SOCIAL CAPITAL IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION: AN EXAMINATION OF THE INTERACTION BETWEEN SOCIAL CAPITAL AND DEPARTMENT LEADERSHIP

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

KHAULA AHMAD YAWSON

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE IN MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

JANUARY 2018

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Cennet Engin-Demir
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Duygun Göktürk Ağın
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Sadegul Akbaba Altun (Başkent Uni., EDS) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Duygun Göktürk Ağın (METU,EDS) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Gökçe Gökalp (METU, EDS) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Khaula Ahmad Yawson

Signature:

ABSTRACT

SOCIAL CAPITAL IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION: AN EXAMINATION OF THE INTERACTION BETWEEN SOCIAL CAPITAL AND DEPARTMENT LEADERSHIP

Yawson, Khaula Ahmad

MS, Department of Educational Sciences

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Duygun Göktürk Ağın

January 2018, 147 pages

The primary purpose of this study is to understand and describe how department chairs functioned in their role as leaders, and analyze how social capital is manifested in their leadership.

A single embedded case study approach was used and semi-structured interviews were conducted with nine department chairs from a single public university in Turkey, to ascertain their views about social capital in their practices.

The results of the analysis suggest that, department chairs employed a collegial administration culture, which was marked by high consultation and participative leadership and priority was given to faculty autonomy. As a result of this, department chairs identified mutual trust and respect and shared perspectives as significant social capital within the department in addition to social capital in the form of informal social networks in higher administration that helped them to accomplish their work.

Keywords: higher education leadership, department leadership, social capital, faculty autonomy

ÖZ

YÜKSEK ÖĞRETIMDE SOSYAL SERMAYE: BÖLUM LİDERLİĞİ VE SOSYAL SERMAYE ARASINDA ETKILEŞIMINI SORUŞTURMASI

Yawson, Khaula Ahmad
Yüksek Lisans: Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Assist. Prof. Dr. Duygun Göktürk Ağın

Ocak 2018, 147 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, bir yükseköğretim kurumunda çalışmakta olan bölüm başkanlarının liderlik pozisyonunda üstlendikleri roller ve işlevleri anlamak ve tanımlamak ve sosyal sermayenin liderliklerinde nasıl ortaya çıktığını analiz etmektir.

Çalışmada tek bir vaka çalışması yaklaşımına başvurulmuş ve Türkiye'de yer alan bir devlet üniversitesinden dokuz bölüm başkanıyla görüşmeler gerçeklestirilerek, bölüm başkanlarının sosyal sermaye ile ilgili algıları uygulamalarındaki rolü saptanmaya çalışılmıştır.

Çalışmanın sonuçları, bölüm başkanlarının müzakere ve katılımcı liderliğe dayalı bir üniversite yönetim kültürüne başvurduklarını ve fakülte özerkliğine öncelik verildiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Sonuç olarak, bölüm başkanları, karşılıklı güven ve saygı ile benzer perspektiflerde ortaklaşmaların, üst yönetim kademelerindeki enformel sosyal ağların görevlerini yerine getirmedeki katkısının yanında, bölüm içlerisinde önemli birer sosyal sermaye formu olduğunu belirtmektedirler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: yüksek öğretim liderliği, bölüm liderliği, sosyal sermaye, fakülte otonomisi

To My Family

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am most grateful to God Almighty who has granted me the breath of life and surrounded me with great people. I wish to express my profound gratitude and thanks to my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Duygun Göktürk Ağın for her guidance, patience, advice and support throughout my research.

I am grateful to Assist. Prof. Dr. Gokce Gokalp for her initial support and also for serving my committee. My gratitude also extends to Prof. Dr. Sadegul Akbaba Altun for also serving on my defence committee.

In addition, I would like to express my gratitude to the department chairs who participated in my study, despite their very busy schedules. I also would like to acknowledge the assistance of all the Professors who reviewed my interview protocol.

My master's studies was supported by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK) and I am very grateful for the scholarship. Finally, I would like to thank my family, particularly my mother-in-law and my husband, Ridwan Amoako for their constant love and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM iii
ABSTRACT iv
ÖZ v
DEDICATION vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS viii
LIST OF TABLES x
CHAPTER
1. INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 Background of the Study 1
1.2 The Purpose of the Study 3
1.3 Research Questions 7
1.4 Significance of the Study 7
1.5 Outline of the Study 8
2. LITERATURE REVIEW 10
2.1 Theory of Practice: A Niche for the Concept of Social Capital 10
2.2 Social Capital: A Form of Capital in Activatiing Communities 16
2.3 Towards Understanding the Creation of Social Capital 18
2.4 Critical Perspectives on the Concept of Social Capital 22
2.5 Understanding the Organisation of Higher Education Institutions 28
2.6 Leadership: Theories, Approaches and Perspectives 31
2.7 Leadership in Higher Education Institutions 35
2.8 Social Capital: A Form of Capital in Activating Leadership 43
3. METHODOLOGY 47
3.1 Research Design 47
3.2 Research Questions 48

3.3 Operational Definitions of Key Terms 49
3.4 The Research Setting 50
3.5 Data Sources 52
3.6 Knowing the Participants 54
3.7 Data Collection Instrument 55
3.8 Data Collection Procedure 58
3.8 Trustworthiness 59
4. RESULTS 62
4.1 Perspectives about the role of department chairs 64
4.2 Chairs identified a collegial approach to leadership of the department . 69
4.3 Relationships established within the department were significant sources of social capital as well as a source of challenge 74
4.4 Social networks outside the department were beneficial to the work of department chairs 84
4.5 Seniority may guide interactions and perceptions within departments .. 89
4.6 The nature of the chair role necessitates the use of social capital 90
5. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION 95
5.1 Discussion 95
5.2 Conclusion 105
5.3 Implications 109
5.4 Limitations and Recommendation 110
REFERENCES 112
APPENDICES
A. Personal Data Form 125
B. Interview Protocol 127
C. Participants Invitation Letter 130
D. Sample Interview Extracts About Leadership 132
E. Ethics Committee Approval to Collect Data 134
F. Turkish Summary 135
G. Tez Fotokopisi İzin Formu 147

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

Table 1. Summary of Case Study Participants.....55
Table 2. Themes and Subthemes of Results 62

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

University leadership has continually and increasingly been viewed as a contributing factor for improving the performances of universities' activities (Ball, 2007; Smith & Hughey, 2006). Among the leadership of universities are a group of leaders especially noted for their contributions towards the overall success of universities; department chairs. The department chair's position is often considered as one of the most important roles within the university (Gmelch & Miskin, 2004; 2011). This is especially due to the proportion of decisions taken at this level as well as the central role they play as an interface for many stakeholders (Bolden et al, 2008).

Research indicates that they can significantly affect the future of the department (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011) especially because they constitute the bulk of university leadership (Seagren, Creswell & Wheeler, 1993) and 80% of university decisions are made throughout these institutional units (Carroll & Wolverton, 2004). Akin to the middle level leader or manager in other organizations, department chairs have the unique role of serving as an interface between multiple stakeholders; central administration, colleague faculty members, students as well as other internal and external community constituents (Gmelch & Miskin 2011; Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999; Riley & Russel, 2013). The interactions they engage in provide avenues for establishing multiple and complex relationships and networks. These relationships and networks may result in social capital, an aspect of the formation of relational ties and which department chairs may acquire and leverage as a significant resource.

Re-emerging in the late 20th century, it highlights the pivotal role and importance of establishing and maintaining relationships (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1995). Social capital is a concept that has been researched across socio-economic and political realms and has thus acquired different definitions, interpretations and potential uses (Burt, 2005; Portes, 1998; Putnam, 2000). On one hand, it is understood as the resources an individual is able to activate through networks of relationships (Bourdieu, 2005). It gives an added advantage by virtue of bridging otherwise unlinked networks (structural holes). In this view, benefits include financial resources as well as early access to non-redundant information (Burt, 2005). On the other hand, it has also been defined as the characteristics of social relations found within communities that promote cooperation and other civic engagements (Putnam, 2000). Social capital from this view emphasizes benefits derived from trust, norms and reciprocity associated with social networks (Putnam, 1995& 2000; Coleman, 1988). Adler and Kwon (2002) in summarizing the concept have defined it as the goodwill available to persons and groups, which is derived from the social networks they possess or belong to.

During the 1990s and the early 2000s, the concept became increasingly popular in a wide range of social science disciplines (Adler & Kwon, 2002). Notable among the disciplines on which social capital had or presumed to have enormously influenced is leadership (Hitt & Ireland, 2002; Balkundi & Kilduff, 2005). This is probably due to the reason that, leadership involves a relational process that requires working with others to accomplish a goal or to promote positive change (Yukl, 2013). Higher education leadership in particular has been left out of this social capital research (Bolden, Petrov & Gosling, 2008), however; it is a viable platform to study the relationship between social capital and leadership. This is especially because, within the higher education institutions, there are traces of social capital across all key players; students, faculty and administration (Tonkaboni, Yousefy & Keshtiaray, 2013). Department chairs are among the key persons within the higher education institutions who provide a good silo of leadership for studying social capital within this setting.

1.2 The Purpose of the Study

The management of university affairs involves a complex bureaucratic system, which often encompasses both the administration of operations and projects (Jensen, 2010). Universities are divided into faculties and schools, under which various researches are undertaken and educational programs offered; usually under the sub-divisions of departments. Within these departments, academic staff members are in charge of the operational activities such as teaching, research, curriculum, etc. based on their respective goals. Thus, each department runs its own 'project' (Jensen, 2010).

The management of the overall affairs that affect the operations of departments and faculties are undertaken by the central administration of the university. It runs on a typical line and staff authority (Jensen, 2010) where the president and governing board has an authority relationship with deans, and provosts and they in turn exercise authority over departments under their faculties (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012). There is a chain of command and detailed division of labor such that, the president relies on the work of administrative and academic divisions and deans and directors in turn rely on the departments, which are headed by department chairs.

The department chair like most administrative heads is usually appointed from the faculty to engage in administrative duties alongside an active engagement in the operational duties of teaching and research. Literature suggests that, the ultimate success of a university lies with the success of its micro units, the departments, and inferably the department chair (Knight and Trowel, 2001). The department chair is responsible for effectively steering the affairs of the department through a myriad range of areas and activities. However, this is done with a significant level of frustration and difficulty (Wolverton, Ackerman & Holt, 2005; Hancock, 2007). They face multiple expectations, do not have a clear mandate for

the position, and have unclear lines of authority and other stresses (Seagren et al, 1993).

First, their frustration has been attributed to the responsibilities and tasks inherent in the position. Due to the lack of a clearly designated role definition (Wolverton et al, 2005), department chairs often find themselves dealing with a vast array of tasks and roles, some of which should not necessarily be required of them (Hancock, 2007). Their roles include but not limited to financial management, faculty and human resource management, curriculum and program issues, student related issues as well as implementing policies from the central management (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Hecht et al, 1999; Pinto, 2013). Although there usually may be documents spelling out their duties, these documents do not indicate by way of categorization, their relative importance regarding the results to be achieved (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993, 2011); and it has been noted that some do not even get to see them (Wolverton et al 2005).

Thus, chairs often find themselves entangled by a ton of duties majority of which are especially known for their bureaucratic nature and also require a considerable amount of paper work (Hancock, 2007). New chairs after assuming the role are not very sure about what is actually expected of the position and prospective chairs are also overwhelmed by the thought of duties to be carried out as a chair (Wolverton et al, 2005).

Furthermore, much of the stress department chairs face is also usually related to role conflict they perceive. The roles of department chairs can conflict because there are many things occupying their time and there is the difficulty in trying to dedicate the needed time to each of the roles (Morris, 2012). Department chairs face role conflict when they need to decide between requests or expectations that in some way may conflict (Werkema, 2009). This problem is seen as a significant source of frustration (Gmelch & Burns, 1991) and has the potential of impeding their work (Kezar, 2004). There is usually complains of a mismatch between the power they yield and the numerous responsibilities they are in charge of (Seagren et al, 1993). However, it is also argued that, department chairs possess

other sources of power (usually, personal), the use of which may complement their authority as chair (Hecht et al, 1999).

In view of the challenges faced by the department chair, there have been calls for formal leadership development programs (Seagren et al, 1993; Gmelch & Burns, 1991). However, there continues to be complains regarding little or no leadership training (Wolverton et al, 2005, Morris & Laipple, 2015). Department chairs are usually appointed to the position based their success with scholarly works of teaching and research (Morris, 2012), however, the skills set needed to be effective leaders are totally different from those needed to be a good faculty member (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011). The difference in required skills, accompanied by little or no formal training makes it difficult for chairs to cope (Riley & Russel, 2013, Morris & Laipple, 2015). Whilst a significant number of chairs do not continue with this leadership position, there are some that stay the course (Wolverton et al, 2005), nonetheless, they also report of being more and more dispirited about their work (Morris & Laipple, 2015).

This study adopts the social capital concept as the major focus of its theoretical framework to understand how department chairs have used relationships and the benefits derived from them to accomplish their duties and also in light of these challenges. Social capital has been found to promote knowledge sharing and for that matter access to information, cooperative works as well as wellbeing of persons (Bourdieu, 2005; Burt, 2005; Putnam, 2000). Social capital has been classified into three dimensions; relational, structural and cognitive. The relational dimension describes the kind of relationships that characterize ‘social capital-prone ties’. The structural dimension describes the pattern of networks from which social capital is derived and cognitive dimension describes the aspect of relationships that enhance understanding among individuals (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998).

This study utilizes two perspectives; social capital as a characteristic of a group and social capital as an individual asset. Applying it to department chairs, social capital will help to identify who the chair is linked to; the nature of relationships the chair keeps with constituents internal (as a member of a group) and

external to the department and how social capital has played a role in their ever evolving and challenging position. The department is an example of a social field (Bourdieu, 1984) where power relations between agents (primarily faculty members) take place. As a leader of the department, the chair is a key agent in this social field who may utilize the capital or 'fundamental power' (Bourdieu 1984) in his possession to accomplish his objectives or to be put bluntly, to serve as coping mechanism.

Different fields value particular types of capital- economic, cultural and social (Bourdieu, 1986) and the university is of no exception. The university being an educational and a degree awarding institution presupposes the value placed on institutionalized cultural capital i.e. academic qualifications. However, depending on the kind of good or services in question, some capital may or may not allow immediate access to them (Bourdieu, 1986). Though the university as a whole may have cultural capital as a field-relevant resource, the department chair as a leader may also require other forms of capital in order to function effectively and efficiently. One of such capitals that are of importance to a leader is social capital (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2005). Because the chair is exposed to multiple relationships at different levels, one of the oft-repeated characteristics or expectations of the department chair position is the ability to successfully utilize one's people or social skills (Bryman, 2007; Pepper & Giles, 2014); a skill that could lay a firm grounding for social capital. As stated by Bolden et al (2008), academics in particular have the tendency to establish large networks both inside and outside their universities providing them with an extra advantage.

In view of the above, the purpose of this case study was therefore to discover, understand and describe how department chairs have executed their leadership role and undertaken their duties, tasks and challenges. Particularly, this study seeks the opinions of department chairs concerning social capital, as it has manifested in their leadership practices. It is important to clarify that, the exact focus of this study is not to measure the social capital of department chairs. Rather, the study operates on the assumption that, department chairs in their capacity as

scholars as well as chairs have amassed some social capital over the years. Again, social capital is said to be related to the other forms of capital, that is, cultural and economic capital, which may also be at the disposal of the department chair. It is based on this that we seek to explore for what and how their social capitals have been utilized during the period of serving as chair.

1.3 Research Questions

Many are the studies that have studied *what* department chairs do (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Wolverton et al, 2005) however very few have studied *how* they go about their duties. Responding to the issues surrounding the position of the department chairs require research that will contribute to understanding how to effectively function within their multi layered position (Werkema, 2009). The nature of their work is such that they have the tendency to establish networks of relations with people within and outside the university (Bolden et al, 2008) which can be the basis for establishing and maintaining social capital. Applying Bourdieu's theory of practice, specifically the concept of social capital in a qualitative research design, the objective of this case study was to explore and describe how department chairs have functioned and accomplished their responsibilities and the interplay of their socal capital. The study sought to answer the research question:

1. How do department chairs perceive social capital as it manifests in their leadership practices?

The following are the secondary research questions this study also explored:

2. How do department chairs define their role as the chair of the department?
3. How do they describe their leadership approach?
4. What are the challenges faced and strategies used?

1.4 Significance of the Study

Although there have been vast extant literature on the roles of the department chair, studies show that the position is ever evolving, expanding, and increasing in

their complexity (Pinto, 2013; Werkema, 2009). In view of this, this study will contribute to literature on the duties and roles of the department chair.

In addition, because the value of their success has been associated with or identified as necessary for the quality and success of the entire institution (Knight & Trowler, 2001) the study presents itself as a significant contribution to finding out conditions that may promote the success of such leaders. By exploring their opinions about social capital, the study provided a better picture of how leadership does or does not take place from the social perspective and more importantly, results from this study addressed the possible implications for department chairs that might result from the perceived role of social capital.

Furthermore, faculty members usually hesitate to pursue leadership roles within the academic world (Hill, 2005) probably owing to the reason that their academic profiles will be undermined (Bolden et al, 2008). Current department chairs also do not see themselves continuing especially due to the challenges they face (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011). This study sought to influence practice by providing a reference point from which faculty contemplating on leadership roles can learn and by proposing activities or actions that may promote effective headship and the development of social capital.

Finally, the study will contribute to literature on social capital that combines the major perspectives in one study; providing additional evidence of them not being mutually exclusive. Consequently, this study should be of interest to faculty members considering becoming department chairs, current serving department chairs, higher administration and other faculty and administrative personnel who may seek to assist chairs in their roles.

1.5 Outline of the Study

This study has been organized into five chapters. Chapter one provided an introduction to the study. Chapter two provides an overview of literature primarily related to: 1) Bourdieu's theory of practice as the theoretical framework with a particular focus on the concept of social capital; 2) some organizational theories, particularly emphasizing on leadership theories; 3) the department chair's leadership

role, duties, and challenges faced; and 4) social capital as it may relate to leadership in organizations. Chapter Three describes the study design and qualitative methods used to collect and analyze data. Chapter four presents the results of the analysis conducted whilst the final chapter, chapter five, discusses the results within the context of relevant literature and concludes the thesis with some implications and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter two of this study discusses relevant theories and topics related to the purpose of the study. It provides an overview of literature that is primarily related to: 1) Bourdieu's theory of practice as the theoretical framework with a particular focus on the concept of social capital; 2) some organisational theories, with an emphasis on leadership theories; 3) the department chair's leadership role, duties and challenges faced; and 4) social capital as it may relate to leadership in organizations.

2.1 The Theory of Practice: A Niche for the Concept of Social Capital

This section explains the theory of practice as proposed by Bourdieu. It is within this concept that social capital is situated. Social capital is a sociological concept that was primarily re-introduced by Bourdieu (1930-2002). The core principle of social capital according to various proponents simply is that the relationships and social interactions that exist between or among people are valuable resources that can be utilized as a form of capital (Adler, 2002; Bartkus and Davis, 2009; Leitch, MacMullan & Harrison, 2013; Lin, 2001). It is embedded within the social structure of relations and just like other forms of capital such as human, physical, cultural and economic capitals, it is proposed to have an accelerating effect on the work of whoever is in possession of it (Lin, 2001; Ostrom, 2010). It is productive and makes possible what could have been hitherto unattainable (Burt 2005; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998).

The concept of social capital was first re-introduced as part of a broader theory; the social theory of practice (Bourdieu, 1977). Before moving to define and conceptualize social capital to suit the purpose of this study, it will be essential to

understand the theory of practice, which provides a theoretical as well as methodological context for social capital. As Walther (2014) puts it, it is somewhat impossible to explain an element of Bourdieu's theory without hinting on the other associated concepts.

The theory of practice as proposed by Bourdieu (1977; 1990) is a multifaceted theory, which introduces a framework for understanding the practices of individuals as they exist in the social world (Chudzikowski & Mayrhofer, 2011). It seeks to explain how everyday practices are constituted and reproduced while, in the meantime, they follow regular patterns. First, a discussion of practices is provided below, which enables for the introduction of the other components.

Practice. The major focus of the theory of practice is to understand practices as formulated and repeated by social actors. A number of theorists (Giddens, 1984; Schatzki, 2002; Warde, 2005; Reckwitz, 2002) have proposed their understanding of how practices come about, including the theory of practice as posited by Bourdieu (1977; 1990). Practices as referred to by the theory may be understood as the group of activities or actions bundled together and which may seem as ordinary but are nonetheless essential (Strengers, 2010). According to Bourdieu, practices are a series of moves that have been organized in the form of strategies (Bourdieu, 1977). These activities include "forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, 'things' and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge" (Reckwitz, 2002 p. 249).

Bourdieu's theory seeks to bridge the divide between social structure and agency. A social structure is used to describe "the patterns of social life that are not reducible to individuals and that are durable enough to withstand the whims of individuals who would change them" (Hays, 1994, p. 60). From a 'structuralist' perspective, actions of agents are defined and influenced by the social structure, thus making persons to be perceived as individuals without the free will to decide and formulate their own actions. On the other hand of the spectrum, the 'voluntarilists' perceive practices of individuals as a result of their own free will without any external influences (Hays, 1994). It is this disparity that Bourdieu's theory of

practice seeks to address, whereby he situates practices in the middle of this continuum and perceives practices as a product of structure and agency. It should be noted that, the terms structure, objective structure and social structure have been used interchangeably in this study.

Bourdieu (1977, 1990) posits that, practices or strategies are a result of a relationship between the 'objective structures' and the 'cognitive and motivating structures' resulting in a cyclical reproduction of both structures such that the objective structures produce the cognitive structures and these cognitive structures in turn reproduce the objective structure. The relationship begins with the objective structure defining the conditions within the social world which produces a cognitive structure. This cognitive or motivating structure in the long run also generates practices. These resulting practices tend to more or less produce and reproduce the regularities underlying the objective structure, whilst also adjusting to the demands of the current situation dictated by the cognitive structure. As a result of the system of cyclical influence and continuous reproduction, practices are created, sustained, and transformed in everyday life practices (Strengers, 2010) and they transform the nature of the structures themselves (Hays, 1994).

Within this skeletal interplay between the two structures, there are useful concepts that provide deeper and better understanding of the constitution and reproduction of human behaviour or actions (Bourdieu, 2005). As stated by Strengers (2010), the social, historical, cultural, and material configurations surrounding these practices have the potential to explain behaviours and how these behaviours are explained by actors. These configurations may be expanded by introducing the concepts of habitus, field, and (forms of) capital (Bourdieu, 2005). The following subsections provide brief explanations of these concepts.

Field. The concept of field may be considered as the entry point of the theory of practices (Walther, 2014). Individuals or social agents engage in multiple interactions, which do not take place in isolation but rather are contextualized in their respective social spaces (Bourdieu, 1993). These social spaces are divided into different social fields. As a result, practices must be assessed in their respective

social fields (Kluttz & Fligstein, 2016; Walther, 2014). A social field is "a playground or battlefield in which actors, endowed with a certain field-relevant capital, try to advance their position…and try to follow individual strategies" (Chudzikowski & Mayrhofer, 2011, p. 23). The field under the theory of practice is viewed as a meso-level of social order where agents orient and re-orient their actions to one another (Kluttz & Fligstein, 2016). Actors within a social space or field are oriented towards one another over a common practice, issue, or goal.

As a result, different fields can be identified; the state, the economy, a university, the family are all examples (Bourdieu, 2005). Of specific interest to this study is the university as a social space (Bourdieu, 1988) within which other social fields such as the faculties, departments or intellectual fields such as the field of science, social science, literature etc. are situated (Walther, 2014). Taking the university as a field, actors here refer not only to individuals actors (for example academicians) but collective actors such as a groups of office workers who work and cooperate over a task, subunits of organizations (e.g. faculties and departments) competing for organizational resources (Kluttz & Fligstein, 2016). By immersing themselves in the field, actors take on dispositions and schemas that generate practices (Bourdieu, 2005). The collection of these dispositions is what has been referred to as "habitus".

Habitus. The term habitus has been used to denote the cognitive and motivating structure highlighted in the explanation of practices above. The crux of Bourdieu's argument is that, knowledge is socially constructed with the active involvement of the social agent or individual, and the principle of this construction is the habitus (Bourdieu, 1990). He defined it as "a system of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures, predisposed to function as structuring structures" (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 55). It inclines an actor to behave or act in certain ways. These dispositions are "inculcated, structured, durable, generative and transposable" (Thompson, 1991, p. 12).

The dispositions are inculcated because they come about through gradual processes of socialization; largely primary socialization (childhood experiences

through the family) (Bourdieu, 1977) and secondary socialization (experiences in current contexts such as school, workplace) (Chudzikowski & Mayrhofer, 2011). The habitus is also a structured structure because it is a product of past experiences which are deposited in each individual as perceptions, thoughts and actions and as a result it portrays the condition of living of an individual and the position occupied within the structure from which the habitus was acquired (Bourdieu, 1984). But the habitus is also termed as a 'structuring structure' because it serves the purpose of generating and organizing practices and the perception of these practices even in fields different from those from the which the habitus was produced (Bourdieu, 1990). It is also durable in the sense that it endures through the life of the actor in a way that it is not easily changed (Thompson, 1991 p. 12).

The habitus inclines an agent to act and react; producing practices and attitude,s which are not necessarily consciously coordinated by obedience to rules. They are the basis of individuals' strategies, which enable them to cope with unforeseen and changing situations and tasks (Bourdieu, 1977). Simply put, it provides an individual the sense of what is appropriate and how to act. However it should be noted that, these practices are not the result of only the habitus but rather a product of relationship that occurs between one's habitus and the social context (field) in which the individual puts up such practices (Bourdieu, 1984). The relationship between the habitus and field is a cyclical one. Whilst the habitus is 'modus operandi' the method of operating or of doing things that are recognized as objective, it is also 'opus operandi', the work operating or the result of these practices (Bourdieu, 1977). That is, through interactions and experiences, individuals develop their habitus and the practices of such individuals also shape what goes on in the field (Melville, Hardy & Bartley, 2011).

Capital. Bourdieu also relates practices to the concept of capital. An agent in a field at any point in time occupies a position, which is determined by the structure and quantity of resources (capital) he has at his disposal (Walther, 2014). Each field values a particular kind of capital and depending on the field it functions, capital can either be economic, cultural or social. Although they are different, one form of

capital can be exchanged into another form (Bourdieu, 1986). Economic capital is basically the revenues or financial assets of an individual. It is easily converted into money and may be institutionalized as property rights (Bourdieu, 1986). Cultural capital is the primary deferring factor among agents in a social field (Walther, 2014). It is categorized into three forms: 1) in the embodied form, cultural capital is a durable system of dispositions that represents one's culture and presupposes a process of embodiment (Bourdieu, 1986). This embodied capital, which is transformed into a habitus is not immediately transferred or acquired but rather takes time. Examples include competence and skills; 2) the objectified form of cultural capital exists in material objects and media, such as writings, paintings, and instruments, to mention but a few. Unlike the embodied form, it is easily transferable; and 3) the institutionalized cultural capital takes the form of academic qualifications. It is the cultural capita,l which is academically sanctioned by legal qualifications and is formally independent of its bearer. The academic qualification confers on its holder a guaranteed value with respect to culture (Bourdieu, 1986).

Finally, social capital is defined as "the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition or in other words, to membership in a group, which provide each of its members with the backing of the collectively-owned capital, a 'credential' which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word" (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 51). This definition has formed the basis for many recent studies on social capital. There is yet another type of capital; the symbolic capital. This form of capital is not an independent capital but rather, it is the form that the various types of capital assume when they are perceived and recognized as legitimate (Bourdieu, 1989). It is the capital on which value is ascribed by a particular field.

The theory of practice as introduced by Bourdieu (1977, 1984), proposes a formula that explains the interplay among these concepts. According to Bourdieu (1984), at any moment, an agent finds himself in a social field and through the interaction between his/her habitus and the field; s/he utilizes her/his resources

(capital also referred to as power) to advance his or her interest; [(habitus) (capital) + field] = practice. Capital can be a major cause or reason for distinction among agents in a social field (Bourdieu, 2005). A field is a place of power relations where the position of the actors and their interactions are determined by the kind of resources or capital they are in possession of. The following section focuses solely on one of these capitals; social capital, its conceptualization taking into consideration the two major deferring perspectives, its dimensions, creation and effects or critiques.

2.2 Social capital: A Form of Capital in Activating "Virtual Communities"

Definitions abound on the concept of social capital due to the differences in agreement on the type of construct it is (structure of relationships or content of relationships), or whether social capital is a source or an effect (Batkus & Davis, 2009). However, from the literature, it can be deduced that social capital can generally be conceptualized as having an internal or external perspective (Adler and Kwon, 2002). These perspectives have been discussed below.

Seeking the bridges: The external perspectives of social capital. The external perspective of social capital defines social capital on the basis of an individual's access to and use of resources by virtue of relationships s/he has established with others within the larger social structure (Lin, 2001). The works of Burt (1997; 2005) and parts of the works of Bourdieu (2005) and Coleman (1988) focus on this conceptualization. This line of definitions utilizes network analysis to explain social capital, where the networks external to and in the reach of the individual are perceived as the basis for his or her social capital (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Burt, 2005; Ostrom & Ahn, 2001).

Burt (2005) for instance defines social capital as the advantage one has in bridging structural holes that exist between different network clusters through weak ties. Weak ties are ties between two different persons participating in different social circles or clusters (Lin, 2001). Bourdieu (1986) adds by stating that, by virtue of possessing durable networks of contacts, an individual may gain access to actual and

potential resources. Access here can either be direct through their ties or indirect through ties that may have access to others in possession of such resources (Lin, 2001). It is also termed as bridging social capital (Putnam, 2000).

Under this perspective, social capital is usually perceived as an individual asset. According to Lin (2001), social capital is those resources embedded within social networks which individuals can mobilize to increase their chances of succeeding or achieving whichever goals they may be pursuing. In this sense, the benefit is primarily accrued or enjoyed by the individual nonetheless it may also secondarily be beneficial to the organization to which he/she belongs (Burt, 1997; Leane & Van Buren, 1999). As an individual asset, it varies per individual's position in the network and can be used to promote personal interests (Lin, 2001).

The internal perspective: Looking within for capital. On the other hand, there is the internal perspective (Adler and Kwon, 2002) which analyses social capital in terms of the important features of ties among individuals within a group. The focus is on perceiving those things that characterize the relationships among members of a collective or group as useful resources (Adler and Kwon, 2002). As defined by Fukuyama (1997), social capitals are those informal values people share among themselves which allow them to cooperate with one another. This is also termed as bonding social capital because it comprises all features that encourage collaborations, cooperation and collective action (Ostrom, 2010; Putnam, 1995) and as such promotes 'bonding' (Putnam, 2000).

Unlike the external perspective, it perceives social capital as a collective asset. In this sense, social capital is defined as a public good which is distributed across a social network and is used to solve a collective action problem and therefore its relevance only comes to light when there is a need to work together for a common purpose (Coleman, 1988; Ostrom, 2010; Putnam, 2000). Another form of collective asset is described by Bourdieu (1986) where social capital are the resources a group makes available to its members as a result of mutual acquaintance and recognition. In this case, it is a collectively owned asset which allows for the possession of 'credits' resulting from obligations by a recipient of a favour to pay

back and expectation on the part of the provider that the favour granted will be paid back somehow (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1988). Thus from this angle, the group is the primary beneficiary of social capital and only secondarily confers benefits on the individual (Leane & Van Buren, 1999).

There is another definition which does not take only one side but rather pivots on integrating them both. According to such proponents, both perspectives describe two sides of the same phenomenon. Adler and Kwon (2002) argue that they are just a matter of perspectives, in that, an actor's relation to members of a network is external to that individual and describes the bridging social capital (Putnam, 2000). At the same time, this individual's network may also be found within a particular social structure or group he/she belongs to. In that case, analysing such networks amounts to the group level or bonding social capital. They add that, both perspectives are not mutually exclusive and can co-exist within the same field.

For the purpose of this study, we employed this integrated definition of social capital since the study was aimed at understanding how higher education leaders perceive social capital within the university. Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) also expounded on this definition of social capital, suggested its main dimensions and linked it to the creation of intellectual knowledge within organisations. According to them, social capital is "the sum of the actual and potential resources embedded within, available through and derived from the network of relationships possessed by an individual or social unit" (p. 243). This definition was adopted for this study.

2.3 Towards Understanding the Creation of Social Capital

This section of the literature review discusses the dimensions and sources of social capital, thereby providing a complete understanding. It addresses the three dimensions proposed by Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) and the facets of relationships which allow for the access to and leveraging of social capital.

Social capital: The sum of its parts. Generally, literature identifies three different dimensions of social capital namely structural, relational, and cognitive

(Chow and Chan, 2008; Ghoshal &Nahapiet, 1998; Upholf & Krishna, 1999). Although different, Ghoshal and Nahapiet (1998) argue that, they also overlap and influence one another. These dimensions also provide insight into how social capital is created, sustained and used as a form of capital to facilitate the achievement of goals. To access and benefit from social capital, three factors have been proposed as the essentials: opportunity, motivation and ability to create and leverage social capital (Adler & Kwon, 2002). This section also describes how these factors and dimensions are interconnected.

Structural dimension. This dimension looks at the network ties and the patterns of such ties. It comprises factors such as the network ties between actors, the network configuration (Chow & Chan, 2008), appropriable associations (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998), structural holes (Gonzalez, 2014). Network ties describe the links that exist between people (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998) and it describes the conduits through which interactions are made possible (Lui, Wang & Chua, 2015). Network configuration refers to the particular ways in which such ties are arranged and connected an example being hierarchies of organizations (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). Structural holes refer to the gaps between two network structures the bridging of which constitutes a crucial and worthwhile social capital (Burt, 2005).

Structural dimension creates opportunities. Social networks provide such opportunities for interactions (Lui et al, 2015) and the pattern of such ties reinforces these opportunities (Adler & Kwon, 2002). There are two main pattern characteristics described in the literature. Opportunities are enhanced by having either closed network (Coleman, 1988) or sparse networks between which structural holes exist (Burt, 2005). In the group setting especially, it is proposed that, having a denser network is an effective way to gain access to and maintain strong social capital (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1995). Interactions are said to be strong, positive, consist of multiple relations and are often than not reciprocated (Oh, Labianca & Myung-ho, 2006). The other line of argument proposes that, a sparse rather than a dense network solidifies access to more beneficial social capital (Burt, 2005). Due to

differences in the location of actors in formal and informal structures, there are always bound to be gaps (structural holes) between structures (Burt, 2005). It is the bridging of such gaps that allows for opportunities that were hitherto inaccessible to be brokered and gives individuals a better standing to achieve their goals. Therefore, to strengthen social capital a person should have sparse networks with holes (Burt, 2005; Lin, 2001).

The relational dimension. This dimension unlike the structural, refers to the particular kind of relationship that exists or the characteristics of the ties between or among actors (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). This dimension is the core of the group level social capital. It usually comprises of trust, norms, obligation and expectation and associability (Leana & Buren, 1999). Effective norms dictate actions of the people who defined it and can serve as very powerful but sometimes weak form of social capital (Coleman, 1988). Obligation It is created when there is an expectation to repay a favour and one is committed to undertake some activity in an unspecified future time (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Lui et al, 2015). Another very popular component is trust. It is considered a group social capital resource (Coleman, 1988) existing in two forms: thick and thin trust (Putnam, 2000). Thick trust is embedded in personal relations that are strong and frequent whereas thin trust, also termed as generalized trust, extends beyond the people known personally to the focal actor. It is about giving others the benefit of doubt.

Relational dimension provides the motivation to exchange. It is argued that there must be a motivating factor which propels an actor a step closer to gaining or exchanging social capital (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Lin, 2001; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Portes, 1998). Motivation is anything that drives behaviour towards an outcome (Naile and Selesho, 2014). Motivation can be expressive, instrumental or consummatory.

Expressive actions are bound by the motivation to maintain resources already in one's possession (Lin, 2001). Instrumental motivation guides actions to gain access and utilize some resources not yet in a person's possession. From another view point, instrumental motivation is bounded by one's expectation to gain

in an unspecified future time (Coleman, 1988; Portes, 1998). This is as a result of the trust he or she has that the assistance he is offering will be reciprocated (Coleman, 1988). The recipient of the assistance then assumes an obligation to reciprocate either due to personal reasons such as gratitude, friendship, respect or due to enforcement by the group (Bourdieu, 1986). Consumatory motivation, on the other hand, is when actions are based on shared norms and solidarity that exist as a result of identifying with a particular network (Bourdieu, 1986; Portes, 1998).

The ability factor. Relational dimension is said to be the resources embedded within relationships. However, social capital is also said to include the resources people have actual and potential control over (Adler & Kwon, 2002). In this regard, Lin (2001) expresses that social capital is embedded in relationships and networks which make those resources controlled directly or indirectly by actors in their personal or positional capacity, available to others. Indeed it has been argued that, this resource perspective is the essence of individual social capita (Rostila, 2011). The value of all human-made capital such as social capital depends on the actual capital possessed by actors (Bourdieu, 1986) and this includes the skills and proficiency (Ostrom, 2010) political assets (Lin, 2001; Rostila, 2011) as well as information (Burt, 2005). Without these resources, an individual is unable to actually lend any assistance to another, thus the term ability factor.

***Cognitive dimension*.** This dimension is often found in knowledge creation and sharing literature as well as management literature. It refers to the aspect of social relationships that enhances common understanding between and among actors (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). Groups often communicate in a 'local dialect' that may basis of what cognitive dimension entails. It includes facets such as shared goals and vision, shared codes and language, shared narratives, beliefs and values (Chow & Chan, 2008; Lui et al, 2015; Upholf & Krishna, 1991; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). These shared factors promote the creation of a common understanding of the group or collective goals thereby engendering the 'proper' ways of acting within that system (Ghoshal & Tsai, 1998). A shared vision or a set

of shared values, for instance, are said to help facilitate actions that can be of benefit to the whole organization (Ghoshal & Tsai, 1998)

The categorization into structural, relational, and cognitive dimensions allows for the deeper understanding of the nature of social capital. It also provides answers to questions on how social capital is created, defined and (re)located in various contexts. With this understanding, the review proceeds to discuss some critical arguments on social capital.

2.4 Critical Perspectives on the Concept of Social Capital

The section under this theme will address some pertinent criticisms and evaluations of social capital. Firstly, discussions will centre on the downside of the concept and then move on to some benefits of social capital.

Some critiques on social capital. All forms of capital, though originally created or invested to positively promote the work of individuals, have the potential of constraining or even causing 'harm' to others (Ostrom, 2010; Coleman, 1988). Social capital is of no exception. Though inherently positive, its effect may vary depending on the setting or context it is being applied to (Ahn and Ostrom, 2001).

Portes (1998) explains that, although social capital makes opportunities available, it also may be a basis for creating inequalities in a social sphere in terms of access to resources and opportunities. This has been referred to as 'opportunity hoarding' (DiTomaso, 2013). Such that, while others may gain easy access to opportunities, favouritism or nepotism resulting from this concept ensures the exclusion of those outside the network or tie thereby restricting their access to that opportunity (Ostrom, 2010). For instance, DiTomaso (2013) found out through her qualitative study that, the acts of favouritism that whites showed to each other was the basis for racial inequality in America and was primarily as a result of opportunity hoarding and the exchange of social capital only among white Americans.

Another critical argument against social capital is that, the concept defeats the purpose of the universality ideal of the organization and self-reliance. It overly emphasizing on the in-group and risking favouritism and nepotism within

organizations (Portes, 2014). That is, people within the in-group are sometimes preferred to counterparts outside the group and are given exclusive access the best opportunities.

In addition, others also argue that, although norms as a form of social capital may be used to solve problems related to collectives, they may also restrict innovation due to their prescriptive nature (Coleman, 1988; Portes, 1998). It may result in excessive claims on some successful group members and even restrict individual freedom. Excessive trust in in-group members may also lead to oversight errors (Portes, 2014). In a study by Levine, Apfelbaumc, Bernard, Bartelte, Zajacf, and Stark (2014), it was discovered that traders in ethnically homogeneous markets made errors regarding the pricing of goods. According to them, the presence of other ethnically similar players in the market caused others to be overconfident and feel excessively comfortable, resulting in a more careless monitoring of market fluctuations which in turn resulted in pricing errors.

Another critique to social capital concerns the ease with which people with a particular type of capital may be able to access more social capital than others. According to Bourdieu (1986), all forms of capital; social, cultural and economic, are can be 'traded' for one another. Therefore, an individual with higher cultural capital may have easy access to some forms of social capital and a person can also acquire social capital by virtue of possessing considerable amounts of economic capital. The reverse can also be the case, such that a person with more social capital can obtain cultural and economic capital or power. But Bourdieu argues further that, the underlying factor of social capital and other capital for that matter is economic capital; as such all social capital finally dissolved into economic capital. This is because the amount of economic capital possessed determines the quality of social capital one may access. Inferably, people with more economic capital gain access to better resources and even better networks and the opposite is also the case. This results in differences in the opportunities to access social capital, thus putting the dominant class (Bourdieu, 1986) in a more advantaged position.

This phenomenon can also be explained by the theory of homophily which proposes that, people are more likely to interact if they share similarities in some attributes and socio-economic characteristics such as income, status (Lin, 2001) and educational qualifications (Bourdieu, 1988). Lin (2001) goes on by stating that it is more likely for networks to exist between such individuals with better status, thereby increasing their chances of accessing better social capital, resulting in reinforced and reproduced privileges through repeated exchanges (Bourdieu, 1986). Social capital consequently becomes a means to establish and maintain social reproduction (Bourdieu. 1986), which means that the better and dominant social positions within a social structure are always occupied by persons from the dominant class with better social, cultural and economic capital, whereas other positions are always occupied by the dominated class (Walther, 2014).

Despite these criticisms of the concept, it has also been found to provide some beneficial outcomes to people and groups. Some of these benefits are discussed in the following section.

Evaluating the benefits of social capital. Social capital has been analysed at different levels such as individual, societal, and, organizational. In all these levels, social capital is found to facilitate and enhance the work of individuals and groups as well as create opportunities previously inaccessible (Lin, 2001; Ostrom, 2010; Uphoff & Krishna, 1999).

At the individual level, social capital has been found to promote the sense of job satisfaction, work engagement and engagement in clinical improvements for health workers (Strőmgren, Eriksson, Bergman, Dellve, 2016). Strőmgren et al, (2016) examined social capital in the form of reciprocity, trust and recognition in relation to healthcare professionals' work engagement and job satisfaction. Their results indicated that social capital, especially in the form of recognition, is strongly associated with the professionals' job satisfaction as well as work engagement. They believe that, social capital can be used to develop sustainable health care organisations. Additionally, social capital is also found to be positively related to an individual's current salary, number of promotions over the career, and career

satisfaction (Seibert, Kraimer, Liden, 2001). According to them, the social network of employees enabled them access to certain social resources such as information, career sponsorship and resources, which had effects on their career success in the form of promotions and salary increases (Seibert, et al, 2001).

At the societal level, social capital is also said to promote cooperation. For example, in their study of the relationship between social capital and performance, Uphoff and Krishna (1999) found that social capital was significantly and positively linked to superior development outcomes in watershed conservation as well as cooperative development activities. Their study was aimed at assessing the performance of 64 villages after seven years of engaging in watershed conservation and development projects. The study revealed that, although social capital was not the only determinant, some villages benefited greatly from it, as a product of collective thinking and activities. Collective action was achieved through participative decision making and learning by monitoring. Thus, they concluded that, attitudes and beliefs about participation coupled with easy-to-follow rules and prior experiences with collective action, promoted their social capital and consequently improved watershed developmental outcomes in some villages.

Finally, at the organizational level, social capital is said to influence top management support for complex and cross-functional Information Technology (IT) projects (Liu, Wang & Chua, 2015). Liu et al, (2015) discovered that due to prior interactions with strategic decision makers at the helm of affairs, IT project team members were able to create a positive impression of their group. The repeated interactions allowed them to establish strong structural, cognitive, and relational ties with managers. This also promoted top management's trust for and sense of shared identity with the groups, establishing a feeling of an obligation to cooperate.

All these benefits were due to some specific roles social capital played. There is a seeming consensus on what these roles are and have generally been classified in relation to information, influence and solidarity.

a) Social capital facilitation of information sharing. Though information is the basis for action, it is quite difficult to gather (Coleman, 1988). Social capital

facilitates easier and sometimes timely information accessibility (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Burt, 2005; Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1995; Lin, 2001; Oh et al, 2006; Seibert, Kraimer & Liden, 2001). The assumption is that, different functional groups within an organization for instance, hold different kinds of information and views. Thus contacts with others from different groups provide access to information not available to his or her own functional group (Seibert et al, 2001).

Social capital facilitates the deployment of information in a strategically befitting manner thus making actions more efficient (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998) and consequently more valuable (Burt, 2005). This is a result of particularly the diversity of information sparse networks can make available (Burt, 2005); the timely transfer of information through weak ties (Lin, 2001); and the free flow of information among individuals belonging to a network, group, organization or community and the closeness between those ties (Chow & Chan, 2008; Putnam, 1995). In their study of career success, Seibert et al, (2001) found that the effect of social capital on career success was mediated by access to information. Through employees' social networks at functional and higher management levels, they were able to access organizational information through which they had access to key resources which also influenced their job satisfaction.

b) ***Promoting cooperation and solidarity.*** Furthermore, social capital is said to facilitate coordination, cooperation and solidarity among people (Putnam, 1995; Putnam; 2000; Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998; Gonzalez-Brambila, 2014; Ostrom & Ahn, 2001). It is believed that, some outcomes are better achieved together, and social capital facilitates that process of collective action (Ostrom & Ahn, 2001). Norms, trust, and reciprocity encourage compliance with rules, citizens' civic engagements, cohesion and they resolve certain problems associated with collective action such as opportunism (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Putnam, 1995; Ostrom, 2010). Instead of, for example, hierarchical control mechanisms, individuals can effectively operate as a collective because of the general understanding, norms and trust they have developed for one another at the workplace (Leana & Van Burren, 1999). Social capital may also be used as an effective tool for facilitating technological

innovations through research and development based on networks between governments, businesses and academia (Ostrom & Ahn, 2001).

c) ***Access to influence.*** Social capital also provides access to influence, control, and power (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Bourdieu, 1986; Lin, 2001). Through the accumulation of obligations, people are able to gain the power to get things done (Coleman, 1988). One's location and position in a network may mean more valued resources and greater power (Lin. 2001). Actors may, therefore, be able to increase the effect of an outcome due to obligations others owe them or due to their tie with people in influential positions such as persons in decision making positions. For instance, Liu et al (2015) found that Information Technology (IT) project teams could leverage top management support by increasing the strength of their social capital and this was achieved through repeated interactions and trust which allowed for reduced negotiations and a shared identity.

Furthermore, Burt (2005) proposes that people who are able to identify and bridge structural holes become more influential since they can serve different interests. Within formal organizations, managers and leaders who bridge structural holes become influential and in some cases may be able to pull external resources to solve organizational problems (Burt, 1997).

Summary

This just ended section examined two major contributing facets of this study. First, it discussed Bourdieu (1977)'s theory of practice which posits that, an individual acts not only out of his own free will but with the guiding frame of an objective structure. By locating oneself in a field, an individual adopts a habitus which is an acquired system of generative schemes that produce thoughts and actions spontaneously without consciousness. The habitus generates practices as it interacts with the field, subsequently reproducing the objective system. Bourdieu also identifies different forms of capital; economic, cultural and social capital which are used by actors to advance their interest in the field. The possession of a capital that is symbolic to the field, promotes the strategic positioning of the actor.

The focus of discussion then moved to the concept of social capital. Social capital is the resources embedded within and derived through social networks. It comprises of three dimensions: 1) the structural dimension consists of the structural networks and provides the opportunity for interaction; 2) the relational dimension consists of the features of the relationships that enhance cooperation and provide the motivation to act; and 3) the cognitive dimensions comprise of shared meanings which promote a common understanding of issues. The dimensions of social capital as discussed will contribute to understanding the aspects of higher education leadership which may serve as capital for department leaders.

There have been some arguments both for and against the concept. On one hand, it is argued that, social capital is beneficial for accessing extra information and resources hitherto inaccessible. It also enables cooperation between and among people. Nonetheless, on the other hand, it has been criticized for promoting nepotism and excessive trust which may lead to negative consequences. After providing a holistic description of the concept, the literature review proceeds to examine the context within which the leadership practices of department chairs take place. In particular, the following section discusses the organizational structure and culture of higher education institutions.

2.5 Understanding the Organisation of Higher Educational Institutions

Higher education management involves a complex system of both the administration of overall operations and as well as different projects under different faculties and departments (Jensen, 2010). We discuss the overall structure of these institutions in order to ascertain a strong foundation for further discussions about universities, as well as to be able to situate the work of department chairs in an appropriate in context.

An organisational structure provides an organisation with its framework for vertical control and horizontal coordination (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012). Most higher education institutions are managed based on a bureaucratic model (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012). The bureaucratic structural model suggests certain

structural imperatives needed to ensure effectiveness and efficiency. The model characterized by, 1) a division of labour, that is, jobs are specialized and divided; 2) performance rules: tasks must be performed according to some rules; 3) hierarchy of offices: positions are arranged according to a hierarchy with a chain of command; 4) competence; personnel are selected based on their technical skills; 5) impersonality: personal and property rights must be separated, with a social distance between managers and subordinates (Bowman & Deal, 2009; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012). However, Elcemir (2012) argues that the bureaucratic model provides a general description of an ideal type of organisation, which conditions the development of further and diversified organizational styles.

A number of models have been proposed to understand an organisation's structure and components; one of which is Mintzberg (1979)'s structural configuration. No attempt is made to project it as the best among other models. Rather, it was chosen only to enable a holistic description of the structure of higher education institutions. Baker (1983) argues that any attempt to examine or understand an organizational structure must focus on the variance within the organisation. He states that higher education institutions comprise of two main structures: the parent organizational structure and the unit's structure (Baker, 1983; Jensen, 2010). Thus, Mintzberg's configuration was chosen because it provides a basis for understanding the roles of the various constituents of higher education institutions and how they affect, directly and indirectly, the overall purpose.

Mintzberg (1979) explains an organization's structure based on the strategy used to achieve its objective. According to him, an organisation comprises of five parts; a) the 'operating core' comprises those who perform the actual work directly related to the organisation's aim. For universities, this would be the academic staff members. b) 'The strategic apex' is responsible for the overall organisation. They include the president and governing bodies of the university. c) The 'middle line' is the middle and lower level management who link the apex to the operating core by serving as the liaison. This will encompass deans, directors as well as department chairs. d) The technostructure comprises the analysts and their supporting clerical

staff whose work affects the functioning of the entire structure. They include accountants and their cleric staff. e) The ‘support staff’ provides indirect support to the organisation and includes departments such as the university bookstore, janitorial services and canteen services.

According to this configuration, organisations can be differentiated based on their key parts, the primary coordinating mechanisms and the decentralization used. For a university, such as the case for this study, the key part is the operating core, which is the academic staff. Their work is coordinated through the standardization of skills and decentralization is done vertically through the formal authorities but also horizontally to provide professors with some autonomy (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012). A university therefore, operates as a professional bureaucracy; though very bureaucratic, the operating core has controls over its own work.

The management of a higher education institution is also said to be influenced by its culture. McNay (1995) distinguishes between collegium, bureaucratic, corporate and enterprise cultures in university management, based on the form and intensity of controls and focus on policy and strategy. A collegium culture consists of loose policy and operational control and emphasizes individual freedom. A bureaucratic culture consists of loose policy definition but tight control implementation. The corporate culture focuses on tight policy and control implementation and dominance of senior management. Finally, the enterprise culture consists of tight policy definitions but loose controls with an external reference. According to McNay (1995), all four cultures coexist in most universities but with varying balances, which is determined by factors such as the university’s traditions and mission, external pressures and leadership style.

Higher education institutions have complex structures involving many influential constituents. The strategy it adopts to coordinate affairs as well as the culture of the university both play a role in how it is managed. Nonetheless, as noted by McNay (1995), leadership can play a role in how the higher education institutions are managed. And whilst leadership may influence the structure, it is also a fact that the structure also affects the leadership behaviours of administrators

(Baker, 1983). In view of this, the following section addresses and discusses leadership as a major aspect of organisations in general, and higher education institutions in particular.

2.6 Leadership: Theories, Approaches and Perspectives

The quest for optimum organizational performance has seen a continuous change in the focus of effective leadership studies. Despite the inability to define its essential attributes, this quest has not diminished, probably due to the uncontested importance that leadership holds (Bolden et al 2008; Marshall, 2005). Leadership has been found to be a significant contributor to the ultimate success of every organization, be it in the private or public sector, in business or academia (Naile & Selesho, 2014; Smith & Hughey, 2006).

Before proceeding to discuss leadership, it would be beneficial to distinguish between leadership and management. Managers are concerned about how things are accomplished and focus on trying to get people to perform better. Leaders, on the other hand, are concerned with finding the meanings people attribute to things, thus they seek people's agreement about the most important things to be done (Yukl, 2013). Lunenburg and Ornstein (2012) posit that every organisation needs a combination of both effective leaders and managers and both can be found in one person (Yukl, 2013). The objective of this study is to identify how leaders within universities accomplish their tasks. In view of this, we discuss leadership within organisations in the following sections.

Organisational Leadership Theories. The study of leadership within organizational settings has being the approach of behavioural theorists. Behavioural theorists studied the behaviours exhibited by leaders in formal organizational settings (Northouse, 2007). A few of these theories are discussed below.

***Behavioural leadership theories*.** The pioneering studies at the Ohio State University and the University of Michigan in the mid-20th century provided two broad categories of leadership behaviours (Northouse, 2004). These are task oriented and relationship oriented behaviours. The categories have recently been

broadened further with the addition of two more: change oriented and external oriented behaviours (Yukl, 2013).

The task-oriented category, also labelled as initiating structure describes behaviours which have the primary aim of completing tasks as efficiently and effectively as possible and the concern is to facilitate the accomplishment of goals and objectives (Northose, 2004; Yukl, 2012; 2013). Relationship-oriented behaviours are aimed at increasing the quality of relationships within the group or organization (Yukl, 2012). As a result, such behaviours seek to enhance the way members feel about themselves, their colleagues and the situation the find themselves in (Northouse, 2004). Change-oriented behaviours are exhibited in order to increase innovation and adaptability among members whereas the externally-oriented behaviours are aimed at acquiring the necessary resources and promoting organization's interest outside (Yukl, 2012). Beyond these broad categories, other theories proposed that leadership behaviours must be contingent on a number of factors, which are external to the leader. They are classified as contingency theories.

Contingency theories. These theories posit that, for leaders to be effective, they ought to give some consideration to the context within which they operate. That is, different settings and situational factors call for different styles of leadership (Northouse, 2004). Among such theories are situational leadership and Fieldler's contingency theory. Situational leadership posits that a leader needs to evaluate and assess the commitment and competence levels of subordinates (situation) and decide on which style to adopt. In addition, Fiedler's contingency theory suggests that the effectiveness of a leader depends on how best his or her style fits the context (Northouse, 2004).

Team and relational theories. Apart from behavioural theories, some scholars have proposed a different approach to examining leadership in organisations. The relational theories perceive leadership as relationship based. They tend to examine relationships and structures that promote collaboration and teamwork and the impacts they have on outcomes. Proponents of the relational theories often see leadership as "a social influence process through which emergent

coordination (i.e., evolving social order) and change (e.g., new values, attitudes, approaches, behaviours, and ideologies) are constructed and produced" (Uhl-Bien, 2006 p. 668). A typical example is the distributed leadership as proposed by Spillane (2005) who defines leadership as the collection of practices that are influenced by the interplay between leaders, followers, and situation.

These are among the salient leadership theories that have gained prominence in organizational literature. The behavioural, contingent and relational theories are by no means exhaustive, however, they provide a good overview of the various perspectives of leadership. The review now proceeds to identify an operational definition of leadership.

Definition of leadership. It has been argued that leadership as a term is difficult to define due to the complex nature of the processes it involves (Jex & Britt, 2008). Nonetheless, this section examines and describes the major dichotomy identified in the literature and proceeds to choose a definition.

Some researchers perceive leadership as a specialized role of one entrusted with the functions and responsibilities of leadership (Yukl, 2013), usually in relation to formal organizations. This is also referred to as assigned leadership (Northouse, 2004). This view has primarily been projected by the behavioural theories of leadership discussed earlier. According to them, leadership, as a process, begins from a source and leaders represent that source because they serve as the primary stimulus for activities to be undertaken (Baker, 2001). On the other hand, it is argued that leadership process involves interdependencies rooted in the connections and relationships that leaders are engaged in (Uhl-Bien, 2006). According to this perspective, leadership occurs throughout the organization as well as the wider social system (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2005).

Irrespective of the argument, all definitions agree to the need for influence in leadership. Ball (2007) states that common among all leadership definitions are the issues of goal setting and achievement, group activities and influence. For a person to be a leader, it is agreed that he or she has to be able to exert influence; intentionally or otherwise, on a person or group of persons (Jago & Vroom, 2007).

This influence can be exercised on a couple of areas such as the choice of objectives members make, the motivation of members as well as influencing outsider's engagement (Yukl, 2013). Thus For this study, leadership is defined as a process an individual undergoes to exert influence on a group of people aimed at achieving a common goal (Northouse, 2004).

This section defined leadership and discussed two arguments; whether leadership is accomplished under a specialized role (an individualized type) or a social process (includes social contracts). This study is based on the assumption that as an assigned leader, the department chair can either choose to direct the process of influence personally or may decide to direct the process of influencing such that it becomes a social process whereby everybody is involved. Considering these definitions and approaches to leadership, the next section is dedicated to examining some of the specific leadership styles of organisational leaders.

Leadership styles in organisational settings. The leadership theories identified earlier all have implications on the kind of style a leader may use (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012). Under this subsection, some of the leadership styles have been described. Leadership style has been proposed as an example of behavioural theories since it directs attention to the actions of leaders. But it has also been characterized as a relationship based leadership approach because there is the tendency to rely on followers' reactions and work situations (Hollander, 1979 in Uhl-Bien, 2006).

The style here is used to describe the manner in which individuals align with others to influence them and accomplish mutual and organizational goals (Uhl-bien, 2006). As stated by Northouse (2004), the influence process of leadership can be observed in the behaviours exhibited by a leader, therefore, leadership styles provide a framework for assessing the major components of leaders' behaviours used in this process (Northouse, 2004). There are two major styles which are related to leadership in higher education institutions; participative versus directive leadership.

a) Directive leadership style. The directive leadership style involves making subordinates aware of what is expected of them and giving guidance on how it

should be accomplished. Leaders characterized by this style, set clear goals, maintain a certain standard of performance, and require their members or followers to abide by stipulated rules and regulations (House & Mitchell, 1974). Leaders who use this style usually use one-way communication channels to set timelines, what is to be done and how it should be accomplished. The standards of performance are clearly stated and communicated (Northouse, 2004).

b) Participative leadership styles. Participative leadership involves the use of some procedures that give room for others, aside from the leader, to influence the decision-making process (Yukl, 2013). Leaders who use this style engage members or subordinates in a shared decision-making process. They usually consult to obtain differing opinions, take their suggestions into consideration, and try to inculcate ideas into final decisions where necessary (House & Mitchell, 1974; Northouse, 2004; Yukl, 2013). Both styles have been found to be useful in different situations. For instance, participative leadership was found to promote shared values of employees and their commitment to service quality and innovation whiles directive leadership is noted for ensuring clarity of goals and promoting team reflections in functionally homogenous groups (Dolatbadi & Safa, 2011; Somech, 2006).

There are of course other leadership styles such as transformational and transactional, charismatic, to mention a few. However, these two are among the most researched styles within formal organizations (Dolatbadi & Safa, 2011; Lian & Tui, 2012; Somech, 2006). The focus will now move to discuss leadership research in higher education institutions.

2.7 Leadership in Higher Education Institutions

The educational sector, specifically higher education, has been exposed to changes in its environments and increased calls for accountability, (Ball, 2007; Jones, Harvey, Lefoe & Ryland, 2014; Odhiambo, 2014) improved teaching practices (Humphrey, 2013) and more relevant research (Ball, 2007). These demands have drawn attention to the need to develop astute leadership (Odhiambo, 2014) necessary to manage the affairs affecting various aspects of higher education

institutions in effective and efficient ways (Ball, 2007). According Hills (2005) leadership should be seen as is a key driver of change in higher education.

A number of researches have attempted to understand leadership in higher education institutions (Davis, 2011; Bolden et al, 2008; Marshall, 2005; Jones et al, 2014; Odhiambo, 2014; Spendlove, 2007). According to some, , practices within the higher education points to the use of transformational leadership approach (Ball, 2007; Davis, 2011; Odhiambo, 2014), whereas the participative style of leadership has also been noted by some faculty members as most suitable for universities especially with regards to increasing innovation (Sart, 2014). Others have also arrived at the conclusion that there is a tendency of a rather multi-layered or blended form of leadership within the higher education setting (Bolden et al., 2008; Collinson & Collinson, 2009). It is described as blended due to the preference of a mix of different and usually contradictory leadership styles. For instance, Collinson and Collinson (2009) found that though participative leadership is usually sought, directive leadership style is sometimes the preference depending on the situation at hand. It has also been found that, there is a tendency for leadership to be distributed particularly at the departmental levels (Bolden et al, 2008) such that, more people are involved in leadership practices. Smith (2005) discovered that, in mostly statutory institutions, leadership within larger the departments are usually distributed through the established formal structures.

These leadership studies mentioned above were conducted at different hierarchical levels; from presidents (e.g. Spendlove, 2007) to deans and associate deans (e.g. Pepper and Giles, 2014) as well as department chairs (e.g. Smith 2005; Bryman, 2007). This study also focuses on leadership at the department level since it is at that level that majority of university decisions and operational activities are accomplished (Bolden et al, 2008; Carroll & Wolverton, 2004). The following sections describe the roles and responsibilities undertaken under that position, some of the challenges department chairs face and the behaviours that promote effectiveness at that level of hierarchy.

Department Leadership. Leadership and management of the department within the university is the responsibility of the department chair or head with the support of assistants and committee heads (Hancock, 2007). This position can be paralleled to middle or first line managers within other organizational settings (Bryman, 2007; Pepper & Giles, 2015). Despite their resemblance, they do not necessarily possess the same roles. This is especially due to the difference in organizational structure and environment (Bryman, 2007).

Majority of faculty members who assume this leadership position do not have a concrete idea of what it exactly entails (Pepper & Giles, 2015; Wolverton, et al, 2005). Despite this commonality, most academics take up this position for different reasons. For some, it is the desire to serve as change agents and make a difference in their departments, whilst for others it is their sense of duty towards the department that leads them to pursue the position. Other academics perceive the position as an opportunity to take up challenging leadership roles and learn new skills (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Hancock. 2007; Pepper & Giles, 2015). As a first step to understanding leadership of the department chair, the next subsection discusses some of the roles and responsibilities of the department chair as stipulated in the literature.

The roles and responsibilities of department leaders. The department chair is responsible for a diverse set of roles and responsibilities which are often unclear and sometimes ambiguous (Dickson, Mitchell, Ott, Pailus & Wild, 2012; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011). It is argued that department chairs should only focus on the 'most important' aspects of their work (Hancock, 2007) however; these important tasks are not explicitly known (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011).

Earlier studies on the role of department chairs sought to discover and produce lists of what department chairs were engaged in. For instance, Hecht et al, (1999) grouped all the tasks and duties of the department chair under eight categories: department governance and office management, curriculum and program development, faculty matters, student matters, communication with external publics, financial and facilities management, data management, and institutional support.

Gmelch and Miskin (2011) have also grouped the tasks and responsibilities of the department chair under four different roles. According to them, the chair takes up the roles of faculty developer, manager, scholar and leader. The chair as a scholar contributes to academic work such as teaching and researching and as a manager, they see to the administrative tasks such as preparing and managing budgets, assigning duties and managing facilities and finances. As a leader, he or she is responsible for setting the direction, seeing to curriculum development as well as representing the department within and outside of the university. As a faculty developer, Chairs recruit, motivate and evaluate faculty members. These last two roles are perceived by chairs as the most important roles (Riley and Russels, 2013).

Research indicates that these responsibilities have continuously expanded, alongside changes in economic and social environments (Pinto, 2013). The position is said to have become very managerial, with increase in activities such as presenting and defending budgets, working with students' admissions, writing for grants, fundraising, serving on numerous committees, managing conflict among others (Hancock, 2007; Pinto, 2013). These duties are however accomplished through a considerable number of challenges, a few of which are discussed below.

Challenges of the department chair. Chairs are usually appointed to the position based on the criterion of being good faculty members and not necessarily good managers. It is not surprising then that they wished they had some information concerning the nature of the roles prior to taking up such positions (Wolverton et al, 2005). The job of the department chair has undoubtedly been regarded as a tedious one, plagued with issues of role ambiguity, role conflict, job-related stress and unparalleled authority (Hecht et al, 1999; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Seagren, Creswell & Wheeler 1993, Wolverton et al, 2005).

Role Ambiguity. Department chairs suffer from role ambiguity because they face multiple expectations and do not have a clear mandate for the position (Seagren et al, 1993). Due to the lack of role clarity (Wolverton et al, 2005), department chairs often find themselves dealing with a vast array of tasks, some of which should not necessarily be required of them (Hancock, 2007). Wolverton et al (2005)

interviewed a number of deans, department chairs, and prospective chairs to discover their developmental needs. When questioned about perceived tasks under the position, prospective chairs provided a 'laundry list' of supposed necessary tasks ranging from organizing meetings, attending to students and colleagues, evaluation, and serving as an interface. Whilst the current chairs stressed on their responsibilities concerning budgetary issues, leadership, personnel management and balancing tasks, the deans only stressed on communication and conflict management and did not seem to consider budgetary as requiring important attention (Wolverton et al, 2005).

Different stakeholders (students, colleagues, administration) have varying expectations for the Chair and that can aggravate this problem (Seagren et al, 1993). There seem to be some uncertainties and discrepancies in the perceptions held about the duties and roles of the chair thus its ambiguous nature (Carrol & Wolverton, 2004; Hecht et al, 1999). Although there may be documents describing their duties, these documents only provide basic descriptions rather than focusing on the results to be achieved (Gmelch & Miskin, 1993, 2011); some chairs do not even get to see them (Wolverton et al, 2005)

Role conflict. Another challenge is related to role conflict. The nature of the position is such that department chair represents top management of the university as well as the department. Due to this, there are usually questions concerning how they should be perceived and how they should act. It becomes more difficult when the stakeholders and constituencies with whom they interact hold very simple perceptions of their position (Hecht et al, 1999.) To some, the chair if first and foremost a peer who is serving and representing the department (Gmelch & Burns, 1993) and thus are often expected to be highly committed to it by prioritizing its progress (Bryman, 2007; Smith, 2005). On the other hand, they are required by the central administration to be very cooperative and effective in order to implement policies, change and ensure the quality of programs (Hecht et al, 1999).

Role conflict has been defined as "the simultaneous occurrence of two (or more) sets of pressures such that compliance with one would make more difficult

compliance with the other. In the extreme case, compliance with one set of pressures excludes completely the possibility of compliance with another set; the two sets of pressures are mutually contradictory (Kahn et al., 1964, p. 19 cited in Werkema, 2009)". Negotiating rules; mediating among faculties; faculty evaluations and supervision; dealing with crushing bureaucracies as against faculty ego are among the challenges faced by the chair (Hancock, 2007). This dual role under this position has been identified as a source of worry and great stress for most chairs (Gmelch & Miskin, 1991; Wolverton et al, 2007). An additional challenge related to this is the feeling of a sense of isolation (Pepper and Giles, 2015).

Workload and Authority. Another challenge relating to the position is the stress associated with the workload. There has been a significant increase in responsibilities of the chair over the years (Pinto, 2013). This has seen a consequential surge in workload, paper works and ultimately working hours; alongside truncated personal interests; effort draining activities due to the reactive nature of the position and time management (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Hancock, 2007; Pinto, 2013). All these add up to the challenges department chairs face. In a study of university administrators, majority of which were department chairs, it was found that more than 70% of participants reported of being no longer interested in their work due to the stress (Morris & Liapple, 2015). The stress is more so when these duties are combined with active academic work of teaching and research (Hancock, 2007; Marshal, 2005; Wolverton et al, 2005). And it is further aggravated by complaints concerning the imbalance in authority and responsibility (Bexley, James and Arkoudis 2011; Hancock, 2007; Pepper & Giles, 2015).

It has been noted that, Chairs complain they are devoid of the requisite power to accomplish certain responsibilities that come with the position, whether assumed or delegated (Carrol & Wolverton, 2004; Hecht et al, 1999; Pepper & Giles, 2015; Riley & Russels, 2013). This sense of lack of power is linked to the conflict they experience over whether they are faculty or administrators as well as the magnitude of responsibilities they perceive.

Other challenges also emerge from their dealings with people especially regarding conflict management, coping with the thick bureaucracy and the negative impact on research quality (Carroll & Wolverton. 2004; Hancock, 2007; Wolverton, 2005). Leaders are valuable assets to every organisation (Morris & Liapple, 2015) and with increasing accountability and criticism, paying attention to the effectiveness of the department chair is of great importance (Hecht et al, 1999; Riley and Russel, 2013). The next section examines some literature that addresse the effectiveness of department chairs.

The department chair as a leader. Studies on the department chair has been mainly focused on the tasks and responsibilities; placing more emphasis on administration of the department and not leadership of the department (Seagren et al, 1993). The ultimate expectation is for the chair to be effective at heading the department (Hecht et al, 1999) and for this, it is proposed that, department chairs must possess the necessary leadership skills in order to move the department forward (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011). In fact leadership was found to be one of the most enjoyable roles the chair assumes; the ability to mentor, motivate and guide fellow and junior faculty members is one source of satisfaction for department chairs (Carroll & Wolverton, 2004; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Pepper & Giles, 2015; Riley & Russels, 2013). However despite being one of the most crucial aspect of the position, chairs often take up the position, ill-prepared; with very little or no leadership training (Carrol & Wolverton, 2004; Dickson et al, 2006; Hecht et al, 1999; Gmelch & Miskin, 1993; 2011; Wolverton et al, 2005).

Certain skills set and behaviors have been proposed as necessary to become an effective department head. As leaders, they are expected to provide a sense of direction, communicate well and seek opinions, provide an atmosphere conducive for teaching and research, demonstrate integrity and trustworthiness and protect and support staff members (Bryman, 2007). In a study to assess the satisfaction of faculty members, Ambrose, Huston and Norman (2005) discovered that, faculty members described effective department chairs as those who were able to create a sense of community, manage conflicts well, provide feedback and were able to

communicate effectively. Basically, department chairs are expected to have excellent people's skills in order to be effective; that is, they treat people fairly and are consistent, inclusive, responsive and encouraging (Ambrose et al, 2005; Wolverton et al, 2005). Astin and Astin (2000) also believe that the effectiveness of higher education leaders lies in their collaborations.

According to Wolverton et al (2005), the position is a communal affair which entails a series of "interruptions and interactions" at different levels within the institution. In view of this, Kezar (2004) has stressed on the need to build and maintain good relationships. For the department chair, relationships are key mechanisms for effective leadership especially because they engender trust which in turn encourages the sharing of ideas and information. Consequently, it promotes quality decision making because there is a consensual focus on the bigger picture rather than self-interests (Kezar, 2004).

Summary. Department chairs are responsible for their department and the course it takes. They engage in multiple duties associated with faulty, students, and administration. They assume the role of a leader, manager, faculty developer as well as strive to maintain scholarly works. In view of the multiplicity of their interactions the position is plagued with a significant level of challenges and stressors such as unclear mandate and authority and conflicting roles.

The essence of the effectiveness of the department chair cannot be underplayed. In many ways they have an effect on students, the central administration, and faculty (Ambrose et al, 2005; Astin & Astin, 2000). Amidst the many challenges they face, department chairs ought to find constructive ways to be effective and one of which is the emphasis on quality of relationships. As a result, it will be prudent to analyse the content and structure of the relationships the department chair establishes in managing the department affairs. Utilizing the concept of social capital will be helpful as an alternative way to understanding the dynamics surrounding their roles as leaders (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2005). Accordingly, the following section discusses the interaction of leadership and social capital as it takes place within other organizational frameworks.

2.8 Social Capital: A Form of Capital in Activating Leadership

This section examines the interactions that exist between leadership and social capital. Social capital has been identified as an equally useful tool for leaders, in addition to the already existing physical, cultural, economic, and human capital (Hitt & Ireland, 2002). This section discusses social capital within formal organizations and the higher education institution as an example of such organizations.

Social capital in organisations. Social capital is grounded in social relations and within the context of formal organizations, it is proposed that, the ties that underlie social capital ought to in some ways go beyond the prescribed workflow interactions (Koput, 2010). However Adler & Kwon, (2002) and Lin, (2001) both argue that, hierarchical, market or other relations such as work relations may also give rise to social capital so long as there are repeated interactions.

The organization as a group can be perceived as a whole unit as well as a summation of the different parts it is made of i.e. people (Oh et al, 2006). In this sense, social capital within the organisation is operationalized as the configuration of group members' social relationships within the organization as well as members' individual social capital within and outside the organization (Oh et al, 2006 p. 861). Therefore, a leader within an organization has access to both organizational and personal social capitals; the proper balancing of which can promote his/her position and consequently the organizational goals (Leana & Van Buren, 1999).

There have been a number of studies on social capital that have been connected to leadership. These studies have come about due to the interests in the social dimension of leading a group of people (Balkundi and Kilduff, 2005). Social capital has been identified as a potentially important resource or tool for leaders to fulfil their roles and responsibilities (Hitt & Ireland, 2002). In an attempt to emphasize this, Balkundi and Kilduff (2005) have gone a step further to define leadership as social capital. According to them, leadership should be understood as the social capital surrounding leaders; both in terms of how they perceive it as well as the actual structure of social relationships they are engaged in.

Whilst most leadership studies look at the human capital aspect of leadership, it is posited that social capital aspects also play a significant role worth considering. Specifically, it is found to enhance leaders' human capital and performance through relationships that promotes cooperation, access to and exchange of resources. It is also said to play a key role in the processes and procedures involved in leadership developments programs (Leitch et al, 2013).

The role of social capital in an academic social structure: The higher education institutions are fertile places for the creation of all forms of relationships including social relations which are the underlying source of social capital. It can thus be inferred that they offer a fertile ground for social capital (Tonkaboni, Yousefy & Keshtiaray, 2013). From the student body to faculty to management of universities, there are numerous opportunities available to create and access social capital due to the socialization processes underpinning teaching and learning (Tonkaboni, et al, 2013).

In the higher education setting, social capital is an important factor as far as the creation of intellectual knowledge is concerned (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). In her study, Gonzalez-Brambila (2014) found that researchers and faculty members rely on social capital for collaborative works so as to produce new knowledge. In addition, the perception of social capital amongst faculty members has also been found to be associated with the level of job satisfaction they feel (Vigoda-Gadot, Talmud & Peled, 2011).

Limited studies on social capital in higher education are mostly focused on the actual work of scholarship or students' use of social capital to enhance their studies and future aspirations (Chesters & Smith, 2014; Gonzalez, 2014). However, there is another viable area for social capital research and that is the leadership of the academic work specifically department leadership.

Higher education leadership and social capital. Exploring social capital within the higher education institution has been proposed as a viable means to provide better understanding of how leadership is accomplished (Bolden et al 2008). Leadership at the department level is a multi-layered process focusing on the

discipline and institution (Marshal, 2005) as well as the internal and external environments (Collinson & Collinson, 2009). This complexity lays a firm foundation for social interactions at various levels.

Kezar (2004) proposed that through the proper management of these interactions or relationships the university governance can achieve effective as well as efficient decisions and policies aimed at accomplishing the overall agenda. For instance, Pepper and Giles (2015) disclosed that some associate deans believed networking helped them to gain an understanding of the true picture of their role as middle managers. These interactions have been seen as an important constituent of leadership (Uhl-Bien, 2006) and social capital has been identified as an example of the subtleties resulting from such relationships (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2005). This study draws on Bourdieu's theory of practice especially focusing on social capital, to try to seek a wholesome understanding of how department chairs have undertaken their roles and responsibilities and how they perceive social capital as a significant player.

In fact, among the benefits which faculty members enjoy are symbolic capital in terms of research and publications, social capital in terms of the relationships and networks they are able to create and cultural capital in terms of the credentials they acquire (Ball, 2007; Bourdieu, 1986). Capital is used to propel the work of whoever has possession thus by occupying a leadership position, department chairs have in their reach these capitals - acquired either by virtue of being an academic or by occupying a position. However, as discussed earlier in the literature review, while capital is inherently perceived as a positive factor, all forms of capital have the tendency to be used to the disadvantage of others. In this case, social capital may provide a basis for inequalities, discrimination or nepotism.

Summary. Under the literature review we discussed the major topics of this thesis which play a role in providing an understanding of the background of the study. Leadership studies in organizational settings focus on leader behaviours that promote effectiveness. There are four major leadership behaviour categories: task oriented, relationship oriented, change oriented and achievement oriented

behaviours. From these, managers and leaders develop a number of styles through which they get by their work. Two examined in the review are participative and directive styles. The participative leadership style focuses on building relationships and seeking other's opinions in order to accomplish tasks whereas directive leadership style is concerned with giving directions and clarifying duties for others using a top-down approach to get work done. For higher education institutions, there is the tendency for a mix of these styles (Bolden et al, 2008; Collinson & Collinson, 2009).

These discussions provide a background for examining the work of department leaders who also perform practices. In view of this, they are likely to influence and be influenced by the principles established within the social structure university. The theory of practice explains that such social agents can have access to cultural, economic, and social capital, through which they can influence their interests.

All the interactions and role playing of leaders result in relationship building from which social capital may arise. It was discussed that social capital exists within formal organisations and the university to be specific. Whilst an organization can benefit from its own social capital as well as social capital of its members, similarly, leaders can benefit from their personal as well as organisation's social capital Therefore, this study aims at seeking the opinions of current department chairs on how social capital has manifested in their work as they seek to influence the multiple outcomes of the department they lead. In order to accomplish this, the study used a couple of research methods which are discussed in detail in the succeeding chapter.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the research methods used to conduct this study. In the form of subsections, this chapter outlines the research design, research questions addressed, the context of the study, the sources of data and instruments used as well as the procedures followed in collecting and analysing data. Finally, the limitations of this study will also be addressed.

3.1 Research Design

Qualitative research. This study uses a qualitative research design to explore, understand and describe (Creswell, 2014; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Flick, 2009; Lapan, Quartaroli, & Reimer, 2012) the duties of department chairs and particularly, their views about the role of social capital as it manifested in their years as a leader. One of the aims of the qualitative design is to focus on understanding perspectives and circumstances of people (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013) about an area of interest. In addition, qualitative research is regarded as a credible tool that enables researchers to bring deeper meaning to myriad human behaviours (Higgs & Cherry, 2009) by exposing the meanings people ascribe to certain issues and how they deal with them (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Flick, 2009).

Case study approach. Among the approaches used for qualitative research is the case study approach. According to Savin-Baden and Major (2013), a case study approach offers a good ground for understanding the relationship that exist between people and the structure within which they work and this is what the current study aims to do, that is, to explore the work of department chairs and understand their views about social capital as it relates to leadership within the higher education institution they are part of. Stake (2009) also states that, by using a case study, a researcher is able to study how the social, political and other contexts influence the knowledge of individuals within their own environments.

A case study can be intrinsic or instrumental, descriptive, exploratory or explanatory (Yin, 2003). This study is an instrumental single case study (Creswell, 2014, Stake, 2009) in the sense that, it seeks to provide insight into the interaction between leadership in higher education institution and social capital. It is also descriptive in nature because it seeks to provide a holistic description (Yin, 2003) of the work of department chairs in one of the largest public universities in Turkey. Despite the benefits case study renders to this study, it has been criticized because of the tendency for researcher biases, resulting from intense engagement with the case (Idowu, 2016). Nonetheless, by allowing this form of engagement with the members of the case, one is able to understand behaviours, relationships, and attitudes within a particular organizational setting (Berg, 2001).

A case study can be considered as a way of choosing what to be studied; as such, a researcher must choose a methodological approach to study that particular case (Stake, 2009). In this respect, the researcher approaches this case study from a pragmatic research point of view. In the sense that, pragmatic research offers a "comprehensive summary" of the experiences of participants by the most suitable practical approach to answering the research questions (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). The aim is to describe the experiences of department chairs without necessarily adopting an ethnographic approach as well as proving an interpretation but not as thick as it would be done in phenomenological approaches (Neergaard, 2009). This is a single embedded case study because it comprised of different departments within one university (Yin, 2006). A case study of a community may include a section of the community or a particular category of people within the community (Berg, 2001). In this regard, department chairs are an integral part of a university and they are the focus of this study. The following section provides a description of the research questions that guided this study.

3.2 Research Questions

This section gives details about the research questions, which directed the overall flow of this study. In order to achieve a holistic understanding, it is recommended that qualitative research questions be open and cladded in the 'what'

and ‘how’ formats (Creswell, 2007; 2014; Flick, 2009; Holstein & Gubrium, 2005). The following research questions were guided by the reviews conducted on the general social capital literature and department chair leadership literature. The nature of their work is such that they engage in multiple interactions at various levels with different stakeholders, particularly within the university and outside as well. In view of this the central research questions are:

1. How do department chairs perceive social capital as it manifests in their leadership practices?

This research questions is based on the assumption that social capital may have a significant role to play in department chairs’ leadership duties especially due to the many interactions they encounter in their day to day activities.

The following are the secondary research questions this study also explored:

2. How do department chairs define and execute their roles as the chair of the department?

This question seeks to provide a description of the meanings they ascribe to the role and what they do. This question is important as it provides a background for further enquiry into their leadership practices. According to the literature, what chairs do and how they function is influenced by their perception of their roles (Caroll & Wolverton, 2004).

3. How do they describe their leadership approach?

The third question sought to explore the choices of leadership approach they made when engaged in leadership practices in their institutional unit.

4. What are the challenges faced and strategies used to tackle them?

By answering this question, the study also explored the difficulties they faced and how they managed them.

3.3 Operational definitions of key terms

The use of a theoretical framework or orientation, though not necessary in a qualitative study such as this, lends itself as a useful factor. Not only does it provide a guide to the research questions (Berg, 2001), it also can be very useful for the final

description and interpretation of data (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013, Yin, 2006). The following are the operational definitions of the key concepts used for this study:

a. Social capital: the resources embedded within and accessed through social networks (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998).
b. Social networks: a group of individuals with whom one shares informal norms or values that goes beyond the normal work interactions (Fukuyama, 1997)
c. Leadership approach: the manner of influencing and accomplishing target goals and practices (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012).
d. Leadership practices: actions of department chair that sought to achieve a set department goal (Bolden et al, 2008).

3.4 The Research Setting

Case studies explain the relationships between parts of a whole (Stake, 2005) and so emphasis is placed on the context (Idowu, 2016) within which these relationships take place. Therefore, it is necessary to provide a detailed description of the context or setting within which this case is found (Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). Information was retrieved from the university's website as well as the interviews conducted with participants.

The study is centred on a single public university in Turkey, established about 60 years ago and which is among the most prominent in the country. The university's major aim is to establish itself as a research-intensive university. Towards this end, it has been striving to increase the grants received from research works, the industry collaborations both nationally and internationally, as well as the percentage of its spending on research works. As a result of this, institutional units within the university have adopted a research perspective and are working to increase the number of research carried out.

The university has an internationalization approach, having a number of its undergraduate courses accredited by an international body; engaging in international collaborations as well as having a significant number of joint degree programs with

foreign universities at undergraduate and graduate levels. It is also host to more than 1000 international students. The academics are therefore engaged in multiple collaborations and conferences, establishing networks within and outside the country. Aside promoting research within academic units, it is also an advocate of inter-disciplinary works. This has seen a number of academics engage in interdisciplinary research and programs with colleagues within and outside the university.

In order to avert inbreeding of professionals, the university advocates for academic staffs to gain a significant part of their tertiary education from a higher education institution abroad. This has resulted in a considerable number of its professors having graduate and postgraduate degrees from foreign universities. New faculty members upon joining the university undergo a development program, which is aimed at accelerating their socialization into the university by exposing them to facilities, collaboration opportunities, teaching techniques, as well as other faculty members.

The university is run by a president alongside a senate and administrative board with the assistance of advisors and vice presidents. It employs more than 2000 academic staff made up of full, associate and assistant professors, instructors, and research assistants. The university runs more than 150 undergraduate and graduate programs in ten faculties and graduate schools. These faculties and graduate schools comprise of more than 50 departments headed by department chairs, who are tasked with the responsibility of overseeing affairs of these departments. The chairs report to the deans of faculties or directors of school, who in turn also report to the top administration.

According to the information from some of the department chairs, the procedure in the university is that, department chairs are selected from among the academic staff working within the department. First the department undergoes a faculty election process after which results are collated and presented to dean or director. The dean or director then appoints the chair. Department chairs usually

have two vice or assistants (depending on availability of faculty) who help them in the management of the department affairs.

Department chairs serve as the interface between the students, academics, and central administration and according to information from the website, the central administration within this university tries to engage them as much as possible in administrative works. They advocate for inclusive administration and delegation. This has resulted in significant number of committee meetings the department chairs must attend. Indeed from the interview conversations with participants, it was discovered that, most department chairs attended at least one of such meetings in a week and which according to some, were not beneficial as far as new initiatives were concerned. Again it was discovered that, department chairs of this university do not undergo any form of training about their duties as chairs, and there is no detailed official document or policy by the university stating their roles and responsibilities. The major primary sources of regulations are those set by the Higher Education Council of the country.

Since its inception, the university has been at the helms of leading the higher education system in the country in terms of innovative educational methods. This lends itself as a viable study focus due to its pioneering works. Combining all the characteristics of this university; inclusive administration, multiple collaborations, international perspective, increasing undergraduate and graduate programs, the university presents itself as a viable case to studying views of department chairs about their jobs as chairs, as well as the role of social capital. In addition, due to the extensive focus of academic staff on the work of research, the study will provide insights into their views concerning these extra duties. The following section discusses how the university and participants were sampled.

3.5 Data Sources

As a sampling method, purposive sampling was used to seek participants for this study. Purposive sampling is particularly used for qualitative studies since it participants can purposely provide answers to the questions at stake (Creswell, 2014; Patton, 2002). For this study, the target population was academic staff who

were currently working as department chairs. To select the university, convenience sampling (Dudovskiy, 2016; Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012) was used as the researcher was familiar with the university and academic divisions within it. Since the university was selected as the case for this study, the sample participants were selected from within the university.

The study's objective was to collect thoughts of department chairs concerning the role of social capital in their conduct as chairs. In view of this, the only criterion used was that the academic should be currently serving as a department chair. For the purpose of accessibility, another criterion was that they should be situated on the main campus of the university. Since all department chairs were assumed to have similar responsibilities of chairing the department, the sample included all department chairs located on the main campus of the university. This means that departments outside the main campus were excluded. Apart from this criterion, there was no other special criterion such as particular departments or academic units, duration in position or academic ranks. This strategy of including all departments is referred to as maximum variation sampling strategy and its goal is to present as much diverse variations as possible (Creswell, 2014; Patton, 2002). By sampling all departments, the researcher sought to highlight any differences, uniqueness as well as shared patterns within that common context (Patton, 2002).

A total of 47 department chairs from five faculties and one graduate school/institute were contacted. The faculties included Education, Arts and Science, Engineering, Architecture, Economics and Administrative Science, School of Foreign Languages and Graduate School of Informatics. Two graduate schools consisted of the same departments in some faculties and whilst another did not provide any information about the department chairs or administration, as a result, only departments from one institute were contacted. Details of the procedure are outlined under the subtitle of data collection procedure. Out of this total, nine department chairs agreed to and actually participated in the study. A small sample size is usually criticized for not providing a basis for scientific generalization (Idowu, 2016). Nonetheless, because this is a qualitative study and the aim is to

understand perspectives and not generalize to the population, having a small sample size may not affect the aim of the study. In fact, one of the useful criteria for screening to select the candidates within a case is their willingness to participate (Yin, 2006). Thus as it has been explained in the subsequent sections, many candidates were unwilling to participate. The next sections give descriptions of the participants and their faculties.

3.6 Knowing the Participants

For this study, nine department chairs participated in this study out of which four were females and five were males. They came from the faculties of Education, Architecture, Arts and Science, School of Foreign Languages and Graduate School of Informatics. Six of them had attained the rank of full professor whilst one and two were associate and assistant professors respectively. All but one of the participants has obtained their undergraduate studies from the same university. Five of the participants had obtained their PhDs from foreign universities whiles the remaining four had obtained their degrees from the same university they are hired.

Participants have spent an average of two and half years in their current position, with the minimum (as at the time of the interview) being eight months and longest being six years. It should however be clarified that, the calculation excluded previous years spent in the chair roles. For instance, Aygül and Derya had both served as department chairs some years ago before assuming the position again. While two participants reported on no previous administrative or leadership roles, the remaining seven identified little or extensive prior administrative and/or leadership roles.

Aygül and Derya who had both served previous terms reported of having insignificant stress whilst the Çiğdem, Yavuz and Aydın all readily mentioned that they were much stressed. Both Yavuz and Aydın reported of no previous leadership roles and they were both running the largest departments within this study. They both reported of being extremely stressed, to the extent of the latter reporting of having a permanent health problem as a result. Overall, all department chairs mentioned that they had very supportive departments colleagues whose help had

been very essential to the managing of the department. The descriptive statistics of department chairs are presented in table one below.

Table 1.0

Summary of Case Study Participants

Pseudonym	Faculty/School	Sex	Duration	Previous Leadership Position	Duration in position
Derya	Arts and Science	Female	36	Yes	2 years
Pembe	Foreign Language	Female	16	Yes	11 months
Yavuz	Education	Male	20	No	9 months
Aygül	Architecture	Female	31	Yes	3 years
Aydın	Arts and Science	Male	27	No	2 years
Çiğdem	Education	Female	12	No	8 months
Deniz	Arts and Science	Male	23	Yes	2 years
Emre	Education	Male	20	Yes	6 years
Savaş	Informatics	Male	27	Yes	2 years

3.7 Data Collection Instruments

In order to answer the research questions of this study, two primary data collection instruments were initially used; an information form and semi-structured interviews; the latter being the main instrument for data collection.

Personal information form. This document includes open and closed ended questions about the personal, academic and professional background of the participants. This form was developed from scratch alongside an interview guide and takes less than two minutes to complete. The information forms were filled by interviewees before the interview day however due to time constraints, a day could not be scheduled for a few of the participants for it thus, for them researcher asked the questions during the interview sessions. For instance, one participant given pseudonym Deniz sent an email at 12:44 indicating that he was available for interview that same day at 14:00 for only a short time. Thus in order to maximize the time, the researcher asked the questions during the interview session. Some of the information had even surfaced during the interviews.

Semi-structured interviews. Interviews are one of the methods under qualitative research used to gather data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Fraenkel et al, 2012; Mason, 2002; Stake, 2005). It is the careful asking of questions to gather data (Fraenkel et al, 2012). Interviews are not only used to seek specific answers but most importantly to gain enough information which will promote an in-depth understanding of participants' perspectives as well as their context (Mason, 2002; Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). For the purpose of this study, semi-structured interviews were used as the major instrument for collecting and gathering data. Interviews are used to capture participants' viewpoints more closely (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011) and they are noted as one of the methods by which a researcher can reach data saturation (Fusch & Ness, 2015). Data saturation is when there is enough information to replicate the study and when there is rich and thick data description (Fusch & Ness, 2015).

One key feature of qualitative research design is that the researcher serves as a human instrument used for collecting data (Creswell, 2014; Stake, 2009). The researcher was the sole and key data collector for this study with the aid of an interview guide. First, the interview questions was constructed from scratch based on the literature review conducted on department chairs, social capital and leadership. These questions were categorized under the major themes of: department

leadership, social capital within the university, and leadership and social capital. After this, eight professors from the faculty of education of three universities were contacted by email for their expert review on the set of questions. Seven of them agreed to provide expert review. Four of the reviews were received after the first week whilst the remaining three were received after two weeks of initial contact and another reminder email was sent in the second week. This process was important because it facilitated the identification of wrongly worded questions or sensitive questions, biases and missing questions (Berg, 2001). All necessary corrections and additions were made to the questions after which the researcher applied to the human research ethics committee for approval to collect data and approval was received after one month. Copies of the personal information form, interview guide and ethics committee approval document can be found in the appendix.

The Interviews conducted were face to face which has the advantage of promoting the establishment of rapport between interviewer and interviewee (Connolly, 2016). Face to face interviews also gave opportunity for unfamiliar terms to be explained, such as social capital, social networks etc. The interview guide was semi-structured with a set of standardized questions which were asked to all participants. This was done to allow for comparison (Freaenkel et al, 2012) between participants as well as promote data saturation (Fusch & Ness, 2015). However, these questions were not prescriptive in the sense that deviations were made as and when necessary so as to explore other areas brought up by the respondent which may have some implications for the topic under study (Connolly, 2016). There were times where the conversation necessitated the asking of other probing questions aside the scheduled probes in the interview protocol.

Electronic public documents. Documents are another source of data for qualitative research which provide extra information about the context of a research study and may take the form of written, photographic or electronic (Mason, 2002; Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). The documents used were public documents retrieved from the website of the university as well as the regulations concerning higher education in Turkey, retrieved from the website of the higher education council.

These documents were useful in providing background information for the context of this study. For instance, some information about the research setting was taken from such documents. Again, during the course of data collection, some participants referred to the regulations on higher education as well as some university information and so the researcher thought it would be beneficial for the study in terms of data triangulation (Patton, 2002). Triangulation is a way in which researcher explores different level or perspectives of the same phenomenoon (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Fusch & Ness, 2015).

3.8 Data Collection Procedures

After approval was received from the ethics committee, electronic mails were sent to sampled population, inviting them to participate in the study. A copy of the invitation letter is attached in the appendices. According to the invitation, participants were informed that they may be contacted by telephone should they not respond after a week's time. Thus after the waiting period of a week, during which two positive responses were received, telephone calls were made to the offices of department chairs. As a result of this, six positive responses were received. A second batch of emails containing the same invitation letter was sent again after which telephone calls were again made. All these steps yielded a total of about 14 department chairs who were interested however some later declined stating that they were very busy whilst another declined because he claimed he was not familiar with the research topic. In the end, a total of nine department chairs participated.

Under qualitative research design, phenomena are usually studied in their natural settings due to the critical role it plays in providing deeper meaning (Mason, 2002; Savin-Baden & Major, 2013; Stake, 2005). For these nine participants, an interview date and time was scheduled both by email and by telephone calls. Five of the interviews were conducted in the offices assigned to the department chairs whereas the other four interviews were conducted in the personal offices of department chairs. The interviews lasted for an average of 40 minutes with the longest lasting an hour and shortest lasting 30 minutes.

All but two of the interviews were completely audio-recorded. For the remaining two, one declined the request to record whilst for the other, a technical problem occurred half way through the interview. For these two interviews, extensive notes were taken to augment the absence of an audio-recording and their accounts are paraphrased.

3.9 Trustworthiness

Prior to analysis the audio recordings of interviews were transcribed verbatim and this allowed for thorough reading and discovery of themes, issues and topics (Berg, 2001; Creswell, 2014). The transcripts of raw data were first forwarded to participants to check for accuracy. Seven out of the nine participants returned either the same transcripts, transcripts with grammar corrections or transcripts with portions of data taken out.

After this step, summary of analysis were again sent to all participants, out of which five returned with same transcripts, confirming accuracy of summary. The major concern was in trying to conceal participant identity, and so, certain information or descriptions that they believed may identify them were pointed out and which were removed accordingly. According to Flick (2009), confidentiality is very important, especially if the people involved were drawn from the same research setting. In view of this pseudonyms were used for all participants. This process of sending these to participants is referred to as member checking.These steps were taken to ensure the credibility and trustworthiness of the results obtained. (Creswell, 2014; Idowu; 2016). In order to further establish the trustworthiness of findings, the tole of the researcher has been explained in details below.

Role of the researcher. Qualitative research and interviews to be specific are considered to be social situations or acts like other interactions; as a result it is argued that knowledge is also created during such discourses (Altheide & Johnson, 2011; Mason, 2002). Both the researcher and participant engage in a collaborative effort to construct knowledge (Fontana & Frey, 2005; Mason, 2002). By adopting a descriptive as well as interpretive approach, the researcher may be influenced by

certain background factors such as personal history, values and ideologies, gender and ethnicity (Chenail, 2011; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

In view of the above, it is important to note that, the researcher comes from a background that may be considered collectivist and so data collection and analysis may have been influenced by certain biases, although it is not explicitly known. Again, the researcher is a member of the wider university community, which is the case of this study and so, may also have been influenced by certain experiences during her studies at the university. These possible influences must however not be seen in the negative sense but rather they added to the overall understandability and went on to flesh out the underlying patterns discovered during the analysis.

The use of a qualitative case study design means that researcher subjectivity may also affect the overall analysis of the results, although Flick (2009) argues that, the researcher's subjectivity in the form of reflections, feelings, impressions are part of the study and part of interpretation. Nonetheless, in order to augment any biases and subjectivity, the researcher employed certain remedies suggested by scholars such as a) triangulating the descriptions and interpretations (Idowu, 2016; Stake, 2005) with the aid of information from the documents, b) providing thick descriptions and establishing a chain of evidence by producing context information through excerpts (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Flick, 2009; Idowu, 2016).

Although the researcher also belongs to the same research setting, she is also an international student, and as much as possible, she tried to capture the perspectives and reality of participants as accurately as possible. However, it is also worth mentioning that, the researcher entered the field of department chairs as 'a visitor' who met with participants once and tried to seek their insider perspectives (Flick, 2009). As a result, certain aspects of reality may not have been disclosed. This and other limitations are discussed later.

The aim of the analysis was to discover and provide a holistic description of the case as well as seek patterns and underlying meanings (Altheid & Johnson, 2011; Berg, 2001; Creswell, 2014). As a result, the basic qualitative research procedure of content analysis which involved organizing data, reducing data into

themes through coding and finally representing the data (Berg, 2001; Creswell, 2014) was used. After data was organized, it was colour coded to apportion the transcript into the various research questions they answered. Transcripts were read repeatedly to enable categories to be identified. After this, open and systematic coding was applied to the data. Nonetheless, because I personally transcribed most of the interviews, I had immersed myself into the data and had become very familiar with them. This enabled me to come up with themes by asking two questions: a) what are they saying? and b) what seems to be the linkage between their assersions?

As a result of this, more than 30 themes were constructed which was later reduced to 14 themes around which data was categorized. The initial coding also helped in finding specific data and categorizing them. Inductive approach was used to enable the perspectives to be portrayed as accurately as possible (Berg, 2001; Lapan et al, 2012). After this process, categories were compared and grouped under umbrella themes, resulting in six major themes. These themes are presented in next chapter.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents results of the analysis of the collective accounts of participants under themes. These themes were informed by the research questions for this study. In order to substantiate the results, participants' were often quoted verbatim. For the two interviews where notes were taken, participants' views were also paraphrased. The chapter is divided into six major themes, 1) Perspectives about the role of department chairs; 2) Chairs identified a collegiate approach to leadership of the department; 3) relationships established within the department were significant source of social capital as well as source of challenge; 4) social networks outside the department were beneficial to the work of department chairs; 5) Some participants made reference to possible ways seniority may guide interactions and perceptions within the department.; and 6) the nature of department chair role necessitates the use of social capital.

Table 2.0

Themes and Subthemes of Results

Main Theme	Subtheme
Perspectives about the role of department chairs	a. "we are among equals"; b. Department chairs as 'managers' of department; c. Department chairs engage in leadership-related activities d. "At the end of the day I'm an academic".
Chairs identified a collegiate approach to leadership of the department	a. Chairs define an effective leader as, social, transparent and open b. Department chairs described a leadership approach marked with high consultation

Table 2.0 (continued)

Main Theme	Subtheme
	c. Faculty meetings are an important platform for department leadership;
Relationships established within the department were significant source of social capital as well as a source of challenge	a. Social relationships among faculty members are rooted in a shared history b. Friendship relations within the department were a significant source of social capital. c. Department members were a significant source of support for department chairs d. Certain features within the department were particularly useful for the work of department chairs
Social networks outside the department were beneficial to the work of department chairs	a. Maintaining social networks from within the higher university administration were very useful for department chairs b. External networks can also be useful for the work of department chairs
Seniority may guide interactions and perceptions within the department.	
The nature of department chair role necessitates the use of social capital	a. Risks of social capital within the department chair

4.1 Theme 1: Perspectives about the role of department chairs.

This study first sought the understandings of current chairs about their position and the tasks they were engaged in. In this section we seek answers the research question; how do department chairs define their role as head of the department? The four subthemes that emerged from the data analysis were: 1) "we are among equals"; 2) department chairs as 'managers' of department; 3) leader-related activities were a significant aspects of chair role; and 4) "at the end of the day I'm an academic". These sub-themes are presented below.

"We are among equals". Analysis of chairs' perception of the position revealed that, the essence of department chairs was to see to the interest of department members first; both faculty and students. As Deniz simply put it "a department chair is a friend of the faculty". Cigdem sheds more light on this by stating, "A department chair is the responsible of the personnel in the department, the students, the research assistants the academic personnel". All participants shared a common understanding of this definition of chair. In this sense, they defined themselves as regulators, coordinators and bureaucracy man.

As a result this understanding, most mentioned that the first priority is to make sure the routines go on successfully. When asked about his understanding, Emre responded in the following words "You know what, there are different parameters. First off, the duties I guess, the most important one, you have to get daily routines done, that's important because there's a number of student affairs, there is a number of petitions that you have to respond to, students always have problems with courses, with scheduling, with other problems, like accommodation problems, transportation problems, so you have to be, like, responsive to student needs". Similarly, Çiğdem also mentioned that, "I feel you know because the routines in this department should go on and if I see something that limits the routine then I go on and I start to solve that problem".

Derya also provided another perspective to answering this question when she expressed that, "We are among equals in the university therefore to be a department chair or to be rector does not mean much really. So I mean usually there is the

understanding that it is your turn now kind of a thing. It's a burden which we do in turns that is… so it's not an authority position so everybody obeys you". Savaş, Emre, Yavuz and Deniz all made similar comments to the point that, the position is not one which reigns on authority since they are all equals, no one is superior to the other as Deniz put it "one is not a superior anyway, one is just a bureaucracy man". As a result, he believes that, a chair must be modest and not surround him/herself with "airs of superiority."

The results presented in this section relates to the viewpoints of department chairs about their position. It answered the question, how do department chairs define their roles as head of the department. According to the results, although department chairs are responsible for the needs of department members, theirs is not an authority position to demand obeisance because they are among equals but are not their superior. The following three sub themes describe the duties chairs were engage in. Accounts of department chair about their duties and responsibilities revealed that they assumed three primary roles these are presented below.

Department chairs are administrators, regulators. and coordinators of department activities. Participants of the study were asked about their understanding of their position. Many described their position as administrators and coordinators of activities. The role of a department chair as administrator mostly entailed all the tasks for which they are usually accountable which promoted the smooth functioning of other members. Though not in a written form, they are mostly required or expected of them by the top administration. This encapsulates academic, administrative and infrastructural affairs of the department. The academic and administrative affairs are primarily related with "course coordination of undergrad courses, post-grad courses of course it is also the decisions about promotions, I mean of course I don't give the decisions about promotions but I suggest to the higher authorities about those who are supposed to be promoting [sic]or recruitment of new members, so it's administration, we don't have much involvement in research but it's mainly about educational duties, under-grad post-grad, plus recruitment and promotion duties" [Derya].

In addition, some described their work as coordinators, who coordinates the works of and serve as a liaison between different people and committees. One also described the role as a regulator, who regulates the many processes within the department such as curriculum development, teaching schedules and recruitment [Aygül].

Although department chairs named the tasks they were engaged in, most revealed that, there was no detailed written job description for their position except for a clause under the Turkish law for higher education, which was described as "brief" by Aygül and "vague" by Yavuz. Indeed a look at the clause under the Higher Education Law attested to this. According to the regulation, "The Head of the Department is responsible for education and research at every level in the Department and for the orderly and productive functioning of all activities within the Department" (Council of Higher Education, 2000).

As a result, many chairs noted that they learnt on the job. For instance, Emre spoke about his first year in the administrative position. His response sums all others' while saying "you know, that's the challenge for this university, I guess because when I first started working as an assistant chairperson, I never came across with any definition like official job description for what a chair does, what a vice dean [does], you just figure this out by intuition honestly. You just look at what others are doing, how they are doing that, so it's more like learning by doing, honestly. I didn't receive any consultancy or training or guidance, but I asked, I mean whenever I was in trouble. I gave a call to other people who had been doing this for a long time and I asked them how they handled this, and I learnt, for the last 20 years. I learnt how to handle a department. "

Among these tasks, recruitment was perceived as the most crucial responsibility. This was because of the long-term effect it has on the attainment of the ultimate goal of providing quality education. Aygül states that, "of course giving a good quality education to students, both in the undergraduate and graduate and PhD programs. To do that, we are developing curriculum, and in order to conduct all of these, we are recruiting people here, I mean qualified uh experts here… without

recruitment, we can't do. But of course, the major goal is to give a good quality education".

Because of the interactional nature of their position, some department chairs also emphasized on the need to get the right kind of people, to avoid any relational problems in the future. Savaş remarked that, "when we have candidates for faculty, we sort of take our time to get the right kind of people so that we don't have to worry about that later. So, I mean most people just pick, check publication records. I, we try to do we invite for seminars; we take them out for social gathering to see how, you know, he behaves and all that. I mean it's not deliberately planned but we want to get to know, before we hire."

This section identified that, department chairs within this study identified administrative tasks as the primary duties. Administrative tasks related to student and academic affairs as well as infrastructure and equipment. Among these, recruitment was a major priority for most department chairs. These tasks are not officially written but department chairs learn on the job by asking others and following higher administration requirements.

Department chairs engage in leadership-related activities. The results indicated that, in addition to administrative role, department chairs often engaged in leadership-related practices. These leadership-related practices ranged from motivating faculty, directing the goal setting and curriculum development process, developing strategic policies, conditioning the environment for maximum productivity, representing department, and seeking opportunities for department members. For instance, Aygül spoke about goal setting, allowing for participative decision making, "I must listen to them first and understand their needs listen to as many parties as possible and then we develop strategies to achieve a set goal; so to establish those goals of course, all together again." These excepts can be found under the appendices.

"At the end of the day I'm an academic". Finally, analysis showed that department chairs strive to maintain their faculty identity by actively engaging in academic work, albeit minimally. The academic roles of chairs were the primary

faculty roles of teaching and research. In fact, it is required by the law for higher education that they engage in teaching for a minimum period of five hours per week upon assuming the chair role (Higher Education Council, 2000, Article 36), although some chairs' teaching load, especially in smaller departments was more than that.

For instance, both Çiğdem and Aygül reported of having nine and fifteen hours respectively. The teaching load may be reduced but that is what they'd rather do in place of administration. Yavuz for instance indicated, "I now teach three hours per week. So that's again based on the regulations. But you know, I prefer teaching, I prefer teaching because I feel extremely lonely in this office".

In addition to teaching, department chairs also engaged in research work, however, one common challenge mentioned was reduced research work. This was a major cause of stress especially for one participant, Yavuz who mentioned, "I am extremely unhappy, extremely unhappy being a chair, because I think it has, it has stolen many opportunities I have as an academic staff member; in the sense that I have very little time to do my own research". This was also the sentiments of Aydın, Çiğdem and Emre as well.

This section identified and discussed the perceptions of department chairs about their position, answering the question, how do department chair define their role as head of the department. Respondents identified that, their primary role was to serve the department members and as such did not believe in the authority of the position. Without a detailed official job description to which they can refer, all chairs learnt to perform their duties through on the job training. In the course of their work, chairs assume the roles of a manager, leader and of course a scholar, trying to maintain their academic identity as well. Of particular interest to this study is the leadership role they assume. The next major theme discusses results in light of how leadership of the department is accomplished.

4.2 Theme 2: Chairs identified a collegium approach to leadership of the department

In the preceding theme, it was identified that, department chairs engaged in multiple leadership-related activities. This section will present findings about how department chairs approach leadership of their departments. This will be done under four subthemes: a) Chairs define an effective leader as, social, transparent and open; and b) Department chairs described a leadership approach marked with high consultation; c) faculty meetings are an important platform for department leadership; d) chairs mentioned other strategies for effective department leadership.

When asked about their views about an effective leader, most department chairs gave definitions in reference to their personal characteristics and chair activities. One however objected to the use of the term 'leader' to describe his position, stating that, academics do not need a leader. His statement provides a background for the subthemes discussed in this section.

He mentioned that, "I mean do you want to be a leader? I don't want to be a leader. I don't think we need a leader, okay, because we are all leaders anyway. These are all academic staff members, they're all very eccentric people, I don't think they would like the idea of a leader anyway. If they do, then I'm not the right person". Upon further enquiry he explained that, his rejection of the term leader is based on his understanding of 'the Turkish perspective'. He said that, "I understood that this country views a typical leader or a good leader in a completely different way. In a way which I don't like at all, okay … The Turkish perspective tells you, as a leader, in quotations, you are basic autocratic, yes. Okay? But that's not my conception of being a leader to be honest." In fact, his sentiments were shared by almost all the participants of this study. This was evident in the subthemes discussed below.

Department Chairs described effective leaders as social, transparent and open. According to chairs, an effective leader ought to be social, paying attention to his relational skills which entailed being positive, understanding, patient and empathetic to others. For instance, Emre described an effective leader by citing

what he did. He remarked, “That’s out of my experience; let me put it this way. I am only task oriented, not person oriented. I never put any person at the center of my discussion, I never do that. I just look at the outputs and I always criticize the job done, not the person. And I always try to understand the other people in terms of…, since it’s a relatively small department”. Cigdem, Savaş, Derya, Pembe, Derya, Aydın, and Aygül all mentioned directly or indirectly the importance of interpersonal skills.

Another important issue mentioned was the need to be transparent and treat others with integrity. In this sense, they hammered on the invaluable benefits of being honest with colleagues about administrative issues and sharing all necessary information with them. Necessary information because, Savaş noted that, not all information can be made public and this sometimes creates a tensed atmosphere for him especially when others may read a different meaning into that. Information such as application for professorship, projects and publishing statistics of faculty etc. are only spoken about with other administrators.

Statements such as “I have to convince them that I don’t have a second agenda” [Deniz]; “if they believe in what you’re saying , and that you know you’re not hiding anything” [Savaş]; “I always share everything. I don’t have any second agenda, let me put it this way” [Emre] and “I’m transparent I share every other knowledge with them” [Derya], all suggest that chairs seemed to be concerned about portraying an image of dishonesty. A perceived lack of honesty or integrity by other faculty members may affect the effectiveness of a leader. This was the case of Deniz when he first assumed the position but mentioned that he succeeded in convincing most of them by trying to be friendly with them.

In addition to the above, all chairs professed the need for leaders to be open to suggestions, ideas and discussion. According to them, a leader, rather than imposing his opinion, shapes the collective opinion by being open to and incorporating other people’s suggestions. Pembe expressed not only her thoughts but that of other respondents when she said “[being] open to new ideas, being

flexible, this is really important because it's not only my ideas or it's not only my plans".

Some department chairs also mentioned the need for strategic vision. A few of the participants iterated the need for leaders to look at the bigger picture by defining the significance of the department and seeking to align the discipline to the larger context. For instance, Aygül mentioned,

> "To put future goals and you know, how the discipline will evolve. What are the current premises that affects the discipline, you know, how does it evolve; how can discipline help to solve social problems"

Similarly, Derya also expressed her thought about situating the department within a context "you have to know about the significance of this department compared to the other [name] departments in Turkey or in the world. Where are we? What are [sic] our capacity? How can we develop our capacity, potentials?"

Under this sub theme, we identified that department chairs described an effective leader to be one who has good interpersonal skills, has integrity and is open to suggestions. In addition, the need for a strategic vision was also noted.

Department chairs described a leadership approach marked with high consultation.

The analysis also revealed that, department chairs did not like to use their authority to impose their decisions but rather always tried to consult with department members. For instance, Yavuz said "the regulations give you a lot of freedom at the end of many many clauses. In the regulations, it said this is decided upon by the departmental chair. And so any, so in a sense I am the one who has the final say according to the regulation. But I don't like that." Similarly, other department chairs also noted that they do not believe in the use of authority. In tune to this, department chairs described a more democratic or participative approach and sometimes a distributed approach to leadership of the department which is discussed under this theme.

All department chairs use participative approach to leadership. The leadership approach of department chairs of this study could be described as

participative and sometimes distributed. Participative because, chairs described an inclusive approach to decision making where they include other academics in the decision making process. However, the way this was accomplished seemed to differ.

For some, although they consult others when making a decision, they still had the final say. For example, Aydın mentioned that, before making any decision, he consults the department to find out how they "feel about it" and then takes the decision by himself. Çiğdem also described it in this way "if the decision making process is related with the academic issues, I share the issue through email with them, and I need your ideas related with it, until this time; I give a deadline. And if the issue is urgent or if the issue is really very important, I make a meeting and in the meeting we discuss the issue, and then after voting related with the issue, I state my decision to the other instructors" After such a process, Derya also believes that, "When I give a decision they have to know why I decide like this."

The other way the participative process takes form is that, the issue is discussed and everybody, including the chair is entitled to one vote. With this procedure, the chair discusses and negotiates with other academic staff but the chairs' proposed idea could be voted down. Emre stated that, "Even though the department doesn't agree with me and they take a decision which is opposite to my proposal, I don't get hurt, I don't care, I say, you have the responsibility guys because you decided on this. I never change the decision, I never do that. Even though I don't respect the decision, let me put it this way, but that's the way they want, they go ahead, because they learn from their mistakes. They need to see the consequences of their decisions." The use of participative processes was for deciding on key issues that affects all members.

Leadership of academic work usually adopted a laissez faire style. Others also mentioned that it is necessary to allow academics to do what they want provided it fell within the boundaries of the law. Deniz for instance explicitly stated that his style was the laissez faire, laissez passez. "To try to be friendly and let others do their best. There's a French word, may be French expression, laissez fair laissez passez, that's my motto". Developing their own courses, research,

pedagogical techniques were among the things mentioned to which this approach was applied. Other Chairs also spoke of similar perspective. For instance, Savaş added that “I mean these are all people with PhDs, they know, they know what they want to do.” In as much as department chairs try to give preference to the needs of colleagues, they also try to make sure that their dealings were within the limits set by the law.

Some department chairs described a form of distributed leadership approach. Among the participants of this study, some described a leadership approach that promoted the distribution of the task of leadership. The chairs of the largest department within this study mentioned that they worked through the commissions and committees that have been instituted in the department as decision making bodies. This was particularly the case of Yavuz when he described the recruitment process his department used in selecting a candidate, which involved about five or six academic staff members “This is why we have established many committees and commissions. So, it’s never me who has the final say, in fact. It’s always, am just coordinating things and passing on final decisions to a separate commissions or committees and then we decide altogether” [Yavuz].” It was also the case for Aydın, who instituted committees to review the curriculum and come up with changes and Pembe, whose work could not be achieved without her course coordinators. Aygül also mentioned about how she, together with her two vice chairs, and two other faculty members carried out specific tasks such as allocating studios and staff.

Faculty meetings are an important platform for department leadership. The participative leadership approach used meant that, faculty meetings were important platforms for department chairs to provide a means interaction among faculty members themselves and between members and chairs. Meetings were for sharing and discussing new information and for discussing issues and taking decisions.

This theme presented results and analysis regarding the perception of effective leadership and their approach to leading the department. Overall responses

indicated that effective chairs maintain good interpersonal skills, have integrity, are open to suggestions and seek for a larger goal towards which the department should be directed. These characteristics are in tune with the participative and distributed leadership approach used by most departments to execute leadership practices. In addition, chairs also used the laissez faire approach for academic issues. Department chairs also noted the important role of faculty meetings, which provides a great opportunity for interaction. In the next theme, results pertaining to relationships within the department are presented.

4.3 Theme 3: Relationships established within the department were significant source of social capital as well as a source of challenge

This section addresses and describes the relationships within the department between chairs and other faculty members as well among the faculty members as perceived by chairs. This is one of two themes that seek to answer the question, how do department chairs perceive social capital as it manifests in the leadership practices. The subthemes presented are: a) Social relationships among faculty members are rooted in a shared history; b) relation c) Department members were a significant source of support for department chairs; d) Certain features within the department were particularly useful for the work of department chairs

Social relationships among faculty members are rooted in a shared history. The data analysis also revealed that, all but one department chair had obtained their undergraduate degree from the current university. And a number of them had also obtained their masters and doctorate degree from the university as well. Deducing from responses, this phenomenon also applied to majority of faculty members as well. During the course of our conversation, Savaş provided his understanding of this phenomenon, in the following words, “there is a common understanding in the university I think. This university is based on the idea that if the best undergraduate from Turkey come here you’ll give them BS, MS and they go somewhere else and then come back and they have this loyalty all the time”. Meaning that, at a point in time majority of the faculty is made of a blend of ‘formers’; former colleagues, former students, former professors and tutors.

As a result of these forms of shared history or inbreeding, most relationships seemed to qualify for access to social capital. As is the case of Yavuz who remarked "I started here as a research assistant. So some of these were my classmates, some of the faculty staff members were fellow assistants. With some we knew each other before and others were my teachers so we have a pretty good relationship in that sense". This was also the case of other participants like Derya, who also remarked that most of the faculty members were her students. In fact, Savaş noted that, a very important network for faculty were students, because "in the long run, you become colleagues, that tends to help a lot, they appreciate the opportunity, and they appreciate that fact that you try to keep it professional, …so they keep your contact and we keep their contact as well".

Friendship relations within the department were a significant source of social capital. In light of the above subtheme, it was very common for participants to refer to some persons as friends from the past. Aygül – "well the current dean is my friend actually, he's from my generation" and Deniz – "I'm here for 23 years; we all know each other, very friendly." Again, it was popular for participants to refer to other staff members as friends, often citing friendship or friendliness as the defining characteristics of their relationships. For instance, Pembe noted that friendliness was the defining feature of key relations in the department. Towards this she said "here we are friends with my colleagues because with don't only to talk about departmental issues we also share some personal problems; uh most of us have children for example children, children related issues. So we are friends, so it's a quite friendly atmosphere". This was familiar across many of the participants of this study.

On the contrary, although Savaş also noted he had friendly relationships with some, especially with the dean he emphasized on the need for being professional and "keeping things academic". He explained that, "actually we set up this department twenty years ago. And one of my objectives was to you know, just to keep things academic and never personalize problems because I've suffered enough from that. These are [sic] people are very unproductive when you do that I think. I

try to avoid that as much as I can". This subsection disclosed that, department chairs within this study shared informal relationships with a number of members in the department, often describing them as friends.

Department members were a significant source of support for department chairs. Many department chairs mentioned that faculty members especially within but also outside the department provided significant support. A statement by Yavuz provides insight in to this. He mentioned, "So when I talk about these extremely beneficial networks I'm talking about people in this networks that I would categorize as friends. Okay so friends in a broad manner with a small 'f'. So friends that you can rely on to a certain extent, friends that can help out at points, friends that you may consult with at points, err I think they are quite beneficial"

Notable among these colleagues were vice chairs, who work together with the chair in accomplishing their tasks. Actually, majority of the participants immediately mentioned their vice as the network or persons they rely on mostly. One participant's description seemed to suggest a kind of distributed form of leadership, where vice chairs were as significant contributors for accomplishing leadership practices, not in the sense that work is delegated (as mentioned by some) but in the sense that it is performed together. Senior faculty members as well as Research Assistants were also mentioned as great source of support. Some participants also mentioned the invaluable service rendered by administrative staff members.

The kind of support rendered ranged from opinions, actual administrative assistance and psychological support as well. Aydın for instance mentioned that, 'time to time when I need to discuss something, I meet with some senior academics for advice; I am respectful to their opinions, not necessarily accepting them but just…' Other department chairs were also a source of support for chairs especially in times of uncertainties regarding administrative duties. Emre mentioned that, "whenever I was in trouble, I gave a call to other people who had been doing this for a long time and I asked them how they handled this" Savaş also mentioned that, sometimes when he needed some information, he reached out to certain committee's

members “, some of our faculty do publications statistics, you probably know [name of committee]… actually they are meeting now, in the next room so they can compile university statistics like hiring rates, where the papers are going in fields, they can do that in less than a day so sometimes I ask them for extra help and they never said no. so I got lucky ”.

Pembe, Aydın and Yavuz mentioned the psychological support they receive from their colleagues as well. Yavuz mentioned that, “they provide me with psychological support, seriously, and this happened just yesterday. They said yeah you know you’re doing a very good job, you should be continuing, I said no I won’t and then they were like come on you’re doing a very good job, we like you being chair, bla bla bla. So I feel that they are there for me, and in in various ways.” This was especially helpful for Yavuz because he reported of being ‘extremely unhappy’, “I think I am going through a very stressful, because academically speaking, things are piling up, so duties are piling up, I have many reviews I have to conduct, my international collaborations have suffered”.

This subsection presented results indicating that, department chairs relied on the relationships within the department in accomplishing their duties. As was seen in this study, department chairs benefited from both formal but also informal relations within the department; proving assistance in administrative assistance, personal opinions as well as psychological support. The next subsection identifies the defining features of these relationships referred to by the participants.

Certain features within the department were particularly useful for the work of department chairs. Aside friendship, most participants mentioned also identified key features that have promoted and enabled the relative ease with which they conduct their roles. Notable among them were trust and honesty, mutual respect, and shared values.

Trust and honesty. From the analysis, department chairs regarded trust as a necessary condition for successful interactions. Aygül explained the value of trust for her in the department as she remarked, “Trust is a default thing you know, without it, it will be impossible to move, really... of course trust is really, you know,

starts with assumption which also involves taking risk, so there's of course disappointments but disappointments are rare you know. But successes are more common you know. When you start with trust and when you proceed you usually succeed you know, very few times disappointments happen". Other department chairs similarly cited trust or trustworthiness as a something that enabled opinion sharing. Aydın mentioned 'I believe trust is really important, with it you can create better things, you can express your opinion and seek other's too; I expect opinions freely'.

Pembe also mentioned that she had great trust in the people with whom she worked; her assistants and administrative personnel. But she also emphasized on the importance of generalized trust between herself and instructors. She said,

> "I mean in front of me I have the exams for example we are going to administer so they should trust us that I mean we're following the laws, we are following, we are doing everything legally and I have the financial issues as well so the money of the department is in control of me so trust is keyword but its mutual trust. I trust my instructors as well , we don't have a building where we have classes, our instructors just wonder all around the campus so I never go and check whether they are in class, whether they are having it on time or not, whether they are using English or Turkish in classes I trust my instructors in that sense"

In the same vein, Savaş also remarked about his approach; he said, "and to make sure that we keep a higher standard in courses, so that's um, well it's not really like policing; I don't go out and check on what they do, I know that, I know what they do so.

Mutual respect. Another useful feature of interactions often cited was respect. Çiğdem mentioned that there was a respectful and positive relationship between each other and that was especially important for her. Emre expressed his opinions about the need for respect in the following statement, "we don't have to be in love with each other but we have to work together. It's that simple. And everybody knows my style I mean I don't have to love you or you don't have to love

me, but we have to work under the same roof, so make sure that we respect each other"

Savaş also emphasized that mutual respect was a critical aspect of relationships. However he remarked that, mutual respect comes in two ways: the classical and generalized mutual respect of fellow academics and the tolerance of some other academics. He explained "When when people are you know, very research oriented, they have run lots of projects and labs and they can be a bit mean on the other side of things. So there I think, I don't know, my attitude is I guess umm, it's not the mutual respect in that sense, but its um, [pause] I guess an understanding that I mean, if you're delivering the goods, because I'll just tolerate your foul personality".

Creating a warm atmosphere conducive for work. Some participants mentioned that, a feeling of friendliness, mutual respect and trust provided "a harmonious atmosphere" which promotes the work of academics and chair. For instance, Derya stated, "I mean you cannot function in a hostile environment or with people who are irresponsible". Similarly, Aydın spoke of the repercussions of the absence of such good relations especially for academics, 'If the environment is highly stressful, [it] can inhibit productivity, if you have problems, it can inhibit scientific relations and therefore bigger challenges'. Sometimes when things do not go well for some faculty colleagues, these relationships were helpful in providing a platform for communicating and seeking an understanding. Yavuz explained,

> "Well you know sometimes there are things that you have to handle which you would rather like to avoid right. So you have to take certain deci..we have to take certain decisions, somebody's gonna suffer, you may have to close down a course, you may have to reject somebody's course proposal, bla bla bla right? Sometimes that happens, and then it's always an advantage if you can talk to a person as a friend, and if that person knows that you have no bad intentions, that helps as well because you go, 'you know, you know this, we have to do this, but next time its bla bla'. She knows that as a friend I would not let her down or he knows that this isn't gonna happen."

One of challenge most participants mentioned was having to deal with attitudinal issues as well as some opposition from members. Deniz mentioned that, his friendliness and openness had helped him to calm down such resistance, as he put it.

Inducing support from fellow staff. One major challenge cited by department chairs was the sheer load they have to deal with especially in terms of administrative work. As discussed in previous subthemes as well, department chairs were a great source of support. These factors were a basis for stimulating and inducing faculty to render assistance or support. Deniz remarked, "well then you share the business, the job with others, then they will be willing to cooperate, then they will be willing to shoulder tasks, then they will work more efficiently". Çiğdem also relied on her relationship with her neighbor to make extra time for her research work. She mentioned "I feel myself better in that way, I have good interaction with them, they know my musts and then I say [to] them for example my neighbor Fatma hoca, I say that I have to work for two hours. I am inside but I am locking my door… so if I don't have any social interaction, I wouldn't say it". Savaş also mentioned that he relied the trust invested in him and the good relations with others to talk to them whenever a tension arose in the department

Shared values and understanding. Participants also identified shared values and understanding as a contributing factor to their effective functioning. These manifested in two ways: shared understanding within the department and within the larger university context.

Shared understanding within the department. Yavuz was among those who cited colleague friends as the most beneficial of his networks to his work. About them he remarked, "we are basically of the same opinion in this department" and he explained how this came about "this has come about in the following way; in the past we had department chairs that did not think this way and this resulted in many problems. So haven experienced all those problems, we kind of have decided that this should be the way to go".

Pembe also mentioned of sharing similar values with those she works with. "We're friends actually, so we never keep any secret from ourselves, we share

everything. Umm all of us have the same attitude as well that's also important; both towards instructors and students because we see here more than instructor, students. So we have to be positive towards them as well. So we all share the same personality traits actually. We are different but we have common values so similar teaching philosophies, similar perspectives towards life"

It should be noted that though it was common for department chairs to refer to others as friends, some also reported of not having positive or informal social relationships with other department members. Aydın, Derya and Deniz all claimed that, despite their openness, there were about two or three persons who disliked them because they perceived them as not open. For Pembe, after what seemed to be a tensed department chair election process (as described by her), she noted that " the others, I mean they might think, the others I mean not those that I am quite close with, they might think I am favoring some people"

Shared understanding within the larger university context. As part of these shared perspectives, there were often mention of university-wide shared values which had also promoted their work of Chairs. Whilst some were mentioned in connection to their leadership approaches, some were also about common values shared by members of the university.

It was surprising how these comments came together to provide a more holistic understanding of what was going on. Derya remarked that, "we have also conscience about good quality, although the rules says that, if you miss a class, you have to fulfill, replace this class. There's no need. We do it from our own conscience; it's from the feeling of responsibility. So I think that all members of staff have this feeling of responsibility very much. A major characteristic… it is Yaprak University (YU) I think. They are all from YU. That's YU training; it gives you this spirit, this value I think we have that may lead to something. you have to do something, you do something it must be good, this is the YU understanding and they are all trained here. It's a major value of YU."

In contrast, Savaş believes that, that spirit of excellence is equally the essence of most universities although it had worked for this university. He shared his perspective on this in the following statement,

> "they ask the professors to be mentors for the new to show them around and what does it mean and then they said just talk about being you know YU ruhu , I said, well you know that vary, depending on people. So I usually, my response to that is, I think you have to be able to..YU ruhu is'nt really any different than Standford ruhu or Gazi ruhu or anything else. It just you have to be able to be an independent thinker umm and you you never give up on on highest standards and that to me is the YU spirit but that's also anybody's, you know, ideals."

Nonetheless, he also believes that compared to other universities in the country, the YU spirit stands out and it has worked for the university too. About this he added, "In this university it worked umm for Turkish okay, everybody knows this is a good university, you coming from outside. Whereas you can't say the same thing, I don't know, in Eskisehir, I don't know, it's just good wishes."

Some other participants also compared YU to other university contexts. Regarding mutual respect, Çiğdem mentioned that, "I see some chairs they are just focusing on respect issue you know, they are not smiling they are not interpersonal, but you have to obey to them. I see it, I see in in most of the universities or in the meetings I go. But in our faculty I see that socialization, smiling face, cross, cross-respect, me and you respectful to each other. In the other faculties, I see that the administrators or chairs try to get one way respect you know, the person around them, should show respect but they don't respect to them… not faculties at YU, other universities, the ones I just observed". Deniz also compared the university to others within the country when he was asked to explained what he meant by "I'm not elected as a chair, a traditional chair". He remarked, "well outside the university such chairs are easily recognized, easily found. They act like dictators, they are not open, they are secretive…of course, in many departments here this is not the case but in Turkey in the country, this is almost true".

Mutual respect, openness and democratic traditions were the keywords deduced from these and other accounts, as university-wide values which are shared by most chairs as well as faculty and students. Since all but one of the participants were graduated from this university, it is assumed that they were also trained the YU way, as Derya put it. This is not to discount the role of individual or personal values of chairs however, by situating their comments into a larger context, we make such interpretation. But even for the chair who was not a graduate in any way, his comments suggest that he has also been socialized to the extent of internalizing the values of the university. When asked about relationship with the Dean, he remarked, 'Not good. I don't like here style. There is favoritism; you have to be close to her before you can get something done otherwise no. There has not been any department chairs meeting anymore. She is not open. I don't like her administrative style. It's not parallel with values at YU; we discuss everything, we like to criticize and they answer'.

Because many department chairs were referring to the university's values, the researcher included a document analysis of some documents taken from the university website. This was done to provide a holistic description of the case. After a keyword analysis, researcher found either the same or similarly expressed perspectives or values as mentioned by most if not all participants. Particularly, in relation to administrative issues, these words were basically the same; openness, flexibility, mutual respect, transparency and maintaining high standards.

This third theme explored the perceptions of department chair about social capital in relation to their leadership practices. Department chairs of this study have a shared history with most department members which has also resulted in such informal relationships most of which they define as friendship, though not all academic staff were within this network of informal interaction. Rooted in these friendship relationships are features such as mutual trust, respect and mutual support.

Department chairs relied greatly on colleagues' support in conducting their work; ranging from psychological support, administrative work but mostly opinions

and suggestions. In addition, department chairs also mentioned that some shared perspectives, values and understanding about issues and behaviours which was shared by other university members, also enabled them to work with such people. These included values such as mutual respect and openness, flexibility and most importantly, conscience of good quality.

4.4 Theme 4: Social networks outside the department were beneficial to the work of department chairs

Whilst some members identified friends within the department as their most beneficial network with whose assistance they have managed to execute their work, a few also emphasized on the invaluable help they have received through networks outside the department. This theme presents results under three sub theme: a) maintaining social networks from within the higher university administration were useful for department chairs work and b) networks outside were also useful for the work of department chairs.

Maintaining social networks from within the higher university administration were very useful for department chairs. To ascertain opinions about social capital, participants were first asked about their views about beneficial networks. While a few mentioned benefits of external networks, others also spoke about having beneficial networks within the university. Precisely, most participants made mention of having the necessary links within university administration. For such networks, department chairs expressed that it was very useful and beneficial for their work. The benefits mentioned ranged from solving administrative problems, seeking assistance, influencing decision making and communicating department needs.

As a means for solving administrative problems. Derya's description of the department chair's work provides a good background to understanding the use of networks within top administration. She said "As I said, this is a limited work. In the university, to be an administrator in a university, it's not like being a chair of a firm or a business. It's a very limited position. All our problems are mostly related to

student problems, promotion, recruitment, and paper work which is, I mean, I always need their help and I use their help and that is, I solve the problems"

Emphasizing the essence of such networks, Savaş stated that, "well I guess we can talk of three kinds of networks, for the university; with the administration, with our colleagues in the world um and university and the students. umm, uh for administration, its priceless, I mean, I end up going to meetings and cocktails that I never thought I would go, just so that I will know the administrator so that next time I enter a problem, I know who to call. Is that social capital? I don't know it's just I think mutual, sort of rubbing shoulders with these people who have power. Because if I need [help] then I have to ask these people, and they would know me so that they listen to what I'm asking for"

Emre also gave a different perspective to having social network in administration. He explained that using the official means to request assistance is not as effective as using social networks. Regarding this he remarked "Let me put it this way, why? Because we have different departments at 'Yaprak University, administrative departments, let's say student affairs. I always call the person who is in charge of the task that I need to get a service on, because sending an official letter doesn't fix the problem. I call the person and I always keep good touch with them. Of course, I visit them even though I don't need anything from them, I ask them how they are doing, I call them and kindly ask them if they can help me about this, they always help me. But I never do this: Hey I am the chairperson of this department, I want you to bla bla. It never works, they don't respond, and they hate you, they hate you. And whenever they see your name on the letter, they don't respond to that letter. So that's the reason I value them." In a similar light,

Derya also mentioned that she receives timely and otherwise inaccessible information to solve certain problems in the department; "I use my networks to a great extent, especially within the university. Not in my private life maybe. But in this university I use social networks because to know these civil servants in the registry, in the social sciences institute or in the Dean's offices is very helpful. I can directly open my phone to them and I can ask what they are doing etc etc without

going through the formal rules. So I take quick information. I have quick access through my network and they know me. So without going to the high ups I can solve my problems very quickly and very efficiently. So that is within the university I have my network and I keep them very well pampered especially when I go to the meetings I ask them how are you? How is it going? so to show that I care for them." she added that "If you don't know the administrators, they won't tell you. And it is not written somewhere that you can get hold of. It is their, its practical and they know it, you don't know it."

As a means of communicating the interests of department. Chairs also identified that, networks within top administration were a means to satisfy the interest of the department by seeking to influence decision making or communicating needs of the department.

For instance, although Yavuz mentioned that his most beneficial network for his job were his friends, he also stated that he has some networks within the administration. About it he remarked "As a chair, you need to take care of the interest of the department, take care of the interest of the individuals in the department, so you wanna be part of some networks that entail decision makers and you wanna influence them of course, right?" He later added that, "but like I said, those people were part of my social capital beforehand anyway, okay? I definitely added a couple of people to that, right? But I had a very nice social capital already."

Similarly, Deniz also mentioned about using contacts within higher administration to communicate the needs of the department especially with regards to his greatest challenge; recruitment. "In this recruitment thing, uh I was able to explain our needs and they helped a lot. And they saw that we're in need and they helped a lot, our dean, our previous Dean." But he said that these contacts must be known to other members. He explained further by stating that "And so it's easier to, sometimes it's easier to go to the second top, third top. Uh assistant to the Dean for example, we have very friendly relations with the former assistant to the Dean, and she also helped a lot communicate with the rest of the network; both with the rector's office and the Dean. So uh, but you have to open as I said and everyone

knew what I was after here. My friends knew what I was going to the Dean or the Assistant to the Dean, uh, so I was in contact with everyone in my department here.

Concerning the issue of not keeping contacts secret, Yavuz also expressed similar sentiments when he said "I'm not somebody who is trying to keep other people away from social networks. And then coming back to your previous question, now I understand. Your social capital and leadership, I think I'm doing this. Because the people I've been interacting with over the years, did exactly this, okay? And I think that now that you've asked me about this I think I've found this quite beneficial, and I think this is the right way to go. Okay? Because in the end, you'll, you'll establish a network, and in the end you will leave this post. And then the new person will start, that doesn't make sense; it's our department, right? "

Although Aydın also acknowledged the importance of having such social networks in administration, he however believes that there ought to be some sort of regulations concerning its use. He explained that because of such connections, processes slowdown and because of that you may have to contact someone too. He said that although he did not like to mix social relations with administrative work, nonetheless, when you are making some final decisions, you will ultimately be directed to certain persons.

Yavuz also mentioned that, although such networks were useful, they were counter-productive because, in the end they will collapse with a change of administration. "Sometimes you willingly or involuntarily establish networks to reach people higher up in the hierarchy okay, to get things smoothly done, to get answers to your questions in a very informal fashion, quickly, without having to result in other things. Well those networks are always prone to collapse, right? And if you are somewhere in the middle, then you'll collapse as well. You'll be part of this collapse. And we have an, we have an evidence of this very recently because our Rector changed".

Under this subtheme, we described the benefits department chairs cited from having social ties particularly with people in higher administration. These included access to non-redundant information, resources (influence) and leveraging

assistance all of which are supported by previous studies (Burt, 1997; Chow & Chan, 2008; Lui et al, 2015; Seibert et al, 2001).

External networks can also be useful for the work of department chairs. Some department chairs identified networks outside the university as beneficial to their work. Pembe noted that, as a leader, it is important to have networks not only within but outside the university as well. She expressed "outside the university as well because YU is one of the best universities in Turkey. I mean people usually in other universities try to follow us and they say we have the YU way. In that sense I mean we are pioneering in the part, in the country I can say. But at the same time we try to follow others not only in turkey but in the world. We sometimes send our instructors to other universities for staff exchange programs just to see what they're doing and in conferences we come across or we meet lots of people from other universities and other countries other institutions. So after those conferences for example we still keep in touch we send our instructors to some trainings that's how we keep in touch so in that sense we have a great network"

Aygül also noted that, being a part of networks outside the university was also beneficial to her work as chair. "Also we do collaboration with firms from industry. So we match each student with a firm from industry. So I'm actually building those connections you know with the firm. So matching students with those representatives from firms; so that's another network. I'ts beneficial because while speaking to them, you understand how the discipline, how the discipline can relate itself to these different you know partner areas let's say. I mean the state, industry, designers, [name of group], etcetera, to be in relation with them, to speak to them, to write with them, to read their documents, helps us to build our strategy." Deniz also cited similar associations with which the department interacts. He said "we have such network connections like associations [name of association] for example. We're being called to give talks and we're publishing with them" These networks were usually on the group level networks with which the department had some interactions and may be beneficial to individuals as well.

Theme four identified the benefits derived from external networks for the work of the department chairs. Networks within the higher administration were a means through which some department chairs accessed non-redundant information, assistance and a means to influence certain decisions. In addition, external networks outside the university provided benefits to faculty development issues, strategic goal setting process and students' developmental purposes.

4.5 Theme 5: Seniority may guide interactions and perceptions within the department.

Under this theme, results presented describe the accounts of department chairs that pointed to the fact that it was possible for a faculty member's seniority to guide the interactions and perceptions within the department. For example, Aygül spoke about her relation with research assistants in her department, "now I'm getting more [sic] older and they are younger than me usually, I mean the research assistants of course, it's like some of them are my child's age, so…but I think [it's] not formal". Aydın also mentioned that, because of his age, he feels he was the leader compared to all the others.

Some participants also used the term 'father' in describing certain relations. For instance, Emre also in reference to Research Assistants said "probably they see me as a father or big brother. I don't apply such rules to them as I would normal staff". Pertaining to this, Çiğdem reported of feeling stressed in trying to demand some requirements from some professors who were her former instructors; "I sometimes feel stressed while trying to… ummm… trying to what [pause] there are some instructors at here and they were my instructors also so I am respectful to them, so while wanting something from them I feel sometimes stressed, you know, because they are my instructors and I… I try to get something from them, I want a report from them so I am sometimes having difficulty sometimes while… ummm… defining my roles in this process."

And similarly, Yavuz also mentioned of having to sometimes step back where he normally would not due to such relations with former fathers or students he said, "and emm well [pause] I would say at one point it's quite professional, emm

[pause] but then again, like I said some of the faculty members are former students or fathers, okay and there you lose professionalism, it's very typical of the middle easterners you know. So there i'ts like 'hocam hocam hocam' and you know you sometimes step back where you normally wouldn't."

Outside the department, seniority and duration in the university may also be a contributing factor in accessing social capital. For instance Derya mentioned that "Since I'm the senior of this university, I have various contacts at various levels…this is my advantage, not maybe the advantage of the younger…because I'm the senior in this university. To be a senior, it is your way, because you have plenty of people, especially in the higher levels." Savaş also mentioned that "I know just about everyone in the university. I've been here for, I was an undergraduate student, and then left and came back, so I know just about everyone and that tends to help". All the participants, Aydın, Aygül, Derya, Emre, and Savaş, to whom reference was made; were all full professors.

This section described the responses of participants that suggest the usefulness of being a full professor, graduate and 'senior' of a university within which one works as the department chair.

4.6 Theme 6: The nature of the chair role necessitates the use of social capital

This section presents results that suggest the essential role of social capital in the work of department chairs. As discussed earlier, department chairs perceive this role as not an authority position which requires everyone to obey or a position that gives the Chair enough authority to effect certain changes they would want to. In this sense, department chairs noted that the use of networks, particularly social networks and the resources rooted in them, was essential for their leadership. This was essential because, first, department chairs are thrown into a situation which requires them to strive to maintain good social relationships.

This was the stance of Pembe when she remarked, "I mean they as an ordinary instructor, your only relation is with the student basically. With the colleagues, I mean since you are not in the admin position, you're just friends but

here sometimes I have a different hat. Remember I told you about my close friends for example, or the others I mean they might think, the others I mean not the ones that I am quite close with, they might think I am favoring some people, in order not to have that feeling I have to be fair, so an ordinary instructor does not have to deal with these issues. So in that sense quite restricted capital of course but with me it's different". Similarly, Deniz also mentioned that, as an administrator, he needs to "be in contact with everyone and try to find a means to be in contact with everyone. So this is very important issue."

Others also hinted that the role of social capital is inevitable for the work of department chair due to the need for consulting others and relying on others to accomplish the work. Particularly in reference to top administration, Derya also states, "if you want to have a ni..free going [sic], easy leadership, you have to have a social capital. Especially you have to know the right people in the right place. Otherwise, just reading the rules, you cannot be a leader. Especially in terms of consultation or finding quick solutions, learning about clues, they, you need this network, within the university and which I think I have them and I have my advantage in that sense."

All chairs mentioned that, their position links them to the top administration thus differentiating them from other academics without an administrative position in terms of possible social interactions. Some also mentioned that, chairs have more social contacts within higher administration than ordinary faculty. However, Yavuz emphasized that, though a chair can have different social network base, it does not have to be the case especially when the position is temporary. His approach was to therefore engage as many people as possible in his work, for them to gain exposure because "in the end, I will leave this post".

In terms of engagements within the department, Pembe stated her need for social capital in the following words, "you have to have that social capital. I mean you cannot be an only man that's not possible here uh, you have to have that network that good relation with others if you want to lead in a good way. I cannot say perfect that's impossible you cannot be perfect nobody is perfect". Similarly,

other participants such as Yavuz, Deniz, Çiğdem and Aydın mentioned the usefulness of social networks to leadership especially within the department not just with faculty but students as well. As Savaş stated that, "I guess what we get from students, giving them an opportunity to do, you know, not having an immediate return from them soon because you know, they are going somewhere else, in the long run, you become colleagues, that tends to help a lot".

This subtheme identified that, the nature of chair position requires them to establish multiple interactions and having good relationships with various people is crucial because it is with that that they can accomplish their work

Risks of social capital within the department chair. Some participants' responses pointed to the potential of favoritism resulting from social networking. For instance, Pembe mentioned that, of course prior to becoming Chair, she had amassed significant number of social networks, within and outside the department. In addition, this was a source of great worry for her in her early days. She mentioned,

> "This means I have a lot of friends both working here and outside YU. What this means is I have to be fair to all my teachers. I should not favor some of them because they are my friends, but some of them just ask for some favors so you have to say no, that's the problem I guess because you don't want to hurt their feelings that's one issue"

On the contrary, Savaş noted that, because he 'keeps things academic', he is able to use directness in dealing with certain difficult situations involving colleagues. To this he said, "if a faculty is not doing the minimum required; attending to courses, reading the exams, and things like that, that's a big problem. And um there were few occasions where I had to go and say, you have to straighten things up and that's very difficult, doing it to a colleague. But I did it, a couple of occasions."

Emre also stated his displeasure at his dean's administrative style. He mentioned that, he did not like her approach because she was not open and also because you only get assistance if she is your friend. In both accounts, it means that,

there is a very high likelihood that either the chair may engage in favoritism and/or those who were not close to the department chairs may sometimes complain of favoritism.

Under this subsection, it was identified that, the nature of their position engenders friendship relationships to be maintained. In addition, they also have are automatic link to higher administration from whom they can also earn extra benefits by means of social networks. However, this may also indicate the presence of nepotism within university administration.

Summary. Results from this qualitative single case study indicate that, department chairs perceive their role were active managers and leaders of the department. In addition to all these, department chairs strive to maintain active academic life especially in the field of research though it was at a significantly reduced rate. Department chairs also employ a collegiate approach to managing affairs of the department. This means more faculty involvement in terms of opinions sharing, and consensus seeking in decision-making; for which faculty meetings were very useful platform. Department chairs try to share their work as much as possible through this means and do not interfere in the academic work of fellow academics so long as they remained in the confines of academic rules. To be effective, chairs emphasized on the need for honesty and openness.

In order to accomplish their work efficiently and effectively, chairs relied on relationships within and outside the department. Such persons were usually considered as friends, and were a good source of administrative, intellectual and psychological support.. Chairs identified trust, mutual respect, flexibility and shared values as very useful characteristics of these relationships. Chairs also used, to a great extent, their networks within the higher administration and these provided benefits such as quick access to information and assistance and a means to communicate department needs. This was especially the benefits for some senior department chairs. Other networks outside the university also promoted the work of department chairs.

Department chairs noted that, the nature of department chairs necessitates that they interact with many people and unlike their fellow academics without leadership positions, they have to find a means to get in contact with not just everybody but the right people in the right places. The following chapter presents conclusion and implications of this study.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Discussions

Under this section, results obtained from the analysis are discussed in light of relevant literature. Discussions are done in relation to the various themes that emerged from the results.

5.1.1 Theme 1: Perspectives about the role of department chairs.

The literature on department chairs' duties have been well established. Yet for understanding the manifestation of social capital within their leadership practices, this study first sought to discover what department chairs did. Strengers (2010) define practices to include what people do as well as how these doings are constituted. Also according to Gmelch and Carroll (2004), department chairs' view of themselves has an impact on how they carry out their roles as chairs. Towards this end, this study first sought the understandings of current chairs about their position and the tasks involved.

Many department chairs asserted that they did not see the position as one of authority and that department chairs were not superiors. This assertion may also render meaning to an unplanned observation made during the data collection period. It was observed that, with the exception of two, all other seven department chairs were found in their personal academic offices. Out of these, three later offered to conduct the interview in their official chairperson office, perhaps because the interview was about their chairperson identity. In fact, one of the chairpersons seemed not to have used his office in a long time. As stated by Carroll and Wolverton (2004), most department chairs draw their identity from both faculty and administration however, they are more biased toward their faculty identity (Carroll, 1991). This study seems to provide support for this assertion.

Department chairs are administrators, regulators and coordinators of department activities. Participants mostly referred to the administrative nature of their position when asked about their tasks. According to studies, department chairs were significantly administrators and it has been noted to be the most engaging yet least liked role because it is very time consuming and effort draining (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Riley & Russel, 2013). Indeed the results support this claim and most department chairs complained of the excessive administrative load they have which has taken a toll on their research work. The other issues pertaining to the absence of a detailed description, lack of training and therefore on the job learning are also well documented (Gmelch and Miskin, 2011; Wolverton et al, 2005; Hanckok, 2007). In fact the need for training and detailed job description has been propagated for long (Seagren et al, 1993) however, very little seems to be done about it.

Department chairs engage in leadership-related activities. Considering that leadership is the process of mobilizing, motivating and influencing a people to utilize their skills and knowledge for a chosen cause, (Eyal & Roth, 2011), chairs' activities involved a considerable number of leadership practices. The leadership role of department chair is supported by the literature as well (Bryman, 2007; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Riley & Russel, 2013; Smith, 2005). Details of how leadership of the department is accomplished are discussed under subsequent theme.

"At the end of the day I'm an academic". This university has a major focus on research, however, due to the time involved especially in administrative work, chairs seemed to struggle to maintain an active and full research life. Staying up at night or locking oneself in the office were some the strategies some department chairs used although this was barely enough to secure time. Reduced academic work resulting from limited time has been noted in the literature (Hancock, 2007; Werkema, 2009).

5.1.2 Theme 2: Chairs identified a collegium approach to leadership of the department

Perspectives about the chair position point to a preference for a collegial system, where attention is given to preferences of colleagues and autonomy to work. This is discussed under the subthemes below.

Chairs identified effective leaders as social, transparent and open. One major characteristics of effective department leadership mentioned in the literature was the need for transparency and honesty (Bryman, 2007) in addition to mastering social skills (Kezar, 2004). In their study about perceptions of developmental needs of department chairs, Wolverton et al, (2005) revealed that, Deans also portrayed a similar understanding of what skills department chairs should have. Their emphasis was on the ability of chairs to deal effectively with difficult people and resolve conflicts through the use of excellent social skills as well as being honest and fair to faculty members. Similarly, in a study by Ambrose et al, (2005), it was discovered that, faculty members view department chairs as effective if they possess integrity and treat them fairly. In addition to the above, it has also been emphasized that, department chairs must provide a sense of direction to the department (Bryman, 2007; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011).

Department chairs described a leadership approach marked with high consultation.

The need for providing direction has been supported in the literature nonetheless, it notes that, the professional orientation of academics and their need for autonomy makes it difficult for them to accept the traditional role of the leader to provide (Bryman, 2007). It is not surprising that department chairs (who are themselves academics) denounce any authoritarian oriented behaviour. Rather, department chairs mentioned that they provided avenues for participative leadership where opinions of other members were requested (Collinson and Collinson, 2009; Sart, 2014) as well as fostering a supportive environment (Ambrose et al, 2005; Bryman, 2007) by giving room for faculty autonomy especially with regards to academic work.

Again, by putting leadership practices centre-stage (Bolden et al, 2008), it was perceived that, the work of department chairs were accomplished through a shared system, which involved coordinators and committees or commissions. This form of distribution is categorized as a) collaborated distribution and b) collective/pooled distribution (Spillane, 2005).

Collaborated distribution is when two or more people work together in time in order to perform a leadership activity. The collective or pooled distribution occurs when two or more people work, separately but interdependently to accomplish a goal. This result also tallies that of Smith (2005) who discovered that, leadership of larger departments in the United Kingdom (UK) was distributed through both formal and informal committees and commissions.

In sum, the descriptions of participants provides insight to a form of collegiate system which is based on consensual decision making and mutual cooperation and permissiveness (McNay, 1995) and which provides a means for fostering relationships (Bryman, 2007); relationships which, according to subsequent analysis revealed that, they were very essential to the management of the department.

5.1.3 Theme 3: Relationships established within the department were significant source of social capital

Social capital is rooted in social relations, however, official, hierarchical and work relations also provide opportunities for the establishment of social capital particularly due to the tendency for frequent interactions (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Lin, 2001). Likewise, department chairs in all sense share formal relations with other academic staff nonetheless, the interactions among faculty members provide interesting opportunities for accessing social capital.

Social relationships among faculty members are rooted in a shared history. Participants had spent an average of 23 years, working in academia. Although some had worked in other countries, majority of their academic professional life had been spent at this institution. Most of all the participants, graduates or not, had spent some number of years at the same university and have

therefore, established and maintained plethora of both strong and weak relationships over a long period of time through which they can access social capital.

Literature notes that time and frequency of interactions are essential factors in leveraging social capital (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Ostrom, 2010; Granovetter, 1983). Granovetter (1983) stressed on the need for frequency; the more frequently individuals interact with each other, the more they build strong sentiments of friendship. In addition, according to Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998), all forms of social capital depend on stability and continuity of a social structure and formal organisations represent the establishment and maintenance of an enduring structure of ties whose design provides a basis for forming relationships which may be appropriated for other purposes.

Friendship relations within the department were a significant source of social capital. The workplace is a very common source of friendship (Grey & Sturdy, 2007). Social ties solidify through constant interactions (Krackardt and Hanson, 1993). According to Grey and Sturdy (2007), by virtue of preexisting work relations, neighborhood and engagement in similar groups and shared educational backgrounds, friendship can be 'grafted' unto these relationships, thereby becoming the most likely characterizing feature described by those involved. Again, Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) explain that, organizational settings are conducive for the evolution of social relations and for that matter social capital because they comprise of certain factors that are embedded in the concept of organisations. These factors are time, closure, interaction and interdependency.

Grey and Sturdy (2007) mentioned that, friendship may be understood and distinguished in terms of shared activities as well as the depth and length of time the persons involved have been associated with each other. As is evidence from the study, participants had referenced the duration of their professional life as a basis of the establishment of friendship. Emre, Deniz, Derya, Pembe and Yavuz, all referenced their length of service. Although not the only factor, it can be said to be a 'cavas factor' for the definition of friendship by department chairs of this study.

Krackardt and Hanson (1993) described informal networks as "the central nervous system driving the collective thought processes, actions and reactions of its business unit" (p. 1). These, informal networks within formal organisations, according to them, are effective in promoting many agenda including helping one to meet extraordinary deadlines. With this in mind, we proceed to the next sub theme which discusses the benefits of such informal relationship as cited by participants of this study.

Department members were a significant source of support for department chairs. The department chairs interviewed seemed to have obtained a great deal of support from their friends. A lot of them, if not all, referred to friends within the department with whose assistance they carried out their tasks. Most of them were colleagues from the past or colleagues with whom they share certain commonalities such as being research partners or working on the same project. Friendship plays significant role in people's life (Adam & Allan, 1998) and this typically involves mutual affection, intimacy, freedom and support (Grey & Sturdy, 2007).

Certain features within the department were particularly useful for the work of department chairs.

Trust and honesty. Trust has been a defining factor of social capital, indeed often paralleled to the concept (Putnam, 2000; Coleman 1988). From the analysis, department chairs regarded trust as a necessary condition for successful interactions. Fukuyama (1997) posits that, the social capital in the form of trust is critical to the management of highly skilled workers such as professors manipulating complex and tacit knowledge and processes. He states that such professionals are not managed through the usual work rules and standard operating procedures but rather "they are trusted to be self-managing on the basis of internalized professional standards" (p. 437). This may also provide insight into the laissez faire approach used by department chairs as discussed in an earlier theme. Trust and honesty are paired here because, from the responses of participants, a perception of lack of honesty by faculty members engenders distrust. This was also discussed under theme two

above. Trusting relationships evolve from engaging in social interactions over time as the relationship becomes more concrete and actors involved are more likely to be perceived as trustworthy (Granovetter, 1983).

Trust, friendship and respect are all manifestations of relational dimension of social capital. Relational as the name implies describe those assets that are rooted in relationships (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998) and which also promote mutual support and cooperation (Tsai & Ghoshal, 1998). For participants of this study, these features have been very beneficial to them. According to them, a friendly atmosphere promoted the accomplishment of their duties in two ways: creating a warm atmosphere for work and by inducing support from fellow staff. Similarly, in a study of the effects of trust on authentic leadership and organisational deviance within ten Turkish universities, it was found that, trust as well as psychological contract violation had mediating effect on the negative relationship between authentic leadership and organisational deviance (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2013). This goes to stress on the importance placed on trust by not only the leaders but also the department members of Turkish institutions.

Shared values within department and university setting. Shared norms, values and perspectives are the major manifestation of the cognitive dimension social capital as conceptualized by Nahapiet and Ghoshal, (1998). Tsai and Ghoshal (1998) found from their study that, by having similar or same perspectives about how to interact with one another, organizational members were able to avoid misunderstandings in their resource and exchange combination. This is because, shared values facilitate understandings of both collective goals and ways of behaving in a particular system (Tsai & Ghoshal, 1998).

Again, Fukuyama (1997), expressed that, a corporate culture ideally provides individuals with not only a group but also an identity thereby engendering efforts towards the group. Although department chairs do not undergo any form of training, they seem to display similar thoughts perspectives and actions. The researcher sought to understand this further and employed Bourdieu's concept of habitus as discussed earlier in the literature review. According to him, apart from individual's

own habitus, members of a common social structure will display the class or group habitus. In explaining group habitus he said, "individual habitus in so far as it expresses or reflects the class, could be regarded as a subjective but non-individual system of internalized structures, common schemes of perception, conception and action, which are the precondition of all objectification and appreciation; and the objective coordination of practices and the sharing of a world-view could be founded on the perfect impersonality and interchangeability of singular practices and view" (Bourdieu, 1977 p. 79).

By relating practices to a strategy-generating structure, the researcher does not mean to say that there is no free will (Lyke, 2017). On the contrary, as is evident from this study, participants always referred to their personal styles, approaches and opinions of doing things. The fact that their practices are similar to the values expressed by the university may suggest a 'homologous habitus'. Bourdieu (1977) explains that, in so far as members' habitus are produced by the same history, objectified in structures and habitus, their practices will more likely be mutually intelligible. It is understood that, it is not possible for all the participants to have the same experiences within a large social structures, nonetheless, Bourdieu (1977) explains that, by being members of the same group, they are more likely to have been confronted with similar situations that are frequent for that group's members, thereby the likelihood of a shared habitus or disposition. This analysis provides a deeper understanding of the discovery made from the analysis of results of the study.

5.1.4 Theme 4: Social networks outside the department were beneficial to the work of department chairs

Balkundi and Kilduff (2005) emphasized that leaders can be effective based on their cognition about their networks and their actual structural ties through which they can influence their access to important resources. Similarly, Lin (2001) posits that, resources embedded within a hierarchical network structure such as a university administration where formalization are a basis of differentiations, can be

easily access through the use of social capital. According to him, access to social capital promotes ‘upper reachability’.

From another perspective, Bolden et al, (2008) explained that, organisational level social capital is not just the total of member’s social capital but also additional relationships that are meaningful at the group level. Just as individual networks could be beneficial to the group, so can group level networks be beneficial to group members (Lean & Van-Buren, 1999). In this case, they were beneficial for faculty development as well as a means for providing opportunity for students.

5.1.5 Theme 5: Some participants referred to possible ways seniority may guide interactions and perceptions within the department.

In order to attempt an understanding of this issue, we dive into the argument of Bourdieu (1988). He mentions that during the life of a graduate student, he or she actively seeks a supervisor and a kind of dependency relationship is established with this person and from which the supervisor may derive some form of academic power or capital. He defined academic power as “obtained and maintained by holding a position enabling domination of other positions and their holders” (p. 89). Bourdieu explains that such a supervisor monitors the progress of their ‘student’, ensuring that they respect the field’s “order of succession” (p. 84). As a result, of this, students acquire a certain habitus in relation to recognizing the hierarchical order of academics and how things ought to be.

According to Bourdieu, not only the university but also the department is a social field of struggles where, one’s position (not necessarily formal position), is determined by the symbolic capital one has acquired. Within universities, symbolic capital is primarily cultural capital in the form scientific capital such as academic qualifications, publications and academic rank (Bourdieu, 1988). All these may affect the recognition one may receive. For instance, Savaş commented about other faculty members who he only “tolerates”. He remarked that “sometimes when people are very successful in research, getting papers published, getting grants all the time, they think they can get away with anything, including being rude to

people, that happens a lot with people running big research labs. Because they are used to all the people around, it's a big lab; they think they can do that to faculty, they can't. Sometimes they have to be told just that.

Bourdieu (1986) asserts that, one form of capital may be used to access another form of capital. Although Bourdieu describes academic capital (which may in some way be associated to the cultural capital) in terms of knowledge creation, it is believed that this may also have an impression on the perception of who the real leader is. For instance, Bolden et al (2008) in their study of university leaders particularly department chairs, found many informal leaders such as professors and previous holders of the position who may wield significant influence, consciously or unconsciously, intentionally or unintentionally.

Carroll and Wolverton (2004) asserted that, being a department chair without being a full professor may yield authority problem. In addition to this, it is proposed that being a department chair with full professorship may be more useful in terms of accessing social capital in the university, both within and outside the department. Attaining the rank of full professor is related to time and age (Bourdieu, 1988), but also alongside that is the accumulated academic or cultural capital that has earned one, the rank of professorship. This may also suggests that one's cultural capital may influence access to social capital in the form of networks. As presented in the extract from Savaş, such professors running big labs have "people around them".

5.1.6 Theme 6: The nature of the chair role necessitates the use of social capital

Literature has noted the potential of social capital to be a means of favoritism or nepotism (Portes, 2014). Favoritism is the seeking of or request for preferential treatment based on shared characteristics other than the rationality or regulations (Ozler & Buyukarslan, 2011). Favoritism involves such treatments to close friends, pals and acquaintances whereas nepotism which is considered a form of favoritism, consists of such treatments to kinship (Büte, 2011; Özler & Büyükarslan, 2011). A perception of favoritism within an organisation affects members' organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Büte, 2011).

From this study it was noted that, this may apply to both departments as well as the wider administrative structure. It may be interesting to note that, among all participants, the only one who complained of being a victim to favoratism was the only one who did not graduate from the university. In all excerpts from participants suggest that though one may establish friendly relationships with colleagues, this should not be used to compromise on professionalism or as a basis of favoritism.

5.2 Conclusion

The main aim of this case study was to understand the relationship between social capital and department leadership, from the viewpoints of department chairs. Leadership practices were operationalized as what chairs claimed they did as well as their perceptions of what and how they do it. As a result, the study explored what department chairs did, their perceptions about them and their views about the interplay of social capital in those practices. The results provided information about the practices of department chairs and how they use up their social capital to achieve benefits for their work.

The work of department chairs is such that, their primary concern is to carry out those practices they considered routine and which were aimed at providing an environment conducive for teaching, learning and research. Providing such an environment also means catering for its long and short-term goals. Short-term goals in the form of administrative affairs such as daily correspondence and facility management and long term goals in the form of seeing to the development of high standard curriculum, motivating young faculty and selecting the most suitable expert to execute overall goal of providing quality education and research.

For these two primary goals, bonding social capital becomes very instrumental. Bonding social capital represents the relational dimension of social interactions, which constitute features enabling cooperation and collaborations. Because these tasks require collaboration with and cooperation of other department members in the form of providing opinions, time and understanding, bonding social capital was mostly relied on. Chief of these features were mutual trust, mutual respect, openness and honesty all of which are characteristics of strong ties. Strong

ties are used to describe ties with which more time is spent, there is emotional intensity and intimacy as well as frequent reciprocal services Granovetter's (1983). Again, since a more collegiate management culture was used within all departments studied, and such an approach not only relies on but also engenders relationships, it may also suggest that bonding social capital breeds within departments with collegiate systems. Future research may be conducted in this area.

On the other hand, in the course of their dealings, when they require assistance or resources which are not in their reach especially within the department, department chairs often reach out by means of bridging social capital. Bridging social capital are the links and network of interaction that link a person to another social structure or circle. In the case of department chairs within this study, bridging networks embodied networks within higher administration, with other colleagues from other departments and some networks outside the university. Such networks were used for dealing with issues such as seeking assistance for students and faculty related bureaucratic and administrative processes, seeking for information to solve irregularities and seeking to influence certain decisions that may serve the interest of department members. Bridging social capital usually encapsulates weak ties; ties with which there are less frequent interaction, or intimacy. This captures the essence of Granovetter's (1983) argument when he posits that, there is strength in weak ties.

Adler and Kwon (2002) termed this division as the task contingencies of social capital. That is, the type of task to be achieved influences the form social capital will take. Thus, for the primary duties of chairs which required cooperation of all department members, specifically academic and administrative staff, bonding social capital comes to play. On the other hand those tasks that require resources (information, expertise, power) which were not in their possession, called for the use of bridging social capital. This study provided evidence that helps to bridge the divide between the two major deferring arguments on social capital which is; whether closure is more beneficial or bridging structural holes is more beneficial. Both have different roles to play and are beneficial in their respective contexts.

In addition to this clarification, the results also brings to the fore, possible additional explanation to the concept of social capital as a public good. The similar accounts of department chairs as well as analysis of the university values seem to suggest a high level of shared values, especially for those who graduated from this university. By means of shared perspectives and values about how to behave and how things ought to be, department chairs were able to rely on their colleagues although their respective relational characteristics played a major role.

But, the point here is, wide spread shared values such as open-mindedness and mutual respect promote to some extent, the interaction and reliability of members of this university. As found by Tsai and Ghoshal (1998), shared values and vision also promotes trusting relationships. This captures the essence of the public good nature of social capital posited by Coleman (1988) such that, a common understanding of proper ways of acting within this university can be appropriated by members of that group – in this case department chairs – as a resource to promote their personal and departmental agenda.

In addition, the seeming congruity between the department chairs' values and university principles suggest an internalization of the externality. According to Bourdieu (1990) understanding of practices can only be deduced by relating the social conditions in which the habitus was created, to the social condition within which the habitus is implemented. For this study, the two social conditions were similar, if not same. Therefore, it may also suggest not only the internalization of externality but the externalization of internality. These personal values of university members have created an objectified system or structure, and based on which a subjective system of strategy generating schemes is acquired.

The accounts of participants about having a shared history with a significant number of people as well as the congruity of values, may suggest a situation of academic inbreeding, also referred to as institutional breeding which is defined as the situation where universities hire their own doctorate graduates (Horta & Yudkevich, 2016). Indeed, the university under study, has instituted a policy of having such graudates seek post doctorate studies from other institutions so as to

augment the effects of inbreeding, one of which has been identified as lower levels of productivity in terms of scholarly works (Horta 2013) and that also applies to some university departments in Turkey(Inanc & Tuncer, 2011).

Nonetheless, it may be argued that, in so far as they were graduates of such institutions, some other effects of inbreeding may still exist. For instance, it has been noted that, by hiring inbred faculty, the institution facilitates the continuous replication of already existing norms and social structures which were taught or adopted during their earlier stages of socialisation (Yamanoi, 2005). This conclusion is very similar to what has been revealed in this study. The critical question that arises at this point is that, how beneficial is the extent of the similarity and shared values both within departments and the university as a whole? To what extent has the policy to avert negative effects been successful? Further studies may be conducted on this.

Based on the results of this study, two conclusions have been arrived at: The first is that, indeed relationships matter especially for the department chair, whose work requires that multiple interactions be made; whose work is not perceived as one with authority who can order his way around; whose position lacks the necessary authority to effect certain changes in the structure; whose effectiveness lies on the cooperation of many stakeholders and whose success, translates into the success of the university. Department chairs need to build their social capital in order for them to 'get by' their work more effectively and efficiently. This is in tune with the findings of Vigoda-Gadot et al, (2011) who studied perceptions of academics about internal politics and concluded that staff and managers who wish to improve work outcomes must give attention and greater resources to improve social capital, social skills and social capacities.

Nonetheless, it should be made clear that, informal interactions and relationships is not proposed to be substituted with professionalism but rather used alongside it. Indeed the results indicated a possible use of such capital to promote favoritism. Keyza (2004) has also emphasized that for effectiveness in university

governance, there is the need for leadership, relationships and trust within formal structures. Trust is a risk, but with every risk is great return.

The second conclusion is that, the leadership practices of department chairs of this university are shaped not only by their individual agency but also the university's structure, culture and principles, through the organizational and acquired habitus. These habitus serve as frameworks guiding (and not dictating) their actions. This means that, actions of department chairs are predisposed to take certain forms as defined by the social structure. This conclusion is also supported by studies (Ball, 2007; Bolden et al, 2008). In addition, a homologous habitus seems to provide this university's department chairs with an extra source of social capital which they can appropriate to serve their respective departments.

5.3 Implications

For practice. The purpose of this study was to discover and describe how leadership of the department was accomplished, by exploring the views of department chairs about social capital in relation to their leadership practices. The results imply that, appointing full professors to the position of chair may be beneficial in terms of leveraging social capital for the benefits of the department. The results suggest certain recommendations for current and new chairs, higher administration and for future research.

For new and current department chairs. The results of the study showed that, sharing the job with department members was one of the easiest ways to get by. Thus, new chairs should especially seek to form strong bond with vice chairs, not just seeing them as vice chairs to whom they delegate but rather as leaders with whom the task will be accomplished together. Again, current chairs should also seek to engage other members in the administrative processes so that they get a feel of how things are done or whom to go to when problem arise. The position is often temporarily occupied thus such a move may be used as a way to prepare future and prospective chairs. Again the results indicated that, relationships within the department were the primary source of social capital. Current chairs should strive to create an atmosphere conducive for relationship building, mutual trust and respect.

Most importantly, current chairs must strive to be fair and not base on informal relationships as a means to favor a few. Indeed this promotes distrust and resistance and consequently the formation of cliques who may downplay the efforts of the chair because they are left out or because they deliberately disengage themselves or oppose certain proposals.

For prospective department chairs. Results seemed to indicate that, those with prior administrative duties reported of being less stressed out due to the previous exposure. Prospective chairs may decide to engage themselves in the administration of the department, to gain exposure.

For top administration. New chairs, especially those without any prior exposure to the administrative processes, may face a lot of physical and psychological stress. It is recommended that, a detailed job description be drafted, discussed and instituted. This will be very helpful for especially the new chair, who may seem at sea on what to do or not to do upon assuming the position for the first time. In addition, just like the mentorship of faculty members within this university, a training and mentorship program can be instituted for new department chairs as well. This may provide them with basic tools that will help them to work more effectively. Tools such as knowledge of administrative processes, leadership skills training and a network of both current and past chairs from and with whom, knowledge and experiences may be learnt and shared respectively.

5.4 Limitations and Recommendations for Future Studies

Despite efforts to minimize the limitations, this study has a number of them especially regarding the methodological approaches used. First, the study used a case study design and examines only one public higher education institution in Turkey. Future studies may be conducted using a two or multiple case study approach, by including other universities based on criteria such as size (large and small), ownership (public and private) or focus (research and teaching).

Secondly, the aim of this study was to discover and describe the opinions of department chairs about leadership and social capital. It did not measure social interaction between them and others they purport to have relationships with, which

usually requires a confirmation on both sides. Only the statements given by participants were used. As a result, the validity relies greatly on their personal narratives. Although another data source was used as a means of triangulation, the accounts given about themselves were not verified. Future studies should, in addition, seek perceptions of some department members about their respective chairs, in order to have a more extensive data especially about their leadership.

Thirdly, for the purpose of validity, raw transcripts of interviews were first sent to participants followed by summary analysis. Due to this process, some data was lost because they were retracted by respondents. This information may have been considered sensitive because they were related to some occurrences within the country and so they were retracted. This may have had an effect on the analysis.In addition, studies may be conducted to investigate the peculiar challenges faced by department chairs who are not full professors as this study suggests.

REFERENCES

Adams, R. G. & Allan, G. (1998). *Contextualizing Friendship*. In R. G. Adams & G. Allan (Eds.), Placing Friendship in context (pp. 1-17). United Kingdom, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Adler, P. S. and Kwon, S. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *The Academy of Management Review, 27(1*), 17- 40

Altheid, D. L., & Johnson, J. M. (2011). Reflections on interpretive adequacy in quantitative research. In N. K. Denin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp.581-594). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication Ltd.

Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(7), 803-830. http://dx.doi:10.1007/s11162-004-6226-6

Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S (2000). Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change. *Higher Education, 13.* http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slcehighered/133

Balkundi, P., & Kilduff, M. (2005). The ties that lead: A social network approach to leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly 16*(6), 941-961. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.09.004

Ball, S. (2007). Leadership of academics in research. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 35*(4), 449-477. Doi : 10.1177/1741143207081058

Barker, R. (2001). The nature of leadership. *Human Relations,54* (4), 469–494.

Bartkus, V. O., & Davis, J. H. (2009). Introduction. In V. O. Bartkus, & J. H. Davis, (Eds.), *Social Capital: Reaching out, Reaching In* (pp. 1-14). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar

Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Company

Bexley, E., James, R., & Arkoudis, S. (2011). *The Australian academy in transition*. Commissioned report to the department of education, employment and workplace relations, University of Melbourne, Victoria. Retreived from: http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au

Bolden, R., Petrov, G., and Gosling, J. (2008), Tensions in higher education leadership: Towards a multi-level model of leadership practice. *Higher Education Quarterly, 62(4),* 358-376. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2213.2008.00398.x

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice.* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, CB: Cambridge University Press (Original work published 1972)

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste.* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, CB: Harvard University Press (Original work published 1979)

Bourdieu, P. (1986). "The Forms of Capital". In J. Richardson (Ed.) Handbook of *Theory and research for the sociology of* education (pp. 241-258). New York, NY: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus.* (P. Collier, Trans.). California: Stanford University Press (Original work published 1984)

Bourdieu, P. (1990). The logic of *practice*. (R. Nice, Trans.). California: Stanford University Press (Original work published 1980)

Bourdieu, P. (2005). *The social structures of the economy*. Cambridge, CB2: Polity Press

Boyer E. R. (1990). Scholarship Reconsidered. *Carneige Foundation for the advancement of Teaching.* 14-25

Bryman, A. (2007). *Effective Leadership in Higher Education*. London, England: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education

Burt, R. S. (1997). The Contingent value of social capital. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 42* (2), 339-365.

Burt, R. S. (2005). *Brokerage and closure: An introduction to social capital*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Büte, M. (2011). The effects of nepotism and favoritism on employee behaviors and human resources practices: A research on Turkish public banks. *TODAĐE's Review of Public Administration, 5*(1), 185-208.

Carroll, J. B. (1991). Career paths of department chairs: A national perspective. *Research in Higher Education, 32*, 669-688

Carroll, J. B., & Wolverton, M. (2004). *Who becomes a chair? New directions for chair as academic leader*. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.

Chenail, R. (2011). Interviewing the investigator: Strategies for addressing instrumentation and researcher bias concerns in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 16*(1), 255-262. Retrieved from www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/

Chesters, J., & Smith, J. (2015) Social capital and aspirations for educational attainment: A cross-national comparison of Australia and Germany, *Journal of Youth Studies, 18* (7), 932-949. DOI: 10.1080/13676261.2014.1001831

Chow, W. S., & Chan, L. S. (2008). Social network, social trust and shared goals in organizational knowledge sharing. *Information & Management, 45*, 458–465

Chudzikowski, K., & Mayrhofer, W. (2011). In search of the blue flower? Grand social theories and career research: The case of Bourdieu's theory of practice. *Human Relations, 64*(1), 19–36. DOI: 10.1177/0018726710384291

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(Supplement): S95-S120.

Collinson, M., & Collinson, D. (2006). *Blended leadership: Employee perspectives on effective leadership in the UK further education sector. Lancaster*: Centre for Excellence in Leadership

Connolly, M. (2016). Selecting appropriate research methods for an educational context. In I. Palaiologou, D. Needham, & T. Male (Eds.). *Doing research in education: Theory and practice.* California, LA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th Ed.).

Dickson, D. A., Mitchell, M., Ott, J., Paulus, N., & Wild, L. (2012). Academic leadership (Department head) development: Research and implementation plan. *The Wallace Center at RIT*. 1, 1-23

DiTomaso, N. (2013). *The American non-dilemma: Racial inequality without racism*. New York, NY: Russel Sage Foundation

Erkutlu, H. & Chafra, J. (2013). Effects of trust and psychological contract violation on authentic leadership and organizational deviance. *Management Research Review, 36* (9), 828-848. DOI 10.1108/MRR-06-2012-0136

Eyal, O., & Roth, G. (2011). Principals' leadership and teachers' motivation. *Journal of Educational Administration, 49*(3), 256-275.doi: 10.1108/09578231111129055.

Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research* (4th Ed.). London: Sage Publication Ltd.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2005). From neutral stance to political involvement. In N. K. Denin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (695-728). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication Ltd.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th Ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Company Inc.

Fukuyama, F. (1997). Social capital. *The tanner lectures on human values*. Brasenose College, Oxford

Fusch, P. I., & Ness, L. R. (2015). Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 20* (9), 1408-1416. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol20/iss9/3/

Gmelch, W. H., & Burns, J. S. (1991). *Sources of stress for academic department chairs: A national study.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Boston, MA.

Gmelch, W. H., & Miskin, V. D. (1993). *Leadership skills for department chairs.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Gmelch, W. H., & Miskin, V. D. (2011). *Department chair leadership skills.* Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing

Gmelch, W.H. and Miskin, V.D. (2004). *Chairing an Academic Department*. Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing.

Gonzalez-Brambila, N. (2014). Social capital in academia. *Scientometrics, 101*, 1609- 1625. Doi:10.007/s1192-014-1424-2

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology,78*, 1360-1380.

Grey, C., & Sturdy, A. (2007). Friendship and organizational analysis toward a research agenda. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 16* (2), 157-172. DOI: 10.1177/1056492606295500

Hancock, T.M. (2007). The business of universities and the role of the department Chair. *International Journal of Educational Management, 21*(4), 306- 314.

Marshall, S. J. (2005). Issues in the development of leadership for learning and teaching in higher education. *Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education.* Occasional Paper. Retrieved from: www.olt.gov.au/resource-library?text=marshall

Hangsoek, O., Giuseppe, L. & Myung-ho, C. (2006). A multilevel model of group social capital. *Academy of Management Review. 31* (3), 569-582

Hays, S. (1994). Structure and agency and the sticky problem of culture. *Sociological Theory* 12 (1), 57-72. Doi: 10.2307/202035

Hecht, I.W.D., Higgerson, M.L., Gmelch, W.H. and Tucker, A. (1999). *The Department Chair as Academic Leader*. Phoenix, AZ, American Council on Education/Oryx Press.

Hill, L. A. (2005). Leadership development: A strategic imperative for higher education." *Harvard Business School*, Working Paper, 06-023,

Hitt, M. A., & Ireland, R. D. (2002). The essence of strategic leadership: Managing human and social capital. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(1), 3-14.

House, R.J., & Mitchell, T.R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business. 3*, l–97.

Horta, H. (2013). Deepening our understanding of academic inbreeding effects on research information exchange and scientific output: new insights for academic based research. *Higher Education. 65* (4), 487–510. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9559-7

Horta, H. & Yudkevich, M, (2016). The role of academic inbreeding in developing higher education systems: Challenges and possible solutions. Technological Forecasting & Social Change 113, 363–372. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.06.039

Idowu, E. O. (2016). Criticisms, contraints and constructions of case study research strategy. *Asian Journal of Business Management, 4*(5).

Inanc, O. & Tuncer, O. (2011). The effect of academic inbreeding on scientific effectiveness. *Scientometrics 88* (3), 885–898. Doi: 10.1007/s11192-011-0415-9

Jago, A. G., & Vroom, V. H. (2007). The Role of the Situation in Leadership. *American Psychological Association, 62*(1), 17-24. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.17.

Jensen, S. (2010). The organization of the university. Working Papers 14. *Department of Education, Aarhus University*. Retrieved from: http://edu.au.dk/fileadmin/www.dpu.dk/forskning/forskningsprogrammer/epoke/ workingpapers/WP_14.pdf

Jex, S., & Britt, T. (2008). *Organisational Psychology: A Scientist-Practitioner Approval*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sos, Inc.

Jones, S., Harvey, M., Lefoe, G. & Ryland, K. (2014). Synthesising theory and practice: Distributed leadership in higher education. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership, 42* (5), 603-619.

Kezar, A. (2004). What is more important to effective governance: Relationships, trust, and leadership, or structures and formal processes? *New Direction for Higher Education, 2004*(127), 35–46. DOI: 10.1002/he.154

Kluttz, D., & Fligstein, N. (2016). *Varieties of Field Theory*. In S. Abrutyn (Ed.). Handbook of Contemporary Sociology, Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-32250-6_10

Knight, P.T. and Trowler, P.R. (2001). *Departmental Leadership in Higher Education.* Buckingham, SRHE and Open University Press.

Koput, W. K. (2010). *Social capital: An introduction to managing networks*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing. DOI: 10.1002/hrm.20443

Krackhardt, D., & Hanson, J. R. 1993. Informal networks: The company behind the chart. *Harvard Business Review, 71*(4): 104-111.

Lapan, S. D., Quartaroli, M. T., & Reimer, F. J. (2012). Introduction to Qualitative research. In S. D. Lapan, M. T. Quartaroli, & F. J. Reimer, (Eds.). *Qualitative research: An introduction to methods and designs.* San Franscisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Leana, C. R., & Van Buren, H. J., III. (1999). Organizational social capital and employment practices. *Academy of Management Review, 24*, 538-555.

Leitch, C. M., MacMullan, C. & Harrison, R. T. (2013), the development of entrepreneurial leadership, role of human, social and institutional capital. *British Journal management,24*, 347-366

Levine, S. S., Apfelbaumc, E. P., Bernardd, M., Bartelte, V. L., Zajacf, E. J., & Stark, D. (2014). Ethnic diversity deflates preice bubbles. *Procedings of National Academy of Science, 111* (52), 18524 - 18529.

Li, M. (2013), Social networks and social capital in leadership and management research;A review of causal methods. *The Leadership Quarterly 24* (5), 638-665

Lian, L. K., & Tui, L. G. (2012). Leadership styles and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating effect of subordinates' competence and downward influence tactics. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics, 13*(2), 59-96

Lin, N. (2001). *Social Capital: A theory of social structure and action*. Cambridge, CB: Cambridge University Press

Liu, G. H. W., Wang, E., & Chua, C. E. H. (2014). Leveraging social capital to obtain top management support in complex, cross-functional IT project. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems 16*(8), 707-735.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. O. (2012). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices.* Australia: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning

Marshall, S.J., Adams, M.J., Cameron, A. & Sullivan, G. (2000). Academics' perceptions of their professional development needs related to leadership and management: What can we learn? *The International Journal for Academic Development* 5, 42-53.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching*. (2nd Ed.). London: Sage Publication Ltd.

McCallum, S. & O'Connel, D (2009), Social capital and leadership development, building stronger leadership through enhanced relational skills. *Leadership and organization development journal, 30*(2), 152-166

McLaughlin, G. W., Montgomery, L. R., & Malpass, L. F. (1975). Selected characteristics, roles, goals and satisfactions of department chairmen in state and land-grant institutions. *Research in Higher Education, 3*, 243-259.

McNay, I. (1995). *From the collegial academy to corporate enterprise: The changing cultures of universities*. In T. Schuller (Ed.), The changing university (105-115). Buckingham, MK: The Society of Research in Higher Education, SRHE and Open Press University.

Melville, W., Hardy, I. & Bartley, A. (2011).Bourdieu, department chairs and the reform of science education. *International Journal of Science Education, 33*(16), 2275-2293. Doi: 10.1080/09500693.2010.550334

Mintzberg, H. (1979). The structuring of organizations: A synthesis of the research. New Jersey, Prentice Hall

Morris, A. (2012). Perspectives and thoughts on leadership development in higher education. *e-Journal of Organizational Learning and Leadership, 10* (1), 33-36. Retreived from:

http://www.leadingtoday.org/weleadinlearning/Spring2012/Article%205%20 - %20Morris.pdf

Morris, T. L. & Laipple, J. S. (2015). How prepared are academic administrators? Leadership and job satisfaction within US research universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 37*(2), 241-251. DOI: 10.1080/1360080X.2015.1019125

Nahapiet, J. & Ghosal S. (1998) Social Capital, Intellectual Capital and the organizational advantage. *Academy of management review.* 43(2), 242-266

Naile, I., & Selesho, J. M. (2014). The role of leadership in employee motivation. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 5*(3), 175-182. doi:10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n3p175.

Nappi, J. S. (2014). The teacher leader: Improving schools by building social capital through shared leadership. *The Delta Kappa Gama Bulletin, 80*(4), 29—34

Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Odhiambo, G. (2014). The challenges and future of public higher education in Kenya. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 36(2), 183-195. Doi: 10.1080/1360080x.2014.884676

Oh, H., Labianca, G., & Chung, M (2006). A multilevel model of group social c apital. *Academy of Management Review, 31*(3), 569–582.

Ostrom, E. & Ahn, T. K. (2001). A social science perspective on social capital: Social capital and collective action. Paper presented at the *European Research Conference on "Social Capital: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*," Exeter, United Kingdom, September 15-20, 2001. Retreived from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242569787

Ostrom, E. (2010). What is social capital. In V. O. Bartkus & J. H. Davis (Eds.), *Reaching in reaching out* (17-38). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Ltd

Pepper, C., & Giles, W. (2014). Leading in middle management in higher education. *Management in Education, 29*(2), 46–52. DOI: 10.1177/0892020614529987

Pinto, D. (2013). The evolving role of department chair: leading faculty through times of change. *Computer Science & Information Technology Faculty Publications*. Paper 1. Retrieved from: http://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/computersci_fac/1

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology, 24*, 1-24.

Portes, A. (2014). Downside of social capital. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111*(52). 18407-18408. Doi/10.1073/pnas.1421888112

Putnam, R. D. 1995. Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy, 6*(1), 65-78.

Putnam, R. D. 2000. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Reckwitz, A. (2002).Toward a theory of social practices: A development in culturalist theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5 (2), 243-263. https://doi.org/10.1177/13684310222225432

Riley, T. A., & Russel, C. (2013). Leadership in higher education: Examining professional development needs for department chairs. *Review of Higher Education and Self-Learning, 6*(21), 38-57

Rostila, M. (2011). The facets of social capital. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 41*(3), 308 – 326. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-5914.2010.00454.x

Sart, G. (2014). The new leadership model of university management for innovation and entrepreneurship. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research. 57*, 73-90. http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2014.57.6

Savin-Baden, M. & Major, C. H. (2013). *Qualitative research: The essential guide to theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge

Seagren, A. T., Creswell, J. W., & Wheeler, D. W. (1993). *The department chair: New roles, responsibilities and challenges.* (Report No. EDO-HE-93-1).

Washington,DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED363164)

Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Liden, R. C. (2001). A social capital theory of career success. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *44*(2), 219-237.

Smith, B. L., & Hughey, A. W. (2006). Leadership in higher education-Its evolution and potential: A unique role facing critical challenges. *Industry and Higher Education*, *20* (3), 157-163. Retrieved from: http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/csa_fac_pub/1

Smith, R. (2005). Departmental Leadership and Management in Chartered and Statutory Universities. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership 33*, 449-464.

Somech, A. (2006). The effects of leadership style and team process on performance and innovation in functionally heterogeneous teams. *Journal of Management*, *32*(1),132-157. DOI: 10.1177/0149206305277799

Spendlove, M. (2007). Competencies for effective leadership in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management* 21 (*5*), 407–17. Doi: 10.1108/09513540710760183

Spillane, J. P. (2005). Distributed leadership. *The Education Forum. 69*, 143-150

Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case study. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The sage handbook of qualitative research.* (pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication Ltd.

Strengers, Y. (2010). Conceptualizing everyday practices: Composition, reproduction and change. Working Paper, 6. *Centre for Design, RMIT University and University of South Australia*

Strömgren, M., Eriksson, A., Bergman, D. & Dellve, L. (2016). Social capital among healthcare professionals: A prospective study of its importance for job satisfaction, work engagement and engagement in clinical improvements. *International Journal of Nursing Studies,53*, 116–125.

Thompson, J. B. (1991). Editor's introduction. In P. Bourdieu, *Language and symbolic power*. (pp. 1-31). Cambridge, CB2: Polity Press.

Tonkaboni, F., Yousefy, A., & Keshtiaray, N. (2013). Description and recognition the concept of social capital in higher education system. *International Education Studies, 6* (9), 40-50. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n9p40

Tsai, W., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social Capital and Value Creation: The role of intrafirm networks. *The Academy of Management Journal, 41*(4), 464 - 476. Retrieved from: http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0001-4273%28199808%2941%3A4%3C464%3ASCAVCT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-1

Uhl-Bien, M. (2006), Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social process of leadership and organizing. *Leadership quarterly, 17(6),* 654-676

Uphoff, N. & Krishna, A. (1999). *Mapping and measuring social capital: Conceptual and empirical study of collective action for conserving and developing watersheds in Rajasthan, India*. Washington, DC: World Bank

Vigoda-Gadot, E., Talmud, I., & Peled, A. (2011). Internal Politics in academia: Its nature and mediating effect on the relationship between social capital and work outcomes. *International Journal of Organisation Theory and Behaviour 4*(1), 1-37.

Walther, M. (2014). *Repatriation to France and Germany*. Wiesbaden: Springer

Werkema, J. R. (2009). M*aking sense of roles and responsibilities: A socialization study of college and university music department chairs*. (Doctoral dissertation) Retrieved from ScholarWorks at WMU (paper 680).

Wolverton, M., Ackerman, R. and Holt, S. (2005). Preparing for leadership: What academic department chairs need to know. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 27: 227-238. Doi: 10.1080/13600800500120126

Yamanoi, A. (2005). The academic marketplace in Japan: Inbreeding, grades and organization at research universities. Higher Education Forum 2, 93–114.

Yin, R. K. (2003). Applications of case study research. California, Sage Publications

Yin, R. K. (2006). *Case study methods.* In J. L. Green, G. Camilli, & P. B. Elmore (Eds.), Handbook of complementary methods in education research (111-122). American Educational Research Association.

Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall

Zheng, Q., Wang, M., & Li, Z. (2011). Rethinking ethical leadership, social capital and customer relationship. *Journal of Management Development 30* (7/8), 663-674. Doi: 10.1108/02621711111150182

APPENDICES

A. Personal Data Form

Section One: Personal Data

1. Sex:

    a. Male b. Female

2. What is your current academic rank? _____

3. What is your educational background? _____

    a. Which institution did you study for your

        i. Undergraduate_____
        department_____

        ii. Masters_____
        department_____

        iii. Doctorate _____
        department_____

        iv. Post-doctorate _____
        department_____

4. Which department are you currently affiliated to? _____

5. How long have you been in academia? _____

6. Did you occupy any leadership position before being a department chair?

a. Yes specify _____

b. No

7. For how long have you occupied your current position? _____

a. What was your appointment process?

_____

B. Interview Protocol for Department Chairs

Section One: Higher Education Leadership

1. What is the job description of the department chair according to university policies?
    a. Can you relate to me your understanding of the role of department chair?
        i. In your opinion, what are the specific roles and responsibilities you deem crucial and need prioritizing and why?
2. How would you describe an effective department leader?
    a. Can you describe to me your approach to leading the department? Can you give some specific examples?
3. What kind of problems have you faced as a department chair? Could you relate some examples?
    a. How have you managed to deal with these problems? (Probe: refer to specific examples given by interviewee)

Section Two: Social Capital in Higher Education

4. On a personal level, how beneficial do you think network of relationships are?
5. How important are networks within the university?
6. Which committees are you expected to be part of as a department chair?
    a. Are there other committees or associations you attend as a member? What are they?

Social capital has been described as the social network of relationships a person is connected to. It is also defined as the characteristics of relationships that allow for cooperative work. In view of this:

7. Can you tell me how your relationship with the dean of the faculty is?

8. How would you describe your relationship with department members?

    a. Did becoming a department chair change anything between you and members of the department?

9. Focusing on the department as a whole, can you name any specific features or norms that characterize relationships among faculty members?

Section Three: Social Capital and Leadership

10. How have these characteristics you just mentioned impacted your leadership of the department?

11. In the course of performing your duties as a department chair, which networks or groups of people do you rely on most? In which ways do they help?

    a. What kind of relationship do you have with these persons you just mentioned?

12. In your view, can you tell me how social capital relates to leadership?

13. All things being equal, do you think a faculty without a leadership position differs from you in terms of social capital? In which ways do they differ?

14. Has a lack of social capital ever affected your work as a chair? If yes how?

15. In the early part of our conversation, you mentioned a few of the challenges you faced as a chair, what role you say social capital has played in tackling these challenges?

Usually, there are two lines of argument concerning social capital; some argue that it is important for a person to belong to a denser network where everyone is connected to each other. On the other hand, others argue for a sparser network, where relationship is with key individuals.

16. Could you share with me your perception about which one of the two has been more useful for leadership and how?

C. Participants' Invitation Letter

Dear _____,

My name is Khaula Ahmad Yawson I am a graduate student of the Department of Educational Sciences of the faculty of Education in Middle East Technical University. I am conducting a study as part of the requirements of my degree in Educational Administration and Planning and I would like to invite you to participate. I am studying the perception of department chairs on social capital and the role it plays in higher education leadership.

Should you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to first fill and sign a participant consent form after which you will fill a one-page personal data form which contains questions about your position and personal background. This will take less than 5 minutes to complete.

After this you will meet with me for an interview to discuss your thoughts about leadership, the roles and challenges you have faced and how you dealt with them. In particular, you will be asked about, your perception on what social capital is and whether or not it has played a role during your leadership of the department.

The meeting will take place in your office at an agreed upon time. This will last approximately 45 minutes or an hour. I will be taking note of your responses during the interview. However, in order to accurately grasp what will be discussed, the interview session will be audio recorded to enable me carry out proper analysis. I will later transcribe this recording and send back to you to assess its authenticity. The audio recordings will then be destroyed.

Participation is confidential and optional. The final results may be published but your identity will not be revealed. You may decide not to answer any question you are not comfortable answering. It is my hope that the results of this study will bring to bear the true nature of your work from a new angle, serve as a reference point for prospective department chairs who will wish to learn from your experiences and also contribute to enriching the already existing literature on department leadership.

I will be happy to answer any questions you have about the study. You may contact me through my mobile number (+905399149569) or my email address (khaulay@gmail.com). You may also contact my faculty advisor, (Dr. Duygun Gokturk, dgokturk@metu.edu.tr)

If you would like to participate, please reply to this e-mail and state accordingly. After which I will submit the hard copy of the consent form and personal data sheet to your office. If I do not receive an e-mail, I may call you after a week to find out if you are willing to participate.

Thank you for your consideration.

With kind regards,

Khaula Ahmad Yawson

D. Sample Interview Extracts about Leadership-Related Activities

Leadership-related activity	Extract
Providing a Sense of direction	"I make projections about the department, what field we need more in the department, what kind of people we want to see in the department in terms of faculty, and students." [Savaş]
Developing strategic policies	"When I first served for six years as a department chair, uh I wrote down, you know every problem that occurred that I have to solve. Those were specific problems, those were cases. But deriving from them, I actually extracted principles, so I wrote down list of principles to be followed in solving such kind of problems. So you know those problems one by one do not mean anything but if you follow these principles in solving them, uh it's like a guide and it can help to solve future problems." [Aygül]
Motivating faculty	"On the other hand, you have those young faculty members who are at the very beginning of their careers, and you're also responsible of their professional development. You have to motivate them in terms of, like, hey, you have to submit a paper to this conference, you have to attend a conference, you have to publish, you have to conduct a research, this is another side". [Emre]
Ensuring a harmonious environment conducive to academic work	"I am responsible for the social atmosphere of the department, you know, the interaction between the people. I try to make the department a positive environment."[Cigdem]

Sample Interview Extracts Continued

Leadership-related activity	Extract
Creating a supportive environment for teaching and research	"So good quality teaching and education , what can we do for that? And how can we support our members of staff, our colleagues so that they are motivated for this quality teaching. So what can we do, we are trying to bring new, new facilities, new instruments and tool, technological tools so that the colleagues can use them for their teaching. So this is also another issue which I think it's important, to help them to give good education. " [Derya]
Providing opportunity to participate in decision	"from my perspective, I see it as a coordinator. If you can mobilize, umm, if you can mobilize different people, different ideas, the energy that you have in the department in the right way, then I think things are gonna go pretty well" [Yavuz]
Seeking for opportunities for department members	"You have to find opportunities for your graduates to be hired, and you have to have your department to be known by outsiders to keep your reputation, good reputation so as the last thing I will say the public relations and the relations of the department with other departments and other universities"[Emre]

E. Ethics Committee Approval to Collect Data

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER

ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
ueam@metu.edu.tr
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

Sayı: 28620816 / 198

05 NİSAN 2017

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Yrd. Doç. Dr. Duygun GÖKTÜRK;

Danışmanlığını yaptığınız yüksek lisans öğrencisi Khaula Ahmad Yawson'un ***"The Perception of Department Chairs About Social Capital in Relation to Higher Education Leadership"*** başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay **2017-FEN-012** protokol numarası ile **05.04.2017 – 30.06.2017** tarihleri arasında geçerli olmak üzere verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN
Başkan V

Prof. Dr. Ayhan SOL
Üye

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Gürbüz DEMİR
Üye

Doç. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
Üye

Doç. Dr. Zana ÇITAK
Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Pınar KAYGAN
Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Emre SELÇUK
Üye

F. Turkish Summary/Türkçe Özet

YÜKSEK ÖĞRETIMDE SOSYAL SERMAYE: BÖLUM LİDERLİĞİ VE SOSYAL SERMAYE ARASINDA ETKILEŞIMINI SORUŞTURMASI

Üniversiteler, fakülte ve bölümlerden oluşmakta olup, araştırmalar ve eğitim programlari bu alt birimlerde gerçekleşmektedir. Bu bölümler içinde görev yapan öğretim üyeleri, öğretim, araştırma, müfredat vb. operasyonel faaliyetlerinden kendi hedeflerine dayalı olarak sorumludurlar. Böylece her bölüm kendi "işlevlerini" sürdürmektedir (Jensen, 2010).

Üniversitenin yönetim kademesi idari ve akademik işlerin yürütülmesinden sorumludur. Rektör ve yönetim kurulun üyeleri, fakülteler ve bölümler ile içinde bulundukları ilişkiler ağı aracılığıyla iletişim halindedirler (Jensen, 2010) ve bu yapılanma üzerinden fakülteler ve altında faaliyet gösteren bölümlere yetki verebilmektedirler (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012). Detaylı bir işbölümü ve bu işbölümünde üniversite yönetiminin üst birimlerinin fonksiyonelliği fakülte ve bölümlere bağlı olduğu kadar, bölümlerin fonksiyonelliği de üniversite yönetimi ile doğrudan ilişkilidir.

Bölüm başkanı, çoğu idari başkan gibi, genellikle öğretim üyeleri arasından seçilmekte ve idari görevleri denetlemekle birlikte, öğretim ve araştırmaların görevlerini yerine getirmektedir. Araştırmalar, üniversiteleri başarılı kılan temel faktörün, üniversite bünyesindeki mikro yapılar ile ilişkili olduğunu göstermektedirler ve bölümler ve bmlüm başkanlıkları bu yapılar arasındadır (Knight & Trowel, 2001). Bölüm başkanı, çeşitli alanlar ve etkinlikler aracılığıyla bölümün işlerini etkin bir şekilde yönlendirmekten sorumludur. Bu görevler işe alım süreçlerinin yönetimi, öğretim ve eğitim etkiliklerinin koordinasyonu ile akademik etkinlikler ve öğrenci ve öğretim görevlerin ile ilişkilidir. Ancak, bu süreçlerin manevi zorluklar ve çeşitli güçlükler ile karşılaşılarak öne sürülmektedir (Wolverton Ackerman & Holt, 2005; Hancock, 2007). Beklentiler ile, belirsiz otorite çizgisi ve pozisyona eşlik eden diğer güçlükler bu sürecin parçasıdırlar (Seagren, Creswell & Wheeler, 1993).

İlk olarak, hayal kırıklığı, onların sorumluluklarının ve görevlerinin niteliğine atfedilmiştir. Görev tanımlarında ki belirsizlikten dolayı (Wolverton ve diğerleri, 2005), kendilerini genellikle geniş bir yelpazede ki görev ve rollerle uğraşırmak ile konumlandırmaktadırlar ve bunlardan bazıları ise onların görev tanımında da yer almamaktadır (Hancock, 2007). Görev kapsamları mali yönetim, öğretim üyeleri ve insan kaynakları yönetimi, müfredat ve program konuları, öğrenciler ile ilgili konuların, yanı sıra en üst yönetimden çeşitli politikaların uygulanması ile ilgili çalışmaları da kapsamaktadır (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Hecht Hecht, Higgerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999; Pinto, 2013). Bu tür görevlerin çoğunluğu özellikle bürokratik nitelikleri ile bilinir ve ayrıca önemli miktarda evrak işi gerektirmektedir (Hancock, 2007).

Bunlara ek olarak, bölüm başkanlarının karşılaştığı stresin çoğu genellikle algıladıkları rol çatışması ile ilgilidir. Bölüm başkanlarının görevleri birbiri ile çatışma halinde olanilmektedir çünkü sorumluluklarını üstlendikleri birçok görev bulunmakta ve bu rol ve görevlere gereken zamanı ayırmaya çalışmakta zorluklar ile karşılaşmaktadırlar (Morris, 2012). Ayrıca bölüm başkanları, talepler ve beklentiler doğrultusunda karar vermeleri gerektiğinde rol çatışması ile karşı karşıya kalmaktadırlar (Werkema, 2009). Sahib oldğu güçleri ve sayısız sorumlulukları arasında bir uyuşmazlık olduğu da şikayet edilmektedir (Seagren ve diğerleri, 1993). Ancak, bölüm başkanı olarak yetkilerini tamamlayabilecek diğer güç kaynaklarına (genellikle kişisel) sahip oldukları da iddia edilmektedir (Hecht ve diğerleri, 1999).

Bölüm başkanının karşılaştığı zorlukları düşüncesiyle, resmi liderlik geliştirme programları talep edilmektedir (Seagren diğerleri, 1993; Gmelch & Burns, 1991). Ancak, bu yetersiz liderlik eğitimin konusunda, devamlı şikayetleri bulunmaktadır (Wolverton ve diğerleri, 2005). Bölüm başkanı, genel olarak, öğretim ve araştırma başarısına göre pozisyonu tayın edilir (Morris, 2012), fakat, etkin lider olabilmek için gerekli olan becerileri, iyi bir öğretim üyesi olmaktan tamamen farklıdır (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011). Bölüm başkanlarının karşılaştıkları bu durumlar ve zorluklar onların baş etmekte zorlanmasına yol açmaktadır (Riley & Russel, 2013). Önemli sayıda bölüm başkanı bu liderlik pozisyonunda devam etmeyi tercih

etmemekle beraber, bu pozisyonda çalışmaya devam edenlerde bulunmaktadır (Wolverton ve diğerleri, 2005). Birçoğu, bölüm başkanlarının yaptıklarıyla ilgili araştırmalar yapmış ancak bunları nasıl gerçekleştirdiklerini çok az incelemiş bulunmaktadır (Bryman, 2007; Werkema, 2009).

Araştırmanın Amacı

Bu vaka çalışmasının amacı, bölüm başkanlarının görevlerini nasıl gerçekleştirdiklerini ve sosyal sermayenin bu liderlik rolüyle nasıl ilişkili olduğunu keşfetmek, anlamak ve tanımlamaktır. Bölüm başkanlarının etkili olabilmesi çok önemlidir. Birçok yönden, öğrenciler, merkezi yönetim ve fakülte üzerinde onların etkisi vardır (Ambrose, Houston & Norman, 2005; Astin & Astin, 2000). Karşılaştıkları zorluklar karşısında bölüm başkanlarının etkili olabilmek için yapıcı yollar bulması gerekir. Bu yollardan biri, ilişkilerin kalitesinin sağlanmasına verilen önem olmuştur (Kezar, 2004). Bu nedenle, bu çalışma, bölüm başkanlığını görevini üstlenen öğretim üyelerinin kurduğu ilişkilerin içeriğini ve yapısını analiz etmeye amaçlamaktadır. Sosyal sermaye kavramı bu ilişkilerin anlamlandırılması ve bölüm başkanlığı rolünün dinamiklerini çözümlemek için önemlidir (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2005).

Araştırma soruları

Bu çalışma için temel araştırma sorusu:

1. Bölüm başkanları, liderlik pratiklerinde sosyal sermayeyi nasıl algılamaktadır?

Diğer araştırma soruları ise şunlardır:

2. Bölüm başkanları rollerini nasıl tanımlamaktadırlar?
3. Bölüm başkanları liderlik yaklaşımlarını nasıl tanımlamaktadırlar?
4. Bölüm başkanlarının karşılaştıkları zorluklar ve ve onlarla mücadele etmek için kullandıkları stratejiler nelerdir?

Teorik çerçeve: uygulama teorisi (practice theory)

Bu çalışma, bölüm başkanlarının görevlerini nasıl yerine getirdiklerini anlamak için pratik teoriyi majör kuramsal çerçeve olarak benimser. Bourdieu (1977) 'nun pratik teorisi, bir bireyin yalnızca kendi iradesine sahip olmakla

kalmayıp, objektif bir yapının yönlendirici çerçevesinde hareket ettiğini ileri sürmektedir. Bir alanın bir parçası olarak, bir birey, bilinçsiz olarak kendiliğinden düşünce ve eylemleri üreten kazanılmış bir üretken düzen sistemi olarak tanımlanan bir "habitus" u benimser. 'Habitus' alanla etkileşime girdiğinde, nesnel sistemin altını çizen bir uygulama haline gelir.

Bourdieu (1986), sermayenin farklı biçimleri olan, oyuncuların alana duydukları ilgiyi arttırmak için kullandığı ekonomik, kültürel ve sosyal sermayeleri tanımlar. Ekonomik sermaye bir kişinin sahip olduğu parasal varlıklarla, kültürel sermaye eğitim nitelikleridir ve sosyal sermaye, kişilerin yararlandığı ilişkilerin ağı ile ilgilidir. Bir alanı sembolik olan bir sermayenin sahibi, onun stratejik konumlandırılmasını teşvik eder.

Sosyal sermayeyi kavramı Bu teorik çerçevede, bu çalışma, sosyal sermaye kavramına odaklanmaktadır. Sosyal sermaye, "bir şahsın veya bir sosyal birimin sahip olduğu ilişkiler ağı içinde bulunan ve bunlardan edinilen gerçek ve potansiyel kaynakların toplamı" olarak tanımlanır (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998, p. 243). Sosyal sermaye üç boyuta ayrılmıştır; ilişkisel, yapısal ve bilişsel. Yapısal boyut ağların yapısını açıklar ve bu, toplumsal sermayeye erişme fırsatı yaratır. İlişkisel boyut, insanların sahip olduğu ilişkilerle ilgili olup, bu da sosyal sermayeyi paylaşma motivasyonunu sağlar. Bilişsel boyut, bireyler arasında anlayışı güçlendiren ilişkiler üzerine olan şeyleri tanımlar (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998).

Sosyal sermaye ile ilgili tartışmalar iki şekilde kategorize edilir: a) Birincisi, sosyal sermayenin bir grubun bir özelliği olduğu söylenir ve bu nedenle kapalı ağların daha iyi bir sosyal sermayeyi teşvik edeceği önerilir; b) ikincisi, sosyal sermaye bireysel bir özellik olarak görülür; dolayısıyla faydayı maksimize etmek için bir kişinin seyrek şebekeleri olması gerektiği savunulmaktadır. Kavramı bölüm başkanlarına uygulamak, onların kimlerle ilişki içinde olduğunu belirlemeye ve anlamlandırmaya yardımcı olur; başkanın, içsel ilişkilenmeleri (bir gruba üye olarak) ve bölüm dışında gerçekleşen ilişkilenmelerinin doğası ve sosyal sermayenin zorlukları barındıran konumu için nasıl bir rol oynadığını gösterir. Bu çalışma

bölüm başkanlarının görevlerini nasıl etkili bir şekilde yerine getireceğinin analizini sosyal sermaye kavramı aracılığı ile gerçekleştirmeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Sosyal sermayenin değerlendirilmesi. Sosyal sermayenin, bilgi paylaşımını kolaylaştırdığı söylenir (Burt, 2005; Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1995; Lin, 2001; Oh ve diğerleri, 2006; Seibert, Kraimer & Liden, 2001), işbirliği ve dayanışmayı teşvik etmektedir (Nahapiet ve Ghoshal, 1998 , Gonzalez-Brambila, 2014; Ostrom & Ahn, 2001) ve etki oluşumunu ve güce erişimi sağlar (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Bourdieu, 1986; Lin, 2001). Örneğin, Liu, Wang & Chua (2015), bilgi teknolojisi projesi ekibi üyelerinin, stratejik karar alıcılarla önceki etkileşimlerinin sonucunda kendi gruplarının olumlu bir izlenim yaratmalarını sağladığını keşfetti. Bu terkrarlanan etkileşimleri nedenle, yöneticilerle güçlü yapısal, bilişsel ve ilişkisel bağlantılar sağlandılar. Bu da, üst yönetim ve grupların arasındaki güveni geliştirdi ve işbirliği yapma sorumluğu sağlandı.

Sosyal sermaye bu katkılarına rağmen, özellikle iltimasın teşvikinde oynadığı rol nedeniyle eleştirilmektedir. Portes (1998), sosyal sermayenin fırsatları mümkün kıldığı halde, kaynaklara ve fırsatlara erişim açısından sosyal bir alanda eşitsizlikler yaratmanın temelini oluşturabileceğini belirtmektedir. Bu aynı zamanda 'fırsat saklama' olarak adlandırılmıştır (DiTomaso, 2013). Bazılar, tercihçılık ya da kayırmacılık fırsatlara faydalanabılır iken, şebeke dışındaki kişilerin erişilmesini de sağlar. Sosyal sermayeye ilişkin bir diğer eleştiri, belirli bir sermaye türüne sahip kişilerin diğerlerinden daha fazla sosyal sermayeye sahip olma kolaylığı ile ilgilidir. Bourdieu'ya (1986) göre, her sermaye biçimi; sosyal, kültürel ve ekonomik olarak birbirleri için "ticaret" yapılabilir. Bu nedenle, kültürel sermayesi yüksek olan bir kişi, sosyal sermayeye kolay erişebilir ya da önemli miktarda ekonomik sermayeye sahip olması nedeniyle sosyal sermaye kazanabilir.

Bu bölümde sosyal sermaye kavramınının ana hatlarını tanımşanmıştır. Aşağıda ki bölümde ise yüksek öğretim kurumlarının organizasyonu incelenecektir.

Yüksek Öğretim Kurumlarının Örgütsel Yapısı

Yüksek öğretim kurumlarının organizasyon yapısını anlamak, bölüm başkanlarının çalışmalarının bağlam içinde anlaşılmasını sağlar. Bu çalışma

Minztberg (1979) 'in ‘yapısal yapılandırmasını’ üniversitenin kurumsal yapısında yer alan farklı bölümlerini tanımlamak için kullanmıştır. Minzberg’e (1979) göre bir organizasyonun yapısı beş kısımdan oluşmaktadır: a) Üniversitelerin merkezi idaresi olan 'stratejik tepe noktası'; b) Dekanlar, müdürler ve bölüm başkanlarından oluşan 'orta çizgi'; c) 'İşletim çekirdeği' bölümü ise çalışmaları doğrudan örgütün amaçlarıyla ilişkili olandır. Aynı zamanda bu kişiler bölüm başkanının çalışma alanında yer alan akademik personeldir; d) Merkezi idareye özel yardım sağlayan 'teknolojik yapı', mesela, muhasebecileri de içeriyor, ve e) Akademik işle dolaylı olarak ilişkili olan diğer mesleklerden sorumlu olan 'destek personeli', örneğin taşıma ve temizlik bölümleri olarak ifade edebiliriz

Mintzberg'e göre, üniversite profesyonel bir bürokrasidir, çünkü merkezi yapı bürokratik bir sistem tarafından idare edilmesine rağmen, akademik personel çalışmalarını bazı özerklik alanları sağlayarak ve profesyonel işleyen hiyerarşik bir sistemle yerine getirirler. MacNay (1995) ayrıca bir üniversitenin kültürünün üniversitenin yönetimini de etkileyebileceğini önermiştir. McNay'a (1995) göre, her kurum bu sistemlerden herhangi birinin bir karışımından oluşmaktadır ancak karışımın derecesi gelenekler, dış baskı ve liderlik gibi unsurlar tarafından belirlenir.

Örgütlerde Sosyal Sermaye

Sosyal sermayenin, özellikle beşeri sermayelerini yönetmeleri açısından yöneticilere ve liderlere (Hitt & Ireland, 2002) rekabet avantajı sağlamada faydalı olduğu belirtilmektedir (Burt, 2005). Sosyal sermaye, aynı zamanda yüksek öğretim kurumunda incelenmiştir, akademik araştırma çalışmaları ve iç politika ile ilişkili olarak (Gonzalez-Brambila, 2014; Vigoda-Gadot, Talmud & Peled, 2011) sosyal sermayenin algılanışı iş tatmini sağladığı ve işbirliğine dayalı araştırmalar yoluyla yeni bilgi üretimlerinin ortaya çıkmasında aktif rol üstlendiğine dair çalışmalar yer almaktadır. Sosyal sermayenin belirtilen alanlardaki üstlendiği aktif role istinaden bu çalışmada sosyal sermayenin bölüm başkanlarının faaliyetlerinde nasıl ortaya çıktığının tesbitini yapmak ve sosyal sermayenin yöneticilik pratikleri açısından öneminin ve anlamının incelemesi hedeflenmektedir.

Araştırma tasarımı

Çalışma, tek bir vaka üzerinden niteliksel araştırma yaklaşımlarına başvurularak vaka çalışması olarak dizayn edilmiştir. Nitel araştırma, insanları etkileyen şeylere atfedilen anlamları anlamak, keşfetmek ve sosyal ilişkileri incelemek (Flick, 2009) için faydalı bir araştırma tasarımlarıdır (Densin &Lincoln, 2011). Vaka çalışması, bir grup insan hakkında ayrıntılı bilgi vermek ve tümün parçaları arasındaki ilişkiyi tanımlamak için bir yöntem olarak özellikle yararlıdır (Yin, 2006; Idowu, 2016; Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). Türkiye'nin nitelikli bir kamu üniversitesi bu araştırmanın evrenidir. Bölüm başkanları katılımcılar olarak yer almaıştır araştırma süresince ve katılımcıların belirlenmelerinde amaçlı örneklem belirleme (Creswell, 2014; Yin, 2006) yoluna başvurulmuştur. Katılımcıların araştırma sürecina daveti elektronik posta ve telefon görüşmeleri ile gerçekleşmiştir. Araştırma süresince dokuz öğretim üyesi ile görüşme gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Araştırmada yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme formları (Denzin & Lincolm, 2011; Mason, 2002; Stake, 2005), temel veri toplama aracı olarak kullanılmıştır. Buna ek olarak, üniversite web sayfasından ve Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu'dan YÖK) çeşitli belgelere erişim konusunda faydalanılmıştır. Araştırmacı, elde edilen verileri analiz etmek için betimleyici ve yorumlayıcı yaklaşımları kullanmıştır.

Bu çalışma bazı kısıtlılıklar da barındırmaktadır. İlk olarak nitel bir tasarım ve yorumlayıcı yaklaşım kullanarak, araştırmacının analizi, bazı kişisel deneyimler ve geçmiş bilgilerden etkilenmiş olabilir (Chenail, 2011; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Flick (2009) araştırmacının yansımalarının ve izlenimlerinin araştırmanın bir parçası olduğunu savunmuş olmasına rağmen, yorumlayıcı bir yaklaşımın kullanılmasının bir başka kısıtlılığı, araştırmacı öznelliğe yönelik eğilimdir (Idowu, 2016; Mason, 2002). Bir diğer kısıtlama ise vaka çalışması olması ile de ilişkili olarak, çalışma sonuçlarının genelleştirilebilir olma potansiyelini sınırlayan az sayıda katılımcının araştırmada yer almasıdır (Idowu, 2016; Creswell, 2014).

Sonuçlar ve Tartışmalar

Analiz sonuçları, altı ana tema altındaki alt temalarını üretti. Temalar aşağıda tartışılmaktadır.

Bölüm başkanlarının rolü ile ilgili perspektifler. Çalışmanın katılımcıları pozisyonlarının içeriğine dair üzerine çeşitli perspektifler sunmuşlardır. İlk olarak, bölüm başkanları diğerleriyle eşit olduklarını ve bu yüzden de onlardan üstün olmadıklarını vurguladı. Bunun yerine, onların rolü, gerekli etkinliklerin ve rutinin, öğretim ve araştırmaya elverişli bir ortam sağlayacak şekilde yürütülmesini sağlamaktı. Bu nedenle, bölüm başkanları kendilerini yönetici, düzenleyici ve koordinatör olarak tanımlamışlardır.. Buna ek olarak, bölüm başkanları, yön verme ve stratejik vizyon inşa etmeyi yönlendirmek, genç fakülteyi motive etmek ve uyumlu bir çevre sağlamak için farklı fikirleri bir araya getirmek gibi önemli liderlik faaliyetleriyle meşgullerdi. Ayrıca, özellikle araştırma alanında aktif akademik yaşamı sürdürmek için çaba gösterirler, ancak bu zaman dilimi önemli ölçüde azaltılmıştır. Bölüm başkanları hakkındaki önceki çalışmalar bu bulguları doğrulamaktadır (Bryman, 2007; Gmelch and Miskin, 2011; Riley & Russels, 2013; Wolverton ve diğerleri, 2005).

Bölüm başkanları, bölüm liderliği için bir universiterli özgü yaklaşımı belirledi. Bölüm başkanları, sosyal, şeffaf ve dürüstlük özelliklerinin etkili bir liderin özellikleri olarak tanımladı. Yönetim sürecinin işletilmesinde katılımcılar genellikle diğer bölüm üyelerinin görüşlerini aldıklarını ve idari ve liderlik görevlerine yönlendirmeye çalıştıklarını belirttiler. Bu nedenle tüm bu süreçlerin işletildiği fakülte toplantıları çok önemlidir. Bölüm başkanları meslektaşlarının özerkliğine öncelik vermeye ve, gerekli kurallara uymalarını sağlamaya çalışırlar. Ayrıca bu alandaki araştırmalar, etkili bölüm başkanlarının öğretim üyelerine destekleyici çevre sağlayanlar ve akademik özgürlüğe öncelik veren kişiler olarak tanımlamaktadır (Ambrose ve diğerleri, 2005; Bryman, 2007).

Bölüm içindeki kurulan ilişkiler, hem sosyal sermayenin kaynağı hemde zorlulukların kaynağıydı. İdari görevleri süresince bölüm başkanlarının çoğu bölüm başkan yardımcılarına ve idari personel olmak üzere bölüm içindeki ve dışındaki ilişkiler üzerinden yöneticilik faaliyetlerini yürütmektedirler. BU ilişkiler

ağında yer alan bu kişiler arkadaş olarak konumlanmaktadırlar ve nitelikli bir idari, entelektüel ve psikolojik destek kaynağı olmaktadırlar. Güven, karşılıklı saygı, esneklik ve paylaşılan değerler bu tür ilişkilerin olumlu (ya da kullanışlı) özellikleridir. Paylaşılan değerler, süreçlerin nasıl ilerlemesi gerektiği konusunda ortak bir anlayışın geliştirilmesinde yardımcı olmaktadırlar. İşyerinin çok yaygın bir dostluk kaynağı olduğu kaydedildi (Grey & Sturdy, 2007). Krackardt ve Hanson (1993) bu tür kayıt dışı ağları "toplu düşünce süreçlerini, eylemlerini ve tepkilerini yönlendiren merkezi sinir sistemi" olarak tanımlamaktadırlar (p. 1) ve karşılıklı destek ağları olarak konumlanmakadırlar aynı zamanda. Tsai ve Ghoshal (1998) benzer perspektiflere sahip oldukları için örgüt üyelerinin yanlış anlamalardan kaçınabildiklerini tesbit etmişlerdir.

Bölüm dışındaki sosyal ağlar, bölüm başkanlarının çalışmalarına faydalıydı. Bölüm başkanları, çalışmalarını verimli ve etkili bir şekilde gerçekleştirmek için iletişim ağlarını kullanmaktadırlar. Bu ağlar, bilgi ve yardıma hızlı erişim ve bölümün ihtiyaçlarını iletmek için çeşitli avantajlar sağlamaktadırlar. Üniversite dışındaki diğer ağlar da bölüm başkanlarının çalışmalarını teşvik etmektedir. Lin (2001), üniversitenin idari yapısındaki hiyerarşik ağlarda yer alan kaynaklara sosyal sermayenin kullanımı yoluyla kolayca erişilebileceğini belirtmektedir. Bu açıklama bu sonucu desteklemektedir.

Kıdemlilik, bölüm içindeki etkileşimleri ve algıları yönlendiriyor gibi görünüyor. Analiz aynı zamanda, tam profesörlüğe ve yaşa göre akademik sıralamaya tekabül eden kıdemin, bu üniversitede etkileşimlere ve sosyal sermayeye erişime rehberlik ettiğini ortaya koydu. Bourdieu (1988) 'ya göre, üniversite ve bölümler, bir kişinin pozisyonunun (resmi pozisyon olması gerekmez) o kişinin elde ettiği sembolik sermayeyle belirlendiği mücadelelerin sosyal alanlarıdır. Üniversitelerde, sembolik sermaye öncelikle akademik nitelikler, yayınlar ve akademik rütbe gibi bilimsel sermaye biçimindeki kültür sermayesidir (Bourdieu, 1988). Buna ek olarak, Bourdieu (1986) ayrıca bir sermayenin başka bir sermaye biçimine erişmek için kullanılabileceğini iddia etmektedir. Carroll ve Wolverton

(2004) akademik kadronun etkisi göz önüne alındığında, tam profesör olmadan bir bölüm başkanı olmanın otorite problemi oluşturabileceğini de belirtmektedir

Bölüm başkanının rolü, sosyal sermayenin kullanılmasını gerektirir. Bölüm başkanları, rollerinin doğası gereği birçok insanla etkileşime girmelerini gerektirdiğini belirtmektedirler. Liderlik konumları olmayan diğer akademisyenlerden farklı olarak, sadece herkes ile değil, doğru yerdeki doğru kişilerle temas kurmanın bir yolunu bulmak zorundalar. Ancak, sosyal sermayenin kullanımında riskler bulunmaktadır. Bazı katılımcıların yanıtları, sosyal paylaşımdan kaynaklanan 'iyilikçiliğin' potansiyelini işaret ediyordu. Örneğin, bir katılımcı, başkanlığa gelmeden önce çok sayıda sosyal paylaşım ağını biriktirmişti ve bu onun ilk günlerinde büyük endişe kaynağıydı çünkü insanlar ondan iyilik talep etmektedirler. Portes (2014), sosyal sermayenin iltimas üretme potansiyeline dikkat çekmektedir.

Sonuç

Bu çalışmanın sonuçları, üstlenilen idari kadronun başvurulacak sosyal sermaye türleri ve formlarını belirlediğini ortaya koymaktadır. Adler ve Kwon (2002), bu bölünmeyi sosyal sermayenin görev şartları olarak adlandırdı. Tüm bölüm üyelerinin işbirliği yapması gereken temel görevler için 'bağlayıcı sosyal' sermaye kullanılmıştır. Öte yandan, sahip olmadıkları kaynakları (bilgi, uzmanlık, iktidar) gerektiren görevler, 'köprü kuran' sosyal sermayenin kullanılmasını gerektirdi. Bu çalışma, sosyal sermayeyle ilgili iki önemli itiraz argümanını, yani kapatmanın mı yoksa yapısal boşluklara köprü olmanın mı daha yararlı olduğunu gösteren kanıt sağlamıştır. Her ikisinin de farklı rolleri vardır ve kendi bağlamlarında faydalıdırlar.

Ayrıca, çalışma bölüm başkanları, nasıl davranması gerektiği konusunda paylaşılan perspektifler ve değerler vasıtasıyla meslektaşları ve diğer üniversite üyelerine güvenebildiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Bu, Coleman'ın (1988) öne sürdüğü toplumsal sermayenin kamusal üstünlüğünün esasını ele alıyor; böylelikle, uygun oyun yollarının anlaşılması, bu grubun üyeleri tarafından kişisel veya grup

gündemlerini desteklemek için bir kaynak olarak kullanılmaya başlanabiliyor. Bu çalışmanın sonuçlarına dayanarak, iki sonuca ulaşılmıştır.

İlki, gerçek ilişkiler, özellikle çoklu etkileşim gerektiren bölüm başkanı için önemlidir; otoriteye sahip biri olarak algılanmaz; etkinliği bir çok paydaşın işbirliğine dayanan ve başarısı üniversitenin başarısına dönüşür. Bölüm başkanları, çalışmalarını daha etkili ve verimli bir şekilde yerine getirebilmek için sosyal sermayelerini oluşturmalıdır. Bu, iç siyasetle ilgili akademisyenlerin algılarını inceleyen Vigoda-Gadot ve diğerleri (2011) bulgularıyla uyumludur. Çalışma sonuçlarını iyileştirmek isteyen personelin ve yöneticilerin sosyal sermayeyi, sosyal becerileri ve sosyal kapasiteleri artırmak için dikkat ve daha fazla kaynak sağlamaları gerektiği sonucuna varmışlardır.

Yine de, açıklığa kavuşturulmalıdır ki, profesyonellik, gayriresmi etkileşimler ve ilişkilerle değiştirilecek bir yapı değil ancak bunlarla etkileşim halinde bir yapıdır. Nitekim, sonuçlar taraf tutmayı, iltimas politikalarını teşvik etmek için bu tür sermayenin olası bir kullanımını gösterdi. Keyza (2004) ayrıca, üniversite yönetiminde etkinlik için, resmi yapılar içerisinde liderlik, ilişkiler ve güven ihtiyacına vurgu yapmıştır. Güven bir risktir, ancak her riske rağmen büyük bir geri dönüş söz konusudur.

İkinci sonuç, bu üniversitenin bölüm başkanlıklarının liderlik uygulamalarının yalnızca kendi kurumları değil, aynı zamanda üniversitenin yapısı, kültürü ve ilkeleri ile örgütsel ve edinsel habitus yoluyla şekillendirilmesidir. Bu habitus, hareketlerini yönlendiren (ve dikte etmeyen) çerçeveler olarak hizmet eder. Bu, bölüm başkanlarının eylemlerinin toplumsal yapı tarafından tanımlandığı şekliyle belirli formları almaya yatkın olduğu anlamına gelir. Bu sonuç da çalışmalar tarafından desteklenmektedir (Ball, 2007; Bolden ve diğerleri, 2008). Ayrıca, benzeri bir habitusun, bu üniversitenin bölüm başkanlarına, kendi departmanlarına hizmet etmek için uygun olan ek bir sosyal sermaye kaynağı sunduğu görülmektedir.

Arastirmanin Etkileri ve Oneriler

Bu çalışmanın amacı, bölüm başkanlarının sosyal sermaye formu ile ilgili görüşlerini liderlik uygulamaları ile ilişkilendirerek araştırarak bölüm liderliğine dair pratiklerini tanımlamak ve incelemeyi hedeflemiştir. Elde edilen sonuçlar, mevcut bölüm başkanları ve yeni bölüm başkanları için, yüksek yönetim sisteminin yapısı ve işleyişi bağlamında öneriler sunmaktadır.

Yeni ve mevcut bölüm başkanları için: Sonuçlar, bölüm içindeki ilişkilerin sosyal sermayenin birincil kaynağı olduğunu gösterdi. Mevcut başkanlar, ilişki kurma, karşılıklı güven, saygı ve paylaşma sorumlulukları için elverişli bir ortam yaratmaya çalışmalıdır. En önemlisi, mevcut başkanlar adil olmaya ve birkaçı lehine bir araç olarak gayri resmi ilişkilere dayalı olmamaya çalışmalıdır. Aslında bu, güvensizliği ve direnci ve dolayısıyla takımın oluşturulamamasını destekler.

Merkezi idare için: Özellikle idari süreçlere önceden maruz kalmayan yeni başkanlar, fiziksel ve psikolojik stresle yüz yüze gelebilir. Ayrıntılı bir iş tanımının hazırlanması, tartışılması ve uygulanması önerilmektedir Buna ek olarak, tıpkı bu üniversitedeki öğretim üyelerinin danışmanlığı gibi, yeni bölüm başkanları için de bir eğitim ve rehberlik programı oluşturulabilir.

Gelecekteki araştırmalar için: Bu çalışma, büyük bir devlet üniversitesinin gerçekleştirilen bir vaka çalışması olması nedeniyle, sonuçlar bu üniversitenin bünyesindeki diğer bölümler ile karşılaştırılabilir niteliktedir. Boyut (büyük ve küçük), mülkiyet (kamu ve özel) gibi kriterlere dayanan diğer üniversiteleri içerebilecek çoklu vaka incelemeleri yapılabilir. Buna ek olarak, tam profesörlük akademik statüsünde yer almayan bölüm başkanlarının da karşılaştıkları zorlukları kapsayacak bir çalışma da gerçekleştirilebilir.

G. Tez Fotokopisi İzin Formu

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ■

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı: Yawson
Adı : Khaula Ahmad
Bölümü: Educational Sciences

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce): Social capital in institutions of higher education: an examination of the relationship between social capital and department leadership

TEZİN TÜRÜ: Yüksek Lisans ■ Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ■
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ■
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ■

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: