Evaluation of the Structure of the Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Türkiye

Damla AYDUĞ

Assistant Professor; İstanbul Gedik University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Physical Education and Sports Teaching, 34890, İstanbul, Türkiye

E-mail: daydug@gmail.com   *ORCID: 0000-0001-8348-5098*

Ethical Statement
Ethical approval was not received for the article. The author(s) declares that her work is not subject to ethics committee approval.

Conflict of interest
The authors declare that there is no possible conflict of interest in this study.

Similarity
This study was scanned in the iThenticate program. The final similarity rate is 9%.

Evaluation of the Structure of the Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Türkiye

Abstract

This study aims to reveal the concept of structure in the Ministry of National Education. For this purpose, first of all, organizing forms and Weber's rational bureaucracy model, which forms the basis of the organizational structure, were examined. Then, Burns and Stalker's classification of the mechanical and organic organization and Minztberg's organizational configurations framework models are mentioned. When the organization of the Ministry of National Education is evaluated in terms of Mintzberg's organizational components, the strategic apex consists of the Minister of National Education and Deputy Ministers. In the technostructure, experts are working in various directorates and presidencies within the Ministry such as the General Directorate of Basic Education, the General Directorate of Secondary Education, and the Inspection Board. In the Turkish education system, middle-line managers are those working in the provincial organization (provincial national education directors, district national education directors, and school principals) and the foreign organization (education consultants and education attachés). Employees working under the Ministry such as janitors, health personnel, and cleaning staff constitute the support staff as in schools. Finally, the operating core in terms of the education system is the teachers who carry out education and training services in schools, which is also the most important element of the education system. Finally, the structure of the Turkish Education System was analyzed according to Mintzberg's structure models. It was concluded that the Ministry of National Education is a mixture of machine bureaucracy and professional bureaucracy.

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

Introduction

Although it is difficult to separate the concepts of organization and management with clear lines, organization can be considered as a structure and management as a process that animates and activates this structure (Memduhoğlu, 2010). Therefore, organization and structure are intertwined concepts. It is unthinkable to even define an entity that does not have an organizational structure or whose structure is not determined as an organization. The reasons why these concepts are so integrated can be stated as the fact that the most basic features of the management concept point to the concept of structure and that the concept that classical organization theory, which has significant contributions to the formation of management science, focuses most on is structure.

Structure is the perceived anatomy of an organization. Organizational structure is defined as an element that constitutes the logical organization of tasks within an organization, determining the system (Bursalıoğlu, 2010). The formal organizational structure reveals the visible characteristics of the organization based on the distribution of tasks, authority, and resources (Hunt, 1970). The structure of the organization aims to express the relationships between various actions and to provide a systematic sequence among tasks (Gürsel, 1997). Organizational structure can also be defined as an administrative tool for the formal distribution of job roles and the integration and control of activities related to work. Organizational structure is a vital tool for organizations, as improperly structured, it can lead to serious damage in organizational performance (Demir and Okan, 2009).

As is the case for all organizations, structure is a key element for educational institutions as well. For educational organizations to effectively achieve their educational, organizational, and managerial objectives, the structure of educational organizations must be appropriately designed. Başaran (2000) defines the purpose of organization in education as creating a structure that will facilitate the management process and ensure the realization of its functions, continuously improving this structure following changing technology and societal needs. However, it is frequently emphasized in the literature that many educational organizations struggle to go beyond the classical model.

Method

This study aims to analyze the structure of the Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Türkiye. For this purpose, firstly, organizational forms and Weber's rational bureaucracy model, which forms the basis of organizational structure, have been examined. Subsequently, Burns and Stalker's classification of mechanical

and organic organizations and Mintzberg's structural models have been addressed. Finally, the structure of the Turkish education system has been examined according to Mintzberg's structural models.

Conclusion

In Türkiye, educational organizations have a bureaucratic structure. This situation, as in other organizations, leads to problems in educational institutions as well. The most significant problem brought about by the bureaucratic structure in our country is the sluggishness and slowdown of the Turkish education system, which has a centralized system. This is because hierarchy is essential in a bureaucratic structure, and all procedures progress according to the hierarchy. Additionally, the obligation to report any situation in writing to higher authorities significantly increases paperwork. Weber's bureaucratic model depicts a career orientation based on seniority and success. However, in the Turkish education system based on the bureaucratic model, which is the main actor in the system, teachers do not have any career system. This lack of a clear career orientation based on seniority or success in the bureaucratic model-based Turkish education system can be attributed to the ambiguity and sometimes contradiction between these two criteria. Finally, the uncertainty in Weber's model about whether employees will act based on technical competence and expertise or authority tied to hierarchical position affects the implementation of the bureaucratic model in the education system. This uncertainty has evolved towards an authority perception based on hierarchical positions rather than competence and expertise in the Turkish education system. Therefore, in educational organizations, as a reflection of the bureaucratic model, the importance of employees is placed more on their positions than on their expertise. This situation creates a perception among employees that developing their expertise has little meaning unless they hold a position. In this context, both the lack of career advancement based on expertise and the lack of authority hinder teachers in developing themselves.

The first of Mintzberg's organizational components, from the perspective of schools, refers to school boards (in other countries), school principals, and assistant principals. The technical structure, which represents experts and technicians who standardize, measure, and control outputs and processes, consists of specialists such as assessment and evaluation, program development, psychological counseling, and guidance experts in schools. There is no middle management in schools in the true sense. However, teachers who are held responsible for the management of some boards and units by the school principal can be considered as middle management. Administrative staff in schools constitute support personnel who do not perform a direct function related to educational activities. The production unit of goods and services in schools is formed by teachers who are responsible for the realization of education and teaching.

Mintzberg's five components can be examined within a broader framework from the perspective of the national education system as well. The upper management of the Turkish national education system is composed of the Minister of National Education and Deputy Ministers. In the technical structure, experts are working in various directorates and presidencies within the Ministry, such as the Directorate General of Basic Education, Directorate General of Secondary Education, and Inspection Board Presidency. In the Turkish education system, middle-level managers include those in the field organization (provincial directors of national education, district directors of national education, and school principals) and the overseas organization (education counselors and education attachés). Personnel working in units affiliated with the Ministry, such as the Private Office Directorate, the Directorate General of Legal Services, and the Directorate General of Support Services, constitute the support personnel of the Ministry. Finally, in terms of the education system, teachers in schools, which serve as the fundamental system of the education system, provide educational services and operate as the production unit for goods and services.

Mintzberg (1983) proposed five different organizational structures based on these five fundamental components. These are simple bureaucracy, machine bureaucracy, professional bureaucracy, divisionalized structure, and adhocracy. Schools, which are the most functional element of the education system, generally conform to a simple structure, machine bureaucracy, or professional bureaucracy. However, most schools are typically a combination of these three ideal types as defined (Hoy and Miskel, 2010). Nevertheless, the ideal is for schools to adopt a professional bureaucratic structure.

Keywords: Educational organizations, Organizational structure, the Turkish Republic of Ministry of National Education, The organizational configurations framework model of Mintzberg.

INTRODUCTION

Although it is difficult to separate the concepts of organization and management from each other with certain lines, organization can be considered as a structure and management as a process that animates and activates this structure (Memduhoğlu, 2010). Therefore, organization and structure are intertwined concepts. It is unthinkable to even define a formation that does not have an organizational structure or whose structure has not been determined as an organization. The reasons why these concepts are so integrated can be shown both that the management emphasizes the concept of structure and that the classical organization theory, which has important contributions to the formation of management science, focuses on the structure. Classical organization theory is built on four main bases. These are division of labor, vertical and functional processes, structure, and control area (Gürsel, 1997). It can be said that the keyword of classical organization theory is structure (Memduhoğlu, 2010), and in the historical process, scientists have tried to understand organizations by examining them in terms of their structure and functioning (Katıtaş, 2019).

Structure is the perceived anatomy of an organization. Organizational structure is defined as an element that consists of a logical pattern of tasks in the organization and determines the system (Bursalıoğlu, 2010). Organizational structure is a framework that shows the relationships between people and groups that strive to achieve goals, systems, processes, and processes (Ahmady et al., 2016). Structure in the organization expresses the relationships between various actions and aims to provide an orderly sequence between tasks (Gürsel, 1997). Organizational structure can also be defined as a managerial tool for the formal distribution of job roles and the integration and control of work-related activities. It is a vital tool for organizations as it can cause serious damage to organizational performance when the organizational structure is misconfigured (Demir & Okan, 2009).

The organizational structure is the system that links the distribution of tasks, reporting of tasks, and authority and responsibilities into a hierarchy (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013). Organizational structure includes concepts such as hierarchy, role, status, and decision-making process. The hierarchy formed by the distribution of authority within the organizational structure shows the order of duties in an organization between subordinates and superiors (Balyer, 2017). Hierarchy is important in terms of acting as a bridge between the purpose and structure dimensions of the organization (Bursalıoğlu, 2010). The Turkish Language Association (2022) defines the hierarchy as the order of stages. Therefore, it is inevitable that hierarchy is closely related to the concept of structure, which emphasizes the

ordering between jobs and tasks in the organization. Having a hierarchical feature, which is one of the basic features of management, also emphasizes the importance of hierarchy for all organizations.

Organizational structure includes not only the determination of subordinate-superior relations in the organization but also the clarification of the status of individuals in the organization and the roles appropriate to that status. Status is defined as the position of an individual within social groups and the powers and responsibilities he/she has due to this position. Therefore, the status of an employee in an organization stems from the authority and responsibilities brought by his/her position. The employee is expected to exhibit several behaviors appropriate to his/her status in the organization and these behaviors determine his/her roles (Erdoğan, 1991). In this context, a role is defined as the behaviors expected of a person who fills a certain social position or status (Balyer, 2017; Bierstedt, 1970). The main characteristic of role behavior in a social group is that the individual learns what behaviors are expected of him/her in line with the behavior patterns accepted in the group, how to perform them, and how to apply them (Tekarslan et al., 1989). Role behaviors can be summarized as the behaviors and attitudes determined by the status of the individual in the social group to which he/she belongs. Role in an organization can be expressed as the behavior expected from an individual in a position (Bursalıoğlu, 2010). As a result, it can be stated that the organizational structure is a tool that emphasizes the subordinate-superior relations in the organization, the positions of the employees in the organization, the authorities and responsibilities of these positions, and the behaviors expected from the employees in these positions, and thus reveals the relationship scheme in the organization. Therefore, the organizational structure affects all other elements and processes in the organization and plays a key role.

As in all organizations, structure is one of the key elements for educational organizations. For educational organizations to realize their educational, organizational, and managerial goals effectively, the structure of educational organizations should be created accordingly. Başaran (2000) expresses the purpose of organization in education as creating a structure that will facilitate the management process and ensure the realization of its functions, and constantly renewing this structure following the changing technology and the needs of society. However, it is frequently stated in the literature that most educational organizations cannot go beyond the classical model. Such organizations are getting weaker as they spend most of their power to sustain themselves (Bursalıoğlu, 2010). For this reason, in recent years, it has been discussed what kind of structure educational organizations have and the discourses that the classical view should change should have been increasing (Çınkır, 2010).

This study aims to reveal the concept of structure in schools and new perspectives and trends in the literature. In line with this purpose, firstly, organizational forms in organizations and Weber's rational bureaucracy model, which forms the basis for organizational structure, were examined. Then, various classifications related to organizational structure were mentioned. Examples of these are Burns and Stalker's classification of mechanical and organic organizations and Minztberg's structure model. Finally, the structure of the Turkish Education System is analyzed according to Mintzberg's structure model.

METHOD

The research is a theoretical review. Review articles aim to provide an overview of the research topic. Unlike original research articles, new empirical results are not reached in such articles. A review article is a type of academic publication and is prepared in a similar way to research articles. Both research articles and reviews have a specific purpose and research questions, use systematic methods to collect information, and generally have a structure consisting of an introduction, conclusion, and findings sections. These similarities may be among the features that distinguish reviews from course books (Özer ve Görgülü, 2020). Since the research is a theoretical study, it does not require ethics committee approval. In the study, first of all, organizing forms and Weber's rational bureaucracy model, which forms the basis of the organizational structure, were examined. Then, Burns and Stalker's classification of mechanical and organic organization and Minztberg's structure models are mentioned. Finally, the structure of the Turkish Education System was examined according to Mintzberg's structure models.

Forms of Organizing

Organizing refers to the process of establishing, staffing, and equipping the structure for the realization of organizational goals in an organization. Organizing can also be defined as creating a structure and coordinating people's power and activities to achieve common goals (Taymaz, 2011). Different forms of organizing are encountered in organizations based on the organization's environment, resources, production style, and products or services produced. The most common forms of organizing, which are closely related to the internal dynamics of the organization, are functional, process-based, product-based, customer-oriented, and regional organizing. The characteristics of these organizing forms are as follows (Kondakçı & Zayim, 2013):

Functional organizing: This is the type of organizing in which units and departments are divided according to the function they undertake. This type of organization model is generally

used in business organizations. Organizations that include units such as R&D, human resources, administrative and financial affairs, and production reflect this organizational model (Kondakçı & Zayim, 2013). Özalp (2012) lists the reasons why functional organizing is preferred by organizations as follows:

- Close-knit people and tasks can be easily accomplished.
- Specialization is easily achieved in some jobs.
- Planning, strategizing, and coordinating work can be achieved in a short time through face-to-face relationships.
- Information can flow much faster and without causing communication errors.

The advantages that this type of organizing will provide to the school are that the work will be perfected by bringing together employees who are specialized in their fields, decision-making and coordination will be easier, faster, and more effective, it will be easier to control whether the work is done according to a certain standard, and it will provide savings in resource use. The most important disadvantage of functional organizing is the narrow perspective it creates in the perceptions of employees towards the organization. This type of organizing causes the employees to assume that the purpose of the organization consists of their work and they cannot see the main purpose of the organization (Lunnenberg & Ornstein, 2012). The structure of the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) in Türkiye can be given as an example of this type of organizing.

Process-based organizing: It is a type of organizing in which jobs are grouped or divided according to the activity performed. In the production sector, the division of departments into sections such as production, assembly, and packaging can be given as an example of this type of organizing. In this type of organization, employees involved in the same process focus on a certain part of the whole process (Kondakçı & Zayim, 2013).

Product-based organizing (Purposive organizing): It is a type of organizing in which units are formed based on the product produced. Regardless of their duties in the organization and the processes they are involved in, employees work in a department for the development of a certain product. The main problem in product-based organizing is to be able to separate product types or product groups well. Since the structure of each organization is different and the work or service they perform is specific, it is necessary to respond to the needs of the organization while going to the product basis (Özalp, 2012). The division of a large white goods factory into departments such as refrigerators, TVs, and washing machines is an example of this type of organizing.

Although there is no such organization in formal educational institutions in terms of educational administration, there are private educational institutions that are divided according to the type of education they provide. In addition to this, the supportive-purposive form of organizing, which refers to the presence of support units next to product and service production units, is seen especially in higher education. The creation of units to provide student affairs, housing, food, sports, and cultural services in addition to academic programs at a university is an example of this type of organizing (Kondakçı & Zayim, 2013).

Customer-oriented organizing: It is the type of organizing in which the organization establishes departments according to the customer group it serves. The existence of corporate and retail banking departments in the banking sector is an example of a customer-oriented organization (Kondakçı & Zayim, 2013).

Regional organizing: A type of organizing in which departments are structured according to geographical regions. Regional organizing refers to the organization's autonomy of more than one sub-structure that is not connected to a center. An example of this is the so-called chain schools in education, which have more than one branch in Türkiye. Some schools can make schools bearing their name and functioning in other cities autonomous within themselves, except for certain subjects determined at the center.

These forms of organizing should not be considered independent of each other. It is seen that more than one of these organizing approaches is applied in many organizations, including educational organizations. In addition to all these forms of organizing, new forms of organizing such as project-based organizing, virtual organizing, and work process restructuring have also been mentioned in recent years. These organizing types, which are called contemporary organizing types, are briefly mentioned below (Kondakçı & Zayim, 2013).

Project-based organizing: This is a type of organizing in which functional units are preserved, but each employee is also a member of another group and therefore has two superiors. This kind of organization, which is more typical in dynamic, competitive industries where sharing resources is required (Griffin & Moorhead, 2013), is also thought to be a good fit for managing schools (Başaran & Çınkır, 2011).

Virtual organizing: It is a type of organizing in which an organization comes together with another organization to carry out an activity that it cannot do alone, usually through remote communication, and integrates its knowledge to achieve a project or a job. It is especially encountered in organizations that require fast action, where there is an intense competitive

environment, and where there are jobs that require intensive information that cannot be done by an organization as a whole. Virtual organizations are generally characterized as independent and geographically dispersed networks of organizations. In this network, all employees work in line with their core competencies and cooperation is in the form of semi-stable relationships. In such organizations, innovative and customer-oriented products and services are usually produced (Larsen & McInerney, 2002).

Work process restructuring: This is a type of organizing in which the organization first establishes a basic strategy to determine what its customers expect and how it can meet those expectations, then the leadership of the organization creates teams to implement that strategy, and the roles of the employees are not limited to a unit of the organization and a homogeneous activity. The purpose of this model is to help workers radically change their roles and ways of doing business. This organizing model is not suitable for every type of organization because it requires a philosophical transformation in the whole organization and a radical change in the mental models of the employees. Therefore, in terms of educational management, the applicability of this model in schools does not seem possible (Kondakçı & Zayim, 2013).

Weber's Rational Bureaucracy Model

When the bureaucracy is mentioned in everyday language, excessive prolongation of work and red tape come to mind. However, Weber considered bureaucracy in terms of organization and saw it as a rational basis for the management of large organizations (Özalp, 1992). According to Weber, bureaucracy is the ideal organizational form and the bureaucracy model shows how an organization should be. In his ideal type of bureaucracy approach, Weber identified rational management principles that are compatible with each other and put forward management principles such as a clear division of labor, rules and regulations, gradation of authority, objectivity, competence, and merit (Kondakçı & Zayim, 2013). Therefore, to benefit the most from the bureaucracy model, which Weber argues is superior to any other structure, organizations must have several characteristics. These characteristics are as follows (Aydın, 2010; Özalp, 1992):

Formal, clear, and explicit division of labor based on a high degree of specialization: The tasks necessary for the achievement of objectives are based on a high degree of specialization. The activities necessary for the achievement of the bureaucratic organization's objectives are appropriately distributed in a certain way as formal tasks. This strategy is similar to the principle of division of labor. Weber argued that this is important because employees will

specialize in their work by doing the same jobs and will be held accountable for doing their jobs best.

A well-structured hierarchical authority structure: Authorities are clearly defined within a hierarchical structure. It may be possible to achieve uniformity and coordination of work. The basis of this practice is to minimize job-related uncertainties arising from differences in individuals. In this system, each level can be supervised by a higher level.

A system of formally established rules and regulations that ensure continuity in functioning: Business decisions and activities will be carried out under formally established principles and procedures. Management decisions and rules should be written down.

An objective attitude for the rational execution of tasks: The personnel working in the organization must perform their duties formally and impersonally. The aim is to increase the success of the organization by acting impersonally.

Recruitment based on technical competence and guarantee of lifetime employment in the organization: Employees should be employed according to their technical abilities.

Career orientation with a promotion system based on seniority and achievement: Promotions should be based on performance. Personnel should be selected and promoted according to the results of exams that measure the technical knowledge and skills required by the job.

According to Weber, an organization with these characteristics is the ideal management organization. The fact that the division of labor is based on specialization, that subordinate-superior relations are clearly defined, and that there are organizational employees who are governed by certain rules and perform their duties rationally with an objective attitude makes both the realization of organizational goals and effective management possible. Weber argues that the existence of a clear division of labor in the organization and people doing the same job all the time will lead to specialization, specialization will lead to making technically correct and rational decisions with an objective approach, and rational decisions will enable the organization to have a uniform and stable functioning within the framework of the hierarchy of authority, compliance with orders, rules, and regulations (as cited in Aydın, 2010).

This model put forward by Weber reflects the ideal bureaucracy model. However, it should be noted that it is not possible to apply this model in organizations exactly (Özkalp & Kırel, 2011). In this sense, the fact that Weber's ideal bureaucracy model cannot be applied one-to-

one has brought many criticisms. The criticisms against Weber's ideal bureaucracy model can be summarized as follows (Hoy & Miskel, 2010):

- Excessive emphasis on specialization leads to monotony and decreases productivity
- Excessive orientation towards objectivity leads to the exclusion of emotionality and an insecure atmosphere in the organization
- Hierarchical authority structure leads to obstruction and distortion of communication
- Excessive adherence to rules leads to rigidity, turning rules from a means to an end and creating red tape
- Career orientation based on seniority and achievement creates a conflict between achievement and seniority

Apart from these, some ideas arising from criticisms of Weber's model can also be mentioned. Parkinson's Law, which states that the number of bureaucratic personnel is inversely proportional to the number of work to be done and that the number of personnel increases as the work to be done decreases, and Peter's principle, which means that in bureaucratic structures, people can rise to levels where they do not have the necessary skills, can be given as examples (Efil, 2010).

Weber's bureaucratic model is also criticized for ignoring the informal structure that develops naturally within the organization. However, informal organizations are a system of interpersonal relationships that occur spontaneously in all formal organizations and emerge as a result of the interaction of individuals in the organization with each other in line with their needs (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). Research shows that informal organizations have significant effects on employees. Barnard (1938) states that the informal organization has many important functions such as being an effective communication tool, ensuring cohesion, integrating individuals, and being a protective tool. In addition, informal organization can be used as an effective change mechanism and a constructive force for effective management (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). Therefore, it can be said that the informal organization, which is a very important element in terms of organizational effectiveness and efficiency, is a structure that should not be considered separately from the formal organization and this structure is neglected in Weber's model.

When Weber's model is examined in terms of educational organizations, it can be stated that schools, which are social systems, have at least two basic organizational characteristics, the first of which is bureaucratic characteristics. In the bureaucratic feature dimension, schools are structures that carry out institutional and managerial work between the school and the

society, enforce the laws, perform necessary work within the institution, create resources, and play an intermediary role between students and teachers. The second characteristic is the professional or expertise-based dimension of schools. This characteristic is a technical issue related to the learning and teaching process (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). Teaching is a profession that requires expertise. The social status and prestige of the profession are also related to teachers' knowledge, skills, competencies, and expertise. In a teaching profession where specialization is given more importance, encouraged, and rewarded, teachers' level of commitment to the school organization and the profession may increase. Because the implementation of a purely bureaucratic structure brings along many problems, the bureaucratic and authoritarian structure of schools should be reduced and the expertise of teachers and administrators should be increased (Sezgin, 2013).

Educational organizations in Türkiye have a bureaucratic structure (Bursalıoğlu, 2010; Demir-Tümen, 2014; Doğan, 2004; Özden, 2010). This situation causes problems in educational organizations as in other organizations. The biggest problem brought about by the bureaucratic structure in our country is that it causes the Turkish Education System, which has a centralized system, to become cumbersome and slow down the work. As Bozkuş (2016) points out, while the hierarchy in schools is short, the hierarchy in the Ministry of National Education is long. This is because the bureaucratic structure is based on hierarchy and all procedures proceed according to the hierarchical sequence. In addition, the obligation to report any situation to the higher authorities in writing increases stationery (Arslan & Atasayar, 2008). In Weber's model, the uncertainty of whether the employees will act according to the authority based on technical competence and expertise or according to the authority based on the task in the hierarchical position affects the implementation of the bureaucracy model in the education system. This uncertainty has evolved into a perception of authority based on hierarchical duty rather than competence and expertise in the Turkish Education System. Therefore, as a reflection of the bureaucratic model in educational organizations, the position of the employees rather than their expertise has gained importance and this situation has created the perception that there is no point in developing their expertise unless they have a position. In this context, the fact that authority is not based on expertise and competencies is seen as an obstacle for teachers to develop themselves.

Ayrıca herhangi bir durumun üst makamlara yazılı olarak bildirilmesi zorunluluğu kırtasiyeciliği artırmaktadır (Arslan & Atasayar, 2008). Weber'in modelinde çalışanların teknik yeterlilik ve uzmanlığa dayalı yetkiye göre mi yoksa hiyerarşik konumdaki göreve

dayalı yetkiye göre mi hareket edeceğinin belirsizliği bürokrasi modelinin eğitim sisteminde uygulanmasını etkilemektedir (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). Bu belirsizlik, Türk Eğitim Sisteminde yetkinlik ve uzmanlıktan ziyade hiyerarşik göreve dayalı bir yetki algısına dönüşmüştür. Dolayısıyla bürokratik modelin eğitim örgütlerindeki yansıması olarak çalışanların uzmanlıklarından ziyade pozisyonları önem kazanmış ve bu durum pozisyon sahibi olmadıkça uzmanlıklarını geliştirmelerinin bir anlamı olmadığı algısını yaratmıştır. Bu bağlamda yetkinin uzmanlık ve yeterliliklere dayanmaması öğretmenlerin kendilerini geliştirmelerinin önünde bir engel olarak görülmektedir.

Organizational Structure Classifications

Organizational structure is classified in different ways according to the division of labor (horizontal differentiation) or the distribution of decision-making authority (vertical differentiation). The most widely known of these classifications is Burns and Stalker's (1961) classification of mechanical and organic organizational structure. Mintzberg (1979) named the mechanical-organic structure as a bureaucratic and adhocratic structure. Some researchers have considered organizational structure as a function of the environment (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1969) and technology (Parthasarthy and Sethi, 1992; Woodward, 1965).

Mechanical and organic organizational structure

Burns and Stalker (1961) investigated how external environmental conditions affect organizational structure and classified organizational structure as mechanical and organic (Ghani et al., 2002; Özalp, 1992). The level of standardization of behaviors within the organizational structure, which is known as the main determinant of the behaviors and activities of individuals within the organization (Dalton et al., 1980), reveals the mechanical and organic characteristics of organizational structures. If the level of standardization of behaviors is high in an organization, there is a mechanistic organizational structure, and if it is low, there is an organic organizational structure (Ghani et al., 2002).

Organic organizational structures are characterized by less obvious aspects of work, by features that emphasize flexibility and adaptability, and by communication that is more consultative than commanding. In contrast to organic structures, mechanical organizations are much more rigidly structured (Hunt, 1970). They are typically highly formal, non-participative, hierarchical, tightly controlled, and inflexible. According to Burns and Stalker, who reveal the main differences between mechanical and organic organizational forms and management approaches, the characteristics of a mechanical organizational structure are as follows (Lam, 2010; Önday, 2016):

- The work to be done in the organization is divided into specialized, functionally differentiated tasks.

- Roles have precise and clear definitions of rights, obligations, and technical methods. These roles are translated into the responsibilities of a functional position. There is also a hierarchical structure of control, authority, and communication in the organization.

- Information about the organization as a whole is located at the top of the hierarchy. Internal and local knowledge, experience, and skills that are not related to the organization as a whole are located at lower levels.

- Interactions between members of the organization are vertical in the form of subordinate-superior relationships.

The main features of the organic organizational structure are as follows (Lam, 2010; Önday, 2016):

- Through interaction with others, organizational members constantly alter and redefine their specific roles to advance the organization's overall goal.

- The organization's commitment transcends all technical definitions, control authority structures, and communication networks. Instead of moving vertically, communication is moving laterally.

- Data can be found anywhere in the network, and this transitory place ends up serving as the hub of communication and authority.

- Connections and knowledge that are relevant in industrial, technological, and commercial areas outside the organization are accorded importance and reputation.

Ahmady et al. (2016) point to vertical differentiation of units, rigid and inflexible relationships, formal communication channels, and centralized decision-making mechanisms as prominent features of the mechanistic structure. In the organic structure, they state that there is less horizontal differentiation, both horizontal and vertical cooperation and participation are high, tasks are flexible, tasks are not formal communication is informal, and decision-making mechanisms are decentralized. The mechanical organizational structure is seen as the most appropriate structure when the environmental conditions are stable and balanced and the rate of change is low. In other words, it is suitable for environmental conditions where the environment is stable and predictable. Organic structure, on the other hand, is considered to be the most appropriate organizational structure when environmental conditions are constantly and rapidly changing. Organic organizations with flexible

arrangements are suitable for changing environmental conditions that require immediate and innovative responses. Mechanical and organic organizational structures can be shown as representing two extremes in a direction of change. Between these two extremes, different types of structures can exist (Erkut, 2009; Lam, 2011). The result of Burns and Stalker's study is that there is no organizational structure that does not change in environmental conditions and can be applied in every environment (Özalp, 1992). According to the characteristics of environmental conditions, the appropriate organizational structure will also change.

Organizational structure by technology (Woodward)

Burns and Stalker's study showed that organizational forms can range from mechanical to organic and that more flexible forms are needed to overcome changing environmental conditions (Erkut, 2009). As the situational approach began to be emphasized in organizational theories, it became important to develop a structure depending on the functioning of the organization, the needs of the organization's work, the market environment, the technological environment, and the needs of its members. As the technology used changes, it is thought that there should be significant differences in the organization in parallel with the technology. In this context, the most important study on organizational structure and technology is Joan Woodward's research (Özalp, 1992).

In her study, Woodward investigated the relationship between the structural elements that characterize an organization and technology. In 1950, she examined organizations engaged in manufacturing in England (Özalp, 1992). However, the initial aim of the research was to test the claim that there is the best organizational structure and management system valid in all places and conditions (universality of management). The data collected for this purpose showed that there were significant differences in the structures of organizations. Therefore, the reasons for these differences between organizations have started to be investigated. To find answers to these differences, organizational structure and organizational success and manufacturing type and organizational size were compared, but no significant relationship was found.

Woodward et al. (1973) then focused on the technology used by organizations. They identified three technological levels: single production, mass production, and process production technology. When they classified organizations according to the technologies they use, they revealed that a different organizational structure is appropriate for each type of technology. It has been seen that the elements that determine the structure of the organization such as management level, managerial control area, direct/indirect labor force ratio, and the

ratio of manufacturing workers to staff employees vary according to the type of technology used in the organization (as cited in Erkut, 2009).

As a result of the research, it was determined that in organizations using single production technology, there are small groups with developed human relations, high participation, no rigidity in business relations, and a business environment open to initiative. On the other hand, in organizations using mass production technology, tasks are clearly defined, there is command and staff conflict and industrial relations are generally not good. In organizations using process production technology, the situation was similar to that in single-production enterprises. In addition, it was determined that verbal communication was used more in single-production and process production, while written communication was used more in mass production (Erkut, 2009; Özalp, 1992). Woodward's study concluded that there should be harmony between the applied technology and the organizational structure. Therefore, it has been an important study of the contingency approach that shows that it is not possible to find the best organizational structure that is valid everywhere and in every situation (Özalp, 1992).

Organizational structure by the environment (Lawrence and Lorsch)

Lawrence and Lorsch investigated which organization is more effective in environmental conditions. While investigating this, they started from the assumption that the successful organization in each environment will show a degree of differentiation and integration appropriate to that environment (Erkut, 2009). Lawrence and Lorsch's studies are based on a case study of ten organizations in the plastics, packaging, and food industries (Özalp, 1992). The plastics industry was chosen as an example of turbulent environmental conditions, the packaging industry as an example of stable environmental conditions, and the food industry as an example of environmental conditions with characteristics in between (Erkut, 2009).

Differentiation refers to structural and situational differences between the main parts of organizations. Integration, on the other hand, covers the need to bring together and keep together the differentiated elements of the organization, the status and quality of the cooperation between the organizational units, and how this is achieved. Integration is a movement in the opposite direction to differentiation and can be achieved through the cooperation of specialists working for the realization of the general purpose (Özalp, 1992).

The results of the study revealed that the organizational structure is shaped depending on the state of the relevant environmental conditions. In a dynamic, changing, and uncertain environment, it is appropriate for the organization to be differentiated and integrated, while a static and certain environment does not require much differentiation in organizational units.

This research has shown that the best organizational structure does not exist and that the best one varies according to environmental conditions. The most successful organizational structure is the one that is in harmony with the characteristics of environmental conditions (Erkut, 2009). In addition, different structures can be established between organizational units according to the effect of the environmental factor. For example, the production department and research and development department have very different structures in an organization. One department may be structured in a bureaucratic manner, while another department may be structured according to low differentiation and integration (Özalp, 1992).

The Organizational Configurations Framework Model of Mintzberg

Beyond the traditional schemes of organizational structure, Mintzberg's new structure model draws attention. Mintzberg's structure model is a model that brings together various functions of the organization in groupings, shows their relative size, and shows the effects of different tasks and external challenges (Bolman & Deal, 2013). According to Mintzberg (1983), an organization consists of five different components.

Strategic apex: Strategic apex, which includes the board of directors, the owner of the organization, and/or managers, constitutes the highest level of the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Strategic apex is primarily tasked with ensuring that the organization serves its mission most effectively. They are also tasked with serving the needs of those who control the organization or pressure groups. In this context, the duties of strategic apex can be grouped under three main headings: direct supervision, regulating the organization's management relations with the environment, and developing the organizational strategy. In general, the strategic apex is the broadest, most abstract view of the organization. Jobs at this level usually involve decision cycles that are the least repetitive, involve a lot of discretion, and take a relatively long time. The most preferred coordination mechanism among strategic apex members is mutual alignment (Mintzberg, 2014). Strategic apex, which refers to managers who supervise, coordinate, control, and provide resources to those who produce, includes provincial directors of national education and school boards in school systems (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

Technostructure: The technostructure includes experts, technicians, and analysts who standardize, measure, and control outputs and processes (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Tasks such as strategic planning, staff training, system analysis, and design are performed in the technostructure. The attention of these experts is focused directly on the design and function of the structure. This type of standardization reduces the need for direct supervision by

allowing civil servants to perform tasks that were previously done by managers. Therefore, in a fully developed organization, the technostructure can function at all levels of the hierarchy (Mintzberg, 2014). Accounting and quality control departments in industry and audit departments in public organizations perform such technical functions (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

Middle line: Depending on the size of the organization and if there is direct supervision for coordination in the organization, middle managers are necessary in the organization. Institutionally, a top manager in top management can supervise all workers. In practice, however, direct supervision requires a close relationship between manager and worker. This is because there is a limit to the number of workers each manager can supervise (control area). Therefore, while small organizations can be managed by a single manager, in large organizations more managers are needed and thus a hierarchical structure is formed in the organization. Middle-line managers have tasks such as directing the personnel within their units, developing communication networks, processing the environment and the activities of their units, transferring the information they receive to their units and senior managers, negotiating with outsiders, and resolving conflicts (Mintzberg, 2014).

Support staff: When organizational charts are examined, it is seen that there are many specialized units in every organization. These units are established to provide support to the organization and to fulfill unique functions other than the functioning of the workflow. These units are usually shown together with the structure and provide consultancy services to the management, but they are quite different from the technostructure. These units use the resources of the larger organization but function independently of the goods and services production unit (Mintzberg, 2014). In short, support staff are those who perform tasks that help or facilitate the work of others throughout the organization. For example, in schools, nurses, secretaries, janitors, cafeteria/canteen staff and drivers constitute support staff (Bolman & Deal, 2013). These support units can be found at different levels of the hierarchy depending on the service recipients (Mintzberg, 2014).

Operating core: This unit consists of individuals who produce goods and services in the organization. These individuals perform the basic function of the organization by working on tasks directly related to the production of a good or service. The operating core is the heart of every organization because this part keeps the organization alive by producing basic outputs (Mintzberg, 2014). Teachers in schools, production line workers in factories, doctors and nurses in hospitals, and flight crew in airlines constitute the operating core (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

Mintzberg's structure model provides a rough map of the organizational structure rather than its details and guides managers in determining its location (Bolman & Deal, 2013). It is important to examine Mintzberg's five components in the context of educational organizations and the structure of the education system to understand the structure models that will be mentioned later. The first of Mintzberg's five components, strategic apex, refers to school boards, school principals, and vice principals. The technostructure, which refers to the experts and technicians who standardize, measure, and monitor outputs and processes, consists of experts such as measurement and evaluation, curriculum development, psychological counseling, and guidance experts in schools. There is not a full middle line in schools. However, teachers who are held responsible for the management of some boards and units by the school principal can be considered as middle line. In schools, support staff includes nurses, secretaries, janitors, guards, cleaning staff, cafeteria/canteen staff, and drivers who do not directly carry out any function related to education activities. The operating core of schools is teachers who are responsible for the realization of education and training.

Mintzberg (1983) proposed five different organizational structures based on these five basic components.

Simple structure: These are structures in which the technostructure is very small and has few employees, there is low division of labor, there is no differentiation between units and the level of hierarchy is low (Mintzberg, 1983). In such structures, coordination is provided by the strategic apex. Most organizations start as a simple two-level structure, with a strategic apex and operating core. Coordination in such an organization is achieved primarily through direct control and supervision. Strategic apex constantly monitors what is going on and exercises complete authority over day-to-day affairs. The strength of the simple structure is flexibility and adaptability. One or two people control an entire operation but these strengths can become weaknesses. A management too close to the day-to-day routine can easily be distracted by urgent problems, leading to the neglect of long-term strategic issues. Also, when an organization grows rapidly in size, a simple structure may be inadequate to manage the complexity of that growth. In this case, the simple structure may tend towards machine or professional bureaucracy or evolve towards a divisionalised structure (Bolman & Deal, 2013). When the simple structure is examined in the school context, it can be said that some small primary schools have a simple structure. In such a school, the principal provides strong direction, often autocratic, in an informal environment unconstrained by rules and regulations. In short, although the school is centralized, it has an informal structure (Hoy & Miskel, 2010).

Machine Bureaucracy: In this structure, specialization is at high levels and tasks are routine and formalized. There are many large-scale sub-units within the operating core (Mintzberg, 1983). The environment of these organizations has a simple and stable structure. Therefore, their level of standardization is high. According to Muijen & Koopman (1994), machine bureaucracy is expressed by repetitive and specialized tasks. Rules and regulations are very important and the organizational structure is hierarchical. Important decisions are made by the strategic apex. Daily routine work is controlled by managers through standardized procedures. Machine bureaucracies have a large support staff, a sizable technostructure, and many levels between the strategic apex and operating core (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

The main problem in machine bureaucracy is how to motivate and satisfy the staff in the operating core. People quickly get bored with routine work and standardized procedures. On the other hand, too much creativity and personal challenge can undermine the coherence and uniformity of such a structure. Moreover, in machine bureaucracies, there can be a constant state of tension between the middle line and strategic apex. While middle-line managers are heavily influenced by the local environment, decisions made by strategic apex may not match the needs of the environment (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

In terms of educational organizations, the period when teachers were seen as production workers and schools as machines in line with the scientific management approach can be cited as an example of machine bureaucracy. This period included a teacher-free program, incentive-based payment plans, and annual performance indicators to determine whether test scores or schools were succeeding (Bolman & Deal, 2013). In such schools, behavior is often formalized with detailed rules, procedures, and job descriptions. Power also tends to be highly centralized at the top of the structure and authority is diffused from the top down (Hoy & Miskel, 2010).

Professional Bureaucracy: This structure is based on coordination in the standardization of skills (Yeloğlu, 2011). The operating core is relatively large compared to other structural parts, especially the technostructure. Units can work independently of each other or coexist. Individuals are the key element in this type of organization and control is largely based on vocational training and professional teachings (Mintzberg, 1983). Professionals are not subject to formal interventions and this frees them to use their expertise. Freeing highly trained professionals to do what they do best brings many benefits, but also difficulties with coordination and quality control. A professional bureaucracy reacts very slowly to external change because professionals often see change in their environment as a waste of time.

Therefore, such organizations as a whole change very slowly (Bolman & Deal, 2013). In short, professional bureaucracies do not have a very flexible structure, and there are difficulties in the process of adaptation to managerial innovations (Mintzberg, 1983).

When the professional bureaucracy is considered in terms of educational organizations, it can be said that teachers see themselves as professionals who need enough autonomy to use their experience and judgments to find the best way for students to learn, and they consider schools as organizations that are called professional bureaucracies (Bolman & Deal, 2013). However, for a school to be defined as a professional bureaucracy, it should have teachers who observe their work, participate in teamwork, collaborate with colleagues, share instructional leadership, and the structure should be based on democratic relations among professionals rather than centralization (Hoy & Miskel, 2010).

Divisionalised structure: The units in the organization are separated from each other in terms of their technical and managerial characteristics. Each separated unit has its structure. Therefore, the level of centralization is low. Specialization levels differ from unit to unit (Yeloğlu, 2011). Therefore, in such organizations, a large part of the work is completed in semi-autonomous units. The disadvantages of this structure can be listed as the strategic apex may lose contact with the work and the organization may become cumbersome in the absence of a measurable and reliable information system (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

Adhocracy: The adhocratic structure is a loose, flexible, mostly horizontally interconnected self-renewing organic form. The first striking feature is the high level of organicization. The level of centralization and formalism is quite low. This type of organizational structure focuses on innovation. The level of expertise in the organization is highly valued and employees are continuously trained. Such organizations exist in dynamic and complex environments (Mintzberg, 1983). In such environments, the flexible structure functions as an organizational tent. Inconsistency and instability in the environment can foster a sense of discovery, self-evaluation, and learning (Hedberg, Bystrom & Starbuck, 1976). The organization is dominated by horizontal communication channels and informal communication channels. There are teams of experts to solve problems. Employees are flexible enough to adapt to situations in the environment (Muijen & Kopman, 1994).

Even though schools, which are the most functional element of the education system, usually fit into one of simple structure, machine bureaucracy, or professional bureaucracy, most schools are usually a hybrid of these three ideal types (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). However, the

ideal is for schools to have a professional bureaucratic structure because teaching is a profession and a professional job.

CONCLUSION

According to Mintzberg's (1983) structure model, an organization consists of five different components: strategic apex, technostructure, middle line, support staff, and operating core. The strategic apex, which includes the board of directors, the owner of the organization, and/or the managers, constitutes the highest level of the organization. The technostructure includes experts, technicians, and analysts who standardize, measure, and control outputs and processes. The middle line is managers who are not part of the senior management team but who have the task of directing and managing staff within their units. Support staff are individuals who work in units established to provide support to the organization and perform specific functions outside the operation of the workflow. The operating core consists of individuals who fulfill the basic function of the organization by working on tasks directly related to the goods or services produced. Mintzberg stated that different organizational structures emerge in line with the characteristics of the dominant component of these components. These organizational structures are simple structure, machine bureaucracy, professional bureaucracy, divided structure, and adhocracy (Mintzberg, 1983).

When the organizational structure of MoNE is examined in the context of Mintzberg's components, the strategic apex of MoNE consists of the Minister of National Education and Deputy Ministers. The technostructure includes experts working within the Ministry. Middle-line managers are those in charge of directorates and presidencies such as the General Directorate of Basic Education, the General Directorate of Secondary Education, and the Inspection Board. Employees working under the Ministry such as Press and Public Relations Consultancy, Private Secretary Directorate, and General Directorate of Legal Services constitute the support staff. Finally, in terms of the education system, the operating core is composed of education workers working in institutions affiliated with provincial and foreign organizations. However, considering the size and hierarchical order of MoNE's organizational structure, it should not be ignored that each component also has hierarchical characteristics within itself. For example, it is possible to examine the provincial and foreign organizations, which are operating core of the Ministry, in terms of Mintzberg's components. Therefore, it can be stated that the analysis made here at the MoNE level provides a general framework.

Mintzberg (2014) emphasizes that technostructure is very important in terms of ensuring standardization in the work of the organization, reducing the need for direct supervision, and states that in a fully developed organization technostructure should function at all levels of the hierarchy. In this sense, the MoNE first attempted to meet the need for specialists with Decree-Law No. 652 (Resmi Gazete, 2011). The current structure of the MoNE was regulated by the 1st Presidential Decree. Article 332 of this decree continued to include the statement "In the central organization of the Ministry; National Education Experts and Deputy National Education Experts are employed according to the additional Article 41 of the Law No. 657." (Resmi Gazete, 2018). Although the employment of experts within the MoNE is a positive development, it should be noted that this initiative has not spread to all levels of the hierarchy. Therefore, to achieve an organizational structure in line with Mintzberg's structure model, it is thought that experts should be employed in provincial and district national education directorates and schools, which constitute the operating core of educational services. When the organizational structure of MoNE is evaluated according to Mintzberg's classification of organizational structure, it can be said that the current structure is a mix of machine bureaucracy and professional bureaucracy. The features of the MoNE structure that resemble machine bureaucracy are that the structure is hierarchical, rules and regulations are very important in the organization, important decisions are made by the strategic apex, control through standardized procedures is at the forefront in the supervision of work, in other words, compliance control is at the forefront, there are many levels between the strategic apex and operating core, authority is based on duty or position. However, the main characteristic of machine bureaucracies is that they have a very large technostructure and a high level of standardization of work processes. In the case of education, it is not possible to talk about a high degree of standardization of work because education is a multivariate and complex process that is shaped according to the interests, needs, and expectations of individuals. Moreover, the environment of machine bureaucracies is simple and stable. However, in a period of rapid change and transformation, the environment of educational organizations cannot be expected to be simple and stable because many interest groups affect the education system, which is one of the social subsystems.

MoNE's organizational structure has the characteristics of a professional bureaucracy in that the operating core is large, especially compared to the technostructure, the organizational structure is not very flexible, and there are difficulties in the process of adaptation to administrative innovations. However, the fact that standardization of skills is a key element in this type of organization, that the control of professional organizational employees is largely

based on professional training and professional teachings, that authority is based on knowledge and expertise, and that the management structure is quite horizontal is incompatible with the organizational structure of MoNE.

However, considering that education is a professional job and profession, it is thought that every employee in the education system should be a professional and the structure should evolve from machine bureaucracy to a professional structure due to the nature of education. To achieve this, in addition to the job and role definitions of each position in the education system, competency definitions should also be made and the individuals to be brought to these positions should be selected in line with these competencies.

REFERENCES

Ahmady, G. A., Mehrpour, M., & Nikooravesh, A. (2016). Organizational structure. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *230*, 455-462.

Arslan, M. M., & Atasayar, H. H. (2008). *Ideas of the provincial managers of the Ministry of National Education about localization. Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences, 41*(2), 59-79.

Aydın, M. (2010). *Eğitim yönetimi* (9. Baskı). Hatiboğlu.

Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive.* Harvard University.

Başaran, İ. E. (2000). *Eğitim yönetimi: Nitelikli okul* (4th edition)*.* Feryal.

Başaran, İ. E., & Çınkır, Ş. (2011). *Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi.* Ekinoks.

Bierstedt, R. (1970). *The social order* (3rd edition). McGraw-Hill.

Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (2013). *Örgütleri anlamak: Yetenek, tercih ve liderlik.* Ahmet Aypay ve Abdurrahman Tanrıöğen (Çev.) (4. Baskı). Seçkin.

Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2010). *Eğitim yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış* (15. Basım). Pegem.

Çınkır, Ş. (2010). Eğitim örgütlerinde yeniden yapılanma ve kapasite geliştirme: AB ülkelerinden örnekler. Ekinoks.

Dalton, D. R, Todor, W. D., Spendolini, M. J., Fielding, G. J., & Porter, L. W. (1980). Organizational structure and performance: a critical review. *Academy of Management Review, 5*(1), 49-64.

Demir, H., & Okan, T. (2009). Teknoloji, örgüt yapısı ve performans arasındaki ilişkiler üzerine bir araştırma. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, *10*(1), 57-72.

Demir-Tümen, S. (2014). *Liselerde bürokratikleşme düzeyine ilişkin öğretmen algıları: Bolu ili örneği* [Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi]. Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi.

Doğan, İ. (2004). *Toplum ve eğitim.* Pegem.

Efil, İ. (2010). *İşletmelerde yönetim ve organizasyon* (11th edition). Dora.

Erdoğan, İ. (1991). *İşletmelerde davranış.* İşletme Fakültesi İşletme İktisadı Enstitüsü.

Erkut, H. (2009). *Yönetimin izleri: Yönetim düşüncesinin evrimi.* Yalın.

Ghani, K. A., Jayabalan, V., & Sugumar, M. (2002). Impact of advanced manufacturing technology on organizational structure. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research, 13*, 157-175.

Griffin, R. W., & Moorhead, G. (2013). *Organizational behavior: Managing people and organizations* (11. Basım). South Western Cengage Learning.

Gürsel, M. (1997). *Okul yönetimi.* Mikro.

Hedberg, B. L. T., Nystrom, P. C., & Starbuck, W. H. (1976). Camping on seesaws: Prescriptions for a self-designing organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21*, 41-65.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C.G. (2010). *Eğitim yönetimi: Teori, araştırma ve uygulama* (7.Baskıdan Çeviri). S. Turan (Çev. Ed.). Nobel.

Hunt, R. G. (1970). Technology and organization. *Academy of Management Journal, 13*, 236-252.

Katıtaş, S. (2019). Organizma metaforunun eğitim örgütlerine yansımaları. *IBAD Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *5*, 329-342.

Kondakçı, Y., & Zayim, M. (2013). Yönetim süreçleri. S. Özdemir (Edt.), *Eğitim yönetiminde kuram ve uygulama* (s. 9-57). Pegem.

Lam, A. (2010). Innovative organizations: Structure, learning, and adaptation. In *Innovation Perspectives for the 21st Century* (pp. 163-175). BBVA.

Larsen, K. R., & McInerney, C. R. (2002). Preparing to work in the virtual organization. *Information & Management*, *39*(6), 445-456.

Memduhoğlu, H. B. (2010). Yönetim Düşüncesinin evrimi ve yönetişim. H.B. Memduhoğlu ve K. Yılmaz (Eds.), *Yönetimde yeni yaklaşımlar* içinde (pp.1-29). Pegem.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations.* Prentice Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Structure in fives: designing effective organizations.* Prentice-Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (2014). *Örgütler ve yapıları.* Ahmet Aypay (Çev. Edt.). Nobel.

Muijen van, J. J., & Koopman, P.L. (1994). The influence of national culture on organizational culture: A Comparative study between 10 countries. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist, 4*(4), 367-380.

Önday, Ö. (2016). Modern structural organization theory: From mechanistic vs. organic systems of burns & stalker to technology of Burton & Obel. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, *4*(2), 30-46.

Özalp, İ. (1992). *Yönetim ve organizasyon*. Anadolu Üniversitesi Açıköğretim.

Özalp, İ. (2012). Örgütleme. In C. Koparal (Edt.), *Yönetim ve organizasyon* (pp. 106-123). Anadolu Üniversitesi Açıköğretim.

Özden, Y. (2010). *Eğitimde yeni değerler: Eğitimde dönüşüm.* (8. Baskı). Pegem.

Özer, A., & Görgülü, Z. (2020). Planning and writing a scientific review. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 23*(3), 698-713.

Özkalp, E. & Kırel, Ç. (2011). *Örgütsel davranış* (5. Baskı). Ekin.

Parthasarthy, R. & Sethi, S. P. (1992). The impact of flexible automation on business strategy and organizational structure. *Academy of Management Review, 17*(1), 86-111.

Resmî Gazete (2011). *Millî Eğitim Bakanlığının Teşkilat ve Görevleri Hakkında Kanun Hükmünde Kararname* (Karar Sayısı: KHK/652).

Resmî Gazete (2018). *Cumhurbaşkanlığı Teşkilatı Hakkında Cumhurbaşkanlığı Kararnamesi* (Karar Sayısı: 1).

Sezgin, F. (2013). Sosyal bir sistem olarak okul. S. Özdemir (Ed.), *Eğitim yönetiminde kuram ve uygulama* (ss. 63-98). Pegem.

Taymaz, H. (2011). *Okul yönetimi* (10. Baskı). Pegem.

Tekarslan, E., Baysal, A. C, Şencan, H. & Kılınç, T. (1989). *Sosyal psikoloji.* Filiz.

Türk Dil Kurumu (2022). Hiyerarşi. Retrieved November 14, 2023 from https://sozluk.gov.tr/

Yeloğlu, H.O. (2011). Türk toplumsal kültürünün örgüt yapılarına olan etkilerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir çalışma. *Ordu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2*(4), 153-170.