How Management Styles Predicts School Culture: A regression analysis study*

Mustafa ERDEM[1]

Kırşehir Ahi Evran University

Cem AKIN[2]

Kırşehir Ahi Evran University

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to determine the relationship between management styles and organizational culture in elementary schools. Relational survey model as a quantitative research methodology was employed in the study. The research population consists of 6058 school teachers working in public schools in Şahinbey and Şehitkâmil districts of Gaziantep in the academic year 2018-2019. The sample consists of 388 teachers determined by cluster sampling. The "Perceived Manager Management Style Scale" was used to measure management style, and the "Organizational Culture Scale" was used to measure organizational culture. As a result, it is found that school principals exhibit a collaborative management style and managers do not have authoritarian, resistant and indifferent management styles. Although supportive culture and success culture in schools were determined as dominant cultures, role and power culture was also in moderate levels. The views of male and female teachers about the sub-dimensions of administration style and organizational culture did not show significant difference yet, there are significant low and medium level relationships between management style sub-dimensions and organizational culture. Management style sub-dimensions are a significant predictor of organizational culture. Authoritarian management style had the highest correlation with power culture. Except for resistant management style, a significant relationship was found between management styles and success culture. Collaborative management style had the highest relationship with the culture of success. Collaborative management style had the highest relationship for management styles and support culture. One unit of change in the collaborativemanagement style predicted.51 units of change in the support culture.

Keywords: Management styles, Organizational culture, Predictive level.

Introduction

With many different definitions in the literature, management is generally represented as the process of guiding human and financial resources in a productive way in line with an aim. Management is a case as old as the history of humanity and the differentiation of leaders and managing people can be traced from early periods to the present day. Stages of social life based on forms of production like the transition to settled life, agricultural societies, industrial societies, and scientific and technological developments have ensured the development of management as an academic discipline and led to great changes in the theoretical basis of the organization concept.

Variables like organizational structure, areas of activity, features of employees, and forms of understanding of managers emerge in different management practices and are called 'management style'. Different management styles form a topic of academic studies from this aspect. Organizational culture may be defined as all the values and norms shared by members of an organization. Managers may change the traditions, rules and values of the organization they manage with the managerial behavior they display. In this sense, the management styles displayed by managers can be said to affect the culture of the organization.

Management

Generally, a scientific branch investigating the managerial operations and activities in all types of operations and organizations, management has shown large advances in a theoretical sense since the beginning of the 20th century. Management, with aims like ensuring high productivity and maximizing profits while achieving organizational targets, may be qualified as a young discipline within the social sciences.

Management was defined in different ways by several domestic and international authors. Organizations comprise people coming together to achieve a common aim. Managers are people who organize employees and motivate them in line with organizational aims. In this context, management is a group activity involving people coming together to achieve organizational targets (Eren, 1993). According to another definition, management is the activity of coordinating resources through management processes such as planning, organizing, directing and controlling in order to achieve the organizational aims (Ergun &Polatoglu, 1992). When the common points of these definitions are investigated, factors like unity of purpose, human relationships and management processes emerge.

The first views about management extend back to ancient Egyptian and Babylonian civilizations. A variety of thoughts about state management especially were shared and discussed in ancient China, Greece, and Rome, and in the Seljuk and Ottoman periods. The economic, social and political developments in the industrial revolution experienced in the 18th century prepared the way

for the emergence of new management understandings (Ozer,Akcakaya, Yayli&Batmaz, 2015). After the civil war in the United States, there was a need for development of the public sector and reforms proposed by USA President Wilson with the aim of developing the federal administration were applied to local administrations over time and ensured the development of management as a scientific branch (Tortop, İsbir&Aykac, 1993).

Three basic factors played important roles in the development of management as a scientific branch. These factors are the industrial revolution, world wars and developments in the scientific and technological fields. Social transformations brought by the industrial revolution caused large changes to the qualities of the operation concept and discussions about productivity, motivation and participatory management led to the emergence of ideas and paradigms strengthening management science. The second factor of world wars ensured the application of new methods and techniques in working life. Finally scientific and technological developmentsadvanced management science through many inventions and innovations (İpek, 2016).

Management Style

The basic duty of a manager is to achieve the aims of the organization they manage. The main topic of management is what the manager must do and what path they should follow to achieve the organizational aims (Ozgur, 2011). In this context, management style is a concept affected by many elements like personal traits, world view, organizational structure and qualities of the work, which also affect the decisions of the manager.

Management style affects the behavior of employees. The management style of a manager is a function involving many components like behavior, personality and experience. Management style is also important in terms of being able to cope with problems in working life (Barutcugil, 2002). The broad concept of management style encompasses management processes like organization, planning, staffing and control (Wu, Chiang & Jiang, 2002).

The literature states that there is no single and universal management style that can be applied in organizations, and that there are different management styles which vary according to diverse factors (Poon, Evangelista &Albaum 2005). These factors determining management styles may be explained as organizational culture, information and skill levels of managers and features of employees.

Management style includes all elements related to the decision-making processes of managers as stated in one definition of management(Albaum, Herche, Yu, Evangelista, Murphy & Poon, 2007). A more comprehensive and different definition of management style states it involves the beliefs and

behavior of managers, subordinate-superior relationships, ways of organizing work, and forms of reward, punishment and empowerment (Torre &Toyne, 1978).

Management styles were investigated from many aspects. Just as there are approaches dealing with management styles in terms of autocracy and participation (Key & Key, 2000), there are approaches dealing with them in terms of leadership (Ustuner, 2016). Though management styles are considered in terms of leadership, leadership and management are different concepts. Generally, a leader is a person who gathers a group around certain aims, motivates them through their influence, guides their followers, and has targets, vision and influence (Engin, 2007). A manager is 'a person who works on behalf of others, strives to achieve predetermined goals, plans work, gets things done, and oversees results' (Sabuncuoglu&Tuz, 1995).The most important difference between leadership and management is the source of power that leaders and managers use to influence others (Aydin, 2013). Leaders and managers use different sources of power. Being a leader is not about using authority. Exercising authority is a managerial action performed by managers and involves their right to give an order which is granted by legal regulations (Aydin, 2013).

Organizational Culture

The source of the concept of culture is based on the word 'colere' in Latin involving different meanings like "to care for, to inhabit, to protect". This word later was seen in Western languages and transformed into the English word "cultivation" in the sense of "agriculture". The "culture" word was used in the sense of 'cultivation of the mind' over time (Harvey &Stensaker, 2008).

Organizational culture studies first began with an article published by Pettigrew in 1979 in an academic journal called "Administrative Science Quarterly". Previously this concept, called "organizational climate" by Blake and Mouton, was called "corporate culture" in an article by Silverzweig and Allen in 1976. The concept became popular in the 1980s and entered the European scientific literature after the USA. It is proposed that the increase in organizational culture studies is based on two important reasons. The first is the economic crisis causing large changes in organizations in the 1970s. The second reason is the "Japanese miracle" in the economy in the same period, when Japan became a superpower in an economic sense as Japanese companies overtook the superiority of American companies in many fields. The need to understand the causes underlying this success story directed academics and researchers to study organizational culture (İpek, 1999).

There are many different definitions of organizational culture. According to Pettigrew (1979), who first mentioned organizational culture, organizational culture is defined as a "system of meaning accepted and shared by a group". According to another definition, organizational culture is a phenomenon that teaches behavior patterns and the meaning of success and failure(Tierney, 1997).

Organizational culture encompasses forms of doing work in an organization and the organizational features shared by members of the organization. From this aspect, organizational culture ensures representation of employees' thoughts about an organization and is important in terms of creating a common identity (Balay, 2014). Many studies were performed about organizational culture models. Some of these include organizational culture models developed by Edgar Schein, Bath Consultancy Group and Diana Pheysey(İpek, 2004).

Schein modeled culture at three levels of artifacts, values and basic assumptions. Artifacts are noticeable elements of a culture like technology and art. Values, criteria of goodness or badness of basic beliefs of an organization, involve cultural learning. When an organization encounters a problem, solutions are proposed for the problem and if the proposal is successful, it may gain the quality of being a value. Basic assumptions involve the pre-acceptance of successful solutions continuously applied to problems. Basic assumptions, defined as 'theories in use' by Argyris, are assumptions showing how group members will perceive, think and feel about events and which direct their behavior from this aspect (Schein, 2004). The Bath Consultancy Group developed a new organizational culture model based on studies by Geertz and Schein by analogy to a "water lily". In this model, organizational culture comprises five levels of artifacts (symbols), behavior, worldview, emotional grounding and motivational roots (Hawkins, 1997).

Management styles play an important role in the formation of culture and continuation or development of a pre-existing culture. Authoritarian management styles develop power and role cultures, while collaborative management styles will develop a support culture and a success culture. Just as indifferent and resistant management styles do not have a support culture, they will not be seen in school success. Many models were created for organizational culture. In this study, the organizational culture modeling by Pheysey (1993), considered to be able to form relationships with management styles, was chosen. Pheysey (1993) investigated organizational culture at four levels of role, success, power and support culture. Organizations with role culture have a pyramid-shaped hierarchical structure. Work definitions, rules, behavior and wage principles are determined. In success culture, the focus is more on the work to be done rather than the rules to be followed. In operations dominated by success culture, employees are satisfied with the work and tasks performed by spending their energy and time on success. Power culture collects all authority in the hands of management. The basic features of this culture are respect for authority, strong leaders, and compliant members. In organizations with support culture, members have a strong sense of belonging and commitment to the organization. These types of organizations bring human relationships to the fore. Examples include role culture seen in state institutions, success culture in research institutions, power culture in mafia organizations and support culture in revolutionary committees.

In this study about the prediction levels of school principal management styles for organizational culture in schools, the management style subdimensions of collaborative, authoritarian, indifferent and resistant were considered. The collaborative management style is a management style based on organizational leadership where school principals produce common solutions to problems with teachers. In this management style, school principals encourage teachers and provide the necessary environment for them to be successful (Ustuner, 2016). The authoritarian management style is based on pressure and punishment. In this approach, the school principal thinks with a focus on outcomes and attaches importance to shape and behavior (Ozgur, 2011). The indifferent management style is a management style where school principals leave teachers and other school personnel to their own devices. The school principal avoids determining targets and making decisions. From this aspect, it is a management style causing low efficiency in group work (Kahraman, 2019). The resistant management style is a management style where the manager displays an attitude increasing difficulties instead of solving problems. The basis of this management style is suspicion and distrust (Ustuner, 2016).

The aim of this research was to determine the prediction level of management styles for organizational culture. The answers to the following questions were sought in order to achieve this aim.

1. According to teacher perceptions, what is the management style of school principals and the organizational culture of schools?
2. According to teacher perceptions, are there significant differences in the management style of school principals and organizational culture of schools based on teacher gender, total duration of service and duration of service in the school?
3. Do management styles predict organizational culture?

Method

This research aims to determine the prediction level of management style for organizational culture.Relational survey model as a quantitative research methodology was employed in the study. The target population of the research comprised 6058 middle school teachers employed in public elementary schools in Şahinbey and Şehitkâmil counties of Gaziantep province in the 2018-2019 educational year. As it was not possible to reach the whole population, appropriate sampling method was applied. In the .95 confidence interval with target population of 6058 teachers, 388 teachers was chosen with the cluster sampling method (Balci, 2018).

Firstly, the sample was divided between Şahinbey and Şehitkâmil counties. Then schools were identified based on the number of teachers employed and schools with 50 or more teachers were

included in the sample. The sample comprised 420 teachers employed in 20 state middle schools with 10 schools located in Şahinbey and 10 in Şehitkâmil. The sample of 420 was cut to 388 due to variety of reasons. This number was accepted as sufficient for sample size.

Teachers were determined randomly. Large schools were chosen by considering the number of teachers when selecting the schools. The selection of schools with higher teacher numbers was assumed to be effective as teacher numbers affect management styles of school principals and organizational culture. Permission was granted by Gaziantep Provincial Directorate of National Education in order to apply the surveys. Data were collected by the researchers in person. Frequency and percentage values related to the demographic features of teachers participating in the research are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Percentage and Frequency Distribution of Participant Demographic Variables

Demographic Characteristic	Categories	f	%
	Female	243	63.8
Gender	Male	138	36.2
	Total	381	100.0
	1-5 years	139	36.5
	6-10 years	88	23.1
Total Duration of Service	11-15 years	63	16.5
	16 years or more	91	23.9
	Total	381	100.0
	1-2 years	137	36.0
Duration of Service in	3-5 years	171	44.9
School	6 years or more	73	19.1
	Total	381	100.0

As seen in Table 1, 63.8% of participants were women and 36.2% were men. Of teachers, 36.5% had total duration of service from 1-5 years, 23.1% from 6-10 years, 16.5% from 11-15 years and 23.9% 16 years or more. It appeared that 36% of participants had worked in their school for 1-2 years, 44.9% for 3-5 years and 19.1% for 6 years or more.

Data Collection Tools

The data collection tool comprised three sections. The first section included the Personal Information Form developed by the researchers, the second section included the Organizational Culture Scale developed by İpek (1999) and the third section included the Perceived SchoolPrincipal Management Style Scale developed by Ustuner (2016). The personal information form comprises the variables of gender, total duration of service and duration of service in the school. The Organizational Culture Scale developed by İpek (1999) comprises 36 items and 4 dimensions. The scale dimensions are power culture, role culture, success culture and support culture. The reliability of the Organizational Culture Scale subdimensions was found to be .60 for power culture, .69 for role culture, .78 for success culture and .90 for support culture.

The Perceived School Principal Management Style Scale developed by Ustuner (2016) comprises 25 items and 4 dimensions. The scale dimensions are collaborative, authoritarian, indifferent and resistant. The reliability for the subdimensions of the Perceived Manager Management Style Scale was found to be .92 for collaborative management style, .89 for authoritarian management style, .86 for indifferent management style and .85 for resistant management style.

In order to use both scales in the research, necessary permissions were obtained from the authors by e-mail. The scales both have 5-point Likert ratings from "completely disagree (1)" to "completely agree (5)".

Data Analysis

Data for a total of 388 participants obtained as a result of the research were firstly investigated for missing data (Hair, Black, Babin& Anderson, 2014) and in terms of outlier (end data) values. As a result of the investigation, missing data was at levels lower than 3% for all variables. Missing data were overcome by taking the mean of the series for variables with continuous measurement levels. Additionally, as outlier values significantly affect the normal distribution of data, last data analysis was performed, and the decision was made to remove seven observational values with outlier values from the dataset. The analyses in the research were completed with data obtained from 381 participants.

Data were considered according to .05 significance level and .95 confidence interval. Opinions from 1.00-1.80 were evaluated as completely disagree, 1.81-2.60 were disagree, 2.61-3.40 were agree at moderate levels, 3.41-4.20 were agree and 4.21-5.00 were completely agree.

Before beginning tests, data were investigated for suitability for analysis and the normal distribution status of data was investigated to decide which of the "parametric" or "non-parametric" tests to use. Within this scope, the decision about whether data had normal distribution or not was made by examining skewness and kurtosis values. According to Gurbuz and Sahin (2018), if skewness and kurtosis values are between -1 and +1 it is accepted as an indicator of normality.

Evaluations about all scale items and subdimensions used arithmetic mean and standard deviation values. The t test was used to determine whether scale subdimensions differed significantly or not according to gender. The variation of subdimensions on the two scales according to total duration of service and duration of service in school was tested with one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and the post-hoc Tukey test was used to determine which groups caused the difference. Multiple regression analysis was performed to identify the level of prediction of management style dimensions for organizational culture subdimensions.

Pearson correlation analysis was applied with the aim of determining the correlation between management style and organizational culture values with multiple regression analysis. Correlations emerging from Pearson correlation analysis were evaluated as low with values from 0-0.29, moderate from 0.30-0.69 and high for values of 0.70 and above (Cokluk, Sekercioglu&Buyukozturk, 2014).

Findings

The mean and standard deviation values for items related to management styles and organizational culture that teachers agreed with most or least are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive Analysis Results for Management Styles and Organizational Culture SubDimensions

	Sub Dimensions	n	$\overline{X}$	S	Skewness	Kurtosis
Management Styles	Collaborative	381	4.16	.708	-.765	.343
	Authoritarian	381	2.38	.633	.222	.066
	Indifferent	381	1.70	.548	.326	-.789
	Resistant	381	1.88	.691	.460	-.034
Organizational Culture	Power	381	3.11	.599	-.109	.490
	Role	381	3.32	.502	.019	.507
	Success	381	3.53	.597	.160	.027
	Support	381	3.82	.671	-.314	.224

As seen in Table 2, teachers stated principals had collaborative management style ($\overline{X}$ =4.16), did not have authoritarian ($\overline{X}$ =2.38) and resistant ($\overline{X}$ =1.88) management styles with none having indifferent ($\overline{X}$ =1.70) management style.

Teachers agreed that schools had support ($\overline{X}$ =3.82) and success culture ($\overline{X}$ =3.53), while they agreed at moderate levels that schools had role culture ($\overline{X}$ =3.32) and power culture ($\overline{X}$ =3.11). When the skewness and kurtosis values in Table 2 are investigated, data appeared to have normal distributions these values were between ±1 for all dimensions.

Findings Related to Gender Variable

The independent groups t test was applied with the aim of identifying whether perceptions about management styles and organizational culture of teachers differed at significant levels according to gender. The t test results for management style and organizational culture subdimensions according to gender are given in Table 3.

Table 3. T-Test Findings for Management Style and Organizational Culture SubDimensions According to Gender

Dimensions	Sub Dimensions	Gender	n	$\overline{X}$	S	t	p
	Collaborative	Female	243	4.1344	.71800	-	
							.290
		Male	138	4.2135	.69220	1.060	
	Authoritarian	Female	243	2.3676	.63554	-.503	.615
Management Styles		Male	138	2.4012	.63219		
	Indifferent	Female	243	1.6905	.51544	-.669	.504
		Male	138	1.7292	.60280		
	Resistant	Female	243	1.8852	.66400	-.063	.950
		Male	138	1.8898	.73948		
	Power	Female	243	3.1374	.60984	.979	.328
		Male	138	3.0756	.58098		
	Role	Female	243	3.3308	.52254	.239	.811
Organizational Culture		Male	138	3.3181	.46876		
	Success	Female	243	3.5278	.59315	-.226	.821
		Male	138	3.5420	.60572		
	Support	Female	243	3.8503	.66961	.847	.398
		Male	138	3.7905	.67413		

When Table 3 is examined, the opinions of teachers about management style and organizational culture subdimensions did not differ at significant levels according to the gender variable ($p < .05$).

ANOVA Findings

ANOVA was applied with the aim of identifying whether perceptions about management style and organizational culture of participants in the research differed at significant levels according to total duration of service and duration of service in the school.

Before beginning the analysis, homogeneity of variance, a precondition for ANOVA, was examined. As a result of the analysis, variance for both total duration of service and duration of service in the school variables had homogeneous distribution ($p > .05$). The ANOVA results for management style and organizational culture subdimensions according to total duration of service are given in Table 4.

Table 4. ANOVA Findings for Management Style and Organizational Culture SubDimensions According to Total Duration of Service

	Sub Dimensions	Categories	n	$\overline{X}$	S	F	p
	Collaborative	1-5 years	139	4.1073	.72346	1.53	.207
		6-10 years	88	4.0879	.69499		
		11-15 years	63	4.3063	.63273		
		16 years or longer	91	4.1980	.74464		
		Total	381	4.1587	.71016		
	Authoritarian	1-5 years	139	2.4002	.58724	4.06	.007*
		6-10 years	88	2.4303	.61009		
		11-15 years	63	2.1303	.65177		
Management Styles		16 years or longer	91	2.4594	.67866		
		Total	381	2.3768	.63422		
	Indifferent	1-5 years	139	1.6461	.52704	5.57	.001**
		6-10 years	88	1.7061	.47818		
		11-15 years	63	1.5617	.41938		
		16 years or longer	91	1.8862	.66957		
		Total	381	1.7049	.55097		
	Resistant	1-5 years	139	1.9432	.72252	3.05	.028*
		6-10 years	88	1.9275	.70009		
		11-15 years	63	1.6516	.56823		
		16 years or longer	91	1.9372	.68594		
		Total	381	1.8901	.69080		
	Power	1-5 years	139	3.1410	.56064	.42	.732
		6-10 years	88	3.0629	.55478		
		11-15 years	63	3.1538	.65964		
		16 years or longer	91	3.0920	.64755		
		Total	381	3.1141	.59778		
	Role	1-5 years	139	3.3720	.49618	1.30	.273
		6-10 years	88	3.3712	.47024		
Organizational Culture		11-15 years	63	3.2617	.52405		
		16 years or longer	91	3.2720	.53584		
		Total	381	3.3286	.50627		
	Success	1-5 years	139	3.4536	.51702	3.59	.014*
		6-10 years	88	3.4465	.61685		
		11-15 years	63	3.7026	.72346		
		16 years or longer	91	3.6032	.69499		
		Total	381	3.5305	.63273		
	Support	1-5 years	139	3.7675	.74464	3.29	.021*
		6-10 years	88	3.7317	.71016		
		11-15 years	63	4.0465	.58724		
		16 years or longer	91	3.8581	.61009		
		Total	381	3.8285	.67111		

*p<.05 Sd=373

When Table 4 is investigated, the authoritarian, indifferent and resistant subdimensions of management styles and success and support subdimensions of organizational culture displayed significant differences according to total duration of service of teachers (p<0.05). When the source of the difference is examined, teachers with total duration of service of 11-15 years found managers were less authoritarian ($\overline{X}$ =2.13; F=4.06; p<.05), less indifferent ($\overline{X}$ =1.56; F=5.57; p<.05) and less resistant ($\overline{X}$ =1.65; F=3.05; p<.05).

When organizational culture is examined, the subdimensions of power (F=.42 p>.05) and role culture(F=1,30 p>.05) did not display significant differences according to the total service duration of teachers. Additionally, there were significant differences for the success and support culture subdimensions according to the total employment duration of teachers (p<.05). When the success culture subdimension is examined, teachers with 11-15 years of total employment ($\overline{X}$ =3.70) agreed success culture existed in schools more compared to teachers with 1-5 years ($\overline{X}$ =3.45) and 6-10 years ($\overline{X}$ =3.44) of total employment (F=3.59; p>.01).

When the support culture subdimension is examined, teachers with 11-15 years ($\overline{X}$ =4.04) total employment agreed that schools had support culture more than teachers with other durations of employment (F=3.29; p>.05). The ANOVA results according to employment duration in the school are given in Table 5.

Table 5. ANOVA Findings for Management Style and Organizational Culture Sub Dimensions According to Duration of Service in School

	Sub Dimensions	Categories	n	$\overline{X}$	S	F	p
		1-2 years	137	4.1895	.68934	.999	.369
		3-5 years	171	4.1061	.73790		
	Collaborative	6 years or longer	73	4.2329	.67927		
		Total	381	4.1613	.70930		
		1-2 years	137	2.3110	.60425	1.339	.263
		3-5 years	171	2.4296	.63246		
	Authoritarian	6 years or longer	73	2.3874	.68462		
		Total	381	2.3783	.63366		
Management Styles		1-2 years	137	1.6004	.47886	4.351	.014[*]
		3-5 years	171	1.7547	.57746		
	Indifferent	6 years or longer	73	1.7992	.58420		
		Total	381	1.7076	.54999		
		1-2 years	137	1.8681	.65996	.834	.435
		3-5 years	171	1.9407	.71376		
	Resistant	6 years or longer	73	1.8271	.68795		
		Total	381	1.8921	.68933		
		1-2 years	137	3.1539	.59755	1.384	.252
		3-5 years	171	3.0632	.55794		
	Power	6 years or longer	73	3.1814	.67218		
		Total	381	3.1194	.59675		
		1-2 years	137	3.4087	.50829	2.743	.066
		3-5 years	171	3.2883	.48174		

	Role	6 years or longer	73	3.2730	.54055		
Organizational		Total	381	3.3289	.50566		
Culture		1-2 years	137	3.5218	.50810	1.667	.190
		3-5 years	171	3.4957	.64103		
	Success	6 years or longer	73	3.6446	.64017		
		Total	381	3.5345	.59715		
		1-2 years	137	3.8855	.61533	4.811	.009*
		3-5 years	171	3.7133	.70807		
	Support	6 years or longer	73	3.9723	.64148		
		Total	381	3.8267	.66940		

*p<.05

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that there is a significant difference for the indifferent management style among management style subdimensions according to duration of employment in school (F=4,35; p<.05). When the source of the difference is examined, teachers with 1–2-year seniority ($\overline{X}$=1.60) stated principals displayed less indifferent management style compared to teachers in the 3-5 years ($\overline{X}$=1.75) and 6 years and longer ($\overline{X}$=1.79) groups.

Teacher opinions about the support culture subdimension differed according to duration of service in the school (F=4.81; p<.01). Accordingly, teachers with 6 years or more ($\overline{X}$=3.97) duration of employment agreed that there was more support culture in schools compared to teachers with 3-5 years of employment ($\overline{X}$=3.71).

Regression Analysis Findings

The regression analysis results showing the effects of management style subdimensions on power culture are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Multiple Regression Analysis Showing Effect of Management Styles on Power Culture

Variables	B	S.H.	β	t	p	Partial-r	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	1.888	.291		6.49	.000			
Collaborative	.167	.048	.198	3.46	.001	.174	.715	1.399
Authoritarian	.293	.052	.310	5.68	.000	.279	.783	1.277
Indifferent	-.195	.071	-.179	-2.75	.006	-.139	.552	1.810
Resistant	.088	.060	.101	1.45	.147	.074	.479	2.088

p<.01   F=11.60;   p=.000   R=.32 R^2=.10

According to Table 6, there appears to be significant correlations between power culture and management styles (F=11.60; p<.001). When the R^2 value is examined, it appears management styles explain 10% of power culture (R^2=.108). Two-way comparison found significant correlations between power culture with collaborative, authoritarian and indifferent management styles (6>t<-3; p>.05).

When correlations are examined, the highest correlation was between power culture with authoritarian management style (partial r=.28). Additionally, this correlation was significant and positive, but at low levels. When the B value is examined, one-unit variation in the authoritarian management style caused a .29-unit variation in power culture. There appeared to be a significant, negative but low-level correlation between power culture with indifferent management style (partial r=-.14). When the B value is examined, one-unit change in the indifferent management style caused a .19-unit variation in power culture. There was a significant positive and lower correlation between power culture with collaborative management style (partial r=.17). When the B value is examined, one-unit change in the collaborative management style caused a .17-unit change in power culture. There was no significant correlation between power culture with the resistant management style (p<.05).

When beta values are examined, authoritarian management style (β=.31) was the most effective on power culture, followed by collaborative (β=.20), indifferent (β=.18) and resistant (β=.10) management styles. It appeared there was no collinearity in our model (TV<1.00; VIF<10). The regression analysis results for the effect of management styles on role culture are given in Table 7.

Table 7. Multiple Regression Analysis Showing Effect of Management Styles on Role Culture

Variables	B	S.H.	β	t	p	Partial r	Tolerance	VIF
Fixed	2.023	.234		8.631	.000			
Collaborative	.228	.039	.321	5.849	.000	.286	.715	1.399
Authoritarian	.232	.042	.293	5.587	.000	.275	.783	1.277
Indifferent	-.271	.057	-.296	-4.738	.000	-.235	.552	1.810
Resistant	.140	.049	.193	2.875	.000	.145	.479	2.088

p<.01   F=20.49;   p=.000   R=.420 R^2=.176

According to Table 7, there was a significant correlation between role culture and management styles (F=20.49; p<.01). When the R^2 value is examined, it appears management styles explained 18% of role culture (R^2= .176). When the t values are examined, two-way analysis found that each management style predicted role culture separately (2.00<t>9.00; p<.05). There were significant but low-level correlations between role cultures and management styles (p<.001).

When correlations are examined, the highest correlation was between role culture and the collaborative management style (partial r=.29). Additionally, this correlation was significant, positive and low. When the B value is examined, oneunit of change in the authoritarian management style caused .23-unit variation in role culture.

In second place for role culture, the highest correlation was with authoritarian management style (partial r=28). This correlation was significant, positive and low. The next correlation in third

place for role culture was with the indifferent management style. There was a significant, negative and low correlation between role culture with indifferent management style (partial r=-.24). When the B value is examined, one-unit change in the indifferent management style caused .27-unit variation in role culture.

The lowest correlation with role culture was for the resistant management style. There was a significant, positive but low correlation between role culture and resistant management style (partial r=.15). When the B value is examined, oneunit of change in the resistant management style caused a .14-unit variation in role culture.

When the beta values are examined, the management styles most effective on role culture were collaborative (β=.32), followed by indifferent (β=.30), authoritarian (β=.29), and resistant (β=.19). Our model did not appear to have collinearity (TV<1.00; VIF<10). The regression analysis results showing the effects of management styles on success culture are given in Table 8.

Table 8. Multiple Regression Analysis Showing Effect of Management Styles on Success Culture

Variables	B	S.H.	β	t	p	Partial r	Tolerance	VIF
Fixed	1.604	.232		6.901	.000			
Collaborative	.488	.039	.579	12.650	.000	.543	.715	1.399
Authoritarian	.115	.041	.123	2.800	.005	.142	.783	1.277
Indifferent	-.244	.057	-.225	-4.310	.000	-.215	.552	1.810
Resistant	.020	.048	.024	.422	.673	.022	.479	2.088
p<.01	F=70.96;	p=.000		R=.652	R^2=.426			

According to Table 8, there was a significant correlation between success culture with management styles (F=70.96; p<.001). When the R^2 value is examined, it appeared management styles predicts 43% of success culture (R^2=.426). Looking at the t values, two-way assessments found that, apart from the resistant management style, all other management styles separately predicted success culture (.40<t>13,00; p<.05).

When correlations are examined, apart from resistant management style, there were significant correlations between success culture with the other management styles (p<.001).The highest correlation with success culture was for the collaborative management style (partial r=.54). There was a significant, positive and moderate level correlation between success culture and collaborative management style. When the B value is examined, one-unit change in the collaborative management style caused a .49-unit change in success culture. The second-highest correlation with success culture was for the indifferent management style (partial r=-.22). This correlation was significant, negative and low-level. When the B value is examined, a one-unit variation in the indifferent management style caused a .24-unit variation in success culture. The lowest correlation with success culture was for the authoritarian management style. There appeared to be a significant,

positive and low correlation between success culture and authoritarian management style (partial r=.14). When the B value is examined, a one-unit change in the authoritarian management style caused a .11-variation in success culture.

When beta values are examined, the highest effect on success culture was from collaborative management style (β=.58), followed by indifferent (β=.23) and authoritarian (β=.12) styles. Our model did not appear to have collinearity (TV<1.00; VIF<10). The regression analysis result for the effects of management styles on the support culture dimension are given in Table 9.

Table 9.Multiple Regression Analysis Showing Effect of Management Styles on Support Culture

Variables	B	S.H.	β	t	p	Partial r	Tolerance	VIF
Fixed	2.179	.260		8.370	.000			
Collaborative	.508	.043	.537	11.760	.000	.515	.715	1.399
Authoritarian	-.018	.046	-.017	-.392	.695	-.020	.783	1.277
Indifferent	-.241	.063	-.197	-3.793	.000	-.190	.552	1.810
Resistant	-.007	.054	-.007	-.125	.900	-.006	.479	2.088
p<.01	F=72.15;	p=.000		R=.656	R^2=.430			

According to Table 9, there appears to be significant correlations between support culture and management styles (F=72.15; p<.001). When the R^2 value in Table 9 is examined, management styles explained 43% of the support culture (R^2= .430). When the t values are examined, two-way assessment shows that collaborative and indifferent management styles predicted support culture (-3.70<t>12.00; p<.001).

When correlations are examined, collaborative and indifferent management styles appeared to be significantly correlated with support culture (p<.001). The highest correlation with support culture was for the collaborative management style (partial r=.51). There was a significant, positive and moderate level correlation between support culture and collaborative management style. When the B value is examined, one-unit change in collaborative management style caused a .51-unit change in support culture. The second highest correlation with support culture was from the indifferent management style (partial r=-.19). This correlation was significant, negative and low-level. When the B value is examined, oneunit of change in the indifferent management style predicted.24-unit variation in support culture. When the beta values are examined, the highest effect on support culture was from the collaborative management style (β=.54), followed by the indifferent management style (β=.20). Our model did not appear to have collinearity (TV<1.00; VIF<10).

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

The following results were reached in this research aiming to determine the prediction levels of management styles for organizational culture. Elementary school principals displayed collaborative management style. Principals did not have authoritarian, resistant or indifferent management styles.

Research by Abdurrezzak&Ustuner (2020) observed that collaborative management styles were very high among principals, while authoritarian management style was low and indifferent and resistant management styles were very low, in parallel with the results of our research questions(Abdurrezzak&Ustuner, 2020). In the study by Gedik&Ustuner (2019), teachers stated that principals generally used collaborative management style. The research results revealed that authoritarian, indifferent and resistant management styles remained at low levels. In other studieson managementstyle, schoolprincipals' appeared to be adequate in terms of management, display democratic management style more (Terzi & Kurt, 2005). They had highest averages for collaborative-democratic management style with moderate levels (Ozdemir, Kartal&Yirci, 2014) or low levels (Argon &Dilekci, 2014; Abdurrezzak & Ustuner, 2020) of authoritarian, indifferent and resistant management styles. The results of this study are compatible with results in the literature. Principals in schools displaying collaborativemanagement style is a situation which should be appreciated.

Schools are dominated by support and success culture, with moderate levels of role and power culture. Studies by İpek (1999) and Terzi (1999) in 1997-1998 in public and private high schools are compatible with each other, though different from our research results. The research by Terzi concluded that the most dominant organizational culture in state and private high schools was power culture. In the research by İpek, organizational culture in state high schools was primarily power culture, then role culture, followed by success and support culture. In private high schools, primarily success and power culture were present, followed by support and role culture (İpek, 1999). In this research, primarily support and success culture were present as organizational cultures in schools.

In research by Kahveci in 2015 about primary, middle and high schools, teachers had good perceptions of organizational culture, high perceptions of organizational trust, and low perceptions of alienation and organizational cynicism (Kahveci, 2015). In a study by Ozturk in 2015, teachersgenerally found their school principals were positive, while teachers found their teacher colleagues to be open to cooperation and supportive (Ozturk, 2015). Research by Kilic in 2018 found support culture was the highest determinant of school culture (Kilic, 2018). Again, in research by Sari and Helvaciin 2019, the most common organizational culture in schools was support culture according to teacher opinions, with role culture in second place, success culture in third place and power culture in last place (Sari &Helvaci, 2019). While power culture was ahead in research by İpek and Terzi, support culture was the highest among organizational cultures in schools in this research and research by Ozturk (2015), Kilic (2018), and Sari &Helvaci (2019). Second place went to success culture, while power culture, leading in research by İpek and Terzi, came last. The research results are significant in terms of showing that among organizational culture in schools, support culture developed from the years 1990-2000 to 2015-2020.

Schools, which transfer culture and are the gateway to knowledge, are organizations where support and success culture should dominate. Schools with developed support and success culture are necessary to prepare the environment needed for development of the knowledge and skills of teachers and students and to achieve success in this environment. Additionally, the role and power culture in schools, though at moderate levels, may be due to some managers still having a Taylorist view or classic management understanding. In this approach, management involves tight auditing, control and orders. The best management style is one that is authoritarian, looks from above, gives orders, searches for openings and preserves distance. It means that consulting with employees, laughing at them, causes slacking and procrastination.

In this research, opinions of female and male teachers about management style and organizational culture subdimension did not differ at significant levels. Similar results were found in research by Gedik and Üstüner (2019). In the research by Gedik and Ustuner (2019), there were no significant differences according to gender of teachers for principal management styles(Gedik ve Ustuner, 2019). Research by Arslan, Kuru&Satici (2005) about organizational culture found the opinions of primary level teachers did not differ according to gender, in parallel with the results of our study, while the opinions of secondary level teachers were significantly different. These differences were observed in the ceremonies, meetings, language and material culture subdimensions in secondary level schools(Arslan, Kuru &Satici, 2005).

Teachers with total duration of employment of 11-15 years in the research agreed less that managers had authoritarian, indifferent and resistant management styles compared to teachers with other durations of employment. Again, teachers with 11-15 years total employment agreed more that schools had success and support culture compared to teachers with other durations of service. The differentiation of opinions of teachers with 11-15 years of total employment in a positive sense for both management style and organizational culture is interesting, but the cause of this could not be understood.

Teachers with 1-2 years duration of employment in their school agreed less that managers in schools displayed indifferent management style compared to teachers working in their schools for 3 years or more. The reason for this may be due to managers paying more attention to teachers who are new to the school compared to those who have been there for longer. Just as it is a duty of managers to introduce new teachers to the school, introduce them to the teachers for socialization, ask how they are and pay attention to problems if present, it is a tradition of hospitality in Turkish culture. Additionally, research findings from Abdurrezzak and Ustuner (2020) did not find significant differences between the opinions of teachers about management styles of managers according to seniority.

Teachers with 6 years or more service in their schools agreed more that there was a support culture in schools compared to teachers with 3-5-years service. This situation may be due to teachers employed in the same school gaining increasing friendships with each other through the years, and receiving more support from each other compared to teachers with 3-5-years service. Teachers working in their school for 1-2 years may be supported more both among themselves and from experienced teachers because they are new. However, teachers with 3-5-years service may be considered not have formed settled friendships with other teachers and not to receive sufficient support as they are undecided about requesting a transfer elsewhere or staying in the school.

There was a significant but low-level correlation between management style subdimensions and power culture. The highest correlation with power culture was for the authoritarian management style. All management style subdimensions, apart from resistant management style, had significant correlations with power culture. There were positive correlations with power culture for management styles, apart from the indifferent management style. One unit of increase in the authoritarian management style predicted a .29-unit change in power culture. The subdimensions of management styles explained 10% of power culture. The greatest effect on power culture was from the authoritarian management style, followed by the collaborative, indifferent and resistant management styles.

There were positive correlations between role culture and management styles. The highest correlation with role culture was for the collaborative management style, followed by authoritarian, indifferent and resistant management styles. There were significant, positive (apart from indifferent management style) and low-level correlations between role culture and management styles. A one-unit increase in the collaborative and authoritarian management styles predicted a .23-unit increase in role culture. A one-unit increase in the indifferent management style predicted a .27-unit reduction in role culture. Role culture was mostly affected by collaborative management style, followed by indifferent, then authoritarian and finally resistant management style. Management style subdimensions explained 18% of role culture.

Management style subdimensions were important predictors of success culture. Apart from the resistant management style, there were significant correlations between other management styles and success culture. The highest correlation with success culture was shown by the collaborative management style at moderate levels. The other management styles had low-level correlations. Success culture had a negative and low-level correlation with the indifferent management style. There was a positive but low-level correlation with authoritarian management style. A one-unit increase in the collaborative management style predicted a .49-unit increase in success culture. A one-unit increase in the indifferent management style predicted a .24-unit decrease in success culture. Success

culture was primarily affected by the collaborativemanagementstyle followed by the indifferent and finally authoritarian management styles. Management styles explained 43% of success culture.

Management styles were significant predictors of support culture. There were significant correlations between collaborative and indifferent management styles with support culture. There was a significant, positive and moderate level correlation between collaborative management style with support culture. One-unit variation in collaborative management style predicted a .51-unit variation in support culture. There was a significant, negative and low-level correlation between the indifferent management style with support culture. A one-unit change in indifferent management style predicted a .24-unit reduction in support culture. Management style subdimensions explained 43% of support culture. The highest correlations for management styles were for success and support culture.

Direct studies researching the correlation of management styles with organizational culture could not be reached, both foreign and domestic. Additionally, research about the correlations of these two topics with other variables are available. For example, Kaymaz (2019) observed a positive significant and low-level correlation between success culture and work satisfaction and a positive significant and moderate-level correlation between support culture and work satisfaction in research investigating the effects of organizational culture on work satisfaction. In this study, significant, positive and moderate-level correlations were found between success and support culture with collaborative management style. In parallel with this research, research by Niemann and Kotze found a significant correlation between positive leadership with solidarity culture (Niemann & Kotze, 2007). Research by Turan&Bektas (2013) concluded that creation of a school culture strong in the leadership styles of guidance, creating a vision, encouraging and stimulating followers provided significant positive contributions(Turan&Bektas, 2013). Leadership requires influencing subordinates to receive their support and managing in cooperation with them. Abdurrezzak and Ustuner (2020) revealed that collaborativemanagement style was a more significant predictive variable influencing the commitment of teachers compared to authoritarian, indifferent and resistantmanagement styles (Abdurrezzak&Ustuner, 2020). According to these results, the following recommendations are made:

1. In the research, schools were found to have moderate levels of role and power culture. Workshop studies may be given to principalsfor further development of support and success culture in schools.

2. In the research, the collaborative management style was an important predictor of support and success culture. To increase support and success culture in schools, principals may be shown how collaborative management style works with both good practical examples and applied in workshop studies.

3. The research was performed in state middle schools. It is recommended to repeat the research in different educational organizations and stages like high school and primary school, in addition to private schools.

4. The research was completed as a quantitative study. Qualitative studies or mixed studies using both quantitative and qualitative methods may be performed about the same topic.

References

Abdurrezzak, S. ve Üstüner, M. (2020). Algılanan müdür yönetim tarzı ve içsel motivasyonun öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığına etkisi. *Trakya Eğitim Dergisi, 10*(1), 151-168. https://doi.org/10.24315/tred.604753.

Albaum, G., Herche, J., Yu, J., Evangelista, F., Murphy, B. &Poon, P. (2007). Differences in managers' decisionmakingstyleswith in theAsia-Pacific region: Implicationsforstrategicalliances. *Journal of Global Marketing, 21*(1), 63-78. https://doi.org/10.1300/J042v21n01_06.

Argon, T. ve Dilekçi, Ü. (2014). Öğretmenlerin okul müdürlerinin yönetim tarzları ve kurumsal itibara yönelikalgıları arasındaki ilişki. *Electronic TurkishStudies*, *9*(2), 161-181.

Arslan, H., Kuru, M. ve Satıcı, A. (2005). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim okullarındaki örgüt kültürünün karşılaştırılması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi,* Güz *44,* 449-472.

Aydın, M. (2013). *Eğitimde örgütsel davranış.* Gazi Kitabevi.

Balay, R. (2014). *Yönetici ve öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık.* (2. Baskı). Pegem Akademi.

Balcı, A. (2018). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler.* (13. Baskı). Pegem Akademi.

Barutçugil, İ. (2002). *Organizasyonlarda duyguların yönetimi.* Kariyer Yayıncılık.

Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu G. & Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2014). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları.* (3. Baskı). Pegem Akademi.

Engin, S. (2007). *İdare etmek mi? Yönetmek mi?* Sistem Yayıncılık.

Eren, E. (1993). *Yönetim psikolojisi.* 4. Baskı. Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.

Ergun, T. &Polatoğlu, A. (1992). *Kamu yönetimine giriş.* 4. Baskı. TODAİE Yayınları.

Gedik, A. ve Üstüner, M. (2019). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm düzeylerine algıladıkları müdür yönetim tarzının etkisi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, (37),* 53-68, https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/pausbed/issue/49722/403401.

Gürbüz, S. ve Şahin, F. (2018). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri*. (5. Baskı). Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Hair, J.F, Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. &Anderson, R.E. (2014). *Multivariatedataanalysis.* (7th Ed.). Pearson:Harlow.

Harvey, L., &Stensaker, B. (2008). Qualityculture: Understandings, boundariesandlinkages. *EuropeanJournal of Education, 43*(4), 427-442, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-3435.2008.00367.x.

Hawkins, P. (1997). Organizationalculture: Sailingbetweenevangelismandcomplexity. *Human relations, 50*(4), 417-440.

İpek, C. (1999). *Resmi liseler ile özel liselerde örgütsel kültür ve öğretmen-öğrenci ilişkisi.* [Doktora tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü].https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

İpek, C. (2004). Öğrenen örgütler.K. Demir & C. Elma (Ed.),*Öğrenen örgütler ve örgüt kültürü* (s.51-91) içinde.Sandal Yayınları.

İpek, C. (2016). Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi. 8. Baskı. H. B. Memduhoğlu& K. Yılmaz (Ed.), *Yönetim teorileri*(s.91-133) içinde.Pegem Akademi.

Kahraman, Ü. (2019). *Okul yöneticilerinin yönetim tarzı, örgüt DNA'sı ve örgütsel değişimin okullardaki korku kültürüne etkisi.*[Doktora tezi. Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü]. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Kahveci, G. (2015). *Okullarda örgüt kültürü, örgütsel güven, örgütsel yabancılaşma ve örgütsel sinisizm arasındaki ilişkiler.*[Doktora tezi. Fırat Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü]. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Kaymaz, K. (2019). Örgüt kültürünün iş tatmini üzerindeki etkileri: Diana C. Pheysey'in örgüt kültürü sınıflandırması ekseninde bir araştırma. *Business & Management Studies: An International Journal, 6(4),* 1053-1070. https://doi.org/10.15295/bmij.v6i4.282.

Key, S.&Key, S. (2000). Theeffect of culture on managementstyle: A comparison of US andIndonesianmanagers. *Journal of Transnational Management* Development, *5*(3), 23-46. https://doi.org/10.1300/J130v05n03_03.

Kılıç, B. (2018). *Ruhsal liderlik, örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel sessizliğin okul başarısına etkisi.*[Doktora tezi. Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü]. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Niemann, R. &Kotze, T. (2007). Therelationshipbetweenleadershippracticesandorganizationalculture: an educationmanagementperspective.*South AfricanJournal of Education,26*(4), 609-624.

Özdemir, T. Y., Kartal, S. E. &Yirci, R. (2014). Okul müdürlerinin öğretmenleri motive etme yaklaşımları.*TurkishJournal of EducationalStudies*, *1*(2), 190-215.

Özer, M. A., Akçakaya, M., Yaylı, H. & Batmaz, N. Y. (2015). *Kamu yönetimi, klasik yapı ve süreçler.* Adalet Yayınevi.

Özgür, B. (2011). Yönetim tarzları ve etkileri. *Maliye Dergisi,(161),* 215-230.https://ms.hmb.gov.tr/uploads/2019/09/012.pdf

Öztürk, N. (2015). *Eğitim örgütlerinde örgüt kültürü ve öğretmen liderliği: Lider-üye etkileşiminin aracılık rolü.* [Doktora tezi. Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü].https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Pettigrew Andrew M. (1979). On studyingorganizationalcultures. *AdministrativeScienceQuartely, 24*(4), 570-581.

Pheysey, D. C. (1993). *Organizationalcultures: Typesandtransformations.* Routledge: Londonand New York.

Poon, P.S., Evangelista, F.U. &Albaum, G. (2005). A comparativestudy of themanagementstyles of marketing managers in AustraliaandthePeople'sRepublic of China.*International Marketing Review, 22*(1), 34-47, https://doi.org/10.1108/02651330510581163.

Sabuncuoğlu Z. ve Tüz M. (1995). *Örgütsel psikoloji.*(1. Baskı). Ezgi Kitabevi.

Sarı, R.K. ve Helvacı, M.A. (2019). Okulların örgüt kültürü ile değişime hazırbulunuşluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 9*(2), 307-320.

Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizationalcultureandleadership.* (3rd Ed.). Jossey-Bass:San Francisco.

Terzi, A. R. (1999). *Özel ve devlet liselerinde örgüt kültürü (Ankara ili örneği).* [Doktora tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü]. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Terzi, A. R. & Kurt, T. (2005). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin yöneticilik davranışlarının öğretmenlerin örgütselbağlılığına etkisi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 33*(166), 98-112.

Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizationalsocialization in highereducation. *TheJournal of HigherEducation*, *68*(1), 1-16.https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1997.11778975.

Torre, J. &Toyne, B. (1978). Cross-nationalmanagerialinteraction: A conceptual model. *The Academy of Management Review, 3*(3), 462-474.https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1978.4305732

Tortop, N. İsbir, E.G. & Aykaç, B. (1993). *Yönetim bilimi.* Yargı Yayınları.

Turan, S. & Bektaş, F. (2013). Therelationshipbetweenschoolcultureandleadershippractices. *EurasianJournal of EducationalResearch*, *52,* 155-168.

Üstüner, M. (2016). Algılanan müdür yönetim tarzı ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 22*(3), 429-457.http://abakus.inonu.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/17661/Makale%20Dosyas%C4%B1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Wu, W., Chiang, C. &Jiang, J. (2002). Interrelationshipsbetween TMT managementstylesandorganizationalinnovation. *Industrial Management and Data Systems, 102*(3), 171-183. https://doi.org/10.1108/02635570210421363.