School Culture Types as Predictors of School Leadership Capacity

Gökhan Demirhan[1]
[1]Uşak University, 0000-0002-8342-0160

To cite this article:

School Culture Types as Predictors of School Leadership Capacity

Gökhan Demirhan[1]*

[1]Uşak University

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine the role of school culture types on perceived school leadership capacity according to teachers' views. The study group for this research, which was designed in the relational research model, consisted of 483 teachers working in public schools. Data were collected with the "School Culture Scale" and "Leadership Capacity Scale". Arithmetic mean values were used to analyze the data, and Pearson Correlation Coefficients were calculated to determine the relationships between variables. A hierarchical regression analysis was performed to determine how each of the school culture types played a role in school leadership capacity; administrative experience was coded as a dummy variable and included in the first step of the analysis as a control variable. The findings showed that the most dominant culture type in schools was task culture, and the least dominant culture type was bureaucratic culture. The hierarchical regression results showed that the status of having been a manager was a significant predictor of the perception of school leadership capacity. However, it was concluded that achievement culture and support culture were significant predictors of school leadership capacity perception, but task and bureaucratic cultures were not significant predictors. Moreover, it was found that support culture alone and together with achievement culture played a positive role on school leadership capacity, but with the addition of task and bureaucratic culture characteristics to the regression analysis, the effect of support culture on leadership capacity lost its meaning. Based on the results, various suggestions were developed.

Keywords: School culture, School culture types, School leadership capacity

Introduction

Another concept that has been shaped along with the concepts of culture and organizational culture is the concept of school culture. The concept of school culture, which deals with the school in a much more specific context compared to the concepts of culture and organizational culture, deals with the common beliefs, values, traditions, and practices that play a role in shaping the identity of a school (Deal & Peterson, 2016). School culture, which is shaped by the collective attitudes, behaviors, and relationships of stakeholders such as students, teachers, and administrators within the school, is an effective factor in the formation of expectations, values, and practices based on the interactions and behaviors between stakeholders (Turan & Bektaş, 2013). Similar to organizational culture, there are various components within school culture that support the general structure and character of a school. One of the most prominent among these components is shared beliefs and values. Beliefs and values adopted by stakeholders guide decision-making processes within the school organization, influence interactions, and play a role in school priorities (Kadı & Beytekin, 2015).

Administrators and school leaders, who are among the stakeholders, are also important in the formation of school culture. According to Deal and Peterson (2016), school leaders also have a formative effect on school culture. In this three-stage shaping process, school leaders begin by understanding the historical knowledge and values of the culture, then identify the cultural elements that support the purpose and mission, and finally resort to transformative shaping that emphasizes the positive aspects of school culture. Considering the influence of school leaders, various classifications of school culture have been made. The first of these classifications is the achievement culture as defined by Pheysey (1993) and Cooke & Szumal (1993). At the heart of the achievement culture is the goal of getting things done and achieving goals and outcomes. In addition to this, the concept of individual responsibility is one of the most important terms in the achievement culture (Cooke & Szumal, 1993). Another title in the cultural classification is support culture. This expression, which is adopted in the literature as collaborative culture (Cameron & Quinn, 2006; Kilian, 1999; Saphier & King, 1985) as well as support culture (Pheysey, 1993), emphasizes mutual relationships and interpersonal commitment within the school culture. Other keywords in this culture include collective concepts such as cooperation, trust, participation in

---

* Corresponding Author: *Gökhan Demirhan, gokhan.demirhan@usak.edu.tr*

decision-making, teamwork, a sense of unity, employee participation, and shared values. Another type of culture is the task culture, which focuses on organizational goals (Harrison, 1972; Handy, 1981). In this type of culture, getting things done and expertise are at the forefront, and ability comes before seniority and status. Task culture, which takes a systematic perspective, involves starting with defining the problem, evaluating resources, and identifying solutions. In this context, the emphasis is on achieving organizational goals rather than individual responsibilities and gains. Bureaucratic culture, which is the dimension of cultural classification, deals with a more rigid and control-oriented structure (Vries & Miller, 1986; Kilian, 1999; Kono, 1990). In a bureaucratic culture where a rational perspective is adopted, concepts such as policies, standard processes, and definitions come to the forefront, and there is a structure in which the top management controls the organization. In short, school leaders play an effective role in the process of shaping school culture by understanding historical information, identifying cultural elements that support purpose and mission, and emphasizing positive transformation. School culture can be defined by different cultural classifications such as achievement, support, task, and bureaucracy.

In addition to its place in theory, organizational culture has been one of the practical issues studied in employee behavior and performance. Providing a strong and positive organizational culture within an organization can lead to positive increases in various metrics such as productivity, job satisfaction, and the overall performance of employees (Ilham, 2018; Ismail et al., 2015). On the other hand, a negatively positioned organizational culture can have negative effects on employee behavior and organizational outcomes (Aarons et al., 2017). In studies on organizational culture, shaping employee behavior has been one of the prominent topics. When individuals are in a positive culture, their motivation for their roles increases, and proactive behaviors emerge. Another issue addressed by organizational culture is the determination of standards for performance. Culture plays a role in defining standards for successful performance within an organization, and when employees internalize these standards, they focus on meeting them and play a role in improving performance outcomes (Cheung et al., 2011; Lunenburg, 2011). Another issue in the context of organizational culture is communication and collaboration. Communication and cooperation, which are at the foundation of organizations, come to the forefront in the working processes between employees. In a positive organizational culture, open communication, respect, and teamwork are supported, which in turn encourages knowledge sharing and plays a role in increasing problem-solving skills, innovation, and performance (Ali et al., 2002; Nir et al., 2012). In the 21st century, the concepts of adaptability and change, which are frequently emphasized, are at the heart of a strong organizational culture. When employees are involved in a culture that is open to change and encourages learning and growth, they embrace new initiatives, adapt to conditions, and actively participate in change management processes (Parent & Lovelace, 2018; Rashid et al., 2004). All of the components discussed above as organizational effects of culture are closely related to the phenomenon of leadership. Within the scope of organizational culture, leaders who adopt and promote cultural values have the capacity to inspire their employees in all matters related to organizational goals by creating a positive working environment (Tohidi & Jabbari, 2012). Nowadays, it is very popular to consider leadership as a potential that is spread throughout the organization rather than a quality or responsibility belonging to a single person or group (Kılınç & Özdemir, 2016). From this point of view, when addressing school culture and leadership, it would be appropriate to consider leadership as a kind of capacity that encompasses school stakeholders in general rather than as a position.

In the 21st century, the frequently emphasized concepts of change and transformation have revealed the importance of development. In this direction, the concept of school improvement has emerged within the scope of educational institutions. The concept of school improvement emphasizes increasing capacity in the context of change, transformation, and quality, ensuring quality educational practices, harmonizing stakeholders within the school, and increasing student achievement (Harris, 2010). One dimension of school improvement efforts is the development of leadership capacity in schools. The concept of leadership capacity is defined as a concept in which the leadership process is based on broad-based and skill-based participation, taking into account all stakeholders and processes (Harris & Lambert, 2003; Lambert, 2003). In general terms, leadership capacity is examined under two headings: individual leadership capacity and organizational leadership capacity (Lambert, 2003). While individual leadership capacity deals with the leadership potential that the individual possesses, organizational leadership capacity emphasizes a culture within the organization in which the organization can provide self-leadership and be self-sufficient. Leadership capacity is also examined in sub-headings according to the focus of the organization. In the school context, leadership capacity includes elements such as sharing authority and responsibility, collaborative teamwork, mutual trust, and joint commitment among educational stakeholders. Lambert (1998), who investigates the basic assumptions about school culture and leadership capacity in educational organizations, addresses four basic assumptions. These assumptions are that the theory of leadership traits is outdated, leadership is a learning process that addresses structural changes, collective understanding is the basis, and learning is a shared experience among employees. The classification created by Lambert (1998) is presented with a matrix that addresses the depth of involvement and the depth of skills

possessed. According to this matrix, schools are examined in four quadrants: school administrators, programs, stakeholders, responsibility, inclusiveness, and student achievement.

When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that there are studies on school culture and leadership capacity in schools. For example, Cansoy and Parlar (2017) focused on a group of high school teachers and investigated the relationship between school culture and teacher leadership. The findings showed that teachers perceived school cultures as primarily task-oriented, while their perceptions of teacher leadership focused on organizational development. The study also revealed that there is a positive and significant relationship between school culture and teacher leadership. In terms of predictors, it was concluded that support-oriented and task-oriented cultures were positive predictors of teacher leadership in the organizational development dimension, while achievement-oriented and bureaucratic cultures were positive predictors of teacher leadership in the professional development dimension. In addition, support-oriented, task-oriented, and achievement-oriented cultures were found to be positive predictors of teacher leadership in the dimension of collaboration with colleagues. A similar study on teachers was conducted with high school teachers in the context of Myanmar (Latt & Ye, 2021). In this study, which aimed to investigate the relationship between teachers' perceptions of leadership capacities and organizational culture, a significant but weak relationship was found between perceptions of school leadership capacities and organizational culture. Studies on organizational culture and leadership capacities can also be found at the higher education level. For example, Aung and Ye (2022) focused on the lecturers at a university in Myanmar and examined the relationship between leadership capacity and organizational culture. The findings of the study revealed that there was a moderately positive relationship between lecturers' perceptions of their leadership capacity and organizational culture. Another global study focused on teachers in the USA and examined the relationship between teachers' leadership capacities and campus culture (Harris & Kemp-Graham, 2017). In the mixed-methods study, it was reported that there was a statistically significant relationship between teachers' leadership capacity and campus culture. In his study, Lai (2015) focused on the leadership practices used by school principals to develop school capacity. As a result of his interviews with school principals, he emphasized that encouraging teacher participation and supporting teacher learning in the context of school culture, building school-community connections to facilitate student learning, and aligning external demands and internal conditions of the school were the practices used.

Studies in the literature show that there is a close relationship between school culture and perceived leadership capacity in schools in terms of theory and practice. The purpose of this study is to determine what role school culture types play in the perceived leadership capacity of schools according to teachers' views. Beyond the theoretical discussion of the determinant relationship between school culture and leadership capacity, which is being examined in the context of this research, empirical studies such as Neimann and Kotze (2006) and Tonich (2021) show that all kinds of leadership activities and behaviors in school, The theoretical foundations of the research hypotheses can be based on the results obtained from the aforementioned studies. It can be thought that this study, which is designed with the understanding that different types of culture can exist in a school at the same time but with different weights and not with a classifying approach to school culture, has the potential to fill an important gap in the field in terms of examining the resultant effect of complex and intertwined subcultures on the phenomenon of leadership. In this context, answers to the following research questions were sought:

      1. What are the cultural types and leadership capacities of schools?
      2. What is the relationship between school culture types and leadership capacities?
      3. Are school culture types significant predictors of schools' leadership capacities?
.

Method

In this study, the relationships between organizational culture types and the leadership capacity of schools were examined. Therefore, a relational survey model was used in the study, and quantitative techniques were used to analyze the data collected from the participants.

Participants

This study, in which the relationships between organizational culture types and leadership capacity were determined, was conducted with teachers working in public schools in Kütahya. The data were collected from the study group, and no population-sample determination was made. In this framework, the study group for the research consisted of 483 teachers. Information about the participants is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the sample

		f	*%*
Gender	Female	246	50,9
	Male	237	49.1
Working Year	1-10 years	92	19
	11-20 years	191	39.5
	21 or above	200	41.4
Education Status	Bachelor degree	447	92.5
	Master/Doctorate	36	7.5
Management Experience	Yes	133	27.5
	No	350	72.5
Total		483	

As seen in Table 1, 50.9% of the 483 teachers participating in the study were female and 49.1% were male. Nineteen percent of the teachers had 1–10 years of seniority, 39.5 percent had 11–20 years of seniority, and 41.4 percent had 21 years or more. Considering the educational status of the participants, the number of teachers with bachelor's degrees is 447, while the number of teachers with postgraduate degrees is 36. In addition, it was determined that 27.5% of the participants had administrative experience, while 72.5% had not been managers in their professional lives.

Data Collection Tools
In this study, the "Leadership Capacity in Schools Scale," developed by Lambert (2003) and adapted into Turkish by Kılınç (2013), was used to reveal teachers' views on the leadership capacity of schools. The "School Culture Scale," developed by Terzi (2005), was used to determine organizational cultures. The psychometric properties of the scales are as follows:
School Culture Scale: The scale used to determine school cultures consists of 29 items and four dimensions that define different organizational culture types. This five-point Likert-type scale consists of four different dimensions, namely "support culture, achievement culture, bureaucratic culture, and task culture", which cannot be scored in total. Support culture focuses on mutual trust, interpersonal commitment, helping, unity, common values, and employee participation (Kilian, 1999; Pheyseh, 1993). The achievement culture dimension aims to bring to the fore achieving organizational goals and outcomes and fulfilling individual responsibilities (Cooke & Szumal, 1993). Bureaucratic culture, on the other hand, has content such as supervision and control, standardized criteria, processes, and policies, and the preservation of hierarchy (Vries & Miller, 1986). Within the scope of the task culture dimension, there are objectives such as ensuring the harmony of expertise, authority, and responsibility and focusing on the results (Handy, 1981). As a result of the exploratory factor analysis (EFA), it was determined that the total variance explained by the four-factor structure was 50.965%. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients were calculated to determine the reliability of the scale dimensions; the related values were .88 in the "support culture" dimension, .82 in the "achievement culture" dimension, .76 in the "bureaucratic culture" dimension, and .74 in the "task culture" dimension (Terzi, 2005). Within the scope of this study, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to determine whether the scale was valid or not, and the relevant values were found as [$\chi2/df$ =3.69 (p>05); CFI=.98; RMSEA=0.07]. Cronbach's alpha coefficients calculated for the reliability of the scale .93 for "support culture" dimension; .91 for "achievement culture" dimension; .85 for "bureaucratic culture" dimension; and .91 for the "task culture" dimension. When all the values calculated for validity and reliability were evaluated, it was decided that the school culture scale is a valid and reliable tool that can be used within the scope of this study (Kline, 2011).
Scale of Leadership Capacity in Schools: At the end of the adaptation process of the scale used to determine the leadership capacities in schools into Turkish, it was decided that the structure consisting of 30 items and four dimensions was appropriate. In this context, the scale consisted of "distributive leadership, collaboration, shared responsibility, shared school vision, and perceived student achievement" dimensions. The goodness of fit values obtained as a result of CFA were [$\chi2/df$ =2.47 (p>05); CFI= .98; RMSEA=0.07]. Cranbach Alpha coefficients were calculated as .91 for the "distributive leadership" dimension, .91 for the "collaboration and shared responsibility" dimension; .94 for "shared school vision" dimension; .93 for the "perceived student achievement" dimension; and .97 for the whole scale. Based on the values, it was concluded that the scale was valid and reliable scale (Kılınç, 2013). In order to determine whether the scale is a valid and reliable instrument that can be used within the scope of this research, a CFA was conducted and reliability coefficients were calculated. In this context, CFA values were calculated as [$\chi2/df$ =4.19 (p>05); CFI= .98; RMSEA=0.08]. Internal consistency coefficients were calculated as .90 for the "distributive leadership" dimension; .90 for the "collaboration and shared responsibility" dimension; .92 for the "shared school vision" dimension; .92 for the

"perceived student achievement" dimension; and .97 for the whole scale. When the results of the analysis were evaluated as a whole, it was decided that the leadership capacity scale was a valid and reliable instrument that could be used in this study (Kline, 2011).

Data Collection and Analysis

This study was conducted with teachers working in public schools in Kütahya. The data were collected from 483 teachers who agreed to participate in the study. Before the analyses were conducted within the scope of the research, missing data were determined, and extreme value analyses were performed. The validity and reliability of the scales were analyzed. The kurtosis and skewness coefficients and scatter plots of the data were analyzed to determine whether the collected data were normally distributed. The kurtosis and skewness coefficients were found to be between -1 and +1. The related coefficients and the analyzed graphs showed that the data indicated a normal distribution.

In the analysis of the data in line with the objectives, the arithmetic mean and standard deviation values were calculated from descriptive statistics. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to determine the relationships between organizational culture types and school leadership capacity and its dimensions; hierarchical regression analysis was performed to determine the predictive power of each organizational culture type on school leadership capacity. The reason for using hierarchical regression analysis is that the design of the research is based on the assumption that each of the types of culture in the school organization exists at the same time, even if they are of different severity. Hierarchical regression analysis allows for the detection of interactions that are added to each other, starting with the most related culture type as a result of the correlation analysis. Before the regression analysis, tolerance, VIF, and Durbin-Watson values were examined to determine whether there was a multicollinearity problem. Since the tolerance value was greater than 0.1, the VIF value was less than 10, and the Durbin-Watson coefficient was less than 2, it was concluded that there was no multicollinearity problem (Çokluk, 2010). In the first stage of the analysis in the hierarchical regression, "having been a manager or not" was used as a control variable and coded as a dummy variable. In the other stages of the analysis, culture types were included in the analysis from the highest to the lowest correlation coefficients with school leadership capacity.

Results and Discussion

Firstly, the arithmetic means and standard deviations of school culture types and school leadership capacity and dimensions were calculated. Descriptive statistics for the related variables are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of variables

	$\overline{X}$	*sd*
Organizational Culture Types		
Support Culture	3.24	.87796
Success Culture	3.24	.88591
Bureaucratic Culture	2.89	.65900
Task Culture	3.46	.85806
School Leadership Capacity	2.83	.58871
Distributive Leadership	2.74	.66025
Collaboration and Shared Responsibility	2.87	.62748
Shared School Vision	2.82	.61729
Perceived Student Success	2.90	.61304

As it is understood from Table 2, the arithmetic averages of school culture types according to teachers' opinions are between 2.89 and 3.46, and the highest average belongs to the task culture. In terms of school leadership capacities, it was seen that the general average was $\overline{X}$=2.83; the lowest average belonged to the distributive leadership dimension ($\overline{X}$=2.74), and the highest average belonged to the perceived student achievement dimension ($\overline{X}$=2.90).

Secondly, the relationships between school cultures and school leadership capacity were determined. Table 3 shows the correlation coefficients calculated between the related variables.

Table 3. Correlation coefficients for the relationships between school cultures and school leadership capacity

	Support Culture	Success Culture	Bureaucratic Culture	Task Culture
School Leadership Capacity	**.452****	**.456****	**.254****	**.394****
Distributive Leadership	.403**	.403**	.250**	.325**
Collaboration and Shared Responsibility	.398**	.414**	.232**	.347**
Shared School Vision	.441**	.449**	.253**	.387**
Perceived Student Success	.458**	.450**	.223**	.421**

The correlation coefficients given in Table 3 show that there are positive relationships between all organizational culture types and school leadership capacities. In this context, it is seen that the culture type with the highest correlation with school leadership capacity is achievement culture [(r = .46; p < .01)] and the culture type with the lowest correlation is bureaucratic culture [(r = .25; p < .01)].
The results of the regression analysis based on the last research question of the study are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Hierarchical regression analysis results for the prediction of school leadership capacity

Predictive Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t	β	t
Management Experience	,107	2,370*	,092	2,273*	,095	2,355*	,097	2,400*	,098	2,430*
Success Culture			,453	11,214*	,254	2,629*	,227	2,277*	,226	2,269*
Support Culture					,219	2,274*	,187	1,856	,180	1,778
Task Culture							,073	1,093	,063	,926
Bureaucratic Culture									,030	,622
R^2	.012		.217		.225		.227		.228	
ΔR^2	.012		.205		.008		.002		.001	
F	5.618*		66.410*		46.382*		35.099*		28.121*	

A total hierarchical model was used in the hierarchical regression analysis of the main hypothesis of the study, which is the prediction of school culture types on the level of school leadership capacity. In the first model, there is a demographic variable coded as a dummy variable related to whether the participants have administrative experience or not. The effect of the participant's administrative experience on the level of school leadership capacity perception is statistically significant (t:2,370 p<.05) and explains 1.2% of the variance in the dependent variable (R^2:0.012 F:5.618). In other words, having administrative experience positively affects teachers' perceptions of the school's leadership capacity level.
In the second model, in addition to managerial experience, the achievement culture type, which has the highest correlation with the dependent variable, was included among the school culture types. The effect of management experience (t:2,273 p<.05) and achievement culture (t:11,214 p<.05) variables in the second model on the perceived level of school leadership capacity is statistically significant. The change in the variance explained in the dependent variable with the addition of the achievement culture variable in the second model is 20.5% (ΔR^2:0.205 F:66.410). In other words, the effect of an achievement-oriented culture in the school on the perceived level of school leadership capacity is positive and quite high. The effect of the administrative experience variable continues to be significant in the second model.
In the third model of the hierarchical regression, the support culture variable is included in addition to the independent variables in the previous model. The effect of support culture on the perceived level of school leadership capacity is statistically significant (t: 2,274 p<.05) and its contribution to the total variance explained is 0.8% (ΔR^2: 0.008 F: 46.382). In other words, the support-oriented culture in schools has a positive and significant, even if limited, effect on the perceived leadership capacity level of the school. The significant effects of the independent variables in the previous model, administrative experience (t:2,355 p<.05) and achievement culture (t:2,629 p<.05) on the perceived level of school leadership capacity continue in the third model.
In the fourth regression model, in addition to the variables in the third model, task culture was included in the regression model as an independent variable. The effect of task culture on the perceived level of school leadership capacity was not statistically significant (t: 1,093 p>.05). With the inclusion of the task culture

variable in the model, the support culture variable in the previous model lost its significant effect on the perceived school leadership capacity level (t: 1,856 p>.05). The significant effects of administrative experience (t: 2,400 p<.05) and achievement culture (t: 2,227 p<.05) variables continue. The total variance explained in the fourth model is 22.7% (R^2: .227 F: 35,099).

In the fifth and final model of the hierarchical regression analysis, the bureaucratic culture variable was used in addition to the variables in the previous model. There is no statistically significant effect of the bureaucratic culture variable on the perceived level of school leadership capacity (t: 0.622 p>.05). While the effect of support culture (t:1,178 p>.05) and task culture (t:0,926 p>.05) among the variables in the previous model was not significant in this model, it is seen that the variables of administrative experience (t:2,430 p<.05) and achievement culture (t:2,269 p<.05) maintained their significant effects. With the last model, the total variance explained is 22.8% (R^2: .228 F: 28.121).

Conclusion

The first conclusion that can be drawn from the research is about which culture type is dominant in schools. The categorization of culture types in schools is not done by determining which culture type a school has, but by determining the level of each culture type in a school. For example, the characteristics of the four different culture types discussed in this study are present in almost every school. However, some of these cultural types may be more or less dominant than others. Following these explanations, the results of the study show that the most dominant culture type in the sampled schools is task culture. Task culture is followed by achievement culture and support culture. The least common type of culture is bureaucratic culture. From this point of view, it can be said that schools are dominated by teachers who are dedicated to their profession, who do not refrain from using their expertise to achieve the instructional and social goals of the school, and who have a high sense of duty. However, although our education system has a centralized structure, we see that the effects of bureaucratic culture, which is a type of culture focused on bureaucracy, continuation of the status quo, hierarchical relations, and sharply separated job descriptions, are relatively weak. When the literature is examined, it is seen that similar results were reached in the studies conducted by Işık (2017), Özdemir (2012), and Sezgin (2010).

Another important result is related to the effect of administrative experience on the perception of leadership capacity in schools. Having administrative experience positively affects teachers' perceptions of leadership capacity in schools. This result shows that experience and awareness of managerial practices contribute to the development of positive attitudes among stakeholders towards taking initiative, participating in decisions, being interested in the success of all students, and developing positive attitudes towards the goals and functions of the school in the education and training process within the school. In the studies conducted by Akçay & Sevinç (2021) and Gül (2016), findings supporting this result were included.

It is seen that achievement culture is an important predictor of perceived leadership capacity at all levels of the multiple models used in the study. Achievement culture, by its nature, focuses on elements such as keeping the level of achievement of organizational goals as high as possible, willingness to take individual responsibility, and appreciation of success. Perceived leadership capacity, on the other hand, is composed of components such as sharing the vision of the organization, sharing authority and responsibility, and focusing on success. As can be seen, both variables are closely related to the effectiveness and development of the school as an organization. The reason for the positive effect of achievement culture on perceived leadership capacity is that both theoretical and practical frameworks are built on similar assumptions and beliefs. Similar results were found in the studies of Peker & Demirhan (2021) and Kujur & Ye (2018).

It is noteworthy that while support culture has a significant and positive effect on perceived leadership capacity in the third model, it loses its significant effect with the inclusion of task culture and bureaucratic culture in the fourth and fifth models. It is quite understandable that support culture, which has prosocial and altruistic behaviors and attitudes such as good interpersonal relations and commitment, cooperation, integration around common values, and participation, affects the perception of leadership capacity, which is based on the acceptance of leadership as a shared authority and responsibility spread throughout the organization. However, with the inclusion of elements related to task culture and bureaucratic culture, which are relatively more rigid, supercilious, standardizing, and controlling culture types, in the predictor model, it can be explained that prosocial attitudes and behaviors are suppressed, thus the effect of support culture on the perception of school leadership capacity tends to decrease.

Recommendations

Considering that school culture is a living and dynamic phenomenon, efforts should be made to build a culture that can help schools achieve their instructional and social goals or to transform the existing culture in this direction. It is also very important that the structural and legal system in which the school exists be redesigned

by policymakers to allow and support this transformation. Future research should focus on studies that can describe the cultural dimensions of school organizations in a more specific and detailed way and that can raise awareness that leadership, which is critical for school development, is not a matter of status and authority but a phenomenon of shared and inclusive capacity that is the responsibility of all stakeholders.

Conflicts of Interest
There are no potential conflicts of interest.

Ethical Approval
Ethical permission (05.07.2023 / 2023-155) was obtained from Uşak University Ethical Commission for this research.

References

Aarons, G. A., Ehrhart, M. G., Farahnak, L. R., Sklar, M., & Horowitz, J. (2017). Discrepancies in leader and follower ratings of transformational leadership: Relationship with organizational culture in mental health. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 44, 480-491.

Akçay, P. & Sevinç, H. H. (2021). Okul Yöneticilerinin Algılanan Yönetim Tarzları ve Öğretmenlerin Özerkliği Üzerine Bir Araştırma . *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* , 41 (2) , 1173-1201 . DOI: 10.17152/gefad.906997

Ali, I. M., Pascoe, C., & Warne, L. (2002). Interactions of organizational culture and collaboration in working and learning. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 5(2), 60-68.

Aung, T., & Ye, Y. (2022). The Relationship Between Lecturers' Perceptions Of Their Leadership Capacity And Organizational Culture At Strategy First University, Yangon, Myanmar. *Scholar: Human Sciences*, 14(2), 89. Retrieved From http://www.assumptionjournal.au.edu/index.php/scholar/article/view/5335

Cameron, K., & Quinn, R. E. (2006). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture (edición revisada)*. San Francisco, CA, EE UU.: Jossey-Bass.

Cansoy, R., & Parlar, H. (2017). Examining the relationship between school culture and teacher leadership. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(2).

Cheung, S. O., Wong, P. S., & Wu, A. W. (2011). Towards an organizational culture framework in construction. *International Journal of Project Management*, 29(1), 33-44.

Cooke, R.&. Szumal, J.L (1993). Measuring normative beliefs and shared behavioral expectations in organizations. *Psychological Reports*. 72, 1299-1330.

Çokluk. Ö. (2010). Lojistik regresyon analizi: Kavram ve uygulama. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 10(3), 1357-1407.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (2016). *Shaping school culture*. John Wiley & Sons.

Gül, F. Ö. (2016). *Eğitimsel liderlik uygulamaları bağlamında öğretmen özerkliğinin incelenmesi*, (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Handy, C.B. (1981). *Understanding organization* (second edition). Aylesbury: Hazell Watson Ltd.

Harris, A. (2010). Leading system transformation. *School Leadership & Management*, 30(3), 197–207. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2010.494080

Harris, A., & Lambert, L. (2003). *Building Leadership Capacity for School Improvement*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Harris, D., & Kemp-Graham, K.Y. (2016). The relationship between building teacher leadership capacity and campus culture. *Education Leadership Review of Doctoral Research*. 49-74.

Harrison, R. (1972). Understanding your organization's character. *Harvard Business Review* May-June.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014

Ilham, R. (2018). The impact of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and employee performance. *Journal of Advanced Management Science*, 6(1), 50-53.

Ismail, S., Romle, A. R., & Azmar, N. A. (2015). The impact of organizational culture on job satisfaction in higher education institution. *International Journal of Administration and Governance*, 1(4), 14-19.

Işık, H., (2017). Ortaokullarda okul kültürünün incelenmesi. *İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 9(3), 61-71.

Kadı, A., & Beytekin, O. F. (2015). Okul kültürü ve örgütsel muhalefet davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin mesleki değerler aracılığıyla araştırılması. *Kalem Eğitim ve İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5(1), 71-97.

Kılınç, A. Ç. (2013). *İlköğretim okullarında liderlik kapasitesinin belirlenmesi*. Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi. Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Kılınç, A. Ç. & Özdemir, S. (2016). *Liderlik kapasitesi*. ANKARA: Pegem Akademi.

Kilian, C. (1999). The Two Sides of the School Culture Coin. *Technos*, 8(3), 21-23.

Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Kono, T. (1990). Corporate culture and long-range planning. *Long Range Planning*, 23(4), 9-19.

Kujur, P., & Ye, Y. (2018). The relatıonshıp of teachers'perceptıon towards leadershıp capacıty and organızatıonal culture ın the marıanısts schools, Indıa. *Scholar: Human Sciences*, 10(1), 298-298.

Lai, E. (2015). Enacting principal leadership: Exploiting situated possibilities to build school capacity for change. *Research Papers in Education*, 30(1), 70-94.

Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. ASCD.

Lambert, L. (2003). Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.Latt, Z. T., & Ye, Y. (2021). A study of the relationship between teachers' perceptions of their leadership capacity and organizational culture at the basic education high schools in Thanbyuzayat Township, Mon State, Myanmar. *Scholar: Human Sciences*, 13(1), 176-191.

Lunenburg, F. C. (2011, November). Understanding organizational culture: A key leadership asset. *In National forum of educational administration and supervision journal* 29(4), 1-12.

Niemann, R., & Kotze, T. (2006). The relationship between leadership practices and organisational culture: an education management perspective. *South African Journal of Education*, 26(4), 609-624.

Nir, A. S., Ding, J. F., & Chou, C. C. (2012). Inter-organizational culture, trust, knowledge sharing, collaboration and performance in supply chain of maritime industries: Examining the linkages. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(19), 5927.

Özdemir, S. (2012). İlköğretim okullarında okul kültürü ile örgütsel sağlık arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 4(4), 599-620.

Parent, J. D., & Lovelace, K. J. (2018). Employee engagement, positive organizational culture and individual adaptability. *On the Horizon*, 26(3), 206-214.

Peker, B. & Demirhan, G. (2022). Okullarda Liderlik Kapasitesi, Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı ve Örgüt Kültürü, *Gelecek Vizyonlar Dergisi*, 6(2), 1-17.

Pheysey D.C. (1993). *Organizational cultures: Types and transformations*. London: Routledge.

Rashid, Z. A., Sambasivan, M., & Rahman, A. A. (2004). The influence of organizational culture on attitudes toward organizational change. *Leadership & organization development Journal*. 25(2), 161-179.

Saphier, J., & King, M. (1985). Good seeds grow in strong cultures. *Educational leadership*, 42(6), 67-74.

Schein, E. H. (2010). Organizational culture and leadership (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Sezgin, F. (2010). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığının bir yordayıcısı olarak okul kültürü. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 35(156).

Tonich, T. (2021). The role of principals' leadership abilities in improving school performance through the school culture. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 12(1), 47-75.

Terzi, A. R. (2005). İlköğretim okullarında örgüt kültürü. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 43, 423-442.

Tohidi, H., & Jabbari, M. M. (2012). Organizational culture and leadership. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 856-860.

Turan, S., & Bektas, F. (2013). The relationship between school culture and leadership practices. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 13.

Vries, M. F., & Miller, D. (1986). Personality, culture, and organization. *The Academy of Management Review*, 11(2), 266-279