

TÜRKİYE CUMHURİYETİ GİRESUN ÜNİVERSİTESİ



ULUSLARARASI DOĞU KARADENİZ
TURİZM SEMPOYUMU
07-08-09 EKİM 2010

KONGRE BİLDİRİ KİTABI



ISBN: 978-975-01408-7-7

Yayına Hazırlayanlar

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hakan AKYURT

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kamil YAĞCI

TÜRKİYE CUMHURİYETİ GİRESUN ÜNİVERSİTESİ

ULUSLARARASI DOĞU KARADENİZ TURİZM SEMPOYUMU
07-08-09 EKİM 2010
“Karadeniz’in Yükselen Turizm Değeri”

KONGRE BİLDİRİ KİTABI

Yayına Hazırlayanlar

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hakan AKYURT

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kamil YAĞCI

Giresun, 2011

ISBN: 978-975-01408-7-7

Bilim Kurulu

- Prof. Dr. Alp TİMUR (Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Öcal USTA (Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Haiyan SONG (The Hong Kong Polytechnic University)
Prof. Dr. Necdet HACIOĞLU (Balıkesir Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Cevdet AVCIKURT (Balıkesir Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Füsün İSTANBULLU DİNÇER (İstanbul Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Mithat Zeki DİNÇER (İstanbul Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Meral KORZAY (Boğaziçi Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Celil ÇAKICI (Mersin Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. K. Derman KÜÇÜKALTAN (Trakya Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Nüzhet KAHRAMAN (İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Ahmet AKTAŞ (Akdeniz Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. John E. HALL (Deakin University, Australia)
Prof. Dr. Orhan İÇÖZ (Yaşar Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Salih KUŞLUVAN (Nevşehir Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Muhsin HALİS (Sakarya Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Atilla YÜKSEL (Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Ercan Sırakaya TÜRK (University of South Carolina)
Prof. Dr. Şeyhmus BALOĞLU (University of Nevada, Las Vegas)
Prof. Dr. Yüksel ÖZTÜRK (Gazi Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Azize TUNÇ HUSSEIN (Gazi Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Nilüfer KOÇAK (Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Cevat TOSUN (Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Levent ALTINAY (Oxford Brookes University)
Prof. Dr. A. Akın AKSU (Akdeniz Üniversitesi)
Doç. Dr. Olgun ÇİÇEK (Skyline College, Dubai)
Doç. Dr. Fevzi OKUMUŞ (The University of Central Florida)
Doç. Dr. Orhan BATMAN (Sakarya Üniversitesi)
Doç. Dr. Mustafa TEPECİ (Celal Bayar Üniversitesi)
Doç. Dr. Kurtuluş KARAMUSTAFA (Erciyes Üniversitesi)
Doç. Dr. Özkan TÜTÜNCÜ (Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi)
Doç. Dr. Ünsal BEKDEMİR (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Doç. Dr. Adnan TÜRKSOY (Ege Üniversitesi)
Doç. Dr. Özcan YAĞCI (Başkent Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. İzzet KILINÇ (Düzce Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kamil UNUR (Mersin Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Lütfi ATAY (Çanakkale 18 Mart Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Oğuz TÜRKAY (Sakarya Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hüseyin ALTAY (Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Emrah ÖZKUL (Düzce Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Cafer TOPALOĞLU (Muğla Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Zafer ÖTER (Muğla Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hakan AKYURT (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kamil YAĞCI (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Dr. David BOWEN (Oxford Brookes University)

Düzenleme Kurulu

Genel Koordinatör

Prof. Dr. Mustafa TÜRKMEN
Giresun Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dekanı

Düzenleme Kurulu Üyeleri

Prof. Dr. Alp TİMUR (Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi)
Prof. Dr. Ercan Sırakaya TÜRK (University of South Carolina)
Prof. Dr. John E. HALL (Deakin University, Australia)
Doç. Dr. Fevzi OKUMUŞ (The University of Central Florida)
Doç. Dr. Orhan BATMAN (Sakarya Üniversitesi)
Doç. Dr. Olgun ÇİÇEK (Skyline College, Dubai)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Bünyamin ÇETİNKAYA (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kamil YAĞCI (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hakan AKYURT (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Emrah ÖZKUL (Düzce Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Cafer TOPALOĞLU (Muğla Üniversitesi)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Dursun ŞAHİN (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Öğr. Gör. Şerif Ali DEĞİRMENÇAY (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Öğr. Gör. Kürşad Han DÖNMEZ (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Öğr. Gör. Tuğrul KÜLÜNKOĞLU (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Öğr. Gör. Yasin KELEŞ (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Öğr. Gör. Murat BAYRAM (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Öğr. Gör. Tefvik UZUN (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Öğr. Gör. Hüseyin KARA (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Öğr. Gör. Abdullah DEMİR (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Öğr. Gör. Muhittin KELEK (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Öğr. Gör. Birol GÜNER (Giresun Üniversitesi)
Salih AKGÜN (Giresun Üniversitesi)

Sempozyum Sekreteryası

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kamil YAĞCI
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hakan AKYURT
Öğr. Gör. Tuğrul KÜLÜNKOĞLU
Öğr. Gör. Yasin KELEŞ
Öğr. Gör. Tefvik UZUN

SUNUŞ

Turizmin ekonomik olarak giderek artan önemi ile birlikte, rekabet ortamı da ülkesel ve bölgesel açıdan daha da artmaktadır. Ekonomik açıdan ülkelere sağladığı yararlar sonucunda her ülke turizm politikaları ve planlamaları üzerine farklı çalışmalar yürütmektedir. Son yıllarda artan teknolojik gelişmeler neticesinde, turizme katılan insan sayısının artması, turizm bilincinin yaygınlaşması ve turizmin ekonomiye sağladığı katkılar turizm sektörünü öncelikli sektörler arasına girmesine yol açmıştır.

Ülkemizin diğer rakip ülkelerle rekabet edebilmesi, tarihi ve kültürel zenginliklerini ve alternatif turizm çeşitlerini turistlere sunması ile mümkün olacaktır. Bu bağlamda, yeni turistik destinasyonların ortaya çıkarılması, tarihi ve kültürel alanların turizme kazandırılması ve yeni turistik ürünler sunulması gerekmektedir. Turistik arz verileri bakımından oldukça fazla kaynağa sahip olan ülkemizin öncelikle turistik altyapı olanaklarını geliştirerek, bölgesel olarak farklılıkların ortaya konulması ve bu farklı turistik bölgeler için çalışmalar yapılması gerekmektedir.

Karadeniz bölgesi, turizm açısından diğer bölgelere göre farklı özelliği ve doğa yapısı ile önemli bir bölge olma yolunda ilerlemektedir. Bölgenin turistik değerlerinin ortaya çıkarılması ve tanıtılması için çalışmaların yapılması, özel ve kamu sektör işbirliği ile turizm sektörünün tüm yıla yayılması gerekliliği ortaya çıkmaktadır. Doğu Karadeniz bölgesinin yeni bir turistik destinasyon olarak ülkemiz turizmine kazandırılması ve turizm konusunda bölge halkı bilinçlendirilerek, turizme yönelik faaliyetlerin arttırılması gerekmektedir.

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hakan AKYURT
Tirebolu M.B. Meslek Yüksekokulu
Turizm ve Seyahat Bölümü

ÖNSÖZ

Doğu Karadeniz Bölgesinin turizm konusunda gerek doğal yapısı gerekse tarihi ve kültürel özellikleri ile son yıllarda yeni bir turizm bölgesi olarak talep çekmesi nedeni ile turizm konusunda yatırımlar ve turizme yönelik çalışmalarda artış görülmektedir. Turizmin sürdürülebilirliği açısından özellikle ülkemiz kaynaklarının etkin kullanımı ve farklı turistik talep ihtiyaçlarını karşılayacak ürünlere ihtiyaç vardır. Bölgelerin ekonomik ve sosyal açıdan desteklenmesinde de önemli bir payı bulunan turizm sektörünün tüm ülkeye yayılması ve uzun süreli politikaların ortaya çıkarılması gerekmektedir. Turizm gelirleri bakımından ülkemizin aldığı payı arttırmak için turistik bölge sayısının ve ürünlerin çeşitlendirilmesi politikaları uygulanmaktadır. Doğu Karadeniz bölgesi, bu açıdan birçok farklı turistik ürünü ile yeni bir turizm pazarı olarak önem kazanmaktadır.

Bu kapsamda, Giresun Üniversitesinin düzenlemiş olduğu “Uluslararası Doğu Karadeniz Turizm Sempozyumu” bölgesel anlamda farklı turistik ürünlerin ve bölgelerin ortaya konulması amacı ile öncülük yapmayı amaçlamıştır. Doğu Karadeniz bölgesinin mevcut doğal, kültürel ve tarihi alanlarının öncelikle ülke içinde ve daha sonra uluslararası alanda tanıtımını ve de alternatif turizm çeşitlerinin ortaya konulması amaçlanmıştır. Bununla birlikte, bölgenin turizme bakış açısının değerlendirilmesi, mevcut sorunların tespiti ve yeni fikirlerin belirtilmesi amacı ile bölgenin turizm açısından ön plana çıkması hedeflenmiştir. Bölgenin turizm konusunda ulusal ve uluslararası alanda durumunun belirtilmesi yönünde katkı sağlanmıştır.

Organizasyon boyunca her konuda desteklerini esirgemeyen sempozyum koordinatörümüze, sempozyum sekretaryasındaki arkadaşlarıma, sempozyum düzenleme kurulundaki arkadaşlarıma, bilim kurulunda yer alan ve her türlü bilgi akışını sağlayan sayın öğretim üyelerine, Giresun Valiliğine, Giresun Belediyesine ve özel turizm işletmelerine çok teşekkür ederim.

Ayrıca organizasyonun gerçekleşmesindeki büyük katkılarından dolayı, Giresun Üniversitesi Rektörlüğüne ve çalışanlarına ayrıca teşekkür etmeyi bir borç bilirim.

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hakan AKYURT
Tirebolu M.B. Meslek Yüksekokulu
Turizm ve Seyahat Bölümü

İÇİNDEKİLER

LİSANS DÜZEYİNDE TURİZM EĞİTİMİ ALAN ÖĞRENCİLERİN MEZUNİYET SONRASI YAŞAMLARINDA TURİZM SEKTÖRÜNÜ SEÇMEMELERİNİN NEDENLERİNİ SAPTAMAYA YÖNELİK BİR ARAŞTIRMA	
Ülker ÇOLAKOĞLU, Hakan ATAY, Hatice YILDIRIM	1
GİRESUN'DA FAALİYET GÖSTEREN OTEL İŞLETMESİ İŞGÖRENLERİNİN TÜKENMİŞLİK DÜZEYLERİNİN BELİRLENMESİNE YÖNELİK BİR ARAŞTIRMA	
Azize HASSAN, Elbeyi PELİT, Yasin KELEŞ, Melike ÇAKIR.....	16
THE DELEGATIVE LEADERSHIP FEATURES OF SERVICE MANAGERS: A QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH ON MANAGERS FROM DIFFERENT INDUSTRIES IN EASTERN-MARMARA	
Oğuz TÜRKAY, Aydın ÜNAL, Osman TAŞAR.....	33
DOĞU KARADENİZ BÖLGESİNE TURİZMİN EKONOMİK ETKİSİ	
Sebahattin KARAMAN.....	42
YAVAŞ TURİZM KAPSAMINDA YEREL GİRİŞİMCİLİĞİN DESTEKLENMESİ: TURİSTİK ÜRÜN ÇEŞİTLENDİRMESİNE ALTERNATİF BİR BAKIŞ AÇISI	
Şule TUZLUKAYA.....	54
KARADENİZ BÖLGESİ SULAK ALANLARININ EKOTURİZM BAĞLAMINDA DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ	
Alpay TIRIL	60
KARADENİZ BÖLGESİ YÖRESEL TEKSTİL ÜRÜNLERİNİN TURİZM BAĞLAMINDA İNCELENMESİ	
Onur TEKOĞLU, Akın YILDIRIM.....	75
GİRESUN İLİNİN TURİSTİK ARZ VERİLERİ VE TURİZM POTANSİYELİ BAKIMINDAN DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ	
Hakan AKYURT, Kamil YAĞCI.....	84
YEREL HALKIN TURİZMİN ETKİLERİ KONUSUNDAKİ DÜŞÜNCELERİNİN BELİRLENMESİNE YÖNELİK BİR ARAŞTIRMA: MUĞLA ÖRNEĞİ	
Cafer TOPALOĞLU, Zekeriya BİNGÖL, Taner DALGIN	95
DESTİNASYON MARKA KİMLİĞİ OLUŞTURMADA EFSANELERİN ROLÜ: GİRESUN EFSANELERİ ÜZERİNE BİR DEĞERLENDİRME	
Semra AKTAŞ, Orhan BATMAN.....	105
TÜRKİYE TURİZM STRATEJİSİ 2023 DOĞRULTUSUNDA DOĞU KARADENİZ TURİZMİNİN GELDİĞİ NOKTANIN DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ VE ANALİZİ	
Zeynep ASLAN, Orhan BATMAN.....	118
DOĞU KARADENİZ BÖLGESİNE OLAN TURİSTİK TALEBİN EKONOMETRİK BİR YAKLAŞIMLA TAHMİNİ	
Gökhan EMİR.....	130
DOĞU KARADENİZ MUTFAK KÜLTÜRÜ VE TÜRK TURİZMİ AÇISINDAN ÖNEMİ	
Nurten ÇEKAL	140

**DOĐU KARADENİZ'DEKİ BUZUL GÖLLERİNE TİPİK BİR ÖRNEK: ÇAKIRGÖL VE
TURİSTİK ÖNEMİ**

Serkan DOĐANAY153

**TÜRKİYEDE TURİSTİK ÜRÜN ÇEŞİTLENDİRİLMESİ GEREKLİLİĐİ: TURİSTİK ÜRÜN
ÇEŞİTLENDİRMESİ KAPSAMINDA DOĐU KARADENİZ BÖLGESİNE YÖNELİK BİR
DEĐERLENDİRME**

Hüseyin ÇEKEN, Murat YEŞİLTAŞ165

DOĐU KARADENİZ BÖLGESİNDEKİ GIDA TURİZMİ VE GELENEKSEL GIDALAR...176

**GASTRONOMİ TURİZMİ AÇISINDAN AKÇAABAT KÖFTESİ VE TRABZON'DA
TURİSTİK AKTİVİTEYE KATKISI**

Ahmet ÇAVUŞ184

THE DELEGATIVE LEADERSHIP FEATURES OF SERVICE MANAGERS: A QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH ON MANAGERS FROM DIFFERENT INDUSTRIES IN EASTERN-MARMARA

Asst. Prof. Dr. Oğuz TÜRKAY*

*Sakarya University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Tourism Management
Department

Lecturer. Aydın ÜNAL**

**Kırklareli University, Vocational School of Pınarhisar, Tourism and Travel Program

Osman TAŞAR***

***Sakarya University, Institute of Social Sciences

ABSTRACT

Leadership is crucial concept in any industry for the success of a business. Each business within their own industry conditions and operating conditions are determined the effects of leadership and its domains. Thus, leadership is a value or resources for the business, and it may also occur in different efficiency levels from person to person, from business to business and also from industry to industry. The delegative feature of leaders appears as a necessity to effectively use human resources. This study aims to assess the leadership attitudes of service firms' managers by the context of delegative leadership as one of three leadership styles identified by Lewin, and the differentiations of delegative features by the demographics. Data has gathered by using the survey technique from the managers from four different sub-industries (hotels, restaurants, banks, hospitals). Research has implemented in Kocaeli and Sakarya provinces as two major trade and tourism center of the eastern Marmara region. The responses received from the top and middle managers were analyzed with statistical methods. This study included a total 231 executives. These are found that men are more delegative than women; while the manager's age increases, delegative properties also increased; educational status has no effect on delegative leadership attitudes; delegative leadership attitudes increased by experience; restaurant and hotel managers were displayed higher delegative attitude than hospital administrators. Findings showed that delegative feature is supported in service enterprises by time and experience, and the importance of being delegative also understood by experience. In addition to this, the higher delegative attitudes showed in restaurant and hotel properties must be a proof of the importance of decision-support and power-support provided for employees in this type of service-intensive companies. To produce results for only a single type of leadership and to focus on executives only from two provinces should be stated as the most important limitations.

Keywords: delegative leadership, differentiations by demographics, Kocaeli, Sakarya.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is a concept that many definitions had been developed on. It is defined such as, a process in which a person influences other members to accomplish an objective; ability to use his skills to adapt each member of organization to goals and influence them (Robbins et al., 2004); a relational skill to enable one person to set a determining power on others (Halis et al., 2007); to accelerate the success of aims by ensuring individuals or groups to have a certain power against others in a certain period of time and certain conditions (Cole, 1993:52).

The importance of leaders was understood more clearly while in a structural change had been realized or industries had tried to sustain their competitive power under the conditions of crisis. Groups look for leaders who can lead them in such

times, to overcome the crisis and to motivate people (Begeç, 1999:1). Leadership features has a great importance on implementation and create consistency under the change (Milner and Joyce, 2005:18).

It is emphasized in literature that there were functional differences between leader and administrator. Even though administrator are identified as a man who had driven business by administration of others and by engaging employees effectively to the purposes (Mucuk, 1999), the administrator is thought that focuses on to cope with daily complexities; while leaders are considered more focused on to cope with change. Change growing by the relation of environmental issues and growing competition was required an effective and good leadership in any case (Kotter, 1999:45).

Leadership is to realize of getting effect on and motivation of employees while administration means to complete a 'process' because groups have respect to the leader and getting inquire from him (Ören, 2006:11-12). Administrator works on plans and budgets etc. but leaders must organize change, motivate people and give them a spirit (Milner and Joyce, 2005:18).

1. LEADERSHIP STYLES

There are several identifications of leadership styles had been introduced by many different criteria. As an example, Max Weber has classified leaders such as traditional, charismatic, formal, and technocratic. According to some researchers, styles of leadership are; nervous, friendly, crafty, and successful (Özsalmanlı, 2005:138). Wright (1996) considered leadership styles more diversely. Anxious leader, participative leader, servant leader, libertarian leader, expert leader, change-agent leader, democratic leader, leader as source of inspiration, diplomat leader, human-oriented leader, transformational leader, "brain and heart" leader, ordinary leader, administrator leader, autocratic leader are styles researcher has discussed.

Many researches had been conducted to determine certain features and traits of leaders. Because of this approach, many styles which each of them are going to be apparent with a certain kind of feature, were determined. Therefore, leadership styles were defined by personality traits and biologic necessities which leaders have, situations which determine leadership, behavioral elements which leaders must show, etc (Bass, 2008). The most known style definition on leadership is Kurt Lewin's classification. According to Lewin, the three styles of leadership; authoritarian, participative and delegative styles define major behavioral frame of leadership.

1.1. Authoritarian Leadership

Authoritarian leaders claim that all members of organization should have respect and trust to him. Personality, power and intelligence are most critical factor for this style of leadership (Şafaklı, 2005:134).

Authoritarian leaders usually define the problems, and develop some solutions alternatively. Leader informs members about his last decision and control implementation very strictly. He thinks that the participation of members or employees to the decision processes was firmly unnecessary, unreasonable and not applicable. Therefore under this type of leadership, no facilities offered to employees for participation (Gordan, 1991:382).

1.2. Democratic (Participative) Leadership

In neo-classic theory democratic style of leadership was caught on in parallel with prioritization of human relations. Democratic leader manage the organization with not only his capabilities, but also within the process that taken employees' ideas, comments and contributions (Şafaklı, 2005:134).

He gains and evaluates the ideas and assumptions of employees before he decided. Therefore in the process of determination of objectives, planning, policy development, organization, and making a response to the issues, the ideas of subordinates were taken into consideration. This kind of leadership was growth employee satisfaction. Employees feel responsibility and attend the purposes. Instead of pressing controls, democratic leaders focus to develop employees learning on job responsibility and internalizing it (Vural, 1997:20).

1.3. Delegative (Laissez-Faire) Leadership

In this style of leadership, leader transfers decision making power to employees, but remains responsible for their decisions. Delegative leaders need the authorization very narrowly. He enables the subordinates to determine aims of his job, to develop plans and policies for themselves and than let them alone in the business process (Aykan, 2004:215).

He doesn't play a central role in the decision process but ensure subordinates to develop a decision. Employees decide about their work environment. Thus, these leaders are very far away from power and responsibility while they delegate others. He was tied to subordinates in order to succeeding of subjects. Employees motivate themselves and leaders have no important role on motivation (Newstorm and Davis, 1993:227). Decisions were taken by groups, leader doesn't intervene, power and authority were used by subordinates and therefore followers can direct the leader (Türkmen, 1999: 63).

This style is based on the assumption that the leader has less knowledge about the task compared to the group members whom they practically know what they suppose to do. This is the most effective model where the leader cannot be an expert in all processes. Thus, it is important that the leader delegate certain tasks out to knowledgeable and gain trust worthy of the employees.

Delegation is a key leadership skill and ensures great benefits for leader and team. It liberates the schedule, makes members of team feel valued, and develops capabilities throughout the organization (Osborne, 2008:20). While researchers argued some features such as charisma (Walldman et al., 2004), to be supportive and humanist (Çetin ve Beceren, 2007), to be natural (Başkonak, 2006), to be oriented to others (customer, employee, suppliers, and society) (Baytok, 2006; Dinçer and Bitirim, 2007), delegative features are being more visible in order to explain effective leaders. Delegating and enabling employees is also crucial in order to empower functional parts of organization and make business more competitive. So employees' perceptions were enlarged and their capacity was raised to perform (Fairholm and Fairholm, 2009:79). This kind of leaders show more transformational effects tied to trust and motivation than transactional who formed the relations between employees in a constructive manner and determine status and job qualifications (Shokana et al., 2004:3). Successful leaders who transform the organizational culture have to consider delegation as a vehicle to develop others in order to cope with the change (Dawson, 2010:28) and to increase job satisfaction (Klatt and Hiebert, 2001:126). Therefore, to determine the cause-effect relations

among this kind of leadership is very significant and important. The question on which this study designed is how demographic features of managers affected the delegative leadership.

2. METHODOLOGY

This study aims to determine the delegative features of top and middle level managers in service industry and the differentiation of delegative features under the effects of demographic variables. Survey method was employed and quantitative data were analyzed. Delegative leadership scale has been adapted from “Leadership Style Survey” of Ivy Group in USA (Leadership Style Survey, 2010). This scale consists items stated for the measure of three styles of leadership; authoritarian, participative and delegative. We have just used the part which on delegative leadership. There are 10 items measuring delegative leadership in the scale. The statements are scaled in Likert format as 1 (strongly disagree) – 5 (strongly agree).

Study had been implemented in two cities of Eastern-Marmara, Sakarya and Kocaeli. Questionnaires were distributed to hotels, banks (branches of national-scale banks), restaurants, and hospitals (only private hospitals). Researchers have connected with an authorized member to get authorization. Some firms were accepted and allowed to get answers from managers within face to face sessions. Some of them were received in order to give them to managers and the forms that filled by respondents were collected after a given time. Total 243 questionnaires were collected as filled but 12 of them were precluded because of missing values.

Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was founded as 0,9288. This is a value that demonstrated the consistency and validity of scale for the sample.

3. FINDINGS

Demographic features of sample are given in Table 1 below. % 55.0 of respondents are male and %39,4 are female. %28 of respondents are in the ages of 25-30, % 29,4 of them are in 31–35, %19 are in group of 36-40, and % 1 are in the group of over 41 years old. % 25,1 had middle school and high school education. %24,2 had two year degree. % 41,1 had graduation for four year degree and graduation school. According to work experiences %17,3 have less than 3 year work experience, % 15,2 have 4-7 years, % 16, have 8-11 years, and % 19,0 have more than 1 years. % 39,4 of sampling managers are from restaurants, % 31,6 are from hotels, % 16,5 are from hospitals and, % 12,1 are from banks. Managers who were participated are from Sakarya at the ratio of % 79,2 and from Kocaeli of % 20,8.

Table 1: Demographics of Sampling Managers

Gender	f	%	Experience (as the years totally)	F	%
Male	127	55.0	3 Years and less	40	17.3
Female	91	39.4	4 – 7 Years	35	15.2
Missing	13	5.6	8 – 11 years	39	16.9
Total	231	100.0	12 Years and more	44	19.0
Age	f	%	Missing	73	31.6
25 – 30	65	28.1	Total	231	100.0
31 – 35	68	29.4	Industry	F	%
36 – 40	44	19.0	Restaurant	91	39.4
41 +	44	19.0	Hotel	73	31.6
Missing	10	4.3	Hospital	38	16.5
Total	231	100.0	Banking	28	12.1

Gender	f	%	Experience (as the years totally)	F	%
Male	127	55.0	3 Years and less	40	17.3
Female	91	39.4	4 – 7 Years	35	15.2
Education	f	%	Missing	1	0.4
Secondary and high school	58	25.1	Total	231	100.0
Two year degree	56	24.2	City	F	%
Four year degree and graduate school.	95	41.1	Sakarya	183	79.2
Missing	22	9.5	Kocaeli	48	20.8
Total	231	100.0	Total	155	100,0

The results of participation level evaluations are given below (Table 2). According to managers joined, the self-direction and self-leadership of employees are most crucial in delegation context. The job definitions are second most important attitude of managers taken high average rate. To ensure the implementation of decisions and to control of them, to share of knowledge with his employees, inform the employees for the changes and new processes are relatively important attitudes opposite of others. Furthermore all statements have high mean scores showed that managers are highly delegation-oriented. It can be thought that service production was highly complex process that employee must be empowered to respond all the needs of customers in a short period of time. This necessity required managers should be delegative highly. In the other hand, it may be service employees have high commitment and high competence. According to Ryan (2008:11), if someone has high commitment and high competence they require a delegating style of leadership.

Table 2: The Delegative Attitudes of Managers

Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
I and my employees always vote whenever a major decision has to be made.	3.8908	.98290
For a major decision to pass in my department, it must have the approval of each individual or the majority.	3.7118	1.10616
To get information out, I send it to employees. My employees are then expected to act upon the information.	4.1189	.88695
I allow my employees to determine what needs to be done and how to do it.	3.9432	.95574
I sustain the application of decisions by common agreement and control them.	4.2061	.90838
I delegate tasks in order to implement a new procedure or process.	4.1948	.92838
Each individual is responsible for defining their job.	4.2227	.89257
I like to share my leadership power with my subordinates.	4.0565	1.04957
Employees have the right to determine the organizational objectives.	4.1965	.97368
Employees can lead themselves just as well as a leader can.	4.265	.9730

In this part of study, the differentiations of delegative leadership by the effects of gender, age, education, experience, and industry were tested. Delegative leadership factor was considered as a single variable produced by the means of all 10 statements. To analysis of significances of mean differences t test and ANOVA were employed.

Table 3: The Results of Variance Analyses

	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t / F	Sig.	Sig. Differences between Means
Gender	(1) Female	91	3.9851	.59464	-2.283*	.023	1 < 2*
	(2) Male	127	4.1722	.59833		-2.285*	
Age	(1) 25 -30	65	3.9093	.58946	4.079	.008	1 < 3-4*
	(2) 31 -35	68	4.1462	.59944			
	(3) 36 - 40	44	4.2295	.59625			
	(4) 41 +	44	4.2520	.60784			
Education	(1) Secondary and high school	58	4.0254	.68301	.932	.395	--
	(2) Two year degree	56	4.1744	.55038			
	(3) Four year degree and graduate school	95	4.1262	.57419			
Experience	(1) 3 Years and less	40	3.9639	.70338	5.414	.001	1 < 3-4* 2 < 4*
	(2) 4 - 7 Years	35	3.9661	.72889			
	(3) 8 - 11 Years	39	4.3444	.50195			
	(4) 12 Years and more	44	4.3634	.47793			
Industry	(1) Restaurant	91	4.1980	.55970	8.616	.000	1-2 > 3*
	(2) Hotel	73	4.1865	.67222			
	(3) Hospital	38	3.6444	.64774			
	(4) Bank	28	3.9802	.52771			
City	(1) Sakarya	183	4.1057	.59509	1.098	.277	--
	(2) Kocaeli	48	3.9734	.77754			

*p<.05

The t test results showed that managerial features related to delegation were diversified by gender. While the means are very closed to each other, men are more delegative (means difference is 0,1871).

ANOVA was implemented to determine whether there are differences between age groups. Results showed that there is diversity significantly by the results of multivariate comparison tests (Tukey HSD and Tamhane), between 25-30 age group and 36-40 age group, and also 25-30 age group and 41+ age group. The managers with the age of 25 and less are less delegative than the managers from the groups of 36-40 and 41+. Therefore, it can be said that older managers were more delegative.

Any differentiations were found between the groups of education level. This is also an interesting result showed that leadership features are not kinds of values gained by education.

It is also found that a significant differentiations between experience as time and delegative leadership. The managers have work experience for 8-11 years and 12 and more are more delegative than the managers have experience for 3 years and less. 12 and more year-experienced managers are more delegative than the 4-7 year-experienced managers. This result highlights that the delegating behaviors are increasing by the experience.

Leaders from different industries can develop different attitudes on delegating. This is also analyzed by variance analysis and significant differentiations are detected. According to findings, the managers from restaurant and hotel industries are more delegative than managers working in hospitals. This may be the result of more complex structure of tourism and hospitality, and also more customer-driven processes of these industries.

Any differentiations were found between the participators working in different cities. Therefore, delegative skills have not been differentiated by location.

4. CONCLUSION

Service businesses showing activity in highly competitive environment must develop business capability and support customer satisfaction. This can be realized under a good-management. It is not enough that managers with high capability, but they must have some features related to personality with leadership skills. Leadership has a key role that there is an increasing understanding on the importance of it. In an exact competition, organizations need leaders that to inspire employees and delegate them authorization while identify their responsibilities.

In this study, delegative skills that service leaders have, has analyzed. The level of delegating has been taken in hand. And differentiations of delegative leadership by demographics were assessed. The findings showed that;

- Men are more delegative than women leaders,
- Leaders within higher ages are more delegative than younger-ones.
- Education level has no effect on delegative leadership.
- More experience creates more delegative attitudes.
- Leaders from restaurant and hotel industries are more delegative than leaders working in hospitals.

By the findings the effects of gender, age, experience and industry must be highlighted. If delegation is key to empower the employees as a key to produce more effective and satisfactory services, the capability of delegation and also capability to create more effective management tightly related to these variables.

REFERENCES

- Aykan, E.** (2004), Kayseri’de Faaliyet Gösteren Girişimcilerin Liderlik Özellikleri, Erciyes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Sayı:17, 2004/2.
- Bass, B. and R. Bass** (2008), Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and managerial Applications, 4th Edition, Free Press, New York.
- Başkonak, S.** (2006), Otel İşletmelerinde Evrensel Liderlik Yaklaşımlarının Uygunluğu ve Kabul Edilebilirlik Düzeylerinin Belirlenmesi: Hilton Otellerindeki Alt ve Orta Düzey Yöneticilere Yönelik Bir Uygulama, Basılmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara
- Baytok, A.** (2006), Hizmet İşletmelerinde Örgüt Kültürünün Oluşturulmasında Liderin Rolü, Basılmamış Doktora Tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyonkarahisar.

- Begeç, S.** (1999), Modern Liderlik Yaklaşımları ve Uygulaması, Basılmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gebze Yüksek Teknolojisi Enstitüsü Mühendislik ve Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Gebze
- Cole, G.A.** (1993). Management Theory and Practice. 4th ed., London, DP Publication Ltd.
- Çetin, N.G., E. Beceren** (2007), Lider Kişilik: Gandhi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Yıl/Volume:3, Sayı/Issue:5, 110-132.
- Dawson, C.** (2010), Leading Culture Change: What Every CEO Needs to Know, Stanford University Press, California.
- Diñcer, M.K., S. Bitirim** (2007), Kurum Kültürü Çalışmalarında Hizmetkar Liderlik Anlayışı İle Değer Yaratmak, İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi - Sayı 28
- Fairholm, M.R. and G.W. Fairholm** (2009), Understanding Leadership Perspectives: Theoretical and Practical Approaches, Springer, New York.
- Gordon, J.R.** (1991); A Diagnostic Approach to Organizational Behavior, Third Edition, Boston
- Halis, M., M. Çoban, B. Şafak, H. M. Şahin** (2007), Stratejik Liderlik, Alfa Basım, İstanbul.
- Klatt, B. and M., Hiebert** (2001), The Encyclopedia of Leadership: a Practical Guide to Popular Leadership Theories And Techniques, McGraw Hill.
- Kotter, J.P.** (1999), Harvard Business Review Dergisinden Seçmeler, Çev.Meral Tüzel, BZD Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- Leadership Style Survey (2010), http://www.hrlc.org/gov_relations/ldrship_style_survey-ivygroup.doc, (accessed 05 May 2010).
- Milner, E. and P. Joyce** (2005), Lessons in Leadership, Taylor & Francis Group, Canada.
- Mucuk, İ.** (1999), Modern İşletmecilik, 11. Baskı, Türkmen Kitabevi, İstanbul
- Newstorm, J. W. and K. Davis** (1993), Organizational Behavior at Work, McGraw Hill.
- Osborne, C.** (2008), Leadership, DK Publishing, New York.
- Ören, S.A.** (2006), Günümüzde Liderlik Profili; Transformasyonel (Dönüştürücü) Liderlik Antalya Bölgesinde Bulunan Beş Yıldızlı Otel İşletmelerinde Bir Araştırma, Basılmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya
- Özsalmanlı, A.Y.** (2005); Türkiye’de Kamu Yönetiminde Liderlik ve Lider Yöneticilik, DEÜ, İBBF, Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü, İzmir.
- Ryan, R.** (2008), Leadership Development: a Guide for HR and Training Professionals, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Shokane, M, K. Stanz, J. Slabbert** (2004), Description Of Leadership In South Africa: Organizational Context Perspective, SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 2004, 2 (3), 1-6
- Şafaklı, O.V.** (2005), KKTC’deki Kamu Bankalarında Liderlik Stilleri Üzerine Bir Çalışma, Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi, 6 (1), S.132-143.
- Türkmen, İ.** (1999), Yönetimsel Zaman ve Yetki Devri Açısından Yönetimde Verimlilik, MPM Yayınları., Yayın No:519, Ankara.
- Vural, G.** (1997); Liderlik ve Hemşirelik, Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi, 1(1), ss:15-22

Waldman, D.A, M. Javidan, P. Veralla (2004), Charismatic Leadership At The Strategic Level: A New Application Of Upper Echelons Theory, The Leadership Quarterly,15 (2004) 355–380.

Wright, S. (1996), Unlock the Leadership Potential. Nursing Management, 3(2): 8-10.