

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE IN ACCEPTING AND ADAPTING TO INNOVATIONS: PERCEPTIONS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LECTURERS AT PREPARATORY UNITS AT UNIVERSITIES*

Asuman CİNCİOĞLU**

ABSTRACT

One of the variables having an effect on the decision of accepting and adapting to innovations is the existent organizational culture of an institution. Organizational culture might potentially facilitate or impede the reception of new ideas and practices, which necessitates the process of investigating the relationship between the indicators of organizational culture and the intended change. These indicators might be to do with the management and staff structure, communication channels, and decision-making mechanisms at the related institutions. In this article, how the organizational culture of a school is identified and the relationship between the structure of an organization and its attitude towards change and innovation are discussed with reference to the perspectives revealed through the responses participants provided via research. The research was carried out with 342 lecturers working in English preparatory divisions of 5 public and 7 private universities in Istanbul in the academic year of 2010-2011. The results indicate that although some of the components of the organizational culture of the participating universities appear to be resistant to making changes and adopting innovations, such as the institutions' having mechanistic structure, the organizations might be open to change and innovation with other constituents like having open communication channels and participatory decision-making systems, which will allow the institutions to make the related innovation fit into their culture.
Key Words: Organizational Culture, Organizational Structure, Decision-Making Mechanisms, Innovation at Educational Institutions.

YENİLİKLERİN KABULÜ VE YENİLİKLERE UYUM SAĞLAMADA KURUM KÜLTÜRÜ: ÜNİVERSİTE HAZIRLIK BİRİMLERİNDEKİ İNGİLİZCE OKUTMANLARININ ALGISI

ÖZ

Yeniliklerin kabul edilmesi kararına ve yeniliklere uyum sağlamaya etki eden değişkenlerden biri mevcut kurum kültürüdür. Kurum kültürü yeni düşünce ve uygulamaların kabulünü kolaylaştırabilir ya da engelleyebilir; bu, kurum kültürünün göstergeleri ve planlanan değişim arasındaki ilişkiyi inceleme sürecini gerektirir. Bu göstergeler, ilgili kurumlardaki yönetim ve personel yapısı, iletişim kanalları ve karar alma mekanizmaları ile ilgili olabilir. Bu makalede, bir okulun kurum kültürünün nasıl belirlendiği ve kurumun yapısı ile değişim ve yeniliğe karşı tutumu arasındaki ilişki, bir araştırma yoluyla katılımcıların sağladığı cevaplar ile ortaya çıkan bakış açısına gönderme yapılarak tartışılmaktadır. Araştırma, 2010-2011 akademik yılında İstanbul'daki 5 devlet ve 7 özel üniversitenin İngilizce hazırlık birimlerinde çalışan 342 okutman ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Sonuçlar; katılımcı üniversitelerin kurum kültürlerinin

* Some parts of this article are extracted from the author's doctoral thesis (Cincioğlu, 2012).

** Lect.Dr., Department of Foreign Languages, Istanbul University, Istanbul-Turkey, abirdal@istanbul.edu.tr

bazı bileşenlerinin- mekanik yapıya sahip olmaları gibi-değişiklikler yapmaya ve yenilikleri benimsemeye karşı direnç gösteriyor görünmesine rağmen kurumların ilgili yeniliği kendi kültürlerine yerleştirmelerine olanak sağlayacak diğer bileşenleri ile- iletişim kanallarının açık olması ve karar alma sistemlerinin katılımcı olması gibi- değişim ve yeniliğe açık olabileceklerini göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kurum Kültürü, Kurumsal Yapı, Karar Alma Mekanizmaları, Eğitim Kurumlarında Yenilik

1. INTRODUCTION

Keeping abreast of innovations is one of the central responsibilities of educational institutions as it has a profound effect on preparing learners for the requirements of the future life. However, adapting to innovations and implementing it successfully into the existing environment is often a challenging process, which necessitates examining whether the related context is ready for it or not. Among the factors having an influence on the process of making innovations, the organizational culture of an institution is one of the primary ones in finding out whether the institution will be willing to welcome novelties or resist possible changes. Organizational culture is seen as “the epicenter of change” (Deal, 1985:303, cited in Lindahl, n.d.); there is a natural connection between the organizational culture and change; it should be in a structure which is open to changes and can be changed if the intended change requires it to do so.

Educational institutions need to find out the ways of embracing changes and innovations so as to maintain continual improvement (Brown, 2004; Murphy, 1999; Rhodes, 1994). To Ng’ang’a and Nyongesa (2012:211), for continuous institutional performance, the culture “must be strategically relevant ... strong in order that people care about what is important; and the culture must have an intrinsic ability to adapt to changing circumstances.” All of the members of an institution should participate in the process of innovation and contribute with their “personal interpretation”; however, they should also have “shared vision” (Uzel, 2002:158), which is one of the preliminary features of having well-constructed organizational culture. Institutions are responsible for establishing a structure which will make implementing changes possible through having open communication channels and participatory decision-making systems, offering opportunities for academic and professional development and allowing teachers to put the innovations into practice.

Within this framework, the aim of this paper is to discuss the relation between the organizational culture of an institution and its attitude towards making innovations. To this end, a survey-research was carried out to determine whether there is such a connection or not via the questions designed to identify the organizational culture of the participating institutions and their approach to innovations.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND INNOVATION AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Prior to dealing with the indicators of identifying organizational culture, how the concept has been defined in the literature should be taken into consideration. Most of the definitions describe organizational culture as shared beliefs, values, characteristics within an organization (Liu, 2009; Lunenburg, 2011; Ng’ang’a and Nyongesa, 2012; Tahir and Qadir, 2012). Brown (2004:2) describes ‘culture’ as “a wide range of influences on how people

behave in organizations, communities and even nations”, noting that “an organization’s success can be attributed to its culture.”

Identifying the organizational culture of an institution requires the examination of basic elements, practices prevailing at that institution. Silman et al. (2012:356), referring to Handy and Aitken (1990), state that “every school has its own mix ...”; “to comprehend the complicated nature of these organisations inherent in this mix, it is imperative to understand firstly, the factors by which the organisational culture is explored.” To Richards (2001:198), “the organizational culture of a school refers to the ethos and environment that exist within a school, the kinds of communications and decision making that takes place, and the management and staffing structure they support.” He proposes the indicators to be examined to determine a school’s organizational culture (Ibid., pp.198-199):

- *What are the school’s goals and mission?*
- *What is the school’s management style?*
- *What shared values do staff have?*
- *What are the decision- making characteristics of the school?*
- *What roles do teachers perform?*
- *How are teaching and other work planned and monitored?*
- *What provision is made for staff development?*
- *How are courses and curriculum planned?*
- *How receptive is the school to change and innovation?*
- *How open are communication channels?*

In the way they define the pathway of an institution, goals and missions play a leading role. In essence, the management structure of an institution is the basic indicator of the organizational culture of a school; there are two types of organizational structure: the ‘mechanistic model’ and the ‘organic model’(Richards, 2001; Tosi and Hamner, 1985). In mechanistic organizations, the authority/ responsibility relationships are well-defined; authority is based on position and there is a clear status distinction between hierarchical levels; in addition, policies and procedures are determined and are to be relied on (Tosi and Hamner, 1985). In organic systems authority is based on individual competence and skill (Ibid.). Institutions having an organic structure offer opportunities for professional training; they also encourage research and publications; communication is lateral through cooperative teaching, peer coaching, and observation; teamwork is valued (Richards, 2001). To Claver, in traditional bureaucratic structures “there is reluctance to start innovative processes” (Claver et al., 1999:459, cited in Rice, 2004:145). What role/s teachers perform also determines an institution’s being open to innovations or not as the roles should be in parallel with the day’s requirements. It is possible to investigate teachers’ roles according to several different categorizations; Kumaravadivelu (2003) describes teachers as “passive technicians”, “reflective practitioners”, and “change agents”, emphasizing that today’s teachers should have the features of all as it is no longer enough to be the transmitter of the content knowledge.

The fact that the organizational culture of an institution might have an effect on the institution’s being open to innovations or not also determines the degree of its improvement and success in the long-term. Therefore, institutions are responsible for identifying their culture and raising awareness considering the establishment of the requisite conditions so that they can implement the innovations.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This paper aims to discuss the relation between the organizational culture of an institution and its being open to innovations or not. Research was carried out with 342 English preparatory class lecturers from 5 public and 7 private universities in Istanbul in the academic year of 2010-2011. The goal was to gather information about the perceptions of the English language lecturers working in the related higher education institutions concerning their institutions. The content of the questionnaire is based on the three main items recommended by Richards (2001) to be examined to reveal the institutional factors of a school: (1) the organizational culture, (2) quality indicators, (3) the teaching context. In this article, the statements referring to the participants' responses aiming to identify their institutions' organizational culture will be discussed.

As the data were gathered through a questionnaire, the research is 'a survey research', which is descriptive. The design of the questionnaire was finalized after the expert views were taken and the piloting was completed. The results of the questionnaires were calculated through SPSS program. The answers were evaluated both considering all the responses in total and the ones obtained from the public and the private universities separately.

4. RESEARCH FINDINGS

The findings obtained from the responses given to the statements addressing the identification of the institutions' organizational culture will be discussed here. In addition, the questions intended to reveal the relation between the existing organizational culture and its probability of enabling innovation and improvement will be examined. The findings referring to the total responses will be given in tables; however, only when there is a significant difference spotted in the related statements will there be an explanation addressing the responses attained from the public and private university participants separately. The statements in Table 1 aim at revealing the management structure of the participating institutions.

Table 1: The Organizational Structure at the Participating Institutions

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
QB1 ¹ . The management system is hierarchic.	0,9%	3,8%	16,3%	47,0%	32,0%	100,0%
QB2. The authority/responsibility relationships are clearly defined.	2,7%	13,1%	12,5%	50,7%	21,1%	100,0%
QB3. Authority is based on position.	0,3%	4,5%	17,5%	50,1%	27,6%	100,0%
QB4. Authority is based on individual competence and skill.	8,0%	24,4%	34,8%	29,2%	3,6%	100,0%
QB5. The staff are not limited by policy and procedures.	10,5%	37,3%	25,3%	22,9%	3,9%	100,0%

SD= Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree¹

¹ QB1' stands for 'Questionnaire, Part B, Statement 1'; in this paper, not all the statements and questions examined in the questionnaire are included; only the ones related to the aim and scope of the paper are involved and discussed.

The great majority of the participants are of the opinion that the management system is hierarchic at their institutions; this shows that the organizational structure of the participating institutions in general is mechanistic. Accordingly, more than half of the participants stated that the authority/responsibility relationships are clearly defined and authority is based on position. In addition, about half in total think that the staff are limited by policy and procedures.

The way of communication at an institution is also part of the organizational culture of an institution. The statements given in Table 2 were investigated to find out the culture of the participating organizations in terms of the existing communication channels.

Table 2: Communication Channels at the Participating Institutions

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
QB8. Communication passes in the chain of command.	8,2%	18,8%	29,7%	34,5%	8,8%	100,0%
QB9. There is communication among the teachers through actions such as cooperative teaching/peer coaching/joint piloting of new materials.	6,0%	20,1%	23,4%	39,2%	11,4%	100,0%
QB30. There is easy access to the administrative leaders.	2,4%	4,4%	13,8%	43,8%	35,6%	100,0%
QB33. There is regular communication through bulletins or e-mail among the teachers and the administrators.	2,6%	4,7%	11,7%	45,2%	35,8%	100,0%
QB34. There are informal gatherings that allow the staff to get to know one another and develop collegial relations and friendships.	7,7%	20,4%	26,9%	32,0%	13,0%	100,0%

SD= Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

While less than half stated that communication passes in the chain of command, the results obtained from QB9 shed more light on the issue as more participants are of the opinion that there is lateral communication among teachers. Many of the participating institutions have flexible communication systems regarding the relationship between their administrators and the lecturers. There is also regular communication through bulletins or e-mail among the teachers and the administrators. As regards the comparative results, 28,9% of the public but 42,9% of the private university participants strongly agreed as a response to QB33, which signifies a meaningful difference ($X^2=9,912$; $p<0,05$). As a response to QB34, which investigates whether there are informal gatherings or not, 5,3% of the public but 21% of the private university participants strongly agreed and accordingly 28,1% of the public but 35,9% of the private university participants agreed with the statement. The chi-square test also verifies the difference ($X^2=28,238$; $p<0,05$).

Decision-making system is another indicator of the culture; whether the decisions are made in a top-down or participatory way determines the organization's attitude towards innovations.

Table 3: Decision-making Mechanisms at the Participating Institutions

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
QB12. Decisions are made together through teamwork.	6,8%	19,5%	35,4%	30,1%	8,3%	100,0%
QB29. There are regular meetings to discuss up-to-date issues.	4,7%	16,6%	16,0%	38,6%	24,0%	100,0%
QB31. The administration is receptive to the teachers' suggestions.	3,9%	8,0%	26,7%	43,0%	18,4%	100,0%
QB32. There is a system for collecting feedback on all aspects of the program regularly.	3,3%	15,2%	28,9%	35,4%	17,3%	100,0%

SD= Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

A considerable number of participants selected 'neutral' as a response to QB12; yet, the number of participants who agreed is more than the number of those who disagreed. Checking the comparative results, 27,3% agreed and 7% strongly agreed from the public but 32,9% agreed and 9,6% strongly agreed from the private university participants (QB12). The results prove that the administration at the participating institutions is receptive to the teachers' suggestions. More than half of the participants informed that they regularly hold meetings to discuss the latest issues; however, the private universities appear to be more active (13,4% of the public but 35,2% of the private university participants strongly agreed; $X^2=39,625$; $p<0,05$). In terms of collecting feedback, the results from the public and the private universities show considerable difference ($X^2=14,313$; $p<0,05$); 33,3% agreed and 11,1% strongly agreed from the public university participants while 37,6% agreed and 23,6% strongly agreed among the private university participants.

In order to see the relation between the participants' perceptions regarding decision-making system and the practices, the participants were asked to respond to the questions as regards the practices. 50,9% of the public but 68% of the private university participants reported that the mission statement at their institutions is developed by the administrators; accordingly, 36,5% of the public but 27,5% of the private university participants responded that the administrators and the teachers together develop the curriculum (QD1). In addition, 72,6% of the teachers responded that their language curriculum is developed by a committee of teachers (QD2). 46,2% of the public but 32,5% of the private university participants reported that textbooks at their institutions are selected by a committee of teachers; what is more, just 4,7% of the public but 36,7% of the private university participants responded that textbooks are selected by the administrators (QD4); the chi-square test also verifies the difference ($X^2=55,242$; $p<0,05$). Almost all of the public university participants (91,8%) responded that the testing offices prepare tests, the percentage decreases to 53,3% as far as the private university participants stated (QD6).

Whether an institution encourages its teachers to develop themselves professionally and academically or not was aimed to be manifested through the statements in Table 4.

Table 4: The Participating Institutions' Approach towards Professional and Academic Development

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
QB10. The institution encourages research/publications.	9,3%	13,5%	29,6%	34,4%	13,2%	100,0%
QB11. The institution provides funding to local/regional/national/international professional meetings.	13,0%	22,4%	28,1%	28,4%	8,2%	100,0%
QB35. The teachers participate in professional conferences and seminars.	1,5%	14,4%	31,5%	42,6%	10,0%	100,0%
QB36. In-service seminars/workshops are held on topics of interest to the staff.	7,7%	17,8%	25,4%	41,7%	7,4%	100,0%

SD= Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

Nearly half of the participants -44,2% of the public but 51,2 of the private- stated that their institutions encourage research/publications. As to QB11, it is found out that the private universities financially support professional meetings more (21,8% of the public but 35,4% of the private agreed). Concerning the teachers' participating in professional conferences and seminars and in-service seminars held on topics of interest to the staff, around half strongly/agreed in total.

Knowing the staff structure in terms of the role they perform is another indicator of an institution's approach to innovations. Institutions are responsible for employing teachers who reflect the features of the current world and educate their students accordingly.

Table 5: The Roles Teachers Perform at the Participating Institutions

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
QB13. The teachers' role is to inform students.	0,6%	7,2%	19,5%	58,1%	14,7%	100,0%
QB14. The teachers' role is to solve problems, looking critically and imaginatively.	0,9%	6,9%	24,2%	54,4%	13,6%	100,0%
QB15. The teachers are change agents who aim to bring out socio-political awareness.	7,8%	28,1%	31,7%	24,6%	7,8%	100,0%

SD= Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

A great majority of the participants stated that teachers are informant agents. More than half of the participants pointed out that the teachers at their institutions act as problem-solvers. The results show that being change-agents is not widespread among the participating teachers because 24,6% agreed as a response.

To see the connection between the organizational culture and the organization's approach to making changes and innovations, the participants were asked to respond to the statement asking whether the institutions encourage change and innovation or not.

Table 6: The Participating Institutions' Approach towards Encouraging Change and Innovation

	SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
QB16. The institution encourages change and innovation.	4,7%	16,0%	32,9%	36,2%	10,1%	100,0%

SD= Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

About half stated that their institution encourages change and innovation. Although a great number marked 'neutral', as the number of participants who disagreed and strongly disagreed is considerably less than the number of participants who agreed and strongly agreed, it cannot be concluded that the institutions are not open to change and innovation.

5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Organizational culture influences the success of educational institutions as their attitude towards innovations is closely connected with their culture. Thus, institutions are responsible for identifying the components that form their organizational culture both to be aware of their existing context and to make necessary changes in the process of implementing innovations.

One of the indicators of culture is the organizational structure of an institution. The results of the research demonstrate that most of the participating institutions have a hierarchic management system, which is an indicator of mechanistic organizational structure. At most of the participating institutions, authority/responsibility relationships are well-defined, authority is based on position rather than individual competence and skill, and the staff are limited by policy and procedures. It should be highlighted that there is a need for prioritizing 'the quality of an idea, not the power and authority of the person who proposed it', and "to obtain good results, creative people need to support and compromise of the organization" (Schneider et al., 1994:21, cited in Claver, n.d.:14); that's why individual competence and skill should be seen as one of the positive aspects of organic systems. As a result of the discussion focusing on the aspects of organizational structure, it is suggested to adopt both the organic and the mechanistic models according to the size of the program and the type of staff working in it (Richards, 2001).

The way of communication within an institution is another indicator of the organizational culture; according to the findings, there is no remarkable outcome that communication passes in the chain of command. It is found out that there is lateral communication among teachers through actions such as cooperative teaching/peer coaching/joint piloting of new materials; there is easy access to the administrative leaders; the administration is receptive to teachers' suggestions; there is regular communication through bulletins or e-mail among the teachers and administrators. Therefore, although the management systems of the institutions are said to be hierarchic, communication systems of those institutions are

not top-down; moreover, access to the administrators is not like the one in traditional bureaucratic systems. According to Richards (2001), large institutions tend to be hierarchic and it should be accepted as normal on the grounds that, otherwise, it is hard to provide standardization within those institutions. Smith (1995:3) also points this out, explaining that large institutions need it “to function as a whole without fragmenting”, but he adds that “involvement, co-operation, participation and delegation” should still have its place in these organizations. There is also a need for an interactive communication system in which teachers collaborate (Collet, 2012; Darling-Hammond, 1998; Rotherham and Willingham, 2009; Shower, 2010; Voogt et al., 2011), sharing their knowledge and expertise.

For quality education, it is desirable to make decisions through committees instead of making decisions in a top-down way just by administrative leaders (Brumfit, 1980; Dunham, 1995; Gargan and Guare, 1998). According to the results of the research, although more private university participants strongly/agreed that decisions are made together through teamwork, the public universities reported to be more participatory in the process of developing a mission statement, selecting textbooks, preparing tests.

Institutions’ attitude towards attaching importance to academic and professional development is another component of identifying the organizational culture. The findings indicate that more than half of the participants participate in professional conferences. However, the results show that the private universities appear to be more encouraging towards research/publications and they financially support professional meetings more.

The roles teachers perform play a crucial role in determining the culture and approach to changes as well; institutions should support teachers so that they can follow the latest requirements in terms of their roles and responsibilities, develop their skills accordingly (James, 2001), and transform their teaching practice. The findings of the research pinpoint that the teachers’ role is to inform students; furthermore, they are problem-solvers and critical thinkers, but they cannot be commonly considered to be change-agents yet.

In relation to whether the organizational culture helps or hinders the implementation of innovations at the participating institutions, the findings of the research show that the organizational structure of the participating institutions is mainly mechanistic; however, there is no rigid outcome that mechanistic institutions are not open to change and innovation. Richards (2001) also notifies that if the size of the institution is big with about a hundred teachers, it is normal for the institution to have a mechanistic system; here, the important point is to focus on the other elements that will support the acceptance and implementation of innovative initiatives. Rowan (1998:37) expresses his preference by putting it as “schools are overly bureaucratic and centralized, and that a shift is needed to more ‘organic’ or ‘professionalized’ forms of management that involve supportive forms of administrative leadership, participative forms of school decision making, and staff collaboration.” In this way, educational institutions can keep up with the day’s requirements and promote the cycle of innovation with the likely contribution of their experience to the field. What the institutions need so as to accept and adapt to innovations is to adopt feasible strategies with the advantage of the awareness of their organizational culture and make the related innovation a part of the institution.

REFERENCES

- Brown, R. (2004). School culture and organization: Lessons from research and experience. [Available at: http://www.dpsk12.org/pdf/culture_organization.pdf], Retrieved on July 27, 2014.
- Brumfit, C.J. (1980). *Problems and principles in English teaching*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Cincioglu, A. (2012). *Institutional factors as a component of language curriculum development: Perspectives of English preparatory class lecturers at public and private universities in Istanbul*. İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, İstanbul.
- Claver, E., Llopis, J., Garcia, D., Molina, H. (n.d.). Organizational culture for innovation and new technological behavior. [Available at: http://rua.ua.es/dspace/bitstream/10045/1669/4/Organizational_culture_for_innovation.pdf?origin=publication_detail], Retrieved on July 27, 2014.
- Collet, V.S. (2012). The gradual increase of responsibility model: Coaching for teacher change. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 51, 27–47. [Available at: <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=5&hid=5&sid=b3bd7590-1ec4-4d6394db-e455582a2114%40sessionmgr12>], Retrieved on April 17, 2012.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). The quiet revolution: Rethinking teacher development. In R. Bernhardt et al. (Eds.), *Curriculum leadership: Rethinking schools for the 21st century* (pp.9-19). New Jersey: Hampton Press.
- Dunham, J. (1995). *Developing effective school management*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Gargan, A.M. & Guare, R.E. (1998). Redirecting the professional development of school administrators: Collaborative approaches. In R. Bernhardt et al. (Eds.), *Curriculum leadership: Rethinking schools for the 21st century* (pp.21-36). New Jersey: Hampton Press.
- James, P. (2001). *Teachers in action: Tasks for in-service language teacher education and development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003) *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven: Yale University.
- Lindahl, R. (n.d.) The role of organizational climate and culture in the school improvement process: A review of the knowledge base. [Available at: <http://cnx.org/content/m13465/1.1/>], Retrieved on August 1, 2014.
- Liu, Z. (2009). A case study on the influence of organizational culture on language classroom. *International Education Studies*, 2/3, 114-119. [Available at: file:///C:/Users/oc/Downloads/3332-10030-1-PB.pdf], Retrieved on July 26, 2014.
- Lunenburg, F.C. (2011). Understanding organizational culture: A key leadership asset. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, 29/4, 1-12. [Available at: <http://www.nationalforum.com/Electronic%20Journal%20Volumes/Lunenburg,%20Fred%20C%20Understanding%20Organizational%20Culture%20NFEASJ%20V29%20N4%202011.pdf>], Retrieved on July 27, 2014.
- Murphy, D. (1999). Comment: Patrons, clients, and projects, *ELT Journal*, 53/3, 217- 219.
- Ng'ang'a, M.J. & Nyongesa, W.J. (2012). The impact of organizational culture on performance of educational institutions. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3/8, 211-217. [Available at: http://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_8_Special_Issue_April_2012/24.pdf], Retrieved on July 27, 2014.

- Rhodes, L.A. (1994). On the road to quality. In G.D. Doherty (Ed.), *Developing quality systems in education* (pp. 174-177). London and New York: Routledge.
- Rice, M.F. (2004). Organizational culture, social equity, and diversity: Teaching public administration education in the postmodern era. [Available at: <http://www.naspa.org/initiatives/jpae/pdf/organizational.pdf>], Retrieved on July 27, 2014.
- Richards, J.C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rotherham, A.J. & Willingham, D. (2009). 21st Century skills: The challenges ahead. *Educational Leadership*, 67/1, 16-21. [Available at: <http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com>], October 20, 2010.
- Rowan, B. (1998). The task characteristics of teaching: Implications for the organizational design of schools. In R. Bernhardt et al. (Eds.), *Curriculum leadership: Rethinking schools for the 21st century* (pp.37-54). New Jersey: Hampton Press.
- Shawer, S.F. (2010). Classroom-level curriculum development: Efl teachers as curriculum-developers, curriculum-makers and curriculum-transmitters. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 173–184. [Available at: <http://ehis.ebscohost.com/eds/detail?vid=7&hid=1&sid=a70eed8b-2f50-456e-8aa3ab73295c7d1b%40sessionmgr15&bdata=Jmxhbmc9dHlmc2l0ZT1lZHMtbG12ZQ%3d%3d#b=edselp&AN=S0742051X09000821>], Retrieved on April 11, 2012.
- Silman, F., Özmatyatlı, İ.Ö., Birol, C., Çağlar, M. (2012). Organizational culture at high schools in TRNC: A comparative case study. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 42, 356-366. [Available at: <http://www.efdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/english/abstracts/42/pdf/FATO%C5%9E%20S%C4%B0LMAN.pdf>], Retrieved on July 27, 2014.
- Smith, R. (1995). *Successful school management*. London and New York: Cassell.
- Tahir, A. & Qadir, S.A. (2012). Perspectives of organizational culture in effective teacher socialization: A study of beginning English teachers in Pakistan. *Pakistaniaat: A Journal of Pakistan Studies*, 4/2, 56-86. [Available at: <http://pakistaniaat.org/index.php/pak/article/viewFile/164/164>], Retrieved on July 26, 2014.
- Tosi, H.L., Hamner, W.C. (Eds.). (1985). *Organizational behavior and management*. Ohio: Grid Publishing Company.
- Uzel, F.E. (2002). *An assessment of the curricular change process in initiating content based instruction in the first year English program at Bilkent University and its implications for professional development: A case study*. METU, Doctoral Thesis. [Available at: <http://tez2.yok.gov.tr/>], Retrieved on April 17, 2012.
- Voogt, J., Westbroek, H., Handelzalts, A., Walraven, A., McKenney, S., Pieters, J. et al. (2011). Teacher learning in collaborative curriculum design. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 1235-1244. [Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X11000850>], Retrieved on April 11, 2012.