

Turkish high school students' perceptions of leaders and characteristics of leadership

Kadir Ulusoy

Faculty of Education, Mersin University, Turkey

Accepted 23 December, 2010

Leaders mentioned in history courses are often viewed by Turkish students either as positive role models or as perpetrators of negative deeds. The leadership models included in Turkish high school course materials may significantly influence student perceptions. The purpose of this research study was to determine the effect of a history course in influencing Turkish high school students' identification of leaders as role models, leaders they do not sympathize with, and the rationale behind their decisions. Student opinions regarding desirable characteristics of a leader were also assessed. The participants of the study were 63 female and 53 male students from a Turkish high school in the city of Adiyaman during the 2007 to 2008 academic years. According to the research results, the most positive leader typologies revealed were patriotic, working for the people, good, and far-sighted. The most negative characteristics were selfish, working for his/her own benefits, cowards and traitors. It was found that, students learned about the leaders they viewed either negatively or positively through the content contained in school history books which indicates that curriculum choices play a significant role in the determination and formation of student ideas and attitudes.

Key words: Leadership, history courses, students' perceptions.

INTRODUCTION

In the course of history, many wise, courageous, and foresighted leaders have changed the path of humanity, made important laws, won major battles, developed war strategies, and initiated revolutions. In every era, there have been leaders who were recognized throughout the world. History courses help students familiarize themselves with national and world leaders. Although Demircioglu (2005) found most content matter in history courses were memorized by students because of the way courses were taught, students still form opinions regarding leaders, based upon the information they receive. Some leaders, the students believe, have been guided by their desire to work for the people, the hope for achievement and success, the will to provide peace and happiness for the people, and to spread justice. Other leaders' students perceive as having harmed people, forcing them to live in abject poverty instead of in justice and abundance.

Leadership can be viewed and analyzed from psychological, sociological, political, military, philosophical, and historical perspectives (Sisman, 2002). Bass (1990) stated that, there were as many different

definitions of leadership as there were persons who have tried to define the concept. According to Albritton et al. (2008), the leadership is defined by people's perceptions of the leader. Leadership has been called the process by which an individual affects and directs the actions of others for achieving particular personal or group aims under specific circumstances (Dietzer et al., 1979; Booher and Watson, 1999; Yigit, 2002). According to Carvell (1975), leadership is the process of guiding, directing, and affecting the activities of individuals through the establishment of certain goals. Baltas (2001) perceived an effective leader as a person who was honest, farsighted, inspiring, fair, supportive, expressive, reliable, respectful of others' opinions, a good listener, able to learn from his/her own mistakes and who possessing strong communicative and administrative skills.

According to Middlebrooks and Haberkorn (2009), leadership requires a leader and involves individuals and what they know, believe, and do. In addition, authors also stated that much leadership development has focused on the traits, skills, behaviors, and activities of individuals

who have succeeded in leader positions. A leader has the ability to guide people who share a common goal, determine the most effective methods for achievement, and execute the plan to do so. A desirable leader is also a person who is perceived as a member of the group through his/her actions, and who maintains an organizational environment in which group members feel as comfortable as does the group leader. Physical features, including height, weight, strength, and age, are seen as indicators of maturity, good health, and beauty (Koçel, 1984; Eren, 2000). According to Eren (2000), personal traits of a leader include intelligence, the art of public speaking, skills in interpersonal relations and communication, trustworthiness, the ability to inspire confidence and take risks, entrepreneurial abilities, courage and self-confidence. In addition, Koçel (1984) added initiative, vision, honesty, sincerity, truthfulness, directness, decisiveness, the ability to succeed and emotional maturity to leaders' characteristics.

Kouzes and Posner (1993) stated personality features were influential in the public's perception of individuals as leaders. Brown et al. (1988) categorized Canadians' opinions regarding leadership characteristics as: competence, dynamism, integrity, empathy, responsibility, personal style, political skills, episodic judgment, social background, political position. Gore (1985) listed the features of an ideal leader as: positive behavioral attitudes, courage, decisiveness, dedication, trustworthiness, desire, ability to take the initiative, argumentative, possessing a sense of justice, unselfish, knowledgeable, passionate, truthful, able to move quickly, and the ability to make accurate decisions. Thompson and Stickland (1998) added the terms cultural architect and source creator.

When leader types are considered, the first that comes to mind is the charismatic leader, with its polar opposite, the imprudent leader. In terms of politics, there are autocratic, theocratic, monarchic, and democratic leadership styles. Every age, group, and society may have a unique type of leader, and each type can create a different form of success, behavioral patterns, and attitudes within the group members. Arikan (2001) divided leaders into four categories: transformational, charismatic, coaching and women. According to Carvell (1975), leaders fall into three groups: theocratic, democratic, and fatherly. Theocratic leaders are the voice of authority, whereas democratic and fatherly leaders are much less controlling of their subordinates. Leaders have also been categorized according to the size of the group they oversaw – either personal leaders or managerial leaders, and according to their positions - either positive or negative leaders (Koksal, 1972) as cited in Gore (1985). Canitez (1988) divided leaders into four categories: authoritarian leaders, consultative (supportive) leaders, participatory leaders and freeing leaders. Evans (cited in Canitez, 1988) agreed, with the exception of freeing leaders, replacing them with success-oriented leaders.

Lewin, Lippitt, and White identified three major leader styles (Gore, 1985):

- a. Autocratic leaders are oppressive, dictating, unreasonable but emotional, aggressive, belligerent and harsh. Autocratic leaders want subordinates to do exactly what they are told to do; subordinates are not allowed to affect the decisions of the leader. Autocratic leaders have tremendous power and authority, and use threats to get a job done.
- b. Democratic leaders bring issues to the group for resolution as much as possible, forming a collective policy together. Democratic leaders choose to be role models, and convince others instead of applying authoritarian force and threats. Subordinates are made to feel worthy through acknowledgement of their feelings, recognition of their ideas, and participation in the decision making process.
- c. Noncommittal (Neutral) leaders contribute to the decision-making process to a very limited extent. Members have total freedom regarding group activities and organizations. The noncommittal leader does not intervene, serving as a passive figure of authority.

Another recognized type worthy of mentioning is "charismatic" leadership. Max Weber (N.A., 2009) viewed charismatic leadership as "resting on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism, or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him." Weber defined charisma as "a certain quality of an individual personality, by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. Charismatic leaders are those rare individuals who are perceived to have extraordinary spiritual and/or physical gifts. In Turkish history, Atatürk has been identified as a charismatic leader. Creative leadership was defined by Harris (2009), Stoll and Temperly (2009) as a form of "servant leadership," wherein the main leadership task was to connect different people, ideas and ways of thinking. Creative leadership strives to develop the capabilities and capacities of all those within the organization, so that creativity wherever it occurs on whatever scale, can be captured, supported and enhanced. Creative leadership is considered "leadership without ego."

Leadership perceptions

According to Bauer and Green (1996), personality similarities between a leader and his or her followers impact perceptions about that leader. Turban and Jhones' (1988) investigation also suggested that, similarities in personalities have an effect on an individual's evaluation of a leader. Simons (1962) found

that great military leaders and their ideas influenced the perceptions of trainees in military schools. Military trainees had positive perceptions of important military figures in history, such as Napoleon Bonaparte and Alexander the Great. Turkish youth also held positive views of Atatürk and Mehmed the Conqueror because of the leaders' success both in the military and political arenas.

According to Albritton et al. (2008) people generally have common set of beliefs about the characteristics leaders should possess. The authors also reported that, an individual is more likely to be viewed as a leader, if that individual is perceived to match a follower's leader prototype. Shertzer and Schuh (2004) and Rost (1993) categorized leadership perceptions into two paradigms, industrial and postindustrial. Komives et al. (1998) labeled the industrial paradigm as the "myths" of leadership. According to these researchers, the "myths" of leadership included three characteristics: (a) leaders are born and not made, (b) one needs charisma to be an effective leader, and (c) there is one standard way of leading. Rogers (1996) in turn, defined the postindustrial paradigm: (a) leadership is based on relationships, and does not belong to any individual, (b) leadership is meant to create change, and (c) leadership can be done by anyone, not only by people who are designated leaders. Shertzer and Schuh (2004), in their investigation of student perceptions about leadership, found four commonalities: (a) leadership is an individual possession, (b) leadership is positional, (c) leaders possess particular qualities and skills, (d) leaders act from internal motivations.

METHODS

This research, the blind pursuit of an existing situation due to a descriptive study. Content analysis method employed. Content analysis of data collected to explain the concepts and relationships to reach the objective (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2005). Open-ended questions, the answers will be reserved frequencies. This research is a descriptive study. Leaders mentioned in high school history courses are often viewed by Turkish students either as positive role models or as perpetrators of negative deeds. This study searched for answers to the following questions:

1. Which leaders are high school students informed about in history courses?
2. Which characteristics of these leaders do they find positive/approve of?
3. Which leaders would they not like to be, and why?
4. Which characteristics do the students expect to be inherent in a leader?
5. Into how many categories do the students divide the leaders?

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of a history course in influencing Turkish high school students' identification of leaders as role models, leaders they do not sympathize with, and the rationale behind their decisions. Student opinions regarding desirable characteristics of a leader were also assessed. Data was collected from three sources in order to better clarify students' perceptions, and for triangulating purposes. The primary source

of data was from an open-ended unstructured questionnaire, used to identify students' views regarding leadership. Questions were prepared with the guidance of five specialists. The questionnaire was piloted twice with 15 students in each test group. Two questions that showed different viewpoints in the first and the second pilot studies were excluded from the final questionnaire. Participants of the study were 63 female and 53 male students from a Turkish high school in the city of Adiyaman during the 2007 to 2008 academic year. A second source of data was derived from an analysis of the curriculum. All high school history books were investigated to determine which leaders were recognized. The third source of data consisted of 20 high school history teachers' views regarding how they teach about leaders in history courses.

Two high schools from Adiyaman were chosen for the research. In the participant schools, history instructors gave an overview of the purpose of the study to the students, and asked for volunteer participants who were interested in history. Identical questionnaires were distributed to the student participants, who were told they could answer the questions in any order, and were not obliged to answer all of the questions. Analysis of the results was primarily done in a descriptive manner. According to Wiersma (2000), careful attention to the details is a very important part in the questionnaire analysis. Results were summarized in tables with the numbers and the percentages of the common responses.

FINDINGS

Curriculum analysis and history teachers' views

In high school history courses, which cover the prehistoric ages to the end of World War II, Turkish and world history has been taught through political, cultural, social, and economical perspectives. The following common statements were expressed by the 20 high school history teacher participants:

"I always mention leaders who are relevant to the subject of the lesson."

"If students ask questions, I try to give detailed explanations and information about the specific leaders who are mentioned in the lesson."

"While I am relating past events in history to recent events, I provide a comparison of features of past and present leaders."

"I always discuss relevant leaders when I teach about different types of regimes" (Table 1).

Participants defined a risk-taking leader as someone who was courageous, self-confident, success-oriented, determined, able to produce fast and accurate solutions to problems, and able to convince his/her people. Additional student perspectives included: A risk-taking leader fights for his/her people with all his/her power, despite knowing that death awaits at the end and takes any necessary course of action on the battlefield. Great success comes with great risks. To be successful in life, one must take risks. If a leader can take risks, it shows s/he is self-confident and knows what s/he is doing. S/he can also claim to be fearless.

One student said the following of Osman the Young:

Table 1. In history lessons, which leaders have you learned about who were willing to take risks when dealing with conflict?

Name of the leader	Time series						Total N
	High school 1 female	High school 1 male	High School 2 female	High school 2 male	High school 3 female	High school 3 male	
Kemal Atatürk	15	2	11	7	12	7	54
Mehmed the Conqueror	2	1	10	6	5	7	31
Alexander the Great	2	1	1	3	1	4	12
Enver Pasha	0	1	1	1	0	0	3

Table 2. In history lessons, which leaders have you learned about who affected people’s lives negatively by making bad decisions?

Name of the leader	Time series						Total N
	High school 1 female	High school 2 male	High school 2 female	High school 2male	High school 3 female	High school 3 male	
Sadrazam Damat Ferit Pasha	5	6	3	4	5	5	28
Sultan Vahdettin	2	8	4	2	2	2	20
Enver Pasha	3	1	7	1	3	2	17
Adolph Hitler	0	1	0	3	1	2	7
II. Abdülhamit	1	1	0	0	4	0	6
Genghis Khan	0	0	2	2	0	0	4
II.Beyazıt	0	0	1	0	0	2	3
Cem Sultan	0	0	1	0	0	2	3
Some Ottoman Sultans	0	0	0	2	0	1	3
Yavuz Sultan Selim	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Timur	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Çerkez Ethem	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Nevşehirli Damat İbrahim Pasha	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
IV. Murat	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Süleiman the Magnificent	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Egypt’s Pharaohs	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
II. Selim	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Czar Peter Romanov	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

“He rose to the throne at an early age. He tried to abolish the janissary (the Turkish sultan’s elite personal guard) despite many obstacles. He tried to implement reforms, but was eventually killed. He even risked his life in order to accomplish his ideals.”

Another student commented on Atatürk and Mehmed the Conqueror:

“Atatürk made the soldiers fight for their lives along with him. His last order was “I am not ordering you to fight; I am ordering you to die.” Mehmed the Conqueror ordered his followers to drag ships from the land to conquer Istanbul. Had he not been able to drag the ships from the land, he would not have been able to conquer Istanbul. But he took the risk and won Table 2.”

Some student responses included the following:

Regarding Hitler, they stated, “He burned people alive.

He exterminated the Jews and carried out inhumane implementations. He was a dictator and a racist.”

As for Enver Pasha, students held him accountable for the deaths of 90,000 soldiers who froze to death in Sarikamish, believing if Pasha had considered the weather conditions; such a huge amount of lives would not have been lost. Due to his German sympathies, Pasha forced Turkey to take part in WW I. The students also believed Pasha to have been a dreamer. Of Sultan Vahdettin, the students said: He fled the country while it was in its most vulnerable and helpless state, leaving a nation to its own destiny. He valued his own interests more than he valued the interests of the country. He sold our land and blindly obeyed the orders of other countries’ leaders. He cooperated with occupying forces and brought about the fall of the Ottoman Empire. Grand Vizier Damat Ferit Pasha was identified as someone who was selfish and insolvent enough to subject the country

Table 3. In history lessons, which leaders affected people's futures positively with their decisions?

Name of the leader	Time series						Total N
	Lycee 1 female	Lycee 1 male	Lycee 2 female	Lycee 2 male	Lycee 3 female	Lycee 3 male	
Kemal Atatürk	8	8	16	12	13	12	69
Mehmet the Conqueror	4	6	5	4	4	5	28
Alparslan Türkeş	1	0	2	2	3	1	9
Yavuz Sultan Selim	0	0	1	0	3	4	8
İsmet İnönü	1	2	0	1	0	0	3
II. Mahmut	0	0	0	2	0	1	3
Süleiman the Magnificent	0	0	2	0	0	1	3
III. Selim	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Sokullu Mehmet Pasha	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
IV. Murat	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Yıldırım Beyazıt	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Atilla the Hun	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Che Guevera	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

to British mandates during the Independence War by valuing his own interests more than the interests of the country.

Additional student commentary regarding leaders included the following: Circassian Ethem disturbed the unity of Turkey, Suleyman the Magnificent signed the Capitulation, Selim II brought the Ottoman expansion to a standstill, Grand Vizier Damat Ibrahim Pasha of Nevsehir made superfluous expenditures and thought primarily of his own welfare, Tamerlane defeated Yildirim Beyazıt, and Ghengis Khan massacred many people (Table 3). The students attributed many positive attributes to Atatürk including the establishment of the Turkish Republic, military success in Canakkale, raising Turkey to the level of modern civilization, reforms, his dedication, his leadership in the "Independence War" and his loyalty. Atatürk, the students said, desired the republic to be long lasting, and through his reforms, made it possible for the country to be ruled as a democracy, and set principles that would support the commonwealth by abolishing institutions such as royalty and caliphate. Of Mehmed the Conqueror, the students remarked, "He conquered Istanbul despite all the hardships and reached his goal by sticking to his decisions and course of action, which deeply affected us. He applied an allowance policy and set an example for the whole world in this respect."

Regarding other leaders, the students believed that Yavuz Sultan Selim expanded the country's borders in a very short time to an area three times larger than it was prior to his reign. Murat IV was perceived as caring for the health of his people because he banned smoking and alcohol. Che Guevera was lauded for fighting for the independence of his people. Mahmut II was noted for his abolishment of the janissary, and Selim III was thought to have done beneficial reforms for his people. In general,

the students saw these leaders as making breakthroughs in their time and carrying their societies into the future. In response to the question, "In how many categories can you group the leader types in Turkish history?" the students defined positive leaders as patriotic, good, foresighted and serving the people, while they labeled negative leaders as selfish, cowardly, traitors, and working for their own interests. Other categorizations included those like Atatürk, those unlike Atatürk, those for EU and those against EU. One student divided the leader types into two periods - before and after the caliph (a title taken by Turkish sultans). The leader types identified by the student were: a. terrible, b. disaster, c. weak, d. bad, e. mediocre, f. competent, g. qualified, h. very good, i. excellent j. gigantic, k. perfect, l. worldwide, m. utopist (Table 4). Castro and Guevera were seen as role models, since they fought for their country and never gave up, regardless of the results. The majority of the participants viewed Atatürk as among the best leaders in the world, and believed his leadership was accepted by everyone. Atatürk was seen as having universal ideas. Gandhi was declared to have fought for the independence of his country. In general, students were impressed by the dedicated and endeavoring nature of these leaders (Table 5).

The least favorable leader was Bush, followed by Hitler. The third year students' views about Sarkozy were particularly unfavorable. The effect of Iraq politics, which also impacted Turkey's foreign policies, were revealed in the students' dislike of Bush, Barzani, and Talabani. Students disliked Hitler because of his treatment of humans and his massacres in concentration camps. Bush was viewed as waging war for no apparent reason, causing bloodshed, and giving orders to Turkish leaders. One student said of Napoleon, "Napoleon did not know

Table 4. Who are your five favorite leaders in the world's history?

Name of the leader	Time series						Total N
	Lycee 1 female	Lycee 1 male	Lycee 2 female	Lycee 2 male	Lycee 3 female	Lycee 3 male	
Kemal Atatürk	2	7	8	5	8	9	39
Mehmet the Conqueror	3	4	4	2	5	8	26
Alexander the Great	1	1	2	1	2	1	8
Nelson Mandela	0	0	3	1	3	1	8
Che Guevara	1	0	0	2	1	3	7
Fidel Castro	1	0	0	2	0	1	4
Genghis Kahn	2	0	1	1	0	0	4
Napoleon Bonaparte	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
Mahatma Gandhi	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Julius Caesar	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Enver Sedat	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Adolph Hitler	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Vladimir Lenin	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Harun Reşit	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Cleopatra	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
William J. Clinton	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Lech Walesa	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Haydar Aliyev	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Zülfikar Ali Butto	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mikhail Gorbachev	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Buddha	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Ziya-ür-Rahman	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Muhammet Ali Cinnah	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
John F. Kennedy	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
George W. Bush	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Hugo Chavez	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Saddam Hüssein	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Saakaşvili	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

that there are no pockets in a coffin, “Money, money, money”. There is no end to it.” In summation, the students disliked leaders who favored their own benefits, and liked leaders who served humanity and brought about peace and harmony (Table 6). Students wanted a leader who was honest, farsighted, caring of the people, just, patriotic, fair, tolerant and hardworking. They saw evil leaders as dishonest, unfair, cunning, acting on other countries’ directions, unprogressive, and incapable. When asked which leader in the history they would like to be, a majority of the students named Atatürk. Mehmed the Conqueror was the second most popular answer.

RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In history courses, the characteristics of the leaders mentioned varied according to the era. In Turkish Revolution History and Kemalism classes that focused on

the Republic period, democratic, peacemaker, fair and secular leader types were observed. When the subject matter focused on countries that were not governed with democracy, leaders were seen as autocratic, totalitarian, monarchic, and tyrannical. According to student responses, only successful leaders could assure adaptation to continuously changing developments in the world. There was a yearning for leaders who come once in a hundred years, leading masses, working for the people, positive, foresighted, visionary, courageous, guiding, and able to take risks.

In student responses, statements such as treason and traitor, not favoring for his/her own benefits, caring for the people were abundantly present. The popular press has also played an important role in the formation of such concepts. The concept of leadership is an important issue for our country with its young population. Leaders the students are to be familiarized with should be qualified enough to benefit the society. Almost all of the participants

Table 5. Name five leaders you do not admire in the history of the world.

Name of the Leader	Time series						Total N
	Lycee1 female	Lycee1 male	Lycee2 female	Lycee2 male	Lycee3 female	Lycee3 male	
George W. Bush	6	3	9	11	12	10	51
Adolph Hitler	6	3	12	10	9	9	49
Barzani	1	0	2	2	5	4	14
Jelal Talabani	0	1	3	1	4	4	13
Nicolas Sarkozy	0	0	0	0	3	6	9
Winston Churchill	1	0	1	2	1	2	7
Benito Mussolini	5	0	0	1	0	0	6
Saddam Hussein	1	0	1	1	1	1	5
Genghis Khan	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Muawiyya ibn Ebu- Sufyan	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
Napoleon Bonaparte	1	0	0	0	0	2	3
Julius Caesar	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Alexander the Great	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Pharaohs of Egypt	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Şarlken	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Yezid ibn Muawiyya	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Mao Tse-tung	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Table 6. Which characteristics do you look for in a good leader?

Characteristics	Time series						Total N
	Lycee1 female	Lycee1 male	Lycee2 female	Lycee2 male	Lycee3 female	Lycee3 male	
Honesty	4	2	7	6	8	9	36
Far-sighted	3	3	7	7	6	7	33
Keens on public, loves his nation	0	1	5	5	8	4	23
Hardworking	2	2	4	2	6	0	16
Fair, equal to people	2	0	3	4	5	2	16
Smart	2	1	4	3	3	2	15
Tolerant, doesn't talk abruptly	2	1	1	4	5	2	15
Fearless, brave	0	0	4	2	4	1	11
Contemporary	3	0	2	2	1	0	8
Speaks effectively	0	1	0	2	3	2	8
Atatürkist, secular, has Atatürk principals	3	0	0	1	2	0	6
Self-confident	2	0	1	0	1	2	6
Handsome	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Raises salaries 75 %	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

were fans of Atatürk and Mehmed the Conqueror. Among the evil/bad leaders, Bush and Hitler were at the top of the list. Students viewed Atatürk as a complete leader because he gathered and led masses, and impressed them with his principles and revolution. Among the unfavorable leaders in the history of the world were dictators such as Hitler. However, Mussolini, who lived at the same time as Hitler, was seldom mentioned. This

may be an indicator of views students hold regarding leaders who are popular and covered in the media. Students wanted leaders who will not deceive them. Sincerity and honesty were desirable virtues. Rather than classifying leaders as charismatic, fatherly, autocratic and democratic, as in the literature, students based their judgments on their emotional value systems. It can be concluded from the student responses that leaders who

serve people and affect their lives positively were appreciated and admired, whereas selfish, tyrannical, mindless, and uncaring leaders were not.

Recommendations

1. Students should be provided with the biographies of the leaders they learn about in history courses.
2. Students should not only be taught about Turkish leaders, but also leaders from world history to enable them to compare and contrast leaders' deeds from a broader perspective.
3. Students should be asked to assess good and bad leaders in history courses, and reflect upon the psychological states of those leaders.
4. Students should be guided to learn about different topics and leaders from additional sources other than course books.
5. Students should be knowledgeable about democratic, theocratic, autocratic, and monarchic leaders in order to be able to discriminate between them.
6. Using history as a vehicle in teaching positive and negative leadership values, students should be encouraged to comprehend the distinctions based upon their personal values.
7. Those who aspire to be good leaders now and in the future should analyze past leaders, recognize their social, political, military, and psychological features, and become aware of both their positive and negative aspects.

REFERENCES

- Albritton MD, Oswald SL, Anderson JS (2008). Leadership Quality and Follower Affect: a Study of U.S. Presidential Candidates, *J. Leadership Stud.*, 1(4): 6-22.
- Arkan S (2001). Leadership, (Ed: S. Guney), Management and Organization (285-296). Nobel Publication Distribution, Ankara.
- Baltas A (2001). Teamwork and Leadership, Remzi Bookshop, Istanbul.
- Bass BM (1990). Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications. New York: The Free Press.
- Bauer TN, Green SG (1996). Development of Leader-Member Exchange: A Longitudinal Test. *Acad. Manage. J.*, 39(6): 1538-1567.
- Booher SA, Watson CB (1999). Common Traits of Leaders: An Introduction to "Classic" Leadership Theory, with a Twist, the Institute for Leadership Dynamics.
- Brown SD, Lambert RD, Kay BJ, Curtis JE (1998). In the Eye of the Beholder: Leader Images in Canada *Canadian J. Pol. Sci. / Revue Canadienne de Science Politique*, 21(4): 729-755.
- Canitez E (1988). The Effects of Organizational Communication in the Organization of Various Types in Leadership, Ege University Institute of Social Sciences, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Izmir.
- Carvell FJ (1975). *Human Relations in Business*, New York: Macmillan Publisher.
- Demircioglu IH (2005). 8th grade students' levels of understanding of some concepts regarding time and chronology used in the teaching of history, *Eurasian J. Educ. Res.*, 19: 155-163.
- Dietzer B, Shilliff K, Jucius M (1979). *Contemporary Management Concepts*, Grid Publishing, Inc.
- Eren E (2000). *Psychology of Organizational and Behavior Management*, Beta Publications, Istanbul.
- Gore K (1985). Leadership, Gazi University, Institute of Social Sciences, Unpublished Master's Thesis.
- Harris A (2009). *Creative Leadership: Developing Future Leaders*. *Manage. Educ.*, 23(1): 9-11.
- Kocel T (1984). *Business Management*, Istanbul University, Graduate School of Business and Economics Publications, Istanbul.
- Komives SR, Lucas N, McMahon TR (1998). *Exploring Leadership: for College Students Who Want to Make a Difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes J, Posner B (1993). *Credibility: How Leaders Gain and Lose It Why People Demand It*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers n.a. The Tripartite Classification of Authority. Explanation of Charismatic Leadership of Weber and others. ("22") (20.03.2009). http://www.12manage.com/methods_weber_charismatic_leadership.html
- Middlebrooks AE, Haberkorn JT (2009). Implicit Leader Development: The Mentor Role as Prefatory Leadership Context, *J. Leadership Stud.*, 2(4): 7-22.
- Shertzer JE, Schuh JH (2004). College Student Perceptions of Leadership: Empowering and Constraining Beliefs *NASPA J.*, 42(1): 111-131.
- Stoll L, Temperley J (2009). Creative Leadership Teams: Capacity Building and Succession Planning, *Mgt. Educ.*, 23(1): 12-18.
- Sisman M (2002). *Instructional Leadership*, Pegem A Publications, Ankara.
- Rogers JL (1996). Leadership. In S. R. Komives and D. B. Woodward (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (3. ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 299-319
- Rost JC (1993). Leadership development in the new millennium. *J. Leadership Stud.*, 1: 91-110.
- Thompson AA, Stickland AJ (1998). *Crafting and Implementing Strategy*, Irwin, McGraw Hill Co.Nc.
- Turban DB, Jhones AP (1988). Supervisor Subordinate Similarity: Types, Effects, and Mechanisms. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 73: 228-234.
- Wiersma W (2000). *Research Methods in Education: An Introduction*. Needham Heights MA: Allyn & Bacon - A Pearson Education Company.
- Simons W (1962). The Study of History and the Military Leader, *Military Affairs*, 26(1): 22-27.
- Yigit R (2002). Ways of Being a Good Leader, *Cumhuriyet University J. Nursing*, 6(1): 16-21. (<http://www.coach4growth.com/good-leadership-skills/characteristicsofaleader.html>) The Characteristics of a Leader: Demonstrating Good Leadership Skills (20.03.2009).
- Yildirim A, Simsek H (2005). *Qualitative Research Methods in Social Sciences*, Ankara: Seckin Publishing.