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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.
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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 & Çalış, 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; Jurasaite-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 (Balcı, 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) Pheysey’s (1993) role culture, achievement culture, power culture, and support culture; (viii) Kono’s
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(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 predetermined 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 & Yağıcakaya, 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 subdimensions 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, Şekerchioğlu, & 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Χ̅</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support culture</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement culture</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bureaucratic culture</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Task culture</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Shared vision</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaboration</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal mastery</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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, outweighed 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Bureaucratic</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>(t)</td>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared vision</td>
<td>(.34)</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R =.72, R^2 =) .52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F_{3.411} =112.02, p =.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>(-.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R =.65, R^2 =) .42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F_{3.411} =75.13, p =.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal mastery</td>
<td>(.39)</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>(-.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R =.66, R^2 =) .43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(F_{3.411} =78.62, p =.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 (\(t=-1.22, p>0.05\)). 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 (β = .54) and then task culture (β = .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 (R²=.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 (β=.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,
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 enable 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.
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incelemesi gerektiğini iddia etmektedir. Bu bakımdan mevcut çalışmanın bulguları, okul değişim kapasitesi üzerinde okul kültürünün yordayıcı rolünü ortaya koymak suretiyle ilgili alan yazarına katki sağlayabilir. Bu çalışmada elde edilen bulgular okul kültürünün hangi boyutunu (destek, bürokratik, başarı, görev) okul değişim kapasitesini güçlendirdiği ya da zayıflatığını ortaya koyarak okulda insan kaynaklarını geliştirmek için farklı yollar arayan okul yöneticileri ve politika yapıcılar için önemli görülebilir. O bakımdan mevcut çalışmada aşağıdaki sorulara yanıt aranmaya çalışmıştır:

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 yordayıcı mıdır?

Yöntem

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


Öğretmenlerin yaşına bakıldığında, 90’ı (%21.6) 25-29 yaş aralığı; 130’su (%31.32) 30-35, 53’ü (%12.77), 36-40, 142’si (%34.21) 40 yaş ve üstü olarak tespit edilmiştir. Öğretmenlerin eğitim durumlarına bakıldığında, 29’u (%6.5) ön lisans, 327’si (%79.1), lisans ve 59’u (%14.2) lisansüstü mezunudur. 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 kıdem sahibi olarak tespit edilmiştir.


Örgüt Kültürü Ölçeği: Ölçek, Terzi (2005) tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Ölçek dört boyutta oluşmaktadır. Ölçekte beşlik Likert tipi derecelere türünde hazırlanmış 29 madde bulunmaktadır. Ölçeğin birinci boyutu 8 maddeden oluşan destek (support) kültür (örn maddeler: Bu okulda, (a) insanlar birbirini sever, (b) mesleki gelişim için her türlü fırsat sağlar), ikinci boyutu 6 maddeden oluşan başarı (achievement) kültür (örnek maddeler: Bu okulda, (a) başarılı öğretmen ve öğrenciler ödüllendirilir, (b) bir büyük odlul bir işi başarmaktır), üçüncü boyutu 7 maddeden oluşan bürokratik (bureaucratic) kültür (örnek maddeler: Bu okulda, (a) hıyerarşiyeye önem verilir, (b) kural ihlali karşısında sert önlemler alınır) ve dördüncü boyutu 6 maddeden oluşan görev (task) kültür (örnek maddeler: Bu okulda, (a) programda belirlenen işleri yapmak birinci önceliklidir, (b) diğer okullardan daha “iyi”

Değişim Kapasitesi Ölçeği: Ölçek, Er (2013) tarafından yüksek lisans tezi kapsamında geliştirilmiştir. Ölceğe beşli Likert tipi derecelendirme türüne hazırlanan 26 madde bulunmaktadır. Ölçeğin alt boyutları; 9 maddeden oluşan paylaşılın 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 birlikte çalışmaktadır memnundur, (b) öğretmenler diğer öğretmenlerin öğretim faaliyetlerile ilgilenmez) ve 11 maddeden oluşan kişisel ustalık (personal mastery) boyutu (örnek maddeler: Bu okulda (a) öğretmenler, öğrencilere daha başarılı olmaları için çaba sarf eder, (b) öğretmenler öğrencilere başarsız olması hâline olası sebepleri ararlar) olarak belirlenmiştir. Ölçeğe kullanılan derecelendirme seçenekleri “Hiç Katılmıyorum = 1” ve “Tamamen Katılıyorum = 5” şeklinde oluşturulmuştur. Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışmaları üç faktörlü yapının açıkladığı toplam varyansın yaklaşık %46 olduğunu göstermektedir. Faktörler için iç tutarlık katsayları ise sırasıyla .87 (paylaşılan vizyon) ile .72 (işbirliği) ve .83 (kişisel ustalık) olarak hesaplanmıştır (Er, 2013). Mevcut araştırınada ölçeğin güvenirliği test etmek için hesaplanan madde korelasyonlarının .42 ile .72 arasında değer olduğu, iç tutarlık katsayısının ise .91 olarak belirlenmiştir.


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 algılar arasında, paylaşılan vizyon, işbirliği ve kişisel ustalık algıları 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 puanlarının %52’sini açıkladığı görülmektedir. Destek (t = 5.46, p < .05), başarı (t = 4.57, p < .05) ve görev kültürü (t = 4.72, p < .05) paylaşılan vizyonun anlamlı yordayıcıdır. 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 üstalık boyutlarındaki puanları %43’ünü açıklamaktadır. Bununla birlikte destek \( (t = 5.73, \ p < .05) \) ve görev kültürü \( (t = 8.37, \ p < .05) \) kişisel üstalık boyutunun anlamlı yordayıcılarıdır.
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