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Abstract
In this article, ideal leadership perception of senior undergraduate and graduate students attending economic and administrative sciences and studying management of business administration (MBA) in 2015-2016 term were investigated in terms of some demographic characteristics. In the research, survey was applied to senior undergraduate students (232) studying management of business administration and graduate students (92) studying management of business administration. 324 student data were obtained. According to the data obtained, there is a significant difference between the undergraduate and graduate students in terms of being a model of subleadership perception. But considering the mean value, being a model of subleadership perception of graduate students are higher. There is no significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students in terms creating a shared vision (mean value of undergraduate students’ perception of subleadership of creating a shared vision is higher), risk taking (mean value of graduate students’ perception of subleadership of risk taking is higher), recognition and appreciation (mean value of undergraduate students’ perception of subleadership of recognition and appreciation is higher), focusing on team working (mean value of undergraduate students’ perception of subleadership of creating a shared vision is higher).
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INTRODUCTION
In today's world, changes and developments are realized dizzying pace. In this rapid change and development process, for group, business or society, strong managers or leaders must take responsibility of the management levels not to come across negativity. Group, business or society can only cope with negativity and survive thanks to strong managers or leaders. Leadership is the process which ensures attaining the determined goals and aims by affecting and convincing group, business or society. Leader is the person who performs this process. One of the main tasks all institutions and organizations is creating all necessary conditions facilitate to train this strong manager and leaders. This study describes how undergraduate and graduate students studying MBA perceive linear leadership and whether differentiates according to their demographic characteristics or their educational process in which they exist.

THE CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP AND PERCEPTION
Leadership is one of the most debated issues and foremost issues and researches conducted on management and behavioral sciences. Numerous authors and researches have studied on the concept of leader and leadership. But it is not built consensus on leadership. The reason is that, it is not certain when, where and how leaders occured. Leadership is one of the world’s oldest and most important phenomenon. It is an universal concept for all people, groups, businesses and society. In Oxford English Dictionary, it has been come across the leader term in 1300’s, but it was stated that the leadership term was revealed after the first half of 19’th century. Previously, leadership term was used as prince, king, commander, president (Bass 1990: 3-11). All these
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concepts were used to distinguish managers, managing groups and communities from the members of group an society.

Previous leadership concept used to have a traditional and regional meaning. Namely, it used to include central authority, rules applied everyone, principles, strict inspection, powerful centralized and hierarchical structure (Rost, 1991). However, afterwards when bulk changes occurred in accordance with society, insight of leadership having sense of its period was on agenda.

Leadership is an ability mobilizing people, groups, businesses or societies inline with determined goals an aims (Güney, 2012a). Leadership is a process that determines useful social goals for group or society and by achieving these goals, it is a useful tool for leaders and followers to be happy by persuading and convincing (Heifetz, 1998). Leadership is the ability to achieve these goals set by formal or informal ways to influence group members (Northouse, 1997). Group is an interaction process providing information to its followers about what should be done in business or society. By providing followers behave in this manner, it achieves goals an aims (Shfritz 1998). Leadership is the guiding and accelerating force behind the activities that organizations perform to adapt change and developments in a rapidly changing and developing world (Bennis and Nanus, 1985). For businesses, leadership is a process by which groups or people interact with organization’s concrete and indirect sources to achieve specific goals and aims providing productivity, profitability, creativity, innovation and service (Blake and McCanse, 1991). Leadership is an ability in a process of regulating groups or societies’ activities by taking advantage of capacity of groups or society (Güney, 1992b). Taking into account the definitions given in leadership, it can be defined as; Leadership is an ability to realize goals and objectives by influencing and mobilizing followers.

Perception is one of the important aspects of human consciousness. If everything formed or forming in our surrounding occur in human consciousness, it must certainly be perceived continuously. It is impossible. Therefore, all the experts of psychology, social psychology and behavioral sciences have focused on perception. Perception is transmission of objective world to subjective consciousness via senses. The term perception derived from the term take. Perception is a process having cognitive feature for determining human behaviour. It provides relationship between sensory organs and brain so it facilitates us to make evaluation. Therefore, it is an extremely important process for leadership.

The contingency approach is a phenomenon for perceiving reality. That is, there is not always accuracy and validity for regions and countries. Briefly, facts perceived by people may vary (Friman, 1999). Perception occurred by environmental effects of people’s family and culture may cause differences for perceiving objects and events.

Perception is a process of information, interpretation and evaluation regarding our environment. Perception is consciousness experiences occurring among objects (Coren, Ward and Enns, 1993). Perception concept is a process obtaining, interpretation and evaluation of data related to only event or object (Güney, 2000c). Taking into account these definitions, perception can be defined as; Perception is a psychological process introducing subjects, relations and events in our environment by forming organizations and impressions in our sensory organs. Thanks to this introduction, it allows us to make comments and evaluations.

THE IMPORTANCE OF LEADERSHIP, DEVELOPMENT PROCESS OF AND RELATIONSHIP WITH PERSONALITY

Leadership development process is discussed during specific periods. These periods are as follows (Güney, 2012a, Seters and Filed, 1990):

Period emphasizing importance on personality, taking criteria as an impression power, leaders’ accepted behaviour is important, leadership is up to time and condition as important, expectations from leaders are important, initiating and developing trade relations, taking on and developing role as important, culture criteria is important, change is important. Briefly, it is possible to summarize these periods as follows:

Leadership is accepted according to a variable giving importance to and considering this variable. All leaders leading groups and society have structured personality. Leaders’ personality is shaped by social
and cultural factors in which leaders are brought up. Knowing and examining personality types facilitate understanding leaders setting goals and objectives for groups and societies and mobilizing them. Key factors affecting the formation of personality should be known for analysis of leadership. Knowing key factors affecting the formation of personality is important not only for leadership but also for followers. Only if the personality of followers have features adopting and supporting leader, they can adopt leader. Briefly, the personality and maturity level of leader and followers should adopt and achieve the goals and objectives set. Leaders should have robust characteristics, patient and sense of humour. Also their self-perception should be strong.

THE KEYS TONES OF LEADERSHIP, PRINCIPLES OF LEADERSHIP, POWER TYPES OF LEADERSHIP AND FACTORS AFFECTING LEADER'S SUCCESS NEGATIVELY

As a result of their research carried out by social scientists about leadership and leadership process, they confirmed some important points forming the basis of leadership process based on the data obtained. It is possible to sort out some important points based on leadership: Setting goals and objectives, deciding instantly and accurately, not discriminating among followers, being exciting and refreshing, being communication expert, being open-minded and fair, being sense, being patient and stable, forming team work among followers (Güney, 2012). Keystones sorted out above have important effects on realizing leadership process. If these keystones are less, the rate of person leading group or society will be lesser. As a result of the research carried out by scientists, they set some basic principles on the data obtained about leadership. Leadership principles are sorted based on the data obtained as a result of researches carried out by Ulrich and Smallwood and Sweetman Peter Drucker (Drucker, 2013, Ulrich, Smallwood and Sweetman, 2010 Parsehy of 2014):

- Prospective leaders should have an action plan,
- Prospective leaders should take over the responsibility for their decisions,
- Prospective leaders should focus on opportunities rather than problems,
- Prospective leaders should organize useful meetings,
- Prospective leaders should give priority to group and society,
- Prospective leaders should find the truth for group and society,
- Prospective leaders should always bear in mind what must be done for group and society,
- Prospective leaders should take over the responsibility of the positive and negative consequences of the communications set,
- Prospective leaders should shape the future,
- Prospective leaders should be result-oriented,
- Prospective leaders should create commitment to goals and aims,
- Prospective leaders should train both followers and successors,
- Prospective leaders should train themselves.

Briefly, every scientist has set his own leadership principles based on the research data obtained. Overall rules that must be obeyed for those aiming leadership as (Güney, 2012a):

- Prospective leaders should primarily know themselves and develop their characteristic features,
- Prospective leaders should equip themselves with knowledge,
- Prospective leaders should give importance to responsibility,
- Prospective leaders should be expert in setting goal and aim,
- Prospective leaders should not have hesitation in decision-making process,
- Prospective leaders should not give up principles of justice and law,
- Prospective leaders should be initiator of change,
- Prospective leaders should behave as a leader in any environment,
- Prospective leaders should stand up to challenges,
- Prospective leaders should be courageous.

Although it is not possible to restrict leadership principles as mentioned above, we prioritized some of them.
Power is a very important factor in managing the process. Thanks to their power people have impact on others. There are many types of power that managers utilize when managing people. It can be listed as: Expert power (power originated from knowledge, ability, capacity and capability), legal power (power originated from position, authority, status and law), reward power (power originated from group, business or society’s exhibition of appropriate attitudes and behaviours to goals and aims), charismatic power (power originated from leader’s innate personality features) (Güney, 2009d, Güney, 2012a, Hughes, Ginnett and Curphy, 2012, Daft, 1998, Luthans, 1985, Koçel, 2010, Bertram, 2003):

There are many factors affecting the success of leader negatively. Some of them are: Insisting on the mistakes made, giving too much importance to power, not being humanistic to followers, not being empathetic to followers, not acting mature psychologically, preventing successive leaders to be trained, being selfish, resisting change, not following agenda, not setting new goals, not awarding success, behaving biased, ignoring conflict and discouraging followers.

LEADERSHIP THEORIES

From the past up till now, people have continuously conducted several researchs to comprehend leader and leadership. As the results of data obtained, they put forward various principles and theories. Scientists developed leadership theories as a consequence of their researchs. In this part, we will try to explain the leadership theories put forward by scientists. Some of these theories are explained below.

Great Man Theory

The first theory put forward about leadership is great man theory. This theory played an important role in development of successive theories. According to this theory, the most important trait that leader should have is virtue. In other words, the key factor for leadership is virtue. In ancient Greek, the most important thing that people should have was virtue. According to theory based on virtue, it has been put forward that only people having virtue can be leaders. Because virtue is an innate characteristics of leaders. They can easily lead group or society. According to proponents of this theory, great man can affect and change history of mankind. For instance, Luther, Calvin and Zwingli pioneered Protestant Reform. Voltaire, Robespier, Dalton and Napoleon pioneered French Revolution. great Man Theory was defined as a history of historical biographies (Haslam 2004, Surpass and Musk, 2006). Briefly, according to this theory, great man(leaders) do not occur later, they are born.

Trait Theory

According to this theory, the traits that leaders have are the main factors determining the effectiveness of leadership process. Since the transaction to the community life, people have always been curious about leadership traits. This curiosity led to researchs. This researchs were made about personality traits. As a result of scientific research, it has been concluded that: Leaders having innate abilities and gaining subsequent traits formed the basis of leadership. It has been put forward that, there are certain individual traits distinguishing an effective leader from ineffective leader. This researchs began in 1904 and led to emerging a large quantity of knowledge, finding theories by developing systematically until 1950: (Güney, 2012e). Social scientists conducted many researchs on traits to distinguish leaders from other people. As a result of this research, they identified many leadership traits. At the end of the 1960’s, more than 80 leadership traits were identified in 20 different leadership researchs. But it is interesting that only 4 or 5 of them were common in this 80 traits. The results obtained were not sufficient enough to distinguish leaders easily from other people (Robbins, 1986). Even today, traits that leaders should have are still under investigation.

Social scientists classified the traits that play an important role in distinguishing effective leaders from ineffective ones in 4 groups. These are sorted as: (Güney, 2015f, Güney, 2000c, Erdoğan, 2007, Gibson and Ivancevich, 1982, Korman, 1977, Özkalp and Kırel, 2001, Eren, 1984a:65): Physical, mental and personality traits (individual trust, persuasiveness, understanding, ability, open-minded, calmness, listening ability, sense of responsibility, general speaking and symbolizing, giving directions to events, managing others, self-assessment skills, pay attention to group members, stability, maturity, precision etc.). Traits
explained regarding personality make leaders more powerful, effective and convincing. Despite all these explanations, personality traits are not enough for a man to be a leader alone.

**Behavioral Leadership Theories**

In the face of the necessary traits of leaders, social scientists came to conclusion that traits are required for leadership but it is not enough for one person to be leader alone. Because of this reason, scientists began to conduct new researchs.

Social scientists who are curious about leadership conducted several researchs between 1940 and 1950. Common goal of these researchs was to find out the effective behaviour type for leader. According to data obtained form the researchs, two basic behavioral dimensions were determined to make leaders effective. These behavioral dimensions are (McShane and Glinow, 2009): human-oriented and work-oriented.

According to this descriptions, behavioral leadership theories classified into two groups. Theories giving importance to individual and theories giving importance to individuals’ work. Studies based on behavioral leadership theories are: Researchs conducted by University of Iowa, University of Ohio State, University of Michigan, Likert System 1- 4 Leadership Model, Blake and Mouton’s Managerial Grid Model, McGregor’s X and Y theories.

**Situational Leadership Theories**

Basic variable emphasized on situational leadership is current conditions. In other words, basic factors determining leader are time and conditions.

According to this theory, basic situational factors efficient in determining leader are as follows: Interpersonal, intergroup, interinstitution, intersociety differences, culture and environment. According to the representatives of situational leadership, followers, leadership qualities, behaviours and conditions are basic variables that determine people to lead efficiently (Church, 1986). These variables are mutually interactive.

Fiedler has brought forward his leadership researchs under the name of situational leadership. According to Fiedler’s situational leadership, time and current conditions determine the leader. Three variables determine the efficiency of leader. These are (Fiedler, 1972b, Güney, 2012a, Güney, 2012e, Davis, 1988): Leader-follower relationship, nature of work and power resulting from the position of leader.

**House’s Goal-Oriented Leadership Theory**

Goal-oriented leadership which Evans brought forward in 1970 and later enhanced by Robert J. House was revised and updated in 1966. The impacts of leader’s behaviour on follower’s job satisfaction, motivation and performance was emphasized in House’s goal-oriented leadership theory. House and Mitchell divided leader’s type of behaviour into four groups. These are: authoritarian, supporter, participant and success-oriented behavior (House, 1996, House, 1971b, Chemers, 1997, Nortcraft, 1994).

**Three-Dimensional Leadership Theory**

W. J. Reddin developed leadership theory by adding situational variabes to Blake and Mouton’s managerial grid model. In Reddin’s theory, leader’s impact on followers dependent on environmental conditions was investigated.

Inspired by behavioral leadership theory, Reddin identified four types of leadership behaviour. These are (Sadler, 2005): High duty but low relationship, high relationship but low duty, high relationship and high duty, low relationship and low duty.

In three-dimensional leadership theory, dependent on environmental conditions and utilizing basic leadership behavioral types, eight different leadership behavior was identified that makes leaders effective or ineffective (Reddin, 1967a, Reddin, 1968b, Aşan and Aydın, 2006).

**Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational (Lifecycle) Leadership Theory**

Hersey and Blanchard was interested in followers’ maturity levels. Followers’ maturity levels are not same. Because environment that followers are brought up and their educational levels are not same.
These differences reflect their maturity levels. Subordinates’ maturity levels are different one another. According to Hersey and Blanchard, ones having lack of knowledge, ability, capability and education do not have enough self-confidence. Ones having weak self-confidence expect different behaviours from their leaders than ones having strong self-confidence. In other words, followers having high maturity levels have high expectations from their leaders. In addition, they carry out all the tasks on time and appropriately given to them by their leaders. But followers having low maturity levels face difficulties carrying out tasks given to them (Güney, 2012e). Based on these explanations, task-oriented leadership style is appropriate for the followers having high maturity levels, relationship-oriented leadership style is appropriate for the followers having high maturity levels.

Vroom-Yetton’un Participation in Decision and Decision-Making Leadership Theory
According to leadership theory developed by Victor Vroom and Philip, leaders decision-making process was focused on. Since decision-making is the most important moment for a leader in leadership process. For an effective management, not only leaders but also followers should participate in decision-making process. Allowing followers to participate in decision-making facilitates adapting and accessing the goals and aims set. On the other hand, it increases managerial effectiveness. The most important point in decision-making process is to determine how many followers will participate. The more people participate, the more leader will be effective.

According to Vroom’s participating in decision-making process leadership theory, leaders have five types of decision-making. These are (Jago, Ettling and Vroom, 1985, Vroom and Jago, 1995, Vroom and Yetton, 1973): Leaders and their decision-making types, leaders and their decision-making methods, methods related to decision-making, methods related to commitment to decision-making, methods decreasing time cost. According to Vroom-Yetton, effectiveness of any decision depends on three basic variables. These variables include (Güney, 2012a): quality of decision, acceptability of decision and decision made promptly.

Leader-Member Exchange Theory
As a result of researchs conducted by Grace and Haga, they developed leader-member exchange theory. Unlike other leadership theories, leadership process was explained as: Leadership is the result of interaction between leader and followers. According to the proponents of leader-member exchange theory, leaders can establish relationship with only some of the followers owing to lack of time. Leaders establish special relationship with the followers whom they trust. Apart from this trusted followers (more rewarded), others (less rewarded and less formal relationship with leader) are not too much trusted. Such distinction is secret. Researchs confirmed that trusted people’s success, commitment and job satisfaction are higher than untrusted people (Güney, 2012e). Based on these explanations: Leaders do not treat equally to the followers. In other words, they discriminate between followers.

Modern Leadership Theories
When great man theory, trait theory and behavioural theory were inadequate to explain leadership, situational leadership emerged. Situational leadership theories was supported more than other theories in explaining leadership. But when major changes and developments occurred in institutions and community, this led scientists to conduct new research and investigations about leadership. Transactional, transformational, charismatic and ethical leadership came on the agenda.

Transactional and Transformational Leadership
Transactional leadership has been put forward in 1978 by James MacGregor Burns. Afterwards, it has been developed by some social scientists as well. Transactional leadership is related to tradition and past. Transactional leaders award their followers. Transactional leadership is often used in today’s working life. Transactional leaders know the followers’ senses and desires. That’s why they propose some rewards in response to their talks and want them to select one of the proposals. In this leadership style, situational determination of leadership is focused on. The effectiveness of transactional leadership is determined by
their power and rewards they have (Eren, 2000b, Humphreys, 2001, Bass, 1990a, Luthans, 1995, İşcan, 2006). In other words, transactional leaders should meet the requirements of their followers to some extent in order to activate their actions. There is not too much emphasis on followers’ creativeness.

According to the transactional approach developed by Burns, leadership is a process resulted from mutual agreement between leader and followers to carry out a task effectively (Burns, 1979a, Hartog and Muijen, 1997). In other words, leaders and followers are in mutual interaction. Transactional leader determines and regulates followers’ tasks. Afterwards, followers’ needs are met. In the last phase, successful followers are awarded, unsuccessful followers are punished (Bass, 1990a, Robbins, 1994). Because of all these transactions, this leadership style is defined as transactional leadership.

According to the transformational leadership approach, leader’s power and meeting needs and demands of followers are important in achieving goals and aims set. Transformational leaders create major changes by affecting followers attitudes and behaviours. They realize the process of commitment on institutional or social mission, aim and strategy (Yukl, 1989). Transformational leaders explain followers what is important and appropriate in line with interests of business or society. They motivate followers by doing this (Hartog and Muijen, 1997). In the process of transformational leadership, leaders bring forward the capacity of followers. By that way, followers become self-confident, responsible, efficient, high-motivated leader in transformational leadership process, the work to achieve capacity followers (doing business talents and skills) by bringing forward their self-confident and responsible (Ataman, 2009). According to Bass, transformational leaders emerge when followers interest increase in task, adapt followers by informing about the goals and missions of group and institution, create desire for group or institution’s existence (Bass, 1990a). Briefly, transformational leaders accelerate transformation process about accelerating transformation by informing followers.

General behavioural features of transformational leaders are: Transformational leaders create vision for group, institution or societies in which they manage instead of maintaining current status or managing routine tasks. Current problems are opportunities for them and they are interested in followers’ individual training (Avolio, Waldman and Yammarino, 1991). Transformational leaders behave effectively in achieving goals and objectives set. These effective behaviors have some dimensions. These are (Bass, 1990a, Bass, 1999c, Avolio, Waldman and Yammarino, 1991, Bennet, and Percy, 1994, Hinkin and Tracey, 1999, Güney, 2012a, Güney, 2000c, Güney, 2012e): Individual support, intellectual stimulation, motivation, charismatic effect. Transformational leaders have self-dependence and self-trust. They affect followers by these features.

Charismatic Leadership

Conger and Kanungo formed the approach of charismatic leadership as a result of their studies about leadership. There are three basic stages in charismatic leadership approach These stages are (Conger, Kanungo and Menon, 2000): Environmental assessment, vision formulation and application. In charismatic leaders and followers relationship, there are some basic features different from other leadership styles. Followers of charismatic leaders adopt their leaders trusting and following them. Leader’s setting of visioner, transformative and thrilling aims and goals have impact on them. The charismatic leader-follower fit is more realistic than other leadership styles.

Attribution Theory of Leadership

Attribution theory is dependent on the meaning of certain behaviour which express how we judge people in different forms (Kelley, 1972). In attribution theory, in order to understand people’s behaviour, the basis of their behaviours exhibited should be understood. In other words, the emphasis must be on the reason-conclusion relationship to understand their behaviours. According to this theory, leadership process is realized depending on the features of other people attributed commonly by people. According to the basic assumptions of attribution theory, the most important features of leaders are their efficiency and insistence on achieving goals and objectives set. Another prominent features are; they can make decisions appropriately on time to achieve their goals and objectives set (Robbins, 1986).
In attribution theory, in order to interpret a person’s behaviour, it should be determined whether this behaviours are resulted from internal (behaviours controlled) or external behaviours (behaviors uncontrolled). Three basic variables are needed to understand that: These are (Robbins and Judge, 2013): Differences (determining person’s exhibition as different behaviours in different conditions), compliance, appropriateness and agreement (agreeing on behaviours exhibited suitable for conditions and time by everyone) and consistency (exhibiting always the same attitudes and behaviors).

According to three basic variables, we assess behaviours of people exhibited and attributed to them. In this theory, people’s misconception and prejudice affect their attribution process negatively. It is generally considered that interpreting people’s behaviours rather than external factors, internal factors are effective on emerging these behaviours (Miller and Lawson, 1989). This is a misconception. Because it is wrong to comment that this behaviours occur by internal and external factors.

Ethics and Ethical Leadership
Since ones occupying management positions became more interested in their posts, ethical leadership gained importance. Leaders have major responsibilities in establishing ethical climate (May, Hodges, Chen and Avolio, 2003, Aronson, 2001, Burns, 1978b, Dickson, Smith, Grojean and Ehrhart, 2001, Trevino, Hartman, and Brown, 2000). Because leaders are the role model for employees in terms of ethical attitude and behaviours.

In businesses, acting ethically means obeying democratic rules and ethical norms. That’s why, ethics is the most important instruments to strengthen working life and competitiveness (Northouse, 2014). In businesses, it is a reality that the most effective key in ethical manner is leadership. Anywhere leaders acting in an unethical attitude and behaviours, it is not right to expect employee’s ethical behaviours.

THE AIM, UNIVERSE, SAMPLES, HYPOTHESIS, INSTRUMENTS, DATA EVALUATING METHOD, DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND DATA ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH
The aim of the research is to determine the undergraduate and graduate students’ perception of leadership roles and types studying MBA. Moreover, differences between two groups regarding leadership perception were investigated. The universe of the research consists of the senior undergraduate students attending in a private university studying MBA in 2015-2016 term and all graduate students studying MBA. The sample of the research consists of the senior undergraduate students attending in a private university studying MBA in 2015-2016 term and all graduate students studying MBA.

Hypotheses to be tested in the research are:

H1: There is a significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students’ dimensions of ideal leadership perception.
H2: Duration of attendance is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ dimensions of leadership perception.
H3: There is a significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students’ dimensions of ideal leadership perception in terms of gender.
H4: Education is influential between undergraduate and graduate students’ dimensions of leadership perception.

Research data were obtained by using "Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)" developed by Kouzes ve Posner. The inventory is composed of two parts. The first part is information form, the second part is leadership practices questionnaire. Leadership practices questionnaire composes of five sub-categories. These categories are: Being model: (1, 2, 3), Creating a shared vision: (4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12), Risk taking: (13, 14, 15, 16, 17), Recognition and appreciation: (18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24): Teamwork: (25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30).

SPSS 16.0 software was used in assessing the data obtained. The reliability and validity of the questionnaire were tested and frequency, percentage, mean and standart deviation were calculated. Also Kruskal Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests were used in analysis.
Distribution by Demographic Characteristics
Of 324 students, 199 are between 19-22 age group, 80 are between 23-26 age group, 13 are between 27-30 age group, 32 are over the age of 30. Of students, 124 are female, 200 are male. Of students, 22 are married, 302 are single. Of 324 students, 115 are employed, 209 are unemployed. Of students, 232 are undergraduate, 92 are graduate students.

Validity and Reliability Analysis
The reliability coefficient (cronbach alpha) of the ideal leadership perception questionnaire is 0.907. It is extremely reliable. The cronbach alpha coefficient of dimensions are: being model (0.840), creating shared vision (0.821), risk taking (0.915), recognition and appreciation (0.817), team-work (0.751) respectively.

Analysis of Hypothesis Tests
Differences in Ongoing Educational Levels
H₁= There is a significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students' leadership perceptions.
H₁A=There is a significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students' dimension of being model.
H₁B=There is a significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students' dimension of creating shared vision.
H₁C=There is a significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students' dimension of risk taking.
H₁D=There is a significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students' dimension of recognition and appreciation.
H₁E= There is a significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students' dimension of team-work.

The results of undergraduate and graduate students' leadership perception differences are shown in Table-1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate (232)</th>
<th>Graduate (92)</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>P=0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being Model</td>
<td>155.95, 36181,50</td>
<td>179,01, 16468.5</td>
<td>9153.5</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Shared Vision</td>
<td>167.51, 38862,50</td>
<td>149,86, 13787.5</td>
<td>9509.5</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>161,77, 37530,00</td>
<td>164,35, 15120</td>
<td>10502</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and Appreciation</td>
<td>162.95, 37805,00</td>
<td>161,36, 14845</td>
<td>10567</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-work</td>
<td>164,90, 38256,00</td>
<td>156,46, 14394</td>
<td>10116</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table-1 above, Mann-Whitney U test is used to test the differences between undergraduate and graduate students in subleadership perception of being model, creating shared vision, risk taking, recognition and appreciation and team-work.

There is a significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students' subleadership perception of being model (U= 9153.5, P= 0.043 <0.05). Graduate students' being model perception is higher. The reason may be that graduate students may perceive themselves different from undergraduate students.

There is not a significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students' subleadership perception of creating shared vision (U = 9509.5, P=0.125 > 0.05). But considering mean value, graduate students' creating shared vision is higher. The reason may be that, undergraduate students may easily create vision for their future.

There is not significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students' subleadership perception of risk taking (U=10502; p= 0.822>But considering mean value, graduate students’ risk taking
perception is higher. The reason may be that, graduate students perceive business and country conditions in reality and may be more courageous in risk taking.

There is not a significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of recognition and appreciation (U=10567; p=0.890> 0.05). But considering mean value, undergraduate students’ recognition and appreciation is higher.

There is not a significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of team-work (U =10116; p=0.464>0.05). But considering mean value, undergraduate students’ team-work is higher. The reason may be that, undergraduate students give importance to student solidarity rather than competitiveness.

Differences In Terms of Gender

H$_2$ = Gender is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception.

H$_{2A}$ = Gender is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception of being model.

H$_{2B}$ = Gender is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception of creating shared vision.

H$_{2C}$ = Gender is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception of risk taking.

H$_{2D}$ = Gender is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception of recognition and appreciation.

H$_{2E}$ = Gender is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception of team-work.

Differences of undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception of gender is shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: The Results of Undergraduate and Graduate Students’ Leadership Perception of Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being Model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creating Shared Vision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Taking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognition and Appreciation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team-work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In table 2 above, Mann-Whitney U Tests used to test the differences between undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of being model, creating shared vision, risk taking, recognition and appreciation, team-work in terms of gender.

According to the results of the analysis, there is a significant difference in terms of being model (U=5238, p=0.044 <0.05), risk taking (U=4633, p=0.001 <0.05), recognition and appreciation (U=4824, p=0.005 < 0.05), team-work (U=4109, p=0.000 <0.05) respectively for undergraduate students. There is not significant difference in terms of creating shared vision (U=5278, p=0056> 0.05) for gender. Male undergraduate students have significantly high scores in terms of being model, female undergraduate students have high scores in terms of risk taking, recognition and appreciation and team-work.

Searching graduate students’ results of analysis in terms of gender, there is not significant difference in terms of being model (U = 893.5, p = 0.242> 0.05), creating shared vision (U = 1029, p = 0.931> 0.05), risk taking (U = 866.5, p = 0.169> 0.05), recognition and appreciation Not (U = 805.5, p = 0.064> 0.05), team-work (U = 803, p = 0.061> 0.05) respectively.

Differences in terms of Marital Status

H3= Marital status is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perceptions.
H3A= Marital status is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of being model.
H3B= Marital status is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of creating shared vision.
H3C= Marital status is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of risk taking.
H3D= Marital status is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of recognition and appreciation.
H3E= Marital status is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of team-work.

Students’ differences of leadership perception in terms of marital status is shown in table 3.

Table 3: The Results of Undergraduate and Graduate Students’ Leadership Perception of Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Undergraduate (232)</th>
<th>Graduate(92)</th>
<th>P=0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>193.50</td>
<td>387.00</td>
<td>76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>115.83</td>
<td>26641.00</td>
<td>47.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Shared Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>224.25</td>
<td>448.50</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>115.56</td>
<td>26579.50</td>
<td>48.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>195.00</td>
<td>390.00</td>
<td>73.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>115.82</td>
<td>26638.00</td>
<td>45.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and Appreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>204.50</td>
<td>409.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>115.73</td>
<td>26619.00</td>
<td>46.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>113.50</td>
<td>227.00</td>
<td>224.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>116.53</td>
<td>26801.00</td>
<td>45.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUG=Insignificant
PG=Insignificant
In Table 3 above, Mann-Whitney U test is used to test the differences between undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of being model, creating shared vision, risk taking, recognition and appreciation, team-work in terms of marital status.

According to results of analysis, there is not significant difference of undergraduate students’ being model (U = 76, p = 0.099 > 0.05), risk taking (U = 73, p = 0.095 > 0.05), recognition and appreciation (U = 54, p = 0.062 > 0.05), team-work (U = 224, p = 0.949 > 0.05) respectively in terms of marital status. But there is significant difference in terms of creating shared value (U = 14.5, p = 0.022 < 0.05). Married undergraduate students have significantly higher creating shared vision.

Searching in terms of marital status variable, there is not significant difference in terms of being model (U = 654.5, p = 0.529 > 0.05), creating shared vision (U = 580.5, p = 0.186 > 0.05), risk taking (U = 621, p = 0.345 > 0.05), recognition and appreciation (U = 703.5, p = 0.876 > 0.05), team-work (U = 639.5, p = 0.445 > 0.05) respectively.

**Differences in terms of Employment**

H4 = Employment is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception.

H4A = Employment is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of being model.

H4B = Employment is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of creating shared vision.

H4C = Employment is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of risk taking.

H4D = Employment is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of recognition and appreciation.

H4E = Employment is influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of team-work.

Differences of undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception of employment is shown in Table 4.

**Table 4: The Results of Undergraduate and Graduate Students’ Leadership Perception of Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Undergraduate (232)</th>
<th>Graduate (92)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Being Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>119.82</td>
<td>6590.00</td>
<td>4,685.0</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td>2588.50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>115.47</td>
<td>20438.00</td>
<td>52.80</td>
<td>1689.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creating Shared Vision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>107.78</td>
<td>5928.00</td>
<td>4,388.0</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td>2722.50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>119.21</td>
<td>21100.00</td>
<td>48.61</td>
<td>1555.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Taking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>107.90</td>
<td>5934.50</td>
<td>4,394.5</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>44.99</td>
<td>2699.50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>119.17</td>
<td>21093.50</td>
<td>49.33</td>
<td>1578.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognition and Appreciation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>106.05</td>
<td>5833.00</td>
<td>4,293.0</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>2863.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>119.75</td>
<td>21195.00</td>
<td>44.22</td>
<td>1415.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team-work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>107.59</td>
<td>5917.50</td>
<td>4,377.5</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>46.68</td>
<td>2800.50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>119.27</td>
<td>21110.50</td>
<td>46.17</td>
<td>1477.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

©Society for Business and Management Dynamics
In table 4 above, Mann-Whitney U test is used to test the differences between undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of being model, creating shared vision, risk taking, recognition and appreciation, team-work in terms of employment.

According to the results of the analysis, there is not significant difference in terms of being model (U = 4685, p = 0.671> 0.05), creating shared vision (U = 4388, p = 0.269> 0.05), risk taking (U = 4394.5; p = 0.274> 0.05), recognition and appreciation (U = 4293, p = 0.186> 0.05), team-work (U = 4377.5; 0.259> 0.05) respectively for undergraduate students.

According to results of analysis, there is not significant difference in terms of being model (U = 758.5, p = 0.094> 0.05), creating shared vision (U = 892.5, p = 0.579> 0.05), risk taking (the = 869.5, p = 0.455> 0.05), recognition and appreciation (U = 877, p = 0.548> 0.05), team-work (U = 949.5, p = 0.931> 0.05) respectively for graduate students.

Differences in terms of Age Groups

H5= Age groups are influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception.

H5A= Age groups are influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception of being model.

H5B= Age groups are influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception of creating shared vision.

H5C= Age groups are influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception of risk taking.

H5D= Age groups are influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception of recognition and appreciation.

H5E= Age groups are influential on undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception of team-work.

Undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception of age groups are shown in table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Undergraduate (232)</th>
<th>Graduate (92)</th>
<th>(P=0,05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>115.85</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>116.11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>185.75</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Shared Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>110.55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>140.93</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>162.50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>115.48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>117.32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>195.00</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and Appreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>116.41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>113.92</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>179.50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>115.76</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>115.74</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202.50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In table 5 above, Kruskal-Wallis test is used to test the differences between undergraduate and graduate students’ subleadership perception of being model, creating shared vision, risk taking, recognition and appreciation and team-work in terms of age groups. According to the results of the analysis, there is not significant difference in terms of being model ($\chi^2(2)=2,196; p=0,334>0,05$), risk taking ($\chi^2(2)=2,820; p=0,244>0,05$), recognition and appreciation ($\chi^2(2)=1,832; p=0,400>0,05$) and team-work ($\chi^2(2)=3,324; p=0,190>0,05$) respectively. But there is significant difference in terms of creating shared vision ($\chi^2(2)=8,028; p=0,018<0,05$). Considering age groups’ mean value, “27-30” age groups have the highest (162,50), “19-22” age groups have the lowest (110,55) mean value in terms of creating shared vision.

**Differences In Terms of Creating Shared Vision**

Undergraduate and graduate students’ leadership perception of creating shared vision is shown in table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Undergraduate (232)</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>P=0,05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating Shared Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>20680</td>
<td>2914</td>
<td>0,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>140,12</td>
<td>5885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>95,05</td>
<td>17870</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>137,5</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>22,31</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>26,5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mann-Whitney U test was used to test the differences among age groups, 23-26 age groups’ leadership perception of creating shared vision is significantly higher than 19-22 age groups ($U=2914, p=0,008 <0,05$). Since 23-26 age group has graduated, they may create realistic vision.

According to the graduate students’ results of the analysis, there is not significant difference in terms of being model ($\chi^2(3)=2,331; p=0,507>0,05$), creating shared vision ($\chi^2(3)=2,212; p=0,530>0,05$), risk taking ($\chi^2(3)=1,624; p=0,654>0,05$), recognition and appreciation ($\chi^2(3)=1,483; p=0,686>0,05$) and team-work ($\chi^2(3)=2,038; p=0,565>0,05$) respectively.

**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Leadership is a process by which tempting goal-objective is set and motivate group or society to achieve goal and objective. Human as a leader is the most important element in this process. How, where and when this human leaders emerge is the most intriguing and influential subject for scientists. This curiosity led scientists to make investigations about leadership. Leadership is the foremost concept studied and researched.

Leaders directing group, business and community are different in terms of features and behaviours. Because of these differences, social scientists adapted various leadership styles as a result of their researchs. These differences lay on the basis of various theories put forward regarding leadership. Recently, transactional and transformational leadership have gained the most importance. Because leaders realizing change and transformation against rapid change, advance and competitiveness can be successful. Moreover, corruptions in the business of several countries increased the importance of ethical leadership.

People’s leadership are not the same. In other words, leadership perceptions varies from person to person. We decided to study on this issue, because this difference made us curious.
This research was conducted by applying questionnaire to the undergraduate and graduate students attending private university studying MBA in 2015-2016 term. MBA students were preferred because they take courses about leadership. The goal is to determine the leadership perception of undergraduate and graduate students.

Of 324 students; 232 are undergraduate, 92 are graduate students. Of 324 students; 124 are female, 200 are male students. Of 324 students; 22 are married, 302 are single students. Of 324 students; 115 are employed, 209 are unemployed students. Of 324 students; 199 are between 19-22 age groups, 80 are between 23-26 age groups, 13 are between 27-30 age groups, 32 are above the age of 30.

According to the Mann-Whitney U test results conducted to determine whether there is any difference in terms of undergraduate and graduate students’ being model, creating shared vision, risk taking, recognition and appreciation, team-work. There is significant difference in terms of being model of leadership perception. Graduate students have higher mean value of being model. This may be the result of perceiving graduate students themselves differently from undergraduate students by giving up undergraduate student psychology. There is not significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students in terms of creating shared vision. Graduate students have higher mean value of creating shared vision. This may be the result of undergraduate students’ creating shared vision easily regarding their future. There is not significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students in terms of risk taking. Graduate students have higher mean value of risk taking. This may be the result of graduate students’ perceiving the conditions of business and country more realistic than undergraduate students and daring risk taking. There is not significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students in terms of recognition and appreciation. Undergraduate students have higher mean value of recognition and appreciation. There is not significant difference between undergraduate and graduate students in terms of team-work. Undergraduate students have higher mean value of team-work. This may be the result of undergraduate students’ giving emphasis on student solidarity rather than competitiveness.

According to undergraduate students, there is significant difference in terms of being model, risk taking, recognition and appreciation, team-work regarding gender. There is not significant difference in terms of creating shared vision regarding gender. Male undergraduate students have higher mean value in terms of being model. Female undergraduate students have lower mean value in terms of risk taking, recognition and appreciation, team-work. Female students focus on more recognition and appreciation and team-work than male students. This may be the result of female students’ role in their families.

Examining the results of analysis in terms of being model, creating shared vision, risk taking, recognition and appreciation, team-work regarding gender, there is not significant difference.

According to the undergraduate students, there is not significant difference in terms of being model, risk taking, recognition and appreciation, team-work regarding marital status. But there is significant difference in terms of creating shared vision regarding marital status. Married undergraduate students have higher mean value in terms of creating shared vision than single undergraduate students. This may be the results of higher responsibilities of married students than single students. Ones having responsibility can easily create shared vision. According to the graduate students, there is not significant difference in terms of being model, creating shared vision, risk taking, recognition and appreciation, team-work regarding marital status.

According to the undergraduate students, there is not significant difference in terms of being model, creating shared vision, risk taking, recognition and appreciation, team-work regarding employment. According to the graduate students, there is not significant difference in terms of being model, creating shared vision, risk taking, recognition and appreciation, team-work regarding employment.

According to undergraduate students, there is not significant difference in terms of being model, risk taking, recognition and appreciation, team-work regarding age groups. But there is significant difference in terms of creating shared vision. “27-30” age groups have the highest mean value (162,50), “19-22” age groups have the lowest mean value (110,55). Graduate students are within the bounds of 27-30 age groups. These students can assess business and country conditions more objectively than 19-22 (undergraduate students) age groups. As a result, their mean value of creating shared vision is higher.
26 age groups have significantly higher creating shared vision than 19-22 age groups. Most of 23-26 age groups have already graduated from university, so they can create vision more realistically.

According to graduate students, there is not significant difference in terms of being model, creating shared vision, risk taking, recognition and appreciation, team-work.

The research was conducted on students studying MBA. Those want to search this issue may widen the scope of our research. For instance, students studying (economics, accounting, marketing, finance, sociology, psychology, etc.) may also be included.

Research can be conducted on managers in business regarding their ideal leadership perceptions. The data obtained may be an important reference to managers. Postgraduate survey can be carried out in this field.
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