



Organizational Culture Barriers and Facilitators for Instructional Innovations at the Faculty of Education*

Aysun CALISKAN¹ Chang ZHU²

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 12 Dec, 2019

Received in revised form: 18 Oct, 2020

Accepted: 15 Sept, 2020

DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2021.92.8

Keywords

institutional factors, leadership, reward, support, characteristics of members,

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Organizational culture influences instructional innovations at universities by either allowing or hindering the development of innovations. Therefore, this study aims to demonstrate the organizational culture barriers and facilitators for instructional innovations at Turkish universities. **Research methods:** Using the qualitative method, this study draws upon 20 interviews with academic staff members to uncover the details regarding organizational culture barriers and facilitators for instructional innovations at four Turkish public universities.

Findings: Based on the results concerning organizational culture barriers to instructional innovations, the analysis resulted in the over-centralized higher education structure where academic staff members lack professional practice at schools coupled with being pressured to increase their output of publications. Based on the results concerning organizational culture facilitators for instructional innovations, the results show that bottom-up management features in the university with mid-level leaders using the power of their expertise as part of collaborative research groups is an avenue to instructional innovation. Based on the perceptions, the organizational culture barriers and facilitators are identified as separate factors for instructional innovations in terms of positive and negative aspects. **Implications for Research and Practice:** This study lays the groundwork for future research into using appropriate methods and tools to measure the performance of academic staff members to conceptualize the development of teacher education positively.

* This study is partly based on the first author's PhD Dissertation.

¹ Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Educational Sciences, Brussels, BELGIUM, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2811-286X>, e-mail: aysun.calikan@vub.be

² Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Educational Sciences, Brussels, BELGIUM, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0057-275X>, e-mail: chang.zhu@vub.be

Introduction

A distinguishing characteristic of the globalized world is the rapid change in technology, social life, and the economy, which has led to a growing demand for highly qualified professionals by business, industry, education, and health sectors. As such, higher education institutions are being tasked with better equipping students for our rapidly changing society. However, this endeavour cannot be simply afforded to academic education. Rather, these institutions need to expand students' awareness of socio-cultural and economic development and develop their cognitive habits so that they can transform into efficient, mature, and independent learners (Sanchez & Ruiz, 2008).

Addressing these issues creates pressure on higher education institutions to be innovative, and at many universities, innovation has been identified to be neither entirely beneficial nor usable (Collis, 2010). However, it is generally believed that culture has an impact on innovation. In their report on innovation in higher education, Brennan, Ryan, Ranga, Broek, Durazzi and Kamphuis (2014) draw our attention to the need for an organizational culture in which innovation increases creativity and expands awareness – that is to say, organizations become more open to innovation and less resistant to change. One study conducted by Obendhain and Johnson (2004) analyzed the impact of the types of organizational culture on product and process innovation and concluded that an adhocracy culture is ideal in the case of innovation. In the same vein, Kezar and Eckel (2002), with their focus on institutional culture and change strategies, experienced that change seems to be possible when it is aligned with the culture in place. The literature further contains some items which directly focus on the relationship between organizational culture and organizational innovativeness (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby & Herron, 1996; Mohammed & Bardai, 2012; Vaira, 2004; Zhu, 2013).

To date, several studies (Garison & Kanuka, 2004; Latchem et al., 2007; Schneckenberg, 2009; Zhu & Engels, 2014) have argued that some higher education institutions are hesitant towards and highly resistant to change. In their study on blended learning in higher education, Garison and Kanuka (2004) discuss that the causes of this resistance have been subject to intense debate within their undergraduate experience, innovative policies, and culture. In a similar case, Zhu and Engels (2014) have deduced that higher education institutions have recently experienced various innovations in management, internationalization, teaching, and learning, such as mobility, curriculum, alumni engagement, attracting international students, funding opportunities, accreditation, with management learning strategies at the macro-level alongside instructional approaches and methods, as well as the application of technology in learning and teaching at the micro-level.

Instructional Innovations

In the context of innovation systems, there are plenty of organizations and institutions to foster entrepreneurship, innovation, and economic growth between industry and knowledge-based organizations (Lundvall, 1992). Among these actors,

the role of universities is considered necessary for the undertakings of science and innovation. The existing instructional literature highlights that the term innovation has been perceived as the changes or reforms that take place in such domains as educational policies, practices, academic work, curriculum, assessment regimes, methods of teaching and learning, pedagogy, technology, knowledge and ideas (Cohen & Ball, 2007; Kozma, 1985; Schneckenberg, 2009; Zhu & Engels, 2014). Kozma (1985) states that higher education institutions have been severely forced to change their instructional practices for interaction with other actors. Thus, universities attach great importance to globalization, technology and developments in teaching and learning approaches (Burner, 2018) which appear to be intricately linked to the studies by Biesta, 2010 and Miller et al. 2009. According to Credaro (1997), the 'globalization' of society is an external force that must be maintained in a competitive environment. In terms of educational aspects, this may be considered as the need for adaptation to international research and national trends. Besides, societal changes and the requirements of the job market also produce a need to develop more innovative instructional practices, such as self-directed learning, collaborative learning, and learning with new technologies that are required because of the changes in social life and job requirements (Zhu & Engels, 2014). Moreover, technology is forcing the way of teaching. In the past, teachers possessed much of the information but now it is available online. This changes the old model in which teachers present the content and students absorb it. As a result, educators now need to restructure and redesign the classroom to adopt the different roles of students and themselves (Nour ul Amin, 2018). In a technology adopted environment, collaboration, problem-solving, and higher-order thinking skills can be promoted to create projects, increase student engagement, and learn from each other (Keser, Uzunboylu, & Ozdamli, 2011; Kurt, 2010). The developments in teaching and learning approaches require curricular reform, changes in staff, shifts in teacher-student relationships from being teacher-centred to student-centred, and the need for the modification of teaching practices and policies and procedures (Shen, 2008). Together, these studies indicate that internal and external drivers propel the need for change in educational institutions (Robbins & De Cenzo, 2001).

In higher education institutions, the term innovation has been perceived to refer to the changes or reforms in various domains such as educational policies, practices, academic work, curricula, assessment regimes, methods of teaching and learning, pedagogical technology, knowledge, and ideas (Cohen & Ball, 2007; Kozma, 1985; Schneckenberg, 2009; Scott, 2012; Zhu & Engels, 2014). Thus, universities mainly focus on instructional innovation approaches such as collaborative learning, cooperative learning, student-centred pedagogy, computer-supported learning, online learning, and web-based platforms (Atmaca, 2007; Brandon & Hollingshead, 1999; Ellis, Ginns & Piggott, 2009; Garrison, Kanuka, 2004; Gokhale, 1995; Wright, 2011). These approaches focus more on the active involvement of the learner, maintaining interaction with others, and the reorganization of the knowledge structures (Packer & Goicoechea, 2000), which is what Vygotsky defines as constructivism. In constructivism, as suggested by Vygotsky (1978), the environment in which the learners have grown up is effective in their thinking style and building of knowledge. In a

similar vein, Brandon (2004) states that learners can find solutions to their problems, collaborate, and thereafter assess their learning in constructivist learning environments.

This study, therefore, set out to obtain data on three innovative trends in teaching and learning. (1) Student-centred learning: an active learning process in which students are involved in what they are studying (Brown, 2008), which thus enhances motivation, learning, and student achievement (McCombs & Whisler, 1997), making students creative thinkers and self-sufficient learners (Brown, 2008).

(2) Collaborative learning: in collaborative learning, all participants interact during which students lead the activities while the lecturers act as facilitators or guides (Kirschner, 2001; Weiner, 1986), fostering critical thinking, encouraging deep-learning, and enabling students to perform significantly better than learning individually (Gokhale, 1995).

(3) Using instructional technologies (e-learning and computer-supported collaborative learning): In this research, there are two types of applications, e-learning and computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL), currently being adopted into use as technologies. The first type, e-learning, describes the interaction in which students use numerous electronic synchronous and asynchronous technological applications in study environments, such as computers, the internet, tablets, mobile phones, television, and the radio (El Mhouti, Erradi & Nasseh, 2019). The second type, computer-supported collaborative learning, is defined by Newman, Webb, and Cochrane (1999) as the computer software or network hardware selected to support the collaborative learning process in an instructional environment. The use of technologies in education provides opportunities for countries and chances for the new generation of teachers to be prepared for the current and coming century, and for existing teachers to comply with the 21st-century tools and approaches for learning and teaching (Behera, 2013).

Organizational Culture Barriers and Facilitators for Instructional Innovation

Creating an organizational culture in which all management and academic staff can work collaboratively and consider new ideas has a vital role in developing innovations (Nesbit & Leacock, 2006). Besides, Tanggaard (2014) mentions that there is a growing need to create a more democratic and collaborative organizational culture that would facilitate innovation. Similarly, Lea, Stephenson, and Troy (2003) point out that an organization's success in innovation is based on its organizational culture, as it provides the necessary conditions for learning, support, and innovation. Organizational culture has contributed to an increase in instructional innovation when the ability to encourage instructional innovations (i.e., student-centred learning, collaborative learning, e-learning, computer-supported collaborative learning) is present (Denton, 1998). Kilicer and Odabasi (2013) support the notion that there is a mutual relationship between education and innovativeness wherein both receive input from and are affected by the other. In other words, education shapes innovativeness and supports its development, while innovativeness increases the

quality of education. Umbach and Wawrzynski (2005) suggest that students learn more when the instructional culture emphasizes effective, student-centred practices. In a similar vein, Barkley, Major, and Cross (2014) have also argued that knowledge is better constructed through the creation of a culture of shared artefacts, norms, and values as suggested by constructivists. In their study of culture and e-learning, Newton, and Ellis (2005) identified that e-learning represents and transfers organizational culture. Regarding CSCL, Orlikowski (1992) examined that an organization's culture and its members' understanding of technology has an impact on collaborative supported learning.

When the literature is evaluated, it becomes clear there are certain organizational culture barriers and facilitators that either stimulate or hinder instructional innovation. Among them, Martins and Terblanche (2003) suggest that the structure seemingly emphasizing specific values influences the promotion or restriction of innovation in organizations. Following that concept, Arad et al. (1997) imply that an organizational structure with values like freedom and flexibility supports innovation; however, values like rigidity, control, and predictability (mostly associated with hierarchical structures) will hamper innovation. Additionally, organizational goals and objectives reflect the priorities and values of organizations and, as a result, may promote or hinder innovation (Arad et al., 1997). Judge et al. (1997) claim that top management prescribes a set of strategic goals. If they allow personnel to have greater freedom within the context of these goals, it will have a positive influence that would promote innovation among academic staff members and students (McClure, 2016), otherwise, it will create chaos and thus have a negative influence, a notion also supported by Covey (1993) and Nazari and Shahdadnejad (2011).

In the postulation of new empirical studies, it is clear that management can have either a supporting or a hindering role in innovation. Open communication, managers' tolerance of mistakes, managerial support in the availability of resources and in adapting the rules that are available either improves or detracts from the likelihood of innovation occurring (Ahmed, 1998; Tushman & O'Reilly, 1997). In a similar vein, what Nazari and Shahdadnejad (2011) define as authoritarian management is managers or leaders who are opposed to any changes, which might eventually cause participatory management and creative thinking to disappear. However, the prospect of liberated approaches to innovation depends highly on victory over the obstacles.

In terms of the characteristics of members of universities, it is pivotal that academic staff members' beliefs and attitudes towards innovations are integrated into innovation (Mumtaz, 2000). Therefore, academic staff members with positive attitudes towards instructional innovations will be positively disposed towards using them in the classroom; otherwise, they will be less likely to accept and adapt to instructional innovations than those with positive attitudes (Harrison & Rainer, 1992). One study by Pelgrum (2001) examined the success of instructional innovation, contingent mainly upon the skills and knowledge of the lecturer. Academic staff members' lack of knowledge and skills has a role in affecting the use of instructional innovations for both developed and underdeveloped countries. Khan, Hasan and Clement (2012) state

that vigilant attention needs to be paid to the training of teachers before they are assigned regular classes so that they could be integrated into the innovations at universities. Many researchers argue that organizational culture with a focus on trust and open communication supports innovation (Dunford, 1999; Martins & Martins, 2002), which creates the impression that it will be easier for stakeholders to adapt to the use of innovations if there is a relationship with a high level of trust between employees and academic leaders. In other words, innovation cannot be achieved if organizational culture promotes a low degree of trust (Martins & Martins, 2002). An organizational culture that allows employees to think creatively and spend their time on generating new ideas promotes innovation (Martins & Terblanche, 2003; Shattow, 1996). In contrast, a focus on productivity and downsizing leads to more pressure, serving as a formidable barrier to innovation (Filipczak, 1997).

There are aspects of the literature that can be usefully addressed in analysing the organizational culture and innovation present in higher education, including management, creativity, organizational strategies, collaboration, communication, process innovation, innovative capabilities, and organizational archetypes. However, such studies remain narrow in their focus on dealing with the role of organizational culture features which influence instructional innovations in universities. In their empirical study, Zhu and Engels (2014) report that organizational culture can be an excellent catalyst for instructional change at universities. This view is also supported by Glor (2014), Tushman and O'Reilly (1997), and Tierney (2008), who note that culture plays a crucial role in allowing or hindering instructional innovation in universities.

The overall objective of this study is to contribute to the growing area of research on instructional innovation and organizational culture by demonstrating the organizational culture barriers and facilitators with an impact on instructional innovations at Turkish universities with the academic staff members' views by employing the qualitative method. For these purposes mentioned above, the research questions that guided this study are as follows:

1. What are the views of academic staff members regarding organizational culture barriers to instructional innovation at public universities in Turkey?
2. What are the views of academic staff members regarding the organizational culture facilitators for instructional innovation at public universities in Turkey?

Method

Research Design

To investigate the academic staff members' views of the barriers to and facilitators of instructional innovation in Turkish higher education, the present study applied semi-structured interviews with university academic staff members. The interviews

were used in this study to uncover the details regarding the barriers and facilitators to instructional innovation at Turkish universities.

Research Sample

Regarding the sampling method, a stratified two-stage probability sampling design was used to select the universities that would be a part of this study. During the first stage, we aimed to include universities from the Entrepreneurial and Innovative University Index 2015 prepared by TUBITAK (the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey- Quota sampling). There are, in total, 50 public and private universities on this list. With this list, TUBITAK aims to encourage entrepreneurship and innovation activities at the universities as well as increase competition among the universities for the development of entrepreneurship within the country (Iskender & Bati, 2015). Out of 50 universities, four public universities were selected depending on the degree of heterogeneity and homogeneity of their characteristics. To ensure anonymity, we coded the universities as University 1, University 2, University 3, and University 4, and calculated their approximate percentile. The universities' percentiles are as follows: University 1: between 50-70%. University 2: between 30-50%, University 3: between 10-30%, University 4: top 10%. Each of these universities fills a different mission. For example, University 1 is the first university of the republic, follows the continental European system and specializes in law and political science. University 2 was originally established as a Teacher Training Institute. University 3 was established oriented to medicine. University 4 differs from the others in terms of having an internationally oriented, technically/engineering-oriented program structure and being an Anglo Saxon-campus university. In terms of their history, program structure and physical properties, they differ a lot (ISCED, 1997, TUSIAD, 2008). However, their management system, financial structure, administration structure, level of autonomy, and student admission (university entrance exam) are similar due to the central government (Emil, 2018). We included our sample from the educational faculty of those four public universities to exhibit a proportional representation of the different departments (Bryman, 2016). In the second stage, while selecting academic staff members, the maximum variation sampling type was chosen from the purposeful sampling methods. This type provides more significant insights by identifying and selecting participants that are especially knowledgeable about the organizational culture and instructional innovations (Cresswell & Clark, 2011; Yirdaw 2016). Besides, it helps to maximize rather than generalize the diversity relevant to the research questions (Yildirim & Simsek, 2013). Moreover, Bernard (2002) stressed the importance of availability and willingness to share experiences. In this study, the primary criterion for recruiting participants is their work experience at the university. Participants with a minimum 5-year experience at the university are included. The second criterion was to generalize the findings, thus enable the selection of participants with a variety of academic titles ranging from assistant professor, associate professor to professor.

In addition to the purposeful sampling method of inviting those who met the criteria, initial participants helped the researcher identify and locate others (Merriam,

1988). Thus, the second method utilized was snowball sampling. By applying the criteria above, we interviewed 20 academic staff members from the faculty of education of four public universities in Turkey using a semi-structured interview guide.

To maintain anonymity and confidentiality, we allocated each participant a number and coded them as P1, P2, P3,, P 20. Nearly half of the participants (45%) had 5–15-years of experience at their universities and 40 % had 15-25 years of working experience and 15 % had 25-35 years of working experience. Regarding their ages, the participants were predominantly between 30 and 45 years old (65 %) and the percentages of those participants who are older than 46 years were 35 %. An inquiry into the title each participant held revealed that the majority of them reported working as associate professor (45%), 30% and 25 % reported working as assistant professor and professor, respectively. As to their gender, a considerable number of participants are male (70 %) while 30% were female.

Data Collection

While preparing interview questions, we basically followed social constructivism theory to stress the importance of collaboration between the learners (Duffy & Jonassen, 1992), the relationship between the learner and the instructor (Bauersfeld, 1995) and the content and the learners rather than the instructor (Gamoran, Secada & Marrett, 2000). Moreover, social constructivism assumes that organizations can change their culture by putting people together to collaborate, change the conversation and create new knowledge for new resources (Camargo-Borges & Rasera, 2013). Thus, social constructivism theory guided us to see if it was possible to identify organizational culture elements with either a negative or a positive influence on the implementation of innovative approaches. . Upon determining research questions and limiting the problem situation with the theoretical framework, we formatted different types of interview questions such as opinion, experience and behavioural questions. It also allowed us to determine the orientation of the theoretical framework and the previous research (Sandelowski, 1986; Patton, 2015).

Following this phase, the interview questions (asked in Turkish) were checked by both relevant experts in the field of higher education and language experts so that the potential problems caused by incoherency and inconsistency could be reduced. The pilot interview was carried out by two academic staff members at a Turkish University to ensure that the interview questions were well formulated, and any potential problems or misunderstandings could be avoided. Following the pilot interviews, the interview questions were validated and given some adjustments and improvements, with some of the questions being re-formulated.

In the semi-structured interviews, data were collected from five main questions allowing an inquiry in a flexible, responsive, and open manner. As Patton (2015) suggested, questions allowed to elicit information from the participants. Thus, interviews were just like an open discussion between the interviewee and the interviewer while the questions were formulated in such a way to help the researchers answer the research questions without being too specific. Then, the participants were

asked to provide answers in their own words which led to a different flow. That is, the opening question remained the same for all participants; yet from that on, the participant's responses shaped the rest of the interview. This was exciting but it was also challenging to decide when to follow up, when to move on without interrupting the participants. However, this directed us to go deeper for finding the answers to our research questions. The questions that guided our study were about instructional innovations and organizational culture barriers and facilitators. Therefore, we first asked the participants how they perceived instructional innovations. Then, we questioned how they implemented innovative approaches. Afterwards, we tried to elicit if it was easy or difficult for them to implement these approaches. In addition to the general challenges and facilitators, we asked the institutional, individual factors influencing instructional innovations.

Before collecting data, researchers received ethical approval for it from the METU Ethics Committee. Once the permission was granted, an initial contact in person, by phone or e-mail was ensured to discover whether the participants were willing or they were available at certain times, or they had the experience to participate in the study. Then, we sent an email or a message to schedule the date, time and topic for the interview upon receiving a consent form and offering explanations about the research. We were also noticeably clear that the interview would take some 30-45 minutes. In this study, the data was collected through face-to-face interviews and skype video calls. Just before the interviews, the participants were informed about the study and were asked for their permission to have the audio recorded. One of the participants did not give permission for recording the audio, and hence, notes were taken instead. The rest of the interviews were audio-recorded.

Data Analysis

All data was transcribed after having finished the data collection process. Then, the data was collated, coded, and sorted out into codes, categories, and themes emerging from the data with a thematic approach (Miles, Huberman & Saldana, 2013). While coding, inductive approaches were used from the participants' comments regarding the organizational culture barriers and facilitators for instructional innovation. These codes were constructed and modified throughout the coding process and displayed in diagrammatic and narrative form. In the same table, the frequencies and percentages of the participants were quantified, and in the writing-up process, the research findings were presented through direct quotations from the participants.

Validity and Reliability

To test the credibility (internal validity) of the findings, a member check, also known as respondent validation, was ensured. The first author sent the reports to the participants via e-mail to verify the authenticity of the work, and their comments assisted in checking on the applicability of the findings. The aim was to seek a correlation between the findings and the views of the participants (Bryman, 2016). The researcher also employed what Denzin (2017) calls triangulation; that is, multiple observations, a variety of sources, different methods, and theoretical aspect through

more than one source of data. Denzin (2017) identifies this type as data triangulation which means collecting data in different periods and from different sources to confirm, develop or gain a broader and more detailed description of the research problems. In this study, the findings were triangulated with the Turkish Higher Education Strategic Plan (2015-2019) delivered by the Council of Higher Education (COHE) in 2014. As a response to the developments in the world, this document identifies the needs, opportunities, and threats of Turkish Higher Education Institutions (COHE, 2014). Some notable examples are organizational culture, quality assurance, performance management, the motivation of the staff, centralized governance, distance learning, innovative approaches in graduate, undergraduate education.

Results

Results of the Views of Academic Staff Members regarding the Organizational Culture Barriers to Instructional Innovations at Public Universities in Turkey (RQ1)

Based on thematic coding, five main organizational culture barriers have been identified regarding instructional innovations according to the views of academic staff members at public universities in Turkey. The identified barriers are institutional factors, characteristics of members, rewards and recognition, leadership style, and support mechanisms, all of which can hinder instructional innovation (namely student-centred learning, collaborative learning, and the use of educational technologies) (see Table 1).

Table 1

The Perceptions of Academic Staff Members on Organizational Cultural Barriers to Instructional Innovation

Themes	Categories	f*	%	Codes
Institutional Factors	Mechanistic Structure	20	7.5	Rules and policies
		20	7.5	imbalance between schools and universities
		16	6.01	less autonomy
		14	5.26	less merit
		9	3.3	less freedom
	Top-down management features	14	5.26	micro-managed
		14	5.26	less engagement in decision making
Characteristics of members	Low capacity for innovation			Academic staff members:
		13	4.88	lack of practice
		12	4.5	workload
		10	3.75	reluctance to apply
		9	3.3	misunderstanding instructional innovation (technological tools)

Table 1 Continue

Themes	Categories	f*	%	Codes
		14	5.26	Students: exam anxiety
		10	3.75	lack of higher order thinking skills
	Normative commitment	6	2.25	caring about the defined rules
Reward and recognition	Quantity based achievement criteria	20	7.5	number of projects, articles)
		13	4.88	student assessment of teaching performance
Leadership style	Autocratic			Senior level
		13	4.88	organizer
		14	5.26	using legal power
Support mechanism	Lack of resources	18	6.76	funds
		6	2.25	motivation

For the institutional factors of OC hampering instructional innovation at Turkish Universities, two categories were outlined. Of these, the mechanistic structure is the category cited most frequently compared to the top-down management features. In the mechanistic structure category, participants mostly expressed defined rules and policies as emerging issue. One participant commented on this:

...It is difficult to see the modern management system in Turkish public universities. Instead, we must apply the rules and policies coming from the top. It is quite traditional and mechanistic, so innovation is not easy. When you want to make some changes, you have difficulty in finding support from your superiors. They do not attach importance to our effort. We have less power and support in making changes. In theory, we are free to apply whatever we like. But those approaches sometimes require external support. In addition to these, you know it is not important how you deliver the course for promotion. However, they behave differently to different people and whoever is close to the management is promoted easily without considering their performance. If you are close to the dean, rector or COHE, it is easy to get promoted and get support. (P3, U1, 48, male).

Another participant stated the negative aspect of centralized management on instructional innovation as follows:

... In my university, I cannot use computer-supported collaborative learning or e-learning approaches. These are what we learned from our lecturers at university or from the literature. In real-time

implementation, I find it difficult as our rules and policies do not specifically mention the need for them. When I discuss the necessity in our regular meetings, they, the leaders in particular, do not consider them as priority. They think we have more important issues to tackle with. Unfortunately, I do not have enough power in decision making... (P9, U2, 43, male).

They also referred to the imbalance between schools and universities. Another participant expressed:

...In the teaching practice class, there is a lack of coordination between schools and universities. When we visit schools for internships of our students, it is challenging to establish coordination between the manager, teachers at the schools, and students. They do not help and give us extra work. Naturally, our students grow up as technical staff. They learn the new approaches at the university; however, it does not matter how many new approaches they know. They do not practice at schools as needed. The situation should be the opposite. Schools should also be responsible for teacher training. Schools should be our laboratory. We must place them in real class environments. As to universities, the case is not different. The academic leaders do not simply care. They do not even listen to our criticism. It is a minor issue for them when we compare this with other administrative tasks. They only check if our students have completed internships. (P15, U3, 43, male).

As the second crucial organizational culture barrier to instructional innovation for Turkish academic staff members, two categories were framed under the characteristics of member themes. These are, indeed, closely interwoven aspects of academic staff members' reactions to instructional innovations. Specifically, the organizational culture barriers to instructional innovation, low capacity for innovation, and normative commitment essentially emerged under this theme. A low capacity for innovation in the emerging category was the most frequently cited with two discrete stakeholders emerging from this: academic staff members and second students.

One individual stated regarding academic staff members:

...Instructional innovations are important, but in the academic environment, innovation is understood as technological innovations, using projection, smart boards, computers. These are technological tools. Instructional innovation should be in the methods used in the lecture under the content of the courses. However, we misinterpret them. For example, student-centred learning means students' giving a lesson. Using a computer-supported collaborative approach means academic staff members using PowerPoint with many slides. Besides, the workload and academic staff's lack of knowledge of the culture in primary and secondary schools may account for some of the factors preventing an innovative approach. Unfortunately, we cannot train

future teachers to be equipped with the new approaches... (P8, U2, 45, female).

And another commented on students:

... Our students have been accustomed to the direct method of primary education. They are always evaluated through multiple choice exams. When I ask an open-ended question, they cannot elaborate their deepest ideas. They lack higher-order thinking skills. They are expecting us to tell them everything from A to Z. They do not know how to take on the responsibility of learning. These are the best students in Turkey, or let's say, the best multiple-choice answerers. However, innovative instructional approaches require the active participation of the students, working in teams, or collaboratively. When I try one of these methods, most of them get bored and complain. Their old habits are hard to change in four years. In addition to this, they must take the Public Service Personnel Selection Examination in order to be appointed as a teacher. In the final year, this exam thoroughly reduces their interest in classes. They start to ask questions about this exam as if I am one of the exam developers. The fact that students are not interested in innovative approaches within three years is hampering me... (P20, U4, 43, male).

The issue of reward and recognition was another barrier mentioned. This theme comes up in discussions of quantity-based academic achievement criteria. The comment below illustrates the assessment criteria in terms of the research role of academic staff members:

...The main success criterion for academic staff depends on the number of academic publications. The more publications you have, the more citations you have, the more successful you are. Numerical values measure success... (P7, U2, 42, male).

Another interviewee mentioned the role of teaching as:

...The other important role of the academic staff is teaching. It is important if we are in the classroom rather than how we lecture or which innovative approaches we apply. A rise in salary and academic promotion have become so important that the content of the lessons does not count. Using instructional innovations in such an environment is up to you. They only evaluate the course through student surveys at the end of the year. If you meet the needs of the students written in that survey, it is enough for you to be successful because they do not ask if you are using innovative approaches or not. There is also a contradiction here. Our workload is based on teaching, and our success criteria are based on publications... (P5, U1, 39, female).

The last two themes emerging from the analysis were leadership styles and support mechanisms, the least underlined aspects of organizational barriers to instructional innovations.

The Views of Academic Staff Members regarding organizational Culture Facilitators for Instructional Innovations at Public Universities in Turkey (RQ2)

Five main facilitators have been identified regarding instructional innovation according to the views of academic staff members at public universities in Turkey. Facilitators are those institutional factors, characteristics of members, rewards and recognition, leadership styles, and support mechanisms that can promote instructional innovation, student-centred learning, collaborative learning, and the use of educational technologies. The themes overlap with the ones in organizational culture barriers to instructional innovations, but the categories and the codes displayed variation (see Table 2).

Table 2

The Perceptions of Academic Staff Members on the Organizational Cultural Facilitators for Instructional Innovations

Themes	Categories	f*	%	Codes
Characteristics of members	High capacity for innovation	12	7.05	Academic staff: having research collaboration
		9	5.29	Students: being open to new approaches.
	Affective commitment	10	5.88	caring about image
		8	4.7	caring about organizational citizenship
Leadership style	Democratic	11	6.47	Mid-level caring the efforts
		10	5.88	using expert power
Institutional factors	Bottom-up management features	11	6.47	macro-managed
		8	4.7	democratic
Support mechanism	Flexible structure	7	4.11	freedom of speech
	Availability of resources	12	7.05	permission
Reward and recognition	Development based achievement criteria	4	2.35	incentives
		6	3.52	teamwork
		2	1.17	new and prospective studies

The theme—the characteristics of members—was given utmost importance in comparison to other aspects. In that regard, the categories that surfaced were mainly a high capacity for innovation and affective commitment. A common view concerning issues with high capacity for innovation amongst the interviewees was research collaboration. One stated as follows:

... I find my projects. I collaborate with academics abroad. I see what they do. My network increases. The network is significant for the academician. I feel more flexible to express myself in the projects—I can be more innovative, which is necessary for the project. I get the opportunity to see what others do, and I can transfer these applications to my students. Moreover, I participate in other studies at Turkish universities where I meet different professors and benefit from their ideas. I also undertake interdisciplinary studies. For example, we design robots for students in special education as part of the BAP project. I work together with my colleagues to discuss more in different areas. Thanks to this research collaboration, I share the findings with my students after making a template in my head. I practice in classrooms and I keep going if my students like it. The process of innovation I am experiencing is incredible... (P5, U1, 39, female).

The other most frequent highlights made by the participants centred around two main themes: leadership style and institutional factors. The former theme involves one category and is visible from the frequency analysis in which the participants placed the greatest importance on the democratic leadership style of mid-level leaders. One of the participants mentioned how mid-level leaders are:

... Our dean listens to us and incorporates our ideas in the decision-making process. She does not force us to do what she wants. Let me give you an example. Recently, they wanted to assign one of my Ph.D. students to a faculty journal. They called me and explained the reasons for choosing my student. They asked if it was appropriate, and I felt how they valued me. Furthermore, when I want to develop a project or apply a new approach, she supports me and makes recommendations based on her experience. I am glad to work with the dean. I know that senior-level leaders are oppressive because of the bureaucratic structure. They rule the university with the regulations of the government. But my dean implements her strategy in the most efficient way possible. She does not apply pressure and behaves as a bridge between top management and us. She maintains the balance. My motivation increases and I find myself encouraged to innovate both in class and in my research.... (P2, U1, 39, male).

Concerning the latter theme, the issues that bottom-up management features and organic structure were particularly prominent in the interview data. In that respect, participants mostly mentioned the flow of management as bottom-up. One respondent reported as follows:

... My university has a bottom-up management system. The program comes from senior management. They send it to the relevant academic unit and this unit makes its own decision. I have never experienced a disagreement between the bottom and top levels. A democratic understanding leaves the decision to the concerned group. With this

style, I am more comfortable to suggest new implementations and apply them for the students.... (P18, U4, 51, male).

Very few participants referred to the organizational culture facilitator for instructional innovations in support mechanisms and reward and recognition themes.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

The main goal of this study was to examine the organizational culture barriers and facilitators for instructional innovation. It was based on the views of academic staff members of Turkish public universities. As previously mentioned, the organizational culture barriers and facilitators for instructional innovation were identified as separate factors in terms of negative and positive aspects.

Based on the results concerning organizational culture barriers to instructional innovation, the analysis resulted in several significant findings, three of which seem to be the most important. First, the opinions of the academic staff on the structure reflected the idea that the higher education system in Turkey is over-centralized and has little autonomy and merit. According to the participants, the current structure of higher education may evidence a bureaucratic and mechanistic process due to the influence of COHE as an external governing body for all the universities. Thus, the universities had become subject to increasing challenges concerning instructional innovation. These results are in accordance with the findings in the literature (Aktan, 2007; Balyer, 2011; Guruz, 2001; Ivie, 2005; Ozipek, 2008). They demonstrate that universities are challenged by the control and sovereignty of political authorities, and as a result, academic staff members are becoming increasingly less satisfied. If we now turn to the imbalance between the Ministry of Education (MoE) and universities, participants revealed, as previously proclaimed by Alaz and Birinci (2009), Isikoglu, İvrendi and Sahin (2007), and Shantz (2005), that the relationship between the universities implementing teacher education programs and practice schools under the jurisdiction of the MoE is described as a sophisticated and formal relationship. This finding broadly supports the work of other studies in this area (Guncer, 1997; Kiraz, 2003; Yilmaz, 2011) that cooperation between the faculty members and teachers at the practice schools will ensure that prospective teachers become more innovative and contemporaneous.

The second important finding from the analysis is that academic staff members' lack of practice in schools as either a teacher, director, or inspector. This result is consistent with the findings of Bozak, Ozdemir, and Seraslan (2016), stating that professional practices at school is an essential factor in recognizing the teaching profession. It is encouraging to corroborate this finding with that found by Yilmaz (2017), who reports that academic staff members are recruited at the faculty of education regardless of their experience or their pedagogical background. He further explains that this is due to the culture at the faculty of education. In a similar vein, Ira (2011), Ozcan, Karatas, Caglar, and Polat (2014) support this notion that academic staff members are expected to be dependent individuals who neither criticize nor cause

problems due to the centralized and controlled culture of the faculties of education. The participants also specified that their students are afraid of the KPSS exam (in Turkish: Kamu Personeli Seçme Sınavı - the Public Service Personnel Selection Examination), which is the only way to launch a teaching career at a state school in Turkey. Bozak et al., 2016, and Yilmaz (2017) state that as soon as a student is enrolled in the faculty of education, he /she must consider the KPSS, which harms their education and makes them difficult to focus merely on the instructional innovation present in the courses.

Thirdly, the participants further emphasized the academic achievement criteria as another organizational culture barrier to instructional innovation. In Turkey, the success of academicians is determined by looking at the number of publications they have had, rather than according to the nature of their work or how they teach. However, as a contradictory fact, they are generally tasked with teaching duties that challenge them to publish. As noted by Callinicos (2006), being rewarded at both the institutional and individual levels is achieved according to research performance, which is an inevitable conclusion to the re-construction of higher education for the last 20 years. This idea is broadly supported by the research that has already been conducted in Turkey (Kalayci, 2009; TED, 2009; Yilmaz, 2017; YOK, 2007), stating that the performance evaluation process for the academic staff stemming from neo-liberal policies has resulted in texts being published regardless of their content alongside receiving a performance evaluation-based fee based on the number of publications. This issue has, of course, severed the link between scientific practices and critical thinking and inquiry. Accordingly, Kalayci (2009) clarified that in Turkey, there is no integrated systematic university-specific assessment system covering both summative and formative assessments. She added several appropriate summative and formative evaluation methods, which include student ratings, peer evaluation, self-evaluation of faculty members, assessment of student learning, administrator evaluation, external expert evaluation, alumni ratings, teaching awards, media documentation-videos, and employer opinions of graduates.

Based on the results concerning organizational culture facilitators for instructional innovation, these are the three most important findings. The most mentioned facilitator is the innovative orientation that the participants have is the joint research collaboration in which the researchers come together to address complex issues (Godley, 2013). According to Castells (2000), research collaboration networks are gradually supplanting hierarchical forms of universities, which directly explains the situation in Turkey. Additionally, it is stimulating to compare this result with that of Granovetter (1973) that research collaboration pushes the changes in institutional rules resulting in a reduction of the bureaucracy inherent to an organizational culture. The results of this study are in line with that of Huang (2014), who demonstrated that research networks derive benefit from higher education institutions by taking part in international collaborative projects, promoting creativity and innovation, and enabling organizational development (Godley, 2013). Huang (2014) further emphasizes that this organizational facilitator compels universities to promote the

professional development of their researchers and enhances their research capacity organically from the bottom-up rather than from the top-down.

The second important issue for organizational culture facilitator for instructional innovation are those mid-level leaders who use their expert power and care about the undertakings. Mid-level leaders have a distinctive position to ensure clear communication between high-level leaders and academic staff. Supporting the findings, Layne et al. (2010) further add that they represent the collaborative options of, and push for, the improvement of programs for faculty which require expert power and social skills. This study also supports the evidence from previous studies (Ozaslan, 2006; Sypawka, 2008) stating that mid-level leaders identify the necessary changes and envision the direction of the instructional innovations taking place at universities. However, the results are inconsistent with several other studies (Simsek & Garipagaoglu, 2016; Vatanartiran & Garipagaoglu, 2013) that indicate mid-level leaders attach importance to power and task their subordinates with making the decisions which hampers instructional innovation.

The third significant facilitator in this study is the bottom-up management features at a university. Aside from the present results, previous studies have demonstrated that bottom-up management allows academic staff members through active involvement to be more open, productive, and improve instructional approaches in new ways (Jackson, 2013; Kenney, 2002). These results further support the idea that freedom of speech is a fundamental academic value integral to developing and expounding personal and collective innovative methods at universities, since these are the sources of a university's benefit to the society and itself, as revealed by Bok and Bok (2009) and Boulton and Lucas (2011).

Contributions and Implications

The findings of this research provide several contributions to the current literature to understand the issues associated with the organizational culture barriers and facilitators for instructional innovation in terms of the perceptions of academic staff members. Concerning organizational culture barriers to instructional innovation, this study provides in-depth insight into the common and unique aspects of organizational culture for instructional innovation. The findings corroborate the idea that the higher education system is over-centralized and requires extensive reform to ensure that instructional innovation continues at Turkish universities. Accordingly, the most critical implication here is the introduction of a decentralized higher education system in which academic staff members pursue their research and teaching and are independent from all centralized authority and economic power. As this study has revealed, teaching candidates in the faculties of education are trained theoretically. This finding may help us understand that academic staff members lack knowledge regarding primary/secondary schools. Thus, for a more effective and successful teacher education system, academic staff members can be more inclined to the practices taking place in the schools before joining the staff of a university. Moreover, they may be provided in-service training by teacher support centres. These findings also have significant implications for understanding that quantity based academic

achievement criteria create a competitive and demanding culture. So, this study lays the groundwork for future research into using appropriate methods and tools to measure the performance of academic staff members to conceptualize the development of teacher education positively.

Regarding the organizational culture facilitators for instructional innovation, the contribution of this study has been to confirm that Turkish academic staff members have access to research collaborations to drive their professional success at the individual, organizational, and inter-organizational levels. Academic staff members can be provided opportunities such as projects, seminars, and workshops by the universities to encounter new ideas in instructional approaches. Moreover, this study strengthens the idea that mid-level leaders decisively impact the organizational culture for supporting instructional innovation to ensure a clear direction in Turkish universities. The findings will be of interest to academic leaders that use legal power rather than expert power, since using expert/charismatic power facilitates the formation of an innovative culture. Furthermore, these findings may help us understand that academic staff feel valued when their ideas are appreciated through bottom-up management approaches.

Limitations and Recommendations

Besides these advantages, a few limitations need to be noted. Future studies are necessary for this area to develop a full picture of OC barriers and facilitators for instructional innovation in Turkish universities among all the academic members of all faculties and departments from all stakeholders. A further study focusing on the OC and instructional innovations of both public and private universities is therefore suggested. In future investigations, it might be possible to identify these results by quantitative studies to strengthen the findings of this study in different contexts. As a basis for future research, this study adds value by reflecting Turkish academics' values and beliefs that both hinder and facilitate instructional innovation. Future research can further investigate the relationship between OC and instructional innovation at Turkish universities.

References

- Ahmed, P.K. (1998). Culture and climate for innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 1(1), 30-43.
- Amabile, T.M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., & Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the Work Environment for Creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 1154-1184.
- Aktan, C.C. (2007). Yüksek Öğretimde Değişim: Global Trendler ve Yeni Paradigmalar. In C Can Aktan *Değişim Çağında Yüksek Öğretim*. İzmir: Yaşar Üniversitesi Yayını.

- Alaz, A., & Birinci-Konur, K. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik uygulaması dersine yönelik deneyimleri. *I. Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmaları Kongresi*, 1-3 Mayıs, Çanakkale.
- Alpkan, L., Bulut, Ç., Günday, G., Ulusoy, G., & Kılıç, K. (2010). Organizational support for intrapreneurship and its interaction with human capital to enhance innovative performance. *Management Decision*, 48, 5.
- Arad, S., Hanson, M.A., & Schneider, R.J. (1997). A framework for the study of relationships between organizational characteristics and organizational innovation. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 31, 1, 42-58.
- Atmaca, M. (2007). A case of problematic Internet use successfully treated with an SSRI antipsychotic combination. *Prog. Neuro Psychopharmacol. Biol. Psychiatry*, 31, 961-962.
- Balyer, A. (2011). Akademik özgürlük: Türkiye'deki akademisyenlerin algıları. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 36 (162), 138-148.
- Barkley, E. F., Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H. (2014). *Collaborative learning techniques: A handbook for college faculty*. NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bauersfeld, H. (1995). The Structuring of the Structures: Development and Function of Mathematizing as a Social Practice. In L. P. Steffe & J. Gale (Ed.), *Constructivism in education*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Behera, S.K. (2013). E- and M-Learning: A Comparative Study. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, 4(3), 65.
- Bernard, H.R. (2002). *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative methods*. 3rd edition. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.
- Biesta, G. (2010). *Good education in an age of measurement. Ethics, Politics, Democracy*. London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Bok, D. C., & Bok, D. C. (2009). *Beyond the ivory tower: Social responsibilities of the modern university*. USA: Harvard University Press.
- Boulton, G., & Lucas, C. (2011). What are universities for? *Chinese Science Bulletin*, 56(23), 2506-2517.
- Bozak, A., Ozdemir, T., & Seraslan, D. (2016). Mesleğe yeni başlayan öğretmenlerin eğitim fakültelerinde almış oldukları öğretmenlik eğitimine ilişkin görüşleri. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13(36), 100-113.
- Brandon, D. P., & Hollingshead, A. B. (1999). Collaborative learning and computer-supported groups. *Communication Education*, 48(2), 109-126.
- Brennan, J., Broek, S., Durazzi, N., Kamphuis, B., Ranga, M. & Ryan, S. (2014). *Study on innovation in higher education: Final report*. European Commission Directorate for Education and Training Study on Innovation in Higher Education. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

- Brown, J.K. (2008). Student-centered instruction: Involving students in their own education. *Music Educators Journal*, 94, 5, 30-35.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods (5th ed.)*. London: Oxford University Press
- Burner, T. (2018). Why is educational change so difficult and how can we make it more effective? *Forskning og Forandring*, 1(1), 122-134. <https://doi.org/10.23865/fof.v1.1081>
- Callinicos, A., (2006). *Universities in a Neoliberal World*. London: Bookmarks.
- Camargo-Borges, C., & Rasera, E. (2013). Social constructionism in the context of organization development: Dialogue, imagination, and co-creation as resources of change. *SAGE Open*, 3(2), 1-7.
- Castells, M. (2000). Toward a sociology of the network society. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29, 693-699.
- Cohen, D. K., & Ball, D. L. (2007). Innovation and the problem of scale. In B. Schneider & S. McDonald (Ed.) *Scale-Up in Education: Ideas in Principle (Volume I)*, (pp. 19-36).
- Collis, J. (2010). *Innovate or die: Outside the square business thinking*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Covey, S.R. (1993). Innovation at four levels. *Executive Excellence*, 10 (9), 3-5.
- Credaro, A. (2003). *Change in education*. Retrieved from <http://www.geocities.com>
- Cresswell, J.W., & Plano Clark, V.L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed method research*. Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Denton, K. (1998). Blueprint for the adaptive organisation. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 7(2), 83-92.
- Denzin, N. K. (2017). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (3rd ed. online). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Duffy, T.M., & Jonassen, D.H. (1992). Constructivism: New Implications for Instructional Technology. In T. M. Duffy & D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Constructivism and the Technology of Instruction: A Conversation* (pp. 1- 16). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Ellis, R., Ginns, P., & Piggott, L. (2009). E-Learning in Higher Education: Some Key Aspects and Their Relationship to Approaches to Study. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 28, 3, 303-318.
- El Mhouti A., Erradi M., & Nasseh A. (2019). Application of cloud computing in e-learning: A basic architecture of cloud-based e-learning systems for higher education. In: Ben Ahmed M., Boudhir A., Younes A. (Ed.), *Innovations in smart cities applications*. 2nd Ed. Switzerland: Springer.

- Emil, S. (2018). Can world-class universities really exist in Turkey? A question of autonomy and academic freedom. In Rabossi, M., Joshi, K.M., Paivandi, S. (Ed.), *Pursuit of world-class universities: A global experience* (pp. 239-267). India: Studera Press.
- Filipczak, B. (1997). It takes all kinds: Creativity in the work force. *Training*, 34, 32- 40.
- Gamoran, A., Secada, W. G., & Marrett, C. B. (2000). The organizational context of teaching and learning: Changing theoretical perspectives. In M.T. Hallinan (Ed.), *Handbook of sociology of education* (pp. 37-63). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Garrison, R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7, 95-105.
- Garipagaoglu, B., & Simsek, E. (2016). Bolman ve Deal'in dört çerçeve modeline göre akademik liderlerin liderlik yaklaşımlarının incelenmesi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(1), 81-94.
- Glor, E. D. (2014). Studying the impact of innovation on organizations, organizational populations and organizational communities: A framework for research. *The Innovation Journal*, 19(3), 1-20.
- Godley, A. C. (2013). Entrepreneurial opportunities, implicit, contracts, and market making for complex consumer goods. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 7, 273-287.
- Gokhale, A. A. (1995). Collaborative learning enhances critical thinking. *Journal of Technology Education*, 7(1), 22-30.
- Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), 1360-1380.
- Guncer, B. (1997). *Okullarda uygulama çalışmaları- İlköğretim, Milli Eğitim Geliştirme Projesi Hizmet Öncesi Öğretmen Eğitimi*. Ankara: YÖK/ DB.
- Guruz, K. (2001). *Dünyada ve Türkiye'de yükseköğretim (tarihçe ve bugünkü sevk ve idare sistemleri)*. Ankara: ÖSYM Yayınları 4.
- Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 677- 694. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021987>.
- Harrison, A., & Rainer, K. (1992). The Influence of individual differences on skill in end-user computing. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 9(1), 93-111.
- Hoy, W. K., Miskel, C., & Tarter, J. (2013). *Educational administration: theory, research, and practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Huang, J. S. (2014). Building Research Collaboration Networks- An Interpersonal Perspective for Research Capacity Building. *The Journal of Research Administration*, (45)2, 89-112.

- Isikoglu, N. Ivrendi, A., & Sahin, A. (2007). Öğretmenlik uygulaması sürecine öğretmen adaylarının gözüyle derinlemesine bir bakış. *Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 26,131-142.
- Ivie, R.L. (2005). A presumption of academic freedom. *Review of Education Pedagogy & Cultural Studies*, 27(1), 53-85.
- Ira, N. (2011). *Eğitim fakültelerinde örgütsel kültür ve yönetsel etkililik*. (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi: İzmir.
- ISCAD (1997). *International standard classification of education*. UNESCO.
- Iskender, E., & Bati, G. B. (2015). Comparing Turkish universities entrepreneurship and innovativeness index's rankings with sentiment analysis results on social media. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 195, 1543 - 1552 .
- Jackson, N. (2013). *The wicked challenge of changing a university. A tale of bottom-up innovation supporting strategic change*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/2544746/The_Wicked_Challenge_of_Changing_a_University_A_Tale_of_Bottom-up_Innovation_Supporting_Strategic_Change.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 19, 151-188.
- Kalayci, N. (2009). Yükseköğretim kurumlarında akademisyenlerin öğretim performansını değerlendirme sürecinde kullanılan yöntemler. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 15(60), 625-656.
- Kasalak, G., & Bilgin-Aksu, M. (2014). The relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational cynicism of research assistants in educational sciences. *Theory & Practice*, 14(1), 125-133.
- Kenny, J. (2002). Managing innovation in educational institutions. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 18, 359-376.
- Keser, H., Uzunboylu, H., & Ozdamli, F. (2012). The trends in technology supported collaborative learning studies in 21st century. *World Journal on Educational Technology*, 3(2), 103-119.
- Kezar, A. J., & Eckel, P. D. (2002). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: Universal principles or culturally responsive concepts? *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 435-460.
- Kilicer, K., & Odabasi, H. F. (2013). Exploring the perceived barriers to innovativeness: Views of Turkish preservice teachers as technology leaders. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 28, 246-265.
- Kiraz, E. (2003). Uygulama öğretmeni yeterlik ölçeği: Ölçü aracı geliştirme örneği. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(1), 387-400.

- Kirschner, P. (2001). Using integrated electronic environments for collaborative teaching/learning. *Learning and Instruction*, 2(1),1-9.
- Kozma, R. B. (1985). A grounded theory of instructional innovation in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 56(3), 300-319.
- Kurt, S. (2010). Technology use in elementary education in Turkey: A case study. *New Horizons in Education*, 58(1), 65-76.
- Kyvik, S., & Reymert, I. (2017). Research collaboration in groups and networks: differences across academic fields. *Scientometrics*, 113, 951.
- Latchem, C., Jung, I., Aoki, K., & Özkul, A. (2007). The tortoise and the hare enigma in e-transformation in Japanese and Korean higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(4), 610 - 630.
- Layne, K., Nabeebaccus, A., Fok, H., Lams, B., Thomas, S., & Kinirons, M. (2010). Modernising morning report: Innovation in teaching and learning. *Clinical Teacher*, 7(2), 77-82.
- Lea, S., Stephenson, D., & Troy, J. (2003). Higher education students' attitudes to student-centred learning: Beyond 'educational bulimia'? *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(3), 321-334.
- Lundval, B. (2007). National innovation systems-analytical concept and development tool. *Industry and Innovation*, 14(1), 95-119.
- Mamun, A., & Tapan, S.M. (2009). Using ICT in teaching-learning at the Polytechnic Institutes of Bangladesh: Constraints and limitations. *Teacher's World-Journal of Education and Research*, 33-34, 207-217.
- Martins, E., & Martins, N. (2002). An organisational culture model to promote creativity and innovation. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28(4), 58-65.
- Martins, E. & Terblanche, F. (2003). Building organisational culture that stimulates creativity and innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 6, 1, 64-74.
- McClure, K. (2016). Building the innovative and entrepreneurial university: An institutional case study of administrative academic capitalism. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 87(4), 516-543.
- McCombs, B. L., & Whisler, J. S. (1997). *The Learner-centered classroom and school: Strategies for increasing student motivation and achievement*. The Jossey-Bass Education Series. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. London: Sage.

- Montez, J.M., Wolverton, M., & Gmelch, W.H. (2002). The roles and challenges of deans. *Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 241-266.
- Mumtaz, S. (2000). Factors affecting teachers' use of information and communications technology: A review of the literature. *Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education*, 9(3), 319-342.
- Nazari, M. Z., & Shahdadnejad, N. (2011). *Barriers to creativity and innovation in the organization's management*. International Conference on E-business, Management and Economics, Vol.25. Singapore: IACSIT Press.
- Nesbit, J. C., & Leacock, T. L. (2009). Collaborative argumentation in learning resource evaluation. In L. Lockyer, S. Bennet, S. Agostinho, & B. Harper (Ed.) *Handbook of research on learning design and learning objects: Issues, applications and technologies* (pp. 574- 588). Hershey: Idea Group.
- Newman, D. R., Webb, B., & Cochrane, C. (1997). Evaluating the quality of learning in computer supported co- operative learning. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 6, 484- 495.
- Newton, D., & Ellis, A. (2005). The influence of organisational culture on e-learning design in the Australian Army. *The Knowledge Tree*, 7, 1-10.
- Nour ul Amin, S. (2018). *ICT integration in education: A smart concept of teaching and learning*. New Delhi: Educreation Publishing.
- Obendhain, A., & Johnson, W. (2004). Product and process innovation in service organizations: The influence of organizational culture in higher education institutions. *The Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 9(3), 91-113.
- Orlikowski, W.J. (1992). The duality of technology: Rethinking the concept of technology in organizations. *Organization Science*, 3(3), 398-427.
- Ozaslan, G. (2006). *Eğitim yöneticilerinin güç tipi tercihlerinin değerlendirilmesi*. (Unpublished Master thesis). Selçuk University, Konya.
- Ozcan, K., Caglar, C., Karatas, I., & Polat, M. (2014). Administrators' power usage styles and their impact on the organizational culture in colleges of education: A case study. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 14(2), 560-569.
- Ozipek, B. B. (2008). Akademik özgürlüğün anlamı ve gerekliliği. *Liberal Düşünce Dergisi*, 24, 185-195.
- Packer, M.J., & Goicoechea, J. (2000). Sociocultural and Constructivist Theories of Learning: Ontology, Not Just Epistemology. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(4), 227-241.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pelgrum, W. J. (2001). Obstacles to the integration of ICT in education: Results from a worldwide educational assessment. *Computers & Education*, 37(2), 163-178.

- Robbins. S.P., & De Cenzo. D.A. (2001). *Management*. Prentice Hall.
- Robert, E., Ginns, P., & Piggott, L. (2009). E-learning in higher education: Some key aspects and their relationship to approaches to study. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 28(3), 303-318.
- Scott, S. (2012). Rethinking the roles of assessment in music education. *Music Educators Journal*, 98, 3, 31-35.
- Sanchez, A. V., & Ruiz, M.P. (2008). *Competence-based learning: A proposal for the assessment of generic competences*. Spain: University of Deusto.
- Sandelowski, M. (1986). The problem of rigor in qualitative research. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 8(3), 27-37. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00012272-198604000-00005>.
- Schneckenberg, D. (2008). *Educating tomorrow's knowledge workers*. Delft: Eburon Academic Publishers.
- Shantz, D. (2005). Is an innovative approach or traditional understanding in teacher education? (Translated by: E. Gökçe & S. Demirhan). *Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 38 (2), 187-195.
- Shattow, M. (1996). Out of the blue. *Electric Perspectives*, 21, 3, 44-54.
- Sypawka, W. (2008). *A study of division Deans' in the North Carolina community college system self perceived leadership style based on Bolman and Deal's Four Frame Theory* (Doctoral Dissertation). East Carolina University.
- Tanggaard, L. (2014) A situated model of creative learning. *European Educational Research Journal*, 13(1), 107-116.
- TED (2009). *Öğretmen yeterlikleri*. Ankara: TED.
- Tierney, W. (2008). Trust and Organizational Culture in Higher Education. In J. Välimaa and O.-H. Ylijoki (Ed.), *Cultural perspectives on higher education* (pp. 27-43). USA: Springer.
- Tushman, M., & O'Reilly, C. (1997). *Winning through innovation: A practical guide to leading organizational change and renewal*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- TUSIAD (2008). *Higher education in Turkey: Trends, challenges, opportunities*. Istanbul: TUSIAD publication.
- Umbach, P.D., & Wawrzynski, M.R. (2005). Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, 46, 153-184.

- Vaira, M. (2004). Globalization and higher education organizational change: A framework for analysis. *Higher Education*, 48(4), 483-510.
- Vatanartiran, S., & Garipagaoglu, B. (2013). Why do department chairs suffer the most in higher education hierarchy? *The Business Review, Cambridge*, 21, 2, 189- 196.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in the society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press: USA.
- Weiner B. (1986). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. In *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion*. New York: Springer
- Wright, G.B. (2011). Student-centered learning in higher education. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23(1), 92-97.
- Yanpar-Yelken, T., Celikkaleli, O., & Capri, B. (2007). Eğitim Fakültesi Kalite Standartlarının Belirlenmesine Yönelik Öğretmen Adayı Görüşleri (Mersin Üniversitesi Örneği). *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 3(2), 191-215.
- Yildirim, A., & Simsek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (9. baskı). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yılmaz, K. (2017). Eğitim fakülteleri yeni bir eğitim felsefesi oluşturabilir mi? *Türk Eğitim Dergisi*, 2(1), 22-41.
- Yılmaz, M. (2011). The opinions of primary school teacher candidates about the teaching staff lecturing teaching practice course. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(4), 1377-1387.
- Yirdaw, A. (2016). Quality of Education in Private Higher Institutions in Ethiopia: The Role of Governance. *SAGE Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015624950>
- YOK (2007). *Türkiye'nin yükseköğretim stratejisi*. Ankara: YOK.
- Zhu, C. (2013). The effect of cultural and school factors on the implementation of CSCL. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 44(3), 484-501.
- Zhu, C., & Engels, N. (2014). Organizational culture and instructional innovations in higher education: Perceptions and reactions of teachers and students. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(1), 136 - 158.

Türk Üniversitelerinde Eğitimsel Yenilikleri Engelleyici ya da Kolaylaştırıcı Örgüt Kültürü Faktörleri

Atf:

Çalışkan, A., & Zhu, C. (2021). Organizational culture barriers and facilitators for instructional innovations at the faculty of education. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 92, 137-166, DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2021.92.8

Özet

Problem Durumu: Küreselleşen dünyada işletme, sanayi, sağlık ve eğitim sektörlerinde yüksek niteliklere sahip kişilere ihtiyaç duyulmaktadır. Bu nedenle, yükseköğretim kurumlarından, hızla değişen topluma uyum sağlamaları için öğrencileri daha iyi donatmaları beklenmektedir. Bu konular üniversitelerin yenilikçi olmaları için baskı yaratmaktadır. Ancak yapılan çalışmalar bazı yükseköğretim kurumlarının yeniliğe dirençli olduğunu göstermektedir (Garison & Kanuka, 2004; Latchem & ark., 2007; Schneckenberg, 2009; Zhu & Engels, 2014). Bununla birlikte yenilik üzerinde örgüt kültürünün etkisi olduğuna inanılmaktadır. Brennan, Ryan, Ranga, Broek, Durazzi ve Kamphuis'a (2014) göre, yenilikçi uygulamalar yaratıcılığı artırmakta ve farkındalığı genişletmektedir. Bu nedenle, yeniliğe açık ve değişime karşı daha az dirençli örgüt kültürüne ihtiyacımız olduğuna dikkat çekmektedirler. Obendhain ve Johnson (2004) ise örgüt kültürü tipinin yenilik üzerindeki etkisini araştırdıkları çalışmalarında, yenilikçi (Adhocracy) kültür tipinin yenilik için ideal olduğu sonucuna ulaşmışlardır. Alanyazın ayrıca, örgüt kültürü ile örgütsel yenilikçilik arasındaki ilişkiye doğrudan odaklanan bazı çalışmalar içermektedir (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby & Herron, 1996; Mohammed & Bardai, 2012; Vaira, 2004; Zhu, 2013). Alanyazında yönetim, yaratıcılık, örgütsel stratejiler, işbirliği, iletişim, süreç inovasyonu, yenilikçi yetenekler ve örgütsel tipler gibi yükseköğretimde var olan örgüt kültürünü ve yeniliğini analiz etmede yararlı olacak bazı çalışmalar vardır (Cohen & Ball, 2007; Kozma, 1985; Schneckenberg, 2009; Zhu & Engels, 2014, Durazzi & Kamphuisi 2014). Bununla birlikte, bu tür çalışmalar, yükseköğretim kurumlarında eğitimsel yenilikleri etkileyen örgütsel kültür özelliklerine odaklanmakta sınırlı kalmaktadır. Ayrıca araştırmacılar, örgüt kültürünün üniversitelerde eğitim değişikliği için mükemmel bir katalizör olabileceğini bildirmektedir. (Tushmann & O'Reilly, 1997; Tierney, 2008), Zhu & Engels, 2014; Glor, 2014). Bu bağlamda bu araştırmanın problemini eğitimsel yenilikleri olumlu ya da olumsuz olarak etkileyen örgüt kültürü faktörlerinin neler olduğunu belirlemek oluşturmaktadır.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bu çalışmanın genel amacı, Türk yükseköğretim kurumlarında eğitimsel yenilikleri engelleyici ve kolaylaştırıcı örgüt kültürü faktörlerini belirlemektir. Çalışmada öğretim üyelerinin görüşlerine ve mevcut alan yazına yer verilerek bu faktörlerin neler olduğu belirlenmeye çalışılmıştır.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Bu çalışmada, 4 devlet üniversitesinde çalışan 20 akademik personelle yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşme yaparak, bu kişilerin eğitimsel yenilikleri

engelleyici ya da kolaylaştırıcı örgüt kültürü faktörleri hakkındaki görüşleri araştırılmıştır. Yapılan görüşmeler, Türk yükseköğretim kurumlarında eğitimsel yeniliğin önündeki engeller ve kolaylaştırıcılarla ilgili detayları ortaya çıkarmak için kullanılmıştır. Bu çalışmaya dahil edilecek üniversiteleri seçerken iki aşamalı tabakalı örnekleme tasarımı kullanılmıştır. İlk aşamada TÜBİTAK tarafından 2015 yılında hazırlanan Girişimci Yenilikçi Üniversite Endeksinde yer alan toplam 50 devlet üniversitesi ve özel üniversite dahil edilmiştir. İkinci aşamada, 50 üniversiteden, aynı şehirdeki dört devlet üniversitesi (uygun örnekleme) seçilmiştir, çünkü her biri listede farklı bir yüzde oranının parçasıdır ve yenilikçilik endeksinin gösteren farklı puanlar almıştır (maksimum çeşitlilik). Böylece, bu üniversiteler Türkiye'deki üniversitelerin heterojen yapısını temsil etmesi amaçlanmıştır.

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Türkiye'deki devlet üniversitelerindeki akademik personelin görüşlerine göre eğitimde yenilikçiliğe ilişkin beş ana engel ve kolaylaştırıcı tespit edilmiştir. Bunlar eğitimde yeniliklerden öğrenci merkezli öğrenmeyi, işbirlikli öğrenmeyi ve eğitim teknolojilerinin kullanımını engelleyebilecek veya destekleyebilecek kurumsal faktörler, üyelerin özellikleri, ödüller ve tanınma, liderlik stilleri ve destek mekanizmalarıdır. Eğitimsel yenilikleri engelleyici ya da kolaylaştırıcı örgüt kültürü temaları örtüşmekte; ancak kategoriler ve kodlar değişkenlik göstermektedir.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Öneriler: Akademik personelin görüşlerine göre, eğitimsel yenilikleri engelleyen örgütsel kültür faktörlerinin en önemlisi üniversitelerin yapısıdır. Akademik personel Türkiye'deki yükseköğretim sisteminin aşırı merkezileştirildiğini ve çok az özerklik ve değere sahip olduğu fikrini savunmaktadır. Katılımcılara göre, YÖK'ün tüm üniversiteler için harici bir yönetim organı olmasından dolayı, mevcut yükseköğretim kurumları bürokratik ve mekanik bir yapıya sahiptir. Bu nedenle, üniversiteler, eğitimde yenilik yapma ve yenilikçi yaklaşımları kullanma konusunda zorluklara maruz kalmışlardır. Bu sonuçlar alanyazındaki bulgulara uygundur (Aktan, 2007; Altbach, 2001; Balyer, 2011; Büken, 2006; Gürüz, 2001; İvie, 2005; Özipek, 2008). Bu çalışmalar, üniversitelerin siyasi otoritelerin kontrolü ve egemenliği ile mücadele ettiği ve akademik personelin gittikçe memnuniyet düzeyinin azaldığını göstermektedir.

Eğitimsel yenilik için örgüt kültürü kolaylaştırıcıları ile ilgili sonuçlara bakıldığında, katılımcıların en çok üzerinde durduğu örgüt kültürü kolaylaştırıcısının yeniliğe yönelim olduğu görülmektedir. Katılımcılar, karmaşık sorunları çözmek için meslektaşlarıyla biraraya geldikleri ortak araştırma iş birliği sayesinde eğitimsel yenilikleri öğrenme ve uygulama konusunda kendilerini geliştirdiklerini ifade etmişlerdir. Castells'e (2000) göre, araştırma iş birliği ağları, Türkiye'deki durumu doğrudan açıklayan üniversitelerin hiyerarşik yapısını yavaş yavaş değiştirecek türden birlikteliklerdir. Ek olarak, araştırma iş birlikleri bir kurum kültürüne özgü bürokrasinin azalması için kurumsal kuralların değiştirilmesi için uyarıcı vazifesi görmektedir. Bu çalışmanın sonuçları, araştırma ağlarının uluslararası işbirlikçi projelere katılarak, yaratıcılığı ve yeniliği teşvik ederek ve örgütsel kalkınmayı teşvik ederek yükseköğretim kurumlarının fayda sağladığını gösteren Huang (2014) ile benzerdir. Huang (2014) ayrıca, bu kurumsal kolaylaştırıcısının yükseköğretim

kurumlarındaki arařtırmacıları mesleki geliřime yönlendirdiđini, arařtırma kapasitelerini yukarıdan ařađıya deđil, ařađıdan yukarıya organik olarak arttırdıđını vurgulamaktadır.

Bu çalıřma, öđretmen eđitiminin geliřimini olumlu bir řekilde kavramsallařtırmak için gereken uygun yöntem ve araçları kullanmaya yönelik gelecekteki arařtırmalara zemin hazırlamaktadır. Bu çalıřma, yükseköđretim kurumlarında eđitimsel yeniliklerin kullanımını artırmak için, ařırı merkezizetçi olan yapıda köklü deđiřiklikler yapılması gerektiđini ortaya koymuřtur. Ayrıca, akademik personeli yenilikçi eđitimsel yaklařımları kullanmaya teřvik etmek için bu konular hakkında akademik personele seminerler ve çalıřtaylar düzenlenebilir ve akademik personelin projelere katılması sađlanabilir. Bu çalıřma eđitimsel yeniliklerin uygulamasını engelleyici ya da kolaylařtırıcı kurumsal kültür faktörlerinin neler olduđunu belirlediđi için önem arz etmektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Akademik personel, nitel çalıřma, merkezizetçi yapı, arařtırma ađları.