Beliefs About Leadership: Perspective of Turkey's Administrators and Leading Business People

Sevinç Engin[a]; Şirin Atakan-Duman[b],*

[a]Teacher, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences at Atilim University, Ankara, Turkey. Engineer, Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, Ankara, Turkey.
[b]Ph.D., Assistant Professor in the Department of Business Administration at Turgut Özal University, Ankara, Turkey.
*Corresponding author.

Abstract

The goal of this study is to understand how leading executives, governors and well-known business people in Turkey perceive leadership. This study addresses this nagging question on leadership: leadership is natural or nurtured? With this in mind, administrators and leading business people were asked whether they believe that leaders are born or made. Using this as the main query, about a hundred interviews were conducted, based on which the study elaborates and discusses how personal evaluations of leadership may contribute to construction of leadership identity. In addition, this study investigates the effect of demographical variables on leadership perceptions and aims at understanding the factors, such as demographics, that contribute to construction of leader identity. Although majority of the respondents believe that leaders are born with the qualities and characteristics needed to become a leader a, most of these individuals state that their education is an indispensable part of leadership, both for moving up to a leading position and for making a success out of it. Individuals who claim that leaders are born also communicate a leader identity that cannot be learned or imitated. The paper put forward the perspectives of Turkey's leading administrators and business people by addressing the nagging question on leadership: Leadership is natural or nurtured? Study reveals the beliefs of the individuals that contribute to construction of leader identity.

Key words: Leadership; Administrators; Business people; Leader identity; Interviews; Turkey

INTRODUCTION

Many studies were conducted on leadership, as it arouses interest and attracts attention of individuals from both private and public sectors, besides the academic researchers. This widespread interest, as Yulk (2005) observes, might be because of the fact that leadership affects most of our lives in several ways. Leadership is an interesting subject and has been so since early 1900's. According to Stodgill (1974), leadership has several definitions. Proposing a comprehensive definition for leadership, House, Javidan, and Dorfman (2001, p. 494) state that leadership is "the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organization". From a complementary perspective, Drath and Palus (1994, p. 4) define leadership as "the process of makings sense of what people are doing together, so that people will understand and be committed". Bryman (1992) conceptualizes leadership as a social influence process through which leaders direct the followers toward a common goal.

Some researchers studied different aspects of leadership and identity or organizational identification (Van Dick & Schuh, 2010; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008; Gonzalez & Chakraborty, 2013). Some of these studies examined member identification (Van Dick & Schuh, 2010), and the relationship between authentic leadership and organizational identification (Walumbwa et al., 2008) and the relation between organizational identification and leadership involvement (Gonzalez & Chakraborty, 2013). It is believed that identity construct

provides an understanding on construction of leader identity. In addition, Gonzalez and Chakraborty (2013, p. 7) contend, "social identity perspective on leadership can also explain leader emergence".

However, none of these studies focuses specifically on how the beliefs on leaders contribute to the construction of self-identities. This study aims to fill this gap by evaluating how leading executives, governors and well-known business people in Turkey perceive leadership. With this aim in mind, those leading people were asked whether they believe that leaders are born or made. They were also asked to identify the major characteristics of leaders.

The motivation for this study was the urge to provide an answer to the nagging question, whether leaders are born or made, by interviewing leading individuals in Turkey. In the next section, theoretical background of the link between leadership and leader identity is introduced. The methodology section presents the data collection process and the method of conceptual analysis utilized for this study. In the following section, the results obtained are discussed. The last section presents the conclusions on how beliefs of leaders might contribute to leader identity construction, followed by recommendations for practitioners and implications for future researchers.

1. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Previous studies on leadership focus on leadership traits, with the assumption that leaders are born with some distinctive characteristics, such as intellectual ability, charisma, confidence, extroversion etc. (Kuzugil, 2009; Ballı, 2012).Subsequently, the focus shifted to leaders' behavior. Those studies are based on the assumption that the individual who exhibits certain behavior will become a leader. They thus conceptualize leadership as a learned construct (Kuzugil, 2009). These two opposing concepts give rise to the well-known dilemma of leadership: leaders are born or made? Van Wart (2003, p. 220) listed the issues of unending leadership debate thus: 'The proper focus; does leadership make a difference?; are leaders born or made? and the best style'. This study addresses one of these issues and aims at reflecting the beliefs of Turkey's leading administrators and business people.

Stogdill (1948) investigated the characteristics that constitute a leader and found that a few distinctive traits differentiate a leader from his followers, and that it is hard to come up with a list of traits that might define a leader. Consequently, he concludes that there are no universal leadership traits and that interactions with contextual conditions contribute to the emergence of leaders. However, research also reveals that certain traits contribute to leader's success (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). Therefore, most researchers agree that leadership is a combination of certain traits and behaviors (Doh, 2003), which perfectly match with the circumstances (Blanchard & Donahue, 2008). Blanchard and Donahue (2008)

contend that the right combination of traits, behaviors and contingency theories can contribute to a better leadership.

Gentry, Deal, Stawiski, and Ruderman (2012, p. 4) observed that 'the way we think about leadership affects how we perceive the leaders around us'. They further contend that our underlying cognition about leaders and our beliefs on how they emerge affect our evaluations about them. They argue, therefore, that believing people made into leaders will lead them to invest leader development processes. At this point, the authors of this study believe that social identity theory might shed some light on the construction of leader identity and how leaders' beliefs on leadership might shape their self-evaluations and others perceptions on their identities.

2. CONSTRUCTION OF LEADER IDENTITY

Organizational identification studies are rooted in Social Identity Theory (SIT), the pioneering study of Tajfel (1974, 1978). His theory stresses that individuals construct a collective identity by categorizing themselves according to their membership in certain groups (Ashforth & Mael, 1989), such as the organizations they work for. Some studies reveal that organizational identification yields to favorable organizational outcomes, such as loyalty, employee satisfaction, and overall organizational effectiveness (Brown, 1969; Lee, 1971; Ashforth & Mael, 1989). The organizational identity construct reveals perceptions of "us" and "others". As highlighted by Hall (2008, p. 154), identity is a type of 'cognition about the self'. The organizational identification construct, derived from social identity theory, is identification with the unique norms and values of the organization. In other words, organizational members identify themselves with and through organizational identity. Cooper and Thatcher (2010) observed that identity orientations of individuals vary among personal identity (that relies mainly on self-expressions), relational identity (that relies on developing social relations) and collective identity orientation (that results from motives of both personal identity and relational identity). Scott and Lane (2000) contend that organizational identification emerges when an individual perceives the organization he/she works for as a part of himself/herself.

The identity is a multi-faceted construct as it is conceptualized at collective (Hall, 2008) and individual levels (Baumeister, 1986). When we consider at individual level, it reveals how individuals define themselves according to the social category that they are emotionally attached to (Hogg & Terry, 2000). SIT contends that identity provides an answer to the question of "who am I?" and highlights the main characteristics of the individual (Gioia, 1998). Similarly, Baumeister (1986) contends that identity displays an interpretation of self. Therefore, the way business people perceive leadership will testify their self-conceptions and thus how they interpret their identities.

Leaders nourish their identities relying on followers, and, identity construction being a cognitive process that stems from social interaction, the followers construct the leader identity by looking at the leaders(Goffman, 1978; Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Hogg & Terry, 2000; Osborn, Hunt, & Jauch, 2002). The leader's perceptions and presumptions that are constructed with social interaction (Osborn et al., 2002) will be refined and thus become permanent (Gardner & Avolio, 1998) over time. Therefore, those leadership evaluations will become reliable.

This study was structured to explore the beliefs of leading business people in Turkey on leader emergence and how they construct their identities. In the following section, the approach employed in this study is explained and the process of conducting in-depth interviews described. In the results and discussion section, the main results of the paper are presented and discussed in detail to provide an understanding on how business people in Turkey perceive leader emergence and thus construct their own leader identities. Finally, in the conclusions section, the theoretical and practical implications of the results of this study, including the limitations of this study, and the areas that need future research are discussed.

3. METHODOLOGY

The study aims at providing an answer to the existing dilemma of whether leaders are born or made by eliciting the beliefs of individuals in Turkey who hold leadership positions in various organizations. For this purpose, interviews were considered an appropriate methodology. Therefore, interviews were conducted to identify how administrators and leading business people in Turkey conceptualize leader emergence, and to understand how they construct their leader identities. Data was collected through semi-structured interviews of a hundred administrator/business people who occupy leading positions such as, prime minister, minister, CEO, chairman of board of directors, board member, well recognized entrepreneurs, sports team directors, and faculty members.

To establish the interviewee list, snowball methodology was employed. Each interviewee was asked to name 5 to 10 inspiring persons who hold managerial and/or administrative positions. The process of developing the list continued until the completion of 100 interviews. The interviews were executed face-to-face and each interview lasted for a maximum of 40 minutes. All interviews were recorded with the permission of the respondents, the proceedings stored in separate folders and then transcribed by the researchers.

The interviewees were asked the open-ended question of 'whether leaders are born or made?' and other related questions to develop the interview and fathom the understanding of the interviewee's exact perceptions in line with the study objective. The transcriptions were grouped by pre-reading according to the interviewees' points of view and textual analysis.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This study aims to understand the beliefs of Turkey's leading administrators and business people on the issue of leader emergence. Demographics were also presented to deepen the understanding of the study results. The results reveal that males (84.00%) hold the majority of the top administrative and leading positions in Turkey. The fact that females constitute only 16.00% of the respondents shows that the representation of women in Turkey's administrative and other leading positions is lopsided.

The results show that 75.00% of the female respondents work in private sector and 66.67% of those women hold top managerial positions, such as chairperson of the board of directors, member of board of directors or member of executive board, which might seem quite impressive. However, surprisingly and regrettably, the women respondents who hold leading positions of business groups or companies happen to be members of the founding families. Therefore, it can be interpreted that the women in Turkey, owing to patriarchal characteristic of the country, cannot achieve leading positions solely based on their personal traits or qualities acquired by learning. The remaining women respondents work in the private sector, either as faculty members (25.00%) or as journalists (8.34%). Although the study results are not representative of the country, because the data was collected from only the most recognized individuals following the snowball methodology, the results lead to noteworthy interpretations.

Study results reveal that only 12.50% of the female respondents believe that leaders are born, whereas the rest feel that leadership qualities can be learned. This result might indicate the fact that women perceive themselves disadvantaged for business positions, as they happen to be females, the gender that is considered unfit in the leader stereotype. As a result, it is believed that women holding leadership positions tend to advocate that leadership can be learned.

As can be seen from Table 1, most of the recognized individuals, proposed by the respondents, participated in the interviews. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents hold leadership positions in private sector, but only 12.00% of them are in public sector. Only 9.52% of the respondents, representing the public sector, consider that leaders are made. This might indicate that those individuals, placed in a situation where all promotions and assignments depend on the routine procedures, believe only certain inherited characteristics make all the difference, no matter what has been learned. On the other hand, respondents who represent the private sector stress that endowments are not sufficient to succeed in business world (75.95%).

Table 1
Interviewee Profiles and Their Perceptions on Leadership

	Interviewee	Leading Position	Gender (F/M)	Public/ Private	Belief
1	Abdulkadir Konukoğlu	SANKO Holding Chairman of the Board of Directors	M	Private	Born
2	Abdullatif Şener	Former Minister of State and Deputy Prime Minister	M	Public	Both
3	Adnan Demirel	Demmer Demireller Marble Industries and Trade Inc. Founding Partner and Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors	M	Private	Both
4	Ahmet Arkan	Arkan Group Chairman of the Board of Directors	M	Private	Born
5	Ahmet Çalık	Çalık Holding Chairman of the Board of Directors	M	Private	Both
6	Ahmet Misbah Demircan	Mayor of Beyoğlu, Istanbul	M	Public	Both
7	Ahmet Nazif Zorlu	Zorlu Group Chairman of the Board of Directors	M	Private	Both
8	Ali Saydam	Bersay Communications Group Chairman of the Board of Directors	M	Private	Both
9	Ali Yıldırım Koç	Koç Holding Member of Board of Directors	M	Private	Both
10	Arzuhan Doğan Yalçındağ	Doğan Holding Chairman of the Board of Directors	F	Private	Both
11	Ayhan Sevgi	BT News Executive Editor	M	Private	Both
12	Ayşe Ayata	Faculty Member of Middle East Technical University (METU) Political Science and Public Administration Dept.	F	Public	Made
13	Ayman Güler	Member of Parliament	F	Public	Both
14	Burak Kuntay	Bahçeşehir University, Head of the Social Sciences Institute	M	Private	Both
15	Cem Kozlu	Consultant at Coca-Cola Inc.	M	Private	Made
16	Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı	Faculty Member at Koc University	F	Private	Both
17	David Judson	Journalist	M	Private	Made
18	Demet Sabancı Çetindoğan	DEMSA Deputy Managing Director	F	Private	Both
19	Deniz Gökçe	Faculty Member at Bogazici University	M	Public	Both
20	Deniz Ülke Arıboğan	Faculty Member at Istanbul Bilgi University	F	Private	Both
21	Doğan Satılmış	Habertürk Vice Executive Editor	M	Private	Born
22	E. Fuat Keyman	Faculty Member at Sabancı University	M	Private	Both
23	Ekrem Dumanlı	Zaman Gazetesi Executive Editor	M	Private	Both
24	Ekrem Erdem	AK Political Party Vice President	M	Private	Both
25	Emre Alkin	Istanbul Kültür University, Head of the Economics Dept.	M	Private	Born
26	Emrehan Halıcı	CHP Political Party Vice President	M	Private	Born
27	Erdal Sağlam	Hürriyet Newspaper, Author	M	Private	Both
28	Erdoğan Aktaş	ATV News Executive Editor	M	Private	Both
29	Erol Olçak	AK Political Party, Diplomatic Communicator	M	Private	Both
30	Evrim Aras	Aras Holding Chairman of the Board of Directors	F	Private	Both
31	Eyüp Can	Journalist	M	Private	Made
32	Fahrettin Gülener	Er-Metal A.Ş. Chairman of the Board of Directors	M	Private	Made
33	Faruk Bildirici	Hürriyet Newspaper Reader Representative	M	Private	Made
34	Faruk Eczacıbaşı	Eczacıbaşı Holding Chairman of the Board of Directors	M	Private	Both
35	Fatih Karaca	President of Ipek Media Group	M	Private	Made
36	Fatih Terim	Principle Coach of National Team	M	Private	Born
37	Ferit Parlak	Dünya Newspaper Ankara Agent	M	Private	Made
38	Fikret Bila	Milliyet Newspaper Executive Editor	M	Private	Both
39	Güneri Cıvaoğlu	Milliyet Newspaper, Author	M	Private	Both
40	Hakan Güldağ	Dünya Newspaper Executive Editor	M	Private	Made
41	Hamdi Akın	Akfen Holding Chairman of the Board of Directors	M	Private	Both
42	Hanzade Doğan Boyner	Doğan Holding Member of the Board of Directors and Executive Committee	F	Private	Both
43	Haşmet Babaoğlu	Sabah Newspaper, Author	M	Private	Born
44	Hüseyin Gülerce	Zaman Newspaper, Author	M	Private	Both
45	Loanna Kuçuradi	Director of Human Rights Center, Maltepe University	F	Private	Both
46	Ishak Alaton	Alarko Holding Chairman of the Board of Directors	M	Private	Born
47	İsmail Küçükkaya	Journalist	M	Private	Both
48	İsmail Yalçın Zaim	Director of the Atilim Foundation, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Atilim University	M	Private	Both
49	Kemal Görmez	Head of the Public Administration Department of Gazi University	M	Public	Both
50	Korkut Özal	Former Member of the Parliament	M	Public	Born

To be continued

Continued

	Interviewee	Leading Position	Gender (F/M)	Public/ Private	Belief
51	Leyla Alaton	Alarko Holding Member of the Board of Directors, Alvimedica Member of the Board of Directors	F	Private	Made
52	Mahir Kaynak	Star Newspaper, Author	M	Private	Made
53	Mehmet Ali Birand	Journalist	M	Private	Born
54	Mehmet Ali Kışlalı	Journalist	M	Private	Both
55	Mehmet Hamdi Yıldırım	Deputy Undersecretary of Ministry of Transportation	M	Public	Both
56	Mehmet Hilmi Güler	Minister of Energy and Natural Resources of the 58th 59th 60th Governments	M	Public	Both
57	Mehmet Özhaseki	Mayor of the Kayseri Metropolitan	M	Public	Both
58	Melih Aşık	Milliyet Newspaper, Author	M	Private	Both
59	Melih Gökçek	Mayor of the Ankara Metropolitan	M	Public	Born
60	Meliha Okur	Sabah Newspaper, Author	F	Private	Born
61	Meral Akşener	President of the Parliament, Member of Parliament	F	Public	Both
62	Metin Heper	Dean of the Faculty of the Economics and Administrative Sciences, Head of the Political Science Dept., Bilkent Univ.	M	Private	Made
63	Metin Kilci	Undersecretary of Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources	M	Public	Both
64	Metin Özkan	Journalist	M	Private	Made
65	Metin Yüksel	Sabah Newspaper Vice Executive Editor	M	Private	Made
66	Muhammed Şahin	Former Rector of Istanbul Technical University (ITU)	M	Public	Both
67	Murat Yalçıntaş	Former President of the Istanbul Chamber of Commerce	M	Private	Both
68	Murat Yetkin	Daily News Newspaper Executive Editor	M	Private	Both
69	Mustafa Karaalioğlu	President of Star Media Group	M	Private	Born
70	Mustafa Sarıgül	Former Mayor of Şişli, Istanbul	M	Public	Both
71	Mustafa Süzer	Süzer Group Honorary President	M	Private	Both
72	Mümtazer Türköne	Zaman Newspaper, Author	M	Private	Made
73	Nafi Güral	Kütahya Porcelain Inc. Chairman of the Board of Directors	M	Private	Born
74	Necati Özkan	Founder of the Öykü Advertising Agency	M	Private	Made
75	Nüket Küçükel Ezberci	Güven Hospital Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors	F	Private	Both
76	Okan Müderrisoğlu	Sabah Newspaper, Ankara Agent	M	Private	Made
77	Okay Gönensin	Vatan Newspaper, Author	M	Private	Made
78	Orhan Birgit	Cumhuriyet Newspaper, Author	M	Private	Born
79	Orhan Tatar	Faculty Member of Cumhuriyet University	M	Public	Born
80	Osman Arolat	Dünya Newspaper, Chief Author	M	Private	Born
81	Özlem Çerçioğlu	Mayor of Aydın Metropolitan	F	Public	Made
82	Recep Tayyip Erdoğan	Prime Minister	M	Public	Born
83	Rifat Hisarcıklıoğlu	President of Turkish Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges (TOBB)	M	Private	Both
84	Rona Yırcalı	President of Foreign Economic Relations Board (DEİK)	M	Private	Made
85	Sadettin Saran	Saran Holding Chairman of Board of Directors	M	Private	Born
86	Sahir Erozan	Hotelier	M	Private	Made
87	Sema Güral Sürmeli	Kütahya Porcelain Member of Board of Directors	F	Private	Born
88	Süheyl Batum	Member of Parliament	M	Public	Both
89	Süleyman Ateş	Former Director of Religious Affairs	M	Public	Born
90	Süreyya Ciliv	CEO of Turkcell	M	Private	Made
91	Şükrü Kızılot	Hürriyet Newspaper, Author	M	Private	Born
92	Tamer Koçel	Former Rector of Istanbul Kültür University	M	Private	Born
93	Uğur Dündar	Journalist	M	Private	Both
94	Umur Talu	Habertürk Newspaper, Author	M	Private	Made
95	Umut Oran	President of Domino Textile Inc.	M	Private	Born
96	Utku Çakırözer	Cumhuriyet Newspaper, Ankara Agent	M	Private	Made
97	Vedat Toprak	Faculty Member at METU	M	Public	Both
98	Vuslat Doğan Sabancı	Hürriyet Newspaper, Chairman of Executive Committee and Vice Chairman of Board of Directors	F	Private	Made
99	Yankı Yazgan	Faculty Member at Yale University Child Study Center	M	Private	Made
100	Yusuf Ziya Cömert	Star Newspaper Executive Editor	M	Private	Both

Both views of the leadership dilemma receive considerable support (see Table 2), and hence it is hard to achieve consensus on this issue. However half of the administrators and leading businessmen of Turkey believe that leaders are as much born as they are made. Seventy-six percent of the respondents believe that at least some of the characteristics and qualities that leaders inherit from birth are *sine qua non*. Given that identity is the perception and the interpretation of self (Gioia, 1998; Baumeister, 1986), it is possible to suggest, from the social identity perspective that the perceptions of the leaders on leadership emergence also contribute to their identity constructs.

Table 2
Summary of the Percentiles of Interviewee Beliefs

Leader Perceptions	Frequency (%)
Leaders are made	24
Leaders are born	26
Born and made	50
TOTAL	100

As shown in Table 3, the respondents have made several comments on leadership from different perspectives, which are not directly related with the research question of this study but still valuable. Those comments are included here to promote discussion on some of the results, like gender inequality and the importance of education in leadership.

Table 3
Example quotes of the interviewees

Example Quotes on Importance of Education	Interviewee
It is clear that the education and training cooperation of the Turkic Republics in science and technology will contribute to the development of generations that embrace a common perspective toward our problems and values.	Devlet Bahçeli (The chairman of the Nationalist Movement Party_MHP and former Deputy Prime Minister in the coalition government of Bülent Ecevit)
In my opinion, both leaders are born and also with hard work and determination leaders are made. Although there are some people who advocate that leaders are born, the proposition that leaders are made is more widely accepted. However it cannot be thought, the individual learn it by his/her own will.	Adnan Demirel (Demmer Demireller Marble Industries and Trade Inc. Founding Partner and Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors)
In today's world, I suspect the leadership of people who are not open to innovations, the ones who do not self-educate themselves, in other words who do not know to learn.	Erdoğan Akbaş (ATV News, Executive Editor)
Leaders have to have some leadership qualities from birth. However, those qualities should be developed through education.	Fuat Keyman (Faculty Member of Sabancı University)

Example Quotes on Gender Inequality	Interviewee
There are very few women leaders. It is the result of the inequality of opportunism. If enough opportunity is provided, I believe we can have high quality and distinguished leaders.	Arzuhan Doğan Yalçındağ (Former Head of TUSIAD)
Only 4% of women have leading positions in corporations both in the world and in Turkey.	Evrim Aras (Aras Holding, Chairman of the Board of Directors)
Responsibilities related to your family and children, the responsibility and the pressure of being an honorable and respected woman, limitations and prejudices. We have so many obstacles to come over.	Deniz Ülke Arıboğan (Faculty Member of İstanbul Bilgi University)

The quotes of the respondents on gender inequality support the results presented in Table 4, because very few women could reach leading positions in Turkey. Additionally, 50% of those women, who participated in the study, hold leading positions in family holdings. They seem to have overcome this gender inequality barrier with the support of their families, in addition to their personal qualities and education. Even those women express their concern about gender inequality by highlighting the difficulties they face in dealing with business life in Turkey.

Table 4
Distribution of Leader Emergence Beliefs According to Demographics

	% (n=100)	Born (%)	Made (%)	Both (%)
Gender				
Female	16.00	12.50	25.00	62.50
Male	84.00	26.19	26.19	47.62
Type of Occupation				
Private Sector	79.00	24.05	29.11	46.84
Public Sector	21.00	23.81	9.52	66.67

The respondents also drew attention to the importance of education by stressing that individuals who hold leading positions should enthusiastically pursue their self-education in every possible way. The respondents who advocate that leadership can be learned and those who argue that leaders are both born and made (74.00%) agree that education is inevitable for leadership success.

Holding one opinion or both of the dilemma leads to two consequences in regard to leader emergence. First, those who support one side of the dilemma believe that the individuals in leading positions also communicate their own identities. Their beliefs reveal their perceptions about themselves. It indicates whether they believe that they were born with the necessary characteristics for the positions they hold or that they learned the qualities they need for holding leadership positions. This perspective can be considered inspiring, because it conveys that anyone who wants to be a leader can learn and succeed to be in a leading position.

Second, the participants, while conveying their beliefs on leadership emergence, also establish a perception of their identities. Participants create an identity perception that may be favorable to their beliefs of self-reported dispositions. Therefore, some respondents claim that those, who are born leaders, communicate a leader identity, which cannot be learned. Those leaders claim to have inherited those valuable qualities, which are distinct and cannot be imitated. Those qualities may also serve as a protection for the leader by conveying that leading

positions are hard to get without those-called personality characteristics that can deter potential competitors.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS

The study results stress that practitioners should invest in leadership education, because 73% of the respondents (Table 2) believe that education is one of the most important prerequisites that constitute a leader. Moreover, during in-depth interviews, most of these individuals state that their education is an indispensable part of leadership, both for moving up to a leading position and for making a success out of it. Therefore, education and training programs, designed specifically for managerial positions, will contribute to the development of managerial skills and thus for the overall improvement in the performance of the organization.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

As the number of interviews conducted was only a hundred, the scope of the interviews was relatively limited as compared to that of comprehensive interviews. In future studies the number for interviews could be limited to a reasonable amount in order to conduct more comprehensive interviews to provide in-depth analysis.

REFERENCES

Ashforth, B. E., & Meal, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, *4*(1), 20-39.

Ballı, E. (2012). *The effects of cognitive ability*, *personality and sex on leader emergence*: *An empirical study* (Doctoral dissertation). Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey.

Baumeister, R. E. (1986). *Public self and private self*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Blanchard, L. A., & Donahue, A. K. (2008). Teaching leadership in public administration. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, *13*(3/4), 461-485.

Brown, M. E. (1969). Identification and some conditions of organizational involvement. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *14*, 346-355.

Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London, UK: Sage.

Cooper, D., & Thatcher, S. M. (2010). Identification in organizations: The role of self-concept orientations and identification motives. *Academy of Management Review*, *35*(4), 516-538.

Doh, J. P. (2003). Can leadership be taught? Perspectives from management educators. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*. Retrieved from AMLE website: http://amle.aom.org

Drath, W. H., & Palus, C. J. (1994). *Making common sense*: *Leadership as meaning making in a community of practice*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic relationships: A dramaturgical perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*, *23*(1), 32-59.

Gentry, W., Deal, J. J., Stawiski, S., & Ruderman, M. (2012). *Are leaders born or made? Perspectives from the executive suite*. Greensboro, NC: Center for creative leadership. Retrieved from http://insights.ccl.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/AreLeadersBornOrMade.pdf

Gioia, D. A. (1998). From individual to organizational identity. In D. A. Whetten & P. C. Godfrey (Eds.), *Identity in organizations*: *Building theory through conversation* (pp. 17-31). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Goffman, E. (1978). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Middlesex, UK: Penguin Books.

Gonzalez, J. A., & Chakraborty, S. (2013). Identity orientation, organizational identification, and leadership involvement. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *7*(2), 6-17.

Hall, D. T. (2008). Self-awareness, identity and leader development. In D. V. Day, S. J. Zaccaro, & S. M. Halpin (Eds.), *Leader development for transforming organizations*: *Growing leaders for tomorrow* (pp. 153-176). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(1), 121-140.

House, R. J., Javidan, M., & Dorfman, P. (2001). Project GLOBE: An introduction. *Applied Psychology*: *An International Review*, *50*(4), 489-505.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive*, *5*(2), 48-60.

Kuzugil, Ş. (2009). *Does one size fit all? Value-based subcultures and leadership preferences in Turkey* (Doctoral dissertation). Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey.

Lee, S. M. (1971). An empirical analysis of organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal*, *14*(2), 213-226.

Osborn, R. N., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2002). Toward a contextual theory of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 797-837.

Scott, S. G., & Lane, V. R. (2000). A stakeholder approach to organizational identity. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(1), 43-62.

Stodgill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership*: *A survey of the literature*. New York, UY: Free Press.

Stodgill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, *25*(1), 35-71.

Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information*, *13*, 65-93.

Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups*: *Study in socialpsychology of intergroup relations*. London, UK: Academic Press.

Van Dick, R., & Schuh, S. C. (2010). My boss' group is my group: Experimental evidence for the leader-follower identity transfer. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, *31*, 551-563.

Van Wart, M. (2003). Public-sector leadership theory: An assessment. *Public Administration Review*, *63*(2), 214-228.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, *34*, 89-126.

Yukl, G. (2005). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson-Prentice Hall.