

Examining the Relationship between School Culture and Teacher Leadership

Ramazan Cansoy¹ and Hanifi Parlar²

¹Karabük University, Karabük, Turkey,

²Istanbul Commerce University, İstanbul, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 12.03.2017

Received in revised form

21.03.2017

Accepted 04.04.2017

Available online

15.04.2017

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between school culture and teacher leadership. A total of 366 teachers working in high schools in the Şişli district of İstanbul participated in this study. The data were gathered through the "Organizational Culture Scale" and the "Teacher Leadership Scale." The results of the study showed that the teachers' perceptions of school culture were focused on task-oriented culture, while their perceptions of teacher leadership were concentrated on organizational development. Positive and significant relationships were revealed between all subdimensions of school culture and those of teacher leadership. Support-oriented culture and task-oriented culture were found to be positive and significant predictors of the teacher leadership dimension of "organizational development." In addition, success-oriented culture and bureaucratic culture were positive and significant predictors of the teacher leadership dimension of "professional development." Furthermore, another teacher leadership dimension, "collaboration with colleagues," was positively and significantly predicted by support-oriented culture, task-oriented culture, and success-oriented culture.

© 2017 IOJES. All rights reserved

Keywords:

School culture, Teacher leadership, School development, School improvement

Introduction

Teacher leadership is regarded as an important factor in school development and effectiveness, as well as the dissemination of democratic values (Donaldson, 2006; Frost & Durrant, 2003; Poekert, 2012; Wenner & Campbell, 2016; York-Barr & Duke, 2004), the formation of common values, teacher effectiveness and collaboration (Harris & Muijs, 2005), administrator support (Hobson & Moss, 2010), and improvement in the quality of education (Danielson, 2006; Gehrke, 1991; Kılınç, 2014; Poekert, 2012; Wenner & Campbell, 2016). The concept of teacher leadership refers to teachers' behaviors related to institutional development, professional development and collaboration with colleagues (Beycioğlu, 2009), and their knowledge, skills and behaviors for improving learning and instruction at school (Harris & Muijs, 2005). It can thus be inferred that teachers' leadership behaviors are of significance in enhancing the quality of instruction in schools.

In the literature, there are several studies that have examined the relationship of teacher leadership with job involvement and organizational citizenship (Ülger, 2015), classroom climate (Aslan, 2011), school climate (Kılınç, 2014), teacher competencies (Ağırman, 2016), leadership practices (Dalgıç-Dinlendi, 2012), and the leadership capacity of schools (Özçetin, 2013). In this regard, organizational culture is thought to be another concept that teacher leadership is related to. Katzenmeyer and Moller (2001) specify the characteristics of school culture, which support teacher leadership, as focusing on professional development through which new knowledge and skills are acquired, accepting teachers' efforts as leaders for their contributions to the

¹ Corresponding author's address: İstanbul Commerce University, Sütüce-Beyoğlu, İstanbul

Telephone: +905326779965

e-mail:hanifiparlar@gmail.com, hparlar@ticaret.edu.tr

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2017.02.001>

school, the independence that facilitates the practices of improvement and development, professional collaboration toward improving learning and student behavior, providing opportunities for active participation in school decision-making, effective, open, and honest communication at school, and the existence of a positive and respectful context where teachers support each other. A risk-taking culture, functioning democratic norms, teachers being treated as professionals, participation, collaboration and sharing experiences, making teachers feel that their ideas are valued, and the principal and teachers working together are considered important factors in schools that support teacher leadership (Danielson, 2006). Organizational culture is related to having certain common feelings regarding basic values, norms, beliefs, symbols, and practices (Schein, 2010), and can be said to be of significance in shaping behaviors and practices within the organization. In this respect, the practices in schools as organizations and the structure of school culture can be influential in exhibiting teacher leadership behaviors. Therefore, revealing the relationship between school culture and teacher leadership has significance in terms of enhancing the quality of education. In this way, the findings obtained in the present study can provide important insights to practitioners and policymakers regarding the characteristics of school culture that enable teachers to perform leadership behaviors at a higher level. On the other hand, previous studies examining the relationship between school culture and teacher leadership are limited in number (Kabler, 2013; Öztürk, 2015; Yusof, Osman, & Noor, 2016). Furthermore, in his analysis that examined 52 papers, Poekert (2012) reported that studies mostly focused on the characteristics of teacher leadership, and those related to the development of teacher leadership were still limited. In this regard, this study can contribute to the literature in understanding the relationship of different cultural characteristics of schools with various organizational and personal concepts. As can be inferred from the review thus far, there may be a relationship between school culture and teacher leadership. For this reason, the relationship between these two phenomena was examined in this study.

What is Teacher Leadership?

Teacher leadership emphasizes teachers' behaviors related to ensuring the sustainability and development of education and instruction at school. Teacher leadership is an informal structure that refers to professional behaviors that promote school development (Danielson, 2006), and is actualized through both formal and informal roles (Fullan, 1993). Behaviors of teacher leadership yield certain results in schools: Leading teachers represent change in every aspect of school (Harris & Muijs, 2005; Smylie & Denny, 1990), enhance the effectiveness of administrators, and lead the formation of learning communities (Hobson & Moss, 2010). In addition, they guide new teachers (Gehrke, 1991), participate in administrative matters and decisions related to the school (Smylie & Brownlee-Conyers, 1992), and play a key role in its development (Heller & Firestone, 1995). They also contribute to the school curriculum (Paulu & Winters, 1998), create an instructional vision (Can, 2006), and struggle against bureaucratic obstacles (Crowther, Kaagen, Ferguson, & Hann, 2002). In a seminal work that analyzed 140 studies on teacher leadership, York-Barr and Duke (2004) categorized the duties of leading teachers as ensuring coordination between school and administration, assisting in the professional development of colleagues, participating in the process of school development, ensuring the participation of parents and the environment, contributing to the teaching profession, and providing pre-service teacher training. In another study, Wenner and Campbell (2016) analyzed 54 studies and revealed that teachers who assume leadership roles make other teachers feel supported, encourage professional development and growth, and make significant contributions to the changes that take place in schools.

Based on different theoretical frameworks, Beycioğlu (2009) determined the dimensions of teacher leadership that were used in this study as organizational development, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues. Organizational development refers to sharing the leadership behaviors that principals normally perform, engaging in different activities related to the administration of schools, ensuring solidarity, harmony, and order in the decisions made, and helping activities yield results. Professional development is related to teachers having an influence on their colleagues and students, performing exemplary behaviors, and being open to innovations in the profession. As for the dimension of collaboration with colleagues, this refers to leading teachers forming working groups to enhance collaboration to meet professional development needs and the demands arising from a set of new needs in schools, guiding those who are new to the profession, and conducting case studies to enhance the quality of education.

School Culture

Organizational culture consists of basic values that ensure the unity of a community's perceptions and feelings (Schein, 2010), forms of understandings that determine the way things are done, and common beliefs that individuals share (Robbins, 1990). It is formed by the integration of common beliefs, values, and norms (Mullins, 2016; Robbins, 1990; Schein, 2010), facilitates different units coming together with common goals, and develops an identity in staff members (Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990). School culture, on the other hand, is the atmosphere that creates a feeling of being a member of a community, family, and team, attributes importance to the experiences shared in and outside the school, has common objectives, and in which there is agreement on the curriculum and instructional elements (Wagner, 2006). It is related to teachers' feelings, skills, and job involvement, and administrators' demands and expectations (Demirtaş, 2010). In order to form a culture in educational institutions, it is important for there to be harmony and peace among staff members, implementation of practices toward a common objective, and agreement on a common vision (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). The cultural structure of schools is affected by the behaviors of administrators, teachers, and students. Academic emphasis of the school, teachers' in-class activities, incentive systems, conditions for learning, different responsibilities, approaches and participation at the school level, and the quality of education determine the cultural structure (Celep, 2002). It can be stated that school culture emerges with close relationships among individuals and by combining certain structural components, and the characteristics of a strong school culture include a positive work environment and common objectives. It refers to the culture that raises community awareness among the stakeholders of a school, and in which views and feelings toward enhancing the quality of education are structured and shaped (Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Wagner, 2006).

Although the definition of organizational culture is not always clear (Özdemir, 2012), there are clear categorizations within it. Among these, the categorization of strong and weak culture is widespread. In a strong organizational culture, there is a supportive environment, the level of autonomy is high, and sharing and collaboration are its basis. Moreover, taking responsibility and being sympathetic are important, common values are emphasized, harmony and justice are dominant, and the results yielded for the success of the organization are critical (Şişman, 2002). A functional and strong culture serves as a compass in pursuing common goals (Sergiovanni, 2001).

Harrison (1972) categorizes organizations into power, role, task, or person cultures. In power cultures, formal power is used over individuals. In role culture, written rules are at the forefront and individuals' responsibilities and rights are clearly defined. In task culture, practices of organizations toward accomplishing their goals are regarded as important, whereas in person culture, employees' interests and aims are in the foreground, and the organization is seen as the means for a person's achieving them.

In the scope of this study, the categories of support-oriented culture, bureaucratic culture, success-oriented culture, and task-oriented culture are focused on among other categorizations of organizational culture. The characteristics of these cultures can be listed as follows (Terzi, 2005): In support-oriented culture, collaboration is emphasized, while trust, personal relationships, sympathy, and problem-solving are featured. In bureaucratic culture, formal structures, the feeling of controlling employees and activities, and following standards and rules are regarded as important. Intense control by administrators is felt by teachers. In success-oriented culture, rules are valued less, accomplishing objectives is considered significant, bearing responsibilities is important, and doing one's job well is at the forefront. Those who are successful and make more effort are rewarded. In task-oriented culture, while organizational objectives are emphasized, personal goals are in the background and tasks are highlighted. The source of power is expertise and skills are valued. Being task-oriented is related to power tendency. School culture is situated between bureaucratic culture and support-oriented culture.

The Relationship between School Culture and Teacher Leadership

Schools that support teacher leadership attribute great importance to collaboration among colleagues, a sharing environment at school, education through creating learning communities, and sharing experiences related to instruction. In environments where teacher leadership is encouraged, practices towards ensuring collaboration among colleagues, school administrators' support, and a supportive work setting are significant (Demir, 2014). On the other hand, the elements that improve teacher leadership include principal support (Hart, 1994; York-Barr & Duke, 2004; Wenner & Campbell, 2016), teacher autonomy (Wenner & Campbell,

2016), providing teachers with time and resources (Chew & Andrews, 2010; York-Barr & Duke, 2004), common vision (Chamberland, 2009; Gaffney & Faragher, 2010; Muijs & Harris, 2006), sharing leadership (Brosky, 2011; Chamberland, 2009), school structure and processes (Beachum & Dentith, 2004), team leadership (Gaffney & Faragher, 2010), school-society relationships (Beachum & Dentith, 2004), learning communities (Chamberland, 2009; Gaffney & Faragher, 2010; Hunzicker, 2012), participation in decision-making and developing a common curriculum (Chew & Andrews, 2010), paying attention to trust, respect, and ethics at school (Beachum & Dentith, 2004; Gordin, 2010; York-Barr & Duke, 2004), well-defined tasks (Muijs & Harris, 2006), and a culture of constant development at school (Borchers, 2009).

Certain issues are thought to be influential in creating a school culture that inhibits teacher leadership behaviors. These issues include lack of teachers' time, poor communication, structural factors and personal characteristics (Wenner & Campbell, 2016), heavy workloads and an obstructive work environment (Adams & Gamage, 2008), and an authority and autonomy gap (Friedman, 2011). The lack of a shared vision (Brooks, Scribner, & Eferakorho, 2004), concentrating leadership in a single person (Chew & Andrews, 2010), a lack of trust (Muijs & Harris, 2006), and teachers not being encouraged to engage in different activities may also reduce their levels of performing leadership behaviors (Danielson, 2006). It can thus be inferred that a strict hierarchical structure that is based neither on sharing nor friendship may weaken teacher leadership behaviors.

The results of some studies in the literature on the relationship between school culture and teacher leadership show that, directly or indirectly, these two variables are related. Aslan (2011) found that teachers' levels of performing teacher leadership behaviors differed based on students' satisfaction with the classroom climate. Angelle, Nixon, Norton, and Niles, (2011) revealed that teacher leadership was related to collective activity and trust. In a study on school culture and teacher leadership, Kabler (2013) reported a significant relationship between collaboration, collegiality, and effectiveness. Kılınc (2014) demonstrated negative and significant relationships between inhibiting school culture, which refers to school administrator behaviors that inhibit the activities of school staff and teacher leadership. Öztürk (2015) found that organizational culture predicted teacher leadership, whereas Yusof, Osman, and Noor (2016) reported a strong relationship between teacher leadership and school culture.

As can be inferred from the above review, revealing the relationship between school culture and teacher leadership is of great significance in identifying which dimensions of school culture are related to which teacher leadership behaviors. Teachers who perform teacher leadership behaviors at a high level are able to contribute more to school development. Leading teachers can take a more active role in enhancing the quality of education. Therefore, it can be argued that the relationship of this variable with organizational culture should be examined to develop teacher leadership behaviors. This study can provide findings to administrators, school principals, and teachers who are in decision-making positions. On the other hand, it can also provide insights about the development of teacher leadership and the concept of school culture. Therefore, the primary aim of this study was to examine the relationship between organizational culture and teacher leadership, and the predictive power of organizational culture over teacher leadership. The following research questions were addressed based on this aim:

1. What are the levels of school culture and teacher leadership based on teachers' perceptions?
2. Is there a significant relationship between school culture and teacher leadership based on teachers' perceptions?
3. Does school culture significantly predict teacher leadership based on teachers' perceptions?

Method

This study was designed in the relational model to examine the relationship between the subdimensions of school culture and those of teacher leadership. The subdimensions of school culture were support-oriented culture, success-oriented culture, bureaucratic culture, and task-oriented culture, while those of teacher leadership were organizational development, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues. The independent variables of the study were the subdimensions of school culture, and the dependent variables were the subdimensions of teacher leadership.

Participants

The participants of the study were high school teachers working in the Sisli district of Istanbul in the 2016-2017 school year. From the schools that were accessible and convenient, a total of 366 high school teachers participated in the study. Among them, 201 were female (55%) and 165 were male (45%). The average age of the participants was 39. The teachers' average duration of service in their schools was 6.62 years.

Instruments

The information asked of the participants' regarding their demographic characteristics included gender, age, duration of service in their schools, and the type of school they work in. The School Culture Scale and the Teacher Leadership Scale were employed to gather the research data.

Teacher leadership scale. The scale was developed by Beycioğlu and Aslan (2010) and consists of 25 items. It includes a 5-point grading scale with options ranging from "(1) Never" to "(5) Always." There are three dimensions in the scale: organizational development, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues. These subdimensions contain 9 items, 11 items, and 5 items, respectively. Organizational development refers to teachers' managing certain responsibilities of the principal, taking roles in administrative activities, and focusing on applying decisions and processes. Professional development relates to teachers' self-development, setting an example for their colleagues, and exhibiting exemplary behaviors to their students. Collaboration with colleagues pertains to helping out those new to the profession, highlighting collaboration, and yielding effective results in education. Sample items are as follows: "Adopting participatory attitudes toward the solution of problems related to the school" and "Exchanging ideas with colleagues about students' achievement at the class level." The total variance explained by the scale was 57.23%. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients calculated regarding the reliability of the scale were .87 for organizational development, .87 for professional development, and .92 for collaboration with colleagues. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the whole scale was .95 (Beycioğlu & Aslan, 2010).

In the following step, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to determine whether the three-dimensional structure was suitable for the data in the present study. As a result of the CFA, two items from the dimension "professional development" were excluded from the scale due to their factor loading and reliability values. According to the fit indexes calculated for 23 items and three dimensions, the model showed an acceptable fit to the data, ($\chi^2 = 625.46$; $p < .05$; $df = 197$; $\chi^2/df = 3.17$; RMSEA = .077; CFI = .93; GFI = .85; AGFI=.81; NFI: .90). The factor loadings of the items ranged between .68 and .74. The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients calculated to test the reliability of the scale in the present study were .86 for collaboration with colleagues, .90 for professional development, and .94 for organizational development. The internal consistency coefficient of the whole scale was .96.

School culture scale. This scale was developed by Terzi (2005) with 5-point Likert grading and contains 29 items gathered around four dimensions. The options in the grading scale range from "(1) Never" to "(5) Always." There are four dimensions in the scale. These are support-oriented culture with eight items, success-oriented culture with six items, bureaucratic culture with nine items, and task-oriented culture with six items. Support-oriented culture emphasizes trust, loyalty, and mutual open communication and support. Bureaucratic culture features implementing standards and rules within the organization. Success-oriented culture refers to a perspective in which individuals who do their jobs well are supported, and that prioritizes accomplishing objectives. Lastly, task-oriented culture refers to the culture of organizations that highlights completing tasks to achieve organizational goals. Sample items are as follows: "Individuals like each other," "Everybody is rewarded in return for doing the job well," and "Interpersonal relationships are formal." The total variance explained by the scale is 51%. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the subdimensions in the scale range between .76 and .88. The coefficient for the whole scale is .84 (Terzi, 2005). In the following step, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to determine whether the four-dimensional structure was suitable for the data in the present study. As a result of the CFA, two items from the dimension "bureaucratic culture" were excluded from the scale due to their factor loading and reliability values. According to the fit indexes calculated for 27 items and four dimensions, the model showed an acceptable fit to the data, ($\chi^2 = 731.35$; $p < .05$; $df = 289$; $\chi^2/df = 2.53$; RMSEA = .065; CFI = .93; GFI = .86; AGFI=.83; NFI: .88). The factor loadings of the items in the inventory ranged between .31 and .84. The internal consistency coefficients calculated to test the reliability of the scale in the present study were found to be .88 for task-oriented culture, .91 for

support-oriented culture, .83 for bureaucratic culture, .83 for success-oriented culture, and .95 for the whole scale.

Findings

Data Analysis

The analysis of the data was conducted in two steps. In the first step, the data were examined for missing or incorrect values, outliers, and multivariate variables. In the second step, the research questions were investigated. Missing values were assigned an average value. In addition, multicollinearity, variance inflation (VIF), and tolerance values were also examined. Skewness, Q-Q graph, and mod and median values were first examined for the normality of the data. The data showed skewness values between -.14 and -1.11. It can be stated that skewness and kurtosis values between +1 and -1 show normal distribution (Şencan, 2011). Additionally, a histogram and Q-Q plot graph were examined, and it was assumed that the data were distributed normally considering that the number of data did not exceed 30. Whether there was multicollinearity within the data was also analyzed. Predictor variables were evaluated in this respect, and the correlation values were found to range between .51 and .85. There was a correlation over .80 only between two predictor variables. Correlations between independent variables over .80 can be an indicator of multicollinearity (Büyüköztürk, 2010). VIF values were lower than 10, and there were no tolerance values close to zero. Moreover, CI values were lower than 30. As a result, it was decided that there was no multicollinearity in the data.

In the study, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) was used to determine the relationships between the variables. In order to identify the predictive power of school culture on teacher leadership, a multiple linear regression analysis was performed. In the interpretation of the regression analyses, standardized beta (β) coefficients and t-test results for their significance were considered. The significance level was set at .05.

As for the fit indices used, the GFI is accepted as a good fit if the coefficient obtained from the AGFI is .85 (Anderson ve Gerbing, 1984; Cole, 1987) or .90 (Kline, 2005; Schumacker & Lomax, 1996) and above. Values obtained from RMSEA that are .10 and below are regarded as sufficient for fitness. The ratio of χ^2/df being between 2-5 refers to a good fit, whereas those lower than 2 are considered to be a perfect fit (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2001).

Table 1. Means, standard deviations, and correlation values for school culture and teacher leadership

Variables	\bar{X}	SD	organisational development	professional development	Collaboration with colleagues	Support-oriented culture	Success-oriented culture	Bureaucratic culture	Task-oriented culture
Organisational development	4.16	.72	1	.67**	.70**	.60**	.59**	.51**	.59**
Professional development	3.58	.91		1	.81**	.61**	.64**	.58**	.55**
Collaboration with colleagues	3.74	.84			1	.63**	.63**	.55**	.61**
Support-oriented culture	3.57	.87				1	.85**	.78**	.76**
Success-oriented culture	3.67	.87					1	.71**	.76**
Bureaucratic culture	3.52	.71						1	.64**
Task-oriented culture	3.95	.80							1

** $p < .01$

According to the data in Table 1, the teachers who participated in the study had the highest level of perception in the dimension of "organizational development" ($\bar{X} = 4.16$), and the lowest in the dimension "professional development" ($\bar{X} = 3.58$) in terms of teacher leadership behaviors. As for the subdimensions of

organizational culture, the highest mean score was in task-oriented culture ($\bar{X} = 3.95$), while the lowest mean score was in bureaucratic culture ($\bar{X} = 3.52$).

Among the teacher leadership behaviors, organizational development had the strongest and most significant relationship with support-oriented culture ($r=.60, p<.01$), followed by success-oriented culture ($r=.59, p<.01$), and task-oriented culture ($r=.59, p<.01$). It had the weakest relationship with bureaucratic culture ($r=.51, p<.01$). Professional development had the strongest and most significant relationship with success-oriented culture ($r=.64, p<.01$), followed by support-oriented culture ($r=.61, p<.01$), bureaucratic culture ($r=.58, p<.01$), and task-oriented culture ($r=.55, p<.01$). Collaboration with colleagues had the strongest and most significant relationship with success-oriented culture ($r=.63, p<.01$) and support-oriented culture ($r=.63, p<.01$), followed by task-oriented culture ($r=.61, p<.01$) and bureaucratic culture ($r=.55, p<.01$).

Table 2. Results of the regression analysis for predicting teacher leadership from school culture

Variables(School culture)	Organisational development ^a			Professional development ^b			Collaboration with colleagues ^c		
	β	t	p	β	t	p	β	t	p
Constant		11.45	0.00		3.02	0.00		5.13	0.00
Support-oriented culture	0.22	2.37	0.02	0.07	0.84	0.40	0.19	2.20	0.03
Success-oriented culture	0.14	1.67	0.10	0.38	4.73	0.00	0.22	2.79	0.01
Bureaucratic culture	0.06	1.00	0.32	0.22	3.41	0.00	0.08	1.28	0.20
Task-oriented culture	0.29	4.31	0.00	0.06	0.97	0.33	0.25	3.93	0.00
	^a $R = .64$ $R^2 = .41$. $F = 64.39$. $p < .05$			^b $R = .67$. $R^2 = .45$. $F = 75.04$. $p < .05$			^c $R = .68$. $R^2 = .46$. $F = 77.80$. $p < .05$		

As is seen in Table 2, the variables of support-oriented, success-oriented, bureaucratic and task-oriented culture together revealed a significant relationship with the subdimension of organizational development ($R=.64, p < .05$). These predictor variables explained 41% of the variance in organizational development. The subdimensions of support-oriented culture ($\beta=.22, p < .05$) and task-oriented culture ($\beta=.29, p < .05$) were significant predictors of organizational development. Success-oriented culture ($\beta=.14, p > .05$) and bureaucratic culture ($\beta=.06, p > .05$) did not significantly predict organizational development.

As is also seen in Table 2, the variables of support-oriented, success-oriented, bureaucratic, and task-oriented culture together revealed a significant relationship with the subdimension of professional development ($R=.67, p < .05$). These predictor variables explained 45% of the variance in professional development. The subdimension of success-oriented culture ($\beta=.38, p < .05$) and bureaucratic culture ($\beta=.22, p < .05$) were significant predictors of professional development. On the other hand, support-oriented culture ($\beta=.07, p > .05$) and task-oriented culture ($\beta=.06, p > .05$) did not significantly predict professional development.

The variables of support-oriented, success-oriented, bureaucratic, and task-oriented culture together showed a significant relationship with the subdimension of collaboration among colleagues ($R=.68, p < .05$). These predictor variables explained 46% of the variance in collaboration among colleagues. The subdimension of support-oriented culture ($\beta=.19, p < .05$), success-oriented culture ($\beta=.22, p < .05$), and task-oriented culture ($\beta=.25, p < .05$) were significant predictors of collaboration with colleagues. However, bureaucratic culture ($\beta=.07, p > .05$) did not significantly predict collaboration with colleagues.

Discussion, Results, and Suggestions

In the present study, the relationship between high school teachers' perceptions of school culture and teacher leadership was examined. The results of the study confirmed that school culture is an important variable in predicting teacher leadership. In the study, the teachers' perceptions of school culture were at the highest level in the subdimension of task-oriented culture, while they were at the lowest level in support-oriented culture. In other words, the high school teachers believed that their schools had primarily task-oriented cultures. Similar findings are also reported in the literature (Koşar, 2008; Koşar & Çalık, 2011; Kılınç,

2014; Özdemir, 2012; Sezgin, 2010; Terzi, 2005). According to these findings, it can be stated that individuals accomplishing and finalizing the tasks they undertake at school is regarded as important. Task-oriented culture being perceived at a high level and administrators' being task-oriented can be a result of a power tendency. Besides, in organizations where task-oriented culture is perceived at a high level, it seems that individual goals are mostly in the background, and skills and expertise are not valued. In such a culture, motivation toward doing the task is emphasized (Harrison, 1972; Terzi, 2005). On the other hand, the findings that support-oriented culture was perceived at the lowest level and task-oriented culture at the highest level may show that personal relationships are not as valued as they should be. In this case, common objectives may gradually weaken, and the school may lose its effectiveness. In this respect, it is of significance to accomplish common objectives and meet individual needs for the continuity and effectiveness of the organization. The continuity of the organization is also related to responding to individuals' expectations (Bursalıoğlu, 2011). Therefore, considering that task-oriented culture is perceived at a high level while support-oriented culture is perceived at a low level, activities toward strengthening solidarity, commitment, and individual relationships among school administrators and teachers should be utilized to develop support-oriented culture in schools.

In this study, the teachers' perceptions of leadership behaviors were mostly centered on the subdimension of organizational development, followed by collaboration with colleagues and professional development. Moreover, all subdimensions of teacher leadership were over the moderate level. Several studies in the literature report findings consistent with those of the present study (Ağırman, 2016; Beycioğlu, 2009; Kılınc & Reçepoğlu, 2013; Kölükçü, 2011; Selçuk, 2014). Since the teachers' perception of teacher leadership was at the highest level in organizational development, it can be argued that they take different responsibilities at school, and actively participate in efforts to develop the school and students. Due to the teachers' low perception of professional development, it can be stated that they less frequently perform exemplary behaviors and the behaviors toward adapting themselves to new situations. This finding shows that practices should be implemented to improve the level of professional development in teachers. When the findings are considered as a whole, the level of performing teacher leadership behaviors being over the moderate level can be evaluated as a positive aspect. This is because positive changes are observed in school development (Poekart, 2012; York-Barr & Duke, 2004; Wenner & Campbell, 2016) and teacher effectiveness (Harris & Muijs, 2005) depending on teacher leadership. On the other hand, teacher leadership behaviors being perceived over a certain level can be related to various organizational and personal variables. Teacher leadership seems to be related to school culture (Kılınc, 2014), administrators' leadership practices (Dalgıç Dinlendi, 2012), organizational culture (Kabler, 2013), the organizational structure of the school (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001), and classroom climate (Aslan, 2011). In this regard, teacher leadership behaviors may be shaped by certain organizational and personal elements.

In the present study, there was a positive and significant relationship between all subdimensions of school culture, professional development, and collaboration with colleagues. Similar findings are also reported in other studies (Kabler, 2013; Öztürk, 2015; Yusof, Osman, & Noor, 2016). Accordingly, it can be said that teacher leadership behaviors in high schools increase in parallel with task-oriented, success-oriented, bureaucratic, and support-oriented culture. Factors that affect the development of teacher leadership include school principals supporting the staff in different aspects (Hart, 1994; York-Barr & Duke, 2004; Wenner & Campbell, 2016), giving teachers time to develop themselves (Chew & Andrews, 2010), the existence of learning communities in schools that ensure professional collaboration (Hunzicker, 2012; Chamberland, 2009), and an environment of trust and peace at school (Beauchum & Dentith, 2004; Gordin, 2010; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). However, teachers' lack of time, poor communication, structural factors and personal characteristics (Wenner & Campbell, 2016), lack of shared vision (Brooks, Scribner, & Eferakorho, 2004), excessive workload, insufficient support (Adams & Gamage, 2008), and an authority and autonomy gap (Friedman, 2011) weaken teacher leadership. Consequently, it can be argued that teachers' leadership behaviors increase with the levels of schools regarding task-oriented, support-oriented, bureaucratic, and success-oriented culture.

In the study, the subdimensions of school culture were found to significantly predict the teacher leadership subdimension of organizational development. Furthermore, the school culture subdimensions of support-oriented and task-oriented culture were significant predictors of organizational development. In support-oriented culture, there is an emphasis on collaboration, personal relationships, and solving problems (Terzi, 2005). According to this finding, it can be argued that a support-oriented culture at school leads to

collaboration among individuals, relationships based on sincerity and trust, and teachers performing more behaviors related to organizational development. In schools that ensure the development of teacher leadership, teachers are seen as professionals and collaborate with the principal (Danielson, 2006). Teachers' autonomy and participation in decisions support teacher leadership (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). School administrators' support is vitally important for teacher leadership behaviors (Hart, 1994; York-Barr & Duke, 2004; Wenner & Campbell, 2016). Tschannen-Moran, Parish, and DiPaola (2006) argue that teachers act more professionally in a school environment that involves collaboration.

As for another finding in the study, task-oriented culture predicted the teachers' behaviors related to organizational development. In task-oriented culture, accomplishing organizational objectives and tasks is at the forefront. Activities are valued to the degree that they help achieve the objectives (Şişman, 2002). In task-oriented culture, expertise is a source of power (Harrison, 1972) and related to personal characteristics (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). Koşar (2008) revealed significant relationships between task-oriented culture and the power style of personality. Administrators' behaviors toward the task increase the power tendency (Terzi, 2005). In this respect, it can be argued that in task-oriented cultures, school principals show more power tendencies, while teachers perform more behaviors related to organizational development.

In the study, the subdimensions of school culture were found to significantly predict the teacher leadership subdimension of professional development. Moreover, the school culture subdimensions of success-oriented and bureaucratic culture were found to be significant predictors of professional development. In success-oriented culture, it is important to complete a task with success, and those who are successful are rewarded. Strict commitment to rules is not mentioned (Terzi, 2005). In this regard, in a school where success-oriented culture is dominant, teachers may attribute more importance to professional development activities to maintain their professional success. Success-oriented culture reveals competition in schools and, in this way, may create a motive for teachers' development. This is because the continuity of a development culture (Borchers, 2009), teacher autonomy (Wenner & Campbell, 2016), and learning communities (Chamberland, 2009; Gaffney & Faragher, 2010; Hunzicker, 2012) can be influential in the development of teacher leadership. From this perspective, success-oriented culture can be thought to be an important factor in teachers' professional development. In this study, bureaucratic culture was found to be a positive and significant predictor of professional development. In bureaucratic culture, formal structures, the feeling of controlling employees and activities, and following standards and rules are regarded as important. This represents the intense control of administrators (Terzi, 2005). Hoy and Sweetland (2001) assert that bureaucratic structure can be both supportive and inhibiting in schools. In supportive bureaucratic structures, rules can be a guide and yield effective results for instruction. In well-structured schools, since teachers' skills and expertise are valued, they can find opportunities to improve their professional practices (Cerit, 2012). Supportive structures generate positive results and are functional. However, inhibiting structures yield negative results and have poor functionality (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). For example, Kalkan (2016) found a positive relationship between the supportive bureaucratic structure of schools and the development of learning communities. While Cerit (2012) and Geist (2002) reported a positive relationship between the bureaucratic structure of schools and teachers' professional behaviors, Kılınc (2014) revealed a negative relationship between them. Accordingly, it can be stated that the bureaucratic culture in schools where the present study was conducted was supportive and influential in teachers' performance of more behaviors related to professional development. However, the reasons behind these contradictory findings should be examined in further detail.

In the study, the subdimensions of school culture were found to significantly predict the teacher leadership sub-dimension of collaboration with colleagues. Furthermore, the school culture subdimensions of support-oriented, success-oriented, and task-oriented culture were significant predictors of collaboration with colleagues. The order of these predictors based on their predictive power was task-oriented, success-oriented, and support-oriented culture. Whereas task-oriented culture features completing tasks in the way they should be completed, support-oriented culture emphasizes collaboration and personal relationships. Success-oriented culture, on the other hand, highlights encouraging achievements and points out a success-oriented understanding (Terzi, 2005). In the context of the results reported in this study, the characteristics of task-oriented, success-oriented, and support-oriented culture in schools can be considered as a whole. According to Danielson (2007), school administrators play an important role in the emergence of leading teachers. At the same time, ensuring a safe environment, encouraging leadership behaviors, and providing different

opportunities in schools are significant for the development of teacher leadership. For Beycioğlu (2009), a supportive environment at school can ensure both the development of leading teachers and the emergence of new leaders. In a school culture where teacher leadership is supported, professional development is valued, and teachers are respected and allowed to participate in the decisions made at school, respect and collaboration with colleagues tends to be high (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001). The structure and processes, and a fair environment at school (Beachum & Dentith, 2004; Gordin, 2010; York-Barr & Duke, 2004), well-defined tasks (Muijs & Harris, 2006), and the development culture dominant at the school (Borchers, 2009) are influential factors in the development of teacher leadership. Teachers' collaboration with colleagues can be argued to increase by means of the influence that task-oriented culture has on school administrators regarding the accomplishment of a task, rewarding achievements in success-oriented culture, and highlighting personal relationships and cooperation in support-oriented cultures.

Since the results of the study revealed a positive relationship between school culture and teacher leadership, school-based practices that develop teacher leadership should be emphasized. Practices related to forming a support-oriented culture among the principal, teachers, and students, and forming a success-oriented culture can increase teacher behaviors related to organizational development. Efforts to create a supportive bureaucratic culture and success-oriented culture at school can enhance teachers' behaviors related to professional development. Improving collaboration among teachers and activities for developing support-oriented, success-oriented, and task-oriented culture can be beneficial. Considering these results as a whole, it can be argued that in order to develop teacher leadership, a balance should be established among the different characteristics of school culture, and weak school cultural structures should be identified and improved. The results of the present study can be supported with qualitative methods. The relationship of teacher leadership with different organizational and personal characteristics should be investigated further by future studies.

References

- Adams, D., & Gamage, D. T. (2008). A study of leadership effectiveness in a large VET institution in Australia. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 22, 214-228. doi:10.1108/09513540810861856
- Ağırman, N. (2016). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğretmen yeterlik ve öğretmen liderlik düzeylerinin değerlendirilmesi* Unpublished master's thesis. Atatürk University, Erzurum.
- Angelle, P. S., Nixon, T. J., Norton, E. M., & Niles, C. A. (2011, November). *Increasing organizational effectiveness: An examination of teacher leadership, collective efficacy, and trust in schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA. Accessed from http://web.utk.edu/~elps/Faculty_Staff/CE.TL.Trust.11.19.11.pdf on 12.2.2017.
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. (1984). The effect of sampling error on convergence, improper solutions, and goodness-of-fit indices for maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 49, 155-173. doi:10.1007/BF02294170
- Aslan, M. (2011). *Öğretmen liderliği davranışları ve sınıf iklimi: Öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşleri bağlamında bir araştırma* Unpublished master's thesis. Osmangazi University, Eskişehir.
- Beachum, F., & Dentith, A. M. (2004). Teacher leaders creating cultures of school renewal and transformation. *Educational Forum*, 68, 276-286. doi:10.1080/00131720408984639
- Beycioğlu, K. (2009). *İlköğretim okullarında öğretmenlerin sergiledikleri liderlik rollerine ilişkin bir değerlendirme* Unpublished master's thesis. Malatya, Turkey.
- Beycioğlu, K., & Aslan, B. (2010). Öğretmen liderliği ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *İlköğretim Online*, 9(2), 764-775.
- Beycioğlu, K., & Aslan, B. (2012). Öğretmen ve yöneticilerin öğretmen liderliğine ilişkin görüşleri: Bir karma yöntem çalışması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 2(2), 191-223.
- Borchers, B. T. (2009). *A study to determine the practices of high school principals and central office administrators who effectively foster continuous professional learning in high schools* (Order No. 3389298). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (UMI No. 304932769)

- Brooks, J. S., Scribner, J. P., & Eferakorho, J. (2004). Teacher leadership in the context of whole school reform. *Journal of School Leadership*, 14, 242-265.
- Brosky, D. (2011). Micropolitics in the school: Teacher leaders' use of political skill and influence tactics. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6, 1-11.
- Bursaliođlu, Z. (2011). *Okul ynetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış*. Ankara: Pegem
- Can, N. (2006). ğretmen liderliđinin geliřtirilmesinde mdrn rol ve stratejileri. *Erciyes niversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstits Dergisi*, 21, 349-363.
- Celep, C. (2002). İlkğretim okullarında ğrenme kltr. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eđitim Ynetimi*, 8, 356-373.
- Cerit, Y. (2012). Okulun brokratik yapısı ile sınıf ğretmenlerinin profesyonel davranışları arasındaki iliřki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eđitim Ynetimi*, 4(4), 497-521.
- Chamberland, L. (2009). *Distributed leadership: Developing a new practice: An action research study* (Order No. 3367708). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (UMI No. 304856820)
- Chew, J. O. A., & Andrews, D. (2010). Enabling teachers to become pedagogical leaders: Case studies of two IDEAS schools in Singapore and Australia. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 9, 59-74. doi:10.1007/s10671-010-9079-0
- Crowther, F., Kaagen, S. S., Ferguson, M., & Hann, L. (2002). *Developing teacher leaders: How teacher leadership enhances school success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Cole, D. A. (1987). Utility of confirmatory factor analysis in test validation research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55, 1019-1031. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.55.4.584
- Dalgıç Dinlendi, E. (2012). *Okul ynetimi srecinde İngilizce ğretmenlerinin liderlik uygulamaları* Unpublished master's thesis. Marmara University, İstanbul.
- Danielson, C. (2006). *Teacher leadership that strengthens professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Danielson, C. (2007). The many faces of leadership. *Educational leadership*, 65(1), 14-19. ERIC Number: EJ777070
- Demir, K. (2014). Teacher leadership culture scale: The study of validity and reliability. *Elementary Education Online*, 13(2), 334-344.
- Demirtaş, Z. (2010). Okul kltr ile ğrenci başarısı arasındaki iliřki. *Eđitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 35(158), 3-13.
- Donaldson, G. A. (2006). *Cultivating leadership in schools: Connecting people, purpose and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Friedman, H. (2011). The myth behind the subject leader as a school key player. *Teachers and Teaching*, 17, 289-302. doi:10.1080/13540602.2011.554701
- Frost, D., & Durrant, J. (2003). Teacher leadership: Rationale, strategy and impact. *School Leadership & Management*, 23(2), 173-186. doi:10.1080/1363243032000091940
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces*. Toronto: Falmer.
- Gaffney, M., & Faragher, R. (2010). Sustaining improvement in numeracy: Developing pedagogical content knowledge and leadership capabilities in tandem. *Mathematics Teacher Education and Development*, 12, 72-83.
- Gehrke, N. (1991). *Developing teachers' leadership skills*. ERICDigest ED330691.
- Geist, J. R. (2002). *Predictors of faculty trust in elementary schools: Enabling bureaucracy, teacher professionalism, and academic press* (Order No. 3081919). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (305498718). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/305498718?accountid=25087>.
- Gordin, L. (2010). *Conceptualization and support of the role of teachers serving as team leaders in a professional learning community* (Order No. 3415533). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (UMI No. 725645784)

- Handy, C. B. (1981). *Understanding organizations*. London: Hazell Watson & Viney
- Harris, A. & Muijs, D. (2005). *Improving schools through teacher leadership*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Harrison, R. (1972). Understanding your organization's character. *Harvard Business Review*, 50(23), 119-128.
- Hart, A. W. (1994). Creating teacher leadership roles. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30, 472-497. doi:10.1177/0013161X94030004005
- Heller, M. F., & Firestone, W. A. (1995). Who's in charge here? Sources of leadership for change in eight schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96(1), 65-86. doi:10.1086/461815
- Hobson, L. D., & Moss, L. (2010). Analysis of teacher leadership as a teacher development model: An opportunity for reform and improved practice. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, 27(2), 28-42.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2010). *Eğitim yönetimi*. (S. Turan, Trans.). Ankara: Nobel.
- Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Designing better schools: The meaning and nature of enabling school structure. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37, 296-321.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Bliss, J. R. (1990). Organizational climate, school health, and effectiveness: A comparative analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(3), 260-279. doi:10.1177/0013161X90026003004
- Hunzicker, J. (2012). Professional development and job-embedded collaboration: How teachers learn to exercise leadership. *Professional Development in Education*, 38, 267-289. doi:10.1080/19415257.2012.657870
- Jöreskog, K., & Sörbom, D. (2001). *LISREL 8.51*. Mooresville: Scientific Software.
- Kabler, A. L. (2013). *Understanding the relationship between school culture and teacher leadership* (Order No. 3568739). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1426247303). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1426247303?accountid=25087>.
- Kalkan, F. (2016). Relationship between professional learning community, bureaucratic structure and organisational trust in primary education schools, *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 16(5), 1619. doi:10.12738/estp.2016.5.0022
- Katzenmeyer, M., & Moller, G. (2001). *Awakening the sleeping giant: Helping teachers develop as leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Kılınç, A. Ç. (2014). Examining the relationship between teacher leadership and school climate. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 14(5), 1729-1742. doi:10.12738/estp.2014.5.2159
- Kılınç, A.Ç. & Reçepoğlu, E. (2013). Ortaöğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin öğretmen liderliğine ilişkin algı ve beklentileri. *Kalem Eğitim ve İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(2), 175-215.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principle and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Koşar, S. (2008). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin yönetimde gücü kullanma stilleri ile örgüt kültürü arasındaki ilişki*. Unpublished master's thesis. Gazi University, Ankara.
- Koşar, S. & Çalık, T. (2011). Okul yöneticilerinin yönetimde gücü kullanma stilleri ile örgüt kültürü arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 17(4), 581-603.
- Kölküçü, D. (2011). *İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin öğretmen liderliğini gösteren davranışlarının gereklilik ve sergilenme derecesine ilişkin görüşleri*. Unpublished master's thesis. Başkent University, Ankara.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Muijs, D., & Harris, A. (2006). Teacher led school improvement: Teacher leadership in the UK. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22, 961-972. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.010
- Mullins, L. J. (2016). *Management and organizational behavior*. London: Pitman.

- Özçetin, S. (2013). *Öğretmen liderliğinin okulun liderlik kapasitesinin gelişimine etkisi: Bir durum çalışması* Unpublished master's thesis. Akdeniz University, Antalya.
- Özdemir, S. (2012). İlköğretim okullarında okul kültürü ile örgütsel sağlık arasındaki ilişki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 18(4), 599-620.
- Öztürk, N. (2015). *Eğitim örgütlerinde örgüt kültürü ve öğretmen liderliği: Lider-üye etkileşiminin aracılık rolü* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Gaziantep University, Gaziantep.
- Paulu, N., & Winters, K. (1998). *Teachers leading the way: Voices from the national teacher forum*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Poekert, P. E. (2012) Teacher leadership and professional development: Examining links between two concepts central to school improvement. *Professional Development in Education*, 38(2), 169-188. doi:10.1080/19415257.2012.657824
- Robbins, S. (1990). *Organization theory* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (1996). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Selçuk, G. (2014). *Okul öncesi eğitim kurumlarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin liderlik davranışları* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Zirve University, Gaziantep.
- Sergiovanni, T. (2001). *The principals: A reflective practice perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Sezgin, F. (2010). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığının bir yordayıcısı olarak okul kültürü. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 35(156), 142-159.
- Smylie, M. A. & Brownlee-Conyers, J. (1992). Teacher leaders and their principals: Exploring the development of new working relationships. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, 150-184.
- Smylie, M. A., & Denny, J. W. (1990). Teacher leadership: Tensions and ambiguities in organizational perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 235-259. doi:10.1177/0013161X90026003003
- Şişman, M. (2002). *Örgütler ve kültürler*. Ankara: PegemA.
- Şişman, M. (2004). *Öğretim liderliği*. Ankara: PegemA.
- Terzi, A. R. (2005). İlköğretim okullarında okul kültürü. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 11, 423-442.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Parish, J., & DiPaola, M. F. (2006). School climate and state standards: How interpersonal relationships influence student achievement. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16, 386-415.
- Ülger, M. (2015). *Ortaokul öğretmenlerinin öğretmen liderliği algılarının, örgütsel vatandaşlık ve işe sarılma düzeyleriyle ilişkisi üzerine bir araştırma*. Unpublished master's thesis. Zirve University, Gaziantep.
- Wagner, C. R. (2006). The school leader's tool for assessing and improving school culture. *Principal Leadership*, 7(4), 41-44. Retrived on 12.2.2017 from http://mssaa.org/gen/mssaa_generated_bin/documents/basic_module/School_culture_triage.pdf.
- Wenner, J. A., & Campbell, T. (2016). The theoretical and empirical basis of teacher leadership: A Review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(1), 134-171. doi:10.3102/0034654316653478
- York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(3), 255-316. doi:10.3102/00346543074003255
- Yusof, H., Osman, M. N. A. H., & Noor, M. A. M. (2016). School culture and its relationship with teacher leadership. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 6(11), 272-286. doi:10.6007/IJARBS/v6-i11/2396.