

The Link between Leadership Style and School Culture in Secondary School of Wolaita Zone.

Mulatu Dea Lerra*, Wolaita Sodo University

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to explore the link between leadership style and school culture type and the effect between the two variables in Secondary Schools of Wolaita zone. Descriptive cross sectional survey design through quantitative approach were instrumental. Principals, supervisors, department heads, and teachers were the major source of primary data. The selection of sample teacher respondents was carried out by using stratified simple random sampling technique, whereas the remaining selected purposively. Besides, One-way ANOVA was used in order to examine the differences in perceptions of the respondents on school culture across the eight schools under study. Furthermore, Pearson's correlation was used to determine the relationships between school culture and leadership styles. Tukey post hoc multiple comparisons methods were employed to show whether the significant differences exist. Besides, regression analysis was used to examine the effect of school culture on leadership styles practiced in the schools' understudy. The results showed that, democratic leadership style had a significant strong association with four types of dominant school culture. These implied that improvement in school culture positively affect the practices of democratic leadership style in secondary school'. Finally, the study suggests that providing effective training for current principals on the concepts and practices of contemporary leadership and school culture, techniques on building strong school culture, assigning qualified principals, and facilitating experience sharing programs among effective school leaders to build strong efficient and effective school.

Key Words: Leadership, School Culture, Clan, Adhocracy, Market, Hierarchy

Received on 22 Feb 2021; Revised and Accepted on 15 Mar 2021 and Published in March 2021

Introduction

Culture is complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, laws, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as members of society (Brinkman, 1999). Although there are many definitions of culture in the literature, Taylor definition is compatible with other definition and has found some acceptance (Brinkman, 1999).

The formation of an organizational culture is a complex process that involves many variables, such as socialization, rituals, language, authority, economy, technology, and influence (Mullins, 2016; Mulatu, 2015). For this reason, culture emerges as a product

of the interaction of many dimensions. Some of these dimensions may be more dominant than others. However, the formation of a common culture first depends on the presence and association of a group of people interacting with each other (Mulatu, 2015; Şişman, 2002). In educational organizations, where humans are in the centre, every school has a culture built in the process of its formation (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Organizational culture holds its units together and shares values, norms, philosophies, perspectives, expectations, attitudes, myths, and trends that give it a distinctive identity (Hoy & Miskel, 2010).

According to Mulatu (2015), dominant values, ideas, assumptions, and other cultural

elements of organizations reflect the upper culture of a society. For this reason, in terms of cultural characteristics, an organization can be seen as a sub-culture of society. At the same time, organizations reflecting the culture of the community form their own culture to achieve organizational integration among their members as author (Pandey, 2009). Since each organization is formed by people with different characteristics, culture developed by organizations has unique features that separate it from others (Demetriou & Schmitz-Sciborski, 2011).

Organizations, especially schools, are products of the cultural paradigm of the society in which they exist. Based on its special environment and different inputs and processes, every organizations produces a culture that separates itself from other organizations (Dimmock & Walker, 2005). During the production of school culture, school administrators have some basic tasks, such as setting goals and objectives for the school and education regarding the value desired to take place at the school, guiding the members of the school community to implement these goals and objectives, and creating and sustaining a school culture based on mutual trust (Şişman, 2002).

Organizational theorist now acknowledge culture by recognizing its important role that plays in the lives of organizational members, besides, they began to understand what makes up an organizational culture, and how it is create, sustain and learned will enhance ability to explain and predict the behavior of people at work (Pandey, 2009). There are several ways to identify how culture influences leadership. Primarily, culture shapes the image of the ideal of a particular nation or organization (Hazelkorn, 2008). Cultural groups vary in their conceptions of what is important for effective leadership.

Culture influences the personality traits and work values of leaders and followers in a country or organization (Mulatu, 2015). Personality appears as the outcome of a lifelong process of interaction between individuals and their environment, resulting in systematic differences in the person typical behavior of people who grow up in different culture (Pandey, 2009).

More importantly, culture determines the actual pattern of leadership behaviors in an institution or organization and the cultural values and norms influence the attitudes and behaviors of leaders in ways unconscious to them (Pandey, 2009). In addition, cultural values reflect social norms in the relationships between individuals (Mulatu, 2015). These norms specify acceptable forms of leadership behaviors. For example, the norms appear as societal laws, limiting the use of power to influence the decisions and actions of others. Intercultural leaders must balance commercial and cultural concerns. Commercial imperatives focus on the silent leadership capabilities that corporations must possess to respond successfully to customer needs and competitive threats (Schein, 2002).

School leaders must show strong leadership no matter what this style. Strong principal leadership is defined as having knowledge of teaching and learning processes and the power to motivate other members of the organization to achieve and work toward the common good of the school (Yukl, 2006). Leithwood and Jantzi (1999) see strong administrators as having the ability to know the leadership behaviors that match the needs of the school stakeholders. The suggestion is consistent on the position that strong leadership is very vital to promote effective school, its culture (Yukl, 2006).

Cameroon and Quinn (1999) made a research on organizational effectiveness and success. Based on the competing values framework,

they developed the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument that distinguishes four culture types: Clan, Market, Adhocracy, and Hierarchy. Competing values produce polarities like flexibility versus stability and internal versus external focus-these two polarities were finding to be most important in defining organizational success (Cameroon & Quinn, 1999). The polarities construct a quadrant with four types of culture. Their assessment result suggests that it is important for school leaders to consider the match between strategic leadership initiatives and organizational culture when determining how to embed a culture that produces competitive advantage (Cameroon & Quinn, 1999). By assessing the current organizational culture as well as the preferred situation the gap and direction to change can be made visible as a first step to changing organizational culture (Schein, 1992).

As one can understand that, in perfect circumstances, with a culture, that has the right values, norms and practices it is still not easy to be a leader. There are many challenges that would be leaders face you have to understand how to deal with people define goals that were uniting and foster energy and education toward a brighter and better future. However, even the most talented leader was achieved little if the culture does not allow the same to influence people to work toward a common goal. This study thus, aimed to investigate the effects of the school culture (clan, adhocracy, market and hierarchy) on the leadership style (democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire) and the effect of independent variable on dependent variable. It covered both the negative and positive effects of the organizational culture on leadership style practiced by school principals, and the relationship between dominant school culture and leadership style.

Statement of the problem

Conception of a common culture in educational organizations, particularly in schools, depends first on the presence and cohesiveness of an interacting group of individuals (Schein, 2010). Individual aims are more likely to turn into a shared objective in schools with a strong, participatory culture. Culture shared by all school stakeholders makes the actualization of both short- and long-term objectives easier in education development (Mulatu, 2015).

School culture consists of basic values that ensure unity of community's perceptions and feelings (Schein, 2010), forms of understanding that determine the way things are done, and common beliefs that individuals share (Robins, 1990). It is formed by the integration of common beliefs, values, and norms (Mullins, 2016; Robbins, 1990; Schein, 2010). School 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 significant in shaping behaviors and practices within the organization. In this respect, the practices in schools as organization and the structure of school culture can be influential in exhibiting principals' leadership style (Mulatu, 2015). Therefore, revealing the relationship between school culture and principals' leadership style has significance in terms of enhancing the quality of education (Schein, 2010). School culture is the definitive aspect of how people operate within the school setting. Not only it is important to recognize the enduring impact of culture, leaders are influential in creating school culture. However, leaders alone cannot make a culture strong. Teachers are able to help shaping the school culture as well (Schein, 2010).

However, without effective leadership, culture will not be transformed or sustain the realities of school improvement or change (Mullins, 2016). Sapphire and King (1985:12) suggested twelve norms of school culture, 'collegiality; experimentation; high expectations; trust and coincidence; tangible support; reaching out to the knowledge bases; appreciation and confidence; tangible support; caring celebration and humor involvement in decision making, protection of what's important traditions and honest open communication'. Therefore, it is important to sustain or transform the school culture to enhance education development in general and quality education in particular (Mullins, 2016).

As Yukl (2006), leadership is one of the most important elements of an organization. If leadership and its process are carried out smoothly, the institution would become an effective one and sound school culture maintained. Otherwise, negative or toxic cultural practice like viewing students as the problem, hostile and critical of changes, inability to produce new ideas, demoralizing and discouraging rarely share ideas affects the performance of leaders and intended objectives to be achieved (Mulatu, 2015). In the work of situation, it has clear that leaders can no longer rely on the use of their position in the hierarchal structures as a means of their exercising the function of leadership. In order to get the best result from subordinate the leader must also have regard to encourage high a spirit of involvement and cooperation and willingness to work (Yuki, 2013).

In secondary schools, as Schein (2010) the role of educational leaders emphasized the culture of control and supporting the teaching and learning process. Leader's competence such as knowledge, skills, behavior and attitude are mandatory. School culture affects leadership style, behavior, personality by

way of the follower values, beliefs, assumption and norms build overtime (Mullins, 2016). Leaders cannot choose their style at will. They are constrained by cultural conditions that their followers have come to expect. Nearly every aspect of leadership is affected by culture. Schein said "The values, beliefs, norms and ideals embedded in a culture affect leadership behavior, style, goals and strategies of organizations" (Schein, 2010:24).

As a leader in school, you may face a number of cultural problems: values and beliefs that guide the school are no longer suited to the challenges you face (Mulatu, 2015). According to Mulatu, that the decisions made and the norms of behavior are no longer effective, encountered repeated resistances to what leaders believed were sensible and necessary changes but are uncertainty as to the source of this resistance. The existing relationships may be full of conflict; communication is poor, authority is in double and there are vocal disagreements about the way forward people respond very differently to similar situations and are pulling in opposite directions (Schien, 2002).

However, in Ethiopia various efforts were made to see the influence of culture on the organization. For instance, Bediru's (2011) finding showed that organizational cultures determine the commitment of employees in their institution. Solmon (2018) tried to show the relationship between principals' leadership style and school culture in private secondary schools. Hana (2019) in her study depicted the effect of school culture to school effectiveness in secondary schools of Jimma zone. Besides, Kedir (2019) conducted on other aspects of educational institutions such as job satisfaction, motivation and commitment, remuneration that linked with organizational culture.

As indicated in their findings, they argued that weak school culture has been not contributing for the achievement of intended purpose of the schools. This also needs further investigations. As cited above, the relation between organizational culture and the commitment of employees, students' academic achievements and school effectiveness has been studied extensively, and a gap did exist in what was known about the relation between school culture and principals' leadership style. In spite of these, there is scantiness of studies were found that address the relation between school culture and principals' leadership style the effect of school culture on leadership style in the study area secondary schools. Thus, this study was designed to explor the relationship between school culture and principals' leadership style practiced at sampled school of Wolaita Zone administration. It gives clear framework for understanding the effects and complex relationships with in school management. Hence, the research attempted to answer the following basic research questions:

1. What is the relationship between the existing school culture and the dominant leadership styles perceived in the study schools?
2. To what extent do school culture influence the leadership style in sampled secondary schools of Wolaita Zone?

Method and Materials

Research Method

Since the purpose of this study was to asses and identifies the relationship and effect of school culture on leadership effectiveness, descriptive cross sectional design with quantitative approach were employed in this

study. Descriptive research aims to accurately and systematically describe a population, situation or phenomenon. It can answer what, where, when and how questions, but not why questions. A descriptive research design can use a wide variety of research methods to investigate one or more variables (Cohen, Minion, & Morrison, 2007). In this study both primary and secondary data were used as sources of information. The primary sources of data were collected from secondary school principals, school based supervisors, department heads, and teachers. Whereas, different official documents related to secondary schools and leadership of them were also considered as secondary source of data.

Sample Size: To determine the sample size, a formula developed by Kothari (2004) and recommended by Cohen et al., (2007) in educational research was considered by the researcher for this study. It has helped the researcher to correctly determine appropriate sample size for the study.

$$n = \frac{Z^2 * p * q * N}{(e^2(N - 1)) + (Z^2 * p * q)}$$

Where:

n= the required sample size

Z^2 = is the abscissa of the normal curve that cuts off an area α at the tails ($1 - \alpha$ equals the desired confidence level. The value for Z is found in statistical tables which contain the area under the normal curve. e.g., $Z=1.96$ at 95% confidence level; and $Z^2=3.841$).

N= the population size (320)

P= the population proportion (assumed to be 0.5 since this would provide the maximum sample size)

q= 1-p

e = is the desired level of precision or margin of error (5% error or 0.05)

Thus;

$$= \frac{n}{(0.05^2(313 - 1)) + (3.841 * 0.5 * (1 - 0.5))} = 173$$

Accordingly; on the base of the above formula among 320 academic staffs; 173 of them were identified as a sample size. The number of teachers in each school varied due to differences in the number of students. Therefore, to determine the sample size of teachers to be drawn from each selected school, the researcher was used Formula, $PS = n / N \times \text{No of teacher in each school}$. Then, the identified sample size was distributed to each secondary schools included in this study proportionally in Wolaita Zone administration.

Sampling Technique

Among the total number of academic staffs of the eight secondary schools, the determined sample size for this study was selected using stratified simple random techniques. Because, this sampling technique gives equal chance for each members of the population the likelihood of probability of being chosen for the study as a sample. Thus, using name list of teachers from work attendance sheet, the sample respondents were selected randomly from each secondary school included in this study.

In addition to teachers, school based supervisors and unit leaders of the eight schools were selected using purposive sampling technique to respond to the questionnaire. Since internal supervisors and unit leaders were directly engaged on school leadership activities in collaboration with the principals; they had detailed information about the effects of school culture on leadership effectiveness in the study schools. This helped the researcher to get significant information for the study in Wolaita Zone Secondary Schools. Questionnaire was used

as the main source of data gathering tools in the study, because it is less expensive, offer grater anonymity of respondents and approach for collecting information (Kumar, 2005).

The questionnaire used in this study had three sections. The first section deals about the demographic information that includes sex, age, education level, qualification, and length of service year of the respondents. The second section deals with organizational culture assessment instruments that describe school cultures in terms of the six dimensions of culture: organizational characteristics, organizational leadership, and management of employees, organizational glue, strategic emphasis and criteria of success. The third section includes items that focus on school leadership style. Questions regarding organizational culture included in the questionnaire were obtained from, Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) with permission from the author to measure the type of culture in the schools' understudy. The OCAI was developed by Cameron and Quinn (1999) based on an organization culture framework built up on a theoretical model referred to as the competing values framework which an organization has either a predominant internal or external focus. The OCAI is useful to determine underlying elements in the culture which may affect the leaders' effectiveness. Generally, a cultural profile can be constructed using the competing values framework through the use of the organizational culture profile can be drawn by establishing the organizations dominate culture type characteristics. Using this framework, the overall culture profile of the school as an organization could be identifies as:

Clan- an organization that concentrates on internal, maintains with flexibility, concern

for people, and sensitivity for customer; *Hierarchy*- an organization that focuses on internal, maintains with a need for stability and control; *Adhocracy*-organizations concentrate on external position, high degree of flexibility and individuality, *Market*- an organization that focus on external maintenance with a need for stability and control.

As well, questions related to principals' leadership style were prepared from extensive literature review. In this regard forty questions were prepared with five alternatives in liker-scales. The questions were divided into three parts based up on the three leadership Styles-Democratic, Autocratic, and Laissez-faire styles.

Validity and Reliability of the Questionnaire

In order to assure data quality, the questionnaire prepared for this study were

validated and tested at pilot level for its reliability before distributed for sample respondents and used as data collection instrument. Primarily, the validity of the instruments was tested by experts from the department including the research advisor to judge the items on their appropriateness and clarity of its contents. Then, alterations were made using the comments forwarded on appropriateness and clarity of few items of the questionnaire. Subsequently, the reliability of the questionnaire was tested through pilot study. To measure the reliability of the questionnaire, Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient was calculated for all parts of the questionnaire. Cronbach's alpha is a measure used to assess the reliability, or internal consistency, of a set of scale or test items. In other words, the reliability of any given measurement refers to the extent to which it is a consistent measure of a concept, and Cronbach's alpha is one way of measuring the strength of that consistency

Table 1: Reliability Statistics: Cronbach's Alpha of the Pilot Test

Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
Clan	.831	6
Adhocracy	.885	6
Market	.863	6
Hierarchy	.876	6
Democratic	.811	10
Autocratic	.831	10
Laissez-faire	.895	10
Total	.887	54

Concerning the acceptability of Cronbach's alpha results most authors suggested 0.7 or above. More specifically, Cohen et al., (2007) suggested that, Cronbach's alpha can be used on the basis of the following guidelines: >0.90 = very high reliable; 0.80–0.89 = highly reliable; 0.70–0.79 = reliable; 0.60–0.69= marginally reliable; and <0.60=

lowly reliable or unacceptable. The value was 0.831 for clan culture, 0.885 for adhocracy, 0.863 for market culture and 0.876 for hierarchy culture. In addition, leadership style also assessed. The values for democratic leadership style were 0.811, for autocratic 0.831, and for laissez-faire 0.895. The calculated Cronbach's alpha coefficient for

all parts of the questionnaire was found at 0.887. Thus, the result showed that the instrument was highly reliable and the final version of the questionnaire was administered to the respondents.

Ethical Consideration

In this study, the researcher was governed by the ethical principles of the research. Specially, the two most importantly emphasized ethical principles that were applied in this study are respecting the privacy of respondents and confidentiality of information revealed by the respondents (Leedy & Ornrod, 2005). This requires, prospective research participants must be fully informed about the procedures and risks involved in research and must give their consent to participate. The researcher should assure that the participant's responses will be treated confidentially and with anonymity of the respondents (Johnson and Christensen, 2012). Besides, confidentiality of information about the respondents was secured; no personal details of individual respondents were produced on any parts of the study documents. Furthermore, any confidential information revealed by the respondents was kept secret.

Methods of Data Analysis

The data collected for this study was checked at all level. At the beginning the data

collected from all sources were checked and organized with respect to basic research questions and objectives of the study. It was analyzed quantitatively. The quantitative data were tabulated and processed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS V-22). Then, the analyses of the quantitative data were made using descriptive statistics, like frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviations and ranges. Additional to descriptive statistics, to test the presences of significant differences between teachers and other group of respondents' responses of items of the questionnaire; t-test was calculated. Besides, A-one-way ANOVA was used in order to examine the differences in perceptions of the respondents on school culture across the eight schools under study. Furthermore, Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationships between school culture and leadership styles. Besides, Regression analysis was used to examine the effect of school culture on leadership styles practiced in the schools' understudy. The equation of the regressions was generally built around independent variables (the four domain of school culture) and the dependent variables (leadership styles). The basic objective of using regression equation on this study was to make the study more effective in describing, understanding, predicting, and controlling the stated variables.

Table 2: One-way ANOVA on the perceptions of the respondents across the eight schools

School Culture		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Clan	Between Groups	13.729	7	1.961	4.503	.000*
	Within Groups	84.495	194	.436		
	Total	98.224	201			
Hierarchy	Between Groups	2.254	7	.322	1.064	.388
	Within Groups	58.713	194	.303		
	Total	60.966	201			
Market	Between Groups	6.159	7	.880	1.849	.080

Adhocracy	Within Groups	92.335	194	.476	37.35	.000*
	Total	98.494	201			
	Between Groups	113.188	7	16.170		
	Within Groups	83.979	194	.433		
	Total	197.167	201			

*Correlation significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

In order to determine the difference in the perceptions of the participants across the eight schools, a one-way ANOVA was used to compare whether there is a statistical significant difference exist. Besides, Tukey post hoc multiple comparison method was employed to show whether the significant differences exist in eight sampled schools. As a result, table 2 shows that there is a statistical difference on the perceptions of the participants on clan and adhocracy school culture across the eight schools ($F(4.50)$, $P\text{-value} < 0.05$) and ($F(37.35)$, $P\text{-value} < 0.05$), respectively, but there is no statistical difference on perception of Hierarchy culture across eight schools with the ($F(1.064)$, $P > 0.05$), and Market ($F(.880)$, $P > 0.05$). This indicates that Adhocracy and Clan

school culture highly exhibited in eight selected Government Secondary Schools of Wolaita Zone.

4.3. School Principals' Leadership Style

Table 3 below indicated, respondent's responses regarding the three styles of leadership (democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire) were illustrated. As indicated from the Table 3, regarding democratic leadership style, supervisors had rated relatively high mean value ($M=2.34$, $SD=0.47$) than teacher respondents ($M=2.12$, $SD=0.77$). However, statistically significant difference was not observed between the two groups of respondents in rating the items related to democratic leadership style $t(201) = 1.804$, $P=0.073 > 0.05$.

Table 3: School Principals' Leader Style

No	Leadership Style	Teachers		Supervisors		Total		t-test	P-Value
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	Democratic	2.12	0.77	2.34	0.47	2.17	0.72	1.804	0.073
2	Autocratic	3.47	0.86	3.15	0.65	3.40	0.83	-2.251	0.025
3	Laissez-faire	3.91	0.53	3.74	0.66	3.87	0.56	-1.688	0.093

*. Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Source: Survey data 2013

Scale: ≤ 1.5 - very low performance, 1.50-2.5 - low Performance, 2.50-3.5- medium performance, 3.50-4.5 - high performance and ≥ 4.50 - very high

As it is seen from the Table 3 above, regarding democratic leadership style, supervisors had rated relatively high mean value ($M=2.34$, $SD=0.47$) than teacher respondents ($M=2.12$, $SD=0.77$). As a result,

overall results ($M=2.17$, $SD=0.721$) illustrated in the Table 3 indicated lower level of the practices of democratic leadership style. This indicated that, lower level of supervisors' and teachers' agreements about the practice of democratic leadership style in the schools' understudy.

However, the t-test result $t(201) = 1.804$, $P=0.073 > 0.05$) showed statistically significant difference was not observed between the two groups of respondents in rating items related to democratic leadership style. This implies that teachers and supervisors had similar view regarding democratic leadership style.

Regarding Autocratic leadership style, the data of the Table 3 showed highest mean score rated by teachers ($M=3.47$, $SD=0.864$) and supervisors ($M=3.15$, $SD=0.650$) than democratic leadership style. Moreover, the overall mean results regarding Autocratic leadership style illustrated in the Table ($M=3.40$, $SD=0.832$) also indicated that, leadership style practiced in the study schools was more autocratic than democratic style.

However, the t-test result ($t(201) = -2.251$, $P=0.025 < 0.05$) showed statically significant difference between the two groups of respondents in rating items of Autocratic leadership style. This implies that teachers and supervisors had not had similar view regarding the practices of Autocratic leadership style in the study schools. Few teachers had rated higher mean results than supervisors.

With regards to Laissez-faire leadership style, the overall results illustrated in the Table 3 showed highest mean score ($M=3.87$, $SD=0.559$) rated by both groups of respondents than the two styles of leadership.

The results of t-test ($t(201) = -1.688$, $P=0.093 > 0.05$) not showed statistically

significant difference between the two groups of respondents in rating the items of Laissez-faire leadership style. This implies that teachers and supervisors had similar view regarding the practices of Laissez-fair leadership style in the study school.

In general, when the practice of the three style of leadership was compared at the schools' understudy, respondents' rating results indicated that leadership practice at the study schools had dominated by Laissez-faire leadership style. This implies secondary school leaders in the study schools, give complete freedom to the followers to make individual decision on their own. The authority of power was given to the employee and the most determine goals make decisions, and resolve problems on their own. Such leader at school level is usually recognized as "figure head"; who does not give any direction to the followers but act as a liaison between a school and the community the finding is consistent with empirical study conducted by Martin and Mulatu (Martin, 2001; Mulatu, 2015).

Following, laissez-faire leadership style, in some schools, autocratic leadership style was more practices in the study schools than democratic style of leadership. This means, leadership style in the schools' understudy was characterized by centralized management system, with a little participation of followers. School leaders take full authority, and assume full responsibility from initiation to task completion. In this regards, as argued by Bolden (2003), in autocratic leadership followers are generally expected to obey the orders without any explanation. Leaders are very directive and not allowed their follower to participate in decision making processes. This implies that, authoritarian leaders' practices in the study schools guided school leaders not to consult employees and allowed

to give any input. It initiates them to create resistance between themselves and their followers as a means of emphasizing role distinctions.

In other words, the practice of democratic leaders was less emphasized in the study schools. Leaders do not encourage group discussion and decision-making. Followers were not informed about conditions affecting their job and are not encouraged expressing their ideas and making suggestions.

In general, leadership style practiced in the study schools was dominated by laissez-faire leadership style than democratic once. Accordingly, principals give maximum freedom to teachers and/or students; they loosely control teachers and students; most of the time staff makes decisions by themselves; and principals wait for things to go away before taking action. This implies that, the

Table 4. Correlation Matrix between Types of School Culture and Leadership Styles

	Clan	Adhocracy	Market	Hierarchy	Democratic	Autocratic	Laissez-faire
Clan	1						
Adhocracy	.879**	1					
Market	.859**	.863**	1				
Hierarchy	.833**	.857**	.878**	1			
Democratic	.730**	.705**	.801**	.787**	1		
Autocratic	.522**	.438**	.654**	.637**	.716**	1	
Laissez-faire	.235**	.109	.360**	.252**	.494**	.745**	1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Survey Data ,2020

The results of correlation test conducted to see the association between the four types of school culture and the three leadership style (democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire) and to see which among them had higher correlation with any of the four school culture was illustrated in Table 4 In relation to this, concerning the acceptability of the results of correlation Coefficients, most authors suggest that the value under 0.2 and above

principals disregarded to serve as role model; taking in to consideration staff members' interest and needs; influence teachers to enhance the success of educational programs; encouraging open communication among staff members and maintain respects for difference of opinions; facilitating decision making by the group rather than individuals; and establishing high expectation of students' achievements; and demonstrating excellent communication skill with teachers, student, parents, and the community.

The link between School Culture and Leadership Style

In this part of the chapter the relationship between the types of organizational culture and leadership style practices in the study school was presented based on the following assumptions and using the data collected for this study.

0.91 are very low and very high coefficient of correlation respectively. Generally, the calculated r value lower than 0.21 indicated very weak or negligible correlation; 0.21 to 0.40 a low degree of correlation; 0.41 to 0.60 a moderate degree of correlation; 0.61 to 0.80 a high degree of correlation; and above 0.80 was regarded as very strong correlation.

The data in the Table 4 shows that, democratic leadership style had the highest coefficient of correlation with all the four school culture (Hierarchy=0.878; Market=0.801; Clan=0.730; and Adhocracy=0.705) at 0.01 level of significant. Accordingly, the results of correlation coefficient regarding democratic leadership style illustrated in the Table4 shows very high degree of correlation with Hierarchy and Market types of school culture and High degree of correlation with Clan and Adhocracy school culture than other style of leadership.

In relation to this, as stated by Cameron and Quinn (1999), an organization culture compatible with Hierarchy type is characterized by formalized and structured places to work. In this form of organizational culture; effective leaders are good coordinator or organizers maintain smooth running organization is important. The long form concerns of the organizations are stability, predictability, and efficiency. Formal rules and polices hold the organization together.

Thus, the results of coefficient correlation illustrated in the Table 4 indicated that, as issues associated with Hierarchy culture were strongly practiced; the status of democratic leadership style in the study schools could be improved. In other words, Hierarchy culture leads the school to stable, efficient, highly consistent products, and service. As much as the environment was relatively stable tasks and functions could be integrated, uniformity in products and service was maintained, and workers and jobs were under control, clear line of decision making authority, standardize rules and procedure, and control and accountability mechanism were valued as a key to success.

Moreover, Market forms of organizational culture, as assessed in OCAI, it is result

oriented work places; leaders are hard deriving produces and competitors. They are though and demanding. The glue that holds the organization together is emphasizes on wining. The long-term concern is on competitive actions and achieving stretch goals and targets. Out placing the competition and market leadership are important (Cameron & Quinn, 1999). So, having very strong degree of correlation between democratic leadership style and Market forms of organizational culture indicated that, as the stated issues and activities of Market type of culture improved the status of democratic leadership style in the school understudy could automatically be improved.

With regards to Autocratic leadership, the result showed high degree of correlation with Market (0.6504) and Hierarchy (0.637) and moderate degree of correlation with Clan (0.522) and Adhocracy (0.438). However, the relationship between laissez-faire leadership style was found at low degree of correlation with three domain of school culture (Market=0.360, Hierarchy=0.252, and Clan=0.235). But, the result did not indicate significant relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and Adhocracy type of school culture.

In general, democratic leadership style had a significant strong relation with dominant school culture. However, such relationship was not strong regarding Autocratic and laissez-faire leadership style. These implied that improvement in school culture will positively affect the practices of Democratic leadership style in secondary schools' understudy. Nevertheless, positive change on the four types of school culture (clan, adhocracy, market and hierarchy culture) does not brought significant supportive change on Autocratic and laissez-faire leadership style.

Regression Analysis

Moreover, the effect of the four types of organizational culture on leadership style was presented and analyzed based on the following assumptions and through regression results obtained from SPSS output.

The results of regression analysis illustrated in Table 5 was depend upon the results of data demonstrated in Table 5 that describes about the relationship between types of school culture and leadership style practiced in the schools' understudy. According to the data of this Table, democratic Leadership style had strong relationship with the four types of school culture. Thus, the results of Regression analysis illustrated in Table 5 were focused on the effects of the four types of school culture on democratic leadership practiced by principals of the study schools.

Accordingly, the data illustrated in Table above showed that, the correlation coefficients ($r=0.823$) indicated the existence of strong link between democratic leadership style and types of school culture as determinants. The determination coefficient R-square has the value 0.678 expresses that 67.8% of the occurrence of democratic leadership style can be explained by the types of school culture taken into consideration. From the Table it has been determined that $f=103.698$ and significant at 0.01 level, indicated that, the role of the types of school culture as independent variables to explain the practices of democratic leadership style (the dependent variable). It confirmed that, the regression analysis is valid and can be used to analyze the dependence between the variables.

5. Regression Analysis Result

		R=0.823 Adjuster $R^2=0.671$						
		$R^2=0.678$		F=103.698**				
Culture Type		Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Model 1	(Constant)	.653	.084		7.769**	.000	.487	.819
	Clan	.110	.080	.130	1.379	.170	-.047	.267
	Adhocracy	-.141	.082	-.169	-1.712	.089	-.303	.021
	Market	.411	.083	.493	4.968**	.000	.248	.574
	Hierarchy	.307	.073	.391	4.194**	.000	.163	.452

** . Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Survey Data, 2020

Furthermore, as can be seen from the Table, the constant term, with the value of 0.653 is also the point of intersection of the regression line with Y axis (Zero and Y). Since the statistic $t=7.769$ and $P\text{-value}=0.000<0.05$, it

means that the coefficient is significantly different from zero.

The results of regression analysis presented in the Table 5 further showed that, among the four types of school culture (independent

variables) two of them (Market and Hierarchy) are statically significant to influence the status of democratic leadership style in the schools' understudy. But Clan and Adhocracy type of school culture are not statically significant.

More specifically, Market ($\beta=0.411$) and Hierarchy ($\beta=0.307$) type of school culture obtained significant coefficient results. This means, a one percent improvement on Market and Hierarchy type of school culture will improve the practices of democratic leadership style by 41.10% and 30.7% in secondary schools' understudy respectively. Thus, the following regression model can be resulted from the analysis of the coefficients:

$$\text{Status of Democratic Leadership Style} = 0.653 + 0.411\text{Market} + 0.307\text{Hierarchy}$$

This implies that focusing on internal and external aspect of the school with a need for stability and control can possibly maximize the success of democratic leadership style in secondary schools. So, the conclusion that can be drawn from the results of regression analysis illustrated in above last Table is that, educational leadership and the management of secondary schools' understudy should develop strategies and try to improve issues related to the variables like market and hierarchy type of school culture in order to improve the status of democratic leadership style on continuous bases.

Conclusions

Based on the summary of the study findings, the following conclusions were made regarding organizational culture and leadership style practiced at government secondary schools understudy.

Culture could play an important role in bringing friendly relationship and cooperation among the members of a school and empower for developing a sense of

respect, loyalty, innovation and confidence. So, building a culture of trust which has positive influence on outcomes of students' academic achievements, teachers' job motivation, and better perception of other stakeholders is a compulsory function for school leaders all the time. However, the results of this study showed weak practices of four culture type at sampled schools level and not able to positively influence the achievement of schools goals and objectives. If this was supported by weak leadership practices the problems become more serious and the situation of learning and teaching process may be found at risk.

With respect to the practice of principal leadership style in the current situation, the finding showed that, leadership style practiced in the study schools was dominated by laissez-faire leadership style than democratic once. Accordingly, principals give maximum freedom to teachers and students; they loosely control teachers and students; most of the time staff makes decisions by themselves; and principals wait for things to go away before taking action. This implies that, the principals disregarded to serve as role model; taking in to consideration staff members' interest and needs; influence teachers to enhance the success of educational programs; encouraging open communication among staff members and maintain respects for difference of opinions; facilitating decision making by the group rather than individuals; establishing high expectation of students' achievements; and demonstrating excellent communication skill with teachers, student, parents, and the community. From these one can conclude that, school principals' leadership style currently practices in the study schools was not possibly bring success in their respective school. If so, it is hard to expect effectiveness and efficiency from

those school leaders to achieve the goals and objectives education at school level.

Regarding the relationship between school culture and leadership style, the results of correlation test conducted to see the association between the four types of school culture and the three leadership style (democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire) showed that, democratic leadership style had the highest coefficient of correlation with all the four school culture types at 0.01 level of significant. Furthermore, the results of regression analysis also showed that, democratic Leadership Style can be explained by the types of school culture taken into consideration. These results further indicated that, among the four types of school culture Market and Hierarchy are statically significant to influence the status of democratic leadership style in the schools' understudy. These designated that, democratic leadership style had a significant

strong association with dominant school culture. However, such relationship was not strong regarding Autocratic and laissez-faire leadership style.

These implied that improvement in school culture will positively affect the practices of democratic leadership style in secondary schools' understudy. However, positive change on the four types of school culture (Clan, Adhocracy, Market and Hierarchy culture) does not brought significant supportive change on Autocratic and laissez-faire leadership style. So, the conclusion that can be drawn from these results is educational leadership and the management of secondary schools' understudy should develop strategies and try to improve issues related to Market and Hierarchy type of school culture in order to improve the status of democratic leadership style on continuous bases.

References

1. Bediru Nasir. (2011). The Assessment of Organizational Culture and Employee Commitment of Gurage Zone. Addis Ababa University (Unpublished).
2. Bolden, R. (2003). *Leadership theory and competency frame works*. I J K: Barely Lane.
3. Brinkman. A (1999). *Leading in a Culture of Change*. Paris: Lossy-1 lass
4. Cameron, Kim S. & Quinn, Robert E. (1999). Diagnosing and changing organizational Culture: Based on the Competing Values Framework. Reading, Mass: Addison Wesley.
5. Cohen, Louis; Manion, Lawrence; and Morrison, Keith (2007). *Research Methods in Education (Sixth edition)*. London: Routledge - The Taylor & Francis Group
6. Demetriou, C., & Schmitz-Sciborski, A. (2011). Integration, motivation, strengths and optimism: Retention theories past, present and future. In R. Hayes (Ed.), Proceedings Haktanir et al. 13 of the 7th National Symposium on Student Retention, 2011,

- Charleston (pp. 300–312). Norman, OK: The University of Oklahoma
7. Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2005). Educational leadership: Culture and diversity. London, Sage.
8. Hana Solomon (2019). The effect of school culture to school effectiveness in secondary school of Jimma zone. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia
9. Hazelkorn, E. (2008). Learning to live with league tables and ranking: The experience of institutional leaders. Higher Education Policy y 21, 193-215
10. Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2010). *Educational administration. Boston: McGraw-Hill*
11. Johnson, B., and Christensen, L. (2012). *Educational Research Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches*. UCOM: University of South Alabama.
12. Kedir, H. (2019) The link between Organizational culture with job satisfaction, commitment, and remuneration in secondary school. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia
13. Kumar, R. (2005). *Research Methodology*. London: International and Professional Publishing.
14. Leedy, P. and Ormrod, J. (2005). *Practical research: planning and design* (8th Ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
15. Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (1999) *Transformational school leadership effects: a replication. School Effectiveness and School Improvement Journal*, 10(1), 161-179
16. Martin, J. (2001). *Culture in Organization-three perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford university press.
17. Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). School leadership that works: From research to results. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
18. Mulatu Dea (2015) Exploring institutional culture (Existing and Preferred) at Private University: In case of Admas University. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science: A Arts and Humanities Psychology*. Vol.15(4), 21-34, Global Journal Inc. USA

19. Mullins, D. (2016). *The Relationship between Leadership and Organization Culture in school of Nursing*. Published PhD Thesis, Huntington: West Virginia.
20. Pandey, M. (2009). Organizational Effectiveness and Bureaucracy Red Tape. *Public Performance and management Review*, 3(30), 398-425.
21. Saphires, J. & King, M. (1985). Good Seeds in Strong Cultures.
22. Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass
23. Schein, E. H. (2002). Organizational Culture. *American Psychologist*, 43(2), 109-119.
24. Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
25. Şişman, M. (2002). *Organizations and cultures*. Ankara, Turkey: Pegem A.
26. Solomon Melese (2018). *The Relationship Between Leadership Style and School Culture In Private Secondary Schools of Bole Sub-City*. Unpublished, Addis Ababa University
27. Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations (8th ed.)*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
28. Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations (6thEd.)*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Education.