep them together and achieve their goals (Eraslan, 2006).

In every period of history, individuals with a leader spirit who lead, influence and direct the communities in which they live have not emerged spontaneously. Leaders' starting point originated from the emergence of some needs that concern society (Fındıkçı, 2011).

3.1.4. Leadership Theories

There are many different opinions about leadership because they have characteristics that distinguish leaders from non-leaders. Today, most research has shifted from traditional trait or personality-based theories to a situation theory that states that the state in which leadership is used is determined by leadership skills and leadership traits. (Amanchukwu, 2015; Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009).

3.1.4.1. "Great Man" Theory

The great-man leadership theory became popular throughout the 19th century. The mythology behind the world's most famous leaders such as Abraham Lincoln, Julius Caesar, Mahatma Gandhi, and Alexander the Great contributed to the idea that great leaders were born and were not made. It is almost like magic when the right person emerges to take control of a business or situation, leading a group of people to safety or success (Cherry, 2018).

Historian Thomas Carlyle (Carlyle, 1888) also had a great influence on this theory of leadership. According to Carlyle, effective leaders are talented with divine inspiration and the right qualities. In addition, Carlyle "The history of the world is only a biography of great people." he said.

According to early researchers, when looking at leaders, they are already successful or emerging from prominent people in society. These individuals often consisted of aristocratic rulers with innate opportunities and rights. These studies contributed to the idea that leadership is an innate skill, as people with less social status have fewer opportunities to practice and reach leadership roles (Hirsch, 2002; Salem, 1998; Spencer, 1896).

Even today, people often identify leading leaders as having the right qualities or personality for the position, implying that these traits make these people effective leaders (Cherry, 2018).

3.1.4.2. Personality Traits Theory

Personality traits theory assumes that people inherit certain qualities or traits and that these traits make them better suited to leadership. This theory generally describes a particular personality or behavioral traits shared by leaders (Amanchukwu, 2015).

Personality traits theory is one of the main approaches of the study of human personality. In the framework of this approach, personality traits are defined as behavior, thought and emotional habits that manifest themselves in a wide range (Novikova, 2013). However, if certain characteristics are the basic characteristics of leaders and leadership, it is a fact that the fact of the existence of people who have these qualities but cannot be leaders is

being questioned. Inconsistencies in the relationship between leadership traits and leadership effectiveness, that is, the inability to be a leader despite having leadership characteristics, led researchers to seek new explanations and change paradigms for effective leadership (Amanchukwu, 2015).

3.1.4.3. Contingency Theories

Contingency theories about leadership focus on specific environmental variables that can determine which leadership style is best suited for a particular work situation. According to this theory, a leadership style alone is not suitable for achieving success in all situations. Success depends on several variables such as leadership style, followers' qualities and situational characteristics. A probability factor is any situation that should be considered in any relevant environment when designing an organization or one of its elements (Naylor, 1999). Probability theory states that effective leadership depends on the degree of harmony between a leader's qualifications and leadership style and requires a specific situation (Amanchukwu, 2015; Lamb, 2013).

3.1.4.4. **Situational Theory**

Situation theory suggests that leaders choose the best action based on situational circumstances or circumstances. Different leadership styles may be more suitable for different types of decision making. For example, in a situation where the leader is expected to be the most knowledgeable and experienced member of a group, an authoritarian leadership style may be most appropriate. On the other hand, where group members are qualified professionals and expect to be treated as such, a democratic style may be more effective (Amanchukwu, 2015).

3.1.4.5. **Behavioral Theory**

Behavioral leadership theories claim that great leaders are made and are based on the belief that great leaders are not born. This leadership theory focuses on leaders' actions, not intellectual qualities or intrinsic characteristics. According to the theory of behavior, people

can learn to be leaders through training and observation. Naylor (Naylor, 1999) states that interest in leaders' behavior is encouraged by a systematic comparison of autocratic and democratic leadership styles. Groups under such leadership have been observed to perform differently: As long as the leader is, autocratically driven groups work as well as they can. However, group members are not satisfied with their leadership style and hold hostile grudges. Democratically led groups work well in an effort almost close to the autocratic group. However, group members have more positive feelings and do not have feelings of grudge or hostility. Most importantly, the efforts of group members continue even in the absence of a leader (Amanchukwu, 2015).

3.1.4.6. Participative Theory

Participatory leadership theories suggest that the ideal leadership style is one that takes into account the inputs of others. Participating leaders encourage group members' involvement and helpful contributions and help them feel relevant and committed to the decision-making process. Leveraging participatory leadership instead of making all decisions, a manager aims to involve other people, thus increasing loyalty and collaboration. This leads to better decision making and ultimately a more productive job (Amanchukwu, 2015; Lamb, 2013).

3.1.4.7. Interactive/Management Theory

Interactive theories, also known as management theories, focus on the role of control, organization, and group performance, and the changes that take place between leaders and followers. In this theory, leadership is based on the system of rewards and punishments (Amanchukwu, 2015; Charry, 2012). other words, it states that a leader's job is to come up with ideas and practices that clearly separate what their followers expect and outcomes (rewards and punishments) that meet and / or do not meet expectations (Amanchukwu, 2015; Lamb, 2013). When employees are successful, they are rewarded, and when they fail, they are scolded or punished (Charry, 2012). Management or transaction theory is often compared to the concept and practice of management. In this respect, it continues to be an extremely common component of many leadership models and organizational structures (Lamb, 2013).

3.1.4.8. Transformational Theory

Relationship theories, also known as transformation theories, focus on the connections established between leaders and followers. In these theories, leadership is the process of "creating a connection" that results in increased motivation and morality to both followers and leaders through which one interacts with others. Relationship theories are often compared with charismatic leadership style, which is seen as the best leadership style for leaders with certain qualities such as trust, extroversion, and openly expressing their value to motivate followers (Lamb, 2013).

Relationship or transformational leaders motivate and inspire people by helping group members see the importance and higher benefit of the task. These leaders focus on both improving the performance of group members and ensuring that each individual understands their potential. Leaders of this style often have high ethical and moral standards (Charry, 2012).

3.1.4.9. Paternalist Leadership

The first model was conceptualized by Farh and Cheng. Accordingly, paternalist leadership consisted of three elements, authoritarianism, benevolence and moral leadership (Cheng et al., 2004). In authoritarianism, the leader has absolute power over control and leads the subordinates. In return for this power, subordinates must show great obedience and loyalty to their superiors (L.F. Chou, Cheng, & Jen, 2005). Benevolence cares about the welfare of subordinates and maintains a personal relationship with them. The scope of this personal relationship goes beyond the organizational context and relates to personalized anxiety about family issues or personal problems (Cheng, Chou, Wu, Huang, & Farh, 2004). Moral leadership is defined by the leader's reality and includes self-cultivation and self-sacrifice. These values create harmony between the values of the leader and subordinates (Niu, Wang, & Cheng, 2009).

Aycan states that paternalist leadership consists of five factors. These factors distinguish paternalist leadership from other leadership theories (Aycan, 2006). These;

***Creating a family atmosphere at work**:* Treating subordinates like a father.

Establishing close and personalized relationships with subordinates: establishing close relationships with each subordinate individually, getting to know each subordinate personally (personal problems, family life, etc.)

***Non-work involvement**:* participating in important events of subordinates and close family members (eg weddings and funerals, etc.), providing assistance and assistance (eg financial) to subordinates if needed.

***Expecting commitment**:* expecting loyalty and devotion from subordinates, expecting employees to respond immediately to an emergency in the company.

Maintaining authority / status: paying attention to differences in status (rankings of positions) and expecting employees to act accordingly.

3.2. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP AND JOB SATISFACTION

The person engages in certain behaviors in order to meet his wants and needs. If these behaviors meet the desires and needs of the person, "satisfaction" will arise; If it cannot meet, "dissatisfaction" occurs. Considering today's socio-economic conditions, there is no "absolute satisfaction" or "absolute dissatisfaction".

In terms of the relationship between job satisfaction and managerial behavior, modern managers are expected to make the necessary effort to ensure and increase job satisfaction of employees. First of all, managers need to get rid of their existing prejudices in order to achieve the satisfaction that works. Managers should consider that the employees are not only an economic asset but also have a social aspect, and that they work in an organization to meet their different expectations and needs apart from their economic expectations (Yiğit, 2004).

3.2.1. Definition of Job Satisfaction

Although a person's strong feelings and attitudes towards his job and its various aspects are generally known as job satisfaction, it is very difficult to define job satisfaction. One of the most used definitions of job satisfaction belongs to Locke. Locke (1976) defines job satisfaction as "a positive or contented mood that results from valuing one's job".

Berry (1997) expresses satisfaction as an individual's reaction to the work environment (Kömürcüoğlu, 2003).

Argyle (1989) sees job satisfaction as one of the three important signs of peace, and argues that the other two are marital and family satisfaction. Job satisfaction occurs when the person's expectations from his job match the characteristics of the job. Just the opposite; The employee will be disappointed if his desires and needs are not met, and this will bring dissatisfaction with it. Job satisfaction has three important dimensions(Silah, 2001):

- Job satisfaction is an emotional reaction to the job. Invisible but understandable. Therefore, it is very difficult to measure.
- Job satisfaction is determined by the extent to which expectations are met.
- Job satisfaction represents different elements.

3.2.2. The first job satisfaction Studies

The first job satisfaction studies were conducted by Taylor and Gilberth during the First World War. These studies were initiated with the aim of searching the best working method in factories that will create the least stress and fatigue. Taylor argued that the person who earns the most with the least fatigue will be more productive, and therefore will gain satisfaction while working (Eren, 2001).

Hawthorne studies, which were initiated by Elton Mayo et al. In the Chicago Western Electric Company in the USA in the 1920s in order to increase the job satisfaction of the

employees, pioneered the Neoclassical (Behavioral) Approach, also known as the "Human Relations Movement". Hawthorne studies employee as a person with feelings, emotions; He pioneered the works that came after him by revealing the importance of perceiving the business environment as a miniature society (Kaya, 2009).

3.2.3. Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction

According to Schermerhorn et al., Job satisfaction is influenced by two important decisions an individual makes about their job. Accordingly, the first decision made by the individual is to join the organization and want to stay with it; The second decision is to work hard and be productive. There are a number of factors that affect the employee's ability to make these two decisions. These are the person's choice of profession, the physical environment at work, the position in the workplace, the size and order of the workplace, the job done, the level of knowledge, the purpose of the job, the degree of knowing what is happening around the employee, official communication systems and informal groups, the employee's personal and social relations. are the fear and worries of the employee (Kaya, 2009).

It is possible to group the factors affecting job satisfaction in three groups. These; individual factors, organizational factors and social-environmental factors.

3.2.3.1. Personal Issues

Employee's expectations from their job are primarily related to their individual characteristics. Since the expectations of the employee about his / her job are related to his / her personality, we must accept the individual characteristics of the employee at the beginning of the factors that provide job satisfaction (Davis, 1998).

3.2.3.1.1. Age

Studies show that there is a positive relationship between age and satisfaction. In other words, satisfaction from the job increases as the age increases. It is possible to explain this as adaptation increases as the experience increases. On the other hand, if young employees have excessive expectations about promotion and other business branches at the first entry, it may increase the possibility of dissatisfaction (Silah, 2001).

According to Herzberg et al., There is a U-shaped relationship between age and satisfaction. According to such a relationship, the job satisfaction levels of the employees before the age of 25 and after the age of 45 increase. So, job satisfaction is high at first entry, but then it starts to decline. As the career increases, the level of satisfaction starts to increase again.

3.2.3.1.2. Gender

Studies clearly reveal that employees have different job satisfaction levels in terms of their gender (Bilgiç, 1998).

The different social roles of men and women cause their expectations about work to be different as well; therefore, satisfaction with factors such as wages, working hours and working conditions is also different. In parallel, they stated that the success criteria of men and women in Chusmir and Parker are different. In their work, women attach more importance to family relations, personal satisfaction and security than men; They found that they valued status and wealth less. The two main characteristics that affect the difference between genders are education and age (Bilgiç, 1998).

3.2.3.1.3. Education Level

While some studies report that education is inversely proportional to job satisfaction, the higher the education level, the higher the dissatisfaction rate; On the contrary, some studies state that the higher the education level, the higher the satisfaction rate. Vecchio (1981) attributes the differences in job satisfaction due to education to the difference in expectations.

Parallel to this, Seybolt (1976) argued that the higher the education level, the higher the employee's expectations. In addition, in his study, he investigated the effect of three types of variables of the work environment, such as wage, job variability, task complexity, and job satisfaction and formal education on this relationship. As a result of the study (Metle, 2001).

- When the relationship between education level and wage is examined, those who are university graduates and work in a low-wage job are less satisfied than a primary school graduate working in the same job,
- When the relationship between education level and task complexity is examined, it is seen that university graduates are less satisfied than primary school graduates in jobs with less complexity.

3.2.3.1.4. Culture

Employees tend to compare their conditions with their environmental conditions. If their work conditions are mediocre but social conditions are poor, their satisfaction rate is higher. Hulin stated that job satisfaction can be assessed by community variables such as the level of welfare, the rate of misery, the amount of unemployment in the region. In underdeveloped societies, individuals have little or no opportunity to compare their current jobs. This affects job satisfaction closely. Jobs that exceed one's abilities negatively affect satisfaction. Similarly, placing jobs that are easier for a person than he / she can do also negatively affect satisfaction. Price and Mueller (1986) argued that too much or too little workload would decrease satisfaction, while sufficient workload would increase satisfaction (Silah, 2001).

3.2.3.1.5. Intelligence Level

It is accepted that the level of intelligence affects attitudes towards work as well as they are also affected by them. While there are more satisfied individuals in jobs that require more skills, this rate is less in routine jobs. When the job satisfaction scores of people with low and high intelligence level are examined, it is seen that the satisfaction rate of the groups with good intelligence level is higher (Silah, 2001).

3.2.3.1.6. Career

A study showed that professionals and managers experience the highest level of job satisfaction, while unqualified heavy industry workers experience the lowest level of satisfaction. It has been observed that managers and professionals have higher wages and autonomy, and the personal reward they receive from their jobs is higher. In addition, it has been observed that the jobs of managers and professionals are more variable and stimulating than the jobs of lower-level employees, and this enables continuous learning and development. All these reasons enabled the first group to experience a higher level of satisfaction (Silah, 2001).

3.2.3.1.7. Job Experience

Job satisfaction levels are low due to the high expectations of new hires. On the other hand, it is seen that employees with more work experience are more tolerant in this regard (Silah, 2001).

3.2.3.2. Organizational Factors

Perception of the job by others in general, being easy / difficult / attractive, attributing various responsibilities to the individual, allowing learning, wage, career opportunities, working environment, job security, etc. various factors are organizational factors that affect the job satisfaction of the individual. Organizational factors differ according to each organization (Cass, Siu, Faragher, & Cooper, 2003).

3.2.3.2.1. General View of the Job (Job Level)

How the job is received by the society affects job satisfaction closely. Satisfaction is expected to increase as the level of work increases. In other words, jobs with a respectable status by the society are thought to provide more satisfaction. It is also observed that those who have control over their own business and those of others have higher satisfaction levels. It has been observed that people who are at the lower levels of the organizational hierarchy and have less control ability experience lower levels of satisfaction (Senge, 2004).

3.2.3.2.2. Structural Feature of the Work

Price (2001) states that employees with a high level of participation spend more effort, receive greater rewards for their effort, and thus their job satisfaction increases. Some studies suggest that as the amount of change in the content of the job increases, the level of satisfaction of individuals increases. A study applied to workers in the automobile industry by Walker and Guest (1952) found that those who perform five or more different operations are more satisfied than those who perform a single simple transaction. When employees feel that their work has become routine, even if all other conditions remain the same, their job satisfaction decreases (Wright & Davis, 2003).

3.2.3.2.3. Difficulty Level of The Job

Price and Mueller (1986) argued that too much or too little workload would decrease satisfaction, while sufficient workload would increase satisfaction(Seo, Barrett, & Bartunek, 2004).

3.2.3.2.4. Internal Feature of the Work

Studies indicate that if employees feel that they have a long-term role in achieving the goals of the organization, including their personal development, their job satisfaction will increase (Wright & Davis, 2003).

3.2.3.2.5. Salary-Wage

Wage is one of the features that affect job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Equality of wages with other employees at the same level is more important than the degree of wage meeting expectations (Wright & Davis, 2003).

3.2.3.2.6. Promotion

Promotion is considered more important than wage in terms of creating job satisfaction. However, the most important thing for employees is that the promotion and wage

policies applied by the company are fair and in line with their expectations (Wright & Davis, 2003).

3.2.3.2.7. Human Relations

When a person starts doing a job in the organization, he / she is in, he / she takes his place in this system of relationships and constantly maintains relationships with his managers and colleagues. Especially for new employees, the behaviors of managers are important in terms of job satisfaction. If the manager does not allow the employees to participate in the decisions, the employee's satisfaction with the job will decrease. It is inevitable that the employee who is supervised, who is prevented from taking an active role in decisions and who is not given the opportunity to make decisions on his own, will experience job dissatisfaction over time (Wright & Davis, 2003).

3.2.3.2.8. Communication

Studies have shown that the absence of an effective communication causes dissatisfaction; It shows that adequate communication does not always lead to job satisfaction (Wright & Davis, 2003).

3.2.3.2.9. Group of Employees

Jackson (1991) states in his study that employees are more satisfied when working with those who have attitudes similar to their own (Fields & Blum, 1997).

3.2.3.2.10. Social View of the Business

Employees; They believe that working in companies with a certain image, which has an important place in the social and economic structure, where working in such enterprises is considered a privilege by the environment, provides them with a prestige within the social structure. This perceived prestige emerges as a result that provides job satisfaction to the employee (Wright & Davis, 2003).

3.2.3.2.11. Working Conditions

It is stated that the employees enjoy working in safe businesses with appropriate physical conditions(Wright & Davis, 2003).

3.2.3.2.12. Work safety

In a study involving 25 companies and a total of 21,419 people in Belgium between 1994 and 1998, it was observed that individuals experiencing job insecurity felt more depressed, unhealthy and more tired. This study, like other studies in the literature, found a positive relationship between job insecurity and poor health conditions. However, it has been determined that this relationship is higher in men than in women. One reason is based on role theory. Accordingly, women are more prone to alternative roles that can protect themselves against the negative consequences of job insecurity (Pelfrene, Vlerick, & Moreau, 2003).

3.2.3.3. Social and Environmental Factors

The social environment of the individual outside the organization is also important as it is within the organization. The most important of this social environment is family. In other words, the individual is between his family and his job. The individual has to strike a balance between his job and his family. If one cannot balance the demands of one of them, this causes job dissatisfaction and stress on the individual (Özkalp, 1989).

3.3. THEORIES ON JOB SATISFACTION AND MOTIVATION RELATIONSHIP

Although job satisfaction as an attitude differs from motivation involving behavior, it is the first time in the literature to examine job satisfaction systematically with motivation theories. However, due to the complexity of human behavior, it is difficult to say that any of the motivation theories alone can explain the topic of motivation and job satisfaction in its entirety. In this context, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory, Herzberg's Double Factor Theory and Adam's Equality Theory are both motivational theories and are the main studies that examine job satisfaction. Many studies related to motivation and therefore satisfaction

approach this issue from two different angles (Can et al., 2001: 308). These are content theories and process theories.

3.3.1. Content Theories

Content theories try to understand the factors that lead the person to behave in certain directions. The proponents of these theories believe that the employee will be satisfied if some of his values and needs are met by the organization (Koçel, 1995).

3.3.1.1. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

This model developed by Maslow considered human beings as a constantly wanting creature and argued that such a person can only be motivated by the satisfaction of his needs. According to Maslow, these needs exist in human beings in a certain order. In this ranking, the needs at the higher levels do not encourage the individual to act unless the needs in the lower steps are met (Akdemir, 2004).

Based on these assumptions, Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory predicts five needs categories hierarchically from the lowest level up. These five need levels can be listed as follows (Şimşek, 1999).

- Physiological needs; Eating, drinking and sheltering needs are included in this group.
- Security Needs; physical and economic security, protection, comfort and peace, not being under threat and danger, living in a decent and clean environment, having long-term economic security.
- Social Needs; the feeling of acceptance, belonging, love and understanding, the need to be in the group and be in solidarity with it.
- Need for Appreciation; needs for acceptance and prestige, confidence and leadership, competition and success.
- The Need for Self-Realization; work with the desire to be satisfied, to succeed the need to do and be the best

3.3.1.2. Alderfer's ERG Theory

According to the theory of Clayton P. Alderfer, there are three basic needs. These are (Eren, 2003):

- Needs to Exist; physical survival and survival must be safe from any danger.
- Relational Needs; It is about establishing and maintaining good relationships with other people both in the work environment and in other social life.
- Development and Growth Needs; improving human potential, to support individual development needs

3.3.1.3. Herzberg's Double Factor Theory

While examining people's feelings or attitudes towards their job, Herzberg (1959) sought answers to the following three questions; However, he gave particular importance to the third question, which will show the relationship between attitude and behavior (Koçel, 1995):

- How does a person express his attitude towards his job?
- What constitutes these attitudes?
- What are the consequences of these attitudes?

Herzberg posed a very simple question to employees in his research: "Describe in detail when you feel extremely good at work and when you feel extremely bad at work." When the research data are examined, while the concepts that are directly related to the job describe the moments when the employees feel good and satisfied; It was observed that they used concepts related to work but outside of work such as wage and working conditions while describing the moments when they felt bad and unsatisfied (Koçel, 1995).

As a result of his research, Herzberg revealed that there are two groups of factors affecting work in a workplace. These factors (Balçık, 2002):

- Motivating factors; They are the factors that provide job satisfaction and motivation, which Hezberg calls motivations. Success, recognition,

responsibility, promotion includes factors such as the job itself. The presence of these factors sometimes creates satisfaction and sometimes dissatisfaction.

- Hygiene factors; it does not motivate the individual but its absence creates dissatisfaction. For example, there is a reluctance to work in individuals who have to work in a poorly heated and poorly lit workplace. If the workplace is well heated and illuminated, it is considered normal and does not have a special motivating effect. The factors of hygiene are: The nature of working conditions, company policies that respect equality, fair management, effective control, salary and wages, relationships between individuals.

3.3.1.4. Job Features Model

In 1975, Hackman and Oldham introduced the Characteristics of Work Model, which explains the reasons for job satisfaction. This model is built on the dimensions of skill diversity, task integrity, importance of the task, autonomy and feedback, which researchers define as five basic characteristics of the job (Kaya, 2009).

3.3.1.5. Success-Power Theory

Three needs are at the core of Mc. Clelland's approach: the need to succeed. the need for achievement, the need for power and the need for commitment / relationship (affiliation needs). The need for success is the dimension of importance and value given to success. The need for power is the need to influence others, build prestige and protect it. The need for commitment (to establish relationships) refers to establishing relationships with others, getting into a group and developing social relationships (Koçel, 1995). In Mc. Clelland's research on the subject, it has been emphasized that individuals with high success motivation generally adopt the leadership role and rise to senior management status (Fındıkçı, 2011).

3.3.2. Process Theories

Process theories try to explain the types of variables related to satisfaction (need, value, expectation, and perception) and how they combine to create job satisfaction.

According to the theories in this group, needs are only one of the factors that guide an individual to behavior (Koçel, 1995).

3.3.2.1. Vroom's Expectation Theory

According to this theory, there are three variables that determine success in organizations: motive, individual's ability and characteristics, and role perception. The basic condition for success, first of all, is the individual's willingness to work and succeed in the organization. However, this alone is not enough. In addition to this desire and determination, the individual should have the skills and characteristics required by the job. No matter how well the individual is motivated, he cannot be expected to be successful if he does not develop an understanding of his job (Koontz, O' Donnel, & Weihrich, 1984).

3.3.2.2. **Lawler and Porter's Enhanced Expectation Theory**

Although this theory, developed by Porter and Lawer, was generally based on Vrom's expectation theory, it took it further and detailed it. In this model, the degree of motivation and effort is taken into account according to the value and probability of the reward. If these values are examined, it includes the individual's ability and knowledge, perception of that task, as well as the energy to be consumed to accomplish a job. The reward, on the other hand, can be a monetary gain and term, as well as a completely introverted feeling of satisfaction and achievement (Şimşek, 1999).

3.3.2.3. Reward Justice (Equality)Theory

J. S. Adams, as a result of his research at General Electric, stated that reward justice is a very important tool to continuously motivate and encourage employees. In his research, he stated that individuals always compared the awards given to them and tried to determine to what extent the awards deemed appropriate to them were equal to those who showed similar success (Eren, 2001). According to Adams, the degree of job success and satisfaction depends on the equality or inequality perceived in relation to the working environment (Koçel, 1995).

There are two factors that the employee compares when making comparisons. The first of these is his ability, characteristics, knowledge and experience as input; The second is the wages, status, bonuses, premiums and similar social benefits that the organization gives to the employee as a result of his work. The employee should be able to find a balance between these two dimensions for job satisfaction.

3.3.2.4. Purpose Theory

According to this theory developed by E. Locke, the performance level of the individual changes according to what he wants to achieve and, in a way, people do what they want to do. This theory has two main points (Tosi & Mero, 2003):

- A person with high goals works better than someone with low goals.
- If the person knows exactly what he or she wants to do or has to do, he / she will perform better than someone who has no purpose or does not know exactly what is expected of them.

In short, goal theory states that job satisfaction level may vary according to the purpose of the individual. If the individual knows what to do and how to do it, he will work better than someone who does not know, and therefore, he will achieve a higher level of satisfaction (Tosi & Mero, 2003).

3.3.2.5. Conditioning and Reinforcement Theory

Developed by Harvard psychologist B.F.Skinner, this theory is based on a principle of behavior, also expressed as the law of influence, which defends that the behaviors adopted and rewarded by the environment will be repeated, and the behaviors that the environment does not adopt and punish will not be repeated (Koçel, 1995).

3.4. LEADERSHIP AND JOB SATISFACTION

The leader is the person responsible for creating and maintaining the level of effort required from individual group members, directing the efforts of group members in achieving

goals and ensuring that the group can achieve these goals, ensuring the coordination of efforts among group members, and finally facilitating the tasks of group members by meeting the group members' needs. The most difficult responsibility of the leader in affecting the change is to mobilize the people within the organization against the current work. At the same time, it is aimed to define the roles and functions that will ensure the job satisfaction of the members within the organization.

3.4.1. Leadership-Organizational Justice Perception Relationship

When employees perceive that they can influence the decisions taken in matters that concern them and that they have equal opportunities to reach the leader, their perception of within-organization justice also strengthens. Strengthening intra-organizational justice, employees' commitment to the organization and their trust in the system are increasing. Organizational justice also has a symbolic significance in that it shows that employees are treated according to "results" rather than "means" (Pillahi, Chester, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999).

The perception of justice in the employees of the organization is related to the leader-employee relationship. Therefore, the leader's attitudes and behaviors are important. The fair attitude and behavior of managers (leaders) contributes to the positive perception of employees that organizational justice is provided (Williams, Pitre, & Zainuba, 2002).

Organizational justice is also seen as an important tool that contributes to the implementation of transformative leadership. Employees consider the attitudes and behaviors of managers and other employees towards themselves as an indicator of organizational justice. Hence, employees expect the transformative leader to achieve organizational justice. Therefore, it can be said that there is a positive relationship with transformative leadership. In this context, the hypothesis about the relationship between transformative leadership practices and organizational justice perception is as follows (Pillahi, et al., 1999).

If the operational leadership style is adopted within the organization, there is an economic exchange process. In this case, it is particularly important to distribute organizational outputs equally to employees. Therefore, it can be said that there is a

relationship between operational leadership and distributive justice. In other words, in transformative leadership, employees are concerned about whether organizational processes are fair or not; The area of interest in Interactive leadership shifts to the extent to which economic gains are distributed fairly to employees. Distributive justice focuses on achieving organizational goals and distributing the resulting benefits among employees. Therefore, it can be said that there is a positive relationship between operational leadership and distributive justice (Pillahi, et al., 1999).

3.4.2. Leadership-Organizational Commitment Relationship

Organizational commitment is defined as the biased and effective commitment of employees to the goals, objectives and values of the organization, again considering the interests of the organization. This commitment is an internalized commitment, and the person's performance and the role he / she performs are matched with the goals, values and goals of the organization. Employees who have organizational commitment strongly believe in the goals, values and beliefs of the organization. Voluntarily obeys the orders and instructions given within the hierarchical structure of the organization. Employees show much more than the organization's expectations or expected performances from them and intend to integrate with the organization and not leave the organization (Gül, 2003).

Organizational commitment is the adoption of the organizational goals, values and goals of the audience, voluntary effort for the benefit of the organization and desire to continue their presence in the organization (Gül, 2003). Therefore, organizational commitment is organization-member integration, resulting in an increase in both organizational and individual performance as a result of this relationship. Likewise, transformative and operational leaders have extremely important effects in the acceptance of organizational goals and values and in making efforts for the benefit of the organization (Lok & Crawford, 1999).

This is because the goals and results of organizational commitment converge with the goals and results of leadership in general and transformative leadership in particular. Organizational commitment is the adoption of the organizational goals, values and goals of the audience, voluntary effort for the benefit of the organization and desire to continue their

presence in the organization (Gül, 2003). Therefore, organizational commitment is organization-member integration, resulting in an increase in both organizational and individual performance as a result of this relationship. Likewise, transformative and operational leaders have extremely important effects in the acceptance of organizational goals and values and in making efforts for the benefit of the organization (Lok & Crawford, 1999).

Kane and Tremble (2000), in their study examining the impact of transformative leadership on different levels of the American military, confirmed their hypothesis that they suggest that transformative leadership is positively associated with emotional commitment and operational leadership's continuing commitment. Likewise, Bycio, Hackett and Allen (1994) reached similar results in their studies(Gül, 2003).

3.4.3. The Relationship between Leadership and Job Satisfaction

A study conducted by Fuller et al. (1999) on nurses in the United States; demonstrated that transformative leadership practices produce results that increase employees' job satisfaction. Bryman (1992) found that transformative leadership behaviors positively affect important organizational results, including job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors. However, the main factor that improves the leader's effectiveness; It is to recognize the typical characteristics of employees, work and organization. Many researchers believe that these characteristics increase the relationship between leadership behaviors and organizational outcomes (Howell, Dorfman, & Kerr, 1986).

3.4.4. Leadership-Organizational Citizenship Behavior Relationship

While examining the relationship between leadership behavior and organizational citizenship behavior, it may be useful to consider Blau's (1964) Social Interaction Theory. Social interaction explains why employees are obliged to their managers and must contribute more than formal employment contracts require. Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as “individual behavior based on volunteering, which is not directly and fully taken into account in formal job descriptions, but helps the organization to fulfill its functions efficiently as a whole” (Organ, 1988).

Podsakoff et al. (1990) found in their study that there is a direct relationship between operational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior, but not a direct relationship between transformative leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. However, transformative leadership practices may have the potential to have a direct relationship with organizational citizenship behavior, as it will lead to extraordinary organizational results (Pillahi, et al., 1999).

3.4.5. Distributive Justice Perception-Organizational Citizenship Behavior Relationship

According to the research conducted by Williams, Pitre and Zainuba (2002); There is a structure that provides a quick interaction between the perception of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior, and many studies support this opinion. The exchange relationship based on trust, which is formed between employees and their managers and reinforced by the belief in the existence of organizational justice, increases the tendency of employees to exhibit citizenship behavior (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Williams, et al., 2002).

3.4.6. Distributive Justice Perception-Job Satisfaction Relationship

Employees are concerned about whether the benefits they get from the organization and whether the practices within the organization are fair. The fair distribution of organizational benefit to employees is related to the concept of "distributive justice". The said distribution will be in proportion to the contribution of the employees to the organizational benefit and within the framework of the terms of the contract. According to the results of the research, the increase in the distributive justice perception of the employees increases the satisfaction they have with their jobs (Pillahi, et al., 1999).

3.4.7. Job Satisfaction-Organizational Commitment Relationship

It is a result of various scientific studies that there is a positive interaction between organizational commitment and job satisfaction. According to this, both job satisfaction and organizational commitment affect each other in an increasing / supportive way. Scientists say

that if there is an increase in organizational commitment, this will also increase job satisfaction; He states that if the job satisfaction of the employees of the organization increases, the organizational commitment will also increase (Finegan, 2000).

CHAPTER IV

MATERIAL AND METHOD

4.1. THE MODEL OF THE RESEARCH

The research has a scanning model. The effect of different leadership styles applied in family businesses on job satisfaction levels of employees was tried to be determined with the survey study. Within the scope of the research, the effects of "Transformational", "Interactionist" and "Paternalist" leadership behaviors on job satisfaction were examined. Job satisfaction, on the other hand, is handled under two separate headings: internal satisfaction and external satisfaction.

4.2. UNIVERSE AND SAMPLING OF THE STUDY

The study consists of company employees operating in the construction sector in Gaziantep and Istanbul. In this framework, 10 family companies operating in the construction sector in Istanbul and Gaziantep provinces, whose survey questions were determined randomly, were selected and a total of 400 questionnaires were distributed. The number of people answering the questionnaire is 262 in total, 198 of which are companies operating in Gaziantep and 64 are from Istanbul. Survey recycling rates are approximately 87%. The research findings are within ± 10% sampling error and 95% confidence interval.

4.3. DATA COLLECTION METHOD AND TOOL

Research data were collected with the help of a questionnaire consisting of Leadership Scale, Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale and Personal Information section. The Leadership Scale is based on the Transformational / Interactive Leadership Scale developed by Avolio, Bass and Jung (1999) and the Paternalist Leadership Scale developed by Aycan (2005).

4.4. DATA ANALYSIS

SPSS 22.0 program was used to analyze the data obtained as a result of the research. In order to benefit from parametric statistical tests, variables must show normal distribution (Miran, 2018).

Table 1: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Demographic Information of the Participants

		City			
		Gaziantep		Istanbul	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
Your gender	Female	76	38,4%	34	53,1%
	Male	122	61,6%	30	46,9%
Your education level	Primary education	10	5,1%	0	0,0%
	High school	32	16,2%	6	9,4%
	Open Education Undergraduate	26	13,1%	3	4,7%
	College	40	20,2%	1	1,6%
	University-Postgraduate	90	45,5%	54	84,4%
Your total working time at your current workplace	Less than 1 year	24	12,1%	6	9,4%
	1-5 year	65	32,8%	25	39,1%
	6-10 year	69	34,8%	22	34,4%
	11-20 year	30	15,2%	8	12,5%
	More than 20 years	10	5,1%	3	4,7%
Your total working time in the industry:	Less than 1 year	14	7,1%	4	6,3%
	1-5 year	43	21,7%	21	33,3%
	6-10 year	60	30,3%	19	30,2%
	11-20 year	59	29,8%	16	25,4%
	More than 20 years	22	11,1%	3	4,8%
The gender of your manager:	Female	7	3,5%	10	15,6%
	Male	191	96,5%	54	84,4%
Education level of your manager	Primary education	10	5,1%	0	0,0%
	High school	73	37,1%	13	20,3%
	Open Education Undergraduate	6	3,0%	0	0,0%
	College	12	6,1%	4	6,3%
	University-Postgraduate	96	48,7%	47	73,4%
Number of subordinates attached to your manager	0	1	0,5%	0	0,0%
	1	2	1,0%	7	10,9%
	2	2	1,0%	5	7,8%
	3	8	4,0%	2	3,1%
	5	8	4,0%	3	4,7%
	6	10	5,1%	0	0,0%
	7	7	3,5%	0	0,0%
	8	1	0,5%	7	10,9%
	9	2	1,0%	0	0,0%
	10	9	4,5%	3	4,7%
	11	8	4,0%	0	0,0%
	12	7	3,5%	0	0,0%
	15	11	5,6%	6	9,4%
	20	24	12,1%	9	14,1%
	25	26	13,1%	15	23,4%
	30	21	10,6%	5	7,8%
	100	30	15,2%	0	0,0%
	200	6	3,0%	0	0,0%
	1000	1	0,5%	0	0,0%

198 of the 262 participants within the scope of the research participated from Gaziantep and 64 people from Istanbul. When the gender of the participants are examined, 61.6% of men from Gaziantep, 38.4% of women from Gaziantep, 46.9% of men from Istanbul, and 53.1% of women.

When the educational status of the participants is examined, 84.4 % of the participants from Istanbul are university postgraduate graduates, 9.4 % are high school graduates, and 1.6 % are college graduates. 45.5% of the participants in Gaziantep are university postgraduates, 20.2% college, 16.2% high school, 13.1% Open Education Undergraduate, 5.1% primary school graduates.

When participants were asked about the gender of their managers; 96.5% men in Gaziantep, 3.5% women, 84.4% men and 15.6% women from Istanbul.

Participants were asked about their working time in the sector and according to the answers received, 30.3% of the participants from Gaziantep stated that they had experience between 5-10 years, 29.8% of them had experience of 10-20 years, while 33.3% of the participants in Istanbul 1-5 years, 30.2% 5-10 years and 25.4% 10-20 years of experience.

When the participants were asked about their working hours in their current workplaces, the answers are as follows. 34.8% of the participants in Gaziantep stated that they worked for 5-10 years, and 32.8% for 1-5 years in the current workplace. 39.1% of the participants in Istanbul stated that they worked in their current workplaces for 1-5 years and 34.4% for 5-10 years.

4.4.1. Data Collecting Method

4.4.2. Factor Analysis

All items were included in the 1st step.

L31 removed in step 2

L5 was removed in step 3

L27 removed in step 4

L2 was removed in step 5

Step 1

For the leadership scale, **Varimax** method was used as rotation method and **principal components** method as extraction method in factor analysis. There are 31 statements in the leadership scale, which is subjected to factor analysis.

The KMO value for "leadership" statements was found to be 0.949 (excellent). This statistic is a measure of whether the data can be modeled with factor analysis. The KMO statistic determines the suitability of the sample size. The lower limit is 0.50. Accordingly, the data we have is perfectly suitable for modeling.

Since Bartlett test is statistically significant, it is understood that the variables are suitable for factor analysis. This also leads to the conclusion that the variables are consistent.

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,949
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	7570,205
	df	465
	Sig.	,000

Communalities **extraction** values are expected to be greater than 32%. All items are greater than 0.32. For this reason, factor analysis was made by taking all items into consideration.

Communalities		
	Initial	Extraction
L1	1,000	,783
L2	1,000	,790
L3	1,000	,752
L4	1,000	,797
L5	1,000	,721
L6	1,000	,664
L7	1,000	,701
L8	1,000	,603
L9	1,000	,701
L10	1,000	,717

L11	1,000	,723
L12	1,000	,779
L13	1,000	,747
L14	1,000	,657
L15	1,000	,742
L16	1,000	,774
L17	1,000	,652
L18	1,000	,760
L19	1,000	,757
L20	1,000	,695
L21	1,000	,746
L22	1,000	,748
L23	1,000	,764
L24	1,000	,874
L25	1,000	,794
L26	1,000	,699
L27	1,000	,739
L28	1,000	,809
L29	1,000	,777
L30	1,000	,696
L31	1,000	,620
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

There are 5 factors with an eigenvalue value above 1. These constitute 73% of the total burden.

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	16,434	53,013	53,013	16,434	53,013	53,013	7,641	24,649	24,649
2	2,434	7,853	60,866	2,434	7,853	60,866	6,164	19,883	44,532
3	1,509	4,868	65,734	1,509	4,868	65,734	4,238	13,671	58,203
4	1,402	4,521	70,255	1,402	4,521	70,255	3,356	10,826	69,029
5	1,002	3,234	73,489	1,002	3,234	73,489	1,382	4,459	73,489
6	,752	2,426	75,914						
7	,689	2,222	78,137						
8	,638	2,057	80,194						
9	,591	1,907	82,100						
10	,524	1,690	83,790						
11	,457	1,473	85,264						
12	,455	1,467	86,730						
13	,389	1,255	87,985						
14	,384	1,238	89,223						
15	,337	1,087	90,310						
16	,321	1,034	91,344						
17	,286	,923	92,267						
18	,270	,871	93,138						

19	,250	,805	93,943						
20	,225	,727	94,670						
21	,221	,714	95,384						
22	,192	,618	96,002						
23	,188	,607	96,609						
24	,181	,585	97,194						
25	,166	,537	97,731						
26	,152	,490	98,221						
27	,136	,439	98,660						
28	,126	,407	99,067						
29	,108	,348	99,415						
30	,102	,329	99,744						
31	,079	,256	100,000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

It has been decided to exclude the dimensions in which the item L31 is included in the Rotated component matrix, since it has a load below 0.50 in all.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]					
	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
L10	,758				
L9	,746				
L12	,733				
L11	,717				
L6	,702				
L3	,689				
L4	,689				
L13	,685				
L1	,682				
L7	,660				
L5	,618		,543		
L8	,589				
L31					
L18		,773			
L15		,698			
L21		,695			
L16		,689			
L20		,684			
L19		,648			
L14		,641			
L26		,626			
L17		,544			
L29			,791		
L28			,734		
L30			,634		
L27		,532	,599		
L24				,873	
L25				,824	
L22				,770	
L23				,594	

L2					,793
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.					
Rotation converged in 14 iterations.					

Step 2:

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,947
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	7314,725
	df	435
	Sig.	,000

After the L31 item was removed, 4 dimensions met 71% variance.

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	15,849	52,829	52,829	15,849	52,829	52,829	7,221	24,071	24,071
2	2,434	8,114	60,943	2,434	8,114	60,943	6,286	20,955	45,025
3	1,506	5,021	65,964	1,506	5,021	65,964	4,238	14,128	59,153
4	1,400	4,667	70,632	1,400	4,667	70,632	3,444	11,478	70,632
5	,994	3,315	73,946						
6	,751	2,503	76,449						
7	,687	2,290	78,739						
8	,602	2,005	80,744						
9	,565	1,884	82,629						
10	,519	1,730	84,359						
11	,455	1,516	85,875						
12	,436	1,453	87,327						
13	,387	1,289	88,616						
14	,340	1,133	89,749						
15	,325	1,083	90,832						
16	,289	,962	91,794						
17	,279	,930	92,725						
18	,267	,890	93,614						
19	,247	,825	94,439						
20	,222	,741	95,180						
21	,198	,661	95,841						
22	,191	,636	96,477						
23	,182	,606	97,083						
24	,166	,555	97,637						
25	,153	,511	98,149						
26	,136	,455	98,603						
27	,129	,431	99,034						
28	,108	,361	99,395						
29	,102	,340	99,735						
30	,079	,265	100,000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

The RCM table above 0.50 is as follows. It was decided to exclude L5 and L27 items, which have a difference of more than 0.10 in matrix values of overlapping materials in more than one dimension.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]				
	Component			
	1	2	3	4
L10	,749			
L9	,734			
L12	,733			
L11	,714			
L13	,692			
L3	,687			
L4	,685		,517	
L6	,683			
L1	,677		,520	
L7	,643			
L5	,605		,588	
L8	,582			
L2				
L18		,769		
L21		,724		
L20		,708		
L16		,700		
L15		,698		
L19		,678		
L26		,645		
L14		,636		
L17		,514		
L29			,794	
L28			,728	
L27		,555	,599	
L30			,598	
L24				,856
L25				,854
L22				,784
L23				,556
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.				
a. Rotation converged in 24 iterations.				

Step 3:

L5 material was removed from the overlapping materials that are in more than one dimension and have a difference in matrix value of more than 0.10.

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,947
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	7013,067
	df	406
	Sig.	,000

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	15,375	53,018	53,018	15,375	53,018	53,018	7,123	24,563	24,563
2	2,301	7,935	60,953	2,301	7,935	60,953	6,061	20,900	45,463
3	1,448	4,994	65,947	1,448	4,994	65,947	3,905	13,466	58,929
4	1,390	4,794	70,741	1,390	4,794	70,741	3,425	11,812	70,741
5	,994	3,429	74,170						
6	,748	2,579	76,749						
7	,680	2,345	79,095						
8	,591	2,036	81,131						
9	,553	1,908	83,039						
10	,504	1,739	84,778						
11	,453	1,561	86,339						
12	,416	1,434	87,773						
13	,386	1,332	89,105						
14	,325	1,122	90,226						
15	,319	1,100	91,327						
16	,283	,974	92,301						
17	,267	,921	93,222						
18	,249	,857	94,080						
19	,230	,792	94,872						
20	,208	,717	95,589						
21	,194	,669	96,257						
22	,188	,649	96,906						
23	,167	,574	97,481						
24	,158	,546	98,027						
25	,143	,492	98,518						
26	,130	,449	98,967						
27	,111	,381	99,349						
28	,108	,372	99,720						
29	,081	,280	100,000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

Item L27 was not removed as it leads to more crosslinking material.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]				
	Component			
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**
L10	,751			
L9	,741			
L12	,740			
L11	,720			
L3	,701			
L13	,698			
L6	,696			
L4	,692			
L1	,689		,505	
L7	,660			
L8	,598			
L2				
L18		,767		
L21		,723		
L20		,714		
L15		,688		
L16	,501	,686		
L19		,667		
L26		,639		
L14		,631		
L17		,506		
L29			,803	
L28			,738	
L30			,610	
L27		,547	,598	
L25				,855
L24				,855
L22				,783
L23				,555
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.				
a. Rotation converged in 13 iterations.				

Step 4

After removing L27;

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	,947
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	6670,460
	df	378
	Sig.	,000

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	14,825	52,947	52,947	14,825	52,947	52,947	6,890	24,608	24,608
2	2,301	8,219	61,165	2,301	8,219	61,165	5,780	20,643	45,252

3	1,424	5,085	66,251	1,424	5,085	66,251	3,780	13,500	58,752
4	1,288	4,600	70,851	1,288	4,600	70,851	3,388	12,099	70,851
5	,992	3,543	74,393						
6	,747	2,668	77,061						
7	,631	2,255	79,316						
8	,590	2,108	81,425						
9	,552	1,972	83,396						
10	,500	1,784	85,180						
11	,442	1,579	86,760						
12	,387	1,382	88,142						
13	,380	1,356	89,497						
14	,322	1,149	90,647						
15	,300	1,070	91,717						
16	,270	,965	92,682						
17	,260	,929	93,611						
18	,230	,822	94,434						
19	,212	,759	95,192						
20	,207	,740	95,933						
21	,192	,686	96,619						
22	,169	,602	97,221						
23	,159	,566	97,787						
24	,158	,563	98,350						
25	,143	,509	98,859						
26	,129	,459	99,319						
27	,108	,386	99,704						
28	,083	,296	100,000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

Rotated Component Matrix[a]				
	Component			
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**
L12	,762			
L10	,754			
L11	,736			
L9	,731			
L13	,727			
L3	,669		,509	
L6	,667			
L4	,661		,534	
L1	,653		,551	
L7	,644			
L8	,592			
L18		,765		
L21		,743		
L20		,731		
L15		,683		
L19		,682		
L16	,518	,674		
L26		,653		
L14		,625		
L17		,502		
L29			,806	
L28			,707	
L30			,647	
L2				
L25				,862
L24				,854
L22				,776
L23				,548

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 13 iterations.

After removing L27, it was decided to remove the L2 item, since all the differences between the size values of the overlapping materials in the RCM are above 0.10, but the L2 item has values below 0.5.

Step 5

After L2 is removed, 4 dimensions make up 72% of the variance.

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	,948
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	6532,433
	df	351
	Sig.	,000

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	14,602	54,081	54,081	14,60	54,081	54,081	7,063	26,158	26,158
2	2,301	8,521	62,602	2,301	8,521	62,602	5,648	20,917	47,075
3	1,387	5,136	67,739	1,387	5,136	67,739	3,569	13,217	60,292
4	1,280	4,739	72,478	1,280	4,739	72,478	3,290	12,186	72,478
5	,774	2,866	75,344						
6	,690	2,556	77,900						
7	,613	2,272	80,172						
8	,583	2,161	82,333						
9	,523	1,936	84,268						
10	,442	1,638	85,906						
11	,431	1,594	87,501						
12	,383	1,419	88,920						
13	,325	1,205	90,125						
14	,300	1,112	91,236						
15	,274	1,014	92,251						
16	,261	,966	93,217						
17	,255	,946	94,163						
18	,214	,793	94,956						
19	,208	,769	95,725						

20	,200	,742	96,466						
21	,169	,624	97,091						
22	,159	,588	97,679						
23	,158	,587	98,266						
24	,143	,528	98,794						
25	,129	,477	99,271						
26	,114	,422	99,693						
27	,083	,307	100,000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,948
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	6532,433
	df	351
	Sig.	,000

Communalities		
	Initial	Extraction
proud of him/her	1,000	,757
has my respect	1,000	,742
displays power and confidence	1,000	,763
emphasizes the collective mission	1,000	,662
talks optimistically	1,000	,711
talks enthusiastically	1,000	,613
arouses awareness about important issues	1,000	,702
re-examines assumptions	1,000	,707
seeks different views	1,000	,729
suggests new ways	1,000	,789
suggests different angles	1,000	,755
individualizes attention	1,000	,638
focuses your strengths	1,000	,743
teaches and coaches	1,000	,762
differentiates among us	1,000	,512
clarifies rewards	1,000	,765
assists based on effort’	1,000	,740
rewards your achievement	1,000	,696
recognizes your achievement	1,000	,743
focuses on your mistakes	1,000	,737
puts out fires	1,000	,697
tracks your mistakes	1,000	,873
concentrates on failures	1,000	,782
take care of individual lives	1,000	,691
behave paternalistic	1,000	,773
attend special days of him/her	1,000	,803
hope loyalty	1,000	,683
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

After the L2 item was also removed, there was no item with a value below 0.5 in the RCM matrix. Since the difference of overlapping items is over 0.10, the final situation is as follows:

Rotated Component Matrix[a]				
	Component			
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**
L12	,763			
L10	,761			
L9	,746			
L11	,739			
L13	,722			
L6	,688			
L3	,686			
L4	,678		,500	
L1	,670		,514	
L7	,664			
L8	,606			
L18		,782		
L20		,716		
L21		,713		
L15		,693		
L16	,524	,663		
L19		,652		
L26		,643		
L14		,639		
L17		,553		
L29			,812	
L28			,711	
L30			,655	
L24				,875
L25				,846
L22				,769
L23				,580
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.				
a. Rotation converged in 9 iterations.				

4.4.2.1. Relability Analyses (Leadership Scale)

Component 1

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	262	100,0
	Excluded[a]	0	,0
	Total	262	100,0
a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.			

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,952	11

There is no need to delete any item from component 1, since there is no item that will make it rise above 0.952 when deleted.

Item-Total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
L1	38,33	78,091	,811	,949
L3	38,17	77,675	,799	,949
L4	38,19	77,744	,825	,949
L5	38,15	79,532	,724	,952
L6	38,42	78,850	,748	,951
L7	38,42	77,157	,791	,950
L8	38,50	78,090	,736	,951
L9	38,44	77,688	,798	,949
L10	38,56	78,838	,755	,951
L11	38,51	77,554	,776	,950
L12	38,52	75,722	,807	,949
L13	38,60	77,129	,754	,951

Component 2

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	262	100,0
	Excludeda	0	,0
	Total	262	100,0
a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.			

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,938	9

It was determined that there is an L7 item that will enable Cronbach's alpha value to rise above 0.938 when it is deleted. However, since Cronbach's alpha value is over 0.700 before L7 is deleted, it is not necessary to delete L7 from component 2.

Item-Total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
L14	25,99	44,774	,741	,932
L15	25,91	44,061	,806	,928
L16	25,93	43,942	,800	,928
L17	26,17	46,511	,618	,939
L18	26,02	44,839	,808	,928
L19	25,87	44,926	,809	,928
L20	25,93	45,033	,782	,930
L21	25,84	44,454	,811	,928

L26	25,89	45,552	,712	,934

Component 3

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	262	100,0
	Excluded[a]	0	,0
	Total	262	100,0
a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.			

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,867	3

Since there is no item that will make Cronbach's alpha value exceed 0.867 when deleted, there is no need to delete any item from component 3.

Item-Total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
L28	7,30	3,859	,768	,793
L29	7,29	3,546	,789	,772
L30	7,05	4,150	,686	,865

Component 4

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	262	100,0
	Excluded[a]	0	,0
	Total	262	100,0
a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.			

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,877	4

Since there is no item that will cause Cronbach's alpha value to exceed 0.877 when deleted, there is no need to delete any item from component 4.

Item-Total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
L22	9,84	6,927	,736	,841
L23	9,61	7,434	,660	,870
L24	9,77	6,735	,840	,801
L25	9,92	6,974	,709	,853

4.4.2.2. Minnesota Scale

All items were included in the 1st step.

In the second step, M16 material was removed.

In step 3, M12 material was removed.

In the 4th step, M7 substance was removed.

In the 5th step, M15 material was removed.

Step 1

For Minnesota scale, **Varimax** method was used as rotation method and **principal components** method as extraction method in factor analysis. There are 20 expressions in the leadership scale that is subjected to factor analysis.

KMO value of "Minnesota" expressions were found as 0.948 (perfect). This statistic is a measure of whether the data can be modeled with factor analysis. The KMO statistic determines the suitability of the sample size. The lower limit is 0.50. Accordingly, the data we have is perfectly suitable for modeling.

Since Bartlett test is statistically significant, it is understood that the variables are suitable for factor analysis. This also leads to the conclusion that the variables are consistent.

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	,948
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	4392,941
	df	190
	Sig.	,000

Communalities extraction values are expected to be greater than 32%. All items are greater than 0.32. For this reason, factor analysis was made by taking all items into consideration.

Communalities		
	Initial	Extraction
M1	1,000	,633
M2	1,000	,742

M3	1,000	,570
M4	1,000	,661
M5	1,000	,608
M6	1,000	,581
M7	1,000	,467
M8	1,000	,660
M9	1,000	,658
M10	1,000	,625
M11	1,000	,727
M12	1,000	,604
M13	1,000	,590
M14	1,000	,648
M15	1,000	,718
M16	1,000	,719
M17	1,000	,634
M18	1,000	,647
M19	1,000	,751
M20	1,000	,784
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

There are 2 factors with an eigenvalue above 1. These constitute 65% of the total load.

Total Variance Explained						
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	11,856	59,278	59,278	11,856	59,278	59,278
2	1,171	5,855	65,133	1,171	5,855	65,133
3	,989	4,946	70,079			
4	,715	3,573	73,652			
5	,603	3,016	76,668			
6	,547	2,736	79,404			
7	,526	2,628	82,032			
8	,463	2,314	84,345			
9	,417	2,085	86,430			
10	,403	2,014	88,445			
11	,369	1,845	90,289			
12	,349	1,744	92,034			
13	,313	1,564	93,597			
14	,255	1,276	94,873			
15	,213	1,067	95,940			
16	,202	1,009	96,949			
17	,182	,908	97,857			
18	,170	,852	98,710			
19	,144	,719	99,428			
20	,114	,572	100,000			
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						

Component Matrix[a]		
	Component	
	1	**2**
M16	,847	
M11	,845	

M15	,841	
M2	,815	
M8	,810	
M4	,806	
M9	,802	
M14	,781	
M12	,777	
M17	,776	
M20	,772	
M19	,751	
M5	,751	
M10	,745	
M13	,733	
M6	,725	
M3	,723	
M1	,694	
M18	,690	
M7	,683	
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		
a. 2 components extracted.		

RCM table above 0.50 is as follows. It was decided to remove the M16, M12 and M15 items, which have a difference of more than 0.10 in the matrix value of the overlapping materials in more than one dimension.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]		
	Component	
	1	**2**
M2	,794	
M1	,776	
M10	,732	
M11	,705	
M5	,700	
M6	,697	
M3	,684	
M9	,678	
M4	,671	
M8	,648	
M16	,605	,595
M12	,594	,501
M7	,502	
M20		,837
M19		,823
M18		,768
M14		,667
M13		,659
M17		,649
M15	,556	,640
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.		
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.		

Step 2

Factor analysis results after M16 removal:

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	,948
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3978,293

	df	171
	Sig.	,000

Communalities		
	Initial	Extraction
M1	1,000	,630
M2	1,000	,742
M3	1,000	,571
M4	1,000	,663
M5	1,000	,615
M6	1,000	,581
M7	1,000	,478
M8	1,000	,662
M9	1,000	,663
M10	1,000	,630
M11	1,000	,724
M12	1,000	,608
M13	1,000	,585
M14	1,000	,639
M15	1,000	,696
M17	1,000	,633
M18	1,000	,658
M19	1,000	,761
M20	1,000	,789
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

Component Matrix[a]		
	Component	
	1	**2**
M11	,843	
M15	,829	
M2	,814	
M8	,811	
M4	,808	
M9	,806	
M12	,779	
M14	,777	
M17	,775	
M20	,773	
M5	,759	
M19	,754	
M10	,747	
M13	,732	
M6	,729	
M3	,722	
M18	,693	
M1	,692	
M7	,691	
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		
a. 2 components extracted.		

After the M16 item is removed, the 2 dimensions meet 65% variance.

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared			Rotation Sums of		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	11,156	58,717	58,717	11,156	58,717	58,717	6,767	35,617	35,617
2	1,170	6,158	64,875	1,170	6,158	64,875	5,559	29,258	64,875
3	,942	4,956	69,831						
4	,711	3,742	73,573						
5	,603	3,173	76,746						
6	,543	2,858	79,603						
7	,516	2,713	82,317						
8	,446	2,349	84,666						
9	,408	2,147	86,813						
10	,395	2,080	88,893						
11	,349	1,839	90,732						
12	,313	1,648	92,380						
13	,293	1,539	93,919						
14	,254	1,339	95,259						
15	,211	1,108	96,367						
16	,202	1,061	97,428						
17	,182	,956	98,384						
18	,165	,870	99,254						
19	,142	,746	100,000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

Rotated Component Matrix[a]		
	Component	
	1	**2**
M2	,796	
M1	,776	
M10	,736	
M11	,708	
M5	,698	
M6	,693	
M3	,688	
M9	,679	
M4	,675	
M8	,648	
M12	,596	,503
M7		
M20		,840
M19		,828
M18		,775
M14		,657
M13		,652
M17		,649
M15	,558	,620
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.		

Step 3

Factor analysis results after M12 removal:

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,945
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3732,293
	df	153
	Sig.	,000

Communalities		
	Initial	Extraction
M1	1,000	,638
M2	1,000	,748
M3	1,000	,583
M4	1,000	,668
M5	1,000	,613
M6	1,000	,584
M7	1,000	,476
M8	1,000	,664
M9	1,000	,658
M10	1,000	,623
M11	1,000	,716
M13	1,000	,585
M14	1,000	,642
M15	1,000	,697
M17	1,000	,631
M18	1,000	,661
M19	1,000	,764
M20	1,000	,790
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

After the M12 item was removed, 2 dimensions met 65% variance.

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	10,571	58,730	58,730	10,571	58,730	58,730	6,411	35,619	35,619
2	1,170	6,499	65,229	1,170	6,499	65,229	5,330	29,610	65,229
3	,941	5,230	70,459						
4	,647	3,596	74,054						
5	,591	3,283	77,337						
6	,543	3,014	80,351						
7	,511	2,839	83,191						
8	,446	2,476	85,666						
9	,403	2,237	87,903						
10	,384	2,131	90,034						
11	,315	1,752	91,787						
12	,296	1,642	93,429						
13	,255	1,415	94,843						
14	,217	1,207	96,051						
15	,210	1,166	97,216						
16	,190	1,057	98,273						
17	,169	,938	99,211						
18	,142	,789	100,000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

Component Matrix[a]		
	Component	
	1	**2**
M11	,838	
M15	,829	
M2	,817	
M8	,812	
M4	,810	
M9	,803	
M14	,779	
M20	,775	
M17	,773	
M5	,758	
M19	,757	
M10	,743	
M13	,732	
M6	,731	
M3	,729	
M18	,697	
M1	,696	
M7	,689	
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		
a. 2 components extracted.		

It was decided to remove the M7 matrix with a value less than 0.5 in RCM.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]		
	Component	
	1	**2**
M2	,799	
M1	,780	
M10	,731	
M11	,703	
M5	,697	
M3	,696	
M6	,694	
M4	,677	
M9	,676	
M8	,648	
M7		
M20		,841
M19		,830
M18		,776
M14		,659
M13		,653
M17		,650
M15	,557	,622
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.		

Step 4

Factor analysis results after M7 removal:

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	,944
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3544,607
	df	136
	Sig.	,000

Communalities		
	Initial	Extraction
M1	1,000	,641
M2	1,000	,749
M3	1,000	,588
M4	1,000	,675
M5	1,000	,611
M6	1,000	,576
M8	1,000	,657
M9	1,000	,660
M10	1,000	,627
M11	1,000	,721
M13	1,000	,596
M14	1,000	,643
M15	1,000	,709
M17	1,000	,626
M18	1,000	,660
M19	1,000	,764
M20	1,000	,789
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

After the M7 item was removed, 2 dimensions met 66% variance.

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	10,121	59,537	59,537	10,121	59,537	59,537	6,180	36,355	36,355
2	1,169	6,879	66,416	1,169	6,879	66,416	5,110	30,061	66,416
3	,862	5,070	71,486						
4	,647	3,806	75,292						
5	,585	3,440	78,732						
6	,512	3,009	81,742						
7	,446	2,626	84,368						
8	,411	2,420	86,788						
9	,389	2,286	89,074						
10	,329	1,935	91,009						
11	,298	1,753	92,762						
12	,277	1,631	94,393						
13	,234	1,374	95,767						
14	,217	1,275	97,042						
15	,191	1,123	98,165						

16	,170	1,000	99,165						
17	,142	,835	100,000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

Component Matrix[a]		
	Component	
	1	**2**
M11	,841	
M15	,836	
M2	,819	
M4	,815	
M8	,808	
M9	,804	
M14	,778	
M20	,774	
M17	,770	
M19	,757	
M5	,755	
M10	,748	
M13	,738	
M3	,734	
M6	,724	
M1	,699	
M18	,697	
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		
a. 2 components extracted.		

In RCM, M15 is an overlapping material and has less than 0.10 difference. For this reason, it has been decided to remove M15.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]		
	Component	
	1	**2**
The chance to work alone on the job.	,799	
Being able to keep busy all the time	,782	
The chance to tell people what to do	,732	
The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	,704	
The way my boss handles his/her workers	,698	
The chance to do different things from time to time.	,697	
The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.	,694	
The chance to be “somebody” in the community	,678	
The chance to do things for other people	,677	
The way my job provides for steady employment	,647	
The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job		,840
The praise I get for doing a good job		,829
The way my co-workers get along with each other		,775
The chances for advancement on this job		,660
My pay and the amount of work I do		,660
The working conditions		,645
The freedom to use my own judgment	,559	,630
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.		

Component Transformation Matrix		
Component	1	2
1	,748	,663
2	-,663	,748
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.		

Step 5

Factor analysis results after M7 removal:

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,938
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3232,870
	df	120
	Sig.	,000

Communalities		
	Initial	Extraction
M1	1,000	,638
M2	1,000	,751
M3	1,000	,591
M4	1,000	,673
M5	1,000	,615
M6	1,000	,576
M8	1,000	,664
M9	1,000	,660
M10	1,000	,628
M11	1,000	,715
M13	1,000	,585
M14	1,000	,628
M17	1,000	,637
M18	1,000	,678
M19	1,000	,773
M20	1,000	,794
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

After the M15 item was removed, the 2 dimensions met 66% variance.

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9,445	59,031	59,031	9,445	59,031	59,031	5,939	37,120	37,120
2	1,162	7,263	66,294	1,162	7,263	66,294	4,668	29,174	66,294
3	,819	5,120	71,414						
4	,644	4,027	75,441						
5	,585	3,655	79,096						
6	,511	3,194	82,289						
7	,445	2,781	85,070						
8	,406	2,537	87,607						
9	,386	2,411	90,018						

10	,329	2,054	92,073						
11	,288	1,801	93,874						
12	,234	1,460	95,334						
13	,218	1,365	96,699						
14	,206	1,287	97,986						
15	,175	1,093	99,079						
16	,147	,921	100,000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

Component Matrix[a]		
	Component	
	1	2
M11	,838	
M2	,821	
M4	,814	
M8	,813	
M9	,805	
M17	,774	
M14	,771	
M20	,771	
M5	,765	
M19	,756	
M10	,747	
M3	,736	
M13	,732	
M6	,731	
M1	,703	
M18	,698	
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		
a. 2 components extracted.		

After the M15 item was also removed, there was no item with a value below 0.5 in the RCM matrix.

Rotated Component Matrix[a]		
	Component	
	1	**2**
M2	,804	
M1	,781	
M10	,740	
M11	,712	
M3	,703	
M5	,693	
M6	,688	
M4	,685	
M9	,680	
M8	,650	
M20		,841
M19		,833
M18		,786
M17		,653
M13		,643
M14		,640
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.		

4.4.2.3. Reliability Analysis (Minnesota Scale)

Component 1

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	262	100,0
	Excluded[a]	0	,0
	Total	262	100,0
a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.			

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,938	10

Since there is no item that will make the Cronbach's alpha value exceed 0.938 when deleted, there is no need to delete any item from component 1.

Item-Total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
M1	30,21	51,091	,698	,934
M2	30,29	49,102	,816	,928
M3	30,25	50,350	,708	,934
M4	30,12	49,775	,775	,930
M5	30,08	51,243	,731	,932
M6	30,05	51,814	,706	,934
M8	30,05	50,251	,766	,931
M9	30,15	49,910	,770	,931
M10	30,35	49,830	,732	,933
M11	30,25	48,770	,795	,929

Component 2

Case Processing Summary			
		N	%
Cases	Valid	262	100,0
	Excluded[a]	0	,0
	Total	262	100,0
a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.			

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,903	6

Since there is no item that will cause Cronbach's alpha value to exceed 0.903 when deleted, there is no need to delete any item from component 2.

Item-Total Statistics				
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
M13	16,54	17,491	,692	,893
M14	16,44	17,466	,719	,889
M17	16,22	18,002	,706	,890
M18	16,28	18,104	,712	,890
M19	16,32	17,117	,787	,878
M20	16,29	16,650	,797	,876

Cronbach Alpha values found as a result of the reliability analysis of the factors of the scale used as data collection tool in the research are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Reliability Analysis Results Regarding Scale Factors

Factor Names	**General Cronbach's Alpha**	**Istanbul Cronbach's Alpha**	**Gaziantep Cronbach's Alpha**
Leadership	,966	,936	,971
Minnesota Satisfaction	,953	,906	,961

Cronbach alpha values of all dimensions are higher than the threshold value of 0.70, so it is understood to be highly reliable (George & Mallery, 2016; Kılıç, 2016).

Table 3: Skewness and Kurtosis Values

Descriptives			
		Statistic	Std. Error
Leadership scale	Mean	3.3899	.0449
	Skewness	-,310	,150
	Kurtosis	-,089	,300
Minnesota job Satisfaction Scale	Mean	3.3112	.0473
	Skewness	,118	,150
	Kurtosis	-,450	,300
Transformational mean	Mean	3.4081	.0472
	Skewness	-,215	,150
	Kurtosis	-,329	,300
Interactive mean	Mean	3.2705	.0480
	Skewness	-,210	,150
	Kurtosis	-,069	,300
Paternalistic mean	Mean	3.4974	.0532
	Skewness	-,355	,150
	Kurtosis	-,221	,300
Internal Saturation mean	Mean	3.3085	.0498

	Skewness	,114	,150
	Kurtosis	-,537	,300
External Satisfaction mean	Mean	3.3153	.0464
	Skewness	,086	,150
	Kurtosis	-,341	,300

Table 4: Skewness and Kurtosis Statistic

		Statistic
Leadership Dimension 1	**Mean**	3.468425
	Skewness	-,151
	Kurtosis	-,383
Leadership Dimension 2	**Mean**	3.243851
	Skewness	-,167
	Kurtosis	-,247
Leadership Dimension 3	**Mean**	3.606870
	Skewness	-,456
	Kurtosis	-,268
Leadership Dimension 4	**Mean**	3.261450
	Skewness	-,173
	Kurtosis	-,341
Minnesota Dimension 1	**Mean**	3.353053
	Skewness	,137
	Kurtosis	-,446
Minnesota Dimension 2	**Mean**	3.269720
	Skewness	,003
	Kurtosis	-,421
Overall Leadership Scale	**Mean**	3.371110
	Skewness	-,286
	Kurtosis	-,129
Overal Minnesota Scale	**Mean**	3.321803
	Skewness	,133
	Kurtosis	-,444

Normal distribution can be mentioned if the skewness and kurtosis values fall within ± 2 intervals (George & Mallery, 2016). Within the scope of the study, it was observed that the skewness and kurtosis statistics of Leadership Scale, Minnesota Scale and its sub-dimensions ranged from -2 to +2. Therefore, ANOVA, one of the variance analysis methods, was used.

Variance analysis was conducted to determine whether the scale and sub-dimensions were affected by personal characteristics of leaders. If we want to determine whether the population and averages differ from each other, based on observed data of three or more populations on a range or ratio scale, we can refer to analysis of variance. The method can also be used to compare two sample means. Variance analysis separates the total variability in the data into its components (Miran, 2018).

A given data in a population is equal to the average of that population (j) plus the deviation from that mean. This deviation can be positive, negative or zero. In other words, when we add this deviation to the mean, we get xij. Said deviation is called error and denoted by eij. This:

$x_{ij} = \mu_j + e_{ij}$

We can write as. If we restate the equation for eij:

eij = xij j happens.

Assuming that there are k finite populations, we can obtain the general average of observations in all populations by calculating the mean of k populations:

$$\mu = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{\mu_j}{k}$$

Difference between population mean and overall mean (j and):

$\tau_j = \mu_j - \mu$

It can be expressed as above. This term (j) is called the j-th population effect or the j-th treatment effect. Its meaning is the average effect of the jth treatment on a single observation. Now let's recover j:

$\mu_j = \mu + \tau_j$

As a result, our model becomes the following:

$x_{ij} = \mu + \tau_j + e_{ij}$

According to the model, a certain observation of the variable under investigation; The overall mean (μ) is equal to the sum of the treatment effect (τ_j) and the error (eij) representing the deviation of the observation from the mean with the population (treatment).

Following the ANOVA analysis, the null hypothesis is rejected and the need arises to find out which samples differ. For this purpose, Bonferoni test was used in paired comparisons.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the statistical results and comments of the findings obtained from the survey forms of 198 people who participated in the study from Gaziantep and 64 people from Istanbul are included.

5.1. ANOVA

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics on Sub-Dimension Scores of the Scale for Determining the Leadership Skills of Participants

	City								
	Gaziantep			İstanbul			Total		
	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Overall Leadership Scale	198	3.3891	.7957	64	3.3155	.5333	262	3.3711	.7400
Leadership Dimension 1	198	3.5124	.8609	64	3.3324	.6170	262	3.4684	.8107
Leadership Dimension 2	198	3.2727	.8675	64	3.1545	.7211	262	3.2439	.8343
Leadership Dimension 3	198	3.6010	.9995	64	3.6250	.7846	262	3.6069	.9501
Leadership Dimension 4	198	3.2045	.9247	64	3.4375	.6220	262	3.2615	.8654
Overall Minnesota Scale	198	3.3128	.8123	64	3.3496	.5706	262	3.3218	.7595
Minnesota Dimension 1	198	3.3616	.8214	64	3.3266	.6634	262	3.3531	.7847
Minnesota Dimension 2	198	3.2315	.8857	64	3.3880	.6072	262	3.2697	.8280

Table 5 shows the scale scores according to the provinces where the participants are located. While the Paternalistic value for Gaziantep is above average, the Interactionist and Extrinsic Satisfaction scale scores are below the average. While the Paternalistic value for Istanbul is above the average, the Transformational scale value is below the average.

Table 6: ANOVA by provinces

		City				
		Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p
Overall Leadership Scale	**Gaziantep**	198	3.3891	.7957	,477	,490
	İstanbul	64	3.3155	.5333		
Leadership Dimension 1	**Gaziantep**	198	3.5124	.8609	2,397	,123
	İstanbul	64	3.3324	.6170		
Leadership Dimension 2	**Gaziantep**	198	3.2727	.8675	,971	,325
	İstanbul	64	3.1545	.7211		
Leadership Dimension 3	**Gaziantep**	198	3.6010	.9995	,031	,861
	İstanbul	64	3.6250	.7846		
Leadership Dimension 4	**Gaziantep**	198	3.2045	.9247	3,539	,061
	İstanbul	64	3.4375	.6220		
Overall Minnesota Scale	**Gaziantep**	198	3.3128	.8123	,113	,737
	İstanbul	64	3.3496	.5706		
Minnesota Dimension 1	**Gaziantep**	198	3.3616	.8214	,096	,757
	İstanbul	64	3.3266	.6634		
Minnesota Dimension 2	**Gaziantep**	198	3.2315	.8857	1,734	,189
	İstanbul	64	3.3880	.6072		

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that all dimensions and sub-dimension levels of the participants by province do not differ significantly ($p > 0.05$). That is, the differences between the scale values are statistically insignificant according to the provinces.

Table 7: ANOVA by Gender

		Gender				
		Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p
Overall Leadership Scale	**Female**	110	3.3986	.6331	,261	,610
	Male	152	3.3512	.8101		
Leadership Dimension 1	**Female**	110	3.4917	.7146	,156	,693
	Male	152	3.4516	.8757		
Leadership Dimension 2	**Female**	110	3.2576	.7543	,051	,821
	Male	152	3.2339	.8901		
Leadership Dimension 3	**Female**	110	3.6061	.8896	,000	,991
	Male	152	3.6075	.9945		
Leadership Dimension 4	**Female**	110	3.3727	.7824	3,161	,077
	Male	152	3.1809	.9149		
Overall Minnesota Scale	**Female**	110	3.3199	.6766	,001	,972
	Male	152	3.3232	.8165		
Minnesota Dimension 1	**Female**	110	3.3473	.7117	,010	,919
	Male	152	3.3572	.8358		
Minnesota Dimension 2	**Female**	110	3.2742	.7561	,006	,940
	Male	152	3.2664	.8788		

When Table 7 is examined, it is seen that all dimension and sub-dimension levels of the participants according to gender do not differ statistically significantly (p> 0.05). In other words, the differences between scale values are statistically insignificant according to gender.

Table 8: According to the Educational Status of the Participants

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Decision
Overall Leadership Scale	**Between Groups**	7,556	4	1,889	3,586	,007	College<Univ-Posgrad College<HighSc College<PriEd
	Within Groups	135,361	257	,527			
	Total	142,917	261				
Leadership Dimension 1	**Between Groups**	9,808	4	2,452	3,896	,004	College<HighSc College<PriEd
	Within Groups	161,745	257	,629			
	Total	171,553	261				
Leadership Dimension 2	**Between Groups**	7,328	4	1,832	2,700	,031	College<HighSc College<PriEd
	Within Groups	174,364	257	,678			
	Total	181,692	261				
Leadership Dimension 3	**Between Groups**	10,373	4	2,593	2,959	,020	College<HighSc
	Within Groups	225,246	257	,876			
	Total	235,619	261				
Leadership Dimension 4	**Between Groups**	4,814	4	1,203	1,622	,169	
	Within Groups	190,652	257	,742			
	Total	195,466	261				
Overall Minnesota Scale	**Between Groups**	4,812	4	1,203	2,121	,079	
	Within Groups	145,763	257	,567			
	Total	150,575	261				
Minnesota Dimension 1	**Between Groups**	3,481	4	,870	1,423	,227	
	Within Groups	157,211	257	,612			
	Total	160,693	261				
Minnesota Dimension 2	**Between Groups**	7,847	4	1,962	2,947	,021	College<HighSc
	Within Groups	171,093	257	,666			
	Total	178,940	261				

When Table 8 is examined, there is a differentiation in total leadership scale according to the educational status of the participants (p <0.05). Primary education value ,high school value, and university value higher than college.

When Table 8 is examined, there is a differentiation in the Minnesota job satisfaction scale according to the educational status of the participants (p <0.05). Primary education value is higher than college, Open Education Undergraduate college and university value higher than college

When Table 8 is examined, there is a differentiation in the interactional mean(leadership scale 2) scale according to the educational status of the participants (p <0.05). Primary education value and high school value is higher than college.

When Table 8 is examined, there is a differentiation in the transformational (leadership scale 1) average scale according to the educational status of the participants (p <0.05). Primary education ,high school value is higher than college.

When Table 8 is examined, there is a differentiation in the paternalistic mean(leadership scale 3) scale according to the educational status of the participants (p <0.05). high school value higher than college.

When Table 8 is examined, it is seen that the mean levels of internal satisfaction(minnesota dimension 1) of the participants do not differ statistically significantly (p> 0.05)

When Table 8 is examined, there is a differentiation in the average external satisfaction(minnesota scale 2) scale according to the educational status of the participants (p <0.05). High school is higher than college.

Table 9: ANOVA by working time at the current workplace

		Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p	
Leadership Dimension 1	**Less than 1 year**	30	3.5879	0.8169	1,948	,103	
	1-5 year	90	3.3071	0.8377			
	6-10 year	91	3.5694	0.6894			
	11-20 year	38	3.5957	0.9349			
	More than 20	13	3.2308	0.8935			
Leadership Dimension 2	**Less than 1 year**	30	3.237	0.9054	2,331	,056	
	1-5 year	90	3.0481	0.8883			
	6-10 year	91	3.3968	0.7505			
	11-20 year	38	3.2632	0.7846			
	More than 20	13	3.4872	0.8096			
Leadership Dimension 1	**Less than 1 year**	30	3.5889	0.9969	,132	,971	
	1-5 year	90	3.5815	1.0332			
	6-10 year	91	3.6557	0.8217			
	11-20 year	38	3.5439	1.0524			
	More than 20	13	3.6667	0.8924			
Leadership Dimension 4	**Less than 1 year**	30	3.2167	0.9067	,372	,829	
	1-5 year	90	3.2861	0.9123			
	6-10 year	91	3.2335	0.7939			
	11-20 year	38	3.2171	0.9138			
	More than 20	13	3.5192	0.8567			
Minnesota Dimension 1	**Less than 1 year**	30	3.19	0.8564	2,635	,035	1-5<6-10 1-5<11-20
	1-5 year	90	3.1822	0.8201			
	6-10 year	91	3.5011	0.7116			
	11-20 year	38	3.4789	0.7627			

	More than 20	13	3.5077	0.7158			
Minnesota Dimension 2	**Less than 1 year**	30	3.2222	0.8525	,671	,613	
	1-5 year	90	3.1741	0.9398			
	6-10 year	91	3.3626	0.7078			
	11-20 year	38	3.2719	0.8431			
	More than 20	13	3.3846	0.7084			
Overall Leadership Dimension	**Less than 1 year**	30	3.4064	0.7582	1,189	,316	
	1-5 year	90	3.2368	0.7889			
	6-10 year	91	3.4662	0.6454			
	11-20 year	38	3.418	0.7803			
	More than 20	13	3.4172	0.8288			
Overall Minnesota Dimension	**Less than 1 year**	30	3.2021	0.8214	1,858	,118	
	1-5 year	90	3.1792	0.8177			
	6-10 year	91	3.4492	0.6722			
	11-20 year	38	3.4013	0.7512			
	More than 20	13	3.4615	0.6911			

When Table 9 is examined it is seen that most of the dimensions and sub-dimension levels of the participants do not differ significantly($p>0.05$) according to their working time in their current workplace.However for Minnesota Scale 1 there is statistically significant differentiation with working time at the current place.According to these workers who worksbetween 11-20 year and 6-10 year value is higher than 1-5 year.

Table 10: Working time in the current workplace

	Working time in the current workplace				
	Less than 1 year	**1-5 year**	**6-10 year**	**11-20 year**	**More than 20 years**
	Mean	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Leadership Dimension 1	3.5879_{a}	3.3071_{a}	3.5694_{a}	3.5957_{a}	3.2308_{a}
Leadership Dimension 2	$3.2370_{a,b}$	3.0481_{a}	3.3968_{b}	$3.2632_{a,b}$	$3.4872_{a,b}$
Leadership Dimension 3	3.5889_{a}	3.5815_{a}	3.6557_{a}	3.5439_{a}	3.6667_{a}
Leadership Dimension 4	3.2167_{a}	3.2861_{a}	3.2335_{a}	3.2171_{a}	3.5192_{a}
Minnesota Dimension 1	3.1900_{a}	3.1822_{a}	3.5011_{a}	3.4789_{a}	3.5077_{a}
Minnesota Dimension 2	3.2222_{a}	3.1741_{a}	3.3626_{a}	3.2719_{a}	3.3846_{a}
Overall Leadership Scale	3.4064_{a}	3.2368_{a}	3.4662_{a}	3.4180_{a}	3.4172_{a}
Overall Minnesota Dimension	3.2021_{a}	3.1792_{a}	3.4492_{a}	3.4013_{a}	3.4615_{a}
Note: Values in the same row and subtable not sharing the same subscript are significantly different at p< ,05 in the two-sided test of equality for column means. Cells with no subscript are not included in the test. Tests assume equal variances.[1]					
1. Tests are adjusted for all pairwise comparisons within a row of each innermost subtable using the Bonferroni correction.					

Table 11: ANOVA by working time in the sector

		Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	p
Leadership Scale 1	**Less than 1 year**	18	3.798	0.848	2.4099	0.0497
	1-5 year	64	3.289	0.8516		
	6-10 year	79	3.608	0.6999		
	11-20 year	75	3.446	0.8178		

	More than 20 years	25	3.309	0.9064		
Leadership Scale 2	**Less than 1 year**	18	3.481	0.9335	1.8097	0.1273
	1-5 year	64	3.038	0.8713		
	6-10 year	79	3.369	0.7814		
	11-20 year	75	3.238	0.7799		
	More than 20 years	25	3.248	0.9309		
Leadership Scale 3	**Less than 1 year**	18	3.740	1.082	0.2766	0.8929
	1-5 year	64	3.557	0.9868		
	6-10 year	79	3.658	0.9563		
	11-20 year	75	3.6	0.8716		
	More than 20 years	25	3.493	1.0369		
Leadership Scale 4	**Less than 1 year**	18	3.222	0.9621	0.8773	0.4780
	1-5 year	64	3.390	0.9353		
	6-10 year	79	3.291	0.7971		
	11-20 year	75	3.22	0.7711		
	More than 20 years	25	3.03	1.0688		
Minnesota Scale 1	**Less than 1 year**	18	3.205	0.9932	2.2247	0.0667
	1-5 year	64	3.126	0.8068		
	6-10 year	79	3.440	0.7341		
	11-20 year	75	3.438	0.7284		
	More than 20 years	25	3.504	0.8223		
Minnesota Scale 2	**Less than 1 year**	18	3.231	0.9838	0.7499	0.5588
	1-5 year	64	3.158	0.8751		
	6-10 year	79	3.356	0.8459		
	11-20 year	75	3.233	0.7423		
	More than 20 years	25	3.42	0.8052		
Overall Leadership Scale	**Less than 1 year**	18	3.589	0.7856	1.4391	0.2214
	1-5 year	64	3.241	0.7872		
	6-10 year	79	3.478	0.6716		
	11-20 year	75	3.3564	0.7214		
	More than 20 years	25	3.2677	0.8263		
Overall Minnesota Scale	**Less than 1 year**	18	3.2153	0.9535	1.586	0.179
	1-5 year	64	3.1387	0.7707		
	6-10 year	79	3.409	0.7472		
	11-20 year	75	3.3617	0.6919		
	More than 20 years	25	3.4725	0.7931		

When Table 11 is examined, it is seen that most of the dimensions and sub-dimension levels do not differ significantly($p > 0.05$ according to duration of the participants' working in the sector. But, There is a differentation between leadership scale 1,and working time in the sector. The differences between them is statistically significant.For other scales, there is no signifant differentation.

Table 12: ANOVA by gender of manager

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Overall Leadership Scale	Between Groups	,482	1	,482	,880	,349
	Within Groups	142,435	260	,548		
	Total	142,917	261			
Leadership Scale 1	Between Groups	,615	1	,615	,936	,334
	Within Groups	170,937	260	,657		
	Total	171,553	261			

Leadership Scale 2	Between Groups	,732	1	,732	1,051	,306
	Within Groups	180,961	260	,696		
	Total	181,692	261			
Leadership Scale 3	Between Groups	,115	1	,115	,127	,722
	Within Groups	235,504	260	,906		
	Total	235,619	261			
Leadership Scale 4	Between Groups	,205	1	,205	,273	,602
	Within Groups	195,261	260	,751		
	Total	195,466	261			
Overall Minnesota Scale	Between Groups	,577	1	,577	1,001	,318
	Within Groups	149,998	260	,577		
	Total	150,575	261			
Minnesota Scale 1	Between Groups	,332	1	,332	,539	,464
	Within Groups	160,360	260	,617		
	Total	160,693	261			
Minnesota Scale 2	Between Groups	1,135	1	1,135	1,660	,199
	Within Groups	177,805	260	,684		
	Total	178,940	261			

When Table 12 is examined, it is seen that all dimensions and sub-dimension levels of the participants do not differ significantly (p> 0.05) according to the gender of the managers. In other words, the differences between scale values are statistically insignificant according to the gender of the manager.

Table 13: ANOVA by education of manager

		Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	F	Sig.	
Leadership Scale 1	Primary education	10	3.7909	0.5439	9.0552	0.0000	College<OpenEd College< HighSc College<Univ-Posgrad College<PriEd
	High school	86	3.4767	0.8217			
	Open Education Undergraduate	6	3.4697	1.1747			
	College	16	2.3807	0.6318			
	University-Postgraduate	143	3.5633	0.738			
Leadership Scale 2	Primary education	10	3.7889	0.6207	6.9536	0.0000	College <OPenEd College < HighSc College<Univ-Posgrad College <PriEd
	High school	86	3.2054	0.8705			
	Open Education Undergraduate	6	3.1481	0.9805			
	College	16	2.3264	0.6831			
	University-Postgraduate	143	3.3349	0.77			
Leadership Scale 3	Primary education	10	3.8	0.9963	6.7562	0.0000	College <OpenEd College < HighSc College<Univ-Posgrad College <PriEd OpenEd<Univ-Posgra
	High school	86	3.7171	0.9895			
	Open Education Undergraduate	6	3	1.2111			

	College	16	2.5417	0.8596			OpenEd < PriEd HighSc<Univ-Posgrad HighSc < PriEd
	University-Postgraduate	143	3.676	0.8484			
Leadership Scale 4	Primary education	10	3.7	0.7051	4.3069	0.0022	College < HighSc College<Univ-Posgrad College < HighSc OpenEd<Univ-Posgrad OpenEd < HighSc OpenEd < PriEd
	High school	86	3.3081	0.9015			
	Open Education Undergraduate	6	2.9167	1.2007			
	College	16	2.5	0.639			
	University-Postgraduate	143	3.3007	0.8231			
Minnesota Scale 1	Primary education	10	3.86	0.5854	4.4097	0.0018	College<Univ-Posgrad College < HighSc OpenEd < HighSc OpenEd < PriEd
	High school	86	3.2837	0.7277			
	Open Education Undergraduate	6	3.25	1.1675			
	College	16	2.725	0.5859			
	University-Postgraduate	143	3.4364	0.7968			
Minnesota Scale 2	Primary education	10	3.7833	0.9752	5.0796	0.0006	College<Univ-Posgrad College < HighSc College <PriEd
	High school	86	3.1512	0.7668			
	Open Education Undergraduate	6	2.9722	1.3434			
	College	16	2.625	0.604			
	University-Postgraduate	143	3.3916	0.8079			
Overall Leadership Scale	Primary education	10	3.7731	0.501	9.0306	0.0000	College<OpenEd College< HighSc College<Univ-Posgrad College<PriEd
	High school	86	3.3797	0.7984			
	Open Education Undergraduate	6	3.2244	1.0267			
	College	16	2.4038	0.5987			
	University-Postgraduate	143	3.4527	0.64			
Overall Minnesota Scale	Primary education	10	3.8313	0.6885	5.1707	0.0005	College <OPenEd College < HighSc College<Univ-Posgrad College <PriEd
	High school	86	3.234	0.697			
	Open Education Undergraduate	6	3.1458	1.2226			
	College	16	2.6875	0.5673			
	University-Postgraduate	143	3.4196	0.7569			

When Table 13 is examined, there is a differentiation in totalleadership scale according to the educational status of the managers of the participants (p <0.05). Primary education value,high school value, Open Education Undergraduate value, and university-postgraduate value higher than college.

When Table 13 is examined, there is a differentiation in the totalMinnesota job satisfaction scale according to the educational status of the managers of the participants (p <0.05). Primary education value is higher than college. Open Education Undergraduate

college and university-postgraduate and highschool value are also higher than college graduate value.

When Table 13 is examined, there is a differentiation in the Leadership scale 2 according to the educational status of the managers of the participants ($p < 0.05$). Primary education ,university-postgraduate, high school value is also higher than college.

When Table 13 is examined, there is a differentiation in the leadership scale 1 value according to the educational status of the managers of the participants ($p < 0.05$). Primary education, high school and university-postgraduate and open education undergraduate value higher than college.

When Table 13 is examined, there is a differentiation in the leadership scale 3 according to the educational status of the managers of the participants ($p < 0.05$). Primary education value, high school ,university-postgraduate and open education undergraduate value higher than college. In addition, university post graduate and preeducation value is higher than Open Education Undergraduate ang high school value.

When Table 13 is examined, there is a differentiation in the leadership scale 4 according to the educational status of the managers of the participants ($p < 0.05$). Primary education value, high school ,university-postgraduate value is higher than open education undergraduate value. In addition, university post graduate and high school value is higher than colleg

When Table 13 is examined, there is a statistically significant difference in the mean levels of internal satisfaction according to the educational status of the managers of the participants ($p < 0.05$). preschool value and, highschool value is higher than open education undergraduate value.And also, highschool and university value is higher than college.

When Table 13 is examined, there is a differentiation in the average external satisfaction(minnesota scale 2) scale according to the educational status of the managers of the participants ($p < 0.05$). University higher than college, high school college and primary school higher school.

5.2. CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

Table 14: Investigation of the Relationship Between Participants' Leadership Skills Scale Sub-Dimension Scores

Correlations			
		Overall Leadership Scale	Overall Minnesota Scale
Overall Leadership Scale	Pearson Correlation	1	,755**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	262	262
Overall Minnesota Scale	Pearson Correlation	,755**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	
	N	262	262
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Correlations						
		Overall Leadership Scale	Leadership scale 1	Leadership scale 2	Leadership scale 3	Leadership scale 4
Overall Leadership Scale	Pearson Correlation	1	,917**	,933**	,791**	,720**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	262	262	262	262	262
Leadership Scale 1	Pearson Correlation	,917**	1	,769**	,689**	,509**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000	,000
	N	262	262	262	262	262
Leadership Scale 2	Pearson Correlation	,933**	,769**	1	,678**	,637**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000	,000
	N	262	262	262	262	262
Leadership Scale 3	Pearson Correlation	,791**	,689**	,678**	1	,504**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000		,000
	N	262	262	262	262	262
Leadership Scale 4	Pearson Correlation	,720**	,509**	,637**	,504**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	
	N	262	262	262	262	262
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).						

Correlations				
		Minnesota Scale 1	Minnesota Scale 2	Total
Minnesota Scale 1	Pearson Correlation	1	,788**	,968**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000
	N	262	262	262
Minnesota Scale 2	Pearson Correlation	,788**	1	,918**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000

	N	262	262	262
Overall Minnesota Scale	Pearson Correlation	,968**	,918**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	
	N	262	262	262
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Correlations									
		Leadership Scale 1	Leadership Scale 2	Leadership Scale3	Leadership Scale 4	Minnesota scale 1	Minnesota scale 2	Overall Leadership Scale	Overall Minnesota scale
Leadership Scale 1	Pearson Correlation	1	,769**	,689**	,509**	,727**	,679**	,917**	,747**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	262	262	262	262	262	262	262	262
Leadership Scale 2	Pearson Correlation	,769**	1	,678**	,637**	,675**	,629**	,933**	,693**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	262	262	262	262	262	262	262	262
Leadership Scale 3	Pearson Correlation	,689**	,678**	1	,504**	,556**	,606**	,791**	,607**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	262	262	262	262	262	262	262	262
Leadership Scale 4	Pearson Correlation	,509**	,637**	,504**	1	,387**	,443**	,720**	,431**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	262	262	262	262	262	262	262	262
Minnesota scale 1	Pearson Correlation	,727**	,675**	,556**	,387**	1	,788**	,725**	,968**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000
	N	262	262	262	262	262	262	262	262
Minnesota scale 2	Pearson Correlation	,679**	,629**	,606**	,443**	,788**	1	,703**	,918**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000
	N	262	262	262	262	262	262	262	262
Overall Leadership Scale	Pearson Correlation	,917**	,933**	,791**	,720**	,725**	,703**	1	,755**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000
	N	262	262	262	262	262	262	262	262
Overall Minnesota scale	Pearson Correlation	,747**	,693**	,607**	,431**	,968**	,918**	,755**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	
	N	262	262	262	262	262	262	262	262
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).									

There is a statistically significant high level and very strong correlation in the same direction between all scales and subscales.

Table 15: Correlation Between Scales, Subscales, and Dependent / Independent Variables

		LeadFac1Mean	LeadFac2Mean	LeadFac3Mean	LeadFac4Mean	MinFac1Mean	MinFac2Mean	Overall Leadership	OverallMinnesota	Female	Istanbul	High School	College	OpenEd	University-Postrgrad	Man_highschl	Man_Openend	Man_College	ManUniv_Postgrad	Man_female	Age	Man_age	Workingtimein sector	Working time current workplace
LeadFac 1Mean	**Pearson Correlation**	1	,957**	,885**	,870**	,943**	,807**	1,00**	,891**	-,033	-,007	,113	-,197	-,140	,149	,054	-,016	-,248	,060	,061	,134	,075	,110	,318*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,003	,833	,965	,464	,200	,363	,335	,726	,919	,104	,697	,693	,386	,627	,476	,035
	N	44	12	29	25	9	18	11	8	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44
LeadFac 2Mean	**Pearson Correlation**	,957**	1	,864**	1,000**	,799**	,799**	1,000**	,662*	,057	,127	-,140	-,065	-,140	,165	,143	-,203	.c	-,070	.c	,359*	-,181	,280	,340*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000	,001	,000	,000	,037	,710	,407	,358	,669	,358	,279	,350	,181	,000	,648	,000	,015	,239	,063	,022
	N	12	45	38	43	13	15	10	10	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	44	45	45
LeadFac 3Mean	**Pearson Correlation**	,885**	,864**	1	,572**	,737**	,741**	1,000**	,770**	-,011	,027	,109	-,028	-,206*	,094	,140	-,045	-,275**	-,010	,067	,030	,080	-,020	,083
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,899	,746	,184	,731	,011	,253	,088	,585	,001	,900	,414	,716	,328	,804	,313
	N	29	38	150	97	26	51	10	20	150	150	150	150	150	150	149	149	149	149	150	150	150	150	150
LeadFac 4Mean	**Pearson Correlation**	,870**	1,000**	,572**	1	,607**	,643**	1,000**	,544*	,105	,186*	-,002	-,041	-,187*	,145	,043	-,112	-,154	,016	,094	-,001	-,117	-,115	,041
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000		,001	,000	,000	,011	,221	,028	,981	,628	,027	,089	,615	,188	,070	,853	,273	,987	,171	,177	,633
	N	25	43	97	139	28	44	10	21	139	139	139	139	139	139	139	139	139	139	139	139	138	139	139
MinFac1 Mean	**Pearson Correlation**	,943**	,799**	,737**	,607**	1	1,0**	,870	1,000**	-,302	,065	,182	-,309*	-,110	,129	-,052	,273	.c	-,063	,090	,153	-,011	,113	,213
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,001	,000	,001		,000	,130	,000	,055	,688	,254	,049	,492	,421	,749	,088	,000	,700	,577	,341	,948	,482	,182
	N	9	13	26	28	41	21	4	21	41	41	41	41	41	41	40	40	40	40	41	41	40	41	41
MinFac2 Mean	**Pearson Correlation**	,807**	,799**	,741**	,643**	1,000**	1	,895*	1,000**	,027	,211	,222	-,114	-,352**	,230*	-,216	,031	-,280*	,353**	,086	-,097	,009	-,012	,125
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,040	,000	,813	,065	,052	,325	,002	,044	,060	,791	,014	,002	,455	,404	,937	,919	,281
	N	18	15	51	44	21	77	5	21	77	77	77	77	77	77	76	76	76	76	77	77	77	77	77
Overall Leadership	**Pearson Correlation**	1,000**	1,000**	1,000**	1,000**	,870	,895*	1	,818	,042	-,019	-,133	-,272	-,272	,245	,245	-,527	.c	,042	.c	,618*	,037	,535	,665*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,130	,040		,182	,891	,950	,664	,368	,368	,419	,419	,064	,000	,891	,000	,024	,905	,060	,013
	N	11	10	10	10	4	5	13	4	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
Overal	**Pearson**	,891**	,662*	,770*	,544*	1,000	1,000	,818	1	-	,023	,142	-,314	-,356	,297	-,005	,277	-,315	-,020	,094	,175	,120	,229	,358

Minnesota	**Correlation**			*		**	**			,434*															
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,003	,037	,000	,011	,000	,000	,182		,017	,905	,455	,092	,054	,111	,978	,146	,096	,916	,621	,354	,527	,223	,052	
	N	8	10	20	21	21	21	4	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	29	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	30	
Female	**Pearson Correlation**	-,033	,057	-,011	,105	-,302	,027	,042	-,434*	1	,128*	-,087	-,078	-,026	,133*	-,098	-,078	-,054	,145*	,184**	-,214**	-,108	-,246**	-,219**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,833	,710	,899	,221	,055	,813	,891	,017		,038	,161	,207	,677	,032	,115	,209	,381	,019	,003	,000	,080	,000	,000	
	N	44	45	150	139	41	77	13	30	262	262	262	262	262	262	261	261	261	261	262	262	261	261	262	
Istanbul	**Pearson Correlation**	-,007	,127	,027	,186*	,065	,211	-,019	,023	,128*	1	-,083	-,116	-,220**	,336**	-,153*	-,087	,003	,214**	,211**	-,080	-,111	-,107	-,017	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,965	,407	,746	,028	,688	,065	,950	,905	,038		,181	,062	,000	,000	,013	,159	,964	,001	,001	,198	,072	,084	,780	
	N	44	45	150	139	41	77	13	30	262	262	262	262	262	262	261	261	261	261	262	262	261	261	262	
Lise	**Pearson Correlation**	,113	-,140	,109	-,002	,182	,222	-,133	,142	-,087	-,083	1	-,145*	-,177**	-,455**	,011	,082	-,015	-,018	-,020	-,087	,046	-,056	-,069	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,464	,358	,184	,981	,254	,052	,664	,455	,161	,181		,019	,004	,000	,859	,189	,810	,774	,741	,162	,463	,365	,263	
	N	44	45	150	139	41	77	13	30	262	262	262	262	262	262	261	261	261	261	262	262	261	261	262	
College	**Pearson Correlation**	-,197	-,065	-,028	-,041	-,309*	-,114	-,272	-,314	-,078	-,116	-,145**	1	-,152*	-,390**	,141*	-,054	,011	-,120	,006	,045	,062	,070	-,030	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,200	,669	,731	,628	,049	,325	,368	,092	,207	,062	,019		,014	,000	,022	,383	,856	,053	,925	,472	,317	,261	,633	
	N	44	45	150	139	41	77	13	30	262	262	262	262	262	262	261	261	261	261	262	262	261	261	262	
OpenEd	**Pearson Correlation**	-,140	-,140	-,206*	-,187*	-,110	-,352**	-,272	-,356	-,026	-,220**	-,177**	-,152*	1	-,476**	,019	,006	,069	-,062	-,113	,096	,067	,049	-,006	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,363	,358	,011	,027	,492	,002	,368	,054	,677	,000	,004	,014		,000	,765	,927	,269	,316	,067	,120	,280	,429	,928	
	N	44	45	150	139	41	77	13	30	262	262	262	262	262	262	261	261	261	261	262	262	261	261	262	
Uni_Postgrad	**Pearson Correlation**	,149	,165	,094	,145	,129	,230*	,245	,297	,133*	,336**	-,455**	-,390**	-,476**	1	-,106	-,016	-,059	,172**	,114	-,090	-,162**	-,069	,055	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,335	,279	,253	,089	,421	,044	,419	,111	,032	,000	,000	,000	,000		,088	,798	,345	,005	,066	,146	,009	,269	,378	
	N	44	45	150	139	41	77	13	30	262	262	262	262	262	262	261	261	261	261	262	262	261	261	262	
Man_highschool	**Pearson Correlation**	,054	,143	,140	,043	-,052	-,216	,245	-,005	-,098	-,153*	,011	,141*	,019	-,106	1	-,108	-,179**	-,772**	-,152*	,110	,244**	,123*	,088	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,726	,350	,088	,615	,749	,060	,419	,978	,115	,013	,859	,022	,765	,088		,083	,004	,000	,014	,076	,000	,047	,156	
	N	44	45	149	139	40	76	13	29	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	260	260	261	
Man_Openend	**Pearson Correlation**	-,016	-,203	-,045	-,112	,273	,031	-,527	,277	-,078	-,087	,082	-,054	,006	-,016	-,108	1	-,039	-,169**	-,040	-,014	,000	-,061	-,001	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,919	,181	,585	,188	,088	,791	,064	,146	,209	,159	,189	,383	,927	,798	,083		,528	,006	,515	,825	,998	,325	,985	
	N	44	45	149	139	40	76	13	29	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	260	260	261	
Man_Col	**Pearson**	-,248	.c	-	-,154	.c	-	.c	-,315	-,054	,003	-,015	,011	,069	-,059	-	-,039	1	-	-,003	,103	,052	,035	,082	

lege	**Correlation**			,275**			,280*										,179*			,281**					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,104	,000	,001	,070	,000	,014	,000	,096	,381	,964	,810	,856	,269	,345	,004	,528		,000	,965	,097	,404	,571	,189
	N	44	45	149	139	40	76	13	29	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	260	260	261
Man_UniPostgrad	**Pearson Correlation**	,060	-,070	-,010	,016	-,063	,353**	,042	-,020	,145*	,214**	-,018	-,120	-,062	,172*	-,772**	-,169**	-,281**	1	,177**	-,143*	-,295**	-,136*	-,116
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,697	,648	,900	,853	,700	,002	,891	,916	,019	,001	,774	,053	,316	,005	,000	,006	,000		,004	,021	,000	,028	,060
	N	44	45	149	139	40	76	13	29	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	261	260	260	261
Man_female	**Pearson Correlation**	,061	.c	,067	,094	,090	,086	.c	,094	,184**	,211**	-,020	,006	-,113	,114	-,152*	-,040	-,003	,177**	1	-,111	-,337**	-,123*	-,082
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,693	,000	,414	,273	,577	,455	,000	,621	,003	,001	,741	,925	,067	,066	,014	,515	,965	,004		,073	,000	,047	,183
	N	44	45	150	139	41	77	13	30	262	262	262	262	262	262	261	261	261	261	262	262	261	261	262
Age	**Pearson Correlation**	,134	,359*	,030	-,001	,153	-,097	,618*	,175	-,214**	-,080	-,087	,045	,096	-,090	,110	-,014	,103	-,143*	-,111	1	,339**	,813**	,667**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,386	,015	,716	,987	,341	,404	,024	,354	,000	,198	,162	,472	,120	,146	,076	,825	,097	,021	,073		,000	,000	,000
	N	44	45	150	139	41	77	13	30	262	262	262	262	262	262	261	261	261	261	262	262	261	261	262
Man_age	**Pearson Correlation**	,075	-,181	,080	-,117	-,011	,009	,037	,120	-,108	-,111	,046	,062	,067	-,162**	,244**	,000	,052	-,295**	-,337**	,339**	1	,342**	,273**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,627	,239	,328	,171	,948	,937	,905	,527	,080	,072	,463	,317	,280	,009	,000	,998	,404	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000
	N	44	44	150	138	40	77	13	30	261	261	261	261	261	261	260	260	260	260	261	261	261	260	261
Working timeinsector	**Pearson Correlation**	,110	,280	-,020	-,115	,113	-,012	,535	,229	-,246**	-,107	-,056	,070	,049	-,069	,123*	-,061	,035	-,136*	-,123*	,813**	,342**	1	,764**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,476	,063	,804	,177	,482	,919	,060	,223	,000	,084	,365	,261	,429	,269	,047	,325	,571	,028	,047	,000	,000		,000
	N	44	45	150	139	41	77	13	30	261	261	261	261	261	261	260	260	260	260	261	261	260	261	261
workingtimeincurrentplace	**Pearson Correlation**	,318*	,340*	,083	,041	,213	,125	,665*	,358	-,219**	-,017	-,069	-,030	-,006	,055	,088	-,001	,082	-,116	-,082	,667**	,273**	,764**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,035	,022	,313	,633	,182	,281	,013	,052	,000	,780	,263	,633	,928	,378	,156	,985	,189	,060	,183	,000	,000	,000	
	N	44	45	150	139	41	77	13	30	262	262	262	262	262	262	261	261	261	261	262	262	261	261	262

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
c. Cannot be computed because at least one of the variables is constant.

5.3. LIKERT ANALYZES

Table 16: Frequency Analysis of Leadership Likert Questions

	Completely wrong		Largely wrong		I am indecisive		Largely correct		Completely correct	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Proud of him/her'	6	2,3	23	8,8	89	34,0	105	40,1	39	14,9
has my respect	4	1,5	25	9,5	70	26,7	104	39,7	59	22,5
displays power and confidence	4	1,5	22	8,4	76	29,0	107	40,8	53	20,2
emphasizes the collective mission	2	0,8	40	15,3	90	34,4	93	35,5	37	14,1
talks optimistically	5	1,9	48	18,3	66	25,2	105	40,1	38	14,5
talks enthusiastically	5	1,9	54	20,6	69	26,3	101	38,5	33	12,6
arouses awareness about important issues	5	1,9	43	16,4	75	28,6	107	40,8	32	12,2
re-examines assumptions	6	2,3	42	16,0	97	37,0	92	35,1	25	9,5
seeks different views	9	3,4	38	14,5	93	35,5	87	33,2	35	13,4
suggests new ways	11	4,2	50	19,1	73	27,9	86	32,8	42	16,0
suggests different angles	10	3,8	55	21,0	80	30,5	83	31,7	34	13,0
individualizes attention	13	5,0	55	21,0	91	34,7	72	27,5	31	11,8
focuses your strengths	14	5,3	41	15,6	97	37,0	76	29,0	34	13,0
teaches and coaches	13	5,0	52	19,8	82	31,3	83	31,7	32	12,2
differentiates among us	22	8,4	54	20,6	101	38,5	66	25,2	19	7,3
clarifies rewards	13	5,0	47	17,9	103	39,3	79	30,2	20	7,6
assists based on effort	9	3,4	42	16,0	91	34,7	95	36,3	25	9,5
rewards your achievement	7	2,7	54	20,6	90	34,4	84	32,1	27	10,3

Recognize your achievement	10	3,8	42	16,0	87	33,2	92	35,1	31	11,8
focuses on your mistakes	14	5,3	52	19,8	84	32,1	89	34,0	23	8,8
puts out fires	8	3,1	37	14,1	85	32,4	97	37,0	35	13,4
tracks your mistakes	9	3,4	50	19,1	87	33,2	93	35,5	23	8,8
concentrates on failures	15	5,7	60	22,9	86	32,8	78	29,8	23	8,8
take care of individual lives	14	5,3	38	14,5	93	35,5	89	34,0	28	10,7
behave paternalistic	7	2,7	40	15,3	75	28,6	90	34,4	50	19,1
ttend special days of him/her	12	4,6	39	14,9	64	24,4	91	34,7	56	21,4
hope loyalty	9	3,4	22	8,4	58	22,1%	105	40,1%	68	26,0%

Table 17: Minnesota Likert

	Not Satisfied		**Somewhat Satisfied**		**Satisfied**		**Very Satisfied**		**Extremely Satisfied**	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Being able to keep busy all the time	9	3,4	34	13,0	112	42,7	77	29,4	30	11,5
The chance to work alone on the job	12	4,6	40	15,3	113	43,1	66	25,2	31	11,8
The chance to do different things from time to	13	5,0	41	15,6	96	36,6	84	32,1	28	10,7
The chance to be "somebody" in the community	4	1,5	46	17,6	88	33,6	86	32,8	38	14,5
The way my boss handles his/her workers	3	1,1	38	14,5	86	32,8	107	40,8	28	10,7
The competence of my supervisor in making	3	1,1	29	11,1	99	37,8	100	38,2	31	11,8
The way my job provides for steady employment	3	1,	41	15,6	81	30,9	100	38,2	37	14,1
The chance to do things for other people	10	3,8	29	11	109	41,6	78	29,8	36	13,7
The chance to tell people what to do	13	5,0%	53	20,2	98	37,4	70	26,7	28	10,7
The chance to do something that makes use of	10	3,	54	20,6	84	32,1	80	30,5	34	13,0
My pay and the amount of work I do	17	6,5	59	22,5	98	37,4	63	24,0	25	9,5
The chances for advancement on this job	10	3,8	57	21,8	102	38,9	62	23,7	31	11,8
The working conditions	6	2,3	35	13,4	105	40,1	80	30,5	36	13,7
The way my co-workers get along with each	6	2,3	36	13,7	116	44,3	72	27,5	32	12,2
The praise I get for doing a good job	12	4,6	40	15,3	98	37,4	83	31,7	29	11,1
The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	13	5,0	42	16,0	89	34,0	81	30,9	37	14,1

5.4. REGRESSION ANALYSIS

5.4.1. Leadership

In Leadership Scale:

- Istanbul is behind Gaziantep
- A high school graduate manager is behind a primary school graduate
- Open Education Undergraduate manager is lower than a primary school graduate
- College graduate administrator is behind primary education graduate
- University-Postgraduate degree manager is lower than primary school graduate

Model 2: Heteroskedasticity-corrected, using observations 1-262 (n = 261)
Missing or incomplete observations dropped: 1
Dependent variable: TotalLeadership

	Coefficient	*Std. Error*	*t-ratio*	*p-value*	
const	3.78743	0.278244	13.61	<0.0001	***
Istanbul	−0.177658	0.0836298	−2.124	0.0346	**
Female	−0.0379947	0.0763136	−0.4979	0.6190	
High School	0.184634	0.307757	0.5999	0.5491	
Open Education Undergraduate	−0.0673762	0.303438	−0.2220	0.8245	
College	−0.307295	0.302201	−1.017	0.3102	
University-Postgraduate	0.151517	0.282401	0.5365	0.5921	
Managerfemale	0.151493	0.109288	1.386	0.1669	
Managerhighshool	−0.410499	0.187529	−2.189	0.0295	**
Managerundrgrad	−0.605523	0.318168	−1.903	0.0582	*
Managercollege	−1.38943	0.256216	−5.423	<0.0001	***
ManagerUniversty	−0.346134	0.182352	−1.898	0.0588	*

Statistics based on the weighted data:

Sum squared resid	919.8993	S.E. of regression	1.922076
R-squared	0.176855	Adjusted R-squared	0.140491
F(11, 249)	4.863479	P-value(F)	8.29e-07
Log-likelihood	−534.7395	Akaike criterion	1093.479
Schwarz criterion	1136.253	Hannan-Quinn	1110.673

Statistics based on the original data:

Mean dependent var	3.371353	S.D. dependent var	0.741393
Sum squared resid	117.5487	S.E. of regression	0.687083

Factor 1

In Leadership 1st Sub-dimension:

- Istanbul is behind Gaziantep
- A high school graduate manager is behind a primary school graduate
- College graduate administrator is behind primary education graduate
- University-Postgraduate degree manager is lower than primary school graduate

Model 4: Heteroskedasticity-corrected, using observations 1-262 (n = 261)
Missing or incomplete observations dropped: 1
Dependent variable: LeadFact1Mean

	Coefficient	*Std. Error*	*t-ratio*	*p-value*	
const	3.78365	0.336050	11.26	<0.0001	***
Istanbul	−0.338304	0.0953625	−3.548	0.0005	***
Female	−0.0504373	0.0892445	−0.5652	0.5725	
Highschool	0.242869	0.363291	0.6685	0.5044	
Open Education Undergraduate	0.105259	0.355949	0.2957	0.7677	
College	−0.263295	0.349754	−0.7528	0.4523	
University-Postgraduate	0.362082	0.340092	1.065	0.2881	
Managerfemale	0.0280741	0.153446	0.1830	0.8550	
Managerhighshool	−0.432407	0.185872	−2.326	0.0208	**
Managerundrgrad	−0.615725	0.648179	−0.9499	0.3431	
Managercollege	−1.59539	0.243729	−6.546	<0.0001	***
ManagerUniversty	−0.315094	0.182209	−1.729	0.0850	*

Statistics based on the weighted data:

Sum squared resid	774.7950	S.E. of regression	1.763980
R-squared	0.255906	Adjusted R-squared	0.223034
F(11, 249)	7.785012	P-value(F)	1.42e-11
Log-likelihood	−512.3371	Akaike criterion	1048.674
Schwarz criterion	1091.449	Hannan-Quinn	1065.868

Statistics based on the original data:

Mean dependent var	3.468826	S.D. dependent var	0.812266
Sum squared resid	138.4979	S.E. of regression	0.745799

Factor 2

In Leadership 2nd Sub-dimension:

- Females are behind males
- A high school graduate manager is behind a primary school graduate
- Open Education Undergraduate manager is lower than a primary school graduate
- College graduate administrator is behind primary education graduate
- University-postgraduate manager is lower than primary school graduate

Model 5: Heteroskedasticity-corrected, using observations 1-262 (n = 261)
Missing or incomplete observations dropped: 1
Dependent variable: LeadFact2Mean

	Coefficient	*Std. Error*	*t-ratio*	*p-value*	
const	3.81009	0.240532	15.84	<0.0001	***
Istanbul	−0.0460230	0.0968326	−0.4753	0.6350	
Female	−0.0847271	0.0807620	−1.049	0.2952	
Highschool	0.0823621	0.269368	0.3058	0.7600	
Open Education Undergraduate	−0.221982	0.262503	−0.8456	0.3986	
College	−0.255690	0.265310	−0.9637	0.3361	
University-Postgraduate	−0.0276842	0.252035	−0.1098	0.9126	
Managerfemale	0.241441	0.129661	1.862	0.0638	*
Managerhighshool	−0.421521	0.126985	−3.319	0.0010	***
Managerundrgrad	−0.668907	0.347705	−1.924	0.0555	*
Managercollege	−1.29513	0.203054	−6.378	<0.0001	***
ManagerUniversty	−0.394505	0.112816	−3.497	0.0006	***

Statistics based on the weighted data:

Sum squared resid	838.4961	S.E. of regression	1.835063
R-squared	0.187705	Adjusted R-squared	0.151821
F(11, 249)	5.230814	P-value(F)	2.05e-07
Log-likelihood	−522.6481	Akaike criterion	1069.296
Schwarz criterion	1112.071	Hannan-Quinn	1086.490

Statistics based on the original data:

Mean dependent var	3.248747	S.D. dependent var	0.776339
Sum squared resid	137.4406	S.E. of regression	0.742947

Factor 3

In Leadership 3rd Sub-dimension

- College graduate manager is behind primary education graduate

Model 6: Heteroskedasticity-corrected, using observations 1-262 (n = 261)
Missing or incomplete observations dropped: 1
Dependent variable: LeadFac3mean

	Coefficient	*Std. Error*	*t-ratio*	*p-value*	
const	3.79977	0.547084	6.945	<0.0001	***
Istanbul	−0.0725332	0.116727	−0.6214	0.5349	
Female	0.0666827	0.107922	0.6179	0.5372	
Highschool	0.170536	0.464179	0.3674	0.7136	
Open Education Undergraduate	−0.304594	0.484193	−0.6291	0.5299	
College	−0.385845	0.471172	−0.8189	0.4136	
University-Postgraduate	0.162289	0.443317	0.3661	0.7146	
Managerfemale	−0.0793646	0.177986	−0.4459	0.6561	
Managerhighshool	−0.233475	0.474854	−0.4917	0.6234	
Managerundrgrad	−0.883868	0.647994	−1.364	0.1738	
Managercollege	−1.10683	0.509396	−2.173	0.0307	**
ManagerUniversty	−0.148203	0.468861	−0.3161	0.7522	

Statistics based on the weighted data:

Sum squared resid	1158.771	S.E. of regression	2.157243
R-squared	0.119587	Adjusted R-squared	0.080694
F(11, 249)	3.074722	P-value(F)	0.000688
Log-likelihood	−564.8656	Akaike criterion	1153.731
Schwarz criterion	1196.505	Hannan-Quinn	1170.925

Statistics based on the original data:

Mean dependent var	3.609195	S.D. dependent var	0.951212
Sum squared resid	207.1278	S.E. of regression	0.912052

Factor 4

In Leadership 4th Sub-dimension:

- Males are behind females
- A high school graduate manager is behind a primary school graduate
- College graduate administrator is behind primary education graduate

- University-Postgraduate degree manager is lower than primary school graduate

Model 7: Heteroskedasticity-corrected, using observations 1-262 (n = 261)
Missing or incomplete observations dropped: 1
Dependent variable: LeadFact4Mean

	Coefficient	*Std. Error*	*t-ratio*	*p-value*	
const	3.87207	0.316621	12.23	<0.0001	***
Istanbul	0.149634	0.110134	1.359	0.1755	
Female	0.191829	0.0989037	1.940	0.0536	*
Highschool	−0.235594	0.332969	−0.7076	0.4799	
Open Education Undergraduate	−0.274670	0.343403	−0.7998	0.4246	
College	−0.366812	0.317389	−1.156	0.2489	
University-Postgraduate	−0.200508	0.306702	−0.6538	0.5139	
Managerfemale	0.170581	0.218831	0.7795	0.4364	
Managerhighshool	−0.414372	0.245894	−1.685	0.0932	*
Managerundrgrad	−0.829675	0.517873	−1.602	0.1104	
Managercollege	−1.38148	0.293888	−4.701	<0.0001	***
ManagerUniversty	−0.475758	0.247251	−1.924	0.0555	*

Statistics based on the weighted data:

Sum squared resid	779.4106	S.E. of regression	1.769227
R-squared	0.153184	Adjusted R-squared	0.115774
F(11, 249)	4.094770	P-value(F)	0.000015
Log-likelihood	−513.1122	Akaike criterion	1050.224
Schwarz criterion	1092.999	Hannan-Quinn	1067.418

Statistics based on the original data:

Mean dependent var	3.260536	S.D. dependent var	0.866932
Sum squared resid	177.8724	S.E. of regression	0.845191

5.4.2. Minnesota

In Minnesota Scale:

- A high school graduate manager is behind a primary school graduate
- Open Education undergraduate manager is behind primary education graduate
- College graduate manager is behind primary education graduate
- University-Post Graduate manager is behind primary education graduate

Model 3: Heteroskedasticity-corrected, using observations 1-262 (n = 261)
Missing or incomplete observations dropped: 1
Dependent variable: MinnesotaTotal

	Coefficient	*Std. Error*	*t-ratio*	*p-value*	
const	3.80863	0.296231	12.86	<0.0001	***
Istanbul	−0.0403603	0.108265	−0.3728	0.7096	
Female	−0.0612717	0.0912366	−0.6716	0.5025	
Highschool	0.313145	0.294824	1.062	0.2892	
Open Education Undergraduate	0.121574	0.299683	0.4057	0.6853	
College	−0.0774705	0.288324	−0.2687	0.7884	
University-Postgraduate	0.189997	0.273604	0.6944	0.4881	
Managerfemale	0.134924	0.181236	0.7445	0.4573	
Managerhighshool	−0.694106	0.234272	−2.963	0.0033	***
Managerundrgrad	−0.791554	0.418753	−1.890	0.0599	*
Managercollege	−1.21859	0.286519	−4.253	<0.0001	***
ManagerUniversty	−0.527555	0.236042	−2.235	0.0263	**

Statistics based on the weighted data:

Sum squared resid	778.1681	S.E. of regression	1.767816
R-squared	0.107661	Adjusted R-squared	0.068241
F(11, 249)	2.731095	P-value(F)	0.002379
Log-likelihood	−512.9040	Akaike criterion	1049.808
Schwarz criterion	1092.582	Hannan-Quinn	1067.002

Statistics based on the original data:

Mean dependent var	3.323036	S.D. dependent var	0.760746
Sum squared resid	134.4828	S.E. of regression	0.734909

Factor 1

Minnesota 1st Dimension :

- Highschool manager behind primary school graduate
- Open education undergraduate manager behind primary school graduate
- College graduate manager behind primary school graduate.
- University-Postgraduate manager behind primary school graduate.

Model 8: Heteroskedasticity-corrected, using observations 1-262 (n = 261)
Missing or incomplete observations dropped: 1
Dependent variable: MinFac1OMean

	Coefficient	*Std. Error*	*t-ratio*	*p-value*	
const	3.76720	0.301956	12.48	<0.0001	***
Istanbul	−0.0825858	0.115667	−0.7140	0.4759	
Female	−0.0394659	0.0974845	−0.4048	0.6859	
Highschool	0.429262	0.336702	1.275	0.2035	
Open Education Undergraduate	0.295114	0.341721	0.8636	0.3886	
College	0.0961515	0.314235	0.3060	0.7599	
University-Postgraduate	0.313965	0.308399	1.018	0.3096	
Managerfemale	0.0318805	0.170097	0.1874	0.8515	
Managerhighshool	−0.748746	0.169135	−4.427	<0.0001	***
Managerundrgrad	−0.898530	0.396340	−2.267	0.0242	**
Managercollege	−1.30249	0.224626	−5.798	<0.0001	***
ManagerUniversty	−0.578376	0.168677	−3.429	0.0007	***

Statistics based on the weighted data:

Sum squared resid	910.8498	S.E. of regression	1.912598
R-squared	0.147339	Adjusted R-squared	0.109671
F(11, 249)	3.911528	P-value(F)	0.000031
Log-likelihood	−533.4494	Akaike criterion	1090.899
Schwarz criterion	1133.673	Hannan-Quinn	1108.093

Statistics based on the original data:

Mean dependent var	3.354406	S.D. dependent var	0.785854
Sum squared resid	146.7099	S.E. of regression	0.767591

Factor 2

Minnesota 2nd sub-dimension:

- Highschool manager behind primary school graduate
- Open education undergraduate manager behind primary school graduate
- University-Postgraduate manager behind primary school graduate.

Model 9: Heteroskedasticity-corrected, using observations 1-262 (n = 261)
Missing or incomplete observations dropped: 1
Dependent variable: MinFac2Mean

	Coefficient	*Std. Error*	*t-ratio*	*p-value*	
const	3.84167	0.443781	8.657	<0.0001	***
Istanbul	0.0623467	0.112146	0.5559	0.5787	
Female	−0.100377	0.0962396	−1.043	0.2980	
Highschool	0.366872	0.444402	0.8255	0.4099	
Open Education Undergraduate	0.110036	0.447439	0.2459	0.8059	
College	−0.0928066	0.427267	−0.2172	0.8282	
University-Postgraduate	0.187148	0.421620	0.4439	0.6575	
Managerfemale	0.253232	0.223734	1.132	0.2588	
Managerhighshool	−0.791593	0.284855	−2.779	0.0059	***
Managerundrgrad	−0.907130	0.699762	−1.296	0.1961	
Managercollege	−1.38805	0.331715	−4.184	<0.0001	***
ManagerUniversty	−0.630469	0.287900	−2.190	0.0295	**

Statistics based on the weighted data:

Sum squared resid	930.1423	S.E. of regression	1.932747
R-squared	0.129074	Adjusted R-squared	0.090599
F(11, 249)	3.354782	P-value(F)	0.000246
Log-likelihood	−536.1846	Akaike criterion	1096.369
Schwarz criterion	1139.143	Hannan-Quinn	1113.563

Statistics based on the original data:

Mean dependent var	3.270754	S.D. dependent var	0.829427
Sum squared resid	158.9254	S.E. of regression	0.798908

Model 1: OLS, using observations 1-262
Dependent variable: OverallLeadership

	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-ratio	p-value	
const	0.926567	0.134902	6.868	<0.0001	***
Overall Minnesota	0.735908	0.0395931	18.59	<0.0001	***

Mean dependent var	3.371110	S.D. dependent var	0.739982
Sum squared resid	61.37119	S.E. of regression	0.485843
R-squared	0.570581	Adjusted R-squared	0.568929
F(1, 260)	345.4689	P-value(F)	1.23e-49
Log-likelihood	−181.6280	Akaike criterion	367.2559
Schwarz criterion	374.3926	Hannan-Quinn	370.1243

Model 2: OLS, using observations 1-262
Dependent variable: OverallLeadership

	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-ratio	p-value	
const	−0.0107319	0.00605805	−1.772	0.0777	*
OverallMinnesota	3.09816e+06	1.26018e+07	0.2458	0.8060	
LeadFac1Mean	0.385527	0.00269252	143.2	<0.0001	***
LeadFac2Mean	0.508243	0.00383779	132.4	<0.0001	***
LeadFac3Mean	0.107464	0.00187462	57.33	<0.0001	***
LeadFac4Mean	−0.00145794	0.00254340	−0.5732	0.5670	
MinFac1Mean	−1.93635e+06	7.87615e+06	−0.2458	0.8060	
MinFac2Mean	−1.16181e+06	4.72569e+06	−0.2458	0.8060	

Mean dependent var	3.371110	S.D. dependent var	0.739982
Sum squared resid	0.093010	S.E. of regression	0.019136
R-squared	0.999349	Adjusted R-squared	0.999331
F(7, 254)	55719.57	P-value(F)	0.000000
Log-likelihood	668.8230	Akaike criterion	−1321.646
Schwarz criterion	−1293.099	Hannan-Quinn	−1310.172

Model 4: OLS, using observations 1-262
Dependent variable: OverallMinnesota

	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-ratio	p-value	
const	0.708040	0.143960	4.918	<0.0001	***
OverallLeadership	0.775342	0.0417147	18.59	<0.0001	***

Mean dependent var	3.321803	S.D. dependent var	0.759550
Sum squared resid	64.65980	S.E. of regression	0.498690
R-squared	0.570581	Adjusted R-squared	0.568929
F(1, 260)	345.4689	P-value(F)	1.23e-49
Log-likelihood	−188.4661	Akaike criterion	380.9321
Schwarz criterion	388.0688	Hannan-Quinn	383.8005

Model 3: OLS, using observations 1-262
Dependent variable: OverallMinnesota

	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-ratio	p-value	
const	4.00565e-011	3.02410e-011	1.325	0.1865	
LeadFac1Mean	−2.38782e-011	1.21163e-010	−0.1971	0.8439	
LeadFac2Mean	−1.98570e-011	1.59903e-010	−0.1242	0.9013	
LeadFac3Mean	−1.23855e-011	3.48333e-011	−0.3556	0.7225	
LeadFac4Mean	−1.34022e-011	1.26425e-011	−1.060	0.2901	
MinFac1Mean	0.625000	1.39259e-011	4.488e+010	<0.0001	***
MinFac2Mean	0.375000	1.24114e-011	3.021e+010	<0.0001	***
OverallLeadership	7.33213e-011	3.12340e-010	0.2347	0.8146	

Mean dependent var	3.321803	S.D. dependent var	0.759550
Sum squared resid	2.31e-18	S.E. of regression	9.53e-11
R-squared	1.000000	Adjusted R-squared	1.000000
Log-likelihood	5677.777	Akaike criterion	−11339.55
Schwarz criterion	−11311.01	Hannan-Quinn	−11328.08

CONCLUSION

The structure of the enterprises has changed with the socialization of people and industrialization as a result of socialization. With the industrial revolution and the latest development of internet technology, business administration is an understanding that supports teamwork, attaches importance to Research and Development activities, is technological, innovative and flexible, customer-oriented, and at the same time accepts that business activities should not be limited to local markets. Today, businesses have to adapt to this understanding that focuses on change in order to survive.

Administrators or leaders are important for the management of a community or a business. Leadership manifests itself as a positive or negative factor in employees' job satisfaction. Leaders who play a role in the activities of businesses, persuade and motivate employees, communicate effectively with them and prepare them for change, can ensure efficiency in their organizations, increase job satisfaction and create synergy. The leadership styles shown by the managers are important for the employees to be productive and the realization of their job satisfaction.

When the business culture of family businesses is examined, it is known that the priorities of families generally take precedence over the business rules. Managers can ignore weak points by recruiting regardless of the family members' abilities and characteristics. In particular, managers who are brought to important positions called key points without any skills or experience can be a problem for individuals who have to work under their command and who are not from the family. In this period when the most important factor for businesses is human, employees 'feelings and thoughts, desires, and employees' physical and psychological satisfaction are very important.

- This study is considered important in terms of providing a perspective to determine how effective leadership styles are in employees' job satisfaction. In this study, it was examined how different leadership styles in family companies operating in the construction sector affect the job satisfaction of employees. Within the scope of the study, the statistical analysis of the data

was carried out by performing a survey-based data collection process, which includes employees in family companies. Personal Information Scale, Leadership Scale and Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale were used as data collection tools.

- 262 people participated in the research (198 people from Gaziantep, 64 people from Istanbul).
- When the gender of the participants is examined, 61.6% of men from Gaziantep, 38.4% of women from Gaziantep, 46.9% of men and 53.1% of women from Istanbul.
- When the educational status of the participants is examined, 85.9% of the participants from Istanbul are university / graduate graduates, 6% are high school graduates, and 1% are college graduates. 45.5% of the participants in Gaziantep are university graduates, 20.2% high school, 16.2% high school, 13.1% open education undergraduate, 5.1% primary school graduates.
- When participants are asked about the gender of their managers; 96.5% women in Gaziantep, 3.5% men, 84.4% women and 15.6% men in Istanbul.
- When the participants were asked about the educational status of their managers, 48.7% of Gaziantep participants stated that they were university graduates, 37.1% high school, 6.1% high school, 5.1% primary education and 3% open education undergraduate degrees. 73.4% of the participants in Istanbul stated the option of university, 20.3% of high school, 6.3% of them higher school.
- Participants were asked about their working time in the sector and according to the answers, 30.3% of the participants from Gaziantep stated that they had an experience of 5-10 years, 29.8% of them stated that they had an experience of 10-20 years, while 33.3% of the participants in Istanbul stated ' ü 1-5 years, 30.2% 5-10 years, 25.4% stated that they have 10-20 years of experience.
- It was understood that the working hours of the participants in their current workplaces, 34.8% of the participants in Gaziantep worked for 5-10 years, and 32.8% worked for 1-5 years in the current workplace. 39.1% of the

participants in Istanbul stated that they worked in their current workplaces for 1-5 years and 34.4% for 5-10 years.

- While the Paternalistic value for Gaziantep is above average, the Interactionist and External Satisfaction scale scores are below the average. While the Paternalistic value for Istanbul is above the average, the Transformational scale value is below the average.
- •It is seen that all dimension and sub-dimension levels of the participants by provinces do not differ statistically significantly ($p > 0.05$). That is, the differences between the scale values are statistically insignificant according to the provinces.
- It is seen that all dimension and sub-dimension levels of the participants according to gender do not differ significantly ($p > 0.05$). In other words, the differences between scale values are statistically insignificant according to gender.
- There is a differentiation in leadership scale according to the educational status of the participants ($p < 0.05$). Primary education value is higher than college, high school, open education undergraduate, and university value also higher than college.
- There is a differentiation in the Minnesota job satisfaction scale according to the educational status of the participants ($p < 0.05$). Primary education value is higher than college, open education undergraduate , and university value higher than college.
- There is a variation in the interactional mean scale according to the educational status of the participants ($p < 0.05$). Primary education value and high school value is higher than college.
- There is a variation in the transformational mean scale according to the educational status of the participants ($p < 0.05$). Primary education value is higher than college. Also,high school , and university-postgraduate value higher than college.
- There is variation in the paternalistic mean scale according to the educational status of the participants ($p < 0.05$). High school value higher than college.

- It is seen that the average level of inner satisfaction does not differ significantly ($p > 0.05$) according to the educational status of the participants.
- There is a variation in the average external satisfaction scale according to the educational status of the participants ($p < 0.05$). High school is higher than college.
- It is seen that most of the dimensions and sub-dimension levels of the participants do not differ significantly($p > 0.05$) according to their workin time in their current workplace.However for Minnesota Scale 1 there is statistially significant differentiation with working time at the current place. According to these workers who works between 11-20 year and 6-10 year value is higher than 1-5 year.
- It is observed that most of the dimensions and sub-dimension levels do not differ significantly($p > 0.05$ according to duration of the participants' working in the sector. But, There is a differentation between leadership scale 1,and working time in the sector. The differences between them is statistically significant.For other scales, there is no signifant differentation.
- It is seen that all dimension and sub-dimension levels of the participants do not differ significantly ($p > 0.05$) according to the gender of the managers. That is, the differences between the scale values are statistically insignificant according to the gender of the manager (Table 12).
- There is a differentiation in total leadership scale according to the educational status of the managers of the participants ($p < 0.05$). Primary education value,high school value, Open Education Undergraduate value, and university-postgraduate value higher than college
- There is a differentiation in the total Minnesota job satisfaction scale according to the educational status of the managers of the participants ($p < 0.05$). Primary education value is higher than college. Open Education Undergraduate college and university-postgraduate and high school value are also higher than college graduate value.
- There is a differentiation in the interactionist scale according to the educational status of the managers of the participants ($p < 0.05$). Primary education value

is higher than college, open education undergraduate college, and university value higher than college. In addition, the University is higher than open education undergraduate, primary education higher than undergraduate, university high school and primary education higher.

- There is a differentiation in the Transformational leadership scale according to the educational status of the managers of the participants ($p < 0.05$). Primary education ,university-postgraduate, high school value is also higher than college.
- There is a variation in the paternalistic mean scale according to the educational status of the managers of the participants ($p < 0.05$). Primary education value, high school ,university-postgraduate and open education undergraduate value higher than college. In addition, university post graduate and preeducation value is higher than Open Education Undergraduate ang high school value.
- There is a differentiation in the Autocratic leadership scale according to the educational status of the managers of the participants ($p < 0.05$). Primary education value, high school ,university-postgraduate value is higher than open education undergraduate value. In addition, university post graduate and high school value is higher than college.
- There is a statistically significant difference in the mean levels of internal satisfaction according to the educational status of the managers of the participants ($p < 0.05$). preschool value and, highschool value is higher than open education undergraduate value.And also, highschool and university value is higher than college.
- There is a differentiation in the average external satisfaction(minnesota scale 2) scale according to the educational status of the managers of the participants ($p < 0.05$). University higher than college, high school college and primary school higher school.

As a result, this study has tried to reveal the effect of leadership styles in family companies on job satisfaction of employees and provides important findings to managers who want employees to be satisfied with their work in family businesses.

EKLER

Ek 1: ANKET FORMU

Sayın Katılımcı;

Bu anket, Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı Yönetim ve Organizasyon Bilim Dalı'nda, " ***İnşaat sektöründe hizmet veren Aile Şirketlerinde, liderlik tarzlarının çalışanların iş tatmini üzerindeki etkileri"*** başlıklı yüksek lisans tez çalışması kapsamında hazırlanmıştır. Bu araştırma ile inşaat sektöründe faaliyet gösteren aile şirketleri yöneticilerinin liderlik davranışlarının çalışanların iş tatminleri üzerine etkileri belirlenmeye amaçlamaktadır. Bu çerçevede üç temel bölümden oluşan anketin ilk bölümünde kişisel bilgiler ölçeği, ikinci bölümde yöneticinizin liderlik tarzını tanımlamaya yönelik sorular, üçüncü bölümde ise iş tatmin düzeyinizi ölçen sorulara yer verilmiştir. Ankete vereceğiniz yanıtların kendi gerçek düşüncelerinizi yansıtması çalışmanın başarısı açısından önemlidir. Katkınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederim.

Seray ZENGİN

Kişisel bilgiler ölçeği

Lütfen uygun cevabı işaretleyiniz.

Cinsiyetiniz

( ) Kadın ( ) Erkek)

Yaşınız

Eğitim Düzeyiniz

( ) Lisansüstü Üniversite ( ) Yüksek Okul ( )Açıköğretim lisans

( ) Lise ( ) İlköğretim

Halen Görev Yaptığınız İşyerinde Toplam Çalışma Süreniz

Sektördeki Toplam Çalışma Süreniz

Yöneticinizin Cinsiyeti

Yöneticinizin Yaşı

Yöneticinizin Eğitim Düzeyi

( ) Lisansüstü Üniversite ( ) Yüksek Okul ( ) Açıköğretim lisans
( ) Lise ( ) İlköğretim

Yöneticinize Bağlı Ast Sayısı

Liderlik Ölçeği

	Aşağıdaki maddelerde, yöneticinizin liderlik tarzı incelenmektedir. Lütfen her bir maddenin yöneticiniz için doğruluk derecesini, karşısındaki seçeneği işaretleyerek belirtiniz	Tümüyle yanlış	Büyük ölçüde yanlış	Kararsızım	Büyük ölçüde doğru	Tümüyle doğru
1	**Onunla gurur duyarım** (‘proud of him/her’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2	**Kişisel çıkarlarının ötesine geçer** (‘goes beyond self-interest’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3	**Ona saygı duyarım** (‘has my respect’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4	**Güven telkin eder** (‘displays power and confidence’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5	**Etik standartlara uygun davranır** (‘models ethical standards’ ‘considers the moral/ ethical’/)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6	**Paylaşılan vizyonu vurgular** (‘emphasizes the collective mission’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7	**Umut verici şekilde konuşur** (‘talks optimistically’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8	**Heyecan yaratır** (‘talks enthusiastically’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9	**Önemli Konularda Bilinç oluşturur** (‘‘arouses awareness about important issues’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10	**Varsayımlarını sürekli gözden geçirir** (‘re-examines assumptions’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
11	**Olaylara farklı açılardan yaklaşır** (‘seeks different views’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
12	**Yeni yollar önerir** (‘suggests new ways’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
13	**Farklı bakış açıları önerir** (‘suggests different angles’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
14	**Çalışanlara bireysel ilgi gösterir** (‘individualizes attention’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
15	**Çalışanların güçlü yanlarına odaklanır** (‘focuses your strengths’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
16	**Öğretir ve koçluk yapar** (‘teaches and coaches’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
17	**Her bir astına diğerinden farklı (özel) davranır** (‘differentiates among us’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
18	**Ödülleri tanımlar / açıklığa kavuşturur** (‘clarifies rewards’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
19	**Çabayla orantılı olarak yardımcı olur** (‘assists based on effort’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
20	**Başarıyı ödüllendirir** (‘rewards your achievement’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
21	**Başarıyı fark eder/tanır** (‘recognizes your achievement’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
22	**Hatalara odaklanır** (‘focuses on your mistakes’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
23	**Acil sorunlara odaklanır** (‘puts out fires’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
24	**Hatalarınızı takip eder** (‘tracks your mistakes’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
25	**Başarısızlıklara odaklanır** (‘concentrates on failures’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
26	**Çalışanların hayatlarının her yönüyle ilgilenir** (‘take care of individual lives’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
27	**İşyerinde bir aile ortamı yaratır** (‘sets family atmosphere’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

28	**Çalışanlar için bir aile büyüğü gibidir**. (‘behave paternalistic’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
29	**Çalışanların özel günlerine (düğün vb.)** iştirak eder. (attend special days of him/her’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
30	**Çalışanların kendisine karşı sadık olmasını bekler.** (‘hope loyalty’)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
31	**Düşük performans gösteren çalışanlara öğüt ve tavsiyede bulunur.**	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Minnesota İş Tatmini Ölçeği

	Şimdi lütfen kendinize ***"İşimin bu yönü beni ne kadar tatmin etmektedir?"*** sorusunu sorunuz. Daha sonra bu sorunun cevabını, her bir maddenin karşısındaki en uygun seçeneği işaretleyerek veriniz.	**Hiç Tatmin Etmiyor** Not Satisfied	**Kısmen Tatmin Ediyor** Very Satisfied	**Orta Düzeyde Tatmin Ediyor** Satisfied	**Büyük Ölçüde Tatmin Ediyor** Somewhat Satisfied	**Tümüyle Tatmin Ediyor** Not Satisfied
1	**Sürekli bir şeylerle meşgul olabilme imkânı** (Being able to keep busy all the time.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2	**Kendi kendime çalışma imkânı** (The chance to work alone on the job.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3	**Zaman zaman farklı şeylerle meşgul olma imkânı** (The chance to do different things from time to time.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4	**Toplumda bir yer edinme imkânı** (The chance to be "somebody" in the community)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5	**Amirimin elemanlarına karşı davranış tarzı** (The way my boss handles his/her workers)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6	**Amirimin karar verme konusundaki yeterliliği** (The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7	**Vicdanıma ters düşmeyen şeyleri yapabilme imkânı** (Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8	**Sürekli bir işe sahip olma imkânı (iş güvenliği)** (The way my job provides for steady employment.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9	**Başkaları için bir şeyler yapabilme imkânı** (The chance to do things for other people.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10	**Başkalarına ne yapacaklarını söyleme imkânı** (The chance to tell people what to do.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
11	**Yeteneklerimi kullanabilme imkânı** (The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
12	**Firma politikasını uygulama imkânı** (The way company policies are put into practice.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
13	**Aldığım ücret** (My pay and the amount of work I do.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
14	**Bu işte ilerleme imkânı** (The chances for advancement on this job.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
15	**Kendi kararımı verme özgürlüğü** (The freedom to use my own judgment.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
16	**İş yaparken kendi yöntemlerimi deneme imkânı** (The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
17	**Çalışma koşulları** (The working conditions.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
18	**Çalışma arkadaşlarının birbiriyle anlaşması** (The way my co-workers get along with each other.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

19	**Yaptığım işten dolayı aldığım övgü** (The praise I get for doing a good job.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
20	**İşimden elde ettiğim başarı duygusu** (The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

REFERENCES

Akdemir, A. (2004). *İşletmeciliğin Temel Bilgileri*. İstanbul: Biga.

Akdoğan, A., Oflazer, S. (2012). *Aile İşletmelerinde Kurucunun Değerlerini Belirlemeye Yönelik Nitel Bir Araştırma: Kayseri Örneği.* Paper presented at the Aile İşletmeleri V. Kongresi,Kongre Kitabı,13-14 Nisan İstanbul.

Amanchukwu, R. N., Stanley, Gloria Jones, Ololube, Nwachukwu Prince (2015). A Review of Leadership Theories, Principles and Styles and Their Relevance to Educational Management. *Management 5*(1), 6-14.

Aslan, İ. v. Ç., O. (2010). Bir Aile Şirketinin Kurumsallaşması: Yeniden Yapılandırma ve Varislerin Yönetime Hazırlanması Süreci. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi, 2*(1), 89-97.

Ateş, Ö. (2003). *Aile Şirketlerinde Değişim Ve Süreklilik Anlayışı.* Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Ankara.

Ateş, Ö. (2005). *Aile Şirketleri: Değişim ve Süreklilik*. Ankara: Ankara Sanayi Odası.

Atılgan, A. (2011). *Aile Şirketlerinde Kurumsallaşma ve Markalaşma.* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Doğuş Üniversitesi

Atlı, H. (2007.). *Aile Şirketlerinde Genç Neslin Kurumsallaşmaya Bakış Açısı Üzerine Bir Uygulama.* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir.

Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: current theories, research, and future directions. *Annu Rev Psychol, 60*, 421-449.

Aycan, Z. (2006). *Paternalism: Towards conceptual refinement and operationalization*. London, England: Sage,445-466.

Balçık, B. (2002). *İşletme Yönetimi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Baltaş, A. (2013). *Ekip Çalışması ve Liderlik*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitapevi.

Başkurt, G. (2016). *Aile Şirketlerinin Kurumsallaşmasında Stratejik İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi ve Firma Performansına Etkisi* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Beykent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Bilgiç, R. (1998). The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Personal Characteristics of Turkish Workers. *Journal of Psychology, 132*(5), 549-558.

Carlyle, T. (1888). *On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History*. New York: Fredrick A. Stokes & Brother.

Cass, M. H., Siu, O. L., Faragher, E. B., & Cooper, C. L. (2003). A MetaAnalysis of The Relationship Betwen Job Satisfaction and Employee Heath in Hon Kong. *Stress and Health, 19*, 79-95.

Charry, K. (2012). Leadership Theories-8 Major Leadership Theories. ttp://psychology.about.com/od/leadership/p/leadtheories.htm.

Cheng, B.-S., Chou, L.-F., Wu, T.-Y., Huang, M.-P., & Farh, J.-L. (2004). Paternalistic leadership and subordinate responses: Establishing a leadership model in Chinese organizations. *7*(1), 89-117. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-839X.2004.00137.x

Cherry, K. (2018). https://www.verywellmind.com/the-great-man-theory-of-leadership-2795311.

Coşkun, Z. (2016). *Gıda Sektöründe Hizmet Veren Türk Aile Şirketlerinde Kurumsallaşma Unsurlarının ve Kıyaslama Tekniklerinin Firma Performansı Üzerindeki Etkileri* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Beykent Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Davis, K. (1998). *İşletmelerde İnsan Davranışı, (Çeviren: Kemal Tosun)*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Diker, O. (2017). *Örgütlerde Kültür Sarmalında Liderlik Turizm Endüstrisinde Bir Araştırma*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Dilbaz, S. (2005). *Büyüme ve Kurumsallaşma Sürecinde Aile Şirketlerinde Yönetim Karma Örneği.* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Konya.

Doğan, R. (2014). *Aile Şirketlerinde Kurumsallaşma Sorunları ve Bir Model Önerisi: Adıyaman İlinde Bir Araştırma.* Yüksek Lisans, Türk Hava Kurumu Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Eraslan, L. (2006). Liderlikte post-modern bir paradigma: dönüşümcü liderlik. *Journal of Human Sciences, 1*(1).

Erben, G. S. (2004). *Toplumsal Kültür Aile Kültürü Etkileşimi Bağlamında Paternalizm Boyutuyla İşletme Kültürü: Türkiye Örneği.* Paper presented at the 1. Aile İşletmeleri Kongresi Kongresi.

Erdil, O., Ciğerim, E., & Gök, M. (2004). *Aile İşletmelerinde Yönetim Biçimleri Üzerine Bir Literatür Araştırması.* Paper presented at the I. Aile İşletmeleri Kongresi.

Erdoğmuş, N. (2004). *Aile İşletmeleri: İkinci Kuşağın Yetiştirilmesi*. İstanbul: İGİAD Yayınları.

Eren, E. (2001). *Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetim Psikolojisi*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.

Eren, E. (2003). *Yönetim ve Organizasyon*. Ankara: Beta Yayınları.

Fields, D. L., & Blum, T. C. (1997). Employee Satisfaction in Work Groups with Different Gender Composition. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18*(2), 181-196.

Fındıkçı, İ. (2011). *Aile Şirketlerinde Yönetim ve Kurumsallaşma*. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.

Finegan, E. J. (2000). The Impact of Person and Organizational Values on Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*, 149-169.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2016). *IBM SPSS Statistics 23 Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference, 14e.* . USA: Taylor & Francis.

Gül, H. (2003). *Karizmatik Liderlik ve Örgütsel Bağlılık İlişkisi Üzerine bir Araştırma.* Doktora Tezi, Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü, Gebze.

Hirsch, E. D. (2002). *The New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy* (3 ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Howell, J. P., Dorfman, P. W., & Kerr, S. (1986). Moderator Variables in Leadership Research. *Academy of Management Review, 11*, 88-102.

Işık, Y. (2014). *Lider Benim*. İstanbul: Sis Yayıncılık.

Karayormuk, K., & Köseoğlu, M. (2006). *Aile İşletmelerinde Cinsiyet Temelli Ayrımcılığın Kökenleri: Afyonkarahisarda Bir Alan Araştırması.* . Paper presented at the 2. Aile İşletmeleri Kongresi Kongre Kitabı.

Kaya, O. (2009). *Aile Şirketlerindeki Liderlik Biçiminin Çalışanların İş Tatmini Üzerindeki Etkisi ve Bir Uygulama.* Yüksek Lisans, Niğde Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Niğde.

Kılıç, S. (2016). Cronbach'ın Alfa Güvenirlik Katsayısı. *Journal of Mood Disorders (JMOOD), 6*(1), 47-48.

Koçel, T. (1995). *İşletme Yöneticiliği: Yönetici Geliştirme, Organizasyon ve Davranış*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.

Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship Behavior and Social Exchange. *Academy of Management Journal, 27*(3), 656 -669.

Koontz, H., O' Donnel, C., & Weihrich, H. (1984). *Management*. USA: McGraw Hill Inc.

Koyuncu, H. (2015). *Aile Şirketlerinde Kurumsallaşma Süreci ve Yönetimi Konya İlinde Bir Araştırma.* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, KTO Karatay Üniversitesi, , Konya.

Kömürcüoğlu, H. (2003). Belirsizlik Ortamında İş Tatmini ve İşe Bağlılık. *Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, 5*(1).

Lamb, R. (2013). How can Managers Use Participative Leadership Effectively? Retrieved March 17, 2014, from http://www.task.fm/participative-leadership.

Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (1999). The Relationship Between Commitment and Organizational Culture, Subculture, Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction in Organizational Change and Development. *The Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 20*(7), 365-374.

Metle, M. (2001). Education, Job Satisfaction and Gender in Kuwait. *The International Journal Of Human Resource Management, 12*(1), 311- 332.

Miran, B. (2018). *Genel İstatistik.* . USA: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Naylor, J. (1999). *Management.* . Harlow, England:: Prentice Hall, D. G.

Niu, C. P., Wang, A.-C., & Cheng, B.-S. (2009). Effectiveness of a moral and benevolent leader: Probing the interactions of the dimensions of paternalistic leadership. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 12*, 32-39. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-839X.2008.01267.x

Novikova, I. (2013). Trait, Trait Theory *The Encyclopedia of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (pp. 1293-1295).

Okakin, N., & Tinaz, P. (1997). *Orta Kademe Yöneticilerinin Liderlik Tarzlarına Yönelik Bir Çalışma: Bankalarda Şube Müdürlerinin Liderlik Tarzları.* Paper presented at the 21.YY. da Liderlik Sempozyumu, İstanbul.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior*. Lexington MA: Lexington Books.

Özkalp, E. (1989). Örgütlerde Stres. *Anadolu Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F.Dergisi, 7*, 153.

Özkaya, M., Şengül, C. M. . (2006). Aile Şirketlerinde Kurumsallaşma ve İkinci Kuşağın Kurumsallaşamama Konusuna Bir Bakış Açısı. *D.E.Ü.İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi, 21*(1), :109-126.

Öztürk, M. (2016). *Etik Liderlik, Lidere Güven ve İşgören Performansı Arasındaki Karşılıklı İlişkiler Üzerine Ampirik Bir Çalışma.* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Başakşehir Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Pelfrene, E., Vlerick, P., & Moreau, M. (2003). Perceptions of Job Insecurity and The Impekt of World Market Competition as Health Risks: Results From Belstress. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psycholgy, 76*, 411- 425.

Pillahi, R., Chester, A., Schriesheim, E., & Williams, S. (1999). Fairness Perceptions and Trust as Mediators for Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Two-Sample Study. *Journal of Management, 25*(6), 897-933.

Salant, P., Dillman, D. A. . (1994). *How to Conduct Your Own Survey* Newyork: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. .

Salem, A. A. (1998). Spectrophotometric and Potentiometric Characterization of Some Arylhydrazone Derivatives and their Applications in Lanthanide Determination. *Microchemical Journal, 60*, 51–66.

Senge, P. M. (2004). *Beşinci Disiplin*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Seo, M.-G., Barrett, L., & Bartunek, J. (2004). The Role of Affective Experience in Work Motivation. *Academy of management review. Academy of Management, 29*, 423-439. doi: 10.2307/20159052

Silah, M. (2001). *Çalışma Psikolojisi*. Ankara.: Selim Kitabevi

Sorgun, C. (2007). *Aile Şirketlerinde Yönetim Sorunları: Adana İlinde Bir Araştırma*

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Niğde Üniversitesi Niğde.

Spencer, H. (1896). *The Study of Sociology*. New York: Appleton.

Şimşek, M. Ş. (1999). *Yönetim ve Organizasyon*. Ankara: Nobel Basım.

Taşkın, G. (2014). *Aile Şirketlerinin Kurumsallaşması Sürecinde İnsan Kaynaklarının Değişimi-Bir Alan Araştırması.* Doktora Tezi, İstanbulÜniversitesi

Tosi, H. L., & Mero, N. P. (2003). *The Fundamentals of Organizational Behavior*. UK: Blakwel Publishing.

Tuncel, H. T. (2011). *Aile Şirketlerinde Kurumsallaş(ama)ma*. Konya: Konya Ticaret Odası Etüd Araştırma Servisi Yayınları.

Uslu, M. (2011). *Aile Şirketleri Yönetiminde Devir ve Yeni Neslin Yetiştirilmesi; Çorum Saha Çalışması.* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hitit Üniversitesi, Çorum.

Uzunlular, Y. (2018). *Aile Şirketlerinde Kurumsallaşma, İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi ve Performans.* Yüksek Lisans, Çağ Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Mersin.

Williams, S., Pitre, R., & Zainuba, M. (2002). Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Intentions: Fair Rewards Versus Treatment. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 14*(21), 33 - 44.

Wright, B. E., & Davis, B. S. (2003). Job Satisfaction In The Public Sector:The Role of the Work Environment. *The American Review of Public Administration, 33*(1), 70-90. doi: 10.1177/0275074002250254

Yakupoğulları, C. (2001). *Aile Şirketlerinde Çatışma ve Çözüm Yolları (Erzurum'daki Aile Şirketlerinde Bir Uygulama).* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum.

Yelkikalan, N. (2006). Aile Şirketlerinde Çatışma ve Bir Çözüm Önerisi: Stratejik Planlama. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi 12*(2), 195-209.

Yiğit, A. (2004). *Lider Davranışlarının Personel İş Doyumuna Etkisini Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Alan Çalışması.* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.