

Available online at www.postmodernopenings.com

e-ISSN: 2069-9387; ISSN-L: 2068-0236

Postmodern Openings

2016, Volume 7, Issue 2, December, pp. 93-114

Research of the Effectiveness of Strategic Leadership in Crisis Management: a Comparative Study in Large Scale Enterprises and SMES in Konya 3rd Industrial Zone

Adnan CELIK , Rabia YILMAZ

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18662/po/2016.0702.07>

Covered in:

EBSCO, CEEOL, DOAJ, Erih Plus, Index
Copernicus, Ideas RePeC, EconPapers,
Socionet, Ulrich Pro Quest, Cabel, SSRN,
Appreciative Inquiry Commons,
Journalseek, Scipio.

©2016 The Authors & LUMEN Publishing House.

Selection, peer review and publishing under the responsibility of LUMEN Publishing House.

How to cite: Celik, A. & Yilmaz, R. (2016). Research of the Effectiveness of Strategic Leadership in Crisis Management: a Comparative Study in Large Scale Enterprises and SMES in Konya 3rd Industrial Zone. Postmodern Openings, 7(2), 93-114. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18662/po/2016.0702.07>

Research of the Effectiveness of Strategic Leadership in Crisis Management: a Comparative Study in Large Scale Enterprises and SMES in Konya 3rd Industrial Zone

Adnan CELIK¹, Rabia YILMAZ²

Abstract: Crisis Management (CM) is a necessary concept for organizations to continue their activities and life courses. In this case, one of the most important factor to get different advantages from crisis occurs inside and out of the organization is the degree of the leadership. Strategic leadership (SL) is one of the most important leadership style in CM process due to come to the fore of the concepts of especially innovative, process manager and the status quo guardian. Especially in this article, in large scale enterprises, it is observed an interaction between participative innovator and all crisis periods. Also, in large scale enterprises there is an interaction between high control innovator and all crisis periods. In SMEs there is an interaction between high control innovator and crisis period. And in SMEs there is an interaction between status quo guardian and pre-crisis period. Finally, in SMEs, there is an interaction between process manager and crisis period. This study was conducted by questionnaire technique and performed senior managers in large scale enterprises and SMEs in Konya 3RD Industrial Zone.

Keywords: *Large Scale Enterprises, SME, Crisis Management (CM), Strategic Leadership (SL).*

1. Introduction

In today's world, when crisis occurs, it is very crucial for leaders to turning out this situation with least damage and their organizations own benefit. To obtain this difference, organizations need successful leaders. Briefly, the more important subject is the leaders' continuous success against unexpected crisis situations then overcoming the crisis. Crisis create such sensitive situations that leaders may be forced to take immediate and

¹ Prof. Dr., Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Selcuk University, Turkey. adnancelik@selcuk.edu.tr.

² PhD. Candidate, Institute of Social Sciences, Selcuk University, Turkey. rabia6591@gmail.com.

effective decisions with little information. This case can be brought to the fore instincts against intellect and emotions against logic. Nevertheless, there are some actions for every successful leader to reduce the impact of the hard situations and to shorten the time during the crisis period (Arslan, 2009: 2). This is primarily made possible by a comprehensive leadership type. This case comes to the foreground for the SL which holds all other leadership attributes. Aim of this study named as “Research of the Effectiveness of Strategic Leadership in Crisis Management: A Comparative Study in Large Scale Enterprises and SMEs in Konya 3RD Industrial Zone” is to analyze the effects of the SL dimensions on CM.

2. Effectiveness of the Strategic Leadership in Large Scale Enterprises and SMES in Crisis Management

2.1. Concept of Large Scale Enterprise and SME

Enterprises size is a function of the regional market and the economic development level. Overall large scale enterprises are describes as employing more than 250 working people and annual sales revenue or financial balance sheet exceeds 25 million Turkish liras and classified as economic units in the regulations (Müftüoğlu, 2013: 15). Large enterprises provide decrease on prices and increase on sales by using mass production, specialization with large quantity production and low cost expenses (Yazıcı, 2005: 55). SMEs are described as, employees less than 250 working people, annual net sales revenue and financial balance sheet not exceeding 25 million Turkish liras and classified as micro, small and medium sized enterprises in regulations (Fidan, 2011: 50-51). SMEs play a key role in the whole production systems. SMEs has significantly substantial contributions to the most valuable values manufacturing, employment and GDP (Jahanshahi, et al., 2011 :67).

2.2. Concept of Crisis Management

CM is a process for evaluating signals of the crisis and taking and implementing the necessary measures to overcome the crisis situation with minimal degradation in possible crisis situation. In CM practises, preparing plans to eliminate the negativities appear in internal and external environment, making arrangements to work in harmony with the organizational structure and creation of decision processes are seen (Çelik, 2010: 103). CM requires change and to participate the change before

anything else. To prevent and to manage the crisis in enterprises personnel and organizational structure must be replaced immediately. The ideal CM program must have a structure which includes, strategic activities, technical and structural activities, activities related to communication, psychological and cultural activities. These activities put forth that CM program need to be addressed within the framework of the system approach (İlgin, 2011: 42).

2.3. Crisis Management Levels

1.CM in the Pre-Crisis Period: The various stages in the pre-crisis period are listed as follows: “-The first stage of the CM process in pre-crisis period is passing step by step to the CM and creating the scenarios. Also it is necessary to create crisis scenarios for every situation. Prior to making a crisis plan, true intentions revealed in the scenario (Tutar, 2011: 70); -The second phase of the crisis, is receiving signals pointing to the crisis. Organizations should create various early warning systems to detect these signals correctly (Temir, 2014: 20); -In another step, very important to develop a plan to escape from the crisis. The most important feature of the plans which are developed to escape from the crisis, is made in vague terms (Çetinalp, 2014: 54); -Refraining from the crisis is relatively easiest and low costed phase but sometimes this stage is omitted by managers (Temir, 2014: 21); - Protection from the crisis includes activities which are protect the units of the organization or its environment from the effects of the damages might be caused by deterioration; -The final stage adaptation mechanisms to the crisis and change is developed to respond successfully to the CM (Çetinalp, 2014: 56-57)”.

2.Crisis Management in the Crisis Period: There are several stages during the crisis. They are listed as follows: “-In CM period, it is a process of preventing the fall of the organization to the crisis with showing necessary sensitivity in the detection of the signs of crisis or a rescue process of organization in suddenly emerging crisis situations with minimum cost and loss (Şen, 2011: 73); -It includes developing some techniques for CM to take part in a systematic framework at the stage of establishing a systematic framework for CM (Çetinalp, 2014: 60); -In CM strategies, failure to meet the expected results of the strategy is the first sign of the necessity of rethinking the business theory. Like this, unexpected success is often the first sign of the rethinking of business theory. Therefore if there is a strategy in a situation evaluated as opportunity, the decision may be given, otherwise, there is no way to explain what is the actual steps that lead towards the

organization's desired outcomes, changing the objectives and what it means to share the resources (Çetinalp, 2014: 60)”.

3.Crisis Management in the Post-Crisis Period: Post-Crisis period is a period that previous mistakes not be repeated and the experiences learned by the organization must be converted into a corporate culture (Şen, 2011: 75). Good management of these stages is important to eliminate the negative effects of the crisis. These stages are listed as follows: “-The rehabilitation work after the crisis stage, all organizational structure and processes are re-improved; continuous learning and continuous improvement activities are placed into the organizational approach (Çetinalp, 2014: 66); -In creating flexible and organization structure process, in term of responding crisis easier, the structure must be changed to organic structure from mechanic structure in parallel with the changes (Kaplan, 2006: 29); -Creating innovative and creative organization structure; This stage focuses on innovations. Innovation is an indicator of the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of these ideas and the quality and quantity of the ideas. These two parameters are independent but when these come together they create companies innovation performances (Ryan, 2012: 346; Wattanasupachoke, 2012: 4; Kuczmarsky, 1996: 9); -Elastication and simplification of the organization; is to apply organization type in the companies which are using lean thinking logic (Kaplan, 2006: 29-30); -Reorganization and process renewal; to achieve the objectives of the organization provides the best structure of the creation and continuous improvement activities in a way to maintain (Çetinalp, 2014: 76-77); -Crisis and learning organizations; that is an ability to pace all kinds of interactions, cooperation and a need for responding with showing abilities (Schlechty, 2009: 26); -Crisis and management of downsizing; in crisis periods downsizing decision should be used as a last resort (Çetinalp, 2014: 78); -Rehabilitation to organize against the crisis; Kaizen; it represents a systematic renovation and rehabilitation for enterprises in their activities (Jacobson, 2009: 1342)”.

2.4. Importance of Crisis Management

CM is a group of planned, systematic an rational activities which are used to eliminate crisis. It includes, decisions which are taken systematically, to create a group and taking new decisions. There is not a ready and standart crisis recipe to adapt new conditions. As nations, company's beliefs, values, perspectives, dealing with problems, perceptions, verbal and nonverbal

communication styles and relationships varies widely. Therefore, every enterprise must create an unique synthesis in its private to deal with the crisis (İlgün, 2011: 24-42). The basic features of the crisis can be listed as follows; threatening enterprises' objectives and existence, time pressure, to bring unexpected and sudden changes, to create tension in decision makers, control difficulty, to be a crucial turning point and threatening the organization's image, human resources, financial structure or natural resources (İlgün, 2011: 8). In this situation it is very important for organizations to make a right CM at the right time to get rid of the negative impacts of the crisis and to turn these negativities to positive outcomes.

2.5. Concept of Strategic Leadership

SL is a leadership process to create a vision, mission to continue and achieve organizational goals and having a long time perspective and prediction (Şeremet, 2013: 48). According to another writer SL is creating strategy by analyzing internal and external environment of the organization, applying and evaluating right strategies at the right time and behaving in accordance with the located environment. Strategic leader responsible for the strategic management process and acting for this goal in the organization (Altınkurt, 2007: 11-12). SL is abilities of the leader who has ability to take decisions for activities and tactics in an uncertain environment. SL is related with leadership management, political ethic, movement and purposes linked to tactics (Ireland and Hitt, 2005: 67; Pisapia, 2009: 7). The basic features of SL are as follows; to see the future, to create vision, flexibility, have the power to cope with uncertainty, strengthening employees, affecting significantly and positively others' feelings, thoughts and behaviors, to have ability to manage human resources effectively, to establish good relations with all stakeholders of the organization, to examine and develop paradigms and capabilities constantly, to have ability to take fearless decisions that can be compatible with environmental conditions (Sütçü, 2008: 51).

2.6. Types of Strategic Leadership

1.High Control Innovator: The strategic leader who has High Control Innovator (HCI) ability is a real innovator. While the leader make innovations, he can take high risks. When leaders deciding to innovation they must be very careful. But when the innovator achieved success they will have great advantages. Enterprises should be cautious and foresighted in bringing forward their existing abilities and creating their strategy according

these. In this case, HCI has a high power struggle in order to ensure strict control over organizational functioning. Such leaders see opportunities in the environment and want to use the development to achieve the goals. HCI tends to be conservative regarding the management of their organization and when the external factors exist, innovation requirement will be different. Such leaders has high control requirement, leader creates high control culture and encourage procedures, common objectives and reward them. For this type of leader ideal organization should be innovative and focused (Ergen, 2011: 36; Timurlenk, 2009: 29-30; Gertsen, et al., 1998: 113).

2.Participative Innovator: Innovation helps enterprises to provide competition advantage to continue the life cycle. Leaders provides with the innovations they realize (Tuominen, et al., 1999: 135). The leader who is seeking for innovative strategies and less control requirement has more tendency to continue his works. The leader controls integration and separation of the innovation (Gertsen, et al., 1998: 119). Participative Innovator (PI) sharply opposed to SQG. While there is value control and low risk strategies in SQG, in PI there is a scramble request with the innovation and it's very clear, free and participatory culture and organization. In their opinion, opportunities from the environment and openness to external effects can bring change in all areas including technology. Similarly in HCI, also PI will have a scramble request and likely to determine high risk strategies. An enterprise managed by a PI, oftenly known as replicating with technology, management creativity and innovations. An ideal organization for a PI leader is, open and decentralized, decisions taken at the possible lowest level and leaders low control requirement for authorizing more decisions (Ergen, 2011: 36-37).

3.Status Quo Guardian: In general Status Quo Guardian (SQG), tightly controls and guides the employees who are reluctant to do low and mid-level innovation (Gertsen, et al., 1998: 114). Unlike HCI does not want to fight, but SQG wants to ensure the control such HCI. This kind of leader does control on the inner workings of the organization and avoid risks. Leader wants to protect the organization from some effects such as some trends and some perceived threats from environment. These leaders are dependent on quite well tested and proven strategies rather than looking for new and innovative strategies. For an enterprise which is managed by a SQG, it is not possible to be an industrial leader in innovation and new result development. He is only known as a person with low efficiency and cost. An ideal organization for a SQG is a well-defined culture which

employees and managers approve existing applications highly focused and with strict conservatism (Ergen, 2011: 37).

4.Process Manager: Process Manager (PM) is a combination of PI's internal factors and SQG's external factors. PM leaders prefer tried and tested loyal conservative strategies. These leaders are likely stay away from risky innovations. But low control requirement of the PI may result diversity and openness in the organization. Employees are not need to adhere to a common purpose and culture (Nahavandi, 2006: 210). Already the leader of PM will not be required to wait a commitment from its employees in this way. PM just prefer proven strategies for enterprise (Ergen, 2011: 38).

2.7. The Importance of Strategic Leadership

SL, focuses and develops people, structural and social capital and abilities of the enterprise while meeting the opportunities and threats. In this framework, SL, provides a vision and a roadmap which develops and renovates the enterprise by making of the environmental chaos and uncertainty. SL is also a continuous learning process. The continuous learning system is not active only with their own decisions, tries to uncover the other perspectives in an active way and queries new situations in all manner (Sütçü, 2008: 55). From another perspective, SL is not only necessary leadership to maintain the success of the strategic management process. There are additional benefits for the company provided by SL. These benefits as follows; “SL vision allows to increase business performance, provides increased value to all stakeholders and maximize shareholder value, SL provides increase of profitability and also SL vision provides competition advantage (Learning, 2012: 2-3)”.

2.8. Relationship of Crisis Management and Strategic Leadership

To create a vision that sets out the expectations and requested achievements by the leader is one of the main deals of leadership. Strategic leaders reach this vision by evaluating the history of the company in this vision, by detecting the surrounding opportunities and by understanding the strategic capacity of the organization to ensure superiority for these opportunities (Uğurluoğlu, 2009: 71-72). Accordingly strategic leader must have features as, determining the enterprises objectives and visions, revealing and sustaining the basic skills of the enterprise, developing human resources, maintaining an effective organizational culture, emphasizing ethical practices and creating a balanced organizational control (Ireland and Hitt, 2005: 68-

72). Today's business environment, must be strong to cope with unexpected crises, focused on making plans across enterprise. The key role in strategic management is integrating parties. Indeed, in different phases of the crisis, this situation develops towards achieving expected results by specific actions, responsible authorities and specific management functions. The items listed as anti-crisis measures are required to be discovered by a careful approach in the management of crisis situations and their beginning (Groh, 2014: 11; Lockwood, 2005: 2).

3. Method

3.1. Objectives and Importance of Research

This is a descriptive research made in screening model and its objective to examine the relationship between SL levels and CM levels in SMEs and large scale enterprises. This study is intended for examining impact of the SL to the CM and to uncover the relation type of these component. In SL, to see the results of the behaviours during the CM in enterprises using SL, to determine at which stage the SL has more contribution to the CM in organizations and which sub dimension of the SL should be increased terms are also has importance.

3.2. Sample

The main mass of this study which aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the SL in CM in large scale enterprises and SMEs occurred from managers of large scale enterprises and SMEs located in Konya 3rd Industrial Zone. In this study, 55 SME employees and 36 large scale enterprise employees from 246 company reached via surveys and the application as made on the surveys which are available for use.

3.3. Data Collection

The questionnaire used in the study occurs from 33 questions. The first part contains 7 questions including the general demographic characteristics. The second part occurs from 16 questions and the scale developed by Nahavandi (2006) is used for SL. The third section consists of 10 questions and CM level scale is used. This scale was developed by Tack (1994).

3.4. Evaluation of Data

The data collected through questionnaires were analysed by using SPSS 21 software. In the survey 5-point Likert scale was used to analyse the data. Analysis techniques used can be ordered as; frequency and percentage calculations, reliability analysis, mean and standard deviation calculations, regression analysis and correlation analysis.

3.5. Results and Comments

3.5.1. Results about Demographic Characteristics of Large Scale Enterprises and SMEs

Table-1: Demographic Characteristics (a)

DEMOGRAPHIC INF.	Large Scale Ent.		SME	
	N	%	N	%
GENDER				
Male	30	83,3	52	94,5
Female	6	16,6	3	5,4
AGE				
Between 21 - 25	1	2,7	2	3,6
Between 26 - 30	3	8,3	8	14,5
Between 31 - 40	8	22,2	18	32,7
Between 41 - 45	13	36,1	18	32,7
46 and above	11	30,5	9	16,3
EDUCATION LEVEL				
Primary Education	0	0,0	0	0,0
High School	2	5,5	4	7,2
College	9	25	9	16,3
License	21	58,3	40	72,7
MSc/PhD	4	11,1	2	3,6
POSITION IN ENT.				
Upper Stage Manager	36	100,0	55	100,0
Others	0	0,0	0	0,0
WORKING PERIOD IN ENT.				
Less than 5 years	3	8,3	6	10,9
Between 6 - 10 years	5	13,3	6	10,9
Between 11 - 15 years	10	27,7	20	36,3
16 years and over	18	50	23	41,8
	Large Scale Ent.		SME	
	N	%	N	%
OPERATING AREAS				
Service	0	0,0	0	0,0

Production	4	100,0	12	100,0
Trade	0	0,0	0	0,0

Table-1: Demographic Characteristics (b)

OPERATING SECTOR				
Machine	0	0,0	2	16,6
Metals and products	2	50,0	4	33,3
Chemistry	0	0,0	1	8,3
Automotive	0	0,0	4	33,3
Food and products	1	25,0	0	0,0
Plastic and products	1	25,0	1	8,3

As seen in Table 1, according to the results obtained from the participants, largest rate 83,8 % (30) of participants from large scale enterprises are male and 94,5 % (52) of participants from SMEs are male. The largest rate 36,1 % (13) of participants from large enterprises are between 41-45 years, whereas 32,7% (18) of the SME participants between 41-45 years and likewise 32,7% (18) are 31-40 years old. The largest rate of 58,3 % (21) of the participants from large scale enterprises has a graduate degree, whereas 72,7% (40) of SME participants has a graduate degree. All the surveyed participants of 100,0 % (36) from large scale enterprises is the senior managers and in the same manner 100,0% (55) of SME respondents are senior managers. Largest rate of 27,7 % (10) surveyed participants from large scale enterprises has 11-15 years working experience, whereas participants from SMEs 41,8 % (23) has 16 years and over working experience. All participant 100,00 % (4) large scale enterprises operates in production industry, whereas all participants 100,00 % (12) from SMEs are operating in production industry. The largest rate 50,0 % (2) of the participants from large scale enterprises are active in the metal industry, whereas the participants 33,3 % (4) from SMEs are active in metal and automotive products industry.

3.5.2. Results About Reliability Analysis for Large Scale Enterprises and SMES

The findings obtained from the reliability analysis are as follows.

Table-2: Reliability Analysis Results

Factors	Number of Variables	Cronbach Alpha
HCI	3	0,874
PI	2	0,892

SQG	2	0,725
PM	3	0,742
Pre-Crisis Period	5	0,871
Crisis Period	4	0,845
Post-Crisis Period	7	0,813

According to the results of the reliability analysis in Table 2, it is observed that the factor about PI has the highest value (0,892). The least value is related to SQG is found as (0,725). Thus, we can say that all factors are reliable.

3.5.3. Results About Mean and Standard Deviation for Large Scale Enterprises and SMEs

In this section, findings related to the mean and standard deviation will be analyzed.

Table-3: Mean and Standard Deviation Values Results

Expressions		Mean	Std.Dev.
HCI	L.S.E.	3,213	1,006
	SME	3,637	0,947
PI	L.S.E.	3,811	0,903
	SME	3,697	0,862
SQG	L.S.E.	3,010	0,822
	SME	2,988	0,804
PM	L.S.E.	2,213	0,754
	SME	2,220	0,741
Pre-Crisis Period	L.S.E.	3,715	0,887
	SME	3,723	0,902
Crisis Period	L.S.E.	3,694	0,861
	SME	3,812	0,822
Post-Crisis Period	L.S.E.	3,146	0,832
	SME	3,214	0,902

When the identifier statistic table about mean and standard deviation observed according to the results of Table 3, it is seen that the most positive view of the participants from large scale enterprises with 3,811 response average is for PI and for the SMEs the most positive view with 3,812 response average is also for crisis period.

3.5.4. Results about Correlation Analysis for Large Scale Enterprises and SMEs

The results obtained from the correlation analysis are as follows.

Table-4: The Examination of the Relationship of the Dimensions of SL between Dimensions of CM Period with Correlation Analysis

			HCI	PI	SQG	PM
Pre-Crisis Period	L.S.E	r	0,602	0,702	0,604	0,622
		p	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
	SME	r	0,561	0,683	0,558	0,594
		p	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
Crisis Period	L.S.E	r	0,609	0,652	0,576	0,628
		p	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
	SME	r	0,582	0,668	0,573	0,660
		p	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
Post-Crisis Period	L.S.E	r	0,679	0,782	0,598	0,701
		p	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
	SME	r	0,693	0,764	0,623	0,718
		p	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000

With the highest correlation value, a significant positive correlation is found between PI and scores between post-crisis period with the rate of 78,2 % in large scale enterprises ($r=0,782$; $p=0,000<0,05$). Accordingly, when PI scores increase pre-crisis scores are increasing. Likewise, with the highest correlation value, a significant positive correlation is found between PI and scores between post-crisis period with the rate of 76,4 % in large scale enterprises ($r=0,764$; $p=0,000<0,05$).

3.5.5. Results About Regression Analysis for Large Scale Enterprises and SMEs and Testing the Hypothesis

The results obtained from the regression analysis are described as in the table below.

In this section, participants answers about SL and CM are analyzed, for testing hypotheses about effectiveness of SL in CM, results are presented in regression tables. Analysis results are shown in the following table.

3.5.5.1. Results about Effectiveness of Strategic Leadership in Pre-Crisis Period Level

Through data obtained from the questionnaire, the regression analysis results about effectiveness of the SL in pre-crisis period in large scale enterprises and SMEs are examined by hypotheses.

Table-5: The Regression Model for Testing the Status of Effectiveness of Pre-Crisis Period Levels from Sub-dimensions of SL

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	β	t	P	F	Model (P)	R ²	
Pre-Crisis Period	Const.	L.S.E	0,889	5,518	0,000	88,602	0,000	0,483
		SME	0,878	5,498	0,000	87,914	0,000	0,501
	HCI	L.S.E	0,222	2,803	0,005			
		SME	0,021	0,482	0,103			
	PI	L.S.E	0,307	3,752	0,003			
		SME	0,279	3,681	0,004			
	SQC	L.S.E	0,031	0,502	0,201			
		SME	0,214	2,405	0,006			
	PM	L.S.E	0,091	0,698	0,105			
		SME	0,010	0,765	0,206			

H1: SL has a positive effect on pre-crisis period management in large scale enterprises and SMEs. In Table 5, both large scale enterprises ($F=88,602$; $p=0,000<0,05$) and SMEs ($F=87,914$; $p=0,000<0,05$) values explains pre-crisis period management in other words it is understood that it has contribution to the model. According to this hypothesis H1 is accepted.

H1a: HCI leadership style has a positive effect on pre-crisis period management in large scale enterprises. In Table 5, it is seen that HCI leadership style in large scale enterprises has a meaningful effect on pre-crisis period dimension. When HCI level increased 1 unit, pre-crisis period level increases 0,222 units ($\beta=0,222$; $t=2,803$; $p=0,005<0,05$). According to this hypothesis H1a is accepted.

H1b: HCI leadership style has a positive effect on pre-crisis period management in SMEs. In Table 5, it is seen that HCI leadership style in SMEs has not a meaningful effect on pre-crisis period dimension. When HCI level increased 1 unit, pre-crisis period level increases 0,021 units ($\beta=0,021$; $t=0,482$; $p=0,103>0,05$). According to this hypothesis H1b is not accepted.

H1c: PI leadership style has a positive effect on pre-crisis period management in large scale enterprises. In Table 5, it is seen that PI leadership style in large scale enterprises has a meaningful effect on pre-crisis period dimension. When PI level increased 1 unit, pre-crisis period level increases 0,307 units ($\beta=0,307$; $t=3,752$; $p=0,003<0,05$). According to this hypothesis H1c is accepted.

H1d: PI leadership style has a positive effect on pre-crisis period management in SMEs. In Table 5, it is seen that PI leadership style in SMEs has a meaningful effect on pre-crisis period dimension. When PI level increased 1 unit, pre-crisis period level increases 0,279 units ($\beta=0,279$; $t=3,681$; $p=0,004<0,05$) According to this hypothesis H1d is accepted.

H1e: SQG leadership style has a positive effect on pre-crisis period management in large scale enterprises. In Table 5, it is seen that SQG leadership style in large scale enterprises has not a meaningful effect on pre-crisis period dimension. When SQG level increased 1 unit, pre-crisis period level increases 0,031 units ($\beta=0,031$; $t=0,502$; $p=0,201>0,05$). According to this hypothesis H1e is not accepted.

H1f: SQG leadership style has a positive effect on pre-crisis period management in SMEs. In Table 5, it is seen that SQG leadership style in SMEs has a meaningful effect on pre-crisis period dimension. When SQG level increased 1 unit, pre-crisis period level increases 0,214 units ($\beta=0,214$; $t=2,405$; $p=0,006<0,05$). According to this hypothesis H1f is accepted.

H1g: PM leadership style has a positive effect on pre-crisis period management in large scale enterprises. In Table 5, it is seen that PM leadership style in large scale enterprises has not a meaningful effect on pre-crisis period dimension. When PM level increased 1 unit, pre-crisis period level increases 0,091 units ($\beta=0,091$; $t=0,698$; $p=0,105>0,05$). According to this hypothesis H1g is not accepted.

H1h: PM leadership style has a positive effect on pre-crisis period management in SMEs. In Table 5, it is seen that PM leadership style in SMEs has not a meaningful effect on pre-crisis period dimension. When PM level increased 1 unit, pre-crisis period level increases 0,010 units ($\beta=0,010$; $t=0,765$; $p=0,206>0,05$). According to this hypothesis H1h is not accepted.

3.5.5.2. Results About Effectiveness of the Strategic Leadership in Crisis Period Management

According to the data obtained from questionnaire, the regression analysis results about effectiveness of the SL in crisis period management in large scale enterprises and SMEs are examined by hypotheses.

Table-6: The Regression Model for Testing the Status of Effectiveness of Crisis Period Level from Sub-Dimensions of SL

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	β	t	P	F	Model (P)	R ²	
Crisis Period	Const.	L.S.E	0,529	2,829	0,004	95,698	0,000	0,614
		SME	0,499	2,998	0,003	89,149	0,000	0,503
	HCI	L.S.E	0,313	3,198	0,004			
		SME	0,301	3,403	0,003			
	PI	L.S.E	0,504	4,997	0,000			
		SME	0,095	1,021	0,244			
	SQG	L.S.E	0,096	2,113	0,274			
		SME	0,091	2,071	0,386			
	PM	L.S.E	0,068	1,012	0,182			
		SME	0,299	2,686	0,005			

H2: SL has a positive effect on crisis period management in large scale enterprises and SMEs. In Table 6, both large scale enterprises (F=95,698; p=0,000<0,05) and SMEs (F=89,148; p=0,000<0,05) values explains crisis period management in other words it is understood that it has contribution to the model. According to this hypothesis H2 is accepted.

H2a: HCI leadership style has a positive effect on crisis period management in large scale enterprises. In Table 6, it is seen that HCI leadership style in large scale enterprises has a meaningful effect on crisis period dimension. When HCI level increased 1 unit, crisis period level increases 0,313 units ($\beta=0,313$; $t=3,198$; $p=0,004<0,05$) According to this hypothesis H2a is accepted.

H2b: HCI leadership style has a positive effect on crisis period management in SMEs. In Table 6, it is seen that HCI leadership style in SMEs has a meaningful effect on crisis period dimension. When HCI level increased 1 unit, crisis period level increases 0,301 units ($\beta=0,301$; $t=3,403$; $p=0,003<0,05$). According to this hypothesis H2b is accepted.

H2c: PI leadership style has a positive effect on crisis period management in large scale enterprises. In Table 6, it is seen that PI leadership style in large scale enterprises has a meaningful effect on crisis period dimension. When PI level increased 1 unit, crisis period level increases 0,504 units ($\beta=0,504$; $t=4,997$; $p=0,000<0,05$). According to this hypothesis H2c is accepted.

H2d: PI leadership style has a positive effect on crisis period management in SMEs. In Table 6, it is seen that PI leadership style in SMEs has not a meaningful effect on crisis period dimension. When PI level

increased 1 unit, crisis period level increases 0,095 units ($\beta=0,095$; $t=1,021$; $p=0,244>0,05$) According to this hypothesis H2d is not accepted.

H2e: SQG leadership style has a positive effect on crisis period management in large scale enterprises. In Table 6, it is seen that SQG leadership style in large scale enterprises has not a meaningful effect on crisis period dimension. When SQG level increased 1 unit, crisis period level increases 0,096 units ($\beta=0,096$; $t=2,013$; $p=0,274>0,05$). According to this hypothesis H2e is not accepted.

H2f: SQG leadership style has a positive effect on crisis period management in SMEs. In Table 6, it is seen that SQG leadership style in SMEs has not a meaningful effect on crisis period dimension. When SQG level increased 1 unit, crisis period level increases 0,091 units ($\beta=0,091$; $t=2,071$; $p=0,386>0,05$). According to this hypothesis H2f is not accepted.

H2g: PM leadership style has a positive effect on crisis period management in large scale enterprises. In Table 6, it is seen that PM leadership style in large scale enterprises has not a meaningful effect on crisis period dimension. When PM level increased 1 unit, crisis period level increases 0,068 units ($\beta=0,068$; $t=1,012$; $p=0,182>0,05$). According to this hypothesis H2g is not accepted.

H2h: PM leadership style has a positive effect on crisis period management in SMEs. In Table 6, it is seen that PM leadership style in SMEs has a meaningful effect on crisis period dimension. According to this PM leadership style effects crisis period in SMEs. When PM level increased 1 unit, crisis period level increases 0,299units ($\beta=0,299$; $t=2,686$; $p=0,005<0,05$). According to this hypothesis H2h is accepted.

3.5.5.3. Results About Effectiveness of the Strategic Leadership in Post-Crisis Period Management

According to the data obtained from questionnaire, the regression analysis results about effectiveness of the SL in post-crisis period management in large scale enterprises and SMEs are examined by hypotheses.

Table-7: The Regression Model for Testing the Status of Effectiveness of Post-Crisis Period Level from Sub-Dimensions of SL

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	β	t	P	F	Model (P)	R ²
Post-Crisis Period	L.S.E	0,729	5,642	0,000	163,121	0,000	0,649
	SME	0,801	6,102	0,001	171,348	0,000	0,592

HCI	L.S.E	0,195	3,114	0,003
	SME	0,059	1,070	0,102
PI	L.S.E	0,391	5,889	0,001
	SME	0,371	5,791	0,002
SQG	L.S.E	0,052	0,951	0,214
	SME	0,062	0,894	0,313
PM	L.S.E	0,043	1,018	0,141
	SME	0,038	0,991	0,183

H3: SL has a positive effect on post-crisis period management in large scale enterprises and SMEs. In Table 7, both large scale enterprises ($F=163,121$; $p=0,001<0,05$) and SMEs ($F=171,384$; $p=0,000<0,05$) values explains post-crisis period management in other words it is understood that it has contribution to the model. According to this hypothesis H3 is accepted.

H3a: HCI leadership style has a positive effect on post-crisis period management in large scale enterprises. According to the analysis in Table 7 HCI leadership style in large scale enterprises effects post-crisis period. When HCI level increased 1 unit, post-crisis period level increases 0,195 units ($\beta=0,195$; $t=3,114$; $p=0,003<0,05$) According to this hypothesis H3a is accepted.

H3b: HCI leadership style has a positive effect on post-crisis period management in SMEs. In Table 7, it is seen that HCI leadership style in SMEs has not a meaningful effect on post-crisis period dimension. When HCI level increased 1 unit, post-crisis period level increases 0,059 units ($\beta=0,059$; $t=1,070$; $p=0,102>0,05$). According to this hypothesis H3b is not accepted.

H3c: PI leadership style has a positive effect on post-crisis period management in large scale enterprises. In Table 7, it is seen that PI leadership style in large scale enterprises has a meaningful effect on post-crisis period dimension. When PI level increased 1 unit, post-crisis period level increases 0,381 units ($\beta=0,381$; $t=5,889$; $p=0,001<0,05$). According to this hypothesis H3c is accepted.

H3d: PI leadership style has a positive effect on post-crisis period management in SMEs. In Table 7, it is seen that PI leadership style in SMEs has a meaningful effect on post-crisis period dimension. When PI level increased 1 unit, post-crisis period level increases 0,371 units ($\beta=0,371$; $t=5,791$; $p=0,002<0,05$). According to this hypothesis H3d is accepted.

H3e: SQG leadership style has a positive effect on post-crisis period management in large scale enterprises. In Table 7, it is seen that SQG leadership style in large scale enterprises has not a meaningful effect on post-crisis period dimension. When SQG level increased 1 unit, post-crisis period level increases 0,052 units ($\beta=0,052$; $t=0,951$; $p=0,214>0,05$). According to this hypothesis H3e is not accepted.

H3f: SQG leadership style has a positive effect on post-crisis period management in SMEs. In Table 7, it is seen that SQG leadership style in SMEs has not a meaningful effect on post-crisis period dimension. When SQG level increased 1 unit, post-crisis period level increases 0,062 units ($\beta=0,062$; $t=0,894$; $p=0,313>0,05$). According to this hypothesis H3f is not accepted.

H3g: PM leadership style has a positive effect on post-crisis period management in large scale enterprises. In Table 7, it is seen that PM leadership style in large scale enterprises has not a meaningful effect on post-crisis period dimension. When PM level increased 1 unit, post-crisis period level increases 0,043 units ($\beta=0,043$; $t=1,018$; $p=0,141>0,05$). According to this hypothesis H3g is not accepted.

H3h: PM leadership style has a positive effect on post-crisis period management in SMEs. In Table 7, it is seen that PM leadership style in SMEs has not a meaningful effect on post-crisis period dimension. When PM level increased 1 unit, post-crisis period level increases 0,038 units ($\beta=0,038$; $t=0,991$; $p=0,183>0,05$). According to this hypothesis H3h is not accepted.

4. Results

Today Crisis Management (CM) studies seems essential in all organizations. In particular, the difference of CM mentality in large scale enterprises and SMEs, reveals different relations to CM. CM is a necessary concept for an organization to continue its activities and life course. The degree of the leadership in the organization is one of the most important factor which shows ways to achieve different advantages of the crisis inside or outside of the organization. SL has gained importance and has been one of the important leadership styles in CM process. Because SL in crisis process is a concept based on one organization's capacity of using its resources better than others or ability to perform better some certain activities than its competitors. SL gathers all leadership types under itself so it can be effective in CM.

According to the results significance levels varies. In particular in large scale enterprises and SMEs PI seems seriously come to the fore than other sub-dimensions. The reason of this situation can be explained by the fact that the sub-dimension is acting from a framework that challenging, innovative and respects the ideas of the employees. To create a positive portrayal of organizational structure of this sub-dimension contains a number of cases about the mission of employees on the crisis. Besides, this sub-dimensions ability to keep team spirit alive and creation of a common synergy felt in all levels of the organization. In this direction, PI provides a positive momentum to organization for future by ensuring unity and solidarity and by strengthening the organization. Then, the second most important sub-dimension in large scale enterprises and SMEs in some crisis periods is HCI. For example, the high control innovation occurred in pre-crisis period in large scale enterprises may be related to receipt of crisis signals before crisis, and high control requirement against crisis by managers. Occurred HCI in the crisis period may have been a result of having more control because of the crisis shock. The HCI occurred post crisis period may be the result of the managers demand of control to eliminate the effects of the crisis after the crisis shock. Likewise, the HCI occurred in SMEs in crisis period may be a result of the managers more controller behaviours because of the crisis shock. However, nonexistence of the HCI in SMEs in pre-crisis period and post-crisis period may be explained as rapid spread of the organizations' ideas and beliefs of the employees under the organization's control because of the smaller business structure. In addition, the foreground of the SQG in SMEs in pre-crisis period, may indicate that the moment the leader felt the crisis signal, he may indicate that the strict control requirement with panic. Finally, by the PM occurred in SMEs in crisis period we can understand that the leader without struggle request is refraining from responsibility of the crisis and wants to encumber all crisis problems to the workers.

Finally, research is limited to the factors mentioned in sub-elements. In the field of application of this study includes limiting the number of data creation and existence of other constraints and limitations because of the procedural requirements of the organization. However this study has a directive feature for future studies due to refers to a topic that is not studied before as comparatively especially for large scale enterprises and SMEs. In this study, although the presence of the effectiveness of SL in a crisis environment, that leads us to the suggestion that, this study might be

repeated with a broader sample. In subsequent studies, usage of different organizations and professions and identifying the relations about this subject will be effective on enhancement of the results of this study.

References

- Altinkurt, Y. (2007). Strategic Leadership in Educational Organizations and Strategic Leadership Applications of School Principals, PhD Thesis, Anadolu University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Eskişehir.
- Arslan, A. (2009). Leadership in Crisis Management, Journal of Academic Sight, Volume 18, No. 10: 1-12.
- Çelik, A. (2010). Crisis and Stress Management, 1. Edition, Ankara: Gazi Publishing.
- Çetinalp, H. (2014). Crisis Management in Sports Companies, Master Thesis, Haliç University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration, İstanbul.
- Ergen, T. (2011). Strategic Leadership and its Role in Teamwork an Application in 112 Emergency Health Services in the Province of Erzurum, Master Thesis, Atatürk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration, Erzurum.
- Fidan, M. M. (2011). Asymmetric Information in SME Credit Market and Moral Hazard: Laleli Case, Finance Article, Vol. 25, No. 90: 41-57.
- Gertsen, M. C., Söderberg, A. M. and Torp, J. E. (1998). Cultural Dimensions of International Mergers and Acquisitions, 1. Edition, Berlin: Desktop Publishing.
- Groh, M. B. (2014). Strategic Management in Times of Crisis, Munich Personal Repec Archive, No. 57032: 11–23.
- İlgün, K. (2011). The Effects of Manager's Behavior and Actions on the Success of Business Enterprise during Crisis Times, Master Thesis, Beykent University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration, İstanbul.
- Ireland, R. D. and Hitt, M. A. (2005). Achieving and Maintaining Strategic Competitiveness in the 21th Century: The Role of Strategic Leadership, Academy of Management, Vol.19, No.4: 63-77.
- Jacobson, G. H., McCoin, N. S., Lescallete, R., Russ, S. and Slovis, C. M. (2009). Kaizen: A Method of Process Improvement in the Emergency Department, Academic Emergency Medicine, Vol.16, No.12: 1341-1349.
- Jahanshahi, A. A., Nawaser, K., Khaksar, S. M. S. and Kamalian, A. R. (2011). The Relationship Between Government Policy and the

- Growth of Entrepreneurship in the Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises of India, *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation*, Vol.6, No.1: 66-76.
- Kaplan, B. (2006). The Effect of Transformasyonel Leader Behaviors on Opportunity Management in the Context of Business Performance, Master Thesis, Selçuk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Konya.
- Kuczumarski, T. D. (1996). What Is Innovation The Art of Welcoming Risk, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol.13: 7-11.
- Learning, C. (2012). Strategic Leadership: Managing the Strategy- Making Process for Competitive Advantage, *Academy of Management*, Vol.19, No.4: 63-77.
- Lockwood, N. R. (2005). *CM in Today's Business Environment: HR's Strategic Role*, 2. Edition, USA: Merrill Publishing.
- Müftüoğlu, M. T. (2013). *Business Economy*, 8. Edition, Ankara: Turhan Publishing
- Nahavandi, A. (2006). *The Art And Science of Leadership*, 2. Edition, USA: Prentice Hall.
- Pisapia, J. (2009). *The Strategic Leader New Tactics for a Globalizing World*, 1. Edition, USA: Age Publishing.
- Ryan, A. (2012). Innovation Performance, *Journal of Managed Innovation*, No. 70: 341-361.
- Schlechty, P. C. (2009). *Leading for Learning: How to Transform Schools into Learning Organizations*, 1. Edition, USA: Wiley Publishing.
- Şen, F. (2011). *Crisis Management and the Crisis in the Success of the Effect of Executive Business Behaviour*, Master Thesis, Dumlupınar University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration, Kütahya.
- Şeremet, M. (2013). *The Evaluation of Strategic Leadership Qualifications for Health Sector Executives: A Practice for Balıkesir Province Public Hospitals*, Master Thesis, Beykent University Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Hospital and Health Care Management, İstanbul.
- Sütçü, O. (2008). *Strategic Leadership*, Master Thesis, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration, Kahramanmaraş.
- Tack, P. B. (1994). *In Times of CM*, 2. Edition, USA: Prentice Hall.
- Temir, E. (2014). *Crisis Management and Hermeneutics*, Master Thesis, Erciyes University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Public Relations, Kayseri.
- Timurlenk, B. (2009). *The Effects of Core Employess on Organizational Capabilities and Firm Performance*, Master Thesis, Gebze Technical University,

- Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration, Gebze.
- Tuominen, M., Pippo, P., Yoshio, I. and Yoshio M. (1999). An Analysis of Innovation Management Systems Characteristics, *International Journal of Production Economics*, Vol. 6, No: 3: 135-143.
- Tutar, H. (2011). *Crisis and Stress Management*, 3. Edition, Ankara: Seçkin Publishing.
- Uğurluoğlu, Ö. (2009). *Assessment of Strategic Leadership Characteristics of Hospital Managers*, PhD Thesis, Hacettepe University Institute of Health Sciences Ankara.
- Wattanasupachoke, T. (2012). Design Thinking, Innovativeness and Performance: An Empirical Examination, *International Journal of Management and Innovation*, Vol. 4 No.1: 1-4.
- Yazıcı, A. (2005). *LSB Problems in Aydın and Contribution on Turkish Economy*, Master Thesis, Adnan Menderes University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration, Aydın.