REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Bass (1990) declares that the appearance of the word “leader” in the English language goes back as early as the year 1300 and the word “leadership” did not appear until the first half of the nineteenth century. Furthermore, he claims that it did not reveal itself in the most other modern languages until recent times.

Leadership has been a complex phenomenon about which many theories have been developed. There are numerous definitions about what it is and under what conditions it reveals itself. As Tead (1935) describes, it is an “… activity of influencing people to cooperate towards same goal which they come to find desirable.” As it can be understood from that statement it necessitates an interaction between the two constituents: those who lead and those who follow. Leaders can not exist without followers and vice versa (Slater, 1995).

For ages people have been looking for direction, purpose and meaning to guide their collective activities. Leadership is needed to foster purpose, direction, imagination, and passion, especially in times of crisis or rapid change. At such times people look to leaders for hope, inspiration, and a pathway which will lead them to somewhere more desirable (Bolman & Deal, 1994).

As leadership has had a great impact on the culture, history, and civilization of humankind, theoretical explanations for it have been proffered throughout history. Although the term leadership is mostly associated with industry and business, it is of great importance to education as well. Firstly, this section will provide a historical background to theories of leadership as rooted in business and industry.

Secondly, it will focus on the recent approaches to leadership one of which is the primary concern of this study, namely leadership frames. Finally, it will end by elaborating on educational leadership, some criticisms and researches conducted in the field in Turkey and worldwide.

Leadership Theories

As mentioned before, especially within the past century influential theories for leadership have been developed. The Trait Approach that endured up to the late 1940s claimed that leadership ability is inborn. In the late 1940s to late 1960s Behavioral Approach became dominant advocating that effectiveness in leadership has to do with how the leader behaves. In the late 1960s to the early 1980s the Contingency Approach became popular suggesting that effective leadership is dependent upon the situation (Bryman, 1993). Recent approaches to leadership focus on vision and charisma, the term used by sociologist Max Weber to describe leaders who can lead but who do not hold a “sanctioned office” (English, 1992). Later, Burns (cited in Deluga, 1995) introduced the concepts of transactional and transformational leadership. In 1991,
Bolman and Deal categorized leadership into four frames: the structural, human resource, political and symbolic frame which constitute the background for this particular survey research.

**Trait Theories of Leadership**

The study of special traits of leaders emerged from the belief that leadership and abilities such as intelligence were inherited. In addition to intelligence other factors such as birth order, status and liberal parents highly correlate with leadership abilities (Carlson, 1996).

This approach dominated the study of leadership up to the 1950s. It tried to define any distinguishing physical or psychological characteristics of the individual that explains the behavior of leaders (Hoy & Miskel, 1991). It claims that leadership ability is inborn. As the distinguished philosopher Aristotle (cited in Hoy & Miskel, 1991) enunciates that “from the hour of birth, some are marked out for subjection, others for rule.”

However, some shortcomings of this approach were identified. Firstly, it is not clarified which of the traits are most important and which are not. Secondly, some traits overlap. For example, tact, judgement, and common sense are listed as separate traits but the last one covers the preceding ones. Thirdly, trait studies do not distinguish between traits helping to become a leader and those enabling it to be maintained. Fourthly, most trait studies are descriptive.

There is an assumption that the leader’s traits existed prior to leadership and most of them have failed to approach the study of personality as an organized whole (Gouldner, 1965). Several studies were conducted to identify leader traits. Mann’s later reviews suggested 750 findings about the personality traits of the leaders. However, many of the traits found in one study undermined or were found to be unimportant in others. Gibb (cited in Campell, Corbally & Ramseyer, 1966) argues that failure to outline leadership traits should not be accounted for their absence, but for lack of measurement and comparability of data from different kinds of research.

Recent trait studies utilized measurement procedures focusing on managers and administrators. Gary Yukl emphasized leader effectiveness rather than leader traits based on the assumption that becoming a leader and becoming an effective leader are different tasks (Hoy and Miskel, 1991).

**The Ohio State Studies**

The Ohio State Leadership studies represents an interdisciplinary undertaking. Psychologists, sociologists and economists were the major contributors. Not all projects used the same methods to measure leadership behavior, but The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

This questionnaire has been used in order to study the leadership behaviors of commanders, and crew members of bomber crews in the Department of the Air Force, commissioned officers, non-commissioned personnel and civilian administrators in the Department of the Navy, foremen in a manufacturing plant, executives in regional cooperative associations, college administrators, school superintendents, principals and teachers, leaders in a wide variety of student and
civilian groups and organizations (Stodgill & Coons, 1957).

The question of how a leader behaves was an important motive which urged the researchers to develop a method. The way a leader carries out activities had become the major core of interest common to all individual research activities of the staff members. Therefore, it was decided to make the development of a leader description instrument which aimed at identifying the methods and strategies of a leader (Hemphill & Coons, 1957).

After an extensive factor analyses of all the items in The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, two scores were obtained: Consideration refers to behavior on the part of a leader which is characterized by warm and friendly relations with the group members and concern for the welfare of the group.

Initiating structure also refers to activities on the part of a leader that introduce new ways of doing things, and new procedures for solving group problems (Hemphill, 1957).

Halpin (cited in Hoy & Miskel, 1991) contends that initiating structure represents any leader behavior that clearly outlines the relationship between the leader and the subordinates establishing defined patterns of the organization, channels of communication, and procedures at the same time. However, consideration reflects leader behavior that shows friendship, trust, warmth, interest, and respect.

**The Managerial Grid**

The Managerial Grid or recently called as The Leadership Grid is a framework to classify leadership styles that focus on a leader’s concern for task accomplishment and people at the same time. Concern for production involves results, the bottom line, performance, mission, and profits. Concern for people involves group members and co-workers.

Each of these concerns are in varying degrees along a continuum from 1 to 9. Leaders can integrate their concerns for people with production to be opportunistic or paternalistic/maternalistic.

The opportunistic leader moves to any Grid style needed to achieve personal gain and self-promotion, but the paternalistic/maternalistic adopts the high 9 level of concern from 9,1 and 1,9 in order to create a combined style of monitoring parent-like behavior. On the Grid, a 9,9 style (team management) is desirable in that it results in high productivity, satisfaction, and creativity (DuBrin, 1997).

**Fiedler’s Contingency Model**

Fiedler (1967) claims that if organizational performance is to be improved, we must cope not
only with the leader’s style but also with the situational factors which influence him/her. Organizational performance can be improved either by the leader’s fit to the situation or the situation’s fit to the leader. Fiedler (1961) also states that leadership traits, if exist at all, would be exposed to many outside effects.

Therefore, they are difficult to identify. He argues that a variety of causes may force a man to become a leader, many of which are totally unrelated to personality attributes one of which is inheritance of leadership.

He suggests that dealing with leadership effectiveness would be more logical and beneficial on the grounds that the ability to motivate other people may well be dependent upon one or more personality traits. A leader is effective to the extent to which he renders his group more productive.

Thus, a leadership effectiveness trait can be termed as a consistent and measurable personality attribute which separates effective leaders from ineffective ones. However, the behavior related with these traits will reveal itself only under appropriate conditions.

Fiedler also developed a semantic differentiating instrument through which the leader rated the co-worker with whom he worked least well called Least Preferred Co-worker Questionnaire (LPC). Leaders who rated their least preferred co-worker positively and favorably were classified as “relationship motivated” and those who rated their least preferred co-worker negatively and unfavorably were defined as “task motivated” (Monahan & Hengst, 1982).

Cognitive Resource Theory is an updated version of Fiedler’s contingency theory. According to this theory, cognitive resources are abilities and a leader’s directive or non-directive behavior. Directiveness is most helpful when the leader is competent, relaxed, and supported. When the leader is under stress, experience is more important than ability. There is less leader impact when the group support is low. When the leader is non-directive, group member ability becomes the most important component and there is strong support from the group members (Schermerhorn, Hunt & Osborn, 1994).

**Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Theory**

According to this approach, leadership is the process of influencing an individual’s or a groups activities in their efforts to goal achievement in a given situation. From this definition of leadership, it can be understood that the leadership process is a function of the leader, the follower, and the situation which can be formulated as follows: L= f (l, f, s).

The focus of the situational approach to leadership is on observed behavior, not on any hypothetical inborn or acquired ability or potential for leadership. Utmost importance is attached to the behavior of leaders, their group members (followers) and various situations. Thus, training individuals in adapting styles of leader behavior to varying situations is of prime importance. Therefore, through education, training and development most people can increase their effectiveness in leadership roles. By observing frequency or infrequency of certain leader behavior in numerous types of situations, theoretical models can be developed so as to aid a
leader to adopt the most appropriate leader behavior for the present situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969).

This model claims that the most effective leadership style is contingent upon the readiness level of the group members. It has two components: Ability refers to the skill, knowledge and experience an individual or group brings to a particular task and willingness refers to confidence, motivation, and commitment an individual or group has in order to achieve a specific task. The crucial aspect of situational leadership theory is that a leader should depend more on relationship behavior and less on task behavior as readiness level of the group members increases. Minimum of task and relationship behavior is required when a group member is very ready (DuBrin, 1995).

**Leader Member Exchange Model (Vertical Dyad Exchange Model)**

This model developed by George Graen and his followers challenges the well-established assumption that leadership behavior is consistent. It proposes that a leader might be caring and considerate toward a team member yet uncaring and strict toward another (DuBrin, 1997).

Each of these pairs of relationships or dyads must be evaluated in terms of whether the group member is “in” or “out” with the leader. The leader’s first impression of a group member’s competency has a strong impact of the group member’s belonging to the in-group or the out-group. In-group members have similar values and attitudes with the leader. However, out-group members do not have much in common with the leader and act somewhat detached from him. In-group members can become a part of a smooth functioning team whereas out-group members are unlikely to achieve good teamwork (DuBrin, 1997).

**Leader Participation Model**

Leader Participation Model is based on five modes of decision-making, which ranged from highly autocratic to fully consultative. The effectiveness of a mode depended upon several contingent factors which can be summed up as information sufficiency, structure of the problem, and subordinate attitudes and relationship with the leader (Sinha, 1995).

This theory is normative in nature as it prescribes a set of rules to determine the form and amount of participative decision making in different situations. The model was composed of a complex decision making tree involving seven contingencies whose relevance can be assessed by answering “Yes” or “No” questions and five alternative leadership styles. The model was revised by expanding the contingency variables to twelve, ten of which are answered along a five-point scale.

This model indicates that leadership studies should be geared towards the situation not the leader. It is probably more sensible to talk about participative and autocratic situations than leaders who possess these characteristics as leader behavior alters depending on the situation and a leader can adjust his or her style to different situations (Robbins, 1998).

**Recent Approaches to Leadership**
In this section, the theories developed to understand leadership put aside all the complex and sophisticated explanations about leadership behavior and attempted to examine leadership from the point of view of ordinary and simple people (Robbins, 1998).

**Attribution Theory of Leadership**

According to this theory, people have hidden leadership theories in their minds about what makes a good leader or, in another words, they have a leadership prototype; an image of a model leader. These implicit theories or prototypes refer to a mix of specific and more general characteristics. The leader is favorable provided that he or she appeals to the implicit theories of the followers.

Leadership is regarded as something to be largely symbolic and in “the eye of the beholder” (Schermerhorn et. al., 1994). One of the most interesting aspects of this theory is that effective leaders are associated with consistency in the decision making phase (Robbins, 1998).

**Transactional and Transformational Approaches**

If one attempts to examine transformational leadership theory, it can be clearly seen that it is epistemologically based on positivist/empiricist foundation on which traditional conceptualizations of leadership have been formulated (Allix, 2000).

Burns (cited in Deluga, 1995) holds that leadership can not be separated from followers’ needs and goals. Its essence lies in the interaction between the follower and the leader. This interaction takes fundamentally two different forms: transactional and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership occurs when there is an exchange between people which can be economic, political or psychological in nature. The relationship between the leader and the follower is purely based on bargaining and it does not go beyond this. However, transformational leadership occurs when the leader and the follower elevates one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Carlson (1996) points out that Burns felt that leadership theories developed up to the mid-seventies were lacking ethical/moral dimensions so he elaborated on his exchange theory which maintains that followers play a crucial role in the definition of leadership. This theory is made up of power relations and entails bargaining, trading and compromise among leaders and followers.

This transactional model has a political basis and emphasizes the need to look closely at sociocultural aspects that have an impact on the leader-follower relationships. According to Stodgill (1997) these can be external factors such as the availability or scarcity of resources, changes in the society, and a competitive environment that influences an organization which also in return affects the leadership of the group as well. Transactional leaders encourage subordinates by appealing to their self interest and offering rewards in exchange of work effort which are
contingent reward and management by exception. The former urges the leader to tell the followers what to do in order to achieve a desired reward for their efforts, whereas the latter one allows the leader to interfere with the subordinates’ work only when specifications or standards are not met (Hunt, 1991).

Bass (1961) also maintains that individuals form a group for getting reward or avoiding punishment. They are more attracted to the group if they expect more reward or reinforcement from grouping together. Some members will try to change the behavior of others if there are hindrances to rewards or avoidance of punishments. Transformational leaders urge followers to go beyond their self-interests and be concerned about their organization. They help followers to realize and develop their potential. These leaders identify the needs of their followers and then consider those needs to enhance development.

They gather their followers around a common purpose, mission or vision and provide a sense of purpose and future direction. Furthermore, they act as role models for their followers and encourage them to question problems that underlie basic assumptions from different perspectives. They want their followers to regard challenges as opportunities and they cooperate with them to elevate expectations, needs, abilities, and moral character (Bass & Avolio, 1997).

In the 1990s Bass and Avolio developed the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) so as to identify four distinct characteristics of transformational leaders, which are called as “4Is”:

*Idealized influence or charisma*: Based on follower reactions and leader behavior. Followers identify with and admire these leaders. Such leaders are deeply respected, have referent power, set high standards and challenging goals for their followers

*Inspirational motivation*: Depends on how much followers wish to identify with the leader. The leader makes use of symbols and images to raise awareness of shared and desired goals

*Intellectual stimulation*: Followers let go of their past. They are encouraged to question their own beliefs, values, and expectations, as well as those of the leader and the organization itself

*Individualized consideration*: Different but equal treatment of the followers. The leader delegates assignments to followers to provide learning opportunities and coaches them if they need it (Bass & Avolio, 1997). Leithwood (1994) suggests that transformational school leaders adopt a widely shared vision for the school and clarify its meaning in terms of its practical implications and instruction. In addition to this, they make use of all available resources and opportunities to communicate the school’s vision to staff, students, parents and others. They also focus on teachers’ professional goals and if possible align these goals with those of the school.

Moreover, they make use of the school goals in the decision making process. They encourage their staff to be innovative, hardworking and professional and they also search for these qualities
when they recruit staff. In terms of administrative processes, they delegate responsibility and power for leadership widely throughout the school by providing teachers with autonomy in their decisions.

DuBrin (1995) states that charismatic and transformational leadership are closely related with each other in literature, but reminds the reader that not all leaders are transformational until they bring about a change in their organizations.

**Educational Leadership Theory**

Sergiovanni (1994) claims that educational administration borrows its fundamental concepts for thinking about the structure and coordination of schools; rules and regulations within a school; leadership and how it works from organizational theory which itself derived from management theory. It adopted such terms as quality, productivity and efficiency and its strategies to achieve them.

Moreover, it has borrowed its theories of human nature and motivation from economics which asserts that human beings rely on self interest and seek to maximize their gains and minimize their losses.

Furthermore, he declares that the ways in which we understand schools and view leadership depends upon whether we regard them as communities (gemeinschaft) or societies (gesellschaft). In a community individuals relate to each other by intrinsic meaning and significance. There is no expectation of a reward or benefit. However, in a society individuals relate to each other in order to reach some goal or gain benefit. By adopting community as a theory, schools should be restructured not by brick and mortar but by ideas and relationships.

On the other hand Slater, (1995) declares that leadership is rooted in sociology and it has four social paradigms, which are

- a) structural functionalist, b) political conflict, c) constructivist, and d) critical humanist perspective.

From the structural-functionalist perspective leadership comprises a set of measurable skills. Science can aid us to explore leadership and improve our understanding of how it works and how it can be used to promote group performance (Bolman et.al., 1994).

From the political-conflict perspective, leadership is seen as a power relationship between those who are dominant and those who are subordinate. Some people always have more power than others do. Moreover, subordinates think that their superior’s power is legitimate. The study of leadership those who adopt the political-conflict perspective is not simply interpreting power structures in society but also studying how educational administration and the organization of schooling relate to these power structures (Bolman et. al., 1994).

From the constructivist perspective, prescriptions about leader behavior are nonsense as any behavior can qualify as a leadership behavior if it meets certain conditions and conveys meaning
As opposed to structural functionalist which holds that there is a single reality, a nature which can be discovered and analyzed in terms of its parts, and working relationships, constructivists claim that realities are multiple, constructed, and holistic (Bolman et. al., 1994).

From the critical humanist perspective, leadership is symbolic and values shape the decision making process (Slater, 1995). Critical humanists are committed to social change. They do not support, like structural-functionalists do, that educational administration research is exempt from values (Bolman et.al., 1994).

Moreover, there are other subcategories of the aforementioned theories. Reductionist leadership theory can be examined under structural functionalism. It holds that there are substitutes for leadership, some of which are outcomes of the socialization process such as experience, education, professional orientation, and incentives. Others have to do with group task and organizational structure such as rules and regulations, division of labor, centralization and decentralization, and spatial arrangements (Slater, 1995).

Attribution theory which is a subcategory of constructivism maintains that leadership, in essence, is not effective but people need to believe in it anyway because they need to believe in something (Bolman et.al., 1994). Actually, it is an anti-leadership theory in that leaders do not actually have so much to do with solving problems for they are themselves surrounded by history, politics, protocol, and their environment. However, people need to feel secure and create meaning in their lives. That is when leaders come in for they provide an explanation for why things happen or fail to happen (Slater, 1995). Duke (1998)develops a normative perspective about leadership which supports that leadership can not be fully understood unless it is studied within the immediate context in which it is perceived to exist. Furthermore, he asserts that growing interest in how leaders and leadership are perceived urged him to develop an aesthetic theory of leadership which holds that leadership should be thought of as a perception. It has no existence until an observer perceives it. Therefore, a leader’s declaration of leadership by itself is of little value. Meaning should be attached to what a leader does or does not do, who a leader is or not, or what a leader does or does not symbolize.

Ethical leadership, similar to aesthetic leadership theory, also has a normative content and it forms a subcategory of critical-humanism (Bolman et.al., 1994). Calabrese (cited in Slater, 1995) states that effective schools are synonymous with ethical leadership which is concerned with fairness, equity, commitment, responsibility, and obligation. He maintains that the principals’ actions should be regulated by traditional ethical guidelines and integrated with the values of a democratic society. Starrat (cited in Slater, 1994) asserts that school leaders should commit themselves to three ethics: the ethic of critique, caring, and justice.

Feminist theory of leadership can be considered as a sub-category of political conflict theory for it is concerned with power relationships and social change. Advocates of this theory argue that gender is the single criterion for determining superiority and subordination. They claim that
women are recruited to lower positions and relegated to lower echelons than men simply because they are women. They suffer gender oppression as leader-follower relationship has always been patriarchal (Slater, 1995).

To some critical-humanists, leadership plays a unique and crucial symbolic role in democracy. That is why democracies are more dependent upon symbolic leadership than are other types of sociopolitical systems (Bolman et. al., 1994). A democracy necessitates citizens with tastes, sentiments, and values, that is why schools should provide the children with a set of experiences that they can both practice and observe democracy (Maxcy, 1995).

Maxcy (1995) contends that contemporary leadership theory is deteriorating and that even experts can not tell the difference between leadership and pure luck. People are undergoing a societal and cultural change so newer metaphors, words, problem solving techniques are needed as the old ones have become futile.

Furthermore, Maxcy criticizes such efforts to frame and label leadership by urging framework thinkers to question the validity of frameworking itself. There are difficulties with the framework thinking and one is the assumption that leadership can be described objectively. Next, is the belief that leadership is a single real phenomenon about which there are different and contradictory views.

Gronn and Ribbins (1996) support Maxcy’s criticism against framework thinkers and they suggest that leadership should be studied with the help of a holistic approach. They put forward three types of leadership contexts which are categorical, interpretive and relational.

Categorical conceptions of contexts view leadership phenomena as singular and plural entities like “leader” and “followers”, “superordinate” and “subordinate”. By the effect of the leader followers change their behaviors and this is expressed in numerical measures as increased level of worker satisfaction, enhanced performance, and the like. Similar to the normative and instrumental approaches of which transformational leadership is a representative of. By contrast, the interpretive or constructivist approach to context focuses on the lived experience of a situationally real world actors. This perspective regard organization members as dynamic and active entities who interact with time and space through meaningful negotiation. This is reflected in follower centered approaches and attributions of leadership.

A relational conception of context tries to dwell on the particular institutional forms or patterns of leadership dominant in any one culture. It endeavors to provide an explanation for why those forms persist or change through time.

Bolman and Deal (1994) suggest that leadership is inevitably political as the power to get things done is very significant. When various individuals struggle for power to realize special interests, conflict is inescapable. However, political leaders view conflict as a means of acquiring cohesion and unity. Moreover, when public school sector is concerned, Cronin (cited in Bolman and Deal, 1994) states that the public school leader has to be political and creative by building coalitions, negotiating with forces and constituencies of greater power.
Furthermore, Bolman and Deal (1994) claim that leadership is inherently symbolic for leadership is contextual and leaders should have a deep understanding of the cultures with which they are integrated. Effective leaders value symbols and recognize the importance of articulating a vision that provides purpose, direction and meaning to an organization.

Slater (1994) also supports symbolic leadership and develops a counter argument to Maxcy’s democracy. Slater thinks that symbolic leadership can remedy two weaknesses of democracy which are bearing a tendency to favor conformity of thought; discouraging critical thinking, and underestimating the power of symbols. He states that symbolic leadership is necessary to articulate values and choices that most people find convenient.

Hallinger and Murphy (1985) also acknowledge the importance of a school’s vision. They introduced the concept of instructional leadership which contends that instructional leaders have a vision of a school’s desired goals. They articulate this vision through creating a sense of a shared school mission which they communicate to teachers and students. They should emphasize the important aspects of the school’s mission when they meet with students, teachers and parents and strive towards building an ownership of it. Furthermore, they should periodically go over and discuss the rationale behind it during the meetings with the school board and other members of the school.

Blase and Blase (1999) inquired the key themes in effective instructional leadership and they had 17 professors form a variety of disciplines in education interview 809 full-time public school teachers through The Inventory of strategies used by principals to Influence Classroom teaching (ISUPICT). Two major themes were identified: talking with teachers to promote reflection and promoting professional growth.

Principals who valued dialog above all encouraged teachers to become aware of and reflect on their learning and professional practice. This theme involves principals’ making suggestions, giving feedback, modelling, using inquiry and soliciting advice and opinions form teachers and giving praise.

According to teachers, effective instructional leaders employed six teacher development strategies:

1. Emphasizing the study of teaching and learning
2. Encouraging collaboration
3. Developing coaching among educators
4. Promoting and supporting redesign of programs
5. Making use of the principals of adult learning, growth and development every phase of staff development programs
6. Utilizing action research to encourage instructional decision making (Blase & Blase, 1999).