



The Role of Charismatic Leader in School Culture

Mustafa OZGENEL¹

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 17 Jul. 2019

Received in revised form: 01 Oct. 2019

Accepted: 10 Mar. 2020

DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2020.86.5

Keywords

Leadership, Charismatic Leadership,
School Culture

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This study aims to investigate the level at which the charismatic leadership style of school principals perceived by teachers predicts the school culture.

Research Method: The correlational model, a quantitative research model, was conducted. In this study, 490 teachers participated in Uskudar, Istanbul. The School Culture Scale (Terzi, 2005) and the Charismatic Leadership Scale (Conger & Kanungo, 1994) were used to measure the teacher's perception of the charismatic leadership and school culture.

Correlation analysis was performed to identify the relationship between the charismatic leadership style and the school culture perceived by the teachers. Regression analysis was performed to determine whether the charismatic leadership style was a predictor of school culture.

Findings: The findings obtained after the analyses showed that there was a significant positive relationship between the charismatic leadership and the success culture, support culture, mission culture, and bureaucratic culture and that the charismatic leadership style was a predictor of, respectively, the success culture, support culture, mission culture, and bureaucratic culture. The charismatic leadership explains 29% of the total variance in mission culture, 35% of the total variance in support culture, 36% of the total variance in success culture and 5% of the total variance in bureaucratic culture.

Implications for Research and Practice: The charismatic leadership role of school principals in shaping the school culture should be emphasized. It may be suggested that charismatic leaders who manage the school culture effectively can be successful.

© 2020 Ani Publishing Ltd. All rights reserved

¹ Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, TURKEY, e-mail: mustafa.ozgenel@izu.edu.tr
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7276-4865>

Introduction

The most distinguishing characteristic of successful and effective organizations is their culture. Thus, today's complexities and uncertainties have increased the importance of culture for organizations. Organizations, by developing a clear and plain organization culture that is accepted by employees, adapt to the uncertainties, changes and competition environment and improve their competitiveness (Cameron & Quinn, 2017), and gain advantages by positively influencing the organizational performance, the motivation of the members and the change (Ashkanasy, Wilderom, & Peterson, 2000; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Ouchi, 1981; Schein, 1988, 1990, 2004, 2009). Thus, the considerable importance of culture for the organization's life has been acknowledged. Due to such characteristics of culture, it is an important necessity for the effectiveness of an organization to identify the factors that constitute and influence the organizational culture (Anthony, 1994).

Culture is an abstract concept that is difficult to define (Dimmock & Walker, 2005; Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohavy, & Sanders, 1990). Culture is a complement of norms, values, beliefs, traditions and rituals (Peterson & Deal, 1998) created and shared (Hofstede et al., 1990), learned and transferred (Sisman, 2014) by the members of a certain social group or society that distinguish people in a certain group from those in another group (Keyton, 2005; Riutort, 2017), and provide unity of sentiments and thoughts (Hancerlioglu, 2018). Schein (2004, p. 17), on the other hand, defines culture as follows:

A pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (p. 17).

Schein's definition focuses on the ways new members of an organization learn the culture, assumptions upheld deeply, because any organization can have multiple cultures (Keyton, 2005). In short, culture means "*the historical transfer of the patterns of sense*" (Terzi, 2005, p. 424). These patterns of sense are expressed in beliefs. Organizational culture, on the other hand, is the sum of common senses that arise from the interactions among, and are shared by, the members of an organization (beliefs, sentiments, behaviors and symbols, norms, values, philosophies, perspectives, beliefs, attitudes, myths or ceremonies), interconnect the sub-systems of the organization, create an identity for the organization, and distinguish the organization from other organizations (Hoy & Miskel, 2012; Keyton, 2005; Lunenberg & Ornstein, 2013; Robbins & Judge, 2013; Turner & Crang, 1996). Each organization has a culture, and the cultural differences of organizations manifest themselves as various symbols, heroes, rituals, and values. Symbols are words, gestures, images, or objects that have a certain meaning recognized by those who share the culture. Heroes are people with invaluable qualities that act as a role model in culture. Rituals are collective activities considered socially necessary to achieve the desired objectives. Values are the inclination to prefer certain situations more than others (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010; Schein, 2004).

Schein (2004) and Hofstede et al. (1990) state that there is no consensus among the research on the definition of organizational culture, but that they agree on the characteristics of it. Organizational culture is the language, terminology, rituals and ceremonies used by the members of an organization in their interactions, the principles (observed behaviors), acceptable standard behaviors (norms), shared values (dominant values), principles for how the organization will treat its employees (philosophy of life), the “ropes” that ensure the harmony within the organization and enable new members to hold on within the organization (rules), and the overall atmosphere controlling the organization (sentiments) (Schein, 2004). Culture is holistic, has a historical background, is related to anthropological concepts, is constructed socially, and is hard to change (Hofstede et al., 1990). According to Lunenberg and Ornstein (2013), these characteristics cannot represent organizational culture alone. However, taken as a whole, they mean the organization’s culture (Schein, 2004).

According to Ouchi (1981), organizations have a culture just as nations and people have their own (Hofstede et al., 1990). Since culture consists of unwritten rules (Hofstede et al., 2010), it serves to enable new members to adapt to the organization, the organization to adapt to the internal and external environment, compete and gain control of the environment. An organization culture emerges from the complex and constant interaction network among the members of the organization (Keyton, 2005) and emphasizes what is valuable for the members and how they must think, feel and behave (Turner & Crange, 1996). According to Schein (2004), culture is the shared learning that contains the behavioral, sentimental and cognitive elements of a certain group. These shared learning are named as culture and turn into certain patterns over time. A review of the organizational culture literature shows that different models of organizational culture are presented. For example, Cameron and Quinn (2017) classified organizational culture as a hierarchy (control) culture, market (competition) culture, clan (cooperation) culture, and adhocracy (creative) culture, while Wallach (1983) classified it as bureaucratic culture, innovative culture and supportive culture. Handy (1995) used the ancient Greek gods to symbolize the management cultures or philosophies. According to Handy, there are four types of management culture or philosophy in organizations. These are club-power (Zeus), role (Apollo), mission (Athena) and individual-existentialist (Dionysus) cultures. Denison and Mishra (1995) analyzed organizational culture on two main axes. The first main axis is an organization's ability to adapt to external factors and achieve internal integration. The second main axis is change, flexibility, stability and direction capacities. Although researchers agree that organizations have different cultural structures and that an organization has multiple cultures, they presented different organizational models while explaining the organizational culture. The main reason for this difference may be the different perspectives of the researchers of the organizational culture or the different areas of service they analyzed in the organizations.

Organizational culture is one of the most fundamental characteristics of organizations and may lead to positive organizational results (Peterson & Deal, 2002). Organizational culture creates and shapes a managerial competence with values and

norms to improve organizational performance. Managerial competence subsumes elements, such as knowledge and skills, for leaders to perform their roles and duties in the best way (Hofstede et al., 1990). Leaders are considered a critical variable in determining organizations' success or failure (Schein, 2004). For, today is regarded as a very complex time, which expects many things from leaders (Bennis, 2016). Leadership is not only about visions, transformations and transactions (Antonakis & House, 2013). According to Conger (1989), leadership is the art of empowering others. Considering the complex nature of leadership, there is no, and may never be, a specific and widely recognized definition of it (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004). In this respect, the question to answer is, "*What qualities must effective leaders have?*". McEwan (2018) established that effective leaders were communication experts, a trainer, had a vision, were a facilitator, change experts, motivator, productive, a character architect, encouraging and had the qualities of a *cultural architect*. Leaders also enable the achievement of organizational harmony (Antonakis, 2006). Thus, the qualities of the leaders working at the organization's senior management reflect the organizational culture. Particularly, the approach of senior managers with leadership characteristics at organizations to the general and work life, their values, attitudes, and behaviors identify with the organization and turn into organizational values and principles over time (Baytok, 2006). Leaders influence the culture, just as the cultural influences leaders. In other words, an organizational culture largely flourishes from leaders, and organizational culture can also influence the development of leaders. Cultures of effective organizations are created by their leaders, and leaders build a culture that supports the vision (Bass & Avolio, 1993). If the ideas suggested by leaders work and continue to work, assumptions that once belonged to the leader slowly turn into shared assumptions (Schein, 2004). Leaders act carefully because they believe that their organizational culture is unique and could be an effective tool to attract quality employees and distinguish their organization from the competition (Keyton, 2005). Culture is the result of a complex group learning process influenced by the leader's behaviors. In this sense, leadership and culture are conceptually intertwined (Schein, 2004).

Values, thoughts and behaviors that form the essence of leadership are social and interactive processes, and as a result, influenced culturally (Dimmock & Walker, 2005). Leadership is the source of the beliefs and values that enable one to move while dealing with a group's internal and external problems at the beginning. It is difficult to imagine that social processes, including the organizational culture, would occur without the efforts of leaders (Trice & Beyer, 1991). According to Schein (1985), leadership is critically important for creating and managing the culture and the essence of leadership. Therefore, leaders should read the culture very well, evaluate it, empower or transform it (Peterson & Deal, 2002).

Leading the change of culture means unlocking the key to the mysteries of organizations (Fullan, 2007). However, "*Does culture determine the leadership behaviors or do leadership behaviors change the culture?*" is not an important question to answer. Schein (2004) answers this question as leaders are considered the creators, transformers and managers of organizational culture. Culture and leadership are the

two sides of the medallion because leaders while creating groups and organizations, create a culture as well. Once the culture was created in the organization, it determines the leadership criteria and who can be the leader or not (Schein, 2004). Although culture has different impacts on the emergence of different leader types and their performance, an important aspect of organizational culture allows us to draw some general conclusions about the emergence of leaders and their performance (Mumford, Hunter, Friedrich & Caughron, 2009). At the organizational level, a strong organizational culture encourages the emergence of leaders and their performance and prevents the emergence and performance of leaders who advocate culturally inconsistent visions (Mumford et al., 2009). The research conducted by Schein (2004) on culture showed that the culture of a new culture was influenced by the organization's leader. On the other hand, leaders that entered organizations that had an established culture did not influence the culture equally. The latter shows that an established culture began to define leadership. In this sense, a charismatic leader can be considered a key to cultural change if he/she emerges under appropriate circumstances (Bell, 2013). A charismatic leader, followers and organization culture interact with each other (Arsenault, 1999). While charismatic leaders allow their followers to act freely on the reasons for achieving the goals, they influence and control through goals (Mumford et al., 2009). While charismatic leaders try to create an internal unity with organizational values to create an organizational culture, they create an external harmony with the vision (Eren, Alpkan, & Ergun, 2003), playing an active role in the creation of a culture.

The concept of charisma historically derived from an old Greek word (Conger & Kanungo, 1994) meaning "gift" (House, 1976), and was frequently used in political and religious domains (Choi, 2006). Although the concept was first used by Aristotle, the concept of charismatic leadership was first used by Weber (1947). The word charisma was first regarded as a special talent that gives some people the potential of doing extraordinary things (Northouse, 2014). Gifts that enable Lord to show extraordinary qualities, such as prophecy and healing, were considered (charisma) by the Church of Christianity (Conger & Kanungo, 1994; Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997). However, Weber used the concept of charisma as an umbrella term for social change and innovation in essence (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). It also spread across different fields, such as sociology, organizational research, and anthropology (Sy, Horton, & Riggio, 2018), to define leaders (House, 1976). Charisma is a quality that is "felt" and later attributed by followers to a leader. This makes charisma rare but is easily observed if it exists (Bell, 2013). Charisma provides a vision and a feeling of mission (Bass, 1990), is a values-based, symbolic, and emotion-laden leader signaling (Antonakis, Bastardo, Jacquart, & Shamir, 2016). Charisma can be "verified" only by the perception of followers. Therefore, the very powerful influence of charisma on followers and its theoretical nature must be considered (Antonakis, Fenley, & Liechti, 2011).

Weber defined the powers of authority in society and developed three ideal typologies. These are the charismatic authority, the traditional authority, and rational-legal authority (Conger & Kanungo, 1994; Conger et al., 1997). According to Weber,

legal authority is based on the belief that those ascended to the position of dominance are entitled to give orders; traditional authority is based on the established belief that traditions are sacred and that those who exercise power based on these traditions are legitimate; and charismatic authority is based on the sanctity, heroism or exemplary qualities of an individual. In other words, Weber argues that charismatic authority derives its legitimacy, not from traditions or laws, but the belief in the leader's exemplary quality (Conger & Kanungo, 1994). Trice and Beyer (1986) and Weber (1947) summarized its theory in five items. (1) An extraordinarily talented person, (2) a circumstance of social crisis or desperation, (3) a series of ideas offering a radical solution for the crisis, (4) a series of followers who attract the exceptional person to themselves and believe that the exceptional person is directly connected to the transcendental powers and (5) the verification of the extraordinary gifts and transcendence of that person with repeated achievements. According to Weber, charisma is a rarely seen phenomenon, and therefore, followers perceive the leader as someone with extraordinary qualities (Beyer, 1999; House, 1976). There are, however, researchers who argue that charisma may be a more common phenomenon (Beyer, 1999).

A charismatic leader is generally considered related to social change and renewal. Charismatic authority in Weber's theory typically emerges during crisis times that break both traditions and rational rule (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). In this sense, charismatic leadership develops in three stages: The first stage is examining and defining the opportunities and threats related to the environment as well as employee needs and demands. The second stage is developing and spreading a vision. The third stage is implementing the vision that exhibits a personal risk and uncommon behavior (Nikoloski, 2015).

Weber, being the first person to explain that a charismatic leader influences his/her followers (Antonakis, 2012), argued that charismatic leadership was very important for both continuity and change (Trice & Beyer, 1991). In this respect, the belief that charismatic leadership is the most suitable type of leadership that can achieve large-scale organizational changes has made it a subject of research on an organizational level (Conger et al., 1997). House (1977), being the first person to offer a theoretical framework to explain the behaviors of charismatic leaders, focused on the psychological influence of charismatic leaders on their followers (Antonakis, 2012). Since Weber (1947) and House (1977) introduced the charismatic leadership, many theoretical and empirical studies have sprung on the subject (e.g. Antonakis, 2006, 2012; Antonakis & Atwater, 2002; Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Antonakis et al., 2016; Antonakis et al., 2004; Antonakis et al., 2011; Banks, Engemann, Williams, Gooty, McCauley, & Medaugh, 2017; Bryman, 1992; Conger & Kanungo, 1987, 1988, 1994; Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000; Conger et al., 1997; House, 1976; Mhatre & Riggio, 2014; Shamir, 1999; Yukl, 1999). These studies and theories suggest that charismatic leadership is an indispensable and vital for organizational life. In other words, today's competition, uncertainty, and change influence an organization's life and structures. In such an environment, the need for charismatic leaders increases to sustain organizational harmony, members, and culture (Shamir, 1999).

According to Conger and Kanungo (1987), leadership is an attribution to a person identified at the organization. Attributions to the leader may not be available equally across all leaders (Gul & Col, 2003). Therefore, which qualities of leaders will be considered charismatic by the members of an organization vary. According to Shamir (1999), a charismatic leader is a combination of “an inspiring vision, mitigating concerns, providing a sense, a feeling of control, a strong trust relationship between leader and member.” Conger and Kanungo (1987, 1994, 1998) listed the qualities of a charismatic leader as “setting a vision, environmental sensitivity, exhibiting extraordinary behaviors, taking personal risk, sensitivity to member needs and not maintaining the status quo,” Charismatic leaders are effective when they are in harmony with the values, ideals, and identities of their followers. Such harmony provides an environment for charismatic leaders to create a higher social identity and to internalize the goals their followers believe (Mhatre & Riggio, 2014). Charismatic leaders are not vision setters but also need other qualities to pioneer the organization. Therefore, they must articulate a vision, show empathy, and empower them to achieve motivation (Choi, 2006). The literature on charismatic leadership attributes three personal qualities to charismatic leaders: Extreme self-confidence, dominance, the need to influence, and a strong belief in the moral integrity of beliefs (House, 1976). Also, the sociological and political science literature gives some clues about the behaviors of charismatic leaders. Being a role model, creating a personal image, articulating objectives, having high expectations and trust in followers, being sensitive to followers’ expectations are motivating behaviors (House, 1976).

Followers of charismatic leaders are assumed to be distinguishable by their greater reverence, trust, and satisfaction with their leader and a heightened sense of collective identity, perceived group task performance and feelings of empowerment (Conger et al., 2000). A charismatic leader is defined as an individual who quickly motivates the group in the face of an emergency, and charismatic leadership is the process of the emergence of such leaders and influencing the follower behavior (Grabo, Spisak, & van Vugt, 2017). Charismatic leaders can produce radical social changes (Bacon, 2009), and in this sense, are important for organizational reforms (Conger & Kanungo, 1994).

Charismatic leaders can formulate inspiring visions and behaviors that foster the impression that they and their mission are extraordinary (Cicero & Pierro, 2007). The observed behavior of charismatic leaders is interpreted by their followers as an expression of their charisma. Charismatic leaders differ from other leaders by their behaviors and actions that foster the impression that they and their mission are extraordinary with an inspirational vision (Conger et al., 2000) and achieve great personal loyalty from their followers (Bryman, 1993). Charismatic leadership can be recognized but is a leadership style that can be perceived as less concretely than other leadership styles (Bell, 2013).

Charismatic leaders are considered the leading agents of change in organizational change (Beyer, 1999; Conger & Kanungo, 1998; Fiol, Harris, & House, 1999; House, 1977; Ladkin, 2006; Seyranian & Bligh, 2008; Shamir & Howell, 1999; Waldman & Javidan, 2002; Yukl, 1999). For example, an organizational change may lead to concerns, or challenge the interests of influential groups, and therefore, may lead to a

crisis for charismatic leaders. This crisis is perceived as a threat to the common interests and identity of the group (Levay, 2010), and creates a favorable atmosphere for charismatic leadership to emerge. The group members react as part of the situational context and ensure the attribution of charisma to the leader. What is suggested here is that charisma attribution by followers is intertwined with both the behaviors and contextual conditions of the leader (Bell, 2013).

According to House (1992), the personal qualities of charismatic leaders that have a specific charismatic influence on their followers encompass being dominant and having strong desires, self-confidence, and sound moral values to influence others. Again, charismatic leaders are strong role models, appear competent, articulate objectives, communicate high expectations, give confidence, and exhibit behaviors that arouse motives (Norhouse, 2014). Charismatic leaders use effective communication, formulate a vision, give confidence, have the expertise, are sensitive to situational context (Bell, 2013), use images and are persuasive in communicating the vision. This way, they create an intense emotional connection with their followers (Antonakis, 2012). Charismatic leaders, as individuals who completely adhere to their vision and action style, firmly believe in the rightfulness of their mission and final success and are able to communicate this to their followers (Fiedler, 1996), do not maintain the status quo (Banks et al., 2017) and can create the needed change. Charismatic leaders put their own interests aside and are, therefore, highly revered by their dedicated followers (Antonakis, 2012). A charismatic leader is assumed to influence introducing a radical change with beliefs and values different than the established order (House, 1976). (i) Order, (ii) complexity, (iii) professionalism, (iv) politics and (v) culture are noticeable in the emergence of charismatic leaders and the shaping of their performance (Mumford et al., 2009).

Charismatic leaders more usually emerge during the transitional and crisis times of organizations (Mumford et al., 2009; Zel, 2011). Followers idealize these leaders who become role model for them, provide them with a vision and goal, look strong and self-confident and pay attention to the moral and ethical implications of their decisions (Antonakis, 2012). A charismatic leader, on the other hand, links his/her followers with the organizational identity (Northouse, 2014) and influence their motivation and performance (Antonakis, 2012; House, 1976). Charismatic leaders may or may not influence the organization's achievement of its goals, but their followers are blind, obedient, and loyal (Fiedler, 1996). In other words, followers appear to obey, be loyal, and committed to the leader without question (House, 1976).

A review of the literature shows several studies focusing on the relationship between *organizational cultures and different leadership styles* (Anthony, 1994; Britton, 2018; Chadwick, 1999; Dalgic, 2015; Green, 2016; Kuyumcu, 2007; Lok & Crawford, 1999; Lucas, 2008; Lucas & Valentine, 2002; Marks, 2002; Mees, 2008; Miles, 2002; Ozgenel & Dursun, 2019; Ozgenel & Ankaralioglu, 2020; Ozgozgu, 2015; Yesil, 2016; Waldner, 2005), *academic success* (Gawerecki, 2004; Green, 2016; Le Clear, 2005; MacNeil, Prater, & Busch, 2009; Mees, 2008), *organizational size and structure, product/service quality, organizational climate, organizational silence, commitment to organization, organizational effectiveness, organizational performance, organizational trust,*

organizational alienation and cynicism, personnel motivation, job satisfaction, communication, cooperation, harmony, personnel empowerment and performance (Britton, 2018; Cooper, 2000; Davidson, 2009; Denison & Mishra, 1995; Doran, 1996; Featherstone, 2017; Gordon & DiTomaso, 1992; Hadian, 2017; Jones, 1998; Kahveci, 2015; Lok & Crawford, 1999; Mete, 2017; Nnadozie, 1993; Nystrom, 1993; Reames, 1997; Sorensen, 2002; Sarwono, 1990; Yalcinsoy, 2019; Yildiz, 2018; Zhu, Devos & Li, 2011), *the level of happiness and well-being of teachers, students, administrators and parents* (Yavuz Tabak, 2017; Zhu et al., 2011). There are also studies identifying the relationship between *charismatic leadership and social intelligence, openness to organizational change and leadership effectiveness* (Groves, 2003), *project management, teamwork and leadership, humorous behaviors and meeting effectiveness, innovative work behavior* (Brinkman, 2015; Henderson, 2018; Mete, 2017; Murphy & Ensher, 2008), *personnel empowerment, motivation, job satisfaction and performance and organizational culture, organizational engagement and citizenship behavior* (Arikan, Kilic, & Becerikli, 2017; Cinel, 2008; Conger et al., 2000; Gutierrez-Shackelford, 2016; Gul, 2003; Henderson, 2018; Milton, 2011; Oktay & Gul, 2003; Shastri, Mishra, & Sinha, 2010; Yaldızbas, 2015), *task-oriented leadership, participative leadership, people-oriented leadership, Bass charisma* (Conger & Kanungo, 1994) and *group identity* (Cicero & Pierro, 2007; Conger et al., 2000).

Given that organizations have different cultural structures, this results in them exhibiting different behaviors and different reactions to organizational change (Gizir, 2008). Here, to understand the structure of an organization, the organization, and its employees must be dealt with and examined from a cultural perspective (Schein, 2004). If it is understood how the culture emerged, who is influential, how it developed and changed, then the culture, which is an abstraction, can be better understood in mind. The present study was designed to identify the connection between charismatic leadership and organizational culture based on Schein's (1990, 2004) views that highlight the relationship between culture and leader. Specifically, the study aims to identify the relationship between the charismatic leadership behaviors of school principals and the organizational culture and how well the charismatic leadership is a predictor of the organizational culture. Culture shapes how people think, feel, and act at schools, connect the school society together (Peterson & Deal, 1998) and encourages students to learn (Peterson, 2002). The stronger the school culture is, the more satisfactory and motivated teachers will be, and the higher the student academic success will be (Cheng, 1993). While the culture strongly influences the behaviors of the employees of an organization (Schein, 2004), the role of charismatic leadership in school culture has not been researched (Trice & Beyer, 1993). The present study attempts to identify the relationship between the charismatic leadership style of school principals and the school culture based on the perceptions of teachers working at a public primary school, middle school, and high school. Teacher's perception of leadership is usually based on the behaviors of leaders and which models leaders observe daily (Britton, 2018). The net effect of a charismatic leader binds together the students, teachers, and other employees, the followers who fulfill the school objectives (Sergiovanni, 1984). Sergiovanni argues that perfect schools are distinguished from other schools by their cultural characteristics. Teachers, leaders, students and parents are the groups that both influence and are influenced by the school culture (Koni,

2017). The leadership style of a principal develops, encourages, and feeds a positive school culture (Le Clear, 2005).

Charismatic leaders are a value for the school culture. Charismatic leaders will play an important role in ensuring the change and development of the cultural structure of organizations. Therefore, the present study has emerged to identify the level at which the charismatic leadership styles of school principals influence the school culture since the previous researches were conducted outside the educational institutions of the Ministry of National Education and there is a limited number of studies focusing on these two variables. The present research was conducted to analyze the role charismatic leaders play in the school culture. Identifying the role of a charismatic leader in the school culture may contribute to the practitioners and researchers during the school process. In this sense, the purpose of this research is to determine the influence of the charismatic leadership style of school principals perceived by teachers on managing school culture. For this overall purpose, answers to the following sub-objectives were sought:

1. Is there a significant relationship between the charismatic leadership style of school principals perceived by teachers and the school culture?
2. Is the charismatic leadership style of school principals perceived by teachers a predictor of the school culture?

Method

Research Model

Since this research aims to identify the relationship between the charismatic leadership style of school principals perceived by teachers and the school culture and whether charismatic leadership style is a predictor of the school culture, a quantitative research model, correlational survey model, was used. The correlational model is a research model used to determine whether two variables are related or whether a variable is a predictor of another variable (Creswell, 2012; Isaac & Michael, 1995). Prediction is used to predict the variables that are likely to affect or predict future behavior (Hart, Bergstrom, Chapa, Chowdhury, & Dion, 2012; Mishra & Silakari, 2012).

Research Sample

The research population consists of teachers working at public schools in Uskudar, Istanbul, during the 2018-2019 academic year. The sample was selected using a stratified sampling method. While using this method, the schools were first partitioned into primary schools, middle schools, and high schools, followed by a simple random sampling to select five schools from each school type. The stratified sampling method is the method that allows the sub-populations of a population to be represented satisfactorily within a sample. Four hundred ninety teachers in total from the schools selected using the stratified sampling method volunteered to participate in this study.

294 (60%) of the 490 participant teachers are female while 196 (40%) thereof is male. 147 (30%) of the teachers work at primary schools, 180 (39.7%) thereof at middle schools, and 163 (33.3%) thereof at high schools. The length of service of 63 teachers (12.9%) is 5 years or less, that of 92 teachers (18.8%) is 6-10 years, that of 106 teachers (21.6%) is 11-15 years, that of 125 teachers (25.5%) is 16-20 years, and that of 104 teachers (21.2%) is 21 years or above. 422 (86.1%) of the participant teachers have an undergraduate degree while 68 (13.9%) thereof have a graduate degree.

Research Instruments

Two different scales were used in this research. The School Culture Scale (SCS) with 29 items and four sub-dimensions developed by Terzi (2005) was used to determine the teacher's perception of school culture. The School Culture Scale consists of four sub-dimensions, including support culture, success culture, bureaucratic culture, and mission culture. The support culture expresses the commitment in bilateral relationships, honest and open communication and cooperation based on trust, and supports the members of the organization that perform their jobs successfully and fulfill the goals in the success culture. While standards and rules are paid attention in the bureaucratic culture, in the mission culture, on the other hand, organizational goals, rather than individual goals, are paid attention rather than individual goals. In this study, confirmatory factor analysis was performed to test the construct validity of the scale, and it was found that the scale had acceptable fit values according to chi-square and fit indexes [$\chi^2/df=954.324/360=2.651$; RMR=.062; SRMR=.069; GFI=.881; AGFI=.857; NFI=.852; IFI=.902; TLI=.889; CFI=.901; RMSEA=.058] (Cokluk, Sekercioglu, & Buyukozturk, 2018; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2016; Ozdamar, 2017; Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller, 2003; Schumacker & Lomax, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2015). The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the School Culture Scale in the research was calculated as 0.904.

To identify the teacher's perception of charismatic leadership, the Charismatic Leadership Scale (CLS) with 24 items and six sub-dimensions (articulating a vision, sensitivity to the environment, exhibiting unconventional behaviors, taking personal risk, sensitivity to member needs, not maintaining the status quo) developed by Conger and Kanungo (1994) was used. The scale was adapted by Gül (2003) to Turkish. While adapting the scale, four items were excluded because they disrupted the factor load and distribution. In the study, confirmatory factor analysis was performed to test the construct validity of the scale, and it was found that the scale had good fit values according to chi-square and fit indexes [$\chi^2/df=423.294/153=2.767$; RMR=.066; SRMR=.0574; GFI=.921; AGFI=.891; IFI=.968; NFI=.951; TLI=.961; CFI=.968; RMSEA=.060] (Cokluk et al., 2018; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2016; Ozdamar, 2017; Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003; Schumacker & Lomax, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2015). The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the Charismatic Leadership Scale in the research was calculated as 0.948.

Data Analysis

The data obtained were analyzed using SPSS program. For the normality assumption, kurtosis and skewness values were calculated before analyzing the data. According to Morgan, Leech, Gloeckner and Barrett (2004), for the data to show normal distribution, the skewness and kurtosis values must be between -1 and +1. The kurtosis and skewness values of the scales are given in Table 1. Data were analyzed by correlation and regression analyses. The correlation and regression statistical data analysis techniques were applied to investigate the relations between the variables.

Table 1*Skewness and kurtosis values of the scales*

	Mission culture	Support culture	Success culture	Bureaucratic culture	Charismatic leadership
Skewness	-.263	-.183	-.201	.372	-.273
Kurtosis	-.248	-.385	-.345	.061	-.420

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that the kurtosis and skewness values of the data are between -1 and +1. According to this criterion, it was decided that the data had a normal distribution. Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between charismatic leadership and school culture. Simple regression analysis was performed to determine whether the charismatic leadership style predicts school culture.

Results

The relationship between charismatic leadership and the school culture sub-dimensions are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2*Results of Correlation Analysis Between Charismatic Leadership Style and School Culture*

Variables	N	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1-Mission culture	490	3.922	.618	-				
2-Support culture	490	3.580	.692	.608**	-			
3-Success culture	490	3.629	.700	.605**	.835**	-		
4-Bureaucratic culture	490	3.085	.594	.255**	.144**	.163**	-	
5-Charismatic leadership	490	3.511	.742	.543**	.593**	.603**	.235**	-

$p < .01$

According to the correlation analysis in Table 2, there is a low-level relationship between charismatic leadership and bureaucratic culture; medium-level, positive and significant relationship between charismatic leadership, and mission culture support culture and success culture ($p < .01$). While the most significant relationship is between charismatic leadership and success culture ($r = 0.603$; $p < .01$), the least significant relationship is between charismatic leadership and bureaucratic culture ($r = 0.235$; $p < .01$).

The results of the simple regression analysis performed to determine whether or not the charismatic leadership style of school principals perceived by teachers is a predictor of the school culture are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Results of Regression Analysis on Whether or Not Charismatic Leadership is a Predictor of School Culture

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	B	SD	(β)	t	p	R	R ²	F	p
Constant	Mission culture	2.33	.114		20.50	.000				
Charismatic Leadership		.453	.032	.54	14.30	.000	.543	.295	204.52	.000
Constant	Support culture	1.63	.122		13.41	.000				
Charismatic Leadership		.553	.034	.59	16.25	.000	.593	.351	264.07	.000
Constant	Success culture	1.62	.122		13.31	.000				
Charismatic Leadership		.570	.034	.60	16.71	.000	.603	.364	279.26	.000
Constant	Bureaucratic culture	2.42	.126		19.17	.000				
Charismatic Leadership		.188	.035	.23	5.33	.000	.235	.055	28.42	.000

When Table 3 is examined, charismatic leadership is a significant predictor of (respectively from the most significant to the least significant) the success culture ($R = .603$, $R^2 = .364$, $F = 279.26$, $p < .000$), support culture ($R = .593$, $R^2 = .351$, $F = 264.07$, $p < .000$), mission culture ($R = .543$, $R^2 = .295$, $F = 204.52$, $p < .000$) and bureaucratic culture ($R = .235$, $R^2 = .055$, $F = 28.42$, $p < .000$). However, although the charismatic leadership style significantly predicts the bureaucratic school culture, the prediction level is very low. According to the regression analysis, the regression equation (mathematical model) on the prediction by the charismatic leadership style of school principals of mission support, success, and bureaucratic school cultures are presented below.

$$\text{Mission culture} = 2.33 + (.453 \times \text{Charismatic Leadership})$$

$$\text{Support culture} = 1.63 + (.533 \times \text{Charismatic Leadership})$$

$$\text{Success culture} = 1.62 + (.570 \times \text{Charismatic Leadership})$$

$$\text{Bureaucratic culture} = 2.42 + (.188 \times \text{Charismatic Leadership})$$

The charismatic leadership style of school principals perceived by teachers explains 29% of the total variance in mission culture, 35% of the total variance in support culture, 36% of the total variance in success culture and 5% of the total variance in bureaucratic culture. However, although the total variance in bureaucratic culture is significant, it is not considerable. The B coefficient shows that there is a positive relationship between the charismatic leadership style and school cultures. The standardized regression coefficient (β) shows how much change a one-unit change in the predictor variable charismatic leadership style will lead to in the dependent variable school culture. For example, a 0.453 increase in the charismatic leadership style leads to a 0.543 positive change in the mission culture. In other words, the charismatic leadership style of school principals positively and significantly influences the mission culture, support culture, and success culture.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

Education is a social process and aims to provide individuals with and improve certain behaviors (Lewin, 1948). Schools have an obligation to fulfill this aim as targeted and in a prescribed quality. Therefore, effective management and effective leadership at schools are essential (Bush, 2018). When the leadership models and styles are examined, although there are different alternative approaches, none of them alone guarantees the effective management and leadership of schools. Although each leadership model or style has virtues and limitations, it must be remembered that it may vary based on the school's environment, employees, administrators, and situational circumstances. According to Bush (2018), since these leadership models enlighten some aspects of the school while keeping some in the dark, some negative consequences may occur to the detriment of both the leader and the organization (Conger, 1990). This is exactly why the school cultures should first be analyzed to investigate the school characteristics. The present research was designed to seek answers to the question, "Who shapes school culture?" (Peterson & Deal, 1998). According to Turner and Crang (1996), the better a school's culture is understood and harmonious, the better it can act in harmony with the ideals it desires to achieve and goals it desires to pursue. Leadership behaviors that support a culture encouraging the student learning to characterize an effective school (Gawerecki, 2004). School principals can shape the changes in school culture by improving their leadership knowledge, skills, and behaviors (Hallinger, 2003). This view is considered valuable as school leaders strive to create an effective school (Gruenert & Valentine, 1998). It is the duty of school leaders to define, shape, and maintain a strong, positive, and student-focused culture. Without such supportive cultures, reforms would be lost, and student learning would not be achieved as targeted (Peterson & Deal, 1998). Gawerecki (2004), in his research, revealed the importance of school leaders for developing a strong and cooperative culture that encouraged an effective learning program and curriculum and stated that such culture affected students' academic success.

Generally, leadership qualities of school principals influence the school culture (Le Clear, 2005; Schein, 2004; Sergiovanni & Corbally, 1984). In this respect, it is assumed that a charismatic leader influences introducing a radical change with beliefs and values different than the established order (House, 1976) and that school principal, as a charismatic leader, can build a culture-specific to the school (Sergiovanni, 1984). The results of the analyses performed in line with the purpose of the research show that there is a significant and low-level relationship between charismatic leadership and bureaucratic school culture and that there is a significant, positive and medium-level relationship between charismatic leadership and success, support and mission cultures. School principals must possess and exhibit charismatic leadership qualities in practice to shape the success, support, and mission cultures. Also, according to the teacher's perceptions, charismatic leadership qualities of school principals are an important and significant predictor of the school, mission, and support cultures except for the bureaucratic school culture. In other words, it has been empirically proved that charismatic leadership qualities of school principals play an important role in shaping the success, mission, and support school cultures. In the literature, Aykanat (2010), Gul and Aykanat (2012) found that charismatic leadership behaviors influenced creating an organizational culture at public organizations. Particularly, there is a stronger relationship between the quality of being sensitive to the environment of the charismatic leaders and the organizational culture, and the charismatic leadership qualities can significantly explain the organizational culture. The charismatic leadership behaviors have been found to influence creating an organizational culture (Sandybayev & Yilmaz, 2015). Again, another research found that there was a relationship between the school culture and the charismatic leadership style of the school principals and that the charismatic leadership style exhibited by the school principals was a predictor of the organizational culture (Cheng, 1993). These findings support the literature on charismatic leadership and culture and are consistent with the other research findings.

When we approach the shaping of the organization culture in the context of school, school leaders play an important role in shaping and implementing a school culture (Britton, 2018) and are a key to shaping the school culture. School leaders, while shaping the culture, first read the culture. Second, they identify the disruptive and constructive aspects of the culture. Lastly, they work to strengthen the positive cultural elements and change the negative and non-functional ones (Peterson & Deal, 1998). The school culture is an invisible power that mobilizes all of the individuals at the school in line with the same goals and is behind all of the actions at the school. The school culture regulates what is important for the school society and how the members must think, feel, and behave (Turner & Crang, 1996). Koni (2017) and Turner and Crang (1996) state that changing a school culture requires patience, flexibility, and adaptability. Therefore, school leaders, while shaping the school culture, must honor employees who serve the students and the school objective and recognize the achievements of the personnel, students and school society (Peterson & Deal, 1998).

The present study does not explain the casual relationship since it is a cross-sectional study. Therefore, it cannot be deduced from this study that "the reason for

school culture is the charismatic leader." The findings support the importance and necessity of the charismatic leader and the school culture for discussions on the school development and school effectiveness. In this context, teachers mostly regard school administrators who articulate a vision, are sensitive to the environmental situations, opposing the status quo and bureaucratic structure, take risks and respond to the member needs as a charismatic leader and think that they positively contribute to creating/managing the school culture. When the results are evaluated together, it can be suggested that charismatic leaders who know, understand and influence the school culture can be successful. School principals must understand that they have significant potential and role in creating, communicating, and changing the school culture. The charismatic leadership role of school principals in shaping the school culture must be emphasized. School principals must spend considerable time, energy, and resources to change and manage the culture. Studies show that a leader on every level can be trained charisma (Bass, 1990). Leadership, also including charisma, can be developed (Fiedler, 1972; Antonakis et al., 2011). As a result, school principals can be offered training in charismatic leadership and school culture.

References

- Anthony, L. V. L. (1994). *The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and organizational culture, employee performance, and employee attrition* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Miami, Florida.
- Antonakis, J. (2006). Leadership: what is it and how it is implicated in strategic change? *International Journal of Management Cases*, 8(4), 4-20.
- Antonakis, J. (2012). Transformational and charismatic leadership. In D. V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The Nature of leadership* (256-288). Sage.
- Antonakis, J., & Atwater, L. (2002). Leader distance: A review and a proposed theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(6), 673-704.
- Antonakis, J., & House, R. J. (2013). The full-range leadership theory: The way forward. In *Transformational and Charismatic leadership: The road ahead 10th anniversary edition* (pp. 3-33). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(3), 261-295.
- Antonakis, J., Bastardo, N., Jacquart, P., & Shamir, B. (2016). Charisma: An ill-defined and ill-measured gift. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 3, 293-319.
- Antonakis, J., Cianciolo, A. T., & Sternberg, R. J. (2004). Leadership: Past, present, and future. *The nature of Leadership*, 3-15.

- Antonakis, J., Fenley, M., & Liechti, S. (2011). Can charisma be taught? Tests of two interventions. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(3), 374-396.
- Arikan, E., Kilic, G., & Becerikli, G. (2017). Karizmatik liderlik ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı arasındaki ilişki: Kuşadası'ndaki beş yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde bir uygulama [Relationship between charismatic leadership and organizational citizenship behavior: A study in five star hotels in Kusadası]. *Journal of Turkish Tourism Research*, 1(4), 1-19.
- Arsenault, P. M. (1999). *Using the social constructive perspective to investigate charismatic leadership* (Doctoral dissertation). Temple University, Philadelphia.
- Ashkanasy, N. M., Wilderom, C. P., & Peterson, M. F. (2000). *Handbook of organizational culture and climate*. Sage.
- Aykanat, Z. (2010). *Karizmatik liderlik ve örgüt kültürü ilişkisi üzerine bir uygulama* [An application on the relationship between charismatic leadership and organizational culture] (Master's thesis). Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University, Karaman.
- Bacon, A. R. (2009). *Perceptions of leadership: An exploratory study of charismatic leadership in the Air National Guard* (Doctoral dissertation). Capella University, Minneapolis.
- Banks, G. C., Engemann, K. N., Williams, C. E., Gooty, J., McCauley, K. D., & Medaugh, M. R. (2017). A meta-analytic review and future research agenda of charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(4), 508-529.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 112-121.
- Baytok, A. (2006). *Hizmet işletmelerinde örgüt kültürünün oluşturulmasında liderin rolü* [The role of leader in formation of organisational culture in service enterprises] (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyonkarahisar.
- Bell, R. M. (2013). Charismatic leadership case study with Ronald Reagan as exemplar. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 65(1), 83-91.
- Bennis, W. (2016). *Bir lider olabilmek* (U. Teksöz, Çev.). İstanbul: Aura.
- Beyer, J. M. (1999). Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 307-330.
- Brinkman, W. R. (2015). *How charismatic leadership affects direct follower behavior and perceived meeting effectiveness*. 6th IBA Bachelor Thesis Conference, November 5th, 2015, Enschede, The Netherlands.
- Britton, E. M. (2018). *Influence of school principals on teachers' perceptions of school culture* (Doctoral dissertation). Walden University, Washington.

- Bryman, A. (1993). Charismatic leadership in business organizations: Some neglected issues. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 4(3-4), 289-304.
- Bush, T. (2018). *Eğitim liderliği ve yönetimi kuramları* (R. Sarpkaya, Çev.). Ankara: Pegem.
- Cameron, K. S. & Quinn, R. E. (2017). *Örgüt kültürü: Örgütsel tanı ve değişim* (M. G. Gülcan ve N. Cemaloğlu, Çev.). Ankara: Pegem.
- Chadwick, L. J. (1999). *A comparative analysis of transformational and transactional leadership in public school principals and their effect on school culture* (Doctoral dissertation). Regent University.
- Cheng, Y. C. (1993). Profiles of organizational culture and effective schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice*, 4(2), 85-110.
- Choi, J. (2006). A motivational theory of charismatic leadership: Envisioning, empathy, and empowerment. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 13(1), 24-43.
- Cicero, L., & Pierro, A. (2007). Charismatic leadership and organizational outcomes: The mediating role of employees' work-group identification. *International Journal of Psychology*, 42(5), 297-306.
- Cinel, O. M. (2008). *Karizmatik liderlik özelliklerinin örgütsel bağlılık unsurları üzerindeki etkileri ve bir araştırma* [The effects of charismatic leadership features on organizational commitment and a research] (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Kocaeli.
- Ciulla, J. B. (2003). *The ethics of leadership*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson.
- Conger, J. A. (1989). Leadership: The art of empowering others. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 3(1), 17-24.
- Conger, J. A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19(2), 44-55.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 637-647.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 471-482.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1994). Charismatic leadership in organizations: Perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15(5), 439-452.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1994). Charismatic leadership in organizations: Perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15(5), 439-452.

- Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Menon, S. T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 21(7), 747-767.
- Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., Menon, S. T., & Mathur, P. (1997). Measuring charisma: dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 14(3), 290-301.
- Cooper, E. A. (2000). *Corporate culture and performance: relating concepts and outcomes* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative*. Boston: Pearson.
- Cokluk, Ö., Sekercioglu, G. & Buyukozturk, Ş. (2018). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları* [Multivariate statistics SPSS and LISREL applications for social sciences]. Ankara: Pegem.
- Dalgic, E. (2015). *Okul yöneticilerinin algılanan liderlik stilleri ile okul kültürü arasındaki ilişkinin çok boyutlu incelenmesi* [Multidimensional investigation of the relationship between perceived leadership styles of school principals and school culture] (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Yeditepe University, Istanbul.
- Davidson, G. M. (2009). *The relationship between organisational culture and financial performance in a South African Investment Bank* (Doctoral dissertation). University of South Africa, South Africa.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of organizational life*. Reading/T. Deal, A. Kennedy-Mass: Addison-Wesley, 98-103.
- Denison, D. R., & Mishra, A. K. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. *Organization Science*, 6(2), 204-223.
- Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2005). *Educational leadership: Culture and diversity*. Sage.
- Doran, E. F. (1996). *The effects of person-organization culture fit on employee organizational commitment and employee internet work motivation* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). California State University, Long Beach, CA, USA.
- Eren, E., Alpkın, L., & Ergun, E. (2003). Kültürel boyutlar olarak işletmelerde içsel bütünleşme ve dışsal odaklanma düzeylerinin performans etkileri [The effects on the managerial performance of the levels of internal integration and external orientations cultural dimensions within the firms]. *Doğus University Journal*, 4(1), 55-70.
- Featherstone, G. L. (2017). *Principal Leader Actions and Their Influence on School Culture and School Performance* (Doctoral dissertation). Florida Atlantic University.

- Fiedler, F. E. (1972). Personality, motivational systems, and behavior of high and low LPC persons. *Human Relations*, 25(5), 391-412.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1996). Research on leadership selection and training: One view of the future. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 241-250.
- Fiol, C. M., Harris, D., & House, R. (2002). Charismatic leadership: Strategies for effecting social change. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(3), 449-482.
- Fougère, M., & Moulettes, A. (2007). The construction of the modern west and the backward rest: studying the discourse of Hofstede's culture's consequences. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 2(1), 1-19.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *Leading in a culture of change*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Gawerecki, J. C. (2004). *The impact of principal leadership on student academic achievement: A case study of Southside Intermediate School* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri, Columbia.
- Gizir, S. (2008). Örgütsel değişim sürecinde örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel öğrenme. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 4(2), 182-196.
- Gordon, G. G., & DiTomaso, N. (1992). Predicting corporate performance from organizational culture. *Journal of Management Studies*, 29(6), 783-798.
- Grabo, A., Spisak, B. R., & van Vugt, M. (2017). Charisma as signal: An evolutionary perspective on charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(4), 473-485.
- Green, L. M. (2016). *The relationship between principals' leadership styles and school culture, as assessed by teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Mississippi College.
- Groves, K. S. (2003). *An examination of leader social intelligence and follower openness to organizational change as key components of charismatic leadership* (Doctoral dissertation). Claremont Graduate University, California.
- Gruenert, S., & Valentine, J. (1998). *Development of a school culture survey* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri.
- Gutierrez-Shackelford, E. (2016). *The impact of neuroleadership brain domains versus charismatic leadership on employee motivation* (Doctoral dissertation). Alliant International University, Los Angeles.
- Gul, H. (2003). *Karizmatik liderlik ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi üzerine bir inceleme* [A review on the relationship between charismatic leadership and organizational commitment] (Doktora tezi). Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.
- Gul, H., & Aykanat, Z. (2012). Karizmatik liderlik ve örgüt kültürü ilişkisi üzerine bir araştırma [A research on the relationship between charismatic leadership and organizational culture]. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 16(1), 17-36.

- Hadian, D. (2017). The relationship organizational culture and organizational commitment on public service quality; perspective local government in Bandung, Indonesia. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(1), 230-237.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329-352.
- Hancerlioglu, O. (2018). *Felsefe sözlüğü* [Philosophical dictionary]. Istanbul: Remzi.
- Handy, C. (1995). *Gods of management: The changing work of organizations*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- Hart, A., Bergstrom, C. R., Chapa, S., Chowdhury, N., & Dion, M. (2012). *Report of the society of actuaries predictive modeling survey subcommittee*. <https://www.soa.org/globalassets/assets/files/research/exp-study/research-2012-02-predictive.pdf> adresinden 27 Haziran 2019 tarihinde erişilmiştir.
- Hayes, A. (2019). *What is stratified random sampling?* https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/stratified_random_sampling.asp adresinden 27 Haziran 2019 tarihinde edinilmiştir.
- Henderson, R. D. (2018). *The Perception of the role of charismatic leadership in a research and development environment* (Doctoral dissertation). Grand Canyon University, Arizona.
- Hofstede, G. H., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Culture organization*. McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Ohayv, D. D., & Sanders, G. (1990). Measuring organizational cultures: A qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 286-316.
- House, R. J. (1976). *A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership*. Working Paper Series 76-06. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED133827.pdf> adresinden 18 Mayıs 2019 tarihinde edinilmiştir.
- House, R. J. (1992). Charismatic leadership in service-producing organizaitons. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 3(2), 5-17.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2010). *Eğitim yönetimi* (S. Turan, Çev. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel.
- Hu, L. & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1-55.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1995). *Handbook in research and evaluation: A collection of principles, methods, and strategies useful in the planning, design, and evaluation of studies in education and the behavioral sciences*. San Diego, CA: EdITS Publishers.

- Jones, M. T. (1998). *The relationship of organizational commitment to the organizational culture of high schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Widener University, Harrisburg, PA, USA.
- Kahveci, G. (2015). *Okullarda örgüt kültürü, örgütsel güven, örgütsel yabancılaşma ve örgütsel sinisizm arasındaki ilişkiler* [Relationship between organizational culture, organizational trust, organizational alienation and organizational cynicism in schools] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Firat University, Elâzığ.
- Keyton, J. (2005). *Communication and organizational culture: A key to understanding work experiences*. Sage.
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Yapısal eşitlik modellemesi ve uygulaması* (S. Şen, Çev. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel.
- Koni, L. (2017). *Leading change successfully to create a school culture of high expectations*. 2017 Senior Manager's Sabbatical Report, <http://www.educationaleaders.govt.nz/content/download/81119/664084/file/Liz%20Koni%20-%20leading%20change%20-%20sabbatical%20report%202017.pdf> adresinden 16 Mayıs 2019 tarihinde erişilmiştir.
- Kuyumcu, M. (2007). *İlköğretim okullarında okul kültürü ve takım liderliği* [School culture and team leadership in elementary schools] (elâzığ ili örneği) (Doktora tezi). Firat University, Elâzığ.
- Ladkin, D. (2010). *Rethinking leadership: A new look at old leadership questions*. UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Le Clear, E. A. (2005). *Relationships among leadership styles, school culture, and student achievement* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Levay, C. (2010). Charismatic leadership in resistance to change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(1), 127-143.
- Lewin, K. (1948). *Resolving social conflicts*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (1999). The relationship between commitment and organizational culture, subculture, leadership style and job satisfaction in organizational change and development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 20(7), 365-374.
- Lucas, D. B. (2008). *A study of the relationship between transformational leadership and constructive organizational culture in small manufacturing companies* (Doctoral dissertation). Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan
- Lucas, S. E. & Valentine, J. W. (2002). *Transformational leadership: Principals, leadership teams and school culture*. American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002).

- Lunenburg, A. C., & Ornstein, F. (2013). *Eğitim yönetimi* (G. Arastaman, Çev. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel.
- MacNeil, A. J., Prater, D. L., & Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 12(1), 73-84.
- Marks, D. E. (2002). *A study of two leadership styles and school cultural norms in small middle schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation): Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA,
- McEwan, E. K. (2018). *Etkili okul yöneticilerinin 10 özelliği* (N. Cemaloğlu, Çev.). Ankara: Pegem.
- Mees, G. W. (2008). *The relationship among principal leadership, school culture, and student achievement in Missouri middle schools* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri, Columbia.
- Mete, E. S. (2017). The Path extended from organizational culture to innovative work behavior: A research on a defense company. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 9(1), 403-428.
- Mhatre, K. H., & Riggio, R. E. (2014). Charismatic and transformational leadership: Past, present, and future. In D. V. Day (Ed.), *Oxford library of psychology. The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations* (pp. 221-240). New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.
- Miles, M. T. (2002). *The relative impact of principal instructional and transformational leadership on school culture* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri, Columbia.
- Milton, P. (2011). *Educational leadership and school culture: A study of the perceptions of effective leadership* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Clemson University, South Carolina.
- Mishra, N., & Silakari, S. (2012). Predictive analytics: A survey, trends, applications, opportunities & challenges. *International Journal of Computer Science and Information Technologies*, 3(3), 4434-4438.
- Morgan, G. A., Leech, N. L., Gloeckner, G. W., & Barrett, K. C. (2004). *SPSS for introductory statistics: Use and interpretation*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mumford, M. D., Hunter, S. T., Friedrich, T. L., & Caughron, J. J. (2009). Charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leadership: An examination of multi-level influences on emergence and performance. In *Multi-level issues in organizational behavior and leadership* (pp. 79-116). Emerald Group Publishing.
- Murphy, S. E., & Ensher, E. A. (2008). A qualitative analysis of charismatic leadership in creative teams: The case of television directors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(3), 335-352.

- Nikoloski, K. (2015). Charismatic leadership and power: Using the power of charisma for better leadership in the enterprises. (*JPMNT*) *Journal of Process Management - New Technologies, International*, 3(2), 18-27.
- Nnadozie, C. A. (1993). *A study of the relation between participation in decision-making and school culture and perception of job satisfaction among teachers (empowerment)* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Morgan State University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA.
- Northouse, P. G. (2014). *Introduction to leadership: Concepts and practice*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Nystrom, P. C. (1993). Organizational cultures, strategies, and commitments in health care organizations. *Health Care Management Review*, 18(1), 43-49.
- Oktay, E., & Gül, H. (2003). Çalışanların duygusal bağlılıklarının sağlanmasında Conger ve Kanungo'nun karizmatik lider özelliklerinin etkileri üzerine Karaman ve Aksaray emniyet müdürlüklerinde yapılan bir araştırma [A research on the effects of Conger and Kanungo's charismatic leader characteristics and Aksaray safety directors on the employment of emotional commitments of employees]. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (10), 403-428.
- Ouchi, W. (1981). Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge. *Business Horizons*, 24(6), 82-83.
- Ozdamar, K. (2017). *Eğitim, sağlık ve davranış bilimlerinde ölçek ve test geliştirme: Yapısal eşitlik modellenmesi* [Scale and test development in education, health and behavioral sciences: Structural equation modeling]. Eskişehir: Nisan.
- Ozgenel, M. & Ankaralioglu, S. (2020, February). Farklı okul kademelerinde görev yapan öğretmen algılarına göre yöneticilerin ruhsal liderlik stiline okul kültürüne etkisi [The effect of administrators spiritual leadership style on school culture according to the perceptions of teachers working at different school levels]. *International Symposium on Social Sciences and Educational Sciences*, Istanbul.
- Ozgenel, M. & Dursun, İ. E. (2019, October). Okul müdürlerinin paternalist liderlik davranışlarının okul kültürüne etkisi [The effect of paternalistic leadership behaviors of school principals on school culture]. *2nd International Congress on Seeking New Perspectives in Education*, Marmara University, Istanbul.
- Ozgozcu, S. (2015). *Eğitim örgütlerinde yöneticilerin liderlik davranışları, bilgi yönetimi ve örgüt kültürü ilişkisi* [Leadership behaviors, information management and organizational culture relationship in educational organizations] (Doktora tezi). Ege University, İzmir.
- Peterson, K. D. (2002). Enhancing school culture: Reculturing schools excerpted from positive or negative. *Journal of Staff Development*, 23(3), 13-15.

- Peterson, K. D., & Deal, T. E. (1998). How leaders influence the culture of schools. *Educational Leadership*, 56, 28-31.
- Peterson, K. D., & Deal, T. E. (2002). *The shaping school culture fieldbook*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Reames, E. H. (1997). *A study of the relationships between school work culture and teacher beliefs of efficacy and commitment in middle schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, USA.
- Riutort, P. (2017). *Sosyolojiye giriş dersleri* (E. C. Gürcan, Çev.). Ankara: Doğu Batı.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Örgütsel davranış* (İ. Erdem, Çev. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel.
- Sandybayev, A., & Yilmaz, B. (2015). Charismatic leadership and organizational culture: A Northern Cyprus perspective on the police service employees. *International Journal of Research in Management*, 5(2), 70-78.
- Sarwono, D. (1990). *The impact of organizational culture on organization performance: the case of banks in Indonesia* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Southern California, Los Angeles, USA.
- Schein, E. H. (1988). *Organizational culture*. Sloan School of Management, MIT.
- Schein, E. H. (1990). *Organizational culture*. American Psychological Association. Inc. 0003-066X/90/S00.75. Vol. 45, No. 2, 109-119
- Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey.
- Schein, E. H. (2009). *The corporate culture survival guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey.
- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H. & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online* 8(2), 23-74.
- Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2010). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. *Educational Leadership*, 41(5), 4-13.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Corbally, J. E. (1984). *Leadership and organizational culture*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Seyranian, V., & Bligh, M. C. (2008). Presidential charismatic leadership: Exploring the rhetoric of social change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(1), 54-76.
- Shamir, B. (1999). Taming charisma for better understanding and greater usefulness: A response to Beyer. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(4), 555-562.

- Shamir, B., & Howell, J. M. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 257-283.
- Shastri, R. K., Mishra, K. S., & Sinha, A. (2010). Charismatic leadership and organizational commitment: An Indian perspective. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(10), 1946-1953.
- Sorensen, J. B. (2002). The strength of corporate culture and the reliability of firm performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47(1), 70-91.
- Sy, T., Horton, C., & Riggio, R. (2018). Charismatic leadership: Eliciting and channeling follower emotions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 58-69.
- Sisman, M. (2014). *Örgütler ve kültürler* [Organizations and cultures]. Ankara: Pegem.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2015). *Çokdeğişkenli istatistiklerin kullanımı* (N. Baloğlu, Çev. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel.
- Taylor, F. W. (2013). *Bilimsel yönetimin ilkeleri* (H. B. Akın, Çev.). Ankara: Adres.
- Terzi, A. R. (2005). İlköğretim okullarında örgüt kültürü [Organizational culture in primary schools]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 43, 423-442.
- Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1986). Charisma and its routinization in two social movement organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8, 113-164.
- Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1991). Cultural leadership in organizations. *Organization Science*, 2(2), 149-169.
- Turner, J. & Crang, C. (1996). *Exploring school culture*. Paper submitted to the Centre for Leadership in Learning, University of Calgary. <http://www.educationalleaders.govt.nz/Culture/Understanding-school-cultures/Exploring-school-culture> adresinden 16 Mayıs 2019 tarihinde erişilmiştir.
- Waldman, D. A., & Javidan, M. (2009). Alternative forms of charismatic leadership in the integration of mergers and acquisitions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(2), 130-142.
- Waldner, C. L. (2005). *Relationship between a situational construct, organizational culture, and transformational and transactional leadership* (Doctoral dissertation). Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma.
- Wallach, E. (1983). Individuals and organization: the cultural match. *Training and Development Journal*, 12, 28-36.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of economic and social organization* (Trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yalcinsoy, A. (2019). Örgüt kültürü ve örgüt ikliminin örgütsel sessizlik üzerindeki etkisinin analizi [Analysis of the impact of organizational culture and

organizational climate on organizational silence]. *Journal of Social Sciences of Muş Alparslan University*, 7(2) 67-77.

- Yaldizbas, S. (2015). *Karizmatik liderlik davranışlarının iş performansına etkisinde iş tatmininin aracılık rolü* [Mediator role of job satisfaction on the relation between charismatic leadership behaviors and work performance] (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Süleyman Demirel University, Isparta.
- Yavuz Tabak, B. (2017). *Okullarda demokratik okul kültürüne ilişkin görüşlerin belirlenmesi* [Determining opinions on democratic school culture in schools] (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Yesil, T. (2016). *Destekleyici müdür davranışı ile okul kültürü arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [The relationship between supportive principal behavior and school culture] (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans). Osmangazi University, Eskişehir.
- Yildiz, N. (2018). *Örgüt kültürü ile örgüt yapısı arasındaki ilişki: Muğla'daki hastaneler üzerine bir araştırma* [The relationship between organizational culture and organizational structure: A research on hospitals in Muğla] (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285-305.
- Zel, U. (2011). *Kişilik ve liderlik* [Personality and leadership]. Ankara: Nobel.
- Zhu, C., Devos, G., & Li, Y. (2011). Teacher perceptions of school culture and their organizational commitment and well-being in a Chinese school. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 12(2), 319-328.

Okul Kültüründe Karizmatik Liderin Rolü

Atıf:

Ozgenel, M. (2020). The role of charismatic leader in school culture. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 86, 85-114, DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2020.86.5

Özet

Problem Durumu: Karizmatik liderler, okul kültürü için bir değerdir. Örgütlerin kültürel yapısının değişimini ve gelişimini sağlamada karizmatik liderler önemli bir rol oynayacağı söylenebilir. Bu sebeple daha önce yapılan araştırmaların Millî Eğitim Bakanlığına bağlı eğitim kurumları dışında olması ve bu iki değişkenle yapılan çalışmaların sınırlı sayıda olması sebebiyle okul müdürlerinin karizmatik liderlik stilleri okulların kültürlerini ne düzeyde etkilediğini saptamak amacıyla bu çalışma ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu araştırma, karizmatik liderlerin okul kültürlerinde oynadığı rolün analizine yönelik yapılmıştır. Karizmatik liderin okul kültüründeki rolünün belirlenmesi, okul yönetimi sürecinde uygulayıcılara ve araştırmacılara katkı sunabilir. Bu anlamda *araştırmanın amacı*, okul müdürlerinin öğretmenler tarafından algılanan karizmatik liderlik stiline okul kültürüne etkisini incelemektir. Bu genel amaç doğrultusunda aşağıdaki alt amaçlara cevap aranmıştır.

- i) Okul müdürlerinin öğretmenler tarafından algılanan karizmatik liderlik stili ile okul kültürü arasında anlamlı bir ilişki var mıdır?
- ii) Okul müdürlerinin öğretmenler tarafından algılanan karizmatik liderlik stili, okul kültürünü yordamakta mıdır?

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Bu çalışmada kamu okullarında görev yapan okul müdürlerinin öğretmenler tarafından algılanan karizmatik liderlik tarzı ile okul kültürü algısı arasındaki ilişkinin ve karizmatik liderlik tarzının, okul kültürünü yordayıp-yordamadığının belirlenmesi amaçlandığından nicel araştırma modellerinden ilişkisel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın evrenini, 2018-2019 eğitim öğretim yılı İstanbul ili Üsküdar ilçesinde kamu okullarında görev yapan öğretmenler oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada tabakalı örneklem yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Tabakalı örneklem yöntemi kullanılırken ilk önce okullar ilköğretim, ortaokul ve lise olarak üç tabakaya ayrıldıktan sonra bu okul türlerinden 5'er okul basit seçkisiz örnekleme yöntemi ile belirlenmiştir. Tabakalı örneklem yöntemi kullanılarak belirlenen okullardan toplam 490 öğretmen çalışmaya gönüllü katılmıştır. Katılımcı öğretmenin 294'ü (%60) kadın iken 196'sı (%40) erkektir. Öğretmenlerin 147'si (%30) ilköğretimde, 180'i (%36.7) ortaokullarda ve 163'ü (33.3) liselerde görev yapmaktadır. Bu çalışmada iki farklı ölçek kullanılmıştır. Öğretmenlerin okul kültürü algılarını belirlemek için Terzi (2005) tarafından geliştirilen 29 maddeden ve 4 alt boyuttan oluşan Okul Kültürü Ölçeği (OKÖ) kullanılmıştır. Okul Kültürü Ölçeği, destek kültürü, başarı kültürü, bürokratik kültür ve görev kültürü olarak dört alt boyuttan oluşmaktadır. Okul Kültürü Ölçeğinin bu çalışmada Cronbach Alpha güvenilirlik katsayısı 0.904 olarak hesaplanmıştır. Öğretmenlerin karizmatik liderlik algılarını belirlemek için Conger ve Kanungo (1994) tarafından geliştirilen 24 maddeden ve 6 alt

boyuttan (vizyon belirleme, çevresel duyarlılık, sıra dışı davranışlar sergileme, kişisel risk üstlenme, üye ihtiyaçlarına duyarlılık gösterme, statükoyu sürdürmeme) oluşan Karizmatik Liderlik Ölçeği (KLÖ) kullanılmıştır. Ölçek, Gül (2003) tarafından Türkçe'ye uyarlanmıştır. Ölçek, Karizmatik Liderlik Ölçeğinin bu araştırmada Cronbach Alpha güvenilirlik katsayısı 0.948 olarak hesaplanmıştır. Veriler araştırmacı tarafından toplanmıştır. Araştırmada elde edilen veriler SPSS paket program kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Veriler, korelasyon ve regresyon analizleri yapılarak çözümlenmiştir.

Bulgular: Korelasyon analizine göre karizmatik liderlik ile bürokratik kültür düşük düzeyde; karizmatik liderlik ile görev kültürü, destek kültür ve başarı kültürü arasında orta düzeyde pozitif ve anlamlı bir ilişki vardır ($p < .01$). En yüksek anlamlı ilişki karizmatik liderlik stili ile başarı kültürü arasında iken ($r = 0.603$; $p < .01$); en düşük anlamlı ilişki ise karizmatik liderlik ile bürokratik kültürü arasında ($r = 0.235$; $p < .01$) olduğu görülmektedir. Karizmatik liderlik stiline, (en yüksekte en düşüğe doğru sırayla) başarı kültürünü ($R = .603$, $R^2 = .364$, $F = 279.26$, $p < .000$), destek kültürünü ($R = .593$, $R^2 = .351$, $F = 264.07$, $p < .000$), görev kültürünü ($R = .543$, $R^2 = .295$, $F = 204.52$, $p < .000$) ve bürokratik kültürü ($R = .5235$, $R^2 = .055$, $F = 28.42$, $p < .000$) anlamlı bir şekilde yordadığı görülmektedir. Ancak karizmatik liderlik stili, bürokratik okulu kültürünü anlamlı bir şekilde yordasa da yordama düzeyi çok düşüktür. Okul müdürlerinin öğretmenler tarafından algılanan karizmatik liderlik stili, görev kültüründeki toplam varyansın %29'unu, destek kültüründeki toplam varyansın %35'ini, başarı kültüründeki toplam varyansın %36'sını ve bürokratik kültürdeki toplam varyansın %5'ini açıklamaktadır. Ancak bürokratik kültürdeki toplam varyans oranı anlamlı olsa da dikkate değer düzeyde değildir. B katsayısı karizmatik liderlik stili ile okul kültürleri arasında pozitif yönlü ilişki olduğunu göstermektedir. Standardize edilmiş regresyon katsayısına (β) göre yordayıcı değişken karizmatik liderlik stiline bir birimlik değişikliğin bağımlı değişken okul kültürleri üzerinde ne kadar değişiklik meydana getireceğini gösterir. Örneğin karizmatik liderlik stiline 0.453 birimlik artış, görev kültüründe 0.543 birimlik olumlu değişikliğe neden olmakta ve artırmaktadır. Başka bir ifadeyle okul müdürlerinin karizmatik liderlik stili, görev kültürünü, destek kültürünü ve başarı kültürünü olumlu yönde ve önemli düzeyde etkilemektedir.

Sonuç ve Öneriler: Bu araştırmanın amacı doğrultusunda yapılan analizler sonucunda karizmatik liderlik ile bürokratik okul kültürü arasında düşük; başarı, destek ve görev kültürleri arasında pozitif yönde ve orta düzeyde anlamlı bir ilişki olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Okul müdürleri başarı, destek ve görev kültürlerini şekillendirmek için karizmatik liderlik özelliklerine sahip olması ve bu özelliklerini uygulamaları ile göstermesi gerektiği söylenebilir. Ayrıca öğretmen algılarına göre okul müdürlerinin karizmatik liderlik özelliklerinin, bürokratik okul kültürü hariç diğer başarı, görev ve destek kültürlerini önemli ve anlamlı düzeyde yordamaktadır. Başka bir ifadeyle okul müdürlerinin karizmatik liderlik özelliklerinin başarı, görev ve destek okul kültürlerini şekillendirirken önemli bir rol oynadığı ampirik olarak kanıtlanmıştır. Sonuçlar birlikte değerlendirildiğinde okul kültürünü tanıyan, anlayan ve etkileyen karizmatik liderlerin başarılı olabileceği söylenebilir. Müdürler, okul kültürünün

oluřturulması, aktarımı ve deęişiminde büyük bir potansiyele ve role sahip olduğunu anlamalıdır. Okul müdürlerinin okul kültürünü şekillendirmedeki karizmatik liderlik rolü vurgulanmalıdır. Müdürler, kültürün deęişiminde ve yönetiminde önemli zaman, enerji ve kaynak harcamalıdır. Sonuç olarak, okul müdürleri için karizmatik liderlik ve okul kültürü alanlarında eğitim önerilebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Leadership, charismatic leadership, school culture.