

Leadership Traits Of Managers In Health Sector: Sample Of Isparta

Orhan Adigüzel, Nurittin Arikan², Seher Derya², Belma Keklik¹

1Süleyman Demirel University, Department of Health Administration, Turkey

2Süleyman Demirel University, Department of Business Administration, Turkey

E-mails: *orhanadiguzel@gmail.com, nurittin_arikan@hotmail.com,*

seherderya@gmail.com, belmakeklik@sdu.edu.tr

Abstract

Leadership is a process that affect the activities of people who gathered around the goals and objectives. Leader is a person who directing the behavior of group members in the group's purposes. In this sense, the business leaders exhibit different behaviors when they leading others to perform the jobs and activities. These different behaviors which are exhibited by the leader is his/her management style. Management style is depend on manager's personality, company's sector, organizational structure and members of organization can changeable.

The health sector is a developing with techonological innovations and scientific researches day by day. Behaviors of managers and leaders in this sector also attracted the attention of social scientists and executives.

In this project, behaviors of managers in health sector will be examined and which leadership styles trend is maximum and this trend how change related to the sex, age, the year of work in the company will be analyzed. Thus, the output of our project will help managers to know their behaviors and academicians for new studies.

Keywords: Manegers, Leadership, Leadership styles, Health sector

1.INTRODUCTION

Management concept started very long time ago. Human being beginning from their existence was always the part of this management concept. Even in a small and primitive community management could be said to exist. This concept always affected the life of the people, communities and socities deeply and this concept was always current for the socities

and individuals. People make organizations in order to make their life easier and more stable, they want to reach to their goals and aims with the help of these organizations, and they want to make use of these organizations to succeed the things they could not as individuals. Organizations life, persistence, activity and efficiency are all going to be possible with rational, current, and such a management concept that would satisfy the desires of the organization members and its applications. At that point, it could be claimed that management concept had been one of the most important activity for human being and it would continue being like that in the future.

2. LEADER AND VE LEADERSHIP CONCEPTIONS

Leaders are the people whom the followers follow by their desires. Leaders are the people who have confidence and trust on the followers. Dictionary meaning of leader requires the power, authority, giving order, awarding, and having followers. (Doğan, 2007: 32-33)

Researchers make the definitions of the leadership using their own personal perspective and the conceptions that they value. Together with the leadership research which was common in 1950s, many definitions started to take place. (Zel, 2001: 90-91). Leadership is the action of affecting the people's and the organized group's behaviours within the reason of realizing their aim. (Haas ve Tamarkin, 2000: 6). Leadership is the art of affecting the people's actions and behaviors. Leadership is the ability to make the other people to accept the leader's desires and will by gaining the other people's respect trust and loyalty. (Garih, 2004: 249). In 20th century, leadership has been one of the dominant topics which was having deep scientific work included. In this century, in different fields, not only theoretician but also implementers worked hard to analyse the leadership. (Erçetin, 1998: 5).

2.1. LEADERSHIP FORMS

If leaders are to be classified according to their understanding and behaviour, there are dictator, authoritarian, exact freedom provider, and democratic leaders, in addition to these according to their behaviours, there are charismatic, humanist, autocratic, natural, and transactional, transformational and promotional leaders, and more variety of leaders could be classified. It would be convenient to clarify having the different types of leaders in both sense of behaviours and understanding, the positive and negative effects of these variety of leader types with their general properties.

3. RESEARCH

3.1. Objective and Content of the Research

Objective of this research; to determine the leader properties of the managers in available health associations in Isparta

It is stated that what properties, the people such as city health administrator in manager position, his assistants, governmental and private hospital administrators and their assistants, head doctors, and assistants in health sector in example city Isparta, show when they lead

their teams. There are 133 manager as being administrator, assistant to administrators, department administrators, hospital managers , assistants, head doctors and their assistants, head nurse and head nurse assistants, in 12 associations such as City Health Directorship, Isparta Governmental Hospital, Gulkent Governmental Hospital, Gynecology and Peditry Hospital, Dr. Sadik Yagci Mouth and Teeth Health Center, S.D.U Medicine Faculty Hospital, Private şifa Hospital, Private Davraz Yasam Hospital, Private Isparta Hospital, Private Kariyer Eye Hospital, Private Atanur Eye Hospital, Private Incident Dental Hospital. In this research, questionnaires were done with 108 managers and 25 managers could not be included in these questionnaires. 81% of the managers of the management position were reached and 19 % of them could not be reached.

3.2. Research Findings

108 managers joined in this work to evaluate the leadership properties of managers in the health sector in Isparta. 65 % of the 108 people who had this sample generated, is male. Almost all of them (92%) is married. %58 of them between 25 and 40 years old. Among these 108 people who had this sample formed, there had not been any people who claimed that being highschool graduate or being less then 25 years old. It is observed that half (53 %) of the participants are bachelor degree and half (%54) of them is working in the available position for a period of 1- 4 years. 32% of 108 people who has formed this sample have the working period of 16-20 years in management position.

3.2.1. Confidance Analyze

Confidence of this questionnaire form which was done about the leadership properties of managers in health sector was tested. According to this test, 34 questions scale, confidence coefficient comes out to be as $\alpha=0,915$. That confidence is high enough level confident scale.

In the scale, the average of the questions is 4.281. The average variation range is found as 1.213 (3,546 – 4,759). The difference between the question averages, Hotelling Test and in order to measure the difference that destroy the integrity, the Between Items value in variance analyze werechecked out. According to Hotelling test ($P=0,000$), averages variances are different and it was observed that there are some differences destroying the integrity of questions. ($P=0,000$). At that point, in order to determine the position of every single question in general scale Item- Total correlation should be checked. These correlations are observed to have the range between -0,239 and 0,679

Item –Total correlation constants should not be negative, in fact they should be greater than 0,30. This could destroy the scale addition property. Likewise, in the questions, additive property is mostly destroyed. (Nonadditivity $P=0,000$). In this case, the questions which do not obey the rule are advised to taken out of the scale. But that is not definite rule. With deleting the questions, change in alpha and averave should be checked out.

With taking the questions that have negative correlation coefficients out, (i provide the regulation on my business, i have a consistent form, i have a clear and honest management, i am reassuring, i always know who is responsible with what, i give orders clearly, i respect juniors, i examine the events and i decide with thinking, i am fair to juniors, i am very keen on inspection of business, i give importance to rules and principals, i do plans carefully, my aims are clarified, i defend juniors, i insist on the plans which are being applied) alpha value has become 0,922. This value shows that scale is highly confident.

After this point, if we were to repeat the values which we checked in the beginning; average of the questions in the scale is 4,099. The range of the change in the averages is found as 0,833(3,546 – 4,759). In this case, it is seen that there are differences between question averages but there are not big differences that destroy the integrity of the questions. In this case, when we checked out the Item-Total correlation, it is seen that correlations are changing in between 0,104 and 0,679. When we took the questions that have negative correlation value out, new additive value is determined as (Nonadditivity $P=0,998$). This value shows that in this work questions having the additive property is provided.

According to this, ,analyze was conducted with remained 19 definitions from stated 34 definitions .

3.2.2. Factor Analyze

While factor analyze was being used in this work, it was available that the easy evaluation of the meaningfull common structures related to original datas by using varimax rotation

Before starting the factor analyze, KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure) test was done to understand if this sample convenient and with Bartlett test, factors were tested whether they are dependant to others or not. According to this, KMO= 0,895 was found. This shows us that it has a good sample magnitude to use the factor analyze. Bartlett Test of Sphericity was found as 0,000(Bartlett Test of Sphericity=0,000) . This shows that there is meaningfull difference between factors in factor analyze which was done. That means factors are independant. That also confirms the varimax rotation that was used in factor analyze.

According to this, result of the factor analyze was shown as below(to see total results, please look at appendix 9 table)

Table 1:Rotational Scores

	Eigenvalue	Variance	Cumulative Variance
1	3,701	19,480	19,480
2	3,688	19,408	38,888
3	3,135	16,497	55,386
4	1,685	8,871	64,257

According to this, definitions are gathered in 4 groups (factors). Total variance which these 4 factors clarifies is found as %64,257. The variance which Factor 1 explains is %19,480, the variance which Factor 2 explains is %19,408, the variance which Factor3 explains is %16,497, the variance which Factor 4 explains is %8,871, and these were found.

3.2.3. Regression Analyze

To determine the variables that affect the each factor, regression analyze was done.

For Factor 1;

The regression analyze of the model that is created by the variables that affect Factor 1 was done and it is determined as relevant as being complete considering ANOVA test. ($F=50,413$, $p=0,000$). In addition it is seen that these variables explain the factor 1 with a ratio of 75 %.(R Square= 0,750).

The results of the regression analyze of the dependant and independant variables in the model are shown in the table below.

Table 2: Results of Regression

	B	St Hata	β	t	p
Fixed	-5.786	.359		-16.138	.000
I promote new ideas	.042	.085	.035	.494	.622
I am open to critics	.392	.074	.334	5.277	.000
I like to discuss new ideas	.285	.084	.239	3.371	.001
I am open to change	.428	.115	.289	3.730	.000
I promote development and improvement	.041	.100	.029	.406	.686
I am open to innovation	.200	.104	.141	1.923	.057

In the table, parameters which are obtained and related t values are shown. From the t values of parameters and the variables which was included in the model such as ``I am open to critics, I like to discuss new ideas, I am open to change`` are shown as meaningfull (%5 significance level). The variable `` I am open to critics `` has the effect of 0,392 to factor 1. The variable `` I like to discuss new ideas `` has the effect of 0,285. The variable `` I am open to change`` has the effect of 0,428. According to this, mostly the variable `` I am open to change`` with highest, 0,428 effect, describes factor 1.

For Factor 2;

The regression analyze of the model that is created by the variables that affect Factor 2 was done and it is determined as relevant as being complete considering ANOVA test. ($F=62,021$, $p=0,000$) (BKZ. Ek.13). In addition it is seen that these variables explain the factor 2 with a ratio of 79 %.(R Square= 0,787).

The results of the regression analyze of the dependant and independant variables in the model are shown in the table below.

Table 3: Results of Regression

	B	St Hata	β	t	p
Fixed	-6.562	.345		-19.027	.000
I give juniors the right to speak when i decide.	.210	.077	.164	2.721	.008
I appreciate the good works	.166	.088	.120	1.871	.064
I care about the others thoughts	.712	.109	.459	6.517	.000
I trust to juniors	.034	.068	.029	.495	.622
I provide a friendly and unargued environment	.162	.072	.130	2.249	.027
I listen to others` ideas and advices	.267	.097	.188	2.756	.007

In the table, parameters which are obtained and related t values are shown. From the t values of parameters and the variables which was included in the model such as `` I give juniors the right to speak when i decide, I care about the others thoughts, I provide a friendly and unargued environment , I listen to others` ideas and advices `` are shown as meaningfull (%5 significance level). The variable `` I give juniors the right to speak when i decide `` has the effect of 0,210 to factor 2. The variable `` I care about the others thoughts `` has the effect of 0,712. The variable `` I provide a friendly and unargued environment `` has the effect of 0,162. The variable `` , I listen to others` ideas and advices `` has the effect of 0,267 .According to this, mostly the variable `` I care about the others thoughts `` with highest, 0,712 effect, describes factor 2.

For Factor 3;

The regression analyze of the model that is created by the variables that affect Factor 3 was done and it is determined as relevant as being complete considering ANOVA test. (F=117,247, p=0,000) (BKZ. Ek.15). In addition it is seen that these variables explain the factor 3 with a ratio of 85 %.(R Square= 0,852).

The results of the regression analyze of the dependant and independant variables in the model are shown in the table below.

Table 4: Results of Regression

	B	St Hata	β	t	p
Fixed	-5.860	.248		-23.650	.000
I dont avoid taking risk while making a desicion	.174	.042	.182	4.144	.000
I make plans about future	.237	.056	.197	4.212	.000
I produce new and different ideas about the application of works	.435	.084	.312	5.176	.000
When needed i take quick desicions	.366	.060	.287	6.153	.000

I produce new projects	.283	.068	.228	4.156	.000
------------------------	------	------	------	-------	------

In the table, parameters which are obtained and related t values are shown. From the t values of parameters and the variables which was included in the model, each of variables separately are shown as meaningful (%5 significance level). The variable `` I dont avoid taking risk while making a desicion `` has the effect of 0,174 to factor 3. The variable `` I make plans about future `` has the effect of 0,237. The variable `` I produce new and different ideas about the application of works `` has the effect of 0,435. The variable `` When needed i take quick desicions `` has the effect of 0,366 .The variable `` I produce new projects `` has the effect of 0,283 .According to this, mostly the variable `` I produce new and different ideas about the application of works `` with highest, 0,435 effect, describes factor 3.

For Factor 4;

The regression analyze of the model that is created by the variables that affect Factor 4 was done and it is determined as relevant as being complete considering ANOVA test. (F=130,743, p=0,000). In addition it is seen that these variables explain the factor 4 with a ratio of 71 %.(R Square= 0,713).

The results of the regression analyze of the dependant and independant variables in the model are shown in the table below.

Table 5: Results of Regression

	B	St Hata	β	t	p
Fixed	-6.513	.406		-16.033	.000
I produce possibilities that they eliminate conflictions	1.231	.100	.703	12.290	.000
I have a friendly character	.329	.072	.262	4.581	.000

In the table, parameters which are obtained and related t values are shown. From the t values of parameters and the variables which was included in the model, each of variables separately are shown as meaningful (%5 significance level). The variable `` I have a friendly character `` has the effect of 0,329 to factor 4. The variable `` I produce possibilities that they eliminate conflictions `` has the effect of 1,231...According to this, mostly the variable `` I produce possibilities that they eliminate conflictions `` with highest, 1,231 effect, describes factor 4.

The questionnaire which has 34 questions was completed with 19 questions at the end of confidence analyze. According to this, when factor analyze was done, remaining 19 questions are classified in 4 groups (factors). Each of the factor variables effect was determined with regression analyze.

Before factor analyze, according to literature variables are collected in 4 groups. These are promoter, redirector leader, success focused leader, contributor leader. On the other hand, at the end of factor analyze, when the variables which forms the groups are examined, it is seen

that different leader properties are collected in each factor. According to this, considering the regression result, it is named as the variables having the highest effect on factors. In this case factor names; Factor 1: promoter and redirector leader, Factor 2: Success Focused and promoter leader, Factor 3: redirector and success focused leader Factor 4: redirector leader were determined.

3.2.4. One Sided Variance Analyze

In order to determine the differences between group averages according to each demographic questions, One Sided Variance Analyze (ANOVA) was done to each demographic question.

Before carrying out the One Sided Variance Analyze, homogeneity test was done to see whether variances of the variables are equal or not. According to this, p value of the variable of the promoter and redirector leader is 0.722. P value of the variable of the Success Focused and promoter leader is 0.230. P value of the variable of the redirector and success focused leader is 0.148. P value of the variable of the redirector leader is 0.935. Since all these values are greater than 0,05 ,it is concluded that these all variables are homogen.

Table 6: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (p)
Promoter and Redirector Leader	Between Groups	,037	1	,037	,037	,848
	Within Groups	106,963	106	1,009		
	Total	107,000	107			
Success Focused and Promoter Leader	Between Groups	,131	1	,131	,130	,719
	Within Groups	106,869	106	1,008		
	Total	107,000	107			
Redirector and Success Focused Leader	Between Groups	,002	1	,002	,002	,968
	Within Groups	106,998	106	1,009		
	Total	107,000	107			
Redirector Leader	Between Groups	,539	1	,539	,536	,466
	Within Groups	106,461	106	1,004		
	Total	107,000	107			

Regarding to the analyze, in 95% confidence level, when we consider according to any of the leaders` property, every p values comes out to be greater than 0,05. In this case,it is concluded that leadership properties which determined according to gender does not change. .

Table 7: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Promoter and Redirector Leader	Between Groups	3,426	1	3,426	3,506	,064
	Within Groups	103,574	106	,977		
	Total	107,000	107			
Success Focused and Promoter Leader	Between Groups	,781	1	,781	,779	,379
	Within Groups	106,219	106	1,002		
	Total	107,000	107			
Redirector and Success Focused Leader	Between Groups	2,284	1	2,284	2,312	,131
	Within Groups	104,716	106	,988		
	Total	107,000	107			
Redirector Leader	Between Groups	,014	1	,014	,014	,907
	Within Groups	106,986	106	1,009		
	Total	107,000	107			

Regarding to the analyze, in 95% confidence level, when we consider according to any of the leaders` property, every p values comes out to be greater than 0,05. In this case, it is concluded that leadership properties which determined according to marital status does not change.

Table 8: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Promoter and Redirector Leader	Between Groups	1,262	1	1,262	1,265	,263
	Within Groups	105,738	106	,998		
	Total	107,000	107			
Success Focused and Promoter Leader	Between Groups	2,946	1	2,946	3,001	,086
	Within Groups	104,054	106	,982		
	Total	107,000	107			
Redirector and Success Focused Leader	Between Groups	,196	1	,196	,195	,660
	Within Groups	106,804	106	1,008		
	Total	107,000	107			
Redirector Leader	Between Groups	8,055	1	8,055	8,629	,004
	Within Groups	98,945	106	,933		
	Total	107,000	107			

Regarding to the analyze, in 95% confidence level, when we look at the each leadership properties, only the p value of Redirector Leader is less than 0,05. ($p=0,004$). In this case only Redirector Leader properties shows a change with respect to age groups.

Table 9: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Promoter and Redirector Leader	Between Groups	10,650	3	3,550	3,832	,012
	Within Groups	96,350	104	,926		
	Total	107,000	107			
Success Focused and Promoter Leader	Between Groups	1,965	3	,655	,648	,586
	Within Groups	105,035	104	1,010		
	Total	107,000	107			
Redirector and Success Focused Leader	Between Groups	1,308	3	,436	,429	,733
	Within Groups	105,692	104	1,016		
	Total	107,000	107			
Redirector Leader	Between Groups	,229	3	,076	,074	,974
	Within Groups	106,771	104	1,027		
	Total	107,000	107			

Regarding to the analyze, in 95 % confidence level, when we consider each leader properties, p value of the Promoter and Redirector Leader is less than 0,05 ($p=0,012$) only. In this case, only Promoter and Redirector Leaders properties change with respect to education groups.

It was claimed that Promoter and Redirector Leader property changes with respect education groups. It can be seen from the below table that what age group is the origin to this. According to this table, highschool graduates are more likely to be Promoter and Redirector Leader. ($p=0,28$)

Table 10: Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable		(I) Education Level	(J) Education Level	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Promoter and Redirector Leader	Tukey HSD	High School	Associate degree	,79234362	,46077023	,319	-,4107547	1,9954419
			Undergraduate	1,16880080*	,41311019	,028	,0901457	2,2474559
			Postgraduate	,67185064	,43168612	,408	-,4553073	1,7990086

	Associate degree	High School	-,79234362	,46077023	,319	-1,9954419	,4107547
		Undergraduate	,37645718	,27231571	,513	-,3345752	1,0874896
		Postgraduate	-,12049298	,29974776	,978	-,9031521	,6621662
	Undergraduate	High School	-1,16880080*	,41311019	,028	-2,2474559	-,0901457
		Associate degree	-,37645718	,27231571	,513	-1,0874896	,3345752
		Postgraduate	-,49695016	,21954396	,113	-1,0701924	,0762921
	Postgraduate	High School	-,67185064	,43168612	,408	-1,7990086	,4553073
		Associate degree	,12049298	,29974776	,978	-,6621662	,9031521
		Undergraduate	,49695016	,21954396	,113	-,0762921	1,0701924

Table 11: ANOVA

		Sum Squares	of df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Promoter and Redirector Leader	Between Groups	3,626	3	1,209	1,216	,308
	Within Groups	103,374	104	,994		
	Total	107,000	107			
Success Focused and Promoter Leader	Between Groups	8,057	3	2,686	2,823	,045
	Within Groups	98,943	104	,951		
	Total	107,000	107			
Redirector and Success Focused Leader	Between Groups	1,660	3	,553	,546	,652
	Within Groups	105,340	104	1,013		
	Total	107,000	107			
Redirector Leader	Between Groups	12,516	3	4,172	4,592	,005
	Within Groups	94,484	104	,908		
	Total	107,000	107			

According to analyze, in 95 % confidence level, when we consider all leadership properties, only p value of the redirector leader is less than 0,05.(p=0,005). In this case only redirector leader properties changes with respect to working years groups.

It was claimed that redirector leader property changes with respect to working years. It can be seen in the below table from which part of the study group this was originated. According to this people who work 21 years and more are having more redirector properties with respect to 11- 15 years working period. (p=0,04)

Tablo 12: Multiple Comparisons

Redirector Leader							
Redirector Leader	(I) For how long have you been working?	(J) For how long have you been working?	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Tukey HSD	6-10	11-15	,71930425	,28132426	,057	-,0152500	1,4538585
		16-20	,12141650	,27161167	,970	-,5877776	,8306106
		21 ve üzeri	-,18634199	,29009611	,918	-,9438001	,5711161
	11-15	6-10	-,71930425	,28132426	,057	-1,4538585	,0152500
		16-20	-,59788775	,23934223	,066	-1,2228245	,0270490
		21 ve üzeri	-,90564624*	,26012988	,004	-1,5848607	-,2264317
	16-20	6-10	-,12141650	,27161167	,970	-,8306106	,5877776
		11-15	,59788775	,23934223	,066	-,0270490	1,2228245
		21 and more	-,30775849	,24959390	,607	-,9594629	,3439459
	21 and more	6-10	,18634199	,29009611	,918	-,5711161	,9438001
		11-15	,90564624*	,26012988	,004	,2264317	1,5848607
		16-20	,30775849	,24959390	,607	-,3439459	,9594629

Tablo 13: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Promoter and Redirector Leader	Between Groups	2,168	3	,723	,717	,544
	Within Groups	104,832	104	1,008		
	Total	107,000	107			
Success Focused and Promoter Leader	Between Groups	1,189	3	,396	,389	,761
	Within Groups	105,811	104	1,017		
	Total	107,000	107			

Redirector and Success Focused Leader	Between Groups	,798	3	,266	,260	,854
	Within Groups	106,202	104	1,021		
	Total	107,000	107			
Redirector Leader	Between Groups	3,447	3	1,149	1,154	,331
	Within Groups	103,553	104	,996		
	Total	107,000	107			

With respect to analyze, considering 95% confidence level, when we look at the all leadership properties, all of the p values are greater than 0,05. In conclusion in available position leadership properties doesnt change with respect to working hours.

4.CONCLUSION

Results of this work which was meant to research the leadership properties of managers in health sector, are given below.

Sample was totally 108 people and 65% of this sample group were males. Almost all of them (92%) is married. 58 % of these 108 people is between 25 to 40 years old. . Among these 108 people who had this sample formed, there had not been any people who claimed that being highschool graduate or being less then 25 years old.It is observed that half (53 %) of the participants are bachelor degree and half (%54) of them is working in the available position for a period of 1- 4 years. 32% of 108 people who has formed this sample have the working period of 16-20 years in management position..

According to this, remaining questions are collected under groups by making factor analyze. At the end of regression analyze,these groups are named with respect to the highest factor affecting. These names are `` Promoter and Redirector Leader``, ``Success Focused and Promoter Leader``, ``Redirector and Success Focused Leader``, ``Redirector Leader``. The variables that they collect under in the these leadership groups are shown below.

With respect to demographic properties, the leaderships that take over are determined. According to this, there is not any leaders property that take over in gender, in marital status and in working years in available position

However , people who have 41 years and more and 21 years and more working years are having redirector leadership properties taking over the other leadership properties , among high school graduates, Promoter and Redirector Leaders` property are making more difference with respect to other groups.

REFERENCES

Akat, İ., Gönül Budak ve Gülay Budak (1999), İşletme Yönetimi, Barış Yayınları, İzmir,

Akdemir, A. (2004), İşletmeciliğin Temel Bilgileri, İstanbul

Alpugan, O., Oktav, Mete, Demir, Hulusi ve Üner, Nurel (1993), İşletme Ekonomisi ve Yönetimi, Beta Yayın No:393, 3. Basım, İstanbul

Barner, J. B. ve Griffin, R. W. (1992), Organization, Stragecy, Structure, Behavior, Hougton Mifflin Company, Boston, Toronto

Doğan, S. (2007), Vizyona Dayalı Liderlik, Kare Yayınları, İstanbul

Dougherty, R. M. and F. J. Heinritz. (1985). “Scientific management of library operations”, Management strategies for libraries in (17-23). Ed. Beverly P. Lynch. Newyork: Neal-Schuman Publishers Inc.

Drucker, P. F. (1985), “Management”, Harper&Row, Canada, USA

Drucker, P. F. (2000), 21. Yüzyıl. İçin Yönetim Tartışmaları, Çev: Bahçivangil, İrfan ve Gorbun, Gülenay, Epilson, 2. Baskı, İstanbul

Erçetin, Şule (1998), Lider Sarmalında Vizyon, Kasım

Eren, E. (1990), İşletmelerde Stratejik Planlama ve Yönetim, 3. Baskı, İşletme Fakültesi Yayın No:234, İstanbul

Garih, Ü. (2004), Yönetim İlkeleri, Hayat Yayıncılık, İstanbul

Gordon,T. (1999), Etkili Liderlik Eğitimi, Sistem Yayıncılık

Maxwell, J. C.(1998), Türkçesi: Liderlik Nitelikleri, İbrahim Şener, Reddedilemez 21 Liderlik Niteliği, Beyaz Yayınları, İstanbul

Tekin, M. (2004), Girişimcilik ve Küçük İşletme Yöneticiliği, 4. Baskı, Ankara

Zel, U. (2001), Kişilik ve Liderlik, Seçkin Yayıncılık San. ve Tic. A.Ş, Ankara