

The Relationship between Teachers' Perceptions of Organizational Culture and School Capacity for Change¹

Didem KOŐAR², Ali ađatay KILIN³, Serkan KOŐAR⁴,
Emre ER⁵ & Zeki ĐDEM⁶

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between organizational culture and school capacity for change. A total of 415 teachers employed in 20 primary schools in Kastamonu, Turkey participated in this study. The "School Capacity for Change Scale" and the "Organizational Culture Scale" were used to gather data. Mean, standard deviation, correlation, and regression analyses were performed to analyze the data. Results indicated that school capacity for change and school culture was positively and significantly correlated and that school capacity for change was a significant predictor of school culture. Results of the study were discussed with respect to improving teacher self-efficacy.

Key Words: School capacity for change, Organizational culture, Teacher, Primary school

 DOI Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12973/jesr.2016.62.3>

¹ This study is the expanded form of the proceeding that was presented in the '11th National Education Administration Congress' organized by Dokuz Eylöl University Buca Education Faculty between May 12-14, 2016.

² Assist. Prof. Dr. - Hacettepe University Faculty of Education - didemkosar@hacettepe.edu.tr

³ Assoc. Prof. Dr. - Karabuk University Faculty of Letters - cagataykilinc@karabuk.edu.tr

⁴ PhD. - Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education - skosar@gazi.edu.tr

⁵ Res. Assist. - Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education - eremre@gmail.com

⁶ PhD. - Ahi Evran University Faculty of Education - zekiogdem15@hotmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Culture is regarded as an important concept for organizations, and scholars have recently exerted significant time and effort on investigating the concept of culture in the field of educational administration (Balekoğlu, 1992; Benda, 2000; Cameron & Quinn, 2011; Chang & Lin, 2007; Deal & Kennedy, 1982, 2000; Handy, 1981; Harrison, 1972; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Koşar & Yalçınkaya, 2013; Koşar, 2008; Koşar & Çalık, 2011; Miller, 2001; Neumann, 1997; Reeves, 2006; Schein, 1992; Şişman, 2002; Terzi, 1999, 2005). The concept of organizational culture was put forward in the early 1980s, and started to be used widely in the field of management (Hofstede, 1997). Schein (1992) defines the organizational culture as a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. According to Robbins (1990), the organizational culture provides management with conveniences by supporting the power of the organization's authority structure with the cultural structure of the organization.

Organizational culture is considered as an important concept in terms of organizations' renewing themselves and adapting to changing conditions. Within this context, there are a line of studies emphasizing that school culture should support organizational change (Dalin, 1998; Fullan, 1999; Özdemir, 2000; Seashore, 2009). According to the results of the previous research on change capacity for school, school administrators and teachers take more responsibility for increasing the learning capacity of school in a culture where change is supported (Feiman-Nemser, 2003; Goh, Cousins, & Elliott, 2006; Jurasaitė-Harbison & Rex, 2010; Lieberman, 1995). To create an organizational change culture, therefore, there is a need for employees who are capable of questioning the change and can actively participate in decision-making processes (Wanberg & Banas, 2000), because success is more likely in a dynamic environment (Rosenberg & Mosca, 2011).

There is a need for structural and cultural change in order for schools to meet the demands of society and for students to succeed and learn more effectively within the current structure (Moos, Johansson, & Day, 2011; Schlechty, 2004; Stoll & Seashore Louis, 2007). In this regard, school capacity for change is defined as enabling teachers and school as a whole to learn continuously in order to diversify the learning opportunities of students (Stoll, 2009). In other words, effective schools are expected to have a strong teaching culture in order to provide their employees with a continuous professional improvement opportunity (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Harris & Hopkins, 2000). Another study, which investigated the organizational conditions required for managing change in school with a participative leadership mentality, highlighted that both individual leadership capacity and collective leadership capacity should be improved for a successful change in school (Parsley, 2011). The same study also mentioned that collaboration culture was important for collectively conducting the process of change within schools. From this perspective, the success of change in school is closely associated with school culture, besides the individual motivations and professional skills of teachers (Dalin, 1998). A school's dynamic structure should be examined, and its distinctive characteristics should be focused on in order to generalize its collaboration culture (Fullan, 1999). Although professional expertise levels of teachers have a considerable effect on successful change practices in education (Fullan, 1993), school improvement is essentially an effort to ensure the improvement of teachers and to

create a school culture supporting change and improvement (Harris, 2002). Consequently, a culture-supporting change is likely to generalize collaboration among teachers and enable change to be understood by teachers.

Organizational Culture

Culture is a priority concept that is important for organizations. Organizations do not 'have' a culture, but in fact they 'are' the culture itself; which is the reason why it is so difficult for culture to be changed (Frost, Moore, Louis, Lundberg, & Martin, 1985). People playing leadership roles in an organization are very important for its organizational culture. Leaders create the culture of an organization which, in turn, creates the next generation of leaders (Schein, 1992; Steers, Sanchez-Runde, & Nardon, 2010). It is sometimes difficult for people to know and evaluate the culture in which they live and belong. In other words, the use of culture by people may make such a culture invisible to them. Regardless of the influences of a culture existing within an organization on people, such a culture needs to first be understood correctly in order for it to be changed or utilized (Healthfield, 2008). On the other hand, Morgan (2006) argues that it is difficult to externally evaluate or reason about an existing culture, because a situation which seems unacceptable externally can be quite reasonable when it is addressed within the organization.

It is accepted that every organization has a unique dominant common culture. This dominant culture is not a sum of the sub-cultures existing in the organization, but is made up of certain visible or invisible parts shared by organizational members such as beliefs, values, norms, and symbols. A common school culture emerges only when people in the school participate in the social interaction process equally (Hoy & Miskel, 1991; Koşar & Yalçınkaya, 2013; Şişman, 2002). Cultural structure is a meaningful and important source for teachers, students, and administrators in regard to how they perceive school culture. School culture functions as a compass for employees to act collectively, and sets norms in respect to what they are supposed to achieve (Sergiovanni, 2001). School administrators have a potential influence on the characteristics of schools. In the mutual socialization process, both the new administrator accepts the values and norms of the school, and the school adapts to the new administrator. Personal characteristics of the administrator and organizational characteristics play an important role in this adaptation process (Balci, 2003).

Organizational culture consists of certain forms among coordinated systems of action and differences gaining continuity. It drives these systems to respond to the same stimulus in different ways. When organizations confront changing environmental conditions, some of them prefer to keep their traditional behaviors, while others adopt new behaviors, manners, and methods (Wilson, 1991). Thus, a great variety of classifications are put forward with regard to organizational culture. Some of them are as follows: (i) Harrison's (1972) and Handy's (1981) role culture (Apollo), task culture (Athena), power culture (Zeus), and person culture (Dionysus); (ii) Schneider's (1999) control culture, collaboration culture, competence culture, and cultivation culture; (iii) Deal and Kennedy's (1982, 2000) tough-guy, macho culture, work hard/play hard culture, bet-your-company culture, and process culture; (iv) Kets de Vries and Miller's (1986) paranoid culture, avoidant culture, charismatic culture, bureaucratic culture, and politicized culture; (v) Cameron and Quinn's (2011) hierarchy culture, market culture, clan culture, and adhocracy culture; (vi) Sethia and Glinow's (1985) apathetic culture, caring culture, exacting culture, and integrative culture; (vii) Pheyssey's (1993) role culture, achievement culture, power culture, and support culture; (viii) Kono's

(1992) vitalized culture, follow-the-leader and vitalized culture, bureaucratic culture, stagnant culture, and stagnant and follow-the-leader culture; (ix) Chang and Lin's (2007) cooperativeness culture, innovativeness culture, consistency culture, and effectiveness culture; (x) Hofstede's (2001) power distance, uncertainty avoidance, femininity-masculinity, individualism-collectivism, and short-long term orientation.

This current study was based on Terzi's (2005) classification of support culture, bureaucratic culture, achievement culture, and task culture. *Support culture* is based on human relations and trust relationships. There are interrelations and mutual attachment among organizational members. Trust and confidence, concrete support, high-level expectation for achievement, honest and open communication, and protection of information networks and important things are essential among organizational members. Within organizations of a *bureaucratic culture*, there are rational and legal structures. This culture, which is free from personal relationships, spreads through an administrator's desire to have control over practices. Detailed definitions are used by management in order to control the organization. Rules and standards increase. There is a strong emphasis on following the standards and rules. Instead of rules, the performance of works and the accomplishment of goals are in the foreground within organizations where *achievement culture* is dominant. Individual responsibility is featured, and problems are solved properly. These kinds of organizations support those members who perform their works duly. The focal point of *task culture* is organizational goals. Organizations where this culture is prevalent are referred to as work-centered organizations. In these organizations, everything is goal-oriented. Organizational goals, rather than individual goals, are prioritized.

School Capacity for Change

Organizations having a nature of open system need to develop and sustain a successful change process in the dimensions of structure, strategy, and goal in parallel with changing environmental conditions and social demands. Organizational change refers to a change in various sub-systems of an organization and to various relationships between such systems (Çalık, 2003). Even though a considerable progress has been made in the management of organizational change theoretically, it is thought-provoking that unsuccessful change practices have increased gradually (Burnes, 2009).

Upon examining organizational change practices periodically, Floyd (2002) stresses that organizational change should be considered within the context of competences and capacities of organizations. Thus, it can be argued that organizations need to improve their capacities so that change can be realized and sustained. The success of a change in an organization largely depends on the belief of employees in it besides their eagerness to learn (Özdemir, 2000). In other words, it is important that organizational change is institutionalized by taking into consideration the beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors of employees regarding change.

In consideration of the fact that change in education should be arranged flexibly and by adopting an attitude sensitive to environmental changes rather than focusing on pre-determined organization goals (Fullan, 2007), it is possible to argue that long-term goals aimed at strengthening communication and collaboration in schools should be set to achieve successful change (Harris, 2002; Lashway, 1997). School capacity for change is an important concept that is featured for the successful realization of change in schools where there is an intense mutual interaction and communication. According to Fullan (1993), there is a need

for *shared vision, personal mastery, and collaboration for teaching* among colleagues in order to improve school capacity for change. However, traditional school models have quite a limited school vision, which is necessary for change, and a limited organizational capacity required for accomplishing relevant goals (Hinde, 2003). In other words, traditional school models mostly do not have the organizational qualifications required for shaping the future of school and integrating employees for common goals.

When change in school is addressed in the context of capacity, it is aimed to improve the organizational capacity of school. In the most general sense, capacity enhancement aims at improving the current academic quality at the classroom and schools level. In addition, capacity enhancement may improve school capacity to manage change (Hopkins, 2001). An important difference of capacity enhancement approach from other change approaches is that it refers to a comprehensive development process involving both the organizational structure and the schools' employees (Levin, 2008). Addressing school capacity for change within the framework of the 'Chaos Theory', it was stated by Hannay, Smeltzer-Erb, and Ross (2001) that changes in the organizational structure and culture of schools had a dialectical nature. Accordingly, it was reported that changes in the organizational structure and culture of school could affect each other directly or indirectly, and that the efforts of various sub-groups in school for enhancing school capacity for change and changing its culture were very important. Similarly, Harris (2002) emphasizes that since schools are the center of a network of intense relationships, coordination and collaboration are of vital importance for change capacity.

It is very unlikely for a change model prepared outside of the school to be successful inside the school. Thus, to ensure a successful school development, it is necessary to enhance each school's capacity to manage change and development (Muijs & Harris, 2006). According to Hopkins (2007), while planning education reforms, the needs and goals of schools should be determined according to different development levels, and the policy-making processes aimed at enriching the learning sources of students in schools of different levels should be supported by the appropriate data obtained from schools. It is unlikely that a change planned without taking the school into consideration can be influential on classroom practices, even if implemented in the school (Fullan, 2007). Therefore, focusing on change without improving school capacity for change and its internal dynamics would just be a temporary and ineffectual effort (Harris & Hopkins, 2000).

Contrary to the common idea that the biggest support should come from outside for a successful change in school, the more important thing is to enhance the organizational capacity for managing a successful school change and improvement (Lezotte, 2005). In addition, it can be suggested that teachers in schools with a high change capacity are eager for and successful in applying innovative approaches in school (Hopkins, 2001). Thus, enhancing school capacity for change can be regarded as school's learning how to change. Successful schools take responsibility for their organizational development through an effective internal control (Fullan, 1999). In addition, an approach putting school in the center and determining the needs of each school concerning organizational structure and human resources should be adopted for a successful change in education. The new paradigm in school development practices focuses on the arrangement of change in the processes of planning, implementing, and feedback according to the needs and development level of school. In consideration of the fact that the development needs of teachers vary depending

on their ages, experiences, and branches, the contributions to be made to teachers both personally and in relation to their fields should be determined beforehand in the change planning process (Harris, 2002).

The current study addressed school capacity for change within the context of human resources capacity. Thus, it was deemed suitable to examine school capacity for change based on the perceptions of teachers who were expected to enhance it by diversifying teaching methods inside the classroom and by increasing collaborative opportunities outside of the classroom. School capacity for change was addressed in the dimensions of *shared vision, collaboration, and personal mastery*.

The related literature is quite limited with findings on the relationship between organizational culture and change capacity, albeit there are a range of studies dealing with the relationship between organizational culture and leadership (Balekoğlu, 1992; Benda, 2000; Miller, 2001; Reeves, 2006), power sources in management (Koşar, 2008; Koşar & Çalık, 2011), organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational trust (Koşar & Yalçınkaya, 2013), organizational performance (Lim, 1995), along with studies investigating the effects of organizational culture on organizational structure (Neumann, 1997; Uğuz, 1999), organizational culture in private high schools and public high schools (Terzi, 1999), the determination of the cultural structure in primary schools (Terzi, 2005), and the importance of organizational culture for organizational development (Özsoy, 2005). Thus, it was considered that the current study would make a significant contribution to the literature by revealing the explanatory and predictive relationships between the change capacity and organizational cultures of primary schools. Fullan (2007) argues that school change practices cannot be managed effectively without taking the within-school dynamics into account as they are influential on the success of school change process. Seashore (2009) also claims that the role of culture on school change process should be investigated in order to manage change effectively. Thus, the current study may well contribute to the relevant literature by revealing the predictive role of school culture on change capacity for school. Muijs and Harris (2006) stress there is a strong positive correlation between the qualities of organization's human sources and school capacity for change. Therefore, findings from this study aim to shed some light on which type of culture (support, bureaucratic, achievement and task cultures) fosters or hinders school capacity for change that may help school administrators, practitioners, and policy makers find various ways to develop human resources in the organization. Thus, the current study addressed following research questions:

1. Is there any significant relationship between the characteristics of organizational culture and the perceptions of primary school teachers concerning school capacity for change?
2. Are the perceptions of primary school teachers concerning organizational culture dimensions a significant predictor of school capacity for change?

METHOD

Model

The current study, which investigates the relationships between the perceptions of primary school teachers concerning school capacity for change and organizational culture, employed correlational research model for the research. The dependent variable of the study

was change capacity (*shared vision, collaboration, personal mastery*), while the independent variable consisted of organizational culture dimensions (*support, achievement, bureaucratic, task*).

Sample

This study was conducted in primary schools located in the city center of Kastamonu, Turkey, during the 2013-2014 academic year. A total of 415 teachers participated in the study, all of whom were employed by 20 primary schools chosen through random sampling method. Out of these, 146 (35.2%) were male, 269 (64.8%) were female; 90 (21.6%) were in the 25 to 29 age group, 130 (31.32%) were in the 30 to 35 age group, 53 (12.77%) were in the 36 to 40 age group, and 142 (34.21%) were 41 years old or over; 29 (6.5%) had an associate's degree, 327 (79.1%) a bachelor's degree, and 59 (14.2%) a master's degree; 135 (32.5%) had a seniority of 1 to 7 years, 118 (28.4%) had a seniority of 8 to 14 years, 100 (24.1%) had a seniority of 15 to 21 years, and 62 (14.9%) had a seniority of 22 years and more.

Measures

This study used a questionnaire with three parts to collect data. The first part included the *Personal Information Form* addressing the demographic characteristics of participants such as gender, age, professional seniority, and educational background. The second part was comprised of the *Change Capacity Scale*, which aimed at determining change capacity and the last part included the *Organizational Culture Scale* to measure teachers' perceptions on school culture.

Organizational Culture Scale: The scale developed by Terzi (2005) has a four-dimensional structure, consisting of 29 items on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The scale's four dimensions are: eight items on *support culture* (sample items: (a) People like each other in this school, (b) All kinds of opportunities are provided for professional improvement in this school); six items on *achievement culture* (sample items: (a) Successful teachers and students are rewarded in this school, (b) The biggest prize is achieving something); nine items on *bureaucratic culture* (sample items: (a) Hierarchy is featured in this school, (b) Harsh measures are taken against the violation of rules in this school); and six items on *task culture* (sample items: (a) The first priority is the performance of the works specified in the program, (b) The principle is to work for being "better" than other schools). The scale employs a rating scale from 1 (never) through to 5 (always). Reliability and validity studies on the scale indicated that a total variance explained by the four-factor structure as being approximately 51%. Internal consistency coefficients concerning the factors of the scale varied between .76 (for bureaucratic culture) and .88 (for support culture) (Terzi, 2005). In the current study, item correlations, which were calculated to test the reliability of the scale, varied between .46 and .62, while the internal consistency coefficient was found to be .88.

Change Capacity Scale: This scale was developed by Er (2013) within the scope of a master's thesis. It consists of 5-point Likert-type scale comprised of 26 items. The sub-dimensions of the scale were nine items on *shared vision* (sample items: (a) This school has an open vision, (b) School vision is referenced in meetings in this school); six items on *collaboration* (sample items: (a) Teachers are content with collaborating in this school, (b) Teachers are not concerned with the teaching activities of other teachers in this school); and eleven items on *personal mastery* (sample items: (a) Teachers exert an effort for students to be more successful in this school, (b) Teachers seek possible reasons for failure of students, if

any). The scale employs a rating scale from "I Strongly Disagree = 1" through to "I Strongly Agree = 5". The reliability and validity studies of the scale indicated that the total variance explained by the three-factor structure was approximately 46%. Internal consistency coefficients concerning the factors of the scale were found to be .87 for shared vision, .72 for collaboration, and .83 for personal mastery (Er, 2013). In the current study, item total correlations, which were calculated to test the reliability of the scale, varied between .42 and .72, while the internal consistency coefficient was found to be .91.

Data Analysis

The SPSS 15 statistical analysis computer program was used for data analysis. Mean scores for the dimensions of school culture and school capacity for change were calculated by dividing the sums by the number of items in each scale. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated in order to determine the relationship between the study variables. Then, multiple linear regression analysis with enter method was performed to determine whether or not the dimensions of school culture significantly predicted the dimensions of school capacity for change. Beta (β) coefficient and results for *t*-test were also considered to render the regression analysis results (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu, & Büyüköztürk, 2012).

Before performing the analyses, incorrect data were removed from the dataset and some of the assumptions of multiple linear regression analysis such as multicollinearity and autocorrelation were tested. Furthermore, measures of central tendency were tested such as mode, median and arithmetic mean. Coefficients of skewness were also examined and the values were seen to be within acceptable levels ranging from +1.5 and -1.5 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Scatter graphs were analyzed for linearity relationships among variables and results illustrated that there were no variables whose VIF value were more than 10 and tolerance value was under .20. Furthermore, Condition Index (CI) values ranged from 11.67 to 27.98. Finally, the Durbin-Watson value was calculated as 2.06 indicating no serious autocorrelation problem among the variables (Çokluk et al., 2012).

FINDINGS

Arithmetic Mean, Standard Deviation Values Related to the Variables, and Relationships between the Variables

Table 1 presents the arithmetic mean and standard deviation values related to the research variables, as well as the relationships between the dependent and independent variables.

Table 1. *Arithmetic mean, standard deviation, and correlation values of the variables*

Variables	\bar{X}	S	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Support culture	3.66	.67	-						
2. Achievement culture	3.60	.72	.82**	-					
3. Bureaucratic culture	3.20	.56	.20**	.22**	-				
4. Task culture	3.91	.63	.59**	.56**	.19**	-			
5. Shared vision	3.50	.67	.68**	.66**	.13**	.55**	-		
6. Collaboration	3.79	.59	.63**	.52**	.12**	.49**	.62**	-	
7. Personal mastery	3.96	.54	.57**	.47**	.20**	.59**	.66**	.69**	-

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 1 indicates that according to the teachers' perceptions, task culture ($\bar{X}=3.91$), one of the sub-dimensions of organizational culture, overweighed and was followed by support culture ($\bar{X}=3.66$). As to school capacity for change, teachers' perceptions on the personal mastery was the highest rated ($\bar{X}=3.96$), whereas shared vision was the least ($\bar{X}=3.50$). The correlation results demonstrated that there was a high-level positive relationship between support culture and achievement culture ($r=.82$, $p<.01$), and a medium-level, positive, and significant relationship between support culture and task culture ($r=.59$, $p<.01$). Findings also illustrated that there were positive and significant relationships between the perceptions of shared vision, collaboration, and personal mastery. Positive, medium-level, and significant relationships were detected between personal mastery and collaboration perceptions ($r=.69$, $p<.01$), between personal mastery and shared vision perceptions ($r=.66$, $p<.01$), and between collaboration and shared vision perceptions ($r=.62$, $p<.01$).

School Culture's Level of Predicting

Table 2 presents the regression analysis results concerning the prediction of the sub-dimensions of school change capacity by each sub-dimension of school culture.

Table 2. Regression analysis results concerning the dimensions of school change capacity

Variables	Support			Achievement			Bureaucratic			Task		
	β	t	p	β	t	p	β	t	p	β	t	p
Shared vision $R=.72$, $R^2=.52$ $F_{(3-411)}=112.02$, $p=.00$.34	5.46	.00	.28	4.57	.00	-.04	-1.22	.22	.20	4.72	.00
Collaboration $R=.65$, $R^2=.42$ $F_{(3-411)}=75.13$, $p=.00$.54	7.81	.00	-.02	-.26	.80	-.02	-.47	.64	.19	4.06	.00
Personal mastery $R=.66$, $R^2=.43$ $F_{(3-411)}=78.62$, $p=.00$.39	5.73	.00	-.08	-1.13	.26	.06	1.61	.11	.39	8.37	.00

As can be seen from Table 2, there was a high-level positive and significant relationship between the perceptions of the teachers on school cultures and shared vision dimension of school change capacity ($R=.72$, $p<.05$). These predictive variables explained 52% of the total variance in shared vision scores. The t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients indicated that such sub-dimensions of culture as support ($t=5.46$, $p<.05$), achievement ($t=4.57$, $p<.05$), and task culture ($t=4.72$, $p<.05$) were significant predictors of shared vision, while bureaucratic school culture did not significantly predict shared vision ($t=-1.22$, $p>.05$). Based on the standardized regression analysis coefficients, the order of importance was as follows: support culture ($\beta=.34$), achievement culture ($\beta=.28$), and task culture ($\beta=.20$).

Table 2 reveals a high-level positive and significant relationship between the perceptions of the teachers on school cultures and collaboration dimension of school change capacity ($R=.65$, $p<.05$). These predictive variables explained 42% of the total variance in collaboration scores. The t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients indicated that such sub-dimensions of culture as support ($t=7.81$, $p<.05$) and task culture

($t=4.06$, $p<.05$) predicted collaboration significantly while achievement ($t=-.26$, $p>.05$) and bureaucratic culture ($t=-.47$, $p>.05$) did not significantly predict collaboration. Based on the standardized regression analysis coefficients, the order of importance was support culture ($\beta = .54$) and then task culture ($\beta = .19$).

Table 2 demonstrates a high-level positive and significant relationship between the perceptions of the teachers on school cultures and personal mastery dimension of school change capacity ($R=.66$, $p<.05$). These predictive variables explained 43% of the total variance in personal mastery scores. The t-test results regarding the significance of the regression coefficients indicated that sub-dimensions of culture entitled support ($t=5.73$, $p<.05$) and task culture ($t=8.37$, $p<.05$) predicted personal mastery significantly, while achievement ($t=-1.13$, $p>.05$) and bureaucratic culture ($t=1.61$, $p>.05$) did not significantly predict personal mastery. Based on the standardized regression analysis coefficients, findings illustrated that support and task cultures predicted personal mastery sub-dimension of school change capacity at the same importance level ($\beta=.39$).

RESULT, DISCUSSION, AND SUGGESTIONS

This current study examined the relationship between the perceptions of teachers on school capacity for change and school culture. In this regard, the predictability of school culture dimensions by the perceptions of teachers regarding school capacity for change was investigated. Results indicated that support and task-oriented school cultures predicted all sub-dimensions of school capacity for change. The most significant predictor of shared vision and collaboration dimensions of school capacity for change was support culture, while only support culture and task culture significantly predicted personal mastery sub-dimension of school capacity for change.

According to the research findings, personal mastery dimension had the highest-level perception, followed by the dimensions of collaboration and shared vision, respectively. This finding is consistent with findings of Er (2013). The findings of the current study also showed that teachers' perceptions of support culture, achievement culture, and task culture were higher than their bureaucratic culture perceptions. These findings are also supported by previous studies (Koşar & Çalık, 2011; Özdemir, 2012; Sezgin, 2010; Terzi, 2005). Since a bureaucratic organizational culture does not provide teachers with adequate opportunities to express their feelings and opinions freely, organizations with such an organizational culture have weak and non-reliable aspects (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). In addition, it is emphasized that change is likely to fail in schools with a bureaucratic structure (Dalin, 1998). It is therefore not surprising that teachers participating in the current study had the lowest-level perception in the bureaucratic school culture among the school culture dimensions.

The task culture perceptions of the participant teachers had the highest-level correlation with personal mastery, one of the capacity change dimensions. Considering the fact that the personal mastery of a teacher is about them improving their own professional skills and being open to learning, the above-mentioned high-level correlation with task culture was an expected result. Similarly, some studies stress that school culture should enable teachers to fulfill their tasks in the school and encourage them for learning (Feiman-Nemser, 2003; Jurasaitė-Harbison & Rex, 2010; Lieberman, 1995). Furthermore, shared vision had the highest-level correlation with support culture and achievement culture perceptions. Since school vision reflects the values of school and supports the collaboration of teachers, it is addressed together with school culture in the related literature (Harris, 2002; Lashway,

1997). The perceptions of the teachers regarding bureaucratic culture had a positive and significant, but lower relationship with the sub-dimensions of change capacity in comparison to the other dimensions of school culture. That finding may imply that other culture types are more congruent for change and renewal in comparison to bureaucratic culture.

Results revealed that shared vision was predicted positively and significantly by support, achievement and task cultures. Shared vision dimension of the school change capacity denotes that a school has an open vision that is articulated and defended by school administrators and teachers (Er, 2013). Therefore, it is clear from the results that school members share the same vision and regard it a guide for school improvement in support, achievement and task-oriented cultures. Furthermore, Terzi (2005) notes that school members' commitment develops depending on mutual trust and constructive relations in the schools where support culture is adopted. Thus, supporting cultures enable school members to develop a shared vision that articulates the important purposes of school. Moreover, Knapp (1997) argues that building a supportive culture in school fosters both individual and collective efforts in order to conduct change. The literature also clearly shows that achievement culture which is based on teacher collaboration enables school development and creates capacity for change (Barth, 1990; Conzemius & O'Neill, 2001; Harris, 2002).

In task-oriented cultures, as Harrison (1972) argues, the primary purpose is the achievement the goals of the organization. Task-oriented school cultures focus on teaching and school members exert effort and time to improve their teaching skills to help students learn. Therefore, the same purpose may bring school administrators and teachers together on a shared vision of increasing student achievement. Achievement culture, on the other hand, depends more on individual efforts of school community members to increase student learning (Terzi, 2005). In other words, achievement culture refers to teacher effort and success to teach effectively. Sezgin (2010) points out that school members are appreciated and rewarded and their efforts are supported. Thus, it is more likely that teachers adopt and share the vision of school in achievement-oriented cultures. Shared vision of school is considered significant in that it improves collaboration among teachers and enables teachers to exert effort and time for all students to be successful (Moos et al., 2011; Stoll & Seashore Louis, 2007). Therefore, support, achievement and task-oriented cultures foster the processes of building and sharing a school vision that leads teacher effort and performance to improve teaching and learning.

Another result of the study was that support culture was one of the significant predictors of collaboration and personal mastery dimensions of school change capacity. In other words, collaboration and personal mastery flourish in supportive school cultures. One of the basic characteristics of a supportive school culture is that teachers are encouraged to work together with their colleagues to both improve their knowledge and skills to teach well and to contribute to student learning (Hopkins, 2007). Supportive school culture gives teachers a range of opportunities for colleague collaboration which strengthens teacher learning in school, and to take responsibility for improving their teaching skills. Teachers are not isolated from each other and work on common goals together (Terzi, 2005) as supportive cultures fosters both collegial and congenial relationships and trust among school members (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Therefore, it is understandable that supportive school culture plays a special role in teacher collaboration and personal mastery. As Hargreaves (1994) notes, supportive school cultures focus both on student and teacher learning as

effective teacher learning is a precondition for effective student learning. Fullan (1993) also purports that personal mastery denotes an endless process of learning, improving knowledge and skills and making sense of teaching as a profession. From this perspective, supportive school cultures may enable a safe and healthy environment for teacher mastery and professional development. Results also showed that task culture significantly and positively predicted collaboration and personal mastery. This finding may indicate that teachers who try their best to influence student learning positively collaborate with colleagues and develop their professional knowledge and skills in task-oriented cultures. Task-oriented cultures require employees to possess critical professional knowledge and skills because the most critical jobs are assigned to the most qualified employee in these cultures (Handy, 1995; Harrison, 1972). Therefore, teachers employed in schools with task-oriented culture are more likely to collaborate and to sustain their professional development. In another perspective, Baylor and Ritchie (2002) evidenced that personal mastery level of teachers was closely associated with openness to change and that teachers who were open to change were more likely to have a clearer and deeper understanding of the profession. Thus, the results of the current study may reflect that teachers need to find unique ways to improve their professional knowledge and skills and to collaborate with others to be an important part of the task-oriented school culture.

Results of the current study finally revealed that bureaucratic school culture did not significantly predict any dimensions of school change capacity. In parallel with this, Kılınç (2014) reported that school bureaucratic culture negatively correlated with teacher professionalism. Teacher professionalism depends on teacher collaboration and continuous professional development. Bureaucratic school culture is heavily characterized by standards, procedures and rules to be obeyed by the members of organizations. Job descriptions of employees are detailed and formal procedures include all the steps to be followed by each employee within the organization (Terzi, 2005). Therefore, employee autonomy is highly restricted which probably hinders teacher collaboration and the teachers' professional development. As schools are bureaucracies and thus administered by a line of rules and hierarchy (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991), two distinctive features entitled formalization and centralization impact school as a whole (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Hoy (2003) states that coercive formalization produces teacher alienation and therefore prevents teachers from collaborating with each other and producing and sharing effective teaching practices. Furthermore, hindering centralization prohibits innovative teacher practices to improve student learning and refers to a school environment where autocratic and control-oriented administrative behavior outweighs teachers' professional behaviors. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that school with bureaucratic school cultures do not ensure a positive and suitable environment for school change capacity to flourish.

The current study concluded that school culture was an important variable predicting school capacity for change. Thus, it is reasonable to suggest that school culture plays a significant role in school's developing capacity for change. Findings demonstrated that teachers had positive perceptions concerning school capacity for change. Furthermore, this study put forward some recommendations for the literature and researchers as well as school administrators and teachers for conducting successful change practices in schools, achieving continuous school improvement, and building an organizational culture supporting learning throughout the school. The study indicated the importance of building a supporting and task-oriented school culture to improve school capacity for change. Therefore, schools should

turn into professional learning communities in which effective learning and teaching practices are generated and shared among members of the school community. Depending on the results of the study, it is also meaningful to suggest that school members work together and collaborate within a supporting and task-oriented culture to sustain school capacity for change. Future studies may examine school capacity for change and school culture by taking schools as the unit of analysis and considering different characteristics. The current study obtained quantitative findings. Similar studies may also be conducted with different samples and school types by employing qualitative methods including interview, observation, etc.

REFERENCES

- Balcı, A. (2003). *Örgütsel sosyalleşme: Kuram, strateji ve taktikler [Organizational socialization: Theory, strategy and tactics]*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Balekoğlu, F. (1992). *Liderlik teorilerindeki gelişmeler ve organizasyon kültürü ile ilişkileri [New trends on leadership theories and the relationships between these theories and organizational culture]* (Unpublished master's thesis). Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Barth, R. (1990). *Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents and principals can make difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baylor, A. L., & Ritchie, D. (2002). What factors facilitate teacher skill, teacher morale, and perceived student learning in technology-using classrooms. *Computers & Education*, 39(4), 395-414.
- Benda, S. M. (2000). *The effect of leadership styles on the disciplinary climate and culture of elementary schools* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Widener University, Chester.
- Burnes, B. (2009). *Managing change*. Essex: Pearson.
- Çalık, T. (2003). Eğitimde stratejik planlama ve okulların stratejik planlama açısından nitel değerlendirilmesi [Strategic planning in education and the qualitative evaluation of the schools as regards to strategic planning]. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 11(2), 251-268.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chang, S. E., & Lin, C. S. (2007). Exploring organizational culture for information security management. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 107(3), 438-458.
- Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G., & Büyüköztürk, B. (2012). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik: SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları [Multivariate statistics for social sciences: SPSS and LISREL applications]* (2nd ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Conzemius, A., & O'Neill, J. (2001). *Building shared responsibility for student learning*. Alexandria, Virginia, USA: ASCD.
- Dalin, P. (1998). *School development*. London: Continuum.
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Deal, T., & Kennedy, A. (2000). *The new corporate cultures: Revitalizing the workplace after downsizing, mergers, and reengineering*. London-New York: TEXERE.
- Er, E. (2013). *İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin algılarına göre okulun değişme açıklığı ile değişim kapasitesi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [Examining the relationships between primary school teachers' perceptions on school openness to change and school change capacity]*. (unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2003). What new teachers need to learn. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 25-29.
- Floyd, P. (2002). *Organizational change*. Oxford: Capstone.

- Frost, P. J., Moore, L. F., Louis, M. R., Lundberg, C. C., & Martin, J. (1985). *Organizational culture* (1st ed.). USA: SAGE.
- Fullan, M. (1993). Why teachers must become change agents. *Educational Leadership*, 50(6), 12-17.
- Fullan, M. (1999). *Change forces the sequel*. Routledge Falmer: London.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. Amsterdam: Teachers College.
- Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Education Research Journal*, 38(4), 915-945.
- Goh, S. C., Cousins, J. B., & Elliott, C. (2006). Organizational learning capacity, evaluative inquiry and readiness for change in schools: Views and perceptions of educators. *Journal of Educational Change*, 7(4), 289-318.
- Handy, C. (1995). *Süper yönetim* [Superb management] (S. Hatay, Trans.). Istanbul, Turkey: İlgı.
- Handy, C. B. (1981). *Understanding organizations* (2nd ed.). London: Hazell Watson & Viney.
- Hannay, L. M., Smeltzer-Erb, C., & Ross, J. A. (2001). Building change capacity within secondary schools through goal-driven and living organizations. *School Leadership & Management* 21(3), 271-287.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. London: Cassell.
- Harris, A. (2002). *School improvement: What is in it for schools?* London: Routledge Falmer.
- Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2000). Introduction to special feature: Alternative perspectives on school improvement. *School Leadership & Management*, 20(1), 9-14.
- Harrison, R. (1972). Understanding your organization's character. *Harvard Business Review*, 50(23), 119-128.
- Healthfield, S. M. (2008). *How to understand your current culture*. Retrieved from http://humanresources.about.com/od/organizationalculture/a/culture_create.htm
- Hersey, H., & Blanchard, K. (1982). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Hinde, E. (2003). *Reflections on reform: A former teacher looks at school change and the factors that shape it*. Retrieved from <http://tla.gmu.edu/module2/hinde.htm>
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and organizations* (2nd ed.). USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). USA: SAGE.
- Hopkins, D. (2001). *School improvement for real*. London: Routledge.
- Hopkins, D. (2007). *Every school a great school: Realizing the potential of system leadership*. Berkshire: Open University.
- Hoy, W. K. (2003). An analysis of enabling and mindful school structures. Some theoretical, research and practical considerations. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(1), 87-108.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1991). *Educational administration*. Boston: McGraw-Hill
- Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Designing better schools: The meaning and nature of enabling school structure. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37, 296-321.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). *Open schools/healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate* (1st ed.). Newbury Park: SAGE.
- Jurasaite-Harbison, E., & Rex, L. A. (2010). School cultures as contexts for informal teacher learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 267-277.

- Kets de Vries, M. F. R., & Miller, D. (1986). Personality, culture, and organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(2), 266-279.
- Kılınc, A. Ç. (2014). Öğretmen profesyonelizminin bir yordayıcısı olarak okul kültürü [School culture as a predictor of teacher professionalism]. *Education & Science*, 39(174), 105-118.
- Knapp, M. S. (1997). Between systemic reforms and the mathematics and science classroom: The dynamics of innovation, implementation, and professional learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 67(2), 227-266.
- Kono, T. (1992). *Long-range planning of Japanese corporations*. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Koşar, D., & Yalçinkaya, M. (2013). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının yordayıcıları olarak örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel güven [Organizational culture and organizational trust as predictors of teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors]. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 19(4), 603-627.
- Koşar, S. (2008). *İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin yönetimde gücü kullanma stilleri ile örgüt kültürü arasındaki ilişki* [The relationships between primary school supervisors' styles of using power in management and organizational culture] (unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Koşar, S., & Çalık, T. (2011). Okul yöneticilerinin yönetimde gücü kullanma stilleri ile örgüt kültürü arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between primary school administrators' styles of using power in management and organizational culture]. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 17(4), 581-603.
- Lashway, L. (1997). *Leading with vision*. Eugene, Oregon: Clearinghouse on educational management.
- Levin, B. (2008). These may be good times: An argument that things are getting better. In C. Sugrue (Ed.), *The future of educational change* (pp. 34-47). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Lezotte, L. W. (2005). More effective schools: Professional learning communities in action. In R. Dufour, R. Eaker, & R. Dufour (Eds.), *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities* (pp. 177-193). Bloomington: Solution Tree.
- Lieberman, A. (1995). *Practices that support teacher development: Transforming conceptions of professional learning*. Innovating and evaluating science education forum.
- Lim, B. (1995). Examining the organizational culture and organizational performance link. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 16(5), 16-21.
- Miller, B. P. (2001). *Leadership, organizational culture, and managing change: a case study of North Carolina's Johnston Community College* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). North Carolina State University, Raleigh.
- Moos, L., Johansson, O., & Day, C. (2011). *How school principals sustain success over time*. Nottingham: Springer.
- Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization*. USA: SAGE.
- Muijs, D., & Harris, A. (2006). Teacher led school improvement: Teacher leadership in UK. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(8), 961-972.
- Neumann, D. M. (1997). *Determining organizational culture impacts on choice of influence tactics* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Nova Southeastern University, Florida.
- Özdemir, S. (2000). *Organizational innovation in education*. Ankara, Turkey: Pegem A.
- Özdemir, S. (2012). The relationship between school culture and organizational health in primary schools. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 18(4), 599-620.

- Özsoy, E. (2005). *Örgüt geliştirmede örgüt kültürünün önemi* [Importance of organization culture in developing organization] (unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Parsley, D. (2011). *Creating the organizational conditions that enable and support a shared approach to leading school change* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis database. (UMI No: 3474967)
- Pheyse, D. C. (1993). *Organizational cultures: Types and transformations* (1st ed.). London: Routledge.
- Reeves, T. L. (2006). *Principal leadership and the development of organizational culture in a new school* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of North Carolina, Greensboro.
- Robbins, S. (1990). *Organization theory* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Rosenberg, S., & Mosca, J. (2011). Breaking down the barriers to organizational change. *International Journal of Management & Information Systems*, 15(3), 139-146.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schlechty, P. C. (2004). *Shaking up the schoolhouse: How to support and sustain educational innovation*. San Francisco: Jossey & Bass.
- Schneider, W. S. (1999). Why good management ideas fail: Understanding your corporate culture. *Otherwise, Featured Guest Speaker*. USA: Paradigm Shift International. Retrieved from <http://www.parshift.com/Speakers/Speak016.htm>
- Seashore, K. R. (2009). Leadership and change in schools: Personal reflections over the last 30 years. *Journal of Educational Change*, 10(2-3), 129-140.
- Sergiovanni, T. (2001). *The principals: a reflective practice perspective* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Sethia, N. K., & Glinow, M. A. V. (1985). Arriving at four cultures by managing the reward system. In R. H. Kilmann, M. J. Saxton, R. Serpa and Associates (Eds.), *Gaining control of the corporate culture* (pp. 400-420). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sezgin, F. (2010). School culture as a predictor of teachers' organizational commitment. *Education and Science*, 35(156), 142-159.
- Şişman, M. (2002). *Organizations and cultures*. Ankara, Turkey: Pegem A.
- Steers, R. M., Sanchez-Runde, C. J., & Nardon, L. (2010). *Management across cultures: Challenges and strategies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stoll, L. (2009). Capacity building for school improvement or creating capacity for learning? A changing landscape. *Journal of Educational Change*, 10(2), 115-127.
- Stoll, L., & Seashore Louis, K. (Eds.). (2007). *Professional learning communities: Divergence, depth and dilemmas*. Berkshire, England: Open University Press.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
- Terzi, A. R. (1999). *Özel ve devlet liselerinde örgüt kültürü (Ankara ili örneği)* [Organizational culture in private and public high schools: The case of Ankara province] (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Terzi, A. R. (2005). Organizational culture in primary schools. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 11(4), 423-442.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). A Multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(4), 547-593.
- Uğuz, S. S. (1999). *Örgüt kültürünün yönetim ve organizasyon yapısına etkileri ve örgüt kültürü ile ilgili bir araştırma* [An analysis of outcomes and effects of organizational culture on

- organizational structure] (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Wanberg, C. R., & Banas, J. T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(1), 132-142.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1991). *Bureaucracy: What government agencies do and why they do it*. USA: Basic Books.

Öğretmenlerin Örgüt Kültürü ile Değişim Kapasitesi Algıları Arasındaki İlişki⁷

Didem KOŞAR⁸, Ali Çağatay KILINÇ⁹, Serkan KOŞAR¹⁰,

Emre ER¹¹ & Zeki ÖĞDEM¹²

Giriş

Örgütler açısından kültür önemli bir kavram olarak görülmektedir ve araştırmacılar eğitim yönetimi alanında kültür kavramını inceleme noktasında ciddi bir zaman ve çaba harcamaktadırlar (Balekoğlu, 1992; Benda, 2000; Cameron ve Quinn, 2011; Chang ve Lin, 2007; Deal ve Kenndy, 1982, 2000; Handy, 1981; Harrison, 1972; Hersey ve Blanchard, 1982; Koşar ve Yalçınkaya, 2013; Koşar, 2008; Koşar ve Çalık, 2001; Miller, 2001; Neumann, 1997; Reeves, 2006; Schein, 1992; Şişman, 2002; Terzi, 1999, 2005). Örgüt kültürü kavramı 1980'li yılların başlarında ortaya çıkmış ve yönetim alanında yaygın olarak kullanılmaya başlamıştır (Hofstede, 1997). Schein'e (1992) göre örgüt kültürü, belirli bir grubun içsel bütünleşme ve dışsal uyum sorunlarını çözümlerken yarattığı, keşfettiği, geliştirdiği, geçerli kabul edilecek, yeni üyelere sorunlara ilişkin doğru bir algılamaya, düşünme ve hissetme yolu olarak öğretilecek kadar etkin varsayım ve inançlar bütünüdür. Robbins'e (1990) göre örgüt kültürü, örgütün yetki yapısının gücünü, örgütün kültürel yapısıyla destekleyerek yönetime kolaylık sağlamaktadır. Bir örgütte var olan kültür güçlü ise bürokratik işlemlere daha az gereksinim duyulmakta, planlama ve karar alma süreçleri kolaylaşmaktadır. Örgüt kültürü aynı zamanda, örgütlerin kendilerini yenileyebilmesi ve değişen koşullara uyum sağlayabilmeleri açısından önemli bir kavram olarak görülmektedir. Bu bağlamda okul kültürünün değişimi desteklemesi gerektiğini vurgulayan çalışmalar mevcuttur (Dalin, 1998; Fullan, 1999; Özdemir, 2000; Seashore, 2009)

Alan yazında örgüt kültürü ile liderlik (Balekoğlu, 1992; Benda, 2000; Miller, 2001; Reeves, 2006), yönetimde güç kaynakları (Koşar, 2008; Koşar ve Çalık, 2011), örgütsel vatandaşlık ve örgütsel güven (Koşar and Yalçınkaya, 2013), örgüt performansı (Lim, 1995) arasındaki ilişkileri inceleyen araştırmalarla birlikte örgüt kültürünün örgüt yapısı üzerindeki etkisini (Neumann, 1997; Uğuz, 1999), özel ve kamu ortaöğretim okullarındaki (Terzi, 1999) ve ilköğretim okullarındaki kültürün belirlenmesini (Terzi, 2005) ve örgütsel gelişimde örgüt kültürünün önemini (Özsoy, 2005) ortaya koymaya çalışan araştırmalar yapılmasına rağmen, örgüt kültürü ve okul değişim kapasitesi arasındaki ilişkiye yönelik araştırma bulgularının oldukça sınırlı olduğu görülmektedir. Bu nedenle mevcut çalışmanın örgüt kültürü ve okul değişim kapasitesi arasındaki açıklayıcı ve yordayıcı ilişkileri ortaya koymak suretiyle ilgili alan yazına önemli bir katkı sağlaması beklenmektedir. Fullan (2007) okul değişim pratiklerinin değişim sürecinde etkili olan içsel dinamikler göz önünde bulundurulmaksızın başarıya ulaşamayacağını belirtmektedir. Seashore (2009) da okulda değişim sürecini başarıyla yönetmek için okul kültürünün bu süreç üzerindeki etkisinin

⁷ Bu çalışma, 12-14 Mayıs 2016 tarihleri arasında Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi tarafından düzenlenen 11. Ulusal Eğitim Yönetimi Kongresi'nde sunulan sözlü bildirinin genişletilmiş halidir.

⁸ Yrd. Doç. Dr. - Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi - didemkosar@hacettepe.edu.tr

⁹ Doç. Dr. - Karabük Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi - cagataykilinc@karabuk.edu.tr

¹⁰ Dr. - Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi - skosar@gazi.edu.tr

¹¹ Arş. Gör. - Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi - eremre@gmail.com

¹² Dr. - Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi - zekiogdem15@hotmail.com

incelenmesi gerektiğini iddia etmektedir. Bu bakımdan mevcut çalışmanın bulguları, okul değişim kapasitesi üzerinde okul kültürünün yordayıcısı rolünü ortaya koymak suretiyle ilgili alan yazına katkı sağlayabilir. Bu çalışmadan elde edilen bulgular okul kültürünün hangi boyutunun (destek, bürokratik, başarı, görev) okul değişim kapasitesini güçlendirdiği ya da zayıflattığını ortaya koyarak okulda insan kaynaklarını geliştirmek için farklı yollar arayan okul yöneticileri ve politika yapımcılar için önemli görülebilir. O bakımdan mevcut çalışmada aşağıdaki sorulara yanıt aranmaya çalışılmıştır:

1. İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgüt kültürüne ilişkin algıları ile okul değişim kapasitesine ilişkin algıları arasında anlamlı ilişkiler var mıdır?
2. İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgüt kültürünün alt boyutlarına ilişkin algıları okul değişim kapasitesinin anlamlı bir yordayıcısı mıdır?

Yöntem

İlişkisel tarama modelinde tasarlanan bu çalışmada, ilköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin, okulun değişim kapasitesine ve örgütsel kültürüne yönelik algıları arasındaki ilişkiler incelenmiştir. Araştırmanın bağımsız değişkenini örgüt kültürünün alt boyutları, bağımlı değişkenini ise değişim kapasitesinin alt boyutları oluşturmaktadır.

Araştırmanın evrenini, Kastamonu ili merkezinde bulunan ilköğretim okullarında 2013-2014 öğretim yılında görev yapmakta olan öğretmenler oluşturmaktadır. Bu evrenden basit seçkisiz örnekleme yoluyla 20 ilköğretim okulundan seçilen toplam 415 öğretmen araştırmaya katılmıştır. Araştırmanın evrenini, Kastamonu ili merkezinde bulunan ilköğretim okullarında 2013-2014 öğretim yılında görev yapmakta olan öğretmenler oluşturmaktadır. Bu evrenden basit seçkisiz örnekleme yoluyla 20 ilköğretim okulundan seçilen toplam 415 öğretmen araştırmaya katılmıştır. Bu öğretmenlerin 146'sı (%35.2) erkek, 269'u (%64.8) kadındır. Öğretmenlerin yaşlarına bakıldığında, 90'ı (%21.6) 25-29 yaş aralığında, 130'u (%31.32) 30-35, 53'ü (%12.77), 36-40, 142'si (%34.21) 40 yaş ve üstüdür. Öğrenim durumlarına bakıldığında, 29'u (%6.5) önlisans, 327'si (%79.1), lisans ve 59'u (%14.2) lisansüstü mezundur. Öğretmenlerin kıdemlerine bakıldığında, 174'ü (%42.6) 1-9 yıl, 95'i (%23.2) 10-15 yıl, 85'i (%20.8) 15-19 yıl, 61'i (%13.2) ise 20 yıl ve üzeri kıdeme sahiptir.

Araştırma kapsamında kullanılan veri toplama aracı iki bölümden oluşmaktadır. Birinci bölümde araştırmaya katılan öğretmenlerin cinsiyet, yaş, görev yapılan okuldaki hizmet süresi, mesleki kıdem ve öğrenim durumu gibi demografik bilgilerinden oluşan *Kişisel Bilgi Formu* yer almıştır. İkinci bölümde ise okul kültürüne ilişkin görüşleri belirlemek amacıyla *Örgüt Kültürü Ölçeği* ve değişim kapasitesini belirlemek amacıyla *Değişim Kapasitesi Ölçeği* yer almaktadır.

Örgüt Kültürü Ölçeği: Ölçek, Terzi (2005) tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Ölçek dört boyuttan oluşmaktadır. Ölçekte beşli Likert tipi dereceleme türünde hazırlanmış 29 madde bulunmaktadır. Ölçeğin birinci boyutu 8 maddeden oluşan *destek (support) kültürü* (örnek maddeler: Bu okulda, (a) insanlar birbirini sever, (b) mesleki gelişim için her türlü fırsat sağlanır), ikinci boyutu 6 maddeden oluşan *başarı (achievement) kültürü* (örnek maddeler: Bu okulda, (a) başarılı öğretmen ve öğrenciler ödüllendirilir, (b) en büyük ödül bir işi başarmaktır), üçüncü boyutu 9 maddeden oluşan *bürokratik (bureaucratic) kültür* (örnek maddeler: Bu okulda, (a) hiyerarşiye önem verilir, (b) kural ihlaline karşı sert önlemler alınır) ve dördüncü boyutu 6 maddeden oluşan *görev (task) kültürü* (örnek maddeler: Bu okulda, (a) programda belirlenen işleri yapmak birinci önceliklidir, (b) diğer okullardan daha "iyi"

olmak için çalışmak esastır) olmak üzere dört boyutu vardır. Ölçekte kullanılan derecelendirme seçenekleri “Hiçbir Zaman = 1” ve “Her Zaman = 5” şeklinde oluşturulmuştur. Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışmaları dört faktörlü yapının açıkladığı toplam varyansın yaklaşık %51 olduğunu göstermektedir. Faktörler için hesaplanan iç tutarlık katsayıları ise .76 (bürokratik kültür) ile .88 (destek kültürü) arasında değişmektedir (Terzi, 2005). Mevcut araştırmada ise ölçeğin güvenilirliği test etmek için hesaplanan madde korelasyonlarının .46 ile .62 arasında değer aldığı, iç tutarlık katsayısının ise .88 olarak belirlenmiştir.

Değişim Kapasitesi Ölçeği: Ölçek, Er (2013) tarafından yüksek lisans tezi kapsamında geliştirilmiştir. Ölçekte beşli Likert tipi derecelendirme türünde hazırlanmış 26 madde bulunmaktadır. Ölçeğin alt boyutları; 9 maddeden oluşan *paylaşılan vizyon (shared vision)* boyutu (örnek maddeler: Bu okulda, (a) açık bir vizyon vardır, (b) yapılan toplantılarda okul vizyonundan söz edilir); 6 maddeden oluşan *işbirliği (collaboration)* boyutu (örnek maddeler: Bu okulda (a) öğretmenler birlikten çalışmaktan memnundur, (b) öğretmenler diğer öğretmenlerin öğretim faaliyetleriyle ilgilenmez) ve 11 maddeden oluşan *kişisel ustalık (personal mastery)* boyutu (örnek maddeler: Bu okulda (a) öğretmenler, öğrencilerin daha başarılı olmaları için çaba sarf eder, (b) öğretmenler öğrencilerin başarısız olması hâlinde olası sebepleri araştırır) olarak belirlenmiştir. Ölçekte kullanılan derecelendirme seçenekleri “Hiç Katılmıyorum = 1” ve “Tamamen Katılıyorum = 5” şeklinde oluşturulmuştur. Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışmaları üç faktörlü yapının açıkladığı toplam varyansın yaklaşık %46 olduğunu göstermektedir. Faktörler için iç tutarlık katsayıları ise sırasıyla .87 (paylaşılan vizyon) ile .72 (işbirliği) ve .83 (kişisel ustalık) olarak hesaplanmıştır (Er, 2013). Mevcut araştırmada ölçeğin güvenilirliği test etmek için hesaplanan madde korelasyonlarının .42 ile .72 arasında değer aldığı, iç tutarlık katsayısının ise .91 olarak belirlenmiştir.

Verilerin analizi temel olarak iki aşamada gerçekleştirilmiştir. Öncelikle veri seti eksik ve hatalar veriler açısından incelenmiş ve gerekli düzeltmeler yapılmıştır. Bir sonraki adımda, araştırmanın alt problemleri çözümlenmiştir. Araştırmada alt problemlerin çözümlenmesi aşamasında öncelikle her bir alt boyutta bulunan ölçek maddelerinin aritmetik ortalama değerleri hesaplanmış ve analizler bu faktör değerleri üzerinden gerçekleştirilmiştir. Ayrıca verilerin analizi düzeyinde regresyon ve korelasyon katsayıları hesaplanmıştır.

Bulgular

Korelasyon sonuçlarına bakıldığında, destek kültürü ile başarı kültürü arasında yüksek düzeyde pozitif yönlü bir ilişki ($r = .82, p < .01$), destek kültürü ile görev kültürü arasında orta düzeyde pozitif yönlü anlamlı bir ilişki ($r = .59, p < .01$) olduğu görülmektedir. Okulun değişim kapasitesine ilişkin algılarda ise, paylaşılan vizyon, işbirliği ve kişisel ustalık algıları arasında pozitif yönlü ve anlamlı ilişkiler olduğu görülmektedir. Kişisel ustalık ve işbirliği algıları ($r = .69, p < .01$), kişisel ustalık ve paylaşılan vizyon ($r = .66, p < .01$) ve işbirliği ve paylaşılan vizyon ($r = .62, p < .01$) arasında pozitif yönlü orta düzeyde anlamlı ilişki olduğu söylenebilir.

Regresyon analizi sonuçları, örgüt kültürünün alt boyutlarının birlikte okul değişim kapasitesinin paylaşılan vizyon alt boyutundaki puanların %52'sini açıkladığını göstermektedir. Destek ($t = 5.46, p < .05$), başarı ($t = 4.57, p < .05$) ve görev kültürü ($t = 4.72, p < .05$) paylaşılan vizyonun anlamlı yordayıcılarıdır. Örgüt kültürünün alt boyutları birlikte okul değişim kapasitesinin işbirliği boyutundaki puanların %42'sini açıklamaktadır. Buna

göre destek ($t = 7.81, p < .05$) ve görev kültürü ($t = 4.06, p < .05$) işbirliğinin anlamlı yordayıcılarıdır. Son olarak örgüt kültürünün alt boyutları birlikte okul değişim kapasitesinin kişisel ustalık boyutundaki puanların %43'ünü açıklamaktadır. Bununla birlikte destek ($t = 5.73, p < .05$) ve görev kültürü ($t = 8.37, p < .05$) kişisel ustalık boyutunun anlamlı yordayıcılarıdır.

Sonuç

Mevcut çalışmanın sonuçları, okul kültürünün okul değişim kapasitesini yordayan önemli bir değişken olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu bakımdan, okul kültürünün okulun değişim kapasitesinin gelişmesinde önemli rol oynadığı söylenebilir. Araştırma bulguları öğretmenlerin okullarının değişim kapasitesine ilişkin olumlu algılara sahip olduklarını göstermektedir. Bu araştırmanın sonuçları destekleyici ve görev odaklı bir okul kültürü oluşturmanın okul değişim kapasitesinin geliştirilmesi noktasında önemli olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu nedenle okulların, etkili öğrenme ve öğretim uygulamalarının geliştirildiği ve okul üyeleri arasında paylaşıldığı birer mesleki öğrenme topluluğuna dönüştürülmesi gerektiğini göstermektedir. Araştırma sonuçlarına dayalı olarak öğretmenlerin destekleyici ve görev odaklı bir okul kültüründe okul değişim kapasitesini geliştirmek üzere birlikte çalıştıkları ve işbirliği yaptıkları söylenebilir. Konuya ilişkin yapılacak ardıl çalışmalarda okul değişim kapasitesi ve örgüt kültürü arasındaki ilişkiler temel analiz birimi okul alınmak suretiyle incelenebilir. Bununla birlikte bu çalışmada ele alınan kavramlar arasındaki ilişkiler, farklı örneklemelerde; gözlem ve görüşme gibi farklı nitel araştırma yöntemleri kullanılarak incelenebilir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Değişim kapasitesi, Örgüt kültürü, Öğretmen, İlkokul

Atıf için / Please cite as:

Koşar, D., Kılınç, A. Ç., Koşar, S., Er, E., & Öğdem, Z. (2016). The relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational culture and school capacity for change [Öğretmenlerin örgüt kültürü ile değişim kapasitesi algıları arasındaki ilişki]. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi - Journal of Educational Sciences Research*, 6(2), 39-59. <http://ebad-jesr.com/>