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ABSTRACT
This study focuses on the concept of leadership. It aims to explain the relationship between language and leadership. In this theoretical essay, firstly, the concept of leadership is discussed and then the relationship between semiotics, language, and discourse is described. Taking the obtained theoretical frame as a base, the function of language as a sign of leadership is studied within the frame of leadership approaches. The relationship stated in the study provides a theoretical route map for the academicians conducting empirical studies in this field, and this is the reason why this study is authentic and unique. With the effects of globalization rapidly increasing, the considerations of leadership have also changed, and new leadership typologies have emerged to supply the needs of the information age. Both at home and abroad, language skills and good command of language provide a global and competitive advantage for leaders, and this increases the significance of acquiring the skills mentioned.

INTRODUCTION
Leadership is a notion which has been widely the focus of study so far today. However, with the change of the state of affairs in society, the definition stage of the concept in question has also undergone some changes. Whereas leadership was considered as governing a state in the past, today it is also assigned with micro level meanings. These meanings and perspectives have revealed different definitions and types. This study concentrates on the influence of language on the reception of leadership rather than its definition. The aim of the study is to form a theoretical frame for leadership and to define the function of language within this frame. For this reason, the concept of leadership, its historical development and types were explained. In the following part, semiotics,
language and discourse were tried to be related and in the conclusion part, language and leadership were tried to be related on a theoretical basis.

THE CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP, ITS HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND TYPES

The first part of the study was allocated to the definition of the leadership term as a concept and the review of its typologies. The definition and the review will be used to form a reference frame for the analysis which will be made within the wholeness of the study. Within this respect, in the first subpart the concept of leadership and in the second subpart leadership typologies will be discussed.

Leadership and its Historical Development

Leadership is one of the mutual studies of various social sciences. Over 5000 studies have been conducted and more than 350 definitions have been produced so far (Tabak, Yalçınkaya and Erküş, 2006). On the other hand, there is not a complete agreement among social scientists on what leadership means. Leadership is a notion which could be defined in various ways when considered from different points of view (Şişman, 2004: 1).

Since Socrates, researchers have continuously studied and speculated on the concept of leadership and they have come up with several micro level definitions since the 20th century. In that period, on the contrary to the historical view which considers leadership equal to governing a state, scientific studies in the field of leadership have increased and the term acquired a group dimension. In the period between 1900-1950, the notion of Classical Ruling prevailed and the main leadership philosophy of the period comprised the centralization of power and control (Eren, 2010; Tabak, Yalçınkaya and Erküş, 2006).

Mumford, one of the researchers of the period, defines leadership as one member taking over the group during the period of controlling the social movements. In this regard, he is featuring some power of a leader which is the result of his natural born features and also the attributed hierarchical power he was given by the group. Bogardus, who describes the concept as a process in which some individuals dominate the others during the events and cognitive communication within the group; and Kilbourne, who describes it as asserting the fact that one has most of the characteristics which are fully admired, thus, emphasize the sociopsychological aspect of the concept. Later in 1940s, the group approach seems to prevail. In that period, Whyte describes the concept as an affection process that avoids the relationship between power and benefit whereas Knickerbocker proposes a more functional relationship between the group members and the person who keeps under control all the instruments that will supply all their needs (Erarslan, 2004; Tabak, Yalçınkaya and Erküş, 2006). In 1950-1970, researchers inclined towards behaviorism and defined leadership within that frame. The main characteristic of that approach is the mutual opinion that a leader is determined by his attitude throughout the process rather than his natural born features. In 1950s, Stogdill, one of the researchers of the period, tries to define the concept as influencing the group to set and achieve a goal, while Koontz and O’Donnell try to define it as a process of influencing people to achieve a mutual goal. As for 1960s, the presence of goals drew the attention of researchers. In that period, leadership is defined as influencing people towards mutual goals. Fiedler emphasizes the fact that leaders affect the group performance both by their verbal and non-verbal behaviors and Terry indicates that leadership is an act of influencing people to realize the goals of the group voluntarily. Janda, on the other hand, defines the concept as a perception of having the right to rule the other within a group of two, a behavior which stems from a power relationship. According to Tannenbaum