

ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ

The Leadership Styles Atatürk Displayed within the Framework of Bush and Glover's Nine Models of Leadership

Kenan AKARSLAN¹

ABSTRACT

Atatürk is recognized and taught as a great leader in Turkey and the world. It can be observed that his leadership was first acclaimed internationally after Çanakkale or Gallipoli wars. The studies on Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's leadership types adopt one perspective or another and analyse his leadership accordingly. The main aim of this article is to delve into more number of leadership models Atatürk displayed throughout his life. Therefore, it takes Bush and Glover's (2003) nine leadership models, which they compiled benefitting from Leithwood et al (1999), as the basis and these models are summarized and explained briefly. Relevant themes appearing from the events in and biographical or autobiographical records of Atatürk's life are provided to investigate and exemplify the leadership models he embodied.

Keywords: Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, leadership, models of leadership, transformational leadership, instructional leadership

Bush ve Glover 'ın dokuz liderlik modeli çerçevesinde Atatürk 'ün sergilediği liderlik stilleri

ÖZET

Atatürk Türkiye'de ve dünyada büyük bir lider olarak tanınmakta ve öğretilmektedir. Liderliğinin uluslararası alanda ilk kez Çanakkale veya Gelibolu savaşlarından sonra kabul gördüğü gözlemlenebilir. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk'ün liderlik stilleri üzerine yapılan çalışmalar şu ya da bu açıları benimsemekte ve liderliğini buna göre analiz etmektedir. Bu makalenin temel amacı, Atatürk'ün yaşamı boyunca sergilediği daha fazla sayıda liderlik modelini incelemektir. Bu nedenle, Bush ve Glover'in (2003) Leithwood ve diğerlerinden (1999) yararlanarak derledikleri dokuz liderlik modeli esas alınmakta ve bu modeller özetlenerek kısaca açıklanmaktadır. Atatürk'ün gösterdiği liderlik modellerini incelemek ve örneklandırmek için hayatındaki olaylardan ve biyografik veya otobiyografik kayıtlardan ortaya çıkan ilgili temalar sunulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, liderlik, liderlik modelleri, dönüşümsel liderlik, eğitimsel liderlik

¹ Öğr. Gör., Adana Alparslan Türkeş Bilim ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, Yabancı Diller Bölümü, Adana. kakarslan@atu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-9022-2472.

INTRODUCTION

According to Piccirilli (2016), the loss of the war in Çanakkale, or the Gallipoli, is considered as a tremendous defeat for the Allies during the First World War. On the other hand, it is seen as the emergence of a great leader, Mustafa Kemal, who was later given the surname Atatürk (the Father of the Turks) by the Turkish surname law in 1934. As Piccirilli states (Ibid.), this campaign was an opportunity for the Allies to unlock the door to consolidate their support to the Russian Empire. However, it appears to be a turning point in the history of Turkey and her savior Mustafa Kemal. Not many people may have forecast that Mustafa Kemal would be the leader of the Turkish national resistance, but this campaign had even taught Churchill how important Mustafa Kemal was important (Mango, 2000). Although he had won many battles in his career as a soldier, this victory raised Mustafa Kemal's popularity throughout the country as well as among other countries in the world.

His emergence in battles in Çanakkale wars marked his outstanding features as a leader. Piccirilli (2016) supports that Mustafa Kemal embodied the leadership principles of 'taking initiative leading by example, motivating and inspiring others' and that he can be taken as an example of leadership literally, a leadership that can change the course of history. The leadership features he displayed during the war is not limited to the war scenes. They can be extended to all parts of his life whether educational, political or economical.

There are many studies which focus on the analysis of Atatürk's leadership. For instance, Culpan (2009) explores his transformative leadership whereas Erdem (n.d.) delves into his educational leadership which he sees as an important factor in educational development. Derman (2020) examines Atatürk's leadership in a wider context after explaining the historical development of the leadership theories (see also: Hai, Moiden & Mohaiyadin, 2019).

Before investigating the leadership types, however, the term leadership must be explained further. The term has been studied on and various definitions do exist for leadership to the extent that, according to Derman (2020), leadership is confused with management and occasionally used synonymously, which are fundamentally different. Leadership can be defined within the perspective of goal setting and persuading individuals to behave in expected ways (Axtman, 1998; Gallagher, 2016) whereas Bass focuses on the social aspect of leadership and defines it as a process of social exchange between leaders and their followers (1994). According to Derman (2020):

“Hundreds of definitions have been made in the literature about the phenomenon of leadership. Thousands of academic researches have been made on the concept of leadership and hundreds of definitions have been added to the literature. All scientists doing research in this field have made a description. If it is necessary to make a general definition of leadership, it can be said that it is an energetic process that enables

individuals to adopt and realize common goals in a willing and enthusiastic way by bringing together them within the framework of a jointly created vision.”

Management, on the other hand, is seen as related to ‘systems and paper’ but the development of members (Day, Harris and Hadfield, 2001). The dichotomy between paperwork or managerial issues and personal development creates a tension according to Bush (2003), and he links leadership to values or purposes while management to technical issues.

According to Cuban (1988), at least 350 definitions of leadership exist. As a result, it can be alleged that the definitions provided, day by day, contributes to the complexity and ambiguity of the term. However, we may observe one common element in majority of the definitions: influence (see: Leithwood et al.,1999; Ogawa and Bossert, 1995; Yukl, 2002). There are also studies which relate leadership closely to values (Greenfield and Ribbins, 1993; Wasserberg, 1999) while some others see vision and leadership side by side (Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Southworth 1997).

As this article takes Bush and Glover's (2003) leadership models as the basis, their definition of leadership must be understood to see what is meant by the term throughout the text. Although they defined leadership in educational context, it can be adopted for different contexts as well:

Leadership is a process of influence leading to the achievement of desired purposes. Successful leaders develop a vision for their schools based on their personal and professional values. They articulate this vision at every opportunity and influence their staff and other stakeholders to share the vision. The philosophy, structures and activities of the school are geared towards the achievement of this shared vision. (Bush and Glover, 2003).

Considering all the variations in definitions and terms related by scholars to leadership, there is a need to adopt a framework to explain the leadership types Atatürk displayed. Bush and Glover (2002) investigated some models and came up with a summary of models where they presented an adaptation of Leithwood et al's (1999) typology which originally included six models from their research. Bush and Glover (2003) added two more models as they felt that flourishing literature on leadership ‘has generated a number of alternative and competing, models.’ Consequently, they have generated the following typology including nine leadership models: *Instructional*, *Transformational*, *Transactional*, *Moral*, *Participative*, *Managerial*, *Post-modern*, *Interpersonal* and *Contingent leadership* models. How these models, their definition and explanation will be used is provided in the subsequent part.

1. METHODOLOGY

The methodology of this study is based on qualitative method. The information and data are obtained from secondary sources such as books, journals, and articles. According to Bush & Glover (2003), the research has produced a lot of types and models of leadership. The studies on Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's leadership types adopt one perspective or another and analyse his leadership accordingly (see Çulpan, 2009;

Esteban n.d.; Güney, 1992; Hai et al, 2019). However, this article aims to identify the leadership types Mustafa Kemal Atatürk displayed according to the nine leadership models presented in Bush & Glover (2003). The models are summarized and explained briefly and matching relevant themes appearing from the events in and biographical or autobiographical records of Atatürk's life are tried to be provided to investigate and exemplify the leadership models.

2. LEADERSHIP MODELS AND ATATÜRK

2.1. Instructional Leadership and Atatürk

Leithwood et al. (1999) posit that instructional leadership critically focuses on the behavior where 'leaders engage in affecting the growth of' others. Sheppard (1996) differentiates between instructional leadership and administration and advocates that actions in this leadership have direct relations with teaching and learning and in a wider sense instructional leadership entails all leadership activities. This broader sense, according to Southworth (2002), enables other leaders to play a role and therefore recognizes how organizations operate. He also defines instructional leadership as a strategic perspective that paves the way to benefit from all resources available. According to Leithwood et al (1999), both the expert knowledge and formal authority is needed to lead followers. Bush (2003) supports that in educational contexts leaders' ultimate aim is the students which they manage to achieve by training teachers. Similarly, a leader in a broader sense may try to educate his immediate followers with an aim to educate the public. Bush (2003) also adds that the focus is on the 'direction and impact of influence' but the 'process'.

Erdem (n.d.) focused on Atatürk's educational leadership in his article. He focused on Atatürk's educational reforms:

As an education leader, Atatürk correctly diagnosed errors and malfunctions in education and, accordingly, made radical changes in the education system by implementing them himself.

Erdem (n.d.) emphasized that "schools are expected both to be a leader and raise leaders" who might consist of not only from administrator at every level, inspectors, class teachers but also sometimes from students. He supported that educational leadership atmosphere is determined by the expectations of their followers and therefore educational leaders need to be knowledgeable and versatile. He also established a connection between educational development and a good leadership. He concluded that Atatürk displayed educational leadership by 'making accurate observations and evaluations, bringing principles about education and making radical changes.' He did this by actively involving in the process as an instructor and a trainer. For instance, Atatürk actively participated in educational congresses one of which took place in July, 1921. According to Kapluhan (2015), this congress is the turning point in Turkey's educational history where Atatürk explained his thoughts on the principles to be adopted in reforms as well as his ideas about and expectations from teachers.

This congress was as important as the War of Independence for the Turkish Nation. Erdem (n.d.) gave a few other examples from Atatürk's tours around the country such as Konya in March, 1923 and Rize where he shared his ideas about education.

There are many other examples which show that Atatürk was an active instructional leader. He knew that a new alphabet was crucial for his nation to understand and learn better their own language, history and culture, which would result in the achievement of the goal to catch up and keep up with modern societies. After his Alphabet Revolution, Mert (2017) conveys that he was a teacher at the blackboard and he taught to teachers, scientists and the members of the parliament. He also encouraged them to teach the public and received a lot of support from both the press and the public. Mert (2017) includes that Tekirdağ was the first of the cities where Atatürk taught the new alphabet. "In that time, love and trust that Tekirdağ's people showed towards to Ghazi [Atatürk] and sincerity in learning Turkish Alphabet, increased Ghazi's perseverance and courage about realization of Alphabet Revolution."

Atatürk did not only focus on teachers, the public but also the forerunners of the nation. He sent many talented students abroad as he wanted to start a university reform. Erdem (2012) says:

Atatürk gave attention to universities, students and academic staffs. After proclaiming the republic, Atatürk sent talented students to universities abroad in order to achieve the 'university reform'. Beforehand, Professor Albert Malche, a pedagogue at Switzerland Geneva University, was invited to Turkey and requested to draw up a report based on the investigation about İstanbul Darülfünun. TBMM approved the establishment of İstanbul University affiliated to the National Education Department by the law 2252 on 31st of May 1933. By the university reform, new higher education institutions were established to implement plans. During this reform, Jewish academicians escaped from German as a result of Nazi regime supported the establishments of scientific, modern and democratic universities.

Mustafa Kemal loved to teach and learn at the same time. He used to love reading books which he had never neglected even during the wars he fought. According to Özdil (2018), "His appetite for learning was insatiable. Reading was like breathing to him... Before the battle of Dumlupınar, the entries in his diary included: 'I got up early in the morning and read a book... İsmet Paşa left. I'll read and then go to bed... I am alone I'll read a book for a while". He used to read Diderot, J.J.Rousseau, and books about Islam, the history of the Ottomans as well as poems (p.290). He used to ask his friends to send books so that he could read. He read more than 4000 books. He learned French after he started the military school and took private language lessons. He had many guests for dinner from different backgrounds and professions with whom he enjoyed discussing various subjects about history, science, politics and so on. There also used to be chalks and a blackboard by the table (see Bayar, 2009; Özdil, 2018; Yurdakul, 2008, Yurdakul, 2009). He tried to teach people around by writing books the number of which was 11 including Nutuk that he wrote in three months and read it aloud in six days in the parliament (Özdil, 2018, p. 292).

As a result, by engaging others to get involved in the teaching and learning process, as well as himself, Atatürk displayed the features of the instructional leadership model in which a leader attaches importance to the 'growth of others' as suggested by Leithwood et al. (1999) and Sheppard (1996). Atatürk recognized the role of his followers in achieving his goals and enabled them to actively take part and this understanding is also parallel with Southworth's (2002) ideas about leaders. Atatürk's using each individual, every opportunity and almost every part of the country for educational reforms proves that he took a strategic perspective to benefit from all resources available. Atatürk used his knowledge he accumulated throughout his life and the formal authority he acquired following the struggle for Independence to motivate his followers. His main focus was the 'direction and impact of influence' in Bush's (2003) terms. In other words, Atatürk directed his attention to the improvement of the public and how this aim could be achieved or the 'process' was secondary to his aims.

2.2. Transformational and Transactional Leadership and Atatürk

Burns (1978) is alleged to be the creator of the term Transformational by Gunter (2001) and Allix (2000). Leithwood et al (1999) define Transformational Leadership as a type of leadership that emphasizes commitment and capacities of members. The more members are committed to organisational goals, the higher the capacity to achieve these goals will be as it brings more effort and therefore productivity. According to Miller and Miller (2001), if the commitment and the rise in the capacity to achieve goals is continuous until the transformation of the organisation has ended, then it could be concluded that transformational leadership occurs. On the other hand, if the process is more short-lived and the focus is on brief value exchanges between the leader and their follower, it is more related with Transactional Leadership. Moreover, in transformational leadership, unlike transactional leadership, the values and motives of the both sides merge (Ibid.). Sergiovanni (1992) makes a similar differentiation by focusing on the discrepancy between the length and scope of the objectives and a win win situation between the leader and their followers. In other words, transactional relations occur when an employee earns their salary or a type of reward after completing their tasks while in transformational leadership, the primary focus is on the welfare of the organisation with dependent objectives serving a broader end. According to Day et al (2001), success does not rely on either model but a combination of both. In order for a leader to be successful, specific objectives and more individualistic or occasional needs are to be met as well as long term and united goals so that a 'smooth' and well maintained system is ensured. The two models have been issued under the same title bearing this nuance of meaning in mind.

Transformational model is criticised by Chirichello (1999) and Allix (2000) as it may yield 'despotic' and 'normative' processes towards goals. They imply that the model may turn into a tool to control followers as it involves 'strong, heroic and charismatic

features' that may arouse doubt about its 'appropriateness for democratic organisations'. Allix (2000) further alleges that transformational model involves 'indoctrination of falsehoods and cultivation of ignorance' and therefore it might be used as a tool for 'psychological manipulation.'

Bush (2003) defines Transformational leadership as follows:

Transformational leadership describes a particular type of influence process based on increasing the commitment of followers to organisational goals. Leaders seek to engage the support of teachers for their vision for the school and to enhance their capacities to contribute to goal achievement. Its focus is on this process rather than on particular types of outcome. (p. 15)

Hai et al (2019) support that, as the "world's greatest strategist", Atatürk can be deemed as a transformational leader because he transformed and modernised Turkey (p.71). He displayed not only the characteristics of transformational but also transactional leadership. According to Esteban (n.d.), transformational leaders 'challenge organizational norms and status quo'. He started to challenge norms and the status quo even when he was a child. For instance, he faced two aspects of the society he was in during his childhood. One was a perspective represented the past and the other the future. According to Villalta (2014), his mother represented the past and his father the future and his destiny would be the soul of his nation's transformation. His mother, Zübeyde Hanım (note: 'hanım' is a title which means 'miss, lady or mistress' in Turkish, not the surname), was a pious woman who wanted to send Atatürk to a religious school while his father, Ali Rıza Bey, was a supporter of modern educational system adopted from Europe. Atatürk says (cited in Villalta, 2014), "My father...was a man of liberal views, rather than hostile to religion, and a partisan of Western ideas. He would have preferred to see me go to a lay school, which did not found its teaching on the Koran (the holy book of Muslims) but on the modern science." Atatürk and his father made Zübeyde hanım happy by sending him to Fatma Molla Kadın school. All students had to participate in a ceremony in which students progress through streets to their school. Zübeyde hanım was very happy to see her son in a white suit and wrapped in a white turban (Ibid.) His father took him from the school and sent him to Şemsi Efendi's modern school six months later. That was a school which followed European teaching methods. He chose the new norm he faced while not completely rejecting the former one that was represented by his kind, tender and virtuous mother, who lost six of her children and only sought safety for her only son. However, Mustafa Kemal opted for the new norm or the change by standing up to the status quo of his environment. The dilemmas Atatürk faced in his childhood would follow him all throughout his life, which they allowed him to transform continuously to a state that affected his nation, too.

Atatürk tried to change his environment. Before the First World War, he had met the Young Turks who also supported the modernisation of their country. He was an outspoken critic of the contexts he was in and he had a charismatic personality which

caused even his friends to be his enemies (Bay, 2013). Still, while challenging many, he managed to make his followers believe in and support him because, as Esteban (n.d.) states, ‘he was able to make his followers believe in the common vision of an independent Turkey national state in a short period of time (three years, from 1919 to 1922).’

Esteban (n.d.), defines a transformational leader as someone who leads people to change their perspectives. Atatürk was a leader who encouraged people to think differently even in the darkest moments. For example, he managed to convince his friends and then his people that a free country was possible even before he started the War of Independence. İstanbul was occupied on November, 13, 1918 and İzmir was occupied in on May, 15, 1919. As he explained the situation in Nutuk (his Great Speech), weapons and ammunition were taken from the army, the people were exhausted and impoverished because of the Great war (Özdil, 2018). Under these circumstances he believed that he could change the situation and envisaged a free country. As an instructional leader, which was discussed in the previous title, he addressed the youth in his Nutuk and explained the context he was in and how he overcame difficulties recommending them to believe in themselves to reverse unfavorable conditions (see the Nutuk, Great Speech, in English: Atatürk, 1963).

Apart from these, as a transformational leader, Atatürk always struggled to raise the commitment and capacities of members to boost productivity. As Bay (2011), supports, following all the difficulties, he gained respect from his friends and acquired new skills. He was a leader, he planned, negotiated and compromised when needed. He was angry with those who did not share their opinions with the and rebuke them by saying, “Don’t you have a head on your shoulder, don’t you have an opinion?” (Yurdakul, 2009, p. 231) and, in another occasion, in 1930, when Mustafa Kemal was the president of the republic, he called İnönü (from the governing CHP) and Fethi Bey (from the opposition party that was newly founded with Mustafa Kemal’s encouragement) and told them,

“I am now the father. You are both my sons. There is no difference between the two of you in my eyes. The only thing I wish is the issues to be discussed openly in the parliament. There are no issues that cannot be negotiated in the Turkish Grand National Assembly (TGNA) before the eyes of the public” (Ibid., p. 237-238).

These qualities served to boost the commitment and capacities of his followers. The examples are not limited to these circumstances. The congresses in Amasya, Sivas and Erzurum or the representatives he gathered in Ankara before the War of Independence proves his eagerness to involve all the capacity around him. Moreover, his insistence on a continuous transformational process until he made sure that the change is everlasting shows his transformational leader qualities. His reforms such as the abolishing of caliphate and the six basic principles adopted by the new republic served this main aim. He once said ‘One day my frail body will turn to dust, but the Republic of Turkey will live forevermore’ (Özdil, 2018). He accentuated that since he joined

the army his ultimate goal was an independent country which would survive for a long time.

As Esteban (n.d.) pointed out, the transactional leadership is more connected with management and it is a type of leadership which involves reward following the members achievement. At this point, he exemplifies Atatürk's use of this leadership style by dwelling on his famous words 'independence or death'. The reward and punishment are exposed within the expression. Atatürk involved himself while saying this as he was well aware of the fact that he was a member of the nation destined either to survive or die with them. It can be agreed that transactional leadership has some common aspects with management. Therefore, you may also refer to the Managerial Leadership model which is also discussed in detail.

2.3. Moral Leadership and Atatürk

The main focus of this model is on values and ethics in close connection with the principles adopted by the leaders about what is good or bad and from which the authority of the leader arises (see Leithwood et al, 1999 and Bush 2003). According to Bush (2003), values are central to this model and these values are 'derived from democratic theory'. Sergiovanni (1991) sees this model as close to the transformational model in that it implicates meaning beyond specific, short-term and independent objectives employed by transactional leadership model. West-Burnham (1997) uses the term 'moral confidence' that suggests the long-term consistency in the principles adopted or actions taken by a leader. He further discusses that moral leadership may be 'represented by religious affiliation' which he calls 'spiritual' approach or 'higher order perspectives'. To sum up, a moral leaders must have principles to follow and 'explain and justify' their decisions in morally and 'reinterpret and restate principles' when necessary (Ibid.).

When we consider principles or values there appear some key words related such as 'inclusivity, equal opportunities, equity or justice, high expectations, engagement with stakeholders, co-operation, teamwork, commitment and understanding' (Gold et al, 2002).

Bush (2003) elaborates on his understanding of the term as follows:

Moral leadership is based in the values and beliefs of leaders. The approach is similar to the transformational model but with a stronger values base, that may be spiritual. Moral leadership provides the school [or other contexts] with a clear sense of purpose (p. 17).

Atatürk embodied moral leadership principles and values. Inclusivity is one of the principles followed by such a leader. As mentioned earlier, Atatürk involved all stakeholders in his struggle for independence. Commitment of the followers to the cause was one important criterium to be included. Representatives were elected and sent to form the parliament accordingly. They, therefore, were given equal opportunities to contribute to the transformation process. According to Villalta (2014),

“a moslem woman was condemned to seclusion. She could only go out into the street covered from head to foot... It was not even permitted for her to walk through the streets at her husband’s side...after sunset no woman was allowed to be found in the public streets...the lord of the house... (could) punish her or expel her from the house whenever he wished.” Atatürk’s involving women in the struggle for independence and giving them the right to vote before many European countries justifies his inclusive, equal approach to his followers.

Inclusivity cannot only be practised by involving stakeholders in decision-making. Another way is to involve everyone in the promised end or in the ideal life envisaged by a leader. After the War of Independence, Atatürk continued practising this type of inclusivity by imposing some reforms. According to Bayar (2009), Atatürk aimed at achieving the superiority of his nation by including women in social, economical and political life through Code of Civil Law; by uniting the educational system to refuse the class distinctions and privileges exercised in the Ottoman era; by reforming clothing styles to attain equality of opportunities within the daily life of society (e.g., your clothes showed your social status); by changing the alphabet to make literacy available to all and easier to extend the scope of education to people so that increasing the level of the society from mere *believers* up to *thinkers* (p. 24).

The examples of equity and justice that Atatürk followed showed themselves in his commanding the army. A commander must not start to eat before their soldiers do or try to order food from outside, nor must they try to find a place to rest before they make sure their soldiers have found a place to rest (Atatürk, 2014, p.38). Here follows another event that exemplifies his sense of equity and justice with high expectations: Atatürk ordered his soldiers to die to save the country. However, he was aware that being a commander did not mean you would be an effective leader of your soldiers and having the authority to order would not always suffice. Bay (2011) gives an account of such an occasion. In one crucial instance during the Çanakkale wars, Mustafa Kemal witnessed that some soldiers were escaping from the enemies in panic. He ordered them to stop and fight. He was standing upright on top of a rock where he was in danger of being shot and which showed his courage to the soldiers. He had accounted and maintained his posture purposefully. He knew that if a commander showed weakness and escaped before his soldiers, so would they. In his book *Zabit ve Kumandan ile Hasbihal*, Mustafa Kemal had already warned commanders to attack the enemy before their soldiers and stay behind their soldiers during withdrawals. This principle proves that being fair or just against your followers or showing them, you are as equally ready for the outcomes of decisions as they are, you may lead them effectively. A final example is from Yurdakul (2008) who narrates a memory from Muzaffer Kılıç. On their way from Erzincan to Suşehri (Sivas) on August, 29, 1919, Mustafa Kemal and his convoy had to give a break as his car broke down. They had to spend the night in the forest as everywhere was full of bandits and spies. Atatürk made a plan to dispatch duties. Guarding the team through the night was a matter of life and

death. Despite all the oppositions, Atatürk allotted the most difficult part of the night watch (between 3-5) for himself (2009, p. 72- 73). The attitude Atatürk took is a proof that he was a leader who intimately believed in equal opportunities.

In summary, considering principles or values such as 'inclusivity, equal opportunities, equity or justice, high expectations, engagement with stakeholders, co-operation, teamwork, commitment and understanding' (Gold et al, 2002), we may conclude that Atatürk showed all of the principles and values of moral leadership model in his actions.

2.4. Participative Leadership and Atatürk

Participative leadership can be defined as involving members of groups rather than one person alone. The leadership is also available to any one in the group (Leithwood et al, 1999; Neuman & Simmons, 2000). Bush (2003) supports that problems in an institution may be solved in an interactive process which is complex and this type of leadership can also be called as 'distributed' or 'collegial' and is 'underpinned by democratic ideals'. Sergiovanni (1984) and Copland (2001) support that this type of leadership will not only bond the staff together but also alleviate the burden of single leaders. However, Webb and Vulliamy (1996) argue that a clash between participative/collegial/distributed leadership and 'top-down' management is inevitable. Still, as the world gets more and more complex, it can be advocated that 21st century imposes a more democratic way of leadership (Harris, 2002).

Bush (2003) defines participative leadership as follows:

Participative leadership is concerned primarily with the process of decision-making. The approach supports the notion of shared or distributed leadership and is linked to democratic values and empowerment. Participative leadership is thought to lead to improved outcomes through greater commitment to the implementation of agreed decisions.

One of the main principles in participative leadership is the availability of leadership to other members. Atatürk let others be involved in decision-making as exemplified in his actions while calling for congresses in different cities. Another example of involving others in decision-making is his insistence on starting the final attack on enemies only after having been granted the title of commander-in-chief with "177 yes votes" and "11 votes against" while "13 parliamentarians abstained from the vote" which disappointed Mustafa Kemal who said he was used to unjust criticisms but "was crushed by the votes against the commandership and he couldn't accept abstentions" (Özdil, 2018, p. 143). Moreover, he was ready to hand in the power to his followers when necessary. For instance, he was the founder of the new republic but he never became the prime minister. İsmet İnönü was the first prime minister in Turkey. Moreover, İnönü was the one who represented Turkey in peace talks in Lousanne. Mustafa Kemal always aimed to delegate the responsibility of governing to different parties in his political life. He asked his friend Fethi (Okyar) to form an opposition party, which was called Free Republican Party/Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası, on

condition that the new party followed the ideals of republicanism and secularism (Zürcher, 2017). He also encouraged his closest friend Nuri (Conker) and his sister Makbule Hanım to join the party. The new party did not survive for long. As Webb and Vulliamy (1996) argued, there was a clash between ‘top-down’ management style and distributed leadership. To name the closure of the party as an example of authoritative leadership of Mustafa Kemal as Zürcher (2017) suggests would be unjust. I think this is about the clash between the dilemmas posed by long-lived democratic ideals and short-lived provisional expectations of the representatives of the old regime. According to Celal Bayar (2009), who was a close friend and companion of Atatürk’s and who was the head of the opposing Democrat Party between 1946 and 1950 before Adnan Menderes, *legitimacy* was one of the principles which Atatürk followed. Atatürk was a legitimist in the sense that all his actions were based on the idea that these actions were for the benefit of the nature as well as humans. It was Atatürk, then Mustafa Kemal, in 1909, who struggled for an open struggle of the secret organization CUP (Committee of Union and Progress) and for it to become a political party. It was again Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk), who gathered representatives from all around Anatolia and established the Grand National Assembly. Celal Bayar provides another example which displays Mustafa Kemal’s ultimate aim of participative leadership (2009). A member of the Republican Party (CHP today) offers to create an Independent Group within the party. Mustafa Kemal rebukes him harshly; however, he accepts eagerly the establishment of the first opposition party “Serbest Parti” (Free Party) without batting an eye. Despite all the opposition he had to face which sometimes rendered things almost impossible for him to work within the parliament, he never thought about closing down the parliament even though he had the power to do so (Ibid.)

We can infer from Bush’s (2003) definition of participative leadership that Atatürk’s commitment to improved outcomes was a reflection of his greater commitment to the implementation of agreed decisions. Atatürk’s eagerness to share the power with the stakeholders such as İsmet İnönü, the National Assembly and also with an opposition party already shows that he employed democratic practices within participative leadership styles.

In 1931 in İstanbul, during the visit of the chief of the US Army, General Douglas MacArthur, Atatürk said “Hitler will come to power in Germany within two years and, having its pride destroyed in the Great War, it will gain ambition for payback for its crushed pride. War will break out in Europe by 1940 at the latest... Hitler will drive his society and the world into a great catastrophe, and that’s how he will be remembered in history” (Özdil, 2018, p. 314). Basing his ideals on a democratic process, Atatürk, as a genius of foresight, must have already seen the benefits of his democratic actions for the future of his nation. According to Bayar (2009), Atatürk choose neither Marxism (popular in Stalin’s Soviet Russia) nor fascism (exercised by Hitler in Germany) but a method that had its foundation on an independent method

within science, experiment and reason. However, this method was not based on a mere positivist and pragmatist approach but a more eclectic and contextual approach which considers analysis, assessment and feasibility.

Atatürk's struggle for democracy continues to yield its results today even though we experience some lethargy at intervals. The lethargy has always been existent within the country; however, we should accept it as a predicament which can be overcome within a participatory working environment. I believe that our nation will manage to reach his democratic ideals, because, as Harris advocates, the democratic ideals and a more democratic way of leadership is imposed upon leaders by a more complex world in the 21st century.

2.5. Managerial Leadership and Atatürk

Managerial leadership implies managing an institution rather than leading as, according to Leithwood et al (1999), the emphasis is on 'functions, tasks, and behaviours' and the authority arises from hierarchical or formal relations within an institution. Managerialism may also entail a lot of paperwork hindering a focus on the process of solving a problem and directing others to get involved. Only societal or other wider contexts may force them to act differently from their managerial routines. According to Myers and Murphy (1995), managers function within a hierarchical function which are supervising, controlling input, behavioural control, controlling output, selection/socialisation and controlling environment. Leithwood et al (1999) champions that leaders 'need to adopt a bifocal perspective' which suggests a combination of leadership and management. Managerial type of leadership can be confused with transformative leadership when looked from outside as their practices look alike (Leithwood, 1994).

Bush (2003) defines managerial leadership as follows:

Managerial leadership focuses on functions, tasks and behaviours. It also assumes that the behaviour of organisational members is largely rational and that influence is exerted through positional authority within the organisational hierarchy. It is similar to the formal model of management.

Atatürk can be an example of a managerial leader, too. As Leithwood (1999) emphasizes, Following are the features Leithwood focuses on which Atatürk displayed as a leader. Atatürk used to calculate each individual's 'task, function and behavior' in detail. He appointed important stakeholders to crucial posts during the War of Independence. He had collected many people throughout his life (Özdil, 2018) and asked for their contribution to the struggle. Atatürk set up such a network of people that he could find the people he needed whenever and wherever he needed (Bayar, 2009). Bayar (2009) recounted that he secretly went his home in Bursa so that he would not be noticed by rebels led by one of the insurgents against the national struggle called Anzavur. Ten minutes later, the door was knocked by a mysterious person who gave

him Mustafa Kemal's order to suppress the rebels. Bayar cannot help but admire Mustafa Kemal's ability to reach him under those circumstances.

Mustafa Kemal deployed most relevant people in crucial moments. One such incident occurred before the Great Offensive. Bayar (2009) adds that Atatürk asked some of his friends to sooth the overexcited people who urged for a quick action against the enemy in the parliament. The people whom Atatürk asked to address the parliament were eloquent and managed to ease the tension while keeping the MPs' vigilance active with their speeches (p.29).

Atatürk used to calculate every step he would take a habit which result from his military dialectic (Bayar, 2009). Another incident shows Mustafa Kemal's meticulous calculation of his actions. This incident was also told by Celal Bayar. Before the Great Offensive, one of the MPs says Kuvayi Milliye (National Forces) is a sacred madness, Mustafa Kemal protests and says 'Kuvayi Milliye is calculation!'. 'The War of Independence is a great mathematical architecture... Atatürk implemented all his decisions at the top of the endless possibilities pyramid' (Ibid.). We can observe that, as a leader benefitting from the positive aspects of managerial leadership, Mustafa Kemal considered all the details be it the steps to be taken, tools to be used or people to be deployed.

In this model of leadership, leaders may be delayed until a problem arises and it is the leader who solves potential problems. There are many occasions when Mustafa Kemal delayed his decisions before asserting his ideas. He had always listened to the stakeholders without interfering first, and then having heard everyone stating their opinions, he would give his final talk after synthesizing all ideas convincing everyone who had already started to argue harshly. His aid-de-camps and friends state that they did not remember any moment when they received any orders before having been consulted with (Yurdakul, 2009). Mustafa Kemal did not like to decide without seeing every aspect of a problem and delayed his actions until the moment he was needed to disentangle the problem. This also helped increase the effect of his solution to difficulties enabling his followers welcome his ideas more openly. As we discussed earlier through Myers and Murphy (1995), Atatürk, as a manager, functioned within hierarchy where, rather than being at the top but anywhere at any time, he supervised and analysed his environment through input and output control carefully that led him to select alternatives to solve potential problems within the institutional structure he was trying to form.

As a managerial leader, Mustafa Kemal was fastidious with details and paperwork. He kept journals, notes, and even the receipts of all transactions he conducted. He always paid back loans he received on behalf of his nation so that he would make sure that every step he took was legitimate. Muzaffer Kılıç, Mustafa Kemal's oldest aid-de-camp in Palestine, Gallipoli and many other fronts, highlighted that "Atatürk kept all written orders, telegrams, bills and kept them in envelopes. All documents were

transported on mules and horses to everywhere we went. These were the most valuable possessions of his" (cited in Yurdakul, 2009, p. 44) as Mustafa Kemal used to have a high opinion of accountability.

While sticking to the hierarchy of management and making the best of the circumstances, Mustafa Kemal also believed in the necessity to be a non-conformist when necessary. He was a commander who was raised by the Ottoman Empire. He devised solutions to the problems faced by the Ottomans and tried to strengthen his country by serving in different regions with differing responsibilities during this era (Bay, 2013; Bayar, 2009; Özdil, 2018). Before he gave his final decision to go to Anatolia to start the national struggle, he had looked for ways to serve his country in İstanbul either by sharing his ideas that made the Sultan and his followers uneasy, by offering to take part in the parliament in İstanbul or by asking to be assigned as the Minister of War. Having been disappointed by the attitude of the emperor and the government in İstanbul and following his observations around the Empire, he admitted the need to take the initiative and start a struggle of independence (Bayar, 2009, p. 46; Bozdağ, 2009, p.23; Yurdakul, 2009, p. 228). If he had obeyed the orders of the Sultan Vahdettin to return to İstanbul after his decision to call the nation for a resistance, Mustafa Kemal would never have succeeded in freeing his country. However, his nonconformity is not about disobeying superiors in the military context. In his book, *Zabit ve Kumandan ile Hasbihal*, he emphasized the absolute loyalty of a soldier to his superior and that it was important for a soldier to carry out the order; however, this did not mean that superiors could use their authority to serve their own interests. Serving the ultimate goal of commanding with justice and fairness is the responsibility of superiors (Atatürk, 2014). What is meant by nonconformity depends on the circumstances. One circumstance that exemplifies this is Mustafa Kemal's taking the initiative and saving his nation's future in Gallipoli. Although he was ordered to defend the inner parts of the peninsula, on 25 April, according to Liman von Sanders, he 'used his own initiative to join the battle with his 19th division and pushed the enemy back to the coast. Then for three months he had put up an indomitable resistance against constant violent attacks. I [Liman von Sanders] was thus able to place total trust in his energy and determination" (Mango, 2000; see also Bay, 2013, pp. 18-22 for details of Mustafa Kemal's initiatives).

To sum up, we can infer that Mustafa Kemal's managerial leadership style is among the leadership models that allowed him to be a good leader. It is a style which involves close inspection of details with a lot of calculation before making decisions and which makes room for necessary stakeholders serving different functions as well as reflecting a non-conformist nature along with a willingness to take initiative when necessary.

2.6. Post-modern Leadership and Atatürk

Post-modernism has rendered modernist dichotomies blurry by questioning definitions and delving into the inconsistencies within those definitions. The same situation

applies to the leadership type it is represented in. According to Bush (2003) ‘there is no agreed definition.’ However, Starrat (2001) discusses that this approach boosts a more democratic leadership practice. Keough and Tobin (2001) propose that postmodern leadership may lead to an atmosphere where ‘multiplicity of subjective truths’ are welcome and the concept of absolute authority is unwelcome. They imply that such an atmosphere requires leaders who do not rely on hierarchy or rigid understanding of managing but adopting a perspective including diversity and individuality. According to Bush (2003), Starrat (2001) also supports that postmodern leadership corresponds with democratic stance.

Bush (2003) defines post-modern leadership as follows:

Post-modern leadership focuses on the subjective experience of leaders and teachers and on the diverse interpretations placed on events by different participants. There is no objective reality, only the multiple experiences of organisational members. This model offers few guidelines for leaders except in acknowledging the importance of the individual.

Atatürk was a democratic leader as he appreciated the contribution of other people around him. He was determined but not stubborn as his determination nourished by his in-depth analysis of conditions. As cited in Yurdakul (2008), Mazhar Akifoğlu confirmed that Atatürk was not someone whom you could not object to or whose ideas you could not reject “even in his most powerful time” (p.49). Mustafa Kemal had decided to start the Great Offensive in April, 1922 and sent a telegram to Yakup Şevki Paşa, the commander of the Second Army. Having read the message, Yakup Şevki Paşa replied with a 24-page-telegram objecting with his reasons that April would not be the best time to attack. He recommended August, 1922 instead. Four days later, having travelled a long way on muddy paths through dark and snowy ox-cart tracks, Atatürk arrived at the front and the commanders discussed the issue for hours until early in the morning. Without having a rest Atatürk returned to Ankara and sent another telegram: “The proposals of the Second Army commander were deemed appropriate and orders were given to the necessary places to remedy the deficiencies and the attack date was postponed” (Sadık Atak, Yakup Şevki Paşa’s aid-de-camp, cited in Yurdakul, 2009, p.96). Atatürk displayed a post-modern leadership in many such occasions as this as well as others: gathering congresses, establishing the national assembly, acquiring the authority from the assembly even in most urgent and crucial moments such as the Great Offensive. The examples presented in previous models reflect Atatürk’s post-modern leadership style to some extent.

Mustafa Kemal was a leader who always questioned and analyzed the conditions in detail and acted swiftly. He knew his people very well. For instance, Mustafa Kemal was aware that his nation was not divided by class distinctions unlike the European communities. Instead of adopting democracy as the way it was practised in Europe today, he adapted the general framework of democracy according to the structure and needs of his people (Bayar, 2009). Europe was actually suffering from fascism and socialism in those days. Atatürk was openly fighting with them as fascism says

“everything is for the state” whereas Atatürk said “everything is for the people”. The core idea he adopted was about the power of people which was represented in his founding the Republic. Bozdağ supported that in the version of democracy in Turkey, the state leads the society towards the execution of power by people (Ibid). In other words, the state is for people which also represents Atatürk's nationalism. Bayar argued that this understanding is different from socialism where the state exploits its people instead of the upper class which socialism despises as exploiters. Atatürk had already observed and analysed the shortcomings of fascism and socialism. He looked for another way of governing that would keep away from the disadvantages of them. Bayar alleges that the reason for the chaos in social and political life in Turkey is the pluralist and participatory model of democracy which could work in a society with class distinctions (Ibid.). Societies are active bodies and change continually; therefore, according to Bayar (2009), Atatürk's methodology is the solution. It is a methodology where politicians, heads of syndicates, economic institutions must rely on the will of people and implement the law rather than providing people with specific political views or promises which they do not stick to when in power. This was an approach which Atatürk adopted even in the war time, too. He always believed in his people (p. 14). In conclusion, he was aware of the sources of problems which he analysed meticulously with an approach that involved the multifaceted structure of the society. He always tried to combine many aspects of definitions of governing and reach an optimal level of solutions of governing.

Atatürk was also aware that solutions to problems would never be the end in themselves as the needs are fluent. Therefore, he warned his people that they must not follow his ideas blindly. In 1933, in his opening speech in Republic Festival celebrations Atatürk said: “I leave no frozen and stereotyped rules or dogma as spiritual heritage. My spiritual heritage is science and reason” (Duran, 1997). Atatürk also said, “We will go and take knowledge and science from wherever they are and we will put them into our people's mind. There are no limits and conditions for knowledge and science” (cited in Erdem, 2014 and Mango, 2000). Mango (2000) also cites Atatürk continue his speech as “If social life is permeated with irrational, useless and harmful doctrines and traditions, it becomes paralysed... For everything in the world – for civilization, for life, for success – the truest guide is knowledge and science. To seek a guide other than knowledge and science is [a mark of] heedlessness, ignorance and aberration.’ However, science and reason is not used as a mere positivist method to understand changes. The difference of scientific knowledge relies in its temporariness and inquisitiveness. “Scientific information consists of relative truths established by using scientific methods in research” (Erdem, 2014). Atatürk knew that science itself was prone to change unlike dogmas. The main point here is the possible effects of innovations in techniques and ideas, which must be observed and conditions must be reevaluated to hinder the risk of lethargy and inertia within a society. Actions speak louder than words and Atatürk was a person of his words. Whatever he said was

a reflection of his actions. For instance, he invited John Dewey, a famous educational reformer, to prepare a report for the education system in Turkey. His report guided the struggles for educational reforms and paved the way for the opening of Village Institutes in the beginning of 1940. Musyafa Kemal also invited many German scientists such as Einstein to pursue their academic studies in Turkey, which supports that he practically placed emphasis on education as well as change and science.

Atatürk's rejecting the idea of rigidity in approaching to science is also reflected in his understanding of philosophy. Bayar (2009) quotes Atatürk's approach to philosophy: "The better I have good relations with philosophy, the less with philosophers!... It might sound weird but let me explain myself: Philosophers' disease is to attribute everything to one cause... Different claims (by different philosophers) have some truth. My principle is to examine the truth within its own laws."

The principles put forward by Atatürk reflects the individuality and contextuality of events which also reflects the core of post-modernist view. As a result, we can infer that Atatürk displayed a post-modern leadership model in which he appraised 'subjectivity of experience' and 'diversity of interpretations placed on events by different participants' (see Bush's definition provided above). Post-modern leadership follows that 'there is no objective reality' (Bush, 2003) and this understanding seems to be comprising one of the foundations of Atatürk's post-modern leadership model.

2.7. Interpersonal Leadership and Atatürk

West-Burnham (2001) sees a close relationship between interpersonal leadership and interpersonal intelligence which he defines as 'intuitive behaviours' relying on 'self-awareness' that 'facilitates effective engagement with others'. He also highlights the 'importance of collaboration and interpersonal relationships' (Ibid.)

Contexts change as well as the needs of the followers within the same context. Therefore, a continuous struggle by a leaders to understand their needs by using their interpersonal skills is crucial (Johnston and Pickersgill, 1992).

Bush (2003) defines interpersonal leadership as follows:

Leaders adopt a collaborative approach which may have a moral dimension. They have advanced personal skills which enable them to operate effectively with internal and external stakeholders.

As we mentioned earlier, Atatürk collected people throughout his life which alone shows his interpersonal leadership model. Bayar (2009) suggests that Atatürk started the war of independence with a handful of men without soldiers, money, weapons or cannons. However, he had a potential of followers since his childhood and military years as well as the people of Anatolia and Thrace who had admired him even without seeing. Even Celal Bayar had the opportunity to meet him personally after Atatürk established the National Assembly. When Bayar entered the room there, Mustafa Kemal was listening to a young civilian who was commanding 80-100 people. There

were a group of people together with him. Bayar concluded that Mustafa Kemal was a great commander who knew what each individual did and where they were. He was the one who easily found Bayar in his home in Bursa and he was the one who took into consideration every individual. Bayar added that he and people around Mustafa Kemal knew Turkey did not have the power to cope with her problem; however, they had one reference: Mustafa Kemal. Bayar admitted that people around him felt like tired moths flying towards the flame during the War of Independence, (Ibid.). Yurdakul (2009) expressed that Atatürk's friends respected him so much that they sat upright while they were talking about him and chose the most respectful words about him. For instance, they referred to Atatürk by using the suffix '-ler' in Turkish which means 'they'. "Atatürk, geldiler. Emir verdiler. Beni çağırıldılar (Atatürk, they came. They ordered. They called me.). Their eyes were filled with tears whenever they talked about him. His friends believed in and loved him" (p. 17). Before starting his voyage to Samsun with only a few people, Muzaffer Kılıç, aide-de-camp of Mustafa Kemal since Çanakkale and Aleppo, saw him on Galata Bridge in İstanbul. "Mustafa Kemal was tense and his eyes were shining bronze. After learning that Mustafa Kemal was determined to set off on a dangerous voyage to Samsun, Muzaffer Kılıç insisted on going along with him by saying 'Paşam, I will even go to death with you!' (Ibid. p. 58-59). It was impossible for anyone not to admire him once they have met him. There were few people who welcomed him in Havza; however, after some critical acts against the will of the Sultan who had sent him to inspect the region, a huge crowd of people filled the place to see him off and there were more to welcome him in his next station, Erzurum (Yurdakul, 2009, p. 67). From then on people raced to see him wherever he visited (p.91). Mustafa Kemal had to resign from military and take off his military suit after his intention to start the struggle for independence was obvious to the Sultan. Kazım Karabekir was assigned to his post instead. It was in Erzurum that he thundered into the house where Mustafa Kemal was studying, made a military salute to him and said that he was ready to serve him. Mustafa Kemal was relieved to hear this and hugged and kissed him. Atatürk was now sure that both his comrades and his nation would follow him not because of his military powers but because of their belief in his leadership. The belief of his comrades in Atatürk's leadership displays itself in another occasion, too. Ali Fuat Cebesoy was among the important leaders in the War of Independence. Cebesoy was cited as saying that none of the candidates of leadership such as him, Kazım Karabekir Paşa, Refet Paşa, or Rauf Orbay would accept each other as the chief of the group except for Atatürk who brought all of them together with his superior power, courage, chivalry and honesty (Yurdakul, 2009, p.79).

Another example that displays Atatürk's interpersonal leadership is his beliefs about teamwork. He believed that one needed a team to be successful. As Özdil (2018) quotes, Atatürk said, "A team is necessary. That is, an entire success cannot be attributed to single person. It is necessary to organize so success can be achieved.

Whatever I did, I was able to do with support from my friends and the people. It cannot be attributed to me alone” (p.304).

Here we need to focus on an event Bay (2011) narrates. Mustafa Kemal’s effective and maybe the most unforgettable commandership is apparent in his famous quote ‘I am not ordering you to attack, but to die! Other forces and commanders may replace us until we die!’ during the Çanakkale War proves his active engagement with his followers where he exclaims his commitment to sacrifice himself more than his soldiers. It also proves his courage and the secret of ignoring dangers of the situation he is in, which is based on his self-awareness (Ibid., p.23-24). He convinces his followers by setting himself as an example to engage them more in their actions even there is death in the end.

Atatürk’s engagement with his followers included non-verbal behaviors, too. Bay (2011) expresses that Atatürk was fastidious about his physical appearance and clothes. He was always clean wherever he was. Even when he was fighting behind the front, he was always clean (p.33). Özdil (2018) gives a detailed account of his cleanliness and orderliness:

“He would never be seen in pajamas. He also changed his clothes every day. He would bathe every morning. During most critical days of battle in Tripoli, Gallipoli, Muş, Palestine and Sakarya, he would heat water in a tin basin and bathe in his tent... He would bathe twice a day after becoming president... He gave importance to personal grooming. He shaved every morning. He would have a weekly haircut... He spent his life trudging from front to front, slept on the ground much more than in a bed and would sleep in trenches, but there isn’t one photograph of him looking bedraggled.” (p.333- 335).

It is obvious that Mustafa Kemal believed in team-work. On his way to start the struggle for independence in Samsun, there were at least 20 people who accompanied Mustafa Kemal. He used non-verbal communication ability on a daunting voyage to Samsun. Yurdakul (2009) cites Muzaffer Kılıç’s recollection of the voyage to Samsun, a voyage that was dreary. Although it was Spring, Black Sea was wild with waves. Almost everyone was sea-sick and vomiting. They were all tired of the wobbling of the ship. Mustafa Kemal and his comrades were all army officers, not naval officers, which meant they were not used to the conditions at sea. However, Mustafa Kemal was giving orders to the captain with patience. On the morning of the 19, May, all were exhausted except for ‘Mustafa Kemal who had shaved, put on his *paşa* suit and was standing upright like a statue looking at the shore like a mighty deity. We (Muzaffer Kılıç narrates) all remembered ourselves, shaved, put on our army suits and rowed ashore in a small boat’ (p. 61). In other words, while believing in team-work, Mustafa Kemal also appreciated the responsibilities of leading a team that led him to display strength and persistence in leading people.

Johnston and Pickersgill (1992) highlights that leaders are aware of the needs of their followers. Bayar (2009) gives an account of how Atatürk determined the needs of his nation: Atatürk roamed all around Anatolia to understand the needs of his people. In

1931, after a trip around the country, he recounted his impressions and tallied the needs of the country. The minister of the day told what was necessary to do and Atatürk calculated the amount of money needed as 500 million Turkish liras which was impossible as the minister acknowledged that the country could not even afford 5 million liras. When Atatürk asked them what the “solution” was, none could answer. He was angry and asked if they would just sit and do nothing just because they did not have money. Bayar adds that “we all know all the necessary things accounted to be done at that moment were accomplished soon” as solutions would never end in Atatürk (2009, p. 32). We may conclude that, as a leader displaying interpersonal skills, Atatürk was able to determine the needs of his followers, engage both himself and other in the work to be done through his awareness of himself as well as other stakeholders.

2.8. Contingent Leadership and Atatürk

Rather than being a separate model of leadership which emphasizes one dimension of leadership, contingent leadership refers more to an eclectic approach to leadership according to requirements of differing contexts (see Bush, 2003; Lambert, 1995; Leithwood et al 1999). Rather than being normative, it tries to provide a more comprehensive view of leadership as there is ‘no single best type’ (Lambert, 1995) because the nature of different contexts require different responses from leaders. In this type of leadership model, a leader has the opportunity to choose from a repertory of models or practices specifically. Yukl (2002) also emphasized the complexity and unpredictability of contexts where a single method or approach may not suffice and leaders need to act according to the nature of different problems and adapt themselves when needed (see also Bush, 2003; Bolman and Deal, 1984; Morgan 1986).

Leithwood (1994) focuses on the relation between transformational and contingent leadership models. Transformational leaders may use different practices within specific contexts. The similarity arises from the rejection of using ‘rigid set of leadership behaviours.’

Bush defines contingent leadership as follows:

Contingent leadership focuses on how leaders respond to the unique organisational circumstances or problems they face. The wide variations in ... contexts provide the rationale for this model. Leaders need to be able to adapt their approaches to the particular requirements ..., and of the situation or event requiring attention. (2003).

As can be understood from the definitions provided, contingent leadership is about combining all leadership styles which are prone to change according to the context. As time, place and stakeholders change, so may the leadership acts as different contexts have different requirements (Bolman and Deal, 1984; Bush, 2003 and 1995; Leithwood, 1999; Morgan, 1986). All the examples provided under different models of leadership above prove that Atatürk cannot be a leader who can be defined within a single style as he benefitted from various strategies that can be tagged as differing

leadership models synthesized. Moreover, many events can be and were quoted under more than one title. The nature of the problems also change which means that leaders have to adapt themselves accordingly. However, although Atatürk lived through different contexts and among different people at different types and used different types of leadership models, there was one thing that has not changed. It is “Atatürk Methodology” as Bayar (2009) suggested. He explains what he means by Atatürk Methodology:

1. This methodology is rationality and being realistic. It is an independent method within the borders of science, experiment and reason. However, strict ‘systems’ are not important. Establishing a strong and potent Turkish Republic is crucial.
2. His method involves the benefit of people and nature: “Everything is for the [good of] people, the nature!”, unlike the motto ‘everything is for the state’ adopted by fascism and socialism which stipulates a set ‘system’ of governing. If the results of an action are considered for the welfare of people then those actions are legitimate.
3. This method involves detailed analysis of situation and a mathematical calculation of needs and potentials before acting.
4. This method stipulates that solutions to problems are endless when appropriately confronted with meticulous calculations, and with scientific and technical methods.

These points may provide the foundations for a contingent leadership model. However, Bayar (2009) warns that this method helps one found a country from scratch as Atatürk did; however, it is also a method which might turn into knife in a killer’s hand. Therefore, the benchmark for this method is legitimacy. The legitimacy is based on bearing a true value consistent with the good of humans and the nature. As a result, even if the contexts change, the Atatürk Methodology will provide a path towards a main goal. All the leadership models Atatürk displayed, be it one by one or en masse, may be understood, covered and assessed within this framework that stipulates reconsideration of situations with one main goal in mind: welfare of people and nature.

CONCLUSION

In this study, I have tried to explain Atatürk’s leadership style within the framework summed up by Bush and Glover (2003) who were inspired by Leithwood et al (1999) and included nine leadership models. These models include ‘Transformational, Transactional, Moral, Participative, Managerial, Post-modern, Interpersonal and Contingent Leadership models. Two of these models, Transformational and Transactional leadership models, have been discussed under one title as they pose some similarities. Many examples from Atatürk’s life have been provided to support my arguments about the model of leadership he displayed.

The typologies for leadership models are not limited to the one provided in this study. Bush and Glover (2003) provide other typologies, as well, having recounted the

models that have been discussed here (p.23-27). The number of different typologies prove that the concept of leadership cannot be put in a straitjacket. In other words, there is no one typology or definition that can cover all aspects of leadership.

Some models focus on situational or contextual factors and assert that there is no one universal type of leadership. (e.g., Fiedler's Contingency Theory of Leadership, see Campbell, 1968) while others focus on *forces* that allow leaders to be leaders (e.g., Sergiovanni, 1984). While investigating Atatürk's leadership style based on Fiedler's theory, Güney (1992) observes that Atatürk's leadership styles have changed according to different contexts, such as before the War of Independence, during his presidency in the Parliament and his presidency of the Republic. Güney proceeds that while achieving his goals, Atatürk showed both autocratic and democratic leadership styles. For example, he displayed an autocratic style during the debates in the parliament about his being the chief commander when a quick decision-making procedure was crucial for the safety and therefore the future of the nation (1992).

According to Güney (1992), Atatürk never used his power or the threat of punishment to suppress people in the wars he led, instead he used his status to emotionally connect with his followers. That is, the human factor was important which implies that, even under war conditions, he used a more democratic leadership style as well as an autocratic one which allowed him and his followers to act quickly and save their lives when the pressure actually came from time limitations.

Atatürk displayed a reformist, organizational and guiding leadership style after the proclamation of the Republic (Ibid.) He implemented his revolutions in such a way that even his contemporaries thought that they were supporting their own ideas and knowledge while actually vocalising Atatürk's (Bayar, 2009).

He was a revolutionary leader in that he always featured his main goal which was the welfare of his nation. While doing all these he used all 'leadership forces' suggested by Sergiovanni (1984): Technical (which is close to Leithwood et al's 'managerial leadership', 1999); Human (using interpersonal sources that is close to both 'participative' and 'interpersonal leadership'); Educational (expert knowledge that is close to 'instructional leadership'); Symbolic (close to 'transformational' leadership in that there is a main purpose in all actions); Cultural (which is about building a culture and strengthen and articulate enduring values, beliefs linked to 'moral' leadership force (see Bush, 2003).

One of the important theoretical approaches to leadership is trait theories. Trait approach supports that 'a person must possess a particular set of traits to become a successful leader (Yukl, 2002). Arıkan argues that "it is a well-known fact that being a good leader requires some personality traits. Indeed, being an effective leader requires having 'some right qualities' as well as using power." This theory is important in focusing the leaders themselves. However, it was also criticised as not being sufficient to explain leadership processes (Arıkan, 2001).

The study covers only nine different models of leadership relating each to Atatürk. It does not allege that these models may explain all aspects of Atatürk's leadership. The sources (by Sergiovanni, 1984) and other typologies overlap with one another (Bush, 2003). Therefore, the events in Atatürk's life may overlap and be categorised within any of these typologies. Moreover, one event or action may have different characteristics that may exemplify more than one leadership model. It is important to emphasize that only one or two of these models may not suffice to explain a leader's actions, characteristics or the context as a whole. For instance, Deal cites Gawrych (2013) who argues that many studies focus solely on the intellectual component of Atatürk's leadership, a perspective 'which is too narrow to explain Atatürk' (2015). Gawrych (2013) focuses on conscience and cognitive activities (feeling and mind) in Atatürk's leadership. Atatürk was a leader who could appeal to his nation's feelings and emotions (see Deal, 2015, p. 237). Emotions and conscience are an important aspect of leadership and they cannot easily be categorised under any of the leadership models provided in this article.

Future studies might try to explore emotions, conscience and mind affecting Atatürk's leadership style. As Bayar (2009) expresses a method for leading is like a double-edged knife that could turn into a weapon in an ill-willed person's hand and the method Atatürk used to found a country might as well be used to destroy a country (p. 35). Gawrych (2013) is cited to argue that "Atatürk was capable of callousness and ruthlessness... He accepted the loss of innocent civilian lives as a common feature in warfare. There were, therefore, two sides to Atatürk's character." (see Deal, 2015). On the other hand, Atatürk was a sensitive human. For instance, he was squeamish at the sight of blood. He did not use to consent to the sacrifice of animals during his visits. When reminded of wars he had to fight, he would say that the only thing cared in those moments was the salvation of his nation (Özdil, 2018). Atatürk believed that wars were merely murder if not fought for the defence or salvation of a nation. Bearing the abovementioned aspects of leadership, it can be concluded that the mindset, emotional and conscientious aspects may govern leaders while choosing their styles.

References

- Allix, N.M. (2000). Transformational Leadership: Democratic or Despotic? *Educational Management and Administration*, 28 (1), 7–20.
- Arıkan, S. (2001). Otoriter ve demokratik liderlik tarzları açısından Atatürk'ün liderlik davranışlarının değerlendirilmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19 (1), 231-257.
- Atatürk, M. K. (2014). *Zâbit ve kumandan ile hasbihal*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Atatürk, K. (1963). *A Speech Delivered by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk: 1927*. Ministry of Education Print. Plant.
- Axtmann, R. (1998). State formation and the disciplined individual in Weber's historical sociology. In *Max Weber, Democracy and Modernization* (pp. 32-46). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness Through Transformational Leadership*. Sage Publication: London.
- Bay, A. (2013). *Atatürk: Modern Türkiye'nin kurucusu dahi generalden liderlik üzerine dersler*. (A. F. Aytuna, Çev.). Pegasus Yayınları.

- Bayar, C. (2009). *Atatürk gibi düşünmek*. Der: İsmet Bozdağ. Truva Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Bozdağ, İ. (2009). *Celal Bayar anlatıyor: Bilinmeyen Atatürk*. Truva Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). The strategies for taking charge. *Leaders, New York: Harper. Row, 41*.
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1984). *Modern Approaches to Understanding and Managing Organisations*. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2002). Pilot new visions evaluation: First interim report. Nottingham, NCSL.
- Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2003). School leadership: Concepts and evidence.
- Chirichello, M. (1999). Building Capacity for Change: Transformational Leadership for School Principals. *Paper presented at ICSEI Conference, January 3–6, San Antonio*.
- Copland, M. (2001). The myth of the superprincipal. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*, 528–32.
- Cuban, L. (1988). *Managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools, the*. Suny Press.
- Çulpan, R., (2009, November 2). *Atatürk As A Transformational Leader* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://www.ataturksociety.org/ataturk-as-a-transformational-leader/>
- Day, C., Harris, A., & Hadfield M. (2001). Challenging the orthodoxy of effective school leadership, *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 4* (1), 39–56.
- Deal, R. A. (2015). The Young Atatürk: From Ottoman Soldier to Statesman of Turkey. *Insight Turkey, 17*(1), 236.
- Derman, G. 2020. *The Main Differences Between Leadership And Management "Atatürk's Leadership"*. [online] Ijses.org. Available at: <http://www.ijses.org/index.php/ijses/article/view/248> [Accessed 13 December 2020].
- Duran, A. I. (1997). 21. Yüzyılda Kemalist gençliğe düşen görev: İTÜ 10 kasım 1999 Atatürk'ü anma töreni konuşması. *Aydınlanma 1923, 29*(29), 8-9.
- Erdem, M. (n.d.). Atatürk Hakkında Bilmek İstedığınız Herşey. Retrieved December 12, 2020, from <https://www.atam.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/Menendi-ERDEM-%e2%80%93-Bir-E%c4%9fitim-Lideri-Olarak-Atat%c3%bcrk.pdf>
- Erdem, A. R. (2014). *Atatürk'ün bilime verdiği önem: Bilimi ve bilimsel düşünceyi hayatta rehber edinmesi. Belgi Dergisi, (8)*, 1033-1046.
- Erdem, A. R. (2012). *Atatürk'ün liderliğinde üniversite reformu: yükseköğretim ve bilim tarihimizde dönüm noktası. Belgi Dergisi, 4* (2), 376-388
- Esteban, J. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/33094097/Case_Analysis_Mustafa_Kemal_Ataturks_Leadership on December, 19, 2020
- Campbell, R. (1968). *Administrative Science Quarterly, 13*(2), 344-348. doi:10.2307/2391461
- Gallagher, C. C. R. (2016). Muddling Leadership and Management in the United States Army. *Army Press Online Journal, 16*(32), 1–8.
- Gawrych, G. W. (2013). *The young Atatürk: From Ottoman soldier to statesman of Turkey*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Gold, A., Evans, J., Earley, P., Halpin, D. and Collarbone, P. (2002). *Principled Principals? Values-driven Leadership: Evidence from Ten Case Studies of 'Outstanding' Leaders*. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April.
- Greenfield, T. B., & Ribbins, P. (1993). *Greenfield on educational administration: Towards a humane science*. Psychology Press.
- Gunter, H. (2001). *Leaders and Leadership in Education*. London, Paul Chapman.
- Güney, S. (1992). Fiedler'in Durumsal Önderlik Modeli Açısından Atatürk'ün Önderliğinin Değerlendirilmesi. *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi, 8*(23), 309-316.
- Hai, W. W. L. J. O., Moiden, L. A. H., & Mohaiyadin, N. M. (2019). Qualities of transformational leader: A study on mustafa kemal Ataturk. Retrieved from http://conference.kuis.edu.my/pasak4/images/kk/politik/076-KK_WONG_WAI_LONG_ETAL.pdf on December, 12, 2020
- Harris, A. (2002). *Distributed Leadership in Schools: Leading or Misleading?*. Paper presented at the British Educational Leadership, Management and Administration Society annual conference, Birmingham, September.
- Johnston, J., & Pickersgill, S. (1992), Personal and interpersonal aspects of effective team oriented headship in the primary school, *Educational Management and Administration, 20* (4), 239–48.
- Kapluhan, E. (2015). 1921 Maarif Kongresi'nin Türk Eğitim Tarihindeki Yeri Ve Önemi . *Yalova Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi , 4* (8) , . DOI: 10.17828/yasbed.05955

- Keough, T., & Tobin, B. (2001). *Postmodern Leadership and the Policy Lexicon: From Theory, Proxy to Practice*. Paper for the Pan-Canadian Education Research Agenda Symposium, Quebec, May.
- Lambert, L. (1995). New directions in the preparation of educational leaders. *Thrust for Educational Leadership* 24 (5), 6–10.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing Leadership for Changing Times*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(4), 498–518.
- Mango, A. (2000). *Atatürk: The biography of the founder of modern Turkey*. Woodstock, N.Y.: Overlook Press.
- Mert, Ö. (2017). Harf inkilâbının gerçekleştiği süreçte Atatürk'ün Tekirdağ'ı ziyaretinin basındaki yansımaları. *Journal of Modern Turkish History Studies/Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 17(34).
- Miller, T.W. & Miller, J.M. (2001) Educational leadership in the new millennium: a vision for 2020. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4 (2), 181–89.
- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of Organisation*. Newbury Park, California, Sage.
- Myers, E., & Murphy, J. (1995). Suburban secondary school principals' perceptions of administrative control in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 33(3), 14–37.
- Piccirilli, S. P. (2016, March). *Mustafa Kemal at Gallipoli: A Leadership Analysis and Terrain Walk*. Retrieved from <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1031579.pdf> on December, 12, 2020
- Neuman, M., & Simmons, W. (2000). Leadership for student learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp.9–13, September.
- Ogawa, R.T., & Bossert, S.T. (1995). Leadership as an organizational quality. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31 (2), 224–43.
- Özdil, Y. (2018). *Mustafa Kemal*. Kırmızı Kedi Yayınevi
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral Leadership: Getting to the Heart of School Improvement*. San-Francisco, CA, Jossey Bass.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1991), *The Principalship: a reflective practice perspective*, Needham Heights, MA, Allyn and Bacon.
- Sheppard, B. (1996). Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, XLII(4), 325–44.
- Southworth, G. (1997). Primary headship and leadership. *Leadership and teams in educational management*, 40-60.
- Starratt, R. J. (2001). Democratic leadership theory in late modernity: an oxymoron or ironic possibility? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4 (4), 333–52.
- Villalta, J. G. B. (2014). *Atatürk*. Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Wasserberg, M. (1999). Creating the vision and making it happen. *Living headship*, 154-165.
- West-Burnham, J. (2001). Interpersonal leadership, *NCSL Leading Edge Seminar*, Nottingham, National College for School Leadership.
- West-Burnham, J. (1997), Leadership for learning: reengineering 'mind sets', *School Leadership and Management*, 17(2), 231–243.
- Yukl, G. A. (2002). *Leadership in Organizations* 5 (PrenticeHall, Upper Saddle River, NJ).
- Yurdakul, Y. (2008). *Atatürk'le Yaşanmış Bilinmeyen Anılar*. (1. Baskı). Truva Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Yurdakul, Y. (2009). *Atatürk'ten Hiç Yayınlanmamış Anılar*. (8. Baskı). Truva Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Zürcher, E. J. (2017). *Turkey: A modern history*. Bloomsbury Publishing.