Leadership, Personal Values and Organizational Culture

Oznur Gulen Ertosun and Zafer Adiguzel

Abstract Organizational culture creates a sense of identity and belonging for employees and also has importance in desired organizational behaviors by overlapping organizational values with individual values (Smircich, Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 339–358, 1983). On the other hand, the individual values, beliefs, anticipations, attitudes, behaviors and actions that employees have are considered important factors in shaping and adopting organizational culture (Daft, Organizational theory and design. West Publishing, 1986). Values are immensely substantial with regard to influencing organizational dynamics, especially at a management level (Chusmir and Parker, Journal of Social Psychology, 132, 87–100, 1992). Personal values set standards about thought and sense unclear besides shaping the decisions and behaviors of managers thus constituting an ideology and consequently an organizational culture (Russell, Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 22, 76–84, 2001).

Because of the mentioned critical importance, this study aims to holistically examine the association among culture, leadership, and values. For that purpose, this chapter continues in the following manner; (i) The importance of organizational culture and effect on the decisions and behaviors in an organization (ii) Elements contributing to organizational culture (iii) Personal values and importance within management (iv) Leadership and association with organizational culture, and finally, (v) The effects of a leader's personal value on organizational culture.

1 Introduction

In order to understand organizational life, we need to examine the concept of culture. Social culture defines the acceptable and unacceptable behaviours either consciously or unconsciously. Culture also ensures that the needs of the individuals and the

O. G. Ertosun (✉) · Z. Adiguzel
School of Business and Management Sciences, Istanbul Medipol University, Istanbul, Turkey
e-mail: ogertosun@medipol.edu.tr; zadiguzel@medipol.edu.tr

community are in line with each other, providing guidance and creating norms of behaviour (Hofstede 1980; Smircich 1983).

It is possible to explain the concept of organizational culture with two different approaches. According to the first one, culture is regarded as a subsystem within the organization that allows individuals to adapt to their environment. This is an explanatory approach and accepts that every organisation has a culture, and it is usually enough to make a list of some characteristics of the organization. The second approach regards the organisational culture as an information system within which each member can interpret themselves. This approach allows the social system to have a dynamic structure in all its complexity and then leads to the concept of corporate identity (Koźmiński and Obłój 1989, p. 202).

Organizational culture regulates the behaviours of the participants within the organization and plays an important role in ensuring, in extreme cases, that the organisation acts as a whole. If the organization operates in a similar and steady way for a period of time, gaining goals and achievements, the members of the organisation learn certain behavioural styles and accept some successfully accepted standards. For this reason, organizational culture also means the "idealization of a common experience" (Daft 1986). Organizational culture can, therefore, effectively support or hinder collaboration, information exchange, experience and ideas. For example, the culture that promotes the creativity and participation of all team members provides a favourable environment for employees to be effective in their initiative (Schein 1983).

Similarly, values have a very important role in forming organisational culture and determining an employee's behaviour and judgment. The interactions between values, attitudes, beliefs and behaviours are stated in many studies in literature. A value system can be considered as a relatively permanent frame of perception that shapes and influences the general nature of an individual's behaviour. Values are similar to attitudes, but they are more naturally rooted, permanent, and stable. Furthermore, a value appears to be more general and less connected to any particular object. Values are closer to ideology or philosophy rather than attitude. At a more concrete level, the values are principles that direct an individual's desires, feelings, and actions (Bernthal 1962; Shah 1985).

Also, values predict most of the behaviours at a particular level. But, if the values are not based on prior cultural learning, they can be seen as merely advocated values and do not reflect on employees' behaviours. If the accepted values are logically compatible with the basic assumptions, these values can then be transformed into philosophy, which can bring the group together, establishing an identity and creating basic tasks (Ouchi 1981). Values start at the individual level, thus, the values of a few individuals constitute the values of the group, and the values of a group constitute the values of the organisation (Harrison 1975).

An organizational culture, as well as its values and leadership, are frequently mentioned in the literature as closely related concepts. One of the most known theories is Schein's (2004) culture and leadership theory, which emphasizes the role of leaders in creating, sustaining, and modifying the content of an organizational culture. Schein's theory states that cultural content starts with the decisions taken by

the leaders. In this context, the leader is the one who can create more effects on his/her followers rather than how they influence him/her.

Leadership is extremely important for the organizations in terms of achieving certain common goals because the leaders have a strong influence on the behaviours and performance of individuals and groups. In addition, the aims of the group are also the targets that are approved or requested by the leader (Şimşek 1997). As a result, the leader has an important role in acquiring a new corporate identity during the re-institutionalization processes by supporting certain approaches, attitudes, understandings, values, and behaviours (Merih 2002). Otherwise, if the conflicts of values emerge, it may cause the re-examination of the organizational values, or the establishment of new mechanisms for harmonization, or a change in leadership style.

Additionally, as specified by Schein, the cultural characteristics can be modified according to needs- like behavioural patterns. In the case of strategic conflicts in values, norms, philosophy, organizational rules and organizational culture, the need for the organizational renewal may arise (Schein 1984). It is believed that this study will contribute to the literature by summarizing the critical relationship between these elements and clarifying the conceptual framework.

2 Organizational Culture

Individuals constitute societies who are trying to satisfy their needs and expectations and to find solutions to the problems they are experiencing. As a result, the individuals living in the society jointly create ideas, traditions, and rules to regulate their relationships with each other. This phenomenon, consisting of all these factors, is called culture (Erdoğan 1994).

Culture reflects the lifestyles of the societies and therefore different communities have different cultural characteristics (Baymur 1994). Culture does not differ only among societies. Organizations operate in the same social systems and are also influenced by the values, traditions, customs and beliefs of their communities (Apulgan 1996). Organizations try to survive like any living creature and not only for a certain limited period of time. In line with this, organizations form a culture mosaic consisting of individuals with different beliefs and traditions (Ersen 1997). The existence of "culture" in organizations is a binding element for communication and interactions between employees. Naturally, individuals who participate in a particular culture bring along their own beliefs and traditions (March and Simon 1958).

Although organizational culture is an abstract concept, it affects the employees and organizational processes and plays a significant role in companies. A positive culture is not only a factor for the success or failure of a business, but also can bring significant competitive advantage.

Organizational culture studies began in the USA during the nineteenth century. And, specifically, in the book titled "Institutional Cultures: Rituals in the Life of the Institution", the concept and understanding of positive organizational culture was widely presented (Deal and Kennedy 1982). Since then, organizational culture has

become an integral part of much research, especially in the context of studying business strategies of institutions. It is clear that organizational culture has become an important element for the senior managers; therefore, discussions were carried out regarding the continuity of organizational culture and leadership, notably about leadership and communication methods.

2.1 Definition of Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is a difficult term characterizing the quality of the social climate within an organization that determines the working conditions of all employees. Clearly, it represents a phenomenon related to emotions rather than the rational minds of an observer (Mohelska and Pitra 2012). In addition, the individuals and societies are continuously influenced by their environment and time unclear, and it directly affects concepts of culture thereby making it difficult to define culture within a single expression (Erdoğan 1994).

Yet, it is possible to define organizational culture as a kind of genetic code which leads to the reproducibility of both individual and collective behaviours, images, emotions and attitudes. But, also, it can be defined as a set of symbols, ceremonies, and myths which help members of an organization to understand organizational assumptions and values (Koźmiński and Obłój 1989).

According to Weis and Wiest, organizational culture consists of a system that includes typical values, norms, and symbols of a company. An organisational culture develops over a long period, as a result of the best practices of the whole social group, creating a hierarchy of certain values (West 2000).

Zbiegień-Maciąg (1994) describes organisational culture as a way of perceptions, thoughts, feelings, and reactions that are shared by company employees and often stay deeply hidden and unrecognized in the human mind. It emphasizes what they have in common, what unites them, and what reduces uncertainty. It is accepted as the product of the way employee's live together, interact, and cooperate.

An organizational culture is formulated by Schein (1990) and defined as the whole of basic assumptions that a particular group learnt, discovered, and developed while adapting to their environment or solving problems during internal integration.

Although a culture has various definitions and is difficult to make a joint description about, there are some common characteristics shared by communities. O'Reilly et al. stated seven different characteristics which drive members of an organisation to collectively pursue the aims of an organization (O'Reilly et al. 1991).

1. Innovation and Risk Taking: The level of the incentives provided to help the organizational members to take risks and create innovation within an organization.
2. Attention to detail: The level of importance given to details by the employees when fulfilling their responsibilities, as well as their ability to analyse.
3. Result-Oriented: If the management of the organisation is result-oriented, they will focus on the level of realization and the final result, rather than on how the duties are performed.

4. People-Oriented: The level of importance given to how the decisions of the management will affect the members of an organisation
5. Team-Oriented: The level of the importance attached to tasks that are organised as team-based, rather than individually-based.
6. Aggression: The level of how aggressive the competitive aspects of the members of the organization are, rather than on members having submissive behaviour.
7. Stability: The level of stability of the activities carried out in the organisation, rather than continuous development.

2.2 The Factors that Constitute Organizational Culture

Schein (1990) explains the formation of the organization culture by dividing the organization culture into three layers. The top layer consists of observable objects that can be felt by five senses and are the most openly accessible. The second layer contains norms and values. This part is generally described as a foundation stone and reflects the philosophy, functioning, general aims, and ideals of the organization showing itself in the behaviours of its members. The last layer consists of assumptions. According to Schein (1990), assumptions constitute the core of an organizational culture. This factor is abstract and more difficult to observe, often including perceptions of organizational members about functional problems and solutions.

Organizational culture includes visible cultural items: ceremonies, parades, rituals, stories, myths, symbols, slogans, language, leaders and heroes (Güçlü 2003). It is accepted that common beliefs and assumptions are the invisible dimension of the organisational culture lying at the heart of an organization; however, symbols, heroes, language, and symbols are actually the visible dimension of organisational culture, which are more presentable (Schermerhorn et al. 2000).

The organizational culture is shaped under the influence of very different variables and these variables are categorized in different dimensions in the related literature (Pettigrew 1979; Berberoğlu 1991). In our study, the effects of values and leadership on the formation of culture are examined, and other factors of culture formation are briefly explained as they are frequently discussed in the literature.

2.2.1 Values

Values provides a framework for understanding the beliefs, goals, attitudes, ethics, self-concept, behaviour, and other elements of the individual system; additionally they also help to evaluate the dynamics of an organizational culture (Bernthal 1962).

Past studies define the organizational values in various forms. For example, O'Reilly et al. (1991) describe the values of an organization as "the elements that revolve around norms, symbols, rituals, and other cultural activities." Johnson and Jackson (2009) describe organizational values as the standards that determine member behaviours and organizational success.

Organizational values are based on the ability of directing and influencing the preferences, priorities, actions, and attitudes of an institution and its members (Toh et al. 2008). Chatman (1989) states that the values of an organisation provide a detailed and general justification for the activities and functions of a system and for the appropriate behaviours of its members.

Shared values are the primary focus of organizational culture research, and it is thought that they facilitate effective interaction between members and provide integration. In the literature, there are cultural values that are believed to represent organizational culture. Organizational culture theorists argue that organizations have a relatively narrow set of values and certain values are useful in understanding organizational processes (Meglino and Ravlin 1998).

2.2.2 Leadership

A leader is the person who brings his/her followers together and directs them towards their desired goals. The leader may have an innate ability to influence others or may have charismatic aspects generated by a number of personal characteristics that are highly valuable for his/her followers (Bingöl 2006). It is also possible that the authority is legal (formal).

It can be said that leadership is the most common concept among the factors that constitute culture. In the literature, it is accepted that the organizational culture and leadership have reciprocal effects on each other; therefore they are considered highly related concepts in organizational life (Schein 2004). It is also believed that senior leaders have a primary influence on the creation and development of an organizational culture (Schein 2004; Trice and Beyer 1993).

2.2.3 Other Factors

The level of culture in an organisation is the ultimate determinant of perceptions, language, opinions, emotions, accepted values, and the behaviours of a group. If a group has a common past, they may also have a common culture and therefore many subcultures form within an organization. When we examine the organizational symbols, stories, legends, and other factors of these subcultures, we should know how they relate to fundamental assumptions, and we should be aware of the fact that we might make incorrect deductions (Pondy et al. 1983, 1988; Wilkins 1983) because the meaning of an organizational culture is closely related to the meaning of these factors. Although different studies have had different titles in the literature, they include many factors (rituals, symbols, stories and legends, material symbols, language and metaphors, architectural characteristics and organizational identity, organization history, environment, technology, size) when providing meaning for an organisational culture.

Ceremonies and Symbols

In the literature, ceremony is accepted as the expressions for a planned event or object that is meaningful and special for a certain group of people (Varol 1989). They are the significant key activities of organisation that enable its members to identify themselves with the organization (Kamoche 1995). Symbols are also considered to be indicative of cultures (such as ceremonies, slogans, logos, emblems, and mascots) and are accepted as symbols used to represent culture.

Also, cultural structures have their own symbols and ceremonies. Flags and religions are considered effective unifying symbols for individuals forming a society (Dönmezer 1994). Each culture has its own unique symbols, but the degrees of importance given to the symbols are different for each culture. For this reason, the effect of symbols on a culture changes accordingly. Therefore, it is very important that leaders use symbols effectively in order to be successful in the process of creating and changing cultures (Kamoche 1995).

Ceremonies and symbols can be listed as the meetings and dinners arranged by an organisation; greeting styles of the employees; uniforms or a dress code; events organised to celebrate a foundation day or the founder of the organization; events organised for retiring personnel; the title attached to special moments; the pennants and badges representing the organization; social signs to determine the distance between senior management; and, employees within the organization (Varol 1989).

Stories and Legends

Since the establishment of organizations, stories and myths as culture bearers emerge as a result of the recounting of the past events with exaggerated expressions used to influence employees. The most important feature of stories and legends is that the heroes and symbols serve as a cultural bridge contributing to the adoption of symbols and values among employees (Daniel and Robert 1978). The stories and myths, usually include sections from the life of founders of the organisation, stories of those who break the rules in the organization, those who start from the lower level and reach the top of the hierarchy, or those who started in poverty but become rich (Boje 1991; Deutsch 1991; Seiling 2003).

Language

The most important part of a culture is the "language" that helps to carry the culture among the individuals. Culture that is carried through language between individuals is transferred from generation to the generation and helps the continuation of social relations between individuals (Eroğlu 1996). From the moment that an organization is established, the individuals and sub-units who join organisations begin to use a common language that indicates that they accept and adopt the organisational culture

and are, hence, integrated into the culture. This common language covers the terms used by employees in relation to work (Robbins and Judge 2013).

As the languages used by societies are made up of signs and voices, the concept of "language" falls within symbols (Robbins and Judge 2013). However, the impact on culture must be addressed separately because the language used within the organization is meaningful for individuals working within the organization. Naturally, each organization has its own "special" language that makes sense to them. For this reason, the language used within the organization does not make sense to the external individuals and organizations.

Customs and Manners

Customs and manners are described as the rules affecting the daily lives, attitudes, behaviours, and lifestyles of the individuals generated by the influence of the environment. People may obey those rules, rules which appear or disappear instinctively (Dönmezer 1994).

Manners are the behaviours that are constantly repeated for a period of time, but the majority of the population does not feel obligated to implement. Yet, customs, unlike manners, include punishments if people do not obey and follow the rules. Since the opposition to customs is only moderately tolerated, rules are stricter than manners (Köse et al. 2001).

Schein (1983) points out that an organizations' existing customs and manners largely depend on both what was done before and the success achieved in this way. This leads us to the ultimate source of the organization culture: Founders of the Organization. There are many ways to create a culture, but the most basic beginning is the beliefs of the founders of the organization and those employees who come after them. It is evident that the personalities of the founders are reflected in the organizational culture in terms of training of the employees and their adaptation to customs and manners.

Norms

Norms are defined as orders and rules that individuals, who have adopted a specific role in the organization, must comply with (Erdoğan 1994). Norms constitute the general culture of the communities; therefore, executives who are involved in the formation of organizational norms have an important task. They must create principles and rules of management according to the cultural norms of their employees (Özkalp 1995).

Additionally, norms represents the information that should be obeyed by individuals. It is certain that everybody is informed about the norms through communication between people- sooner or later, directly or indirectly. The norms have an influence on the actions of the participating members and if the norms of organization are known, it would be clearer what information is needed by the employees or

groups and what they can do to forward this information to others (Stamper and Liu 1994).

In organizations, a constant change of norms depends on the mutual interaction between employees: employees observe their environment and reflect, diversify, and change the norms. Norms, in turn, are used to improve the learning ability of organizations as an organizational concept, especially in transforming organizations (Andersen 1995).

It would be possible to obtain very detailed information about organizational change and organizational learning if we had sufficient information about the norm structure of the organisations and the process of creating and changing norms (Stamper et al. 2000).

Socializing is carried out with an aim to help new employees blend into an organisation and adapt to the organisational culture (Cable and Parsons 2001). The basic philosophy of organizational socialization is to ensure that employees become a member that embraces and sustains the organisational culture (Can 1997). Especially important, senior management, due to their position in decision-making mechanism, should spend more time and effort to organise socialization activities for employees.

Socialization is examined in three stages, with the main purpose of each stage examining how long it will take the members to settle into the organisation or how long it will take them to leave (Robbins and Judge 2013). The first stage is called the pre-accession stage. Pre-access refers to the fact that new recruits join the organisation with a number of expectations (Collins 2007). It is possible to predict the attitudes and behaviours of the employees by referring to the attitudes and behaviours they have shown in the past. Therefore, it is necessary give significant importance to the socialization process for pre-accession (Wangm et al. 2011). The Encounter is the stage of clarification between the expectations of the new employees and the organisational environment. If the expectations are met, the individuals socialize faster in the organization (Morrison 2002). Transformation is the stage that employees willingly go through while adapting to the organisation, and specifically, if they realise that the organisation does not comply with their expectations (Bauer et al. 2007).

3   Personal Values

Values are the primary elements that enable individuals to control themselves and the community to control individuals. Consequently, values are influential in determining the status of the individuals within the community. Through these values, an individual can communicate effectively with other people and create a suitable infrastructure for the determination of his/her social position. According to Rokeach (1973), values are the determinants of all important behaviours: social activity, attitudes, ideology, evaluation, moral judgment, and legalization (Cheng and Fleischmann 2010).

Socio-psychological values are important factors and the key predictors for human and social dynamics in explaining individual decisions. In fact, in various fields, the importance of values for describing individual and organizational behaviour has been emphasized. In the literature of personality, it is stated that values are related to personality (Allport 1961). According to Giberson et al. (2009), personal values are the dimension of personal characteristics—the same as personality traits. In related literature, it specifically states that values are an element t governing and motivating one's behaviour (Locke 1976) and managing strong individual differences—such as personality (McClelland 1985; Giberson et al. 2009). In sociology, values are seen as significant variables in defining community consciousness (Durkheim 1960). In the organizational behavioural field, it is stated that values affect strategic organizational decisions and organizational commitments. In political science, personal values are the factor that influences governments, laws, parties, and also institutions (Schwartz 2006; Cheng and Fleischmann 2010).

New social arrangements emerge as an inevitable consequence of socio-economic developments, and it is important that new arrangements should be compatible with the values of the individuals in order to ensure healthy functioning. Accordingly, values should be examined in detail to understand communities better and to achieve social and political success (Kağıtçıbaşı and Kuşdil 2000; Çetin 2004).

3.1 Definition of Personal Values

Indeed, the concept of value is a difficult issue. Values add different characteristics to different people, so it is appropriate to start the analysis of this concept with a few meaningful definitions. Values are accepted as normative standards influenced by the choices of individuals, individuals who selected from several perceptions of alternative actions (Bernthal 1962). Values can thus be seen as an open or implicit understanding of the choice of actions of an individual, group or organization selected from existing alternative modes (Harrison 1975).

"Value" as a term, refers to our standards and principles that constitute our judgment for objects, people, ideas, situations, and actions—such as good, bad, desirable, undesirable (Halstead and Taylor 2000).

Values are the principles that guide human behaviours (Gutman 1982), as well as the tendencies to behave in certain ways according to individual preferences (Grey 2005). Also, values are preferences or standards of each individual (Ramos 2006), and the belief that individuals prefer certain situations to others (Choi 2005), beliefs regarding desirability or undesirability (Byrd 2002).

More broadly, value is defined as beliefs that are long-lasting causing certain behaviours and goals to be preferable to others (Solomon 1996). Rokeach defines value as a constant personal or social belief compelling the preference of particular behaviours or purposes to others (Cheng and Fleischmann 2010). According to Rokeach, each individual has constant values that he/she prefers more than others thereby affecting his/her behaviours. The total value of each person is called a "values system". S value system is a set of persistent beliefs that are related to

one's purpose of existence or preferred behaviours (Rokeach 1973). Kluckhohn (1951) states that values are not rooted from simple desires but from desires that are possible to reach; in other words, they are not just something we want, but things we feel are right and appropriate to desire for ourselves and others (Silah 2005). In literature, the emphasis is put on definitions of how values differ; in contrast, Rokeach and Schwartz say a value is defined as "a constant belief". At the same time, Kluckhohn, Guth and Tagiuri define values as an "understanding", Braithwaite and Blamey define a value as "principles" (Cheng and Fleischmann 2010).

Values are one of the core elements of identity (Schwartz 2000; Hitlin 2003), a key part in a continuing process of presentation that includes consciously designing targets (Bilsky and Schwartz 1994), which, in turn affect an individual's behaviour (Debatts and Bartelds 2006; Lipponen 2004). Values are social representatives of purposes; they act as guiding principles and motivate people (Rokeach 1973; Schwartz 1992; Rohan 2000). These guiding principles can be expressed as an individual's choice of actions, his/her evaluation criteria of other individuals and events, and methods of explaining their own assessments (Schwartz and Sagiv 2000; Gandal and Roccas 2002; Altıntaş 2006).

Hofstede (2001) stated that values are standards of belief related to the right-wrong distinction of individuals. In this sense, values have an impact on the positive or negative attitudes and behaviours of individuals in relation to certain events or results (Rokeach 1973; Mayton et al. 1994; Feather 1995).

Due to the relation between the beliefs and emotions of individuals (Hansson 2001), Wiener (1988) defined values as "internalized normative beliefs". Similarly, Özen (1996) stated that values are the "special state" of beliefs, and this particular state gives value the potential to influence the selection of a certain behaviour towards particular people, objects or events—due to the its normative patterns.

Whiteley (1995) described values as thoughts and emotions deeply related to a particular subject. He also indicated that behaviours are observable but values are not, rather they guide behaviours that are not observable. Therefore, values are concepts that are accepted by individuals in the form of behaviours (Guth and Taguiri 1965; Ericson 1969; Elizur et al. 1991; Schwartz 1990). Accordingly, the values represent the "ideal targets" that are desired, not the easily possible targets. The preference of a target is determined by the benefits presented by the subjects or events in the individual's environment (Bozkurt 1997; Altıntaş 2006).

Organizational values play a critical role in influencing a members' behaviours and actions (Newnam et al. 2008; Robert and Wasti 2002). As Williams (2002) points out, organizational values shape every action and decision made by employees; also, empirical studies show that employees easily adapt rewarded values within their organizations (Chatman 1989). Studies suggest that a value-oriented approach should be adopted to understand organizational behaviour better (Voss et al. 2000).

3.2 Components and Characteristics of Values

The elements, emphasised by the leading scientists who study the distinctive features of values (Rokeach 1973; Chusmir and Parker 1991; Zhao 1998) are:

1. Value is a preference: Value is a preference or request for a particular behavioural rule. As a selective system, values select between behaviours and behavioural systems and put forward some normative regulations.
2. A value is permanent: Values are permanent beliefs. However, they are not completely stable.
3. Values are open to change. The priorities of values can change over time, in order to meet new and emerging needs (Schwartz and Bilsky 1987).
4. A value is a belief: Values, like all beliefs, have cognitive, emotional and behavioural dimensions. If we say that an individual has a value, it means that he/she cognizes that he/she is correct, and he/she holds a characteristic that can cause him/her to behave in a certain way.
5. Value is a form of behaviour or the ultimate state of being: in a way, a value is the main purpose of human life. The possession of a value means that he/she has beliefs about the desirable behaviours or the final result of the situation.
6. Values are related to the goals of the individual (such as equality) and to behaviours performed in order to achieve these goals (being fair, being charitable).
7. Values are above specific actions and situations. For example, the value of obedience is valid at home, at work, at school, and in all of our relationships with people we do not know.
8. Values serve as standards that guide the selection or change of behaviours, people, and events.
9. Values are sorted among themselves according to their level of priority, creating a ranking system that determines the priorities of values. Cultures and individuals can be described by their value priority systems, and different societies may have the same value but the level of importance given to those values can be different. It is the element that separates people and societies from each other and distinguishes values from norms and attitudes (Schwartz 2005).
10. Values shape the perspective of the individual about his/her environment and also are very influential elements of culture that hold the members of a society together (Altıntaş 2006).
11. A value is a mode of personally or socially choosing a preferable behaviour or an eternal belief of the ultimate state of existence (Pang 1996).
12. A value is a great tendency to prefer certain relationships to others (Hofstede 1980).
13. A value is form of selective tendency indicating preferences, interests, motivations, needs, desires, goals, behaviours, and attitudes (Van and Scarbrough 1995).
14. A value is the rule-maker that differentiates results for the individual and others (Carling 1999).

15. It is the standard that helps people to choose between actions and behaviours and motivates ideal behaviour (Kilby 1993).
16. A value functions as a positive situation or object that an individual tries to acquire, apply, honour, proclaim, voluntarily consume, or bear the cost of (Herriot 1976), therefore it influences the level of cooperation, selective perception, and informative comments of the individual.
17. Values limit the field of vision, play an important role in selecting between alternatives, and serve as a plan or basis for decision-making, solving problem and conflicts (Russell 2001).

4 Leadership

Studies about leadership theories include research about what characteristics leaders possess, what they see as important, what actions they take against problems, how their decision-making processes are, how they respond to needs and requests during organisational activities, and how effective they are in affecting individuals and groups (Turhan 2007).

4.1 Definition of Leadership Concept

It is difficult to generate one clear definition of the concept of "leadership" from literature because leadership is a social, universal, and human phenomenon: a concept that is enriched by the fact that individuals have different characteristics and each characteristics carry different meanings (Bolat et al. 2008).

Leadership is the process of interacting with individuals, leading them in the direction of the goals and objectives of the organization by influenced communication. In other words, if individuals freely follow a leader, creating their targets under the influence of the leader, it can be said that is "leadership". We can summarize the concept of leadership as the ability to influence individuals and groups. Otherwise, we can talk about "managerialism" but not the concept of "leadership" (Yulk 2013). Krausz describes leadership as the power to influence the movements of individuals who follow him/her (Krauzs 2003). According to a definition based on the relation between leader and viewers, "a leader is the person who manages the process of social interaction that affects the behaviours of viewers" (Dasborough and Ashkanasy 2002). Another definition states that leadership is a state of being superior to other members of the group as a result of having certain characteristics—such as charisma, intelligence, and talent (Fielder 2005).

4.2 Leadership Theories

Although the act of leadership has existed for ages, the scientific research on this speculative subject only began to be published at the beginning of the twentieth

Fig. 1 The characteristics that leaders should possess

century. Leadership types are popular fields of interest in literature and nearly a new type of leadership is proposed every day. There is no consensus in the literature on classifying types of leadership, but it can be addressed under different approaches according to its focus points. Leadership approaches are summarized below, taking into account the classification preferred by Yukl (1994) in his book.

4.2.1 Theory of Characteristics

Accepted as the first approach developed in relation to the concept of leadership, the characteristics of a leader that influence the leadership process are considered the most important factor. In other words, if an individual emerges as a leader, it means that his/her personal characteristics influence his/her followers and give him power to manage them. The leader, with these characteristics, has a different personality from those who follow him (Koçel 2001). The main philosophy of this theory is based on identifying and distinguishing successful and unsuccessful personality traits of such an individual (Owens 1976).

In literature, one opinion is that "there is no school of leadership", and it explains that leader possesses some innate qualities and attributes that cannot be gained through education. This is a way of summarising the Theory of Characteristics. This theory is also called 'the Great People Approach', and it aims at distinguishing characteristics of leaders from non-leaders—as the researchers make an effort to explain leadership (Buono and Bowditch 1990).

The studies about theory of characteristics summarise the features that leaders should possess as follows (Fig. 1).

4.2.2 Behavioural Leadership Theories

The behavioural approach emphasizes how a leader behaves. It separates the qualitative approach that highlights the leader's personal characteristics from the skills

approach that highlights the leader's talents. The behavioural approach focuses only on what leaders do and how they behave. Researchers examining the behavioural approach state that leadership is composed of two general types of behaviour: Task Behaviours and Relationship Behaviours. Task behaviours help group members to achieve their goals, while relationship behaviours help subordinates to feel comfortable in communicating with their supervisors and colleagues. The main purpose of the behavioural approach explains the reasons a leader's behaviour influences subordinates and helps achieve their aims (Northouse 2013).

In the behavioural leadership style, the leader has mutual communication with his/her subordinates. This communication requires that the leader fulfil the wishes of his/her subordinates in order to fulfil his/her own wishes. In other words, there is a relation of mutual dependency. According to the behavioural approach, the relationships are divided into two groups: low quality relations and high quality relations. Low quality behaviours are based on rights (salary increase, social and personal rights) between leader and subordinates, while high quality behaviours depend on reciprocity between the leader and the subordinates (reward system) (Kuhnert and Lewis 1987, p. 649).

Many studies have been conducted to investigate the behavioural approach. Stogdill (1948) carried out research at Ohio State University, in the late 1940s, which emphasized the importance of the characteristics of leaders in leadership research. At the same time, another group of researchers at the University of Michigan conducted a series of studies that investigate how leadership affects small groups. A third research series was initiated by Blake and Mouton at the beginning of the 1960s and studied how managers use task and relationship behaviours in the organizational environment (Blake and Mouton 1964).

While many studies can be categorized under the heading of Behavioural Approach, the Ohio State studies, Michigan studies, and studies by Blake and Mouton (1964, 1978, 1985) strongly represent ideas in this approach (Blake and Mouton 1985).

4.2.3 Situational Contingency Theory

One of the more widely accepted approaches of leadership is the situational approach introduced by Hersey and Blanchard (1969a, b), which is based on Reddin's (1967) three-dimensional management style theory. As the title implies, situational leadership focuses on the leadership of the situations (Blanchard et al. 1993). The priority of the theory is that different situations demand different leadership. In this sense, an effective leader should customise his or her style according to the demands of different situations (Hersey and Blanchard 1977, 1988).

Situational leadership emphasizes that leadership has both a procedural and a supportive dimension and that each must be applied appropriately for certain situations (Blanchard et al. 1985). To identify what is needed in any situation, a leader must evaluate his employees to decide how competent and determined they are to perform a particular task. Situational leadership—based on the assumption that employees' skills and motivations change over time—suggests that leaders must

change to the degree necessary to meet the changing needs of subordinates (Blanchard 1985). In short, the core of situational leadership is that leaders must determine their style according to the ability and commitment of their subordinates. Effective leaders are people who can identify what their employees need and set their own style to meet these needs (Hersey and Blanchard 1969a, b).

4.2.4 Power/Influence Approach

This approach explains leadership through two aspects. The Power relations period emphasizes the source, the amount of power, and how they used this power. In todays' organizations, a leaders dictatorial and authoritarian characteristics are considered ineffective; however, it is prevalent to experience such managers in organizations. The second aspect is the persuasion period. Instead of cooperation and mutual interaction between the leader and the employee, a structural antagonism emerges which is led by the leader of the employees. The biggest drawback of this aspect is that an employee's competency or ability to take initiative remains undeveloped (Seters and Field 1990).

4.2.5 Modern Leadership Approach

Recently, researchers tried to define new types of leadership ethical, servant, spiritual, and authentic leadership that are centered on different components. They suggested that these types of leadership are more effective in meeting the demands of the new business world and the current needs of employees. Leadership theorists have studied integrative leadership theories containing multiple components: traits, behaviors, influence processes, situational variables, and outcomes. However, new leadership concepts are also insufficient to define all aspects and all required properties of leadership (Yulk 2013).

5 The Relationship Between Leadership, Personal Values and Organizational Culture

Everybody judges situations they encounter differently, which results in different behaviours. The degree of importance given to values differs from person to person, also affecting attitudes in business life (Cohen 2009). In this context, values also have great importance at the management level in terms of organizational effectiveness. Giberson and others carried out a study on the personalities of CEOs and stated that their values not only affected their behaviours and decisions but also the social environment of the organisation (for example, culture). They argue that the personalities of senior managers affect the new or existing members of the organisation and

the relationship between the members as a result of making decisions or approving or disapproving of members' behaviours (Giberson et al. 2009).

Personal values bring certain standards to the thoughts and feelings of the managers within the organizational culture and shape the behaviours and decisions, thus creating an ideology for the organization. The concept of value is highly influential in a managers' decisions about their work, managerial success, and other relationships (Russell 2001; Naktiyok 2002). Again, research on this subject states that personal values influence strategies and behaviours such as selection and reward system, organizational responsibility, adaptation to the job, superior-subordinate relationship, amount of risk, decision style, productivity, service quality, group behaviour, communication, and leadership and conflict level (Burke 1997; Russell 2001). In addition, theorists on this subject state that value is related to leadership types and managerial decision mechanisms (Altıntaş 2006). Life values are considered to be the most important elements of economic, social, and political theories in communities experiencing a rapid development process. When we take into account the above mentioned effects of life values, it is clear that the satisfaction of work life depends on the results of values because behaviours such as election and reward system, organizational responsibility, adaptation to work, superior-subordinate relationship, decision making style, group behaviour, communication, leadership and conflict level are influenced by values and elements of job satisfaction (Naktiyok 2002).

Organizational values constitute the framework of all other strategic decisions. It shapes the professional roles and responsibilities of employees, as well as shaping the company's performance evaluations, training programs, business organization, and key business decisions (Howard 1990, p. 143). Values contribute to the formation of organizational culture through these elements.

Studies have shown that the human resources department within an organization is influenced by the core values of the organization. Toh et al. (2008) found that organizational values are associated with the innovation, human orientation, and the stability of the human resource practices adopted by an organization. Accordingly, reformist organizations give importance to the employees' risk taking, competitiveness, and ability to take advantage of potential opportunities. People-oriented organizations place emphasis on cooperation, support, information sharing, flexibility, respect and tolerance. Lastly, stable institutions take notice of predictability and continuity.

Multidimensional studies have been carried out on leadership and culture relations in literature. Some researchers have found relationships between the personal characteristics of leaders and structural characteristics indicators of companies (Miller 1986). Likewise, it has been pointed out in related literature that the behaviours of senior leaders who aim to improve performance or establish an institution should also form the organizational processes and structural characteristics to strengthen organizational cultures (Tsui et al. 2006). However, in addition to the theoretical studies on the joint subject of culture and leadership, when these subjects were considered separately, it is evident that leaders play an important role in creating and sustaining the culture in organisations (Schein 1992). Furthermore, it

is important to both understand the culture and have the ability to perform successfully in this culture in order to increase the effectiveness of leadership (Hennessey 1998; Bakan 2009).

Organisational culture is a subject that interests researchers of leaderships, management consultants, and company managers. Organizational culture is also described as the reason behind the failure of mergers and acquisitions and as a management tool to create a competitive advantage and provide a base (Bennis and Nanus 1985; Trice and Beyer 1993; Donahue 2001). The senior managers should manage complex relationship in order to create a successful organizational culture (Schein 2004; Trice and Beyer 1993). Although, there are a number of theories that show that leaders are influential in their organizations, there are only a few studies that examine the individual differences of the leaders, and their organizational characteristics and achievements.

The research about leadership characteristics and organizational structures, especially with organizational culture, might be difficult due to the complications in measuring and assessing psychological attributes such as individual personality characteristics of leaders. In 1968, research conducted by L. K. Williams stated that different disciplines have different interests at micro-levels as well as macro levels e.g. personality traits. Williams notes that it is important to study the personality, structure, and functioning of the organizational system concurrently in order to understand organizational behaviours.

Schneider, Goldstein, and Smith (1995) state that organizational goals are generally generated from the personality characteristics of their executive leaders. Thus, top-tier leaders, and especially founders, mirror their own characteristics onto organisations by emplacing their own aims (Schneider 1987). In other words, the content of organisational culture is not randomly formed but is formed by the key strategic and operational decisions of the senior executives, which is a reflection of the characteristics of senior executives. These decisions form the basis of shared values and assumptions that have become the culture of the institution. For this reason, there is a relationship between personal characteristics of senior managers and cultures that emerge in their organizations.

Schein (2004) states that managers consciously and unconsciously place their tendencies and preferences in their organizations through various mechanisms, such as the criteria used to allocate rewards or personnel decisions. Leaders interact with the individuals of the organisation and determine how the organization will reach its targets; meanwhile, leaders also create cultural forms by behaving sensibly on how the organization will work. Leaders further strengthen cultural content through explanation or empowerment mechanisms such as stories, legends and official statements—particularly during the decision process of organizational design.

Researchers who present their views on the causes of relationships between organizational culture and leadership consider culture as a complementary part of an organisation and argue that a leader has a significant influence on organizational cultures since his/her emotions, thoughts and reactions shape the culture (Bass and Avolio 1994; Schein 1992). In addition, Richard Hendrickson, in his 1989 study on culture and leadership, notes that leadership is, in fact, a cultural expression. Both

findings of empirical and theoretical studies and predictions show that these variables have complex relationships, thereby shaping one another.

As a result of these findings, it is understood that the personal values and leadership are inevitably influential in the formation of an organizational culture, which leads to the achievement of desired aims by determining common understanding and behaviours in an organization. For this reason, it is vital for an organization to use these tools effectively in order to achieve positive outputs, competition superiority, and ensure sustainability and continuity, which are the basic principles of an organisation.

References

Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Altıntaş, F. Ç. (2006). Bireysel Değerlerin Örgütsel Adalet ve Sonuçları İlişkisinde Yönlendirici Etkisi: Akademik Personel Üzerinde Bir Analiz. *İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi, 7*(2), 19–40.

Andersen, P. B. (1995). *Organisational semiotics and the theory of autopoesis, colloquium on organisational semiotics*. Enschede: Twente University.

Apulgan, O. (1996). *İşletme Bilimine Giriş* (Vol. 73). Trabzon: Derya Kitabevi.

Bakan, İ. (2009). Liderlik tarzları ile örgüt kültürü türleri arasındaki ilişkiler: Bir alan çalışması. *TISK Academy/TISK Akademi, 4*(7), 138–172.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *International Journal of Public Administration, 17*(3–4), 541–554.

Bauer, T. N., Bodner, T., Erdogan, B., Truxillo, D. M., & Tucker, J. S. (2007). Newcomer adjustment during organizational socialization: A metaanalytic review of antecedents, outcomes, and methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(3), 707–721.

Baymur, F. (1994). *Genel Psikoloji*. İstanbul: İnkilâp Kitabevi.

Baymur. (1994). Genel Psikoloji, İnkilâp Kitabevi, İstanbul.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.

Berberoğlu, G. (1991). *Karşılaştırmalı Yönetim*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi İİBF Yayınları.

Bernthal, W. (1962). Value perspectives in management decisions. *Academy of Management Journal, 5*, 190–196.

Bingöl, D. (2006). *İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi*. İstanbul: Arıkan Basım Yayım Dağıtım Ltd. Şti.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1978). *The new managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1985). *The managerial grid III*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Blanchard, K. H. (1985). *SLII: A situational approach to managing people*. Escondido, CA: Blanchard Training and Development.

Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, P., & Zigarmi, D. (1985). *Leadership and the one minute manager: Increasing effectiveness through situational leadership*. New York: William Morrow.

Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, D., & Nelson, R. (1993). Situational leadership after 25 years: A retrospective. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 1*(1), 22–36.

Boje, D. M. (1991). The storytelling organization: A study of story performance in an office-supply firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*, 106–126.

Bolat, T., Seymen, A. O., Bolat İnci, O., & Erdem, B. (2008). *Yönetim ve Organizasyon* (p. 54). Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Bozkurt, T. (1997). In S. Tevrüz (Ed.), *İşletme Kültürü, Endüstri ve Örgüt Psikolojisi içinde*. Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği ve Kalite Derneği Yayını.

Buono, A. F., & Bowditch, J. L. (1990). *The human side of mergers and acquisitions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Burke, W. W. (1997). What human resource practitioners need to know for the twenty-first century. *Human Resource Management, 36*(1), 71–79.

Byrd, R. R. (2002). *Exploring internet survey techniques: A study of personal values-leadership style congruence*. University of Louisville, Phd dissertation, USA. UMI.

Cable, D. M., & Parsons, C. K. (2001). Socialization tactics and person-organization fit. *Personnel Psychology, 54*, 1–23.

Can, V. (1997). *Okul Kültürü ve Yönetim*. Ankara: Önder Matbaacılık.

Carling, A. (1999). Marxism today: What can we learn from yesterday? *Science & Society, 63*(1), 89–97.

Çetin, M. Ö. (2004). *Örgüt Kültürü ve Örgütsel Bağlılık*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person–organization fit. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 333–349.

Cheng, A.-S., & Fleischmann, K. R. (2010). Developing a meta-inventory of human values. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 47*(1), 1–10.

Choi, C. C. (2005). *Cultural values in context: Implıcations for behavioral intentions*. University of Illinois, Phd dissertation, USA. UMI.

Chusmir, L. H., & Parker, B. (1991). Effects of generation and sex on dimensions of life success. *Psychological Reports, 68*(1), 335–338.

Chusmir, L. H., & Parker, B. (1992). Success strivings and their relationship to affective work behaviors: Gender differences. *Journal of Social Psychology, 132*, 87–100.

Cohen, A. B. (2009). Many forms of culture. *American Psychologist, 64*(3), 194–204.

Collins, C. J. (2007). The interactive effects of recruitment practices and product awareness on job seekers' employer knowledge and application behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 180–190.

Daft, R. (1986). *Organizational theory and design*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.

Daniel, K., & Robert, L. K. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Dasborough, M. T., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2002). Emotion and attribution of intentionality in leader-member relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*, 615–634.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and results of corporate life*. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.

Debats, D. L., & Bartelds, B. F. (2006). *The structure of human values: A principal components analysis of the Rokeach Value Survey*. http://www.Ub.Rug.Nl/Eldoc/Dis/Ppsw/D.L.H.M.Debats/C5.pdf.

Deutsch, C. H. (1991). The parables of corporate culture. *New York Times, 25*.

Dönmezer, S. (1994). *Toplum bilim* (p. 99). İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.

Donahue, L. M., & Webber, S. S. (2001). Impact of highly and less job-related diversity on work group cohesion and performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management, 27*(2), 141–162.

Durkheim, E. (1960). *The division of labor in society*. New York: Free Press.

Elizur, D., Borg, I., Hunt, R., & Beck, I. M. (1991). The structure of work values: A cross cultural comparison. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12*(1), 21–38.

Erdoğan, İ. (1994). *İşletmelerde Davranış* (p. 111). İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.

Ericson, R. F. (1969). The impact of cybernetic information technology on management value systems. *Management Science, 16*(2), 40–60.

Eroğlu, F. (1996). *Davranış Bilimleri* (p. 109). İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.

Ersen, H. (1997). *Toplam Kalite ve İnsan Kaynaları Yönetimi İlişkisi* (p. 42). İstanbul: Sim Mabaacılık.

Feather, N. T. (1995). Values, valences. and choice: The influence of values on the perceived attractiveness and choice of alternatives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 1135–1151.

Fielder, R. (2005). ESAs and leadership development: History, research, and one agency's expe-
rience. *A Journal of Research and Opinion About Educational Service Agencies, 11*, 1–11.

Gandal, N., & Roccas, S. (2002). *Good neighbors/bad citizens: Personal value priorities of
economists* (Working Paper, No. 3660). Center for Economic Policy Research (CEPR).

Giberson, J. R., Dickson, W., Mitchelson, K., Randall, R., & Clark, A. (2009). Leadership and
organizational culture: Linking CEO characteristics to cultural values. *Journal of Business and
Psychology, 24*(2), 123–137.

Grey, C. A. K. (2005). *Managerial ethics: A quantitative, correlational study of values and
leadership styles of veterinary managers*. University of Phoenix, Phd dissertation, USA. UMI.

Güçlü, N. (2003). Örgüt Kültürü. *Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 23*(2), 61–85.

Guth, W. D., & Tagiuri, R. (1965). Personal values and corporate strategy. *Harvard Business
Review, 43*(5), 123–132.

Gutman, J. (1982). A means-end chain model based on consumer categorization processes. *Journal
of Marketing, 46*(2), 60.

Halstead, J. M., & Taylor, M. J. (2000). Learning and teaching about values: A review of recent
research. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 30*, 169–202.

Hansson, S. O. (2001). *Structure of values and norms*. West Nyack, NY: Cambridge University
Press.

Harrison, E. F. (1975). *The managerial decision making process*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hennessey, T. (1998). "Reinventing" government: Does leadership make the difference? *Public
Administration Review, 58*(6), 522.

Herriot, P. (1976). *Essential psychology: Values, attitudes and behavior change*. New York:
Methuen Co. Ltd..

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969a). Life-cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development
Journal, 23*, 26–34.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969b). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human
resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human
resources* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). *Management and organizational behavior*. Englewood
Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hitlin, S. (2003). Values as the core of personal identity: Drawing links between two theories of
self. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 66*(2), 118.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *Journal International Studies of Management &
Organization, 10*(4), 15–41.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and orga-
nizations accross nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Howard, R. (1990). Values make the company: An interview with Robert Haas. *Harvard Business
Review, 68*, 132–144.

Johnson, R. E., & Jackson, E. M. (2009). Appeal of organizational values is in the eye of the
beholder: The moderating role of employee identity. *Journal of Occupational and Organiza-
tional Psychology, 82*, 915–933.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç., & Kuşdil, E. M. (2000). Türk Öğretmenlerin Değer Yönelimleri ve Schwartz Değer
Kuramı. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 15*(45), 59–76.

Kamoche, K. (1995). Rhetoric, ritualism and totemism in human resource management. *Human
Relations, 48*(4), 367–385.

Kilby, R. W. (1993). *The study of human values*. Lanham: University Press of America, Inc.

Kluckhohn, C. (1951). Values and value-orientations in the theory of action: An exploration in
definition and classification. In T. Parsons & E. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action*
(pp. 388–433). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Koçel, T. (2001). *İşletme Yöneticiliği, 8*. İstanbul: Bası, Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.

Köse, S., Tetik, S., & Ercan, C. (2001). Örgüt Kültürünü Oluşturan Faktörler. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi,
C.B.Ü. İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi, 7*(1).

Koźmiński, A. K., & Obłój, K. (1989). *Zarys teorii równowagi organizacyjnej*. Warszawa: PWE.

Krauzs, R. (2003). Power and leadership in organizations. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 16* (Akt; Arıkan, S. (2003). "Kadın Yöneticilerin Liderlik Davranışları ve Bankacılık Sektöründe Bir Uygulama", G.Ü. İ.İ.B.F.Dergisi, 1(2), 2).

Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review, 12*, 648–657.

Lipponen, J. (2004). Perceived procedural justice and employee responses to an organizational merger. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 13*(3), 391–413. https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320444000146.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations* (p. 84). New York: Wiley.

Mayton, D. M., Ball-Rokeach, S. J., & Loges, W. E. (1994). Human values and social issues: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues, 50*(4), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1994.tb01194.x.

McClelland, D. C. (1985). *Human motivation*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Meglino, B. M., & Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies, and research. *Journal of Management, 24*, 351–389.

Merih, K. (2002). *Network Yapılarda Yönetim*. www.eylem.com

Miller, J. (1986). *Pathways in the workplace: The effects of gender and race on access to organizational resources*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Mohelska, H., & Pitra, Z. (2012). *Manaȟerskǔ metody* (1st ed.). Praha: Professional Publishing.

Morrison, E. W. (2002). Newcomers' relationships: The role of social network ties during socialization. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 1149–1160.

Naktiyok, A. (2002). Motivasyonel Değerler ve İş Tatmini: Yöneticiler Üzerinde Bir Uygulama. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 16*(3–4), 166–195.

Newnam, S., Griffin, M. A., & Mason, C. (2008). Safety in work vehicles: A multilevel study linking safety vehicles and individual predictors to workrelated driving crashes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 632–644.

Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership theory and practice* (6th ed.p. 75). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J. A., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person–organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*, 487–516.

Ouchi, W. G. (1981). *Theory Z*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Owens, W. A. (1976). Background data. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 609–644). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Özen, Ş. (1996). *Bürokratik Kültür 1, Yönetsel Değerlerin Toplumsal Temelleri* (p. 272). Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü.

Özkalp, E. (1995). *Örgütlerde Davranış* (p. 116). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Pang, N. S. K. (1996). School values and teachers' feelings: A LISREL model. *Journal of Educational Administration, 34*(2), 64–83.

Pettigrew, A. M. (1979). On studying organizational cultures, qualitative methodology. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*(4), 570–581.

Pondy, L. R., Frost, P. J., Morgan, G., & Dandridge, T. C. (Eds.). (1983). *Organizational symbolism*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Pondy, L. R., Boland, R. J., & Thomas, H. (1988). *Managing ambiguity and change*. New York: Wiley.

Ramos, A. (2006). Social values dynamics and socio-economic development. *Portuguese Journal Of Social Science, 5*(1), 35–64.

Reddin, W. J. (1967). The 3-D management style theory. *Training and Development Journal, 21* (4), 8–17.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational behavior* (15th ed.pp. 511–543). New York: Pearson.

Robert, C., & Wasti, S. A. (2002). Organizational individualism and collectivism: Theoretical development and an empirical test of a measure. *Journal of Management, 28*, 544–566.

Rohan, M. J. (2000). A rose by any name? The values construct. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*(3), 255–277.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.

Russell, R. F. (2001). The role of values in servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 22*(2), 76–84.

Schein, E. H. (1983). The role of the founder in creating organizational culture. *Organizational Dynamics, 12*, 13–28.

Schein, E. H. (1984). Coming to a new awareness of organizational culture. *Sloan Management Review, 25*(2), 3.

Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist, 45*(2), 109–119. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.45.2.109.

Schein, E. H. (1992). The role of the CEO in the management of change. In T. A. Kochan & M. Useem (Eds.), *Transforming organizations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schein. (2016). Learning when and how to lie. Human Relations, 57(3), 259-273.

Schermerhorn, J., Hunt, J., & Osborn, R. (2000). *Organizational Behaviour* (7th ed.). New York: Wiley.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*, 437–453.

Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., & Smith, D. B. (1995). The ASA framework: An update. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 747–773.

Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21*(2), 139–157.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). New York: Academic Press.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal asects in the content and structure of values? *Journal of Social Issues, 50*, 19–45.

Schwartz, S. H. (2000). Worries and values. *Journal of Personality, 68*, 309–346.

Schwartz, S. H. (2005). Basic human values: Their content and structure across countries. In A. Tamayo & J. B. Porto (Eds.), *Valores e comportamento nas organizações* [Values and behavior in organizations] (pp. 21–55). Petrópolis: Vozes.

Schwartz, S. H. (2006). *Basic human values: An overview*. Unpublished manuscript. Accessed August 20, 2013, from http://151.97.110.134/Allegati/convegno%207-8-10-05/Schwartzpaper.pdf

Schwartz. (2016). Individualism-Collectivism. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21(2), 139-157.

Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). *The structure and importance of personal values in six societies*. Manuscript in preparation.

Schwartz, S. H., & Sagiv, L. (2000). Value priorities and subjective well-being: Direct relations and congruity effects. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*(2), 177–198.

Seiling, J. G. (2003). Language, metaphors and stories: Catalysts for meaning making in organizations. *Organization Development Journal, 21*(4), 33–43.

Shah, S. (1985). In V. Gokak Chandana (Ed.), *Education in human values: A medicine for a modern epidemic*. Puttarparthi: Prasanthi Nilayam.

Silah, M. (2005). *Endüstride Çalışma Psikolojisi, 2.Baskı.* Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi.

Şimşek, H. (1997). *Paradigmalar Savaşı*. İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.

Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 28*, 339–358.

Solomon, M. R. (1996). *Consumer behavior: Buying, having and being* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall International Editions.

Stamper, R. K., & Liu, K. L. (1994). Organisational dynamics, social norms and information systems, in Proc. HICSS-27. *Los Alamitos (IEEE Computer Society Press), 6*, 645–654.

Stamper, R., Liu, K. L., Hafkamp, M., & Ades, Y. (2000). Understanding the roles of signs and norms in organizations, a semiotic approach to information design. *Journal of Behaviour and Information Technology, 19*(1), 15–27.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology, 25*(1), 35–71.

Toh, S. M., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2008). Human resource configurations: Investigating fit with the organizational context. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 864–882.

Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1993). *The cultures of work organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Tsui, A. S., Zhang, Z. X., Wang, H., Xin, K. R., & Wu, J. B. (2006). Unpacking the relationship between CEO leadership behavior and organizational culture. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*(2), 113–137.

Turhan, M. (2007). *Genel ve Mesleki Lise Yöneticilerinin Etik Liderlik Davranışlarının Okullardaki Sosyal Adalet Üzerindeki Etkisi* (p. 34).

Van Seters, D. A., & Field, R. H. (1990). The evolution of leadership theory. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 3*(3), 29–45.

Van, J. D., & Scarbrough, E. (1995). *The impact of values*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Varol, M. (1989). *Örgüt Kültürü ve Verimlilik*. Verimlilik Dergisi, MPM Yayını.

Voss, G. B., Cable, D. M., & Voss, Z. G. (2000). Linking organizational values to relationships with external constituents: A study of nonprofit professional theatres. *Organization Science, 11*, 330–347.

Wangm, M. Y. Z., McCune, E., & Truxillo, D. (2011). Understanding newcomers' adaptability and work-related outcomes: Testing the mediating roles of perceived P-E fit variables. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(1), 163–189.

West, M. A. (2000). *Rozwijanie kreatywności wewnątrz organizacji*. Warszawa: PWN.

Whiteley, A. (1995). *Managing change: A core values approach*. Melbourne, VIC: Macmillan Education.

Wiener, Y. (1988). Forms of value systems: A focus on organizational effectiveness and cultural change and maintenance. *Academy of Management Review, 13*(4), 534–545.

Wilkins, A. L. (1983). Organizational stories as symbols which control the organization. In L. R. Pondy, P. J. Frost, G. Morgan, & T. C. Dandridge (Eds.), *Organizational symbolism* (pp. 81–91). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Williams, S. L. (2002). Strategic planning and organizational values: Links to alignment. *Human Resource Development International, 5*, 217–233.

Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in organizations* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yulk, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.p. 18). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zbiegień-Maciąg, L. (1994). Duch przedsiębiorstwa, czyli budowanie corporate identity w polskich firmach. *Przegląd Organizacji*, 11.

Zhao, Y. (1998). *Media, market, and democracy in China: Between the party line and the bottom line*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.