





The Effect of School Administrators' Spiritual Leadership Style on School Culture*

Mustafa Özgenel¹ 

İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University

Samet Ankaraloğlu² 

İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University

¹ Asst. Prof., Faculty of Education, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, İstanbul, Turkey. E-mail: mustafa.ozgenel@izu.edu.tr

² Graduate Student, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, İstanbul, Turkey. E-mail: sametankaralioglu@hotmail.com.tr

Abstract

This study aims to determine whether administrators' spiritual leadership style predicts school culture according to the perceptions of teachers working at different school levels. The study was carried out according to the correlation survey model used in quantitative research methods. The population of the study consists of 3657 teachers working in primary, secondary, and high schools in the Kartal district of İstanbul in the 2018-2019 academic year. The sample of the study was selected using a simple random sampling method; It consists of a total of 446 teachers working in primary, middle school, and high school levels. The Managerial Spiritual Leadership Perception Scale that was developed by Akıncı and Ekşi (2017) and The School Culture Scale that was developed by Terzi (2005) were used to collect the data. Data were analyzed by t-test, ANOVA, correlation, and regression analysis. The findings of the study showed that there was a moderate and positive relationship between school culture and the spiritual leadership styles of administrators according to teachers' perceptions. In addition, it was concluded that the spiritual leadership styles of school administrators were a predictor of school culture according to the teachers' perceptions. While significant differences were found between gender and school-level variables in the support culture sub-dimension of the school culture, age and school-level variables in the success culture sub-dimension, age, occupational seniority, and school-level variables in the bureaucratic culture sub-dimension, age and school-level variables in the task culture sub-dimension, there was no difference between the sub-dimension of school culture and educational status. While there was a significant difference in the level of spiritual leadership perceived by teachers according to the school level variable, there was no significant difference according to the variables of gender, educational level, age, and professional seniority. According to the results of the research, some suggestions were developed.

Keywords: Spiritual Leadership, School Culture, School Principal

Okul Yöneticilerinin Ruhsal Liderlik Stilinin Okul Kültürüne Etkisi

Öz

Bu çalışma, farklı okul kademelerinde görev yapan öğretmen algılarına göre yöneticilerin ruhsal liderlik stiline okul kültürünü yordayıp yordamadığını belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma, nicel araştırma yöntemi ve ilişkisel tarama modeline göre gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırmanın çalışma evrenini, 2018-2019 eğitim-öğretim yılında İstanbul ili Kartal ilçesinde bulunan ilkököl, ortaokul ve liselerde görev yapan 3657 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın örneklemini ise basit seçkisiz örnekleme yöntemine göre ulaşılan; ilkököl, ortaokul ve lise kademelerinde görev yapan toplam 446 öğretmenlen oluşmaktadır. Verilerin toplanmasında Akıncı ve Ekşi (2017) tarafından geliştirilen "Yönetici Ruhsal Liderlik Algı Ölçeği" ile Terzi (2005) tarafından geliştirilen "Okul Kültürü Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Veriler t-testi, ANOVA, korelasyon ve regresyon analizleri yapılarak çözümlenmiştir. Araştırma bulguları, öğretmenlerin algılarına göre okul yöneticilerinin ruhsal liderlik stili ile okul kültürü arasında orta düzeyde ve pozitif yönde anlamlı bir ilişki bulunduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca, öğretmenlerin algılarına göre okul yöneticilerinin ruhsal liderlik stillerinin okul kültürünün bir yordayıcısı olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Öğretmenler tarafından algılanan yönetici ruhsal liderlik stiline okul kademesi değişkenine göre anlamlı bir farklılık görülürken cinsiyet, eğitim durumu, yaş ve mesleki kıdem değişkenlerine göre anlamlı bir farklılık görülmemektedir. Okul kültürünün destek kültürü alt boyutunda cinsiyet ve okul kademesi değişkenlerine, başarı kültürü alt boyutunda yaş ve okul kademesi değişkenlerine, bürokratik kültür alt boyutunda yaş, mesleki kıdem ve okul kademesi değişkenlerine, görev kültürü alt boyutunda ise yaş ve okul kademesi değişkenlerine göre anlamlı farklılıklar görülürken; okul kültürünün alt boyutları ile öğrenim durumu değişkeni arasında anlamlı bir farklılık görülmemektedir. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre bazı öneriler geliştirilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ruhsal Liderlik, Okul Kültürü, Okul Yöneticisi

* This paper was produced from the master's thesis of Samet Ankaraloğlu conducted under the supervision of Dr. Mustafa Özgenel. It was also presented as an oral presentation at the International Social Sciences and Educational Sciences Symposium (USVES-2020).

Corresponding author:

Mustafa Özgenel

E-mail:

mustafa.ozgenel@izu.edu.tr

eISSN: 2458-9675

Received: 10.02.2020

Revision: 11.05.2020

Accepted: 12.05.2020

©Copyright 2020

by Author(s)

Citation: Özgenel, M. & Ankaraloğlu, S. (2020). The effect of school administrators' spiritual leadership style on school culture. *Spiritual Psychology and Counseling*, 5, 137 – 165. <https://dx.doi.org/10.37898/spc.2020.5.2.93>

The complexity and uncertainty experienced today have increased the importance of organizational culture. It is claimed that the most distinctive features of successful and effective organizations are the organizational culture they have. These organizations succeed by developing a definite and easy-to-understand organizational culture accepted by the employees, adapting against the uncertainty, change and competitive environment of the organization and increasing the competitiveness and connecting all the elements that make up the organization (Cameron and Quinn, 2017).

Although there is no consensus on the definition of the concept of culture, many researchers seem to agree that culture is a socially formed, collective and holistic concept shared by a particular social group or community members (Hofstede, Neuijen Ohavy, and Sanders, 1990). For example, Schein (2004) defines culture as the shared learning of the group, which includes the behavioral, emotional, and cognitive elements of the group members. Organizational culture is a value system that separates an organization from other organizations and is shared by members of the organization (Robbins and Judge, 2013). According to Lunenburg and Ornstein (2013), it is the sum of the beliefs, emotions, behaviors, and symbols of the organization. According to another definition, organizational culture is the sum of the orientations shared by organization employees (norms, values, philosophies, perspectives, beliefs, attitudes, legends or ceremonies), connecting the organization's subsystems, giving the organization identity and separating the organization from other organizations (Hoy and Miskel, 2012).

According to Eren (2000), organizational culture reflects the value, recognition, social status of the organization, and its relationship with other organizations and individuals. In this respect, the cultural organization is one of the important tools that socialize the organization and give it social status and value. Organizational culture is an unseen force that mobilizes all individuals in the organization in line with the same goals and is behind all actions in the organization. Culture manages what is important to these individuals, how members should think, feel, and act (Turner and Crang, 1996). According to Aydoğan (2004), organizational culture refers to the community that contains learned behaviors that satisfy the sociological and psychological needs of individuals. Values shared in the organizational environment give individuals identity and increase organizational commitment. However, organizational culture directs individuals' behavior and makes them different from individuals outside the organization.

Although there are different perspectives in the definitions made about organizational culture, it is seen that these definitions have some common features. Baraz and Berberoğlu (1999) listed the common features of the definitions of organizational culture as follows: It expresses the values shared by the members of the organization. It gives identity to the organization and is the distinctive feature of the organization. It is a structure that reflects the organizational values to the

members with symbolic expressions and includes legends, assumptions, and habits through sharing within the organization. It is the source of success and failure. The leader of the organization has a big impact. The strength and degree of integration of culture, the conditions of positive reinforcement, or avoidance depend on the strength and clarity of the assumptions made by the founders or leaders of the organization (Schein, 1990). When we consider schools in this sense, while school leaders shape culture, they first read the school culture. Second, they reveal the core values. Finally, they work to shape a positive context, strengthen cultural elements, and change the negative and dysfunctional (Peterson and Deal, 1998). Each organization creates its culture by creating unique symbols, heroes, rituals, and values. According to Schein (2004), symbols are words, hand gestures, pictures, or objects with shared meaning. Heroes are people with very valuable properties in culture. Rituals are collective activities determined to achieve the desired goals. Values are the reason for choosing the option that occurs in certain situations over others.

Researchers working on organizational culture have found that an organization has more than one culture and that each sub-unit or its subsystems can have different cultures in addition to having a dominant culture. Accordingly, they made different organizational culture classifications. For example, Cameron and Quinn (2017) classify organizational culture as a hierarchy (control) culture, market (competition) culture, clan (collaboration) culture, and adhocracy (creative) culture, while Wallach (1983) classified as bureaucratic culture, innovative culture and supportive culture. Steinhoff and Owens (1989) identified 4 different school cultures. Family culture, Machine culture, Cabaret culture, and Small horror shop culture (Cited in Lunenburg and Ornstein, 2013). Terzi (2005) categorized the school culture as “support culture, success culture, bureaucratic culture, and task culture”. The culture of support shows that teachers love each other, share their joy and sadness and that bilateral relationships are based on trust. The culture of success implies that successful behaviors of teachers are supported and appreciated by the school management. Bureaucratic culture is the culture where the hierarchy is at the forefront in the institution where the teachers are located, personal relationships are in the background and legal sanctions are frequently applied. Task culture is the culture where teachers’ perceptions about the task are high, they tend towards organizational purposes rather than individuality, and it is the first priority to do the tasks they are responsible for.

Culture is the underground flow of norms, values, beliefs, traditions, and rituals that develop over time when people work together, solve problems, and face difficulties. These expectations and values shape how people think, feel, and act in schools. This highly permanent network of effects connects the school and makes it special. School leaders need supportive cultures to identify, shape, and sustain strong, positive, and student-oriented cultures and in this way, they try to achieve their targeted reforms (Peterson and Deal, 1998).

Teachers, leaders, students, and parents are groups that both affect and are affected by school culture. While these groups make decisions democratically, they influence the culture and are indirectly influenced by those effects. In short, these groups are in a changing position, influenced by both the factors that make up the culture and the culture that occurs (Koni, 2017). Culture is the result of a complex process that is influenced by leadership behavior. In this sense, leadership and culture are intertwined (Schein, 2004). Leadership and organizational culture are the main determinants of establishing, managing, and changing business processes of businesses in today's business world. While the concept of leadership is the management of the human factor at the organizational level, organizational culture provides direction and control. The culture of an organization is created, managed, and changed by its leaders or leaders. Likewise, a good and strong organizational culture enables strong leaders to be trained within the organization (Baytok, 2006).

A leader is a visionary person who aims the development of the group in line with its goals and initiates change. The leader is the person who sets realistic goals for the future of the organization with a broad vision and activates the followers to achieve these goals (Şişman and Turan, 2001). According to Eren (2001), leadership is the combination of knowledge and skills to gather a group of people around specific goals and to mobilize them to achieve these goals. Bennis (2001) compares leadership to beauty, saying that it is difficult to define both concepts and that they can be defined only when they are seen. To Önen and Kanayran (20154), leadership is to increase organizational efficiency by motivating employees in line with the goals of the organization. Considering the definitions made about leadership, it is accepted that being able to mobilize people around common goals is one of the common and important characteristics of the leader. Schein (2004) addressed the question of "Culture determines leadership behaviors or leadership behaviors determine culture?" in his research on culture and he demonstrated that the culture of a new organization is influenced by the founder or leader of the organization and school leaders are accepted as the key to shaping school culture (Peterson and Deal, 1998). In this sense, it has become a matter of curiosity that leadership characteristics managers should have.

In today's world, it can be said that there is a need to train effective leaders for successful organizational management. Since the research of Howthorne, organizations have begun to move away from traditional, centralized understanding. However, the importance that organizations attach to the concept of humans is increasing day by day. Studies on the subject led to current approaches in leadership (Baloğlu and Karadağ, 2009). Those who work in organizations where love, respect, and tolerance are dominant want to fulfill their spiritual needs and to be determinant in the formation of organizational culture. Paying attention to the interests, needs, and demands of the employees make the organizations efficient and effective. Even

if organizations are successful outside of this, it is very difficult for them to continue this success (Fairholm, 1998). In this regard, the concept of spiritual leadership is gaining importance day by day in organizational work environments.

“Spirit”, which is the essence of spiritual leadership, comes from the word “spiritus”, which means the breath needed for life in Latin. Spirit is the power believed to bring life to life. It is the real nature and real value of the world of mind and emotion rather than the material aspect of man. Spirituality is an inner journey created to discover the world and the meaning of life (Doğan and Şahin, 2009; Zinn, 1997). People consist of four essential elements: body, mind, heart, and soul. The ability of human self-expression and high performance depends on the harmony of these four elements. Otherwise, a person cannot express himself, perform poorly at work, and become unhappy (Moxley, 2000). According to Polat (2011), employees experience problems such as mental deficiency, psychological problems, loneliness, and meaninglessness. These problems reminded the science of management again the human values such as love, tolerance, compassion, and belonging.

Spiritual leadership is a type of leadership that includes values, beliefs, attitudes, and values that add value to the spiritual lives of employees and increase their inner motivation by means of meaning, difference, acceptance and appreciation (Fry, 2003). Spiritual leadership is the adaptation of human values and organizational structure to working life (Fairholm, 1998). Fry (2005) developed the spiritual leadership theory in “Spiritual Leadership Theory”; In addition to vision, sacrifice, hope/belief, and inner life, he stated that it consists of nine dimensions: meaning, belonging, vital satisfaction, efficiency, and organizational commitment. Spiritual leaders are concerned not only with the material aspects of employees but also with their spirit and emotional worlds. It is the most prominent feature of spiritual leaders that they understand themselves and others, exhibit love-based behaviors, take care of the work and processes in many ways, and focus on vision (Altman, 2010). All humanity needs the leaders who beautify the world by displaying spiritual behaviors instead of reacting negatively to a problem. Leaders who attach importance to spirituality in schools educate individuals who can provide solutions to problems from different angles by providing students with skills such as vision, hope/belief, and dedication (Fry, 2009). It can be said that these leadership characteristics are a determining factor in shaping the school culture.

In his study on transformational leadership and the organizational effectiveness of universities, Harrison (cited from 2000, Çimen, 2018) stated that the leader had an important effect on the formation and development of the school culture; It also emphasized the strong relationship between the school culture and the leader. He stated that leadership behaviors and then school culture were the most effective on the success of the school. Karadağ (2009) emphasized the importance of spiritual leaders in the formation of the school culture in the research that school administrators

examine spiritual leadership behaviors and school culture. He stated that the behaviors of school principals towards happiness and performance have positive effects on teachers' perceptions of school culture. Akar (2010) highlighted that the main purpose of spiritual leadership is to increase the efficiency and organizational commitment of the members by mobilizing the members through a sense of calling and belonging. With this aspect, he concluded that spiritual leadership is applicable in schools. Çimen (2018) found that there was a positive and significant relationship between spiritual leadership and organizational culture and academic achievement in his research, where he examined the relationship between high school teachers' spiritual leadership behaviors, organizational culture, and organizational silence perceptions and academic success.

When the organizational structure of the schools is examined, it is seen that the human factor is at the heart of this structure. Therefore, it is very important for leaders to support the development of members in the school environment, to create an organizational culture that they can learn together, in achieving goals, and increasing organizational efficiency (Bush, 2008). In this context, the fact that school administrators display spiritual leadership behaviors in building school culture can yield positive results. Although not new to the concept of spiritual leadership literature in Turkey also appears to have been studied enough. Although there are some researches about spiritual leadership in our country in recent years, it is seen that researches examining the concepts of spiritual leadership and school culture together is limited. In this context, it can be said that the subject cannot fully see the attention it deserves. The aim of the research is to determine whether the administrator's spiritual leadership style predicts school culture according to the perceptions of teachers working at different school levels. For this purpose, answers were sought for the following questions: (i) Is there a significant relationship between the spiritual leadership style perceived by teachers and school culture? (ii) Does the spiritual leadership style perceived by teachers predict school culture? (iii) Do teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership and school culture differ significantly based on their gender, educational background, age, professional seniority, and school levels?

Method

Research Model

In the study, a relational survey model is used to examine whether the administrators' spiritual leadership style predicts school culture according to the perceptions of teachers working at different school levels. Relational survey models are research models that aim to determine the presence and/or degree of co-variation between two or more variables (Karasar, 2012).

Universe and Sampling

The universe of the research is 3657 teachers working in public schools (elementary, secondary, and high school) in the Kartal district of Istanbul province in the 2018-2019 academic year. The sample of the study was determined by a simple random sampling method. According to Büyüköztürk et al. (2017), the units selected are chosen by giving the possibility of being selected equally to each sample selection in a simple sample selection method. The scale was applied in 27 schools in the Kartal district of Istanbul. 850 scale forms were distributed to schools for research and 462 scale forms were returned. 16 of the returned scales were excluded because they were not filled according to the scale filling technique. The demographic characteristics of the teachers participating in the research are given in Table 1.

Table 1.
Demographic Features of Teachers Participating in the Research

Demographic Features	Category	Frequency (n)	Ratio (f)
Gender	Female	319	71,5
	Male	127	28,5
Age	30 Years and Under	77	17,3
	31-40 Years	207	46,4
	41-50 Years	121	27,1
	51 Years and Above	41	9,2
Occupational Seniority	1-5 Years	73	16,4
	6-10 Years	103	23,1
	11-15 Years	91	20,4
	16-20 Years	73	16,4
Level of Education	21 Years and Above	106	23,8
	Bachelors	381	85,4
	Postgraduate	65	14,6
School Type	Primary (n=7)	105	23,5
	Secondary (n=11)	214	48,0
	High School (n=9)	127	28,5

Collection of Data

In this study, permission was obtained from the researchers who developed the scales to collect data, from Istanbul Provincial Directorate of National Education and the Governorship of Istanbul. In order to collect the data required for the research, the A Spiritual Leadership Perception Scale of Akıncı and Ekşi (2017) and the School Culture Scale of Terzi (2005) were applied. The questionnaires were applied by the researcher himself to teachers working in public schools (primary, secondary and high school) in the Kartal district of Istanbul province between October 2018 and May 2019. 462 out of 850 scales distributed to teachers working at different levels of schools in Kartal have returned. Of the returned scales, a total of 446 scales were evaluated.

Data Collection Tools

Personal information form, the School Culture Scale, and the Managerial Spiritual Leadership Perception Scale were used to collect the data required for this research. "School Culture Scale" developed by Terzi (2005) is used as the first data collection tool. *School Culture Scale* consists of four sub-dimensions and 29 items as Support Culture (7, 10, 11, 16, 18, 24, 26, 27), Culture of Success (9, 17, 21, 22, 25, 28), Bureaucratic Culture (8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 3, 29), and the Task Culture (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6). The total variance explained by the four factors is 50.965%. The internal reliability coefficient of the whole scale determined with Cronbach Alfa was calculated as 0.84. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the support sub-dimension of the School Culture Scale is 0.88, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the success sub-dimension is 0.82, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the bureaucratic sub-dimension is 0.76, and the Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the task sub-dimension is 0.74. The School Culture Scale has a 5-point Likert-type grading system, which has been increasingly rated in the form of (1), rarely (2), sometimes (3), mostly (4), and always (5).

The Managerial Spiritual Leadership Perception Scale, developed by Akıncı and Ekşi (2017), is used as the second data collection tool. The Managerial Spiritual Leadership Perception Scale consists of four sub-dimensions and 28 items as hope/belief (2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 23, 24), signification (5, 9, 17, 18, 20, 28), efficiency (11, 13, 21, 25, 27, 26), and vision (1, 3, 7, 15, 19, 22). The total variance rate explained by the scale consisting of 28 items was determined as 77.27%. The internal reliability value of the whole scale determined with Cronbach Alfa was found to be 0.98. The internal reliability values for the factors of the scale determined by Cronbach Alfa vary between 0.93 and 0.96. The relationship between 0.83 and 0.89 was determined between the four factors of the scale. There are 28 items in the scale, and the items are structured in the 5-point rating type (1 = Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, 5 = I totally agree) considering the structure of the scale.

In order for the data collection tools to be applied in schools, after obtaining permission from the Governor's Office through the Istanbul Provincial Directorate of National Education, necessary explanations were made for the purpose of the application, and the measurement tools were distributed to the teachers and the teachers were asked to answer the scales in a sincere manner.

Data Analysis

SPSS statistics package program was used in the analysis of the research data. Percentage and frequency analysis were made in the analysis of independent variables. Descriptive statistical values, normality values and reliability coefficients of the measurement tools were calculated to determine which tests to perform in the analysis of the collected data and are given in Table 2.

Table 2.
Descriptive Statistical Values of Spiritual Leadership and School Culture Scales

Variables	N	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	(Cronbach Alpha)
Spiritual Leadership	446	3.79	.80	-.69	.51	.97
Support Culture	446	3,67	,77	-.41	.03	.90
Success Culture	446	3.77	.74	.51	-.04	.79
Bureaucratic Culture	446	3.30	.66	.22	-.39	.76
Task Culture	446	4.03	.65	-.62	.10	.78

According to Table 2, it is determined that the administrator spiritual leadership style characteristics perceived by the teachers are at a “high” level ($M = 3.79$), the support culture is at a “high” level ($M = 3.67$), the success culture is “high” ($M = 3.77$), the bureaucratic culture is at a “medium” level ($M = 3.30$), and the mission culture is at a “high” level ($M = 4.03$). Since the kurtosis and skewness values of the data obtained are between -1 and +1, it is decided that the data showed a normal distribution, and parametric tests are performed. In addition, while calculating the reliability coefficient of the spiritual leadership scale as .97, the reliability coefficient of the support culture calculated as .90, the reliability coefficient of the success culture calculated as .79, the reliability coefficient of the bureaucratic culture subscale calculated as .76, and the reliability coefficient of the task culture subscale calculated as .78. In the analysis of the difference, the t-test was used for the analysis of two independent variables, and the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used for the analysis of three or more independent variables. In order to decide which post-hoc multiple comparison technique to be used after ANOVA, Levene’s test, a prerequisite of variance analysis, was performed. LSD multiple comparison tests in cases where variances are homogeneous and sensitive to α error. In cases where variances are not homogeneous, Dunnett C multiple comparison tests were preferred. The significance level was taken as $p < 0.05$. Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the spiritual leadership style perceived by the teachers and the sub-dimensions of the school culture scale. Linear regression analysis was conducted to determine whether the spiritual leadership style perceived by teachers is the predictor of school culture.

Findings

The correlation analysis between the spiritual leadership style and school culture perceived by teachers is given in Table 3.

Table 3.

Results of Pearson Correlation Analysis between Spiritual Leadership Style and School Culture Perceived by Teachers

		Spiritual Leadership
Support Culture	r	,641**
	p	.000
	N	446
Success Culture	r	,675**
	p	.000
	N	446
Task Culture	r	,459**
	p	.000
	N	446
Bureaucratic Culture	r	,014
	p	.761
	N	446

According to the correlation analysis given in Table 3, there is a high level and positive ($r=.641$, $p<.01$) relationship between the spiritual leadership style perceived by the teachers and the support culture. Likewise, a high level and positive ($r=.675$; $p<.01$) relationship is found between the spiritual leadership style and culture of success. In addition, while there are a medium level and positive ($r=.459$; $p<.01$) significant relationship between spiritual leadership style and support culture, there is no significant relationship between spiritual leadership style and bureaucratic school culture ($r=.014$; $p>.05$).

The simple regression analysis results related to the predictability of the spiritual leadership style perceived by teachers in the school culture are given in Table 4.

Table 4.

Simple Regression Analysis Results Analysis Table for Predicting Spiritual Leadership Style Perceived by Teachers in School Culture

Support Culture	B	SHB	β	t	p	r
Constant	10,75	1,09		9,891	0,01	,641
Spiritual Leadership	,18	,010	,64	17,615		
R=0,641; R ² =,41; F _{(1-444)}} = 310,28; p< 0,01						
Success Culture	B	SHB	β	t	p	r
Constant	8,34	,76		11,00	0,01	,675
Spiritual Leadership	,14	,05	,67	19,28		
R=0,675; R ² =0,46; F _{(1-444)}} =371,79; p<,01						
Task Culture	B	SHB	β	t	p	r
Constant	15,75	,79		19,87	0,01	,459
Spiritual Leadership	,08	,05	,469	10,89		
R=0,459; R ² =0,21; F _{(1-444)}} =118,43; p<,01						

As seen in Table 4, the power of the administrator spiritual leadership style perceived by teachers to predict the support culture in school is significant [F (1-444)

= 310,28; $p < .01$]. Spiritual leadership behaviors of school administrators explain 41% of the total variance in school support culture [$R = .641$; $R^2 = .41$]. The power of the administrator spiritual leadership style perceived by the teachers to predict the success culture in school is significant [$F(1-444) = 371,79$; $p < .01$]. Spiritual leadership behaviors of school administrators explain 46% of the total variance in school success culture [$R = .67$; $R^2 = .46$]. As seen in Table 4, the power of the administrator spiritual leadership style, which is perceived by teachers, to predict the task culture at school is significant [$F(1-444) = 118,43$; $p < .01$]. Spiritual leadership behaviors of school administrators explain 21% of the total variance in school task culture [$R = .459$; $R^2 = .21$]. In other words, the spiritual leadership style of school administrators perceived by teachers respectively affects the success culture, support culture, and task culture positively.

The results of the t-test conducted in order to determine whether the school leadership's spiritual leadership style differs significantly according to the gender of the teachers are given in Table 5.

Table 5.

T-Test Results of Teachers' Spiritual Leadership Perceptions by Gender Variable

Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Female	319	3.76	0,80	-1,08	444	.280
Male	127	3.85	0,79			

As seen in Table 5, according to the teachers' perceptions, the spiritual leadership styles of school administrators do not show a significant difference according to the teachers' gender variable ($t_{[444]} = -1.08$; $p > .05$).

The results of the t-test conducted to determine whether the school administrators' spiritual leadership style differs significantly according to the educational status of the teachers is given in Table 6.

Table 6.

Teachers' Spiritual Leadership Perceptions According to the Educational Status Variable t-Test Results

Education Level	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Bachelors	381	3,80	0,79	0,641	444	0,522
Postgraduate	65	3,73	0,84			

As can be seen in Table 6, there is no significant difference between the perceived spiritual leadership styles of school administrators and teachers' educational status variable ($t_{[444]} = 0.64$, $p > .05$).

ANOVA results to determine whether school administrators' spiritual leadership style varies significantly according to the age of the teachers is given in Table 7.

Table 7.
ANOVA Results of Teachers' Spiritual Leadership Perceptions by Age Variable

Age	N	Mean	SD	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p	Difference
1. 30 Years old and under	77	3,83	,77	Btw. G.	2,897	3	,966	1,49	0,215	---
2. 31-40 Years old	207	3,72	,77	In G.	285,173	442	,645			
3. 41-50 Years old	121	3,90	,83	Total	288,070	445				
4. 51 +	41	3,68	,87							
Total	446	3,79	,80							

As can be seen in Table 7, there is no significant difference between the perception of spiritual leadership and the age variable of teachers [F (3-442) = 1.49; p>.05].

ANOVA results are given in Table 8 to determine whether school administrators' spiritual leadership style differs significantly by teachers' occupational seniority level.

Table 8.
ANOVA Results of Teachers' Spiritual Leadership Perceptions According to Occupational Seniority Variable

Seniority	N	Mean	SD	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p	Difference
1. 5 Years and Under	73	3,68	,85	Btw. G.	4,099	4	1,025	1,59	,176	---
2. 6-10 Years	103	3,72	,74	In G.	283,971	441	,644			
3. 11-15 Years	91	3,81	,76	Total	288,070	445				
4. 16-20 Years	73	3,98	,75							
5. 21 +	106	3,77	,87							
Total	446	3,79	,80							

As can be seen in Table 8, there is no significant difference between the perception of spiritual leadership and the occupational seniority of teachers [F (4-445) = 1.59; p<.05]. ANOVA results are given in Table 9 to determine whether the school administrators' spiritual leadership style differs significantly by the level of teachers they work at.

Table 9.
ANOVA Results of Teachers' Spiritual Leadership Perceptions According to School Level Variable

LevLevel	N	Mean	SD	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p	Difference
1. Primary	105	4,00	,66	Btw. G.	11,711	2	5,856	9,38	,00	3<1
2. Secondary	214	3,82	,76	In G.	276,359	443	,624			3<2
3. High School	127	3,56	,91	Total	288,070	445				
Total	446	3,79	,80							

As can be seen in Table 9, there is a significant difference between the perception of spiritual leadership and the variable of the school level where the teachers work [F (2-443) = 9.38; p<.01]. According to the results of LSD test conducted to determine which school levels differ between the administrator spiritual leadership style perceived by teachers, it is found that teachers' working in high schools (M=3.56) perception of school administrators' spiritual leadership is higher than teachers' working in primary schools (M=4.00) and secondary schools (M=3.82).

The results of the t-test conducted to determine whether the school cultures perceived by teachers differ significantly according to the gender of the teachers are given in Table 10.

Table 10.

Independent Group t-Test Results According to the Gender Variable of Teachers' Perceptions of School Culture

School Culture	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p																																
Support Culture	Female	319	3,63	0,79	-2,24	444	,025																																
	Male	127	3,81	0,72				Bureaucratic Culture	Female	319	3,31	0,67	,462	444	,645	Male	127	3,28	0,64	Success Culture	Female	319	3,74	0,75	-1,58	444	,114	Male	127	3,86	0,74	Task Culture	Female	319	4,03	0,63	-,087	444	,931
Bureaucratic Culture	Female	319	3,31	0,67	,462	444	,645																																
	Male	127	3,28	0,64				Success Culture	Female	319	3,74	0,75	-1,58	444	,114	Male	127	3,86	0,74	Task Culture	Female	319	4,03	0,63	-,087	444	,931	Male	127	4,04	0,70								
Success Culture	Female	319	3,74	0,75	-1,58	444	,114																																
	Male	127	3,86	0,74				Task Culture	Female	319	4,03	0,63	-,087	444	,931	Male	127	4,04	0,70																				
Task Culture	Female	319	4,03	0,63	-,087	444	,931																																
	Male	127	4,04	0,70																																			

As shown in Table 10, according to the independent group t-test conducted to determine whether the gender variable of the teachers and the sub-scales of the school culture scale differ, there is no significant difference in bureaucratic culture ($t_{[444]} = ,462$; $p > .05$), success culture ($t_{[444]} = -1.58$; $p > .05$), and task culture ($t_{[444]} = -,078$; $p > .05$) sub-dimensions. However, there is a significant difference between teachers' gender variable and support culture ($t_{[444]} = -2.24$; $p < .05$). It is determined that male teachers ($M = 3.81$) have higher perceptions of the support culture in their schools than female teachers ($M = 3.63$). Male teachers stated that employees in their schools like each other, personal feelings and thoughts are shared, everyone is valued, ideas and opinions are respected, opportunities for professional development are shared, employees' joy and sadness are shared, and the team spirit is dominant to the institution.

The results of the t-test conducted in order to determine whether the school cultures perceived by teachers differ significantly according to the educational status of the teachers are given in Table 11.

Table 11.

Independent Group t-Test Results According to the Education Status of Teachers' Perceptions of School Culture

School Culture	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	P																																
Support Culture	Bachelors	381	3,69	,77	,653	444	,514																																
	Postgraduate	65	3,62	,77				Bureaucratic Culture	Bachelors	381	3,29	,659	,108	444	,914	Postgraduate	65	3,30	,68	Success Culture	Bachelors	381	3,78	,74	,899	444	,369	Postgraduate	65	3,69	,79	Task Culture	Bachelors	381	4,04	,63	1,020	444	,308
Bureaucratic Culture	Bachelors	381	3,29	,659	,108	444	,914																																
	Postgraduate	65	3,30	,68				Success Culture	Bachelors	381	3,78	,74	,899	444	,369	Postgraduate	65	3,69	,79	Task Culture	Bachelors	381	4,04	,63	1,020	444	,308	Postgraduate	65	3,95	,73								
Success Culture	Bachelors	381	3,78	,74	,899	444	,369																																
	Postgraduate	65	3,69	,79				Task Culture	Bachelors	381	4,04	,63	1,020	444	,308	Postgraduate	65	3,95	,73																				
Task Culture	Bachelors	381	4,04	,63	1,020	444	,308																																
	Postgraduate	65	3,95	,73																																			

As it is demonstrated in Table 11, according to the independent group t-test conducted to determine whether the education level of teachers and the sub-

dimensions of the school culture scale differ, there is no significant difference in sub-dimensions of support culture ($t_{[444]} = .65, p > .05$), bureaucratic culture ($t_{[444]} = .108, p > .05$), success culture ($t_{[444]} = .899, p > .05$), and task culture ($t_{[444]} = 1.02, p > .05$).

The results of ANOVA to determine whether the school culture types perceived by teachers differ according to the age of the teachers are given in Table 12.

Table 12.
ANOVA Results of Teachers' Perceptions of School Culture According to Age Variable

	Age	N	Mean	SD	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares	F	p	Difference
Success Culture	1. 30 Years old and Under	77	3,86	0,68	Btw. G.	4,982	3	1,661			
	2. 31-40 Years old	207	3,67	0,78	In G.	244,621	442	,553	3,00	,030	3>2
	3. 41-50 Years old	121	3,91	0,73	Total	249,603	445				
	4. 51 +	41	3,71	0,71							
	Total	446	3,77	0,75							
Bureauc. Culture	1. 30 Years old and Under	77	3,48	0,69	Btw. G.	548,51	3	182,84			
	2. 31-40 Years old	207	3,18	0,65	In G.	15291,16	442	34,59	5,28	,01	1>2 3>2
	3. 41-50 Years old	121	3,40	0,63	Total	15839,68	445				
	4. 51 +	41	3,27	0,68							
	Total	Total	3,30	0,66							
Task Culture	1. 30 Years old and Under	77	4,11	0,59	Btw. G.	143,26	3	47,75			
	2. 31-40 Years old	207	3,95	0,66	In G.	6638,76	442	15,02	3,18	,02	3>2
	3. 41-50 Years old	121	4,15	0,63	Total	6782,02	445				
	4. 51 +	41	3,95	0,72							
	Total	Total	4,03	0,65							
Support Culture	1. 30 Years old and Under	77	3,73	0,78	Btw. G.	148,55	3	49,51			
	2. 31-40 Years old	207	3,63	0,77	In G.	16920,37	442	38,28	1,29	,27	----
	3. 41-50 Years old	121	3,78	0,78	Total	17068,92	445				
	4. 51 +	41	3,59	0,77							
	Total	446	3,68	0,77							

As can be seen in Table 12, there is a significant difference between teachers' perceived success, bureaucratic and task cultures, and teachers' age variable ($p < .05$). However, teachers' perceptions of support culture differ significantly according to the age of the teachers [$F(3-442) = 1.29; p > .05$].

According to the LSD test results conducted in order to determine the age ranges of teachers' perceptions about the success culture, teachers whose age range is between 41-50 years old ($M = 3.91$) have higher perceptions of success culture than teachers between the ages 31-40 ($M=3.67$). Teachers in the range of 41-50 stated that they express their opinions about the practices in the school, their work is appreciated, successful teachers and students are rewarded, and their personal knowledge and abilities are respected. According to the results of LSD test conducted to determine the age ranges of teachers' perceptions about bureaucratic culture, it is discovered that bureaucratic culture perceptions of teachers aged 30 and under ($M = 3.48$) are higher than the bureaucratic culture perceptions of teachers aged 31-40 ($M=3.18$). In addition, the bureaucratic cultural perceptions of teachers between the ages of 41-50 ($M=3.40$) are higher than the bureaucratic cultural perceptions of teachers between the ages of 31-40 ($M=3.18$). Teachers between the ages of 30 and 41 and 41-50 stated that they are privileged to be seniors in their institution, importance is given to hierarchy, solid measures are taken against violation of rules, strict controls, an authoritarian understanding of management prevails, relationships are formal and none of the teachers wants to contradict administration.

According to the results of LSD test conducted to determine which age ranges differ among teachers' perception of the task culture, it is determined that the perception of the task culture of teachers aged 41-50 years old ($M=4.15$) is higher than the teachers' perception of the work culture ($M=3.95$). Teachers between the ages of 41-50 stated that they are the first priority to do the tasks specified in the program in their institutions, it is essential to work to be better than competing institutions, it is aimed to do the right thing for the first time, enough efforts are made for the purposes of the school, students are studied for academic success and technological developments are followed.

The results of ANOVA to determine whether the school culture types perceived by teachers differ according to the occupational seniority of the teachers are given in Table 13.

As it is shown Table 13, there is no significant difference between teachers' occupational seniority variable and support culture [$F(4-441) = 0.63$; $p > .05$], success culture [$F(4-441) = 0.75$; $p > .05$] and task culture [$F(4-441) = 1.61$; $p > .05$]. However, there is a significant difference in the bureaucratic culture sub-dimension [$F(4-441) = 5.60$; $p < .01$]. According to the results of LSD test conducted in order to determine between the seniority intervals of teachers' perceptions of bureaucratic culture, it is found that teachers' perceptions of the bureaucratic culture whose occupational seniority is 5 years and under ($M=3.52$) are higher than teachers' occupational seniority is between 6-10 years ($M=3.13$), 11-15 years ($M=3.24$), and those between 16-20

Table 13.

ANOVA Results of Teachers' Perceptions of School Culture According to Occupational Seniority Variable

	Seniority	N	Mean	SD	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares	F	p	Difference
Support Culture	1. 5 Years and Under	73	3,64	0,86	Btw. G.	97,91	4	24,47			
	2. 6-10 Years	103	3,60	0,75	In G.	16971,09	441	38,48			
	3. 11-15 Years	91	3,70	0,78	Total	17068,96	445		,63	,63	---
	4. 16-20 Years	73	3,71	0,70							
	5. 21 +	106	3,76	0,79							
	Total	446	3,68	0,77							
Success Culture	1. 5 Years and Under	73	3,79	0,76	Btw. G.	61,22	4	15,30			
	2. 6-10 Years	103	3,68	0,74	In G.	8924,46	441	20,23			
	3. 11-15 Years	91	3,76	0,79	Total	8985,69	445		,75	,55	---
	4. 16-20 Years	73	3,79	0,70							
	5. 21 +	106	3,85	0,75							
	Total	446	3,77	0,75							
Bureauc. Culture	1. 5 Years and Under	73	3,52	0,67	Btw. G.	766,44	4	191,61			
	2. 6-10 Years	103	3,13	0,66	In G.	15073,24	441	34,18			
	3. 11-15 Years	91	3,24	0,70	Total	15839,68	445		5,60	01,	1>2, 3, 4; 5>2, 3, 4
	4. 16-20 Years	73	3,21	0,54							
	5. 21 +	106	3,44	0,65							
	Total	446	3,30	0,66							
Task Culture	1. 5 Years and Under	73	4,08	0,61	Btw. G.	97,95	4	24,48			
	2. 6-10 Years	103	3,90	0,67	In G.	6684,07	441	15,15			
	3. 11-15 Years	91	4,02	0,67	Total	6782,02	445		1,61	,17	---
	4. 16-20 Years	73	4,05	0,57							
	5. 21 +	106	4,12	0,68							
	Total	446	4,03	0,65							

years (M=3.21). Moreover, it is discovered that the bureaucratic culture perceptions of teachers with occupational seniority of 21 years or more (M=3.44) are higher compared to those with occupational seniority of 6-10 years (M=3.13), 11-15 years (M=3.24) and 16-20 years (M=3.21). Teachers with 5 years and under occupational seniority and teachers occupational seniority 21 years and above stated that hierarchy is given importance in their institutions, strict measures are taken against violation of rules, strict controls are observed, an authoritarian understanding of management prevailed, relations are formal and nobody wanted to contradict management.

ANOVA results are given in Table 14 in order to determine whether the types of school culture perceived by teachers differ significantly from the levels of teachers' schools they work at.

Table 14.
ANOVA Results of Teachers' Perceptions of School Culture According to School Level Variable

	Level	N	Mean	SD	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	p	Difference
Support Culture	1. Primary	105	3,83	0,66	Btw. G.	267,64	2	133,82	3,52	,030	1>3
	2. Secondary	214	3,68	0,76	In G.	16801,28	443	37,92			
	3. High-School	127	3,56	0,87	Total	17068,92	445				
	Total	446	3,68	0,77							
Success Culture	1. Primary	105	3,95	0,65	Btw. G.	241,15	2	120,57	6,10	,002	1>2 2>3
	2. Secondary	214	3,78	0,70	In G.	8744,54	443	19,73			
	3. High-School	127	3,61	0,86	Total	8985,69	445				
	Total	446	3,77	0,75							
Bureauc. Culture	1. Primary	105	3,44	0,62	Btw. G.	670,26	2	335,13	9,78	,000	1>2; 3>2
	2. Secondary	214	3,16	0,62	In G.	15169,42	443	34,24			
	3. High-School	127	3,43	0,73	Total	15839,68	445				
	Total	446	3,30	0,66							
Task Culture	1. Primary	105	4,24	0,59	Btw. G.	215,89	2	107,94	7,28	,001	1>2 1>3
	2. Secondary	214	3,98	0,63	In G.	6566,13	443	14,82			
	3. High-School	127	3,95	0,70	Total	6782,02	445				
	Total	446	4,03	0,65							

As can be seen in Table 14, there is a significant difference in the school level variable where teachers work, and the sub-dimensions of the support culture [$F(2-443) = 3.52; p < .05$], success culture [$F(2-443) = 6.10; p < .01$], bureaucratic culture [$F(2-443) = 9.78; p < .01$], and task culture [$F(2-443) = 7.28; p < .01$].

In order to decide which post-hoc multiple comparison techniques to be used after ANOVA, the hypothesis of whether the subgroup variance distributions are homogeneous with the Levene's test, which is a prerequisite of variance analysis are tested. Accordingly, since variance distribution in the sub-dimensions of support culture [$L_v(2-443) = 3.78, p < .05$], success culture [$L_v(2-443) = 5.95, p < .05$] and bureaucratic culture [$L_v(2-443) = 4.67, p < .05$] did not show homogeneity, Dunnett C multiple comparison test was performed for these sub-dimensions. In the task culture sub-dimension [$L_v(2-443) = 1.46, p > .05$], LSD multiple comparison test was performed due to the homogeneity of variance distributions. According to the results of the Dunnett C test conducted in order to determine the teachers' perceptions of support, success, and bureaucratic culture between different education levels, the support culture perception of the teachers who work in primary schools

($M=3.83$) is higher than teachers' working in high schools ($M=3.56$). In addition, it is revealed that teachers' perceptions of success culture working in primary schools ($M=3.95$) are higher than teachers' working in secondary schools ($M=3.78$), while teachers' perceptions of success culture working in secondary schools ($M=3.78$) are higher than teachers' working in high schools ($M=3.61$). It has been determined that teachers working in primary schools ($M=3.44$) have higher levels of bureaucratic culture perception than teachers working in secondary schools ($M=3.16$). In parallel, it was found that teachers working in high schools ($M=3.43$) have higher levels of bureaucratic culture perception than teachers working in secondary schools ($p<.05$). According to the results of LSD test conducted to determine which education level that teachers' perceptions differ regarding the task culture, it is determined that teachers' perceptions of duty culture working in primary schools ($M=4.24$) are higher than the teachers' working secondary schools ($M=3.98$) and high schools ($M=3.95$). The teachers working in primary schools stated that doing the tasks determined in the program in their institutions is the first priority, it is essential to work well to be better than the rival institutions, it is aimed to do the right thing for the first time, enough efforts are made for the purposes of the school, students are tried for academic success and technological developments are followed.

Conclusion and Discussion

The aim of this study is to determine whether the school administrators' spiritual leadership style has an impact on school culture according to the perceptions of teachers working at different school levels. According to the research findings, it is shown that there is a medium level and positively meaningful relationship between school administrators' spiritual leadership style perceived by teachers and school culture. In addition, according to teachers' perceptions, it is concluded that school administrators are a predictor of spiritual leadership style and school culture. While there is a significant difference in the spiritual leadership style perceived by teachers according to the school level variable, there is no significant difference in terms of gender, education level, age, and professional seniority. Significant differences were found in the support culture sub-dimension of school culture according to gender and school-level variables.

In addition, there are significant differences in the success culture sub-dimension according to age and school-level variables. Significant differences were found in bureaucratic culture sub-dimension depending on age, professional seniority, and school-level variables. It is noteworthy that there are significant differences in the task culture sub-dimension according to age and school-level variables. However, there is no significant difference between the sub-dimensions of the school culture and the educational background variable.

In the correlation analysis between the spiritual leadership style perceived by teachers and the sub-dimensions of school culture, it is concluded that there is a positive and medium level significant relationship between the spiritual leadership style perceived by teachers and school culture (excluding bureaucratic culture). A low relationship was generally found between the bureaucratic culture of the school and spiritual leadership. In her research on high school teachers, Çimen (2018) found that there is a positive and meaningful relationship between teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership and their perceptions of support, success, and duty culture. Karadağ (2009), in a study on teachers, also found that there is a positive and positive relationship between the perception of spiritual leadership and organizational culture. Özgan et al. (2013), in their study, concluded that there is a highly significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership and their motivations. Considering that the spiritual leader aims to increase organizational commitment and efficiency by increasing the motivation and feelings of belonging of the employees, the result can be said to support the findings obtained from this research.

Based on the findings, it can be said that the administrators, who adopt the spiritual leadership style, are appreciated, respected, rewarded, in solidarity, communicated in a healthy way, they strive to fulfill their duties and responsibilities, and they are willing to solve problems. According to Fry (2003), spiritual leaders help employees make sense of their lives and feel valued by giving them responsibility in realizing their organizational vision. Spiritual leaders appreciate the devoted behavior of the employees and develop their sense of belonging. As a result, it can be said that there is a significant relationship between the spiritual leadership style perceived by teachers and school culture, and the spiritual leadership style is a functional leadership style in creating a school culture. This situation might be explained by the spiritual leadership style being human-centered, appreciating the good, reinforcing corporate belonging, promoting solidarity among members, and instilling a sense of responsibility to its members. Based on the findings, it is possible to say that bureaucratic work and transactions do not overlap with the spiritual leadership style.

The power of the administrator spiritual leadership style perceived by teachers to judge success, support, and duty culture at school is meaningful, but the power to predict bureaucratic culture is not significant. The administrator spiritual leadership style perceived by the teachers explains 46% of the change in the success culture score, 41% of the change in the support culture score, and 21% of the change in the task culture score. In other words, the spiritual leadership style positively affects the most success, support, and task culture, respectively. Karadağ (2009) concluded that the spiritual leadership behaviors of school administrators had a positive effect on teachers' perceptions of school culture. Çimen (2018) stated that as the spiritual leadership perceptions of teachers increase, their perceptions of school culture increase. Rezach

(2002), in his study investigating the suitability of spiritual leadership for educational administrators, concluded that spiritual leadership is a highly functional leadership style in educational institutions. Malone and Fry (2003) stated that the spiritual leadership style of school administrators is effective in increasing students' academic success. Narcıkara (2017) found that spiritual leadership behavior significantly affects employees' psychology, perception of organizational support, and the quality of organizational performance. Bozkuş and Gündüz (2016) emphasized that the spiritual leadership behaviors of school administrators are effective on teachers' organizational commitment. Akıncı (2017) stated that the spiritual leadership behaviors of school administrators have positive effects on achieving the organizational goals of the school. The fact that the administrators' spiritual leadership styles have a predictive effect on teacher performance, student achievement, and organizational goals shows that these concepts, which are important in creating school culture, are positively affected by the spiritual leadership style.

In this study, it is seen that the administrator's spiritual leadership style perceived by the teachers predicted the practices based on the success, support, and task cultures at different levels, respectively, in terms of belief, meaning, efficiency and vision. Based on the findings, it can be said that the behaviors of school administrators such as appreciation, reward, and respect towards increasing the inner motivation of teachers increase teachers' perception towards success. It can be inferred that the school administrators' calling for teachers who are looking for meaning in business life and offering them a family atmosphere positively affects the behavior of teachers such as team spirit, solidarity, healthy communication, respect for different views and desire to solve problems. In addition, it can be concluded that school administrators' efficiency-enhancing behaviors towards goals determined in line with a vision have significant effects on teachers' perceptions of tasks such as fulfilling responsibilities, focusing on success, achieving goals. Considering the averages of school culture scores, it is seen that the power of the administrator spiritual leadership style perceived by teachers to predict school culture is significant. The fact that the spiritual leadership style, which is one of the new leadership approaches, has been gradually being adopted by the leaders in the world and in our country in recent years, which supports the findings obtained from this research. Because the spiritual leadership style that puts human values in its center has positive effects on teachers' perceptions of success, support and task culture confirms this idea. Based on the research results in the literature and on the findings obtained from this research, it can be said that the spiritual leadership style perceived by the teachers has a significant effect on the school culture.

There is no significant difference between teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership and gender. Akıncı (2017), Dağlı and Ardıç (2014), and Tan (2015), in their researches, stated that there is no significant difference between the gender

variable and teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership. However, Gündüz (2014) stated that women's spiritual leadership perceptions are higher than men. The fact that this research was conducted in a different organization other than education may have caused such a result. Because it can be said that there is no such differentiation since male and female teachers working in educational institutions choose this profession according to their interests and abilities rather than their gender roles.

There is no significant difference between teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership and educational background. Akıncı (2017) stated that there is no significant difference between the teachers' spiritual leadership perceptions who has a bachelors' degree and postgraduate degree. Akgüney (2013), on the other hand, stated that individuals with a bachelor's degree have a higher perception of spiritual leadership than individuals with a postgraduate degree. It is seen that the results of this research in the banking and finance sector contradict the findings obtained from our research. In conclusion, this situation might be explained by the fact that there are no significant differences among teachers in terms of educational status. The fact that the majority of the teachers participating in the research have their education level at the bachelors' level and the majority of those who have master education shows that teachers are not decently oriented towards academic development.

There is no significant difference between teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership and the age variable. Akıncı (2017) stated that teachers in different age groups have similar perceptions about the spiritual leadership of administrators, and there is no difference between them. Tan (2015) stated that there is a significant difference between the age variable of the teachers and their spiritual leadership perceptions in favor of older teachers. Based on the findings, it can be said that the age variable does not make a significant difference in teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership. This might be explained by the fact that there are no serious changes in the attitudes and personality traits of the teachers depending on age.

There is no significant difference between teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership and the variable of seniority. While Akıncı (2017) stated that there is no significant difference between the occupational seniority variable and teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership, Bozkuş and Gündüz (2016) claimed that there is a slight difference. Based on the findings and researches in the literature, it can be said that there is no significant difference between teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership and the variable of seniority. This might be explained by the fact that teachers' professional attitudes and personality traits do not change much depending on the time, just like the age variable.

Significant differences were determined between teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership and the variable of school level they served. It is concluded that the spiritual

leadership perceptions of the teachers working at the primary school level are higher than the teachers working at the secondary and high school levels, respectively. Akıncı (2017) stated that there is a significant difference between the school type variable where teachers work and their perceptions of spiritual leadership. Based on the findings, it can be said that primary school administrators mostly care about the quality of work of teachers, regarding the school as a family environment, remind the responsibilities for performance, and encourage the effective use of time. In addition, the fact that the spiritual leadership perceptions of the teachers working in primary schools are higher than the teachers working in secondary and high schools can be interpreted as the primary school teachers feel themselves belonging to the institution they work in, find their work meaningful and strive to be more efficient.

A significant difference was determined between teachers' perceptions of school culture and gender variable in favor of male teachers in terms of support culture. It is determined that the support culture perceptions of male teachers are higher than female teachers. There is no significant difference between success culture, duty culture, and bureaucratic culture and gender variable. Sönmez (2006) and Kadioğlu (2018), in their studies, stated that there is a significant difference between teachers' perceptions of school culture and gender variables in favor of male teachers. On the other hand, Öztürk (2015) and Özgenel, Canpolat ve Yağan (2020) argued that there was no significant difference in teachers' perceptions of school culture by gender. According to findings, it might be said that male teachers, who work in their schools love each other, personal feelings and thoughts are shared, everyone is valued, ideas and opinions are respected, opportunities are provided for professional development, employees' joy and sadness are shared, and the team spirit is dominant in the institution. This can be explained by the fact that male teachers organize various activities outside the school and spend time together as well as inside the school.

There is no significant difference between teachers' perceptions of school culture and the educational background variable. In their research, Fırat (2007) and Şahin (2017) stated that teachers' perceptions of school culture did not differ significantly according to their educational background. Consequently, this situation can be explained by the fact that teachers have similar qualifications in terms of educational status. The majority of the teachers participating in the research have a level of education at the bachelors' level, while the fact that most of the teachers who have a postgraduate degree have only a master's education shows that teachers do not sufficiently turn towards academic development.

Significant differences were determined between teachers' perceptions of school culture and age variable in terms of task culture, success culture, and bureaucratic culture. It is discovered that the teachers' perception of task culture between the ages

of 41-50 is higher than the teachers between the ages of 31-40. It is determined that the perception of the success culture of teachers between the ages of 41-50 is higher than the teachers between the ages of 31-40. The bureaucratic cultural perceptions of teachers who are 30 years old and under and 41-50 years old are found to be higher than those of 31-40 years old. In terms of support culture, no significant difference was found according to the age variable. Öztürk (2015) stated that the age variable shows significant differences in teachers' perceptions of school culture and especially in terms of task culture. He stated that teachers aged 51 and over are more task-oriented than teachers of a young age. In contrast to that, Şirin (2011) argued that there was no significant difference in teachers' perceptions of school culture according to the age variable. The fact that teachers' perceptions of school culture differ significantly in favor of teachers who are older in terms of achievement and duty culture, and in favor of teachers who are younger in bureaucratic culture can be explained by the fact that teachers develop bureaucratic attitudes at a young age and internalize their sense of duty and achievement as they age. Teachers' perceptions of support culture are similar by age variable; it shows that the age variable does not significantly differentiate human perceptions of value, such as solidarity, team spirit, and sharing. It is seen that the teachers between the ages of 41-50 think that it is essential to do the tasks determined in the program in their institutions, to be the first priority, to be better than the rival institutions, to do the right first time, to strive for the purposes of the school, to work for the academic success of the students and to follow the technological developments. It is seen that teachers between the ages of 41-50 think that they can clearly express their opinions about the practices in the school, the studies are appreciated, successful teachers and students are rewarded, and their personal knowledge and skills are respected. Teachers in the age group of 30 and under and in the 41-50 age group think that being seniors in their institutions forges privilege, hierarchy is important, strict measures are taken against violation of rules, strict controls are in place, an authoritarian understanding of administration prevails, relationships are formal and no one wants to contradict administration.

A significant difference was determined between teachers' perceptions of school culture and the variable of occupational seniority in terms of bureaucratic culture. It is revealed that the bureaucratic culture perceptions of teachers with occupational seniority of 5 years and below and teachers with 21 years of age and higher are higher than those of 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16-20 years. There is no significant difference between other dimensions of school culture and occupational seniority variable. Kara (2006) stated that there were significant differences between teachers' perceptions of school culture and professional seniority, while Özgenel, Canpolat ve Yağan (2020) and Kadioğlu (2018) argued that there is no significant difference. Based on the findings, it can be said that teachers with 5 years or less and 21 years or more of occupational seniority think that being seniors in their institutions

forges privilege, importance is given to hierarchy, strict measures are taken against violation of rules, strict controls are carried out, an authoritarian understanding of administration prevails, relations are formal, and nobody wants to contradict with the administration. This situation can be explained by the fact that teachers who are new to the profession are exposed to bureaucratic attitude until they gain experience, while very senior teachers see being a senior as a privilege.

Significant differences were determined between teachers' perceptions of school culture and school-level variables in terms of support, success, task, and bureaucratic culture. It is determined that the support culture perceptions of teachers working in primary schools are higher than the teachers working in high schools. It is discovered that the perceptions of the success culture of teachers working in primary schools are higher than the teachers working in secondary schools, and the perceptions of the success culture of teachers working in secondary schools are higher than the teachers working in high schools. The bureaucratic culture perceptions of teachers working in primary schools are higher than those of secondary school teachers, and the bureaucratic cultural perceptions of teachers working in high schools are higher than teachers working in secondary schools. It is found that the perception of the duty culture of the teachers working in primary schools is higher than the teachers working in secondary and high schools. Terzi (2005), Esinbay (2008), Özdemir (2012) and Özgenel, Canpolat ve Yağan (2020) in their studies, demonstrated that there is a task-oriented school culture in primary schools, as well as there are significant differences in terms of support culture, success culture and bureaucratic culture according to the level of school variable. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that teachers working in primary schools have higher levels of support, success, bureaucracy, and duty awareness than teachers working in secondary and high schools. However, it can be said that teachers working in primary schools think that everyone is valued in their schools, offered opportunities for occupational development, the institution is dominated by the team spirit, works are appreciated, personal knowledge and abilities are respected, there is a hierarchy in their institutions, and that nobody wants to contradict with administration, doing things is seen as the top priority, enough efforts are made for the purposes of the school, students are working for their academic success and technological developments are followed. This might be explained by the fact that teachers working in primary school lectures only in one class, adopt this class, compete with other classes, communicate more with parents and perceive the school as a family environment.

In line with the results of the research, suggestions for practitioners and researchers on the effect of spiritual leadership on school culture are as follows:

- School administrators can give importance to the spiritual aspects of teachers, students, and other employees so that schools can provide targeted education.

- Students, teachers, administrators, and other employees can feel themselves in a family environment in a school where spiritual behavior is emphasized, and they can create a strong school culture by developing features such as belonging and devotion.
- The relationship between the administrator spiritual leadership style perceived by teachers and bureaucratic culture can be examined separately.
- Relationships between spiritual leadership and teachers' commitment to the school and their performances can be examined.

Acknowledgement

In this study, permission was obtained from the researchers who developed the scales to collect data, from Istanbul Provincial Directorate of National Education and the Governorship of Istanbul.

References

- Akar, A. C. (2010). *Ruhsal liderlik ve ruhsal liderliğin eğitim örgütlerinde uygulanabilirliği hakkında teorik bir çalışma [A theoretical study on spiritual leadership and applicability of spiritual leadership in educational organizations]* (Unpublished master thesis - Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Akgüney, E. (2013). *Ruhsal liderliğin örgütsel çıktılara etkisi: Bankacılık ve faizsiz finans sektörleri arasında karşılaştırmalı bir analiz [The effect of spiritual leadership on organizational outcomes: A comparative analysis between banking and interest-free finance sectors]* (Unpublished master thesis - Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Gebze. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Akıncı, T. (2017). *Lise öğretmenlerinin yönetici ruhsal liderlik algılarının öğretmen liderliği ve öz-yetkinliklerine etkisi [The effect of high school teachers' executive spiritual leadership perceptions on teacher leadership and self-efficacy]* (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation-Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi ve İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, İstanbul. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Akıncı, T. ve Ekşi, H. (2017). Yönetici ruhsal liderlik algı ölçeği geliştirilmesi [Development of executive spiritual leadership perception scale]. *Route Educational and Social Science Journal*, 4(7), 294-312.
- Altman, Y. (2010). In search of spiritual leadership: Making a connection with transcendence. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 18(6), 35-38.
- Aslan, M., Özer, N. ve Bakır, A. (2009). Okul kültürüne ilişkin yönetici ve öğretmen görüşleri: Nitel bir araştırma [Views of Principals and teachers about school culture: A qualitative research]. *İlköğretim Online*, 8(1), 268- 281.
- Aydoğan, Z. F. (2004). Örgüt kültürü ve iklimi [School culture and climate]. *Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2: 203–215.
- Bakan, İ. (2009). Liderlik tarzları ile örgüt kültürü türleri arasındaki ilişkiler: Bir alan çalışması [Relationships between leadership styles and organizational culture types: a field study]. *Tisk Akademi*, 4(7), 138-172.

- Balcı, A. (2007). *Etkili okul ve okul geliştirme: Kuram, uygulama ve araştırma [Effective school and school development: Theory, practice and research]*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Baloğlu, N. ve Karadağ, E. (2009). Ruhsal liderlik üzerine teorik bir çözümleme [A theoretical analysis on spiritual leadership]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 58(15), 165-190.
- Baraz, B. ve Berberoğlu, G. N. (1999). TUSAŞ Motor Sanayii A.Ş.'de örgüt kültürü araştırması [Organizational culture research at TUSAŞ Motor Sanayii A.Ş.]. *Anadolu Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(1- 2): 65-84.
- Baş, T. (2013). *Anket nasıl hazırlanır? Nasıl uygulanır? Nasıl değerlendirilir? [How is the survey prepared? How is it applied? How to evaluate?]* Ankara: Seçkin.
- Baytok, A. (2006). *Hizmet işletmelerinde örgüt kültürünün oluşturulmasında liderin rolü [Leader's role in creating organizational culture in service businesses]* (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyonkarahisar.
- Bennis, W. G. (2001). *Bir lider olabilmek [Being a leader]* (U. Teksöz, Çev. / Trans.). İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.
- Bozkuş, K. ve Gündüz, Y. (2016). Ruhsal liderlik ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkinin modellenmesi [Modeling the relationship between spiritual leadership and organizational commitment]. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 24(1), 405-420.
- Bush, T. (2008). *Leadership and management development in education*. Cornwall, Great Britain: Sage Publications.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, A. E., Karadeniz, Ş. ve Demirel, F. (2017). *Bilimsel Araştırma yöntemleri [Scientific research methods]*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Celep, C. (2002). İlköğretim okullarında öğrenme kültürü [Learning culture in primary schools]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, (31), 356-373.
- Cameron, K. S. & Quinn, R. E. (2017). *Örgüt kültürü: Örgütsel tanı ve değişim: Rekabetçi değerler modeli [Organizational culture: Organizational diagnosis and change: Competitive values model]* (M. G. Gülcan ve N. Cemaloğlu Çev. /Trans.). Ankara: Pegem.
- Çimen, B. (2018). *Ruhsal liderlik, örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel sessizliğin okul başarısına etkisi [The effect of spiritual leadership, organizational culture and organizational silence on school success]* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation - Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Çimen, İ. (2016). Öğretmenlerin ruhsal liderliğe ilişkin algıları ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı gösterme düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership and their level of organizational citizenship behavior]. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 27, 9-19.
- Dağlı, A. ve Ardic T. (2014). Ortaokullarda görevli öğretmenlerin ruhsal liderliğe ilişkin algıları [Perceptions of teachers working in secondary schools about spiritual leadership]. *Electronic Journal of Education Sciences*, 3(5), 56-73.
- Denison, D. R., & Mishra, A. K. (1995). Toward a theory of organizational culture and effectiveness. *Organization Science*, 6(2), 204-223.
- Doğan, D. ve Şahin, F. (2009). Ruhsallık, duygusal zekâ ve dönüştürücü liderlik davranışları üzerine bir araştırma [A study on spirituality, emotional intelligence and transformative leadership behavior]. *ISGUC The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources*, 11(4), 67-88.

- Eren, E. (2001). *Örgütsel davranış ve yönetim psikolojisi [Organizational behavior and management psychology]*. İstanbul: Beta Yayıncılık.
- Eren, E. (2000). *Stratejik Yönetim ve İşletme Politikası [Strategic Management and Business Policy]*. İstanbul: Beta Yayıncılık.
- Esinbay, E. (2008). *İlköğretim okullarında örgüt kültürü [Organization culture in primary schools]* (Unpublished master thesis - Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Balıkesir Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Balıkesir. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Fairholm, G. W. (1998). *Perspectives on leadership: From the science of management to its heart*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
- Firat, N., (2007). *Okul kültürü ve öğretmenlerin değer sistemleri [School culture and teachers' value systems]* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation - Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 693-727.
- Fry, L. W. (2005). Introduction to the leadership quarterly special issue: Toward a paradigm of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 619- 622.
- Fry, L. W. (2009). Spiritual leadership as a model for student inner development. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3(3), 79-82.
- Göldağ B. (2015). *Ortaöğretim kurumlarında okul kültürü yoluyla değerler eğitimi (Malatya ili örneği) [Values education through school culture in secondary education institutions: Malatya province example]* (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation /Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). İnönü Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Malatya. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/> adresinden edinilmiştir.
- Gündüz, Ş. (2014). *The relationship between spiritual leadership and organizational cynicism: the mediating effect of emotional intelligence* (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation - Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Hallford, J. M. (1999). Longing for the sacred in schools: A conversation with nel noddings. *Educational Leadership*, 56(4), 28-32.
- Handy, C. (1995). *Gods of management: The changing work of organizations*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- Haviland, W. A., Prins, H. E., Walrath, D. ve McBride, B. (2008). *Kültürel antropoloji [cultural anthropology]*. (İ.D.E Sarioğlu, Çev./ Trans.). İstanbul: Kaknüs.
- 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.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2010). *Eğitim yönetimi [Education management]* (S. Turan, Çev. / Trans. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel.
- Kadioğlu, S. (2015) *Eğitim kurumlarında okul kültürünün iş doyumuna etkisi [Impact of school culture on job satisfaction in education institutions]* (Unpublished master thesis - Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi ve İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, İstanbul. Retrived from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Kara, Y. (2006). *Okullardaki örgütsel kültürün okul yöneticilerinin etik davranışları üzerindeki etkisi [The effect of organizational culture in schools on the ethical behavior of school administrators]* (Unpublished master thesis - Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>

- Karadağ, E. (2009). Ruhsal liderlik ve örgüt kültürü: Bir yapısal eşitlik modelleme çalışması [Spiritual leadership and organizational culture: A structural equation modeling study]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 9(3), 1357- 1405.
- Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri [Scientific research methods]*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Koni, L. (2017). *Leading change successfully to create a school culture of high expectations*. 2017 Senior Manager's Sabbatical Report. Retrieved from <http://www.educationalleaders.govt.nz/content/download/81119/664084/file/Liz%20Koni%20-%20leading%20change%20-%20sabbatical%20report%202017.pdf> in 16 May, 2019.
- Lunenburg, A. C., & Ornstein, F. (2013). *Eğitim yönetimi [Education management]* (G. Arastaman, Çev. /Trans. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel.
- Malone, P. F. ve Fry, L. W. (2003). Transforming schools through spiritual leadership: A field experiment. In *Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*. Seattle, Washington.
- Moxley, R. S. (2000). *Leadership and spirit*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Narcıkara, E. B. (2017). *Spiritüel liderlik davranışının algılanan performans üzerine etkisi [The effect of spiritual leadership behavior on perceived performance]* (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation - Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi, İstanbul. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Önen, S. M. ve Kanayran, H. G. (2015). Liderlik ve motivasyon: kuramsal bir değerlendirme [Liderlik ve motivasyon: kuramsal bir değerlendirme]. *Birey ve Toplum Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(2), 43-64.
- Özdemir, S. (2012). İlköğretim okullarında okul kültürü ile örgütsel sağlık arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between school culture and organizational health in primary schools]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 4(4), 599-620.
- Özgan, H., Bulut, L., Bulut, A. ve Bozbayındır, F. (2013). Öğretmenlerin ruhsal liderlik algıları ile motivasyonları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [Examining the relationship between teachers' perceptions of spiritual leadership and motivation]. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(1), 70-83.
- Özgenel, M., Canpolat, Ö. ve Yağan, E. (2020). School culture as a tool for the development of occupational commitment. *The Journal of Humanity and Society (İnsan & Toplum)*, 1-30.
- Öztürk, D. (2015). *Eğitim örgütlerinde okul kültürü ve tükenmişlik düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki: Bahçelievler ölçeğinde bir araştırma [The relationship between school culture and burnout levels in educational organizations: A research on the scale of Bahçelievler]* (Unpublished master thesis - Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Peterson, K. D., & Deal, T. E. (1998). How leaders influence the culture of schools. *Educational Leadership*, 56, 28-31.
- Rezach, K. (2002). *Spiritual leadership as a model of effective leadership in independent schools*. Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs), 1438.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). Örgütsel davranış [Organizational behaviour] (İ. Erdem, Çev. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel.
- 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.

- Turner, J. & Crang, C. (1996). *Exploring school culture*. Paper submitted to the Centre for Leadership in Learning, University of Calgary. Retrieved from <http://www.educationalleaders.govt.nz/Culture/Understanding-school-cultures/Exploring-school-culture> in 16 May, 2019 .
- Sönmez, M. A. (2006). Meslek liselerinde örgüt kültürü [Organization culture in vocational high schools]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 45(45), 85-108.
- Şahin, M. (2017). Öğretmenlerin yetkinlik algıları ile okul kültürü algıları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [Examining the relationship between teachers' perceptions of competence and their perceptions of school culture] (Unpublished master thesis - Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi ve İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, İstanbul. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Şirin, E. (2011). İlköğretim okullarındaki öğretmenlerin okul kültürü algıları ile örgütsel sinizm tutumları arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between teachers' perceptions of school culture and organizational cynicism attitudes] (Unpublished master thesis - Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi, İstanbul. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Şişman, M. ve Turan, S. (2001). *Eğitimde toplam kalite yönetimi [Total quality management in education]*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Polat, S. (2011). The level of faculty members' spiritual leadership (SL) qualities display according to students in faculty of education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 2033-2041.
- Tan, İ. H. (2015). *İlköğretim ve ortaokul müdürlerinin ruhsal liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin işe tutkunlukları arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between the psychological leadership behaviors of primary and secondary school principals and teachers' passion for work]* (Unpublished master thesis - Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Zirve Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Gaziantep. Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>.
- Taymaz, H. (2009). *İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim okul müdürleri için okul yönetimi [School management for primary and secondary school principals]* Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Terzi, A. R. (2005). İlköğretim okullarında örgüt kültürü [Organizational culture in primary schools]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 43(43), 423-442.
- Wallach, E. (1983). Individuals and organization: the cultural match. *Training and Development Journal*, 12, 28-36.
- Zinn, L. M. (1997). Spirituality in adult education. *Adult Learning*, 8(5-6), 26-30.

