

Full Length Research Paper

Relationship of teachers' readiness for change with their participation in decision making and school culture

Yusuf İNANDI^{1*} and Fahrettin GILIÇ²

¹Education Sciences Department, Faculty of Education, Mersin University, Mersin province, Turkey.

²Ministry of National Education, Mersin Science and Art Center, Mersin, Turkey

Received 1 March, 2016; Accepted 18 April, 2016

The aim of this research is to study the relationship between primary school teachers' level of participation in decision making, school culture and their level of readiness for change. The data in the study were collected from 597 primary school teachers (304 men and 293 women) in central districts of Mersin in 2014 spring semester. Participation in School Management Scale was used to measure teachers' level of participation in decision making, School Culture Scale to measure the dominant school culture and Readiness for Change Scale to measure teachers' level of readiness for change. According to the analysis results, there is a significant relationship between primary school teachers' level of participation in decision making, school culture and their level of readiness for change. It was seen generally that teachers' level of readiness for change is high enough, but their views about school culture and participation in decision making are of medium level.

Key words: Participation in decision making, school culture, readiness for change.

INTRODUCTION

Change, in general, describes transformation of something from a state into another. Change, for organizations, describes transformation of organizations from their current situations into other situations about some activities. In a constantly changing world, it has almost been impossible for organizations to continue their existences stably. Therefore, change can be considered as an obligation for organizations to keep on their existences steadily.

The environment that the contemporary big and complex organizations exist in has gotten diversified day by day and it has been more complex. Today, as

globalization rules the entire world, there has been a rapid "change" in all parts of life from science to technology, economy to social life. With change, it has been understood, the transformation of a system, process or environment from a state to another. It is also essential for organizations, as a subsystem of social system, to keep up with this rapid change occurring in the upper system to which they belong. Any change happening around the organization first unbalances the organization and a need to rebalance shows up. Organizations which fall back on the changes around themselves and resist these changes are likely to have

*Corresponding author. E-mail: inandiyusuf@gmail.com.

difficulty in rebalancing, so they face the danger of losing their existences.

For educational organizations in which organization-environment relationship is the most intense and cannot be evaluated independently of their environment, change has gained great importance. It is important for a healthy society that educational organizations which are the leading organizations that prepare the individuals for the society and regulate their relationship with the environment, be opened to change and coherent with such environmental factors as economical, technological, social and legal circumstances.

Whatever the aim or content is in the process of organizational change, the most important issue that should not be forgotten is the human factor which is the leading actor in such changes. It is not possible to accomplish the purposed change successfully without taking the teachers' (the most important shareholders of educational organizations) thoughts and attitudes into consideration. Otherwise, it is more likely for teachers to show resistance to the change practices which are planned and developed independent of themselves. That is why the aims and reasons for change should be explained to the teachers clearly and their participation should be obtained.

Participation in decision-making

Therefore, it is necessary to know the decision making process well. Decision making process takes an important place in organizational administration. Aydın (2007) and Kaya (2009) acknowledge decision making process at the top of organizational processes. However, within the organizational processes (POSDCoRB) which Luther Gulick developed, decision making process does not take place independently. The reason for this is the notion that decision making is already involved in each of the organizational processes (Lunenburg and Ornstein, 2004). It is understood that decisions that have been made will affect all processes and finally organizational administration. Thus, decision making process is accepted as an important level in organizational administration, even the heart of the administration process.

In traditional administrative approach, the significance of the administrator becomes prominent in decision making process; but in order to obtain favourable results, it is necessary that teachers participate in decisions and share their opinions at policy-making stage in educational organizations (Akdağ, 2002). Besides, it is important that decisions that have been made are embraced by the members of the organization. Keung (2008) asserts that members of the organization who share their knowledge and ideas in the decision making process have a high level of satisfaction with their job.

It is expected to reach some goals by the participation

of the employees in the decision making process. First, it is aimed to maintain a democratic environment in the organization. Members of the organization will feel important and valuable as much as they express their ideas and these ideas take place in the decisions that have been made; furthermore, they will be more willing to apply these decisions which they participate in (Gümüş, 2011). Another goal is to enhance organizational activities and efficiency. The participation of employees in the decision making plays an important role in improvement of their efficiency and efficacy and the employees have the chance of expressing their ideas clearly by especially getting over the strict and secluded structure of the classical administration (Çetin, 2009). Meanwhile, that contributes to the improvement of motivational levels of the employees. Motivational level of an employee who feels important and valuable by participating in the decision making process in administration is expected to be high (Özdoğru and Aydın, 2012).

It is known that participation in decision making (PDM) has many advantages in terms of the organization to reach its goals. It has been viewed through PDM that motivation of the employees has been improved positively (Eren, 2008), their job satisfaction (Chishti et al., 2010) and organizational commitment levels have been higher (Ulutaş, 2011), they have experienced less burnout (Angermeier et al., 2009), their perception level of organizational communication has increased (Takmaz, 2009), they have had higher spirits (Wadesango et al., 2010; Jones, 1997), their organizational efficacy has increased (Kenari et al., 2012) the employees have had less off days (Kim, 2002), and finally, the employees' resistance to change has decreased (Lines, 2004; Singh, 2009). After all, educational organizations differ from many organizations as their inputs and outputs are humans. In this context, unlike others, educational organizations affect almost every zone of the society and that is why decisions should be made by a high level of participation as much as possible (Bursalıoğlu, 2000). When Regulation on Primary School Institutions is analyzed, it is seen that articles 60, 64, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98 and 99 include PDM of teachers within educational activities (Ministry of Education, 2012). So, it is important for educational organizations to become more qualified. Certainly, it is expected that a favourable learning climate and a positive organizational culture are found in educational organizations where PDM is achieved.

Organizational culture

It is necessary to analyze extensively, the organizational culture which is viewed as the most important variable of change. Culture is a concept on which people constantly debate, which cannot be described clearly and lines of which are hard to draw. Definitions concerning culture

usually include attainments of people, containing their productions, their experiences, values, beliefs, symbols that they developed through history and customs inherited from generation to generation (Güvenç, 2003). The relationship of organizations, as social systems which try to survive in social life, with culture is inevitable. Within this scope, if organizations are accepted as minor examples of the societies they belong, it is required to admit that organizations have different cultural qualities since there are different societies and cultures around the world. As culture is formed by relationships between organization and machines and individuals, it takes its place in the global environment and with the changes to which it is exposed as a result of the mutual interactions of individuals participating in the organization, it takes a new outlook and transforms from social culture into organizational culture (Köse et al., 2003).

Accepted as authority in organizational culture, Schein (1990) describes it as a pattern of basic assumptions invented, discovered or developed by a group while learning to handle the problems about harmony with the external environment and inner integration, adding those assumptions worked as nearly right and need to be taught to new members as the right way to deal with the mentioned problems. Culture plays a significant part in creation and success of the aim, decision, strategy, plans and policies, because members of the organization get connected to each other in line with the goals of the organization due to organizational culture (Eren, 2004). If the organizational culture is too weak to be integrative, the commitment of the employees to the organization and to each other decreases. Briefly, organizational culture is the bond that keeps the organization together. Culture provides basic assumptions about how the works will be prosecuted.

It will be useful to explain components of organizational culture in order to make it easy to understand and to form a frame. Basic assumptions are primary of these components. Assumptions that mean the facts and truths which members of the organization adopt with absolute acceptance form an aspect of the cultural structure which is the most difficult to observe and change (Sabuncuoğlu and Tüz, 1995). Basic values and beliefs are other components of organizational culture. Values in general is composed of an invisible, subjective and inner part of the culture and show a form of solution that is accepted as proper in analyzing organizational problems. Beliefs, as well, are values that show what to believe or not, in the organization (Bakan et al., 2004). Artifacts are the third and the last component of organizational culture. Leaders, heroes, norms, ceremonies, tales, myths, symbols and language are among the artifacts.

In the body of literature, there are many models related to organizational culture: Parsons model, Schein model, Harrison and Handy model, Pheysey model, Kilmann model, etc. Since organizational culture has a very large scope, to include one of the organizational culture model

mentioned in the research might make findings to be short. Therefore, in this study, certain aspects from various cultural models, as Terzi (2005) used, will be discussed instead of addressing one of the five different models of organizational culture. According to this, subdimensions of organizational culture are composed of support (Pheysey Model), bureaucratic (Kilmann Model), achievement (Pheysey Model) and task (Harrison and Handy Model) cultures. While determining these subdimensions, bureaucratic structure of educational organizations in Turkey, collaboration and team work, specialisation and the importance given to organizational success have been taken into consideration. It is seen that there is a strict bureaucratic structure in the public institutions in Turkey. It is obvious that human capital has become more important than tangible capital in a world where industrial society has been replaced by information society. Educational organizations are at the top of the institutions which have the most important effect on improving human capital of a society. So, educational organizations' being strictly bound to bureaucracy may build an obstacle against the change. That is why it is necessary for educational organizations to understand and comprehend the innovations that information society brings about; thus targeted organizational culture will develop and the success of educational organization will increase as well.

Change

Accordingly, change is inevitable for educational organizations. In this study, change is comprehended as "a transformation from a state to another" which is as a result of attitudes perceived by people in daily life (Erdoğan, 2012; Honson, 2003; Tokat, 2012). This transformation can either be in a certain time, planned or unplanned and can also develop in terms of attitude, structure, application and results in the subsystems at organizational level.

Improving the effectiveness of the organization, in other words, integrating the requirements of the members who perform the job is one of the objectives of organizational change (Sabuncuoğlu and Tüz, 1995). Besides, other aims of the organizational change are improving the effectiveness of the organization (Luecke, 2009), increasing the level of motivation and satisfaction of the members of the organization to keep them from monotony, preparing the organization for the future in accordance with the technological and social developments (Mittal, 2012), improving the organizational communication, establishing confidence and collaboration between members of the organization, providing guidance based upon proficiency and skills rather than bureaucratic authority and realising innovations in the organization.

In this context, it is possible to sort the reasons that

force the organization to change as organizational and non-organizational reasons. As economical, technological, social and legal factors are among the non-organizational potentials, organizational deficiencies originating from goals, structure, programme and communicational processes of the organization and humans in the organization can be listed as organizational factors (Sabuncuoğlu and Tüz, 1995). In addition to the situations like inflation and stagnation experienced in country economies (Lunenburg, 2010), the fact that globalized markets turn into international competitive environment, and that the events occurring and decisions made in certain regions of the world have effects on the other societies and individuals are economical circumstances which make change inevitable for organizations (Ussahawanitchakit, 2011). Besides economical circumstances, educational organizations have need to make changes in curriculum and staff in order to train employees in accordance with the technological developments as they require new information and skills for employees (Martinic, 2010). Sociocultural factors such as traditions, culture, educational level and population structure are indicative of individuals' needs. In respect to this, the fact that educational organizations have to adapt themselves to the society shows the effect of social conditions on organizations (Nadina, 2011). National and international legislative regulations performed under the name of the education reform (for example, 12 year compulsory primary education effectuated in Turkey in 2012) are also examples of legal conditions requiring organizational change.

Communication which affects the objectives, structure and programme of the organization, decision-making, problems experienced in administrating processes like leadership and motivational strategies form the organizational factors of change (Lunenburg, 2010). Change will be inevitable as a result of situations like poor communication between teachers and administrators, decisions made are ineffective and inadequate, leadership style of the school principal is insufficient for school objectives and to solve the problems and when motivational level of teachers and other staff is low (Honson, 2003). Low performance and absenteeism of teachers and students, teachers' attitudes towards the administration, familial problems of students, school's relationships with families, environment and unions when the school administration is referring to change are among reasons for change based on human factors (Erdoğan, 2012; Lunenburg, 2010). Consequently, it is clearly seen that avoiding or resisting change are impossible; resistance to change is accepted as a standard fact by the researchers as well as inevitability of change.

Although, change is compulsory for organizations to continue their existences, members of the organization are not always ready or willing to change (Bovey and

Hede, 2001). Hultman (1998) seeks reasons for resistance to change and finds out that resistance is experienced since change, either in a small or extensive scale, prevents the preexisting condition from being carried out in the future. Employees of the organization show resistance to change for various reasons such as uncertainties (loss of position, control and power) (Bruckman, 2008), giving up the habits (Griffin and Moorhead, 1986), economical conditions (Sabuncuoğlu and Tüz), group pressure (Lunenburg, 2010) and fear of failure (Trader-Leigh, 2012). Change means uncertainty for individuals as it is from what is known to be unknown either in terms of structure of the organization or relationships in the organization (Agboola and Salawu, 2011). Changing roles and responsibilities after change (Andersen, 2006; Bordia et al., 004; Dijk and Dick, 2009; Hultman, 1998), perception of threat for organizational career (Mittal, 2012; Nodeson, 2012), loss of rights like decision making, access to information and autonomy (Lunenburg, 2010), perceiving belief, values, behaviours and habits are under threat (Griffin and Moorhead, 1986; Hultman, 1998) are among the reasons for resistance to change.

Readiness for change is a concept approached at either organizational or an individual level in organizations in various areas (education, health, industry, finance etc.). In this study, individual readiness for change is discussed. Peach et al. (2005) described readiness for change as individuals having positive thoughts of necessity for change and change will be favourably for both themselves and their organization, However, Armenakis et al. (1993) definition of readiness for change as a cognitive situation which affects the attitudes of the individual towards change is accepted as the most comprehensive definition. Readiness for change is a three-dimension concept, as cognitive, emotion and intention; so, in this research, these dimensions are studied. The fact that these dimensions come first in different stages of change process reveals the complexity of the concept of readiness for change (Bouckennooghe et al., 2009).

Stressing that members of the organization want to apply change as much as they value it, Weiner (2009) expressed that there may be various reasons for members of the organization to value change and lists them thus, they believe a number of changes should be urgently made, and they think the change will solve an important organizational problem, they foresee the favours which the change will bring to administrators, opinion leaders and other colleagues support it.

There are many factors (organizational and individual) which affect the individuals' level of readiness for change. Organizational culture appears to be the primary factor. Harris (2002) remarks that organizational culture and climate is determinant in the attitudes of individuals towards change. Rashid et al. (2004) stated that administration style of leaders and organizational structure are

effective in the attitudes of employees towards change other than organizational culture. Besides these, personal factors have an effect on the level of readiness for change. Perception, attitude and beliefs of individuals are significant for the success of the change. The values at the center of cognitive systems of humans affect their behaviours and attitudes (Schwarz, 1996). As the organizational members' level of readiness for change shows parallelism with their PDM levels in the process of change, it is clearly seen that individuals are not eager enough in the process of change which is put into practice top-down (Cohen and Caspary, 2011).

The organizational members have high level of readiness for change which is accepted as a prerequisite so that the process of change can be applied successfully. Weiner (2009) states that it is highly possible that individuals with high level of readiness for change will be more persistent on starting the process of change, making more efforts for the change and against the obstacles which they encounter in this process. On the other hand, Rafferty et al. (2013) refer to favourable business manners such as high level of job satisfaction and organizational commitment as important results of the individuals' being ready for change. Wanberg and Banas (2000) stated that individuals with low level of readiness for change face problems like experiencing discomfort at work and quitting job while agreeing that individuals with high level of readiness for change will have job satisfaction.

Whatever the size of the change, it is important that the members of the organization are ready for change. Starting the process of change without identifying the readiness for change levels of the members of the organization may cause opportunities and sources to be wasted and even worse, and the existing capacity of the organization to be damaged. That is why it is tried to reveal the relationship between organizational culture, PDM and readiness for change in this research.

Aim of the study

The aim of this study was to reveal whether there is a significant relationship between teachers' level of PDM, prevalent school culture and their level of readiness for change in public primary and secondary schools; and is to determine whether teachers' level of PDM and school culture predict their level of readiness for change. In line with this purpose, answers to the questions below have been sought:

Out of the teachers who work at primary and secondary schools in central districts of Mersin (Turkey),

- 1) Is there a significant relationship between their level of PDM, prevalent school culture and their level of readiness for change?
- 2) To what degree do their level of PDM and prevalent organizational culture at school predict their level of

readiness for change?

METHODOLOGY

Research model

General survey model was used in this study. Survey models aim to give reply to the questions "what, where, when, what degree, how and how often" and describe a case as it is (Büyüköztürk et al., 2009). This study is descriptive as it tries to determine teachers' level of PDM, their opinions about school culture and their level of readiness for change. In addition, it is a relational study since there is relationship between their PDM, school culture and readiness for change.

Study group

The population of the study consists of 5932 teachers in 165 public primary and secondary schools in central districts (Akdeniz, Toroslar, Yenisehir and Mezitli) of Mersin (Mersin Provincial Directorate of National Education, 2014). There are 597 teachers (304 male and 293 female) in the sample formed by unproportional sampling. According to figuring out the size of the sample from a population of which number of members is known (Saunders et al., 2009), the sample of the study is of 95% confidence level, which is considered to be high enough. Detailed information on the sample is given in Table 1.

Data collection tools

Data collection tool is comprised of four parts. Personal information on the participant (gender, seniority and teaching period at the current school) is the first part; "Participation in School Administration Scale" (Uyar, 2007) to determine their participation in decision making is the second part; "School Culture Scale" (Terzi, 2005) to determine the dominant culture in schools is the third part; and "Readiness for Change Scale" (Kondakçı, Zayim and Çalıřkan, 2010) to determine teachers' level of readiness for change is the last part.

Participation in school administration scale

It is a five-point Likert type scale to measure teachers' participation in school administration. It has 53 items and four subdimensions: participation in school administration, opinions about benefits of PDM, factors reducing participation and recommendations to enhance participation. Of these, the first dimension (participation in school administration) was used in this study. Since this study examines teachers' participation in decision making, other dimensions of the scale are excluded. To test reliability and validity of the scale, a pre-implementation was done with 60 teachers and administrators in six primary schools in Mamak, Cankaya and Sincan districts of Ankara. According to factor analysis to test construct validity of the scale, factor loads of 10 items in subdimension of participation in school administration vary between 0.591 and 0.869. Cronbach alpha coefficient of this subdimension was found to be 0.87 (Uyar, 2007). It was also found to be 0.87 in this study.

School culture scale

This scale consists of 29 items and four subdimensions: support, achievement, bureaucratic and task culture. It was developed as

Table 1. Distribution of teachers according to gender, seniority and teaching period at their current school.

Variables		N	%
Gender	Male	304	50.9
	Female	293	49.1
	Total	597	100
Seniority	0-5 years	111	18.6
	6-10 years	134	22.4
	11-15 years	124	20.8
	16-20 years	80	13.4
	21 years or over	148	24.8
	Total	597	100
Teaching period at current school	0-5 years	408	68.3
	6-10 years	106	17.8
	11-15 years	45	7.5
	16-20 years	29	4.9
	21 years or over	9	1.5
	Total	597	100

five-point Likert type. Factor analysis was done to test construct validity of the scale. Factor loads of 8 items in support culture vary between 0.501 and 0.736, and Cronbach alpha coefficient was found to be 0.88. Factor loads of 6 items in achievement culture vary between 0.482 and 0.719, and Cronbach alpha coefficient was found to be 0.82. Factor loads of 9 items in bureaucratic culture vary between 0.443 and 0.736, and Cronbach alpha coefficient was found to be 0.76. Lastly, factor loads of 6 items in task culture vary between 0.563 and 0.672, and Cronbach alpha coefficient was found to be 0.74. Cronbach alpha coefficient of the scale itself was found to be 0.84 (Terzi, 2005). These values prove the scale is of high reliability. In this study, Cronbach alpha coefficient for School Culture Scale as a whole was found to be 0.88 while it was 0.88 for support culture, 0.81 for achievement culture, 0.74 for bureaucratic culture and 0.80 for task culture.

Readiness for change scale

It has 12 items and three subdimensions: cognitive, emotional and intentional readiness. It is a five-point Likert type scale. To test construct its validity, explanatory and confirmatory factor analyses were done using the data obtained from two different samples. Confirmatory factor analysis was found to support the model suggested by explanatory factor analysis. Cronbach alpha coefficient was found to be 0.87 for cognitive readiness, 0.75 for emotional readiness and 0.90 for intentional readiness (Kondakçı et al., 2013). This scale was preferred to be used because individual readiness for change requires one's cognitive and emotional readiness. In this study, Cronbach alpha coefficient for Readiness for Change Scale as a whole was found to be 0.88 while it was found to be 0.78 for cognitive readiness, 0.72 for emotional readiness and 0.84 for intentional readiness. Regarding the factor analyses and validity and reliability tests, these three scales were considered to fit this study as data collection tools.

Data analysis

SPSS software (20.0 version) was used in analysis of the data. Essential statistical operations were done with regards to the aims

of the study by entering the obtained data into the software program. Teachers' opinions on their level of PDM, dominant culture type in their schools and their level of readiness for change were shown through arithmetic mean and standard deviation. Correlation analysis was done to determine whether there is a significant relationship between teachers' level of PDM, their school culture and their level of readiness for change. As a last, multiple regression analysis was done to reveal to what degree their level of PDM and school culture predicts their level of readiness for change. The results were interpreted and discussed in line with these analyses. In the study, 0.05 and 0.01 were taken as significance level.

RESULTS

The findings are given in this part in accordance with aims of the study.

Findings on the relationship between teachers' level of PDM, school culture and their level of readiness for change

The results of correlation analysis to show the relationship between teachers' level of PDM, school culture and their level of readiness for change are given in Table 2. According to this, there is a positive relationship between teachers' level of PDM and their cognitive readiness ($r=0.154$, $p<0.01$) and intentional readiness ($r=0.140$, $p<0.05$). However, there is no significant relationship between teachers' level of PDM and their emotional readiness ($r=-0.066$, $p>0.05$).

There is a positive relationship between support culture and teachers' cognitive readiness ($r=.144$, $p<0.01$) and intentional readiness ($r=0.088$, $p<0.05$). On the other hand, there is no significant relationship between support culture and teachers' emotional readiness ($r=-0.057$,

Table 2. Correlation analysis about the relationship between teachers' level of PDM, school culture and their level of readiness for change.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	M	SS
PDM	1								3.06	0.795
Support culture	0.673**	1							3.21	0.812
Achievement culture	0.652**	0.826**	1						3.22	0.798
Bureaucratic culture	-0.086*	-0.065	-0.008	1					3.13	0.624
Task culture	0.458**	0.543**	0.542**	0.186**	1				3.72	0.728
Cognitive readiness	0.154**	0.144**	0.137**	0.107**	0.201**	1			4.10	0.681
Emotional readiness	-0.066	-0.057	-0.086*	-0.162*	-0.006	0.446*	1		4.01	0.898
Intentional readiness	0.140**	0.088*	0.075	0.115**	0.158**	0.786**	0.429**	1	3.90	0.712

**p<0.01; * p<0.05.

Table 3. Multiple regression analysis of teachers' level of pdm and school culture predicting their level of readiness for change.

Readiness for change Variable	Cognitive				Emotional				Intentional			
	B	SH	β	T	B	SH	β	T	B	SH	β	T
Constant	3.049	0.197	-	15.487	4.948	0.261	-	18.962	2.931	0.207	-	14.177
PDM	0.079	0.048	0.092	1.643	-0.074	0.064	-0.065	-1.157	0.136	0.051	0.152	2.688
Support culture	0.029	0.064	0.034	0.447	-0.001	0.085	-0.001	-0.017	0.004	0.067	0.004	0.052
Achievement culture	-0.021	0.063	-0.025	-0.334	-0.123	0.084	-0.110	-1.470	-0.080	0.066	-0.089	-1.202
Bureaucratic culture	0.100	0.046	0.091	2.183	-0.274	0.061	-0.190	-4.521	0.122	0.048	0.107	2.533
Task culture	0.128	0.047	0.136	2.689	0.146	0.063	0.118	2.317	0.112	0.050	0.114	2.245
	R=0.230		R ² =0.053		R=0.209		R ² =0.044		R=0.213		R ² =0.045	
	F(5)=6.615 p<0.01				F(5)=5.411 p<0.01				F(5)=5.608 p<0.01			

p>0.05). Achievement culture has a positive relationship with teachers' cognitive readiness ($r=0.137$, $p<0.01$) but a negative relationship with their emotional readiness ($r=-0.086$, $p<0.05$). A significant relationship cannot be seen between achievement culture and teachers' intentional readiness ($r=0.075$, $p>0.05$).

There is a positive relationship between bureaucratic culture and teachers' cognitive readiness ($r=0.107$, $p<0.01$) and intentional readiness ($r=0.115$, $p<0.05$); however, a negative relationship is seen between bureaucratic culture and emotional readiness ($r=-0.162$, $p<0.05$). There is a positive relationship between task culture and teachers' cognitive readiness ($r=0.201$, $p<0.01$) and intentional readiness ($r=0.158$, $p<0.01$) while there was no significant relationship between task culture and emotional relationship ($r=-0.006$, $p>0.05$).

Findings on whether teachers' level of PDM and school culture predict their level of readiness for change

Results of regression analysis conducted to show whether teachers' level of PDM and school culture predict their level of readiness for change are shown in Table 3. According to this, PDM and school culture are found to predict readiness for change ($p<0.01$).

Cognitive readiness

Teachers' level of cognitive readiness shows a low but significant relationship with their level of PDM and school culture ($R=0.230$; $R^2=0.053$; $p<0.01$). School culture and PDM explain 5.3% of variance of cognitive readiness for change. School culture and PDM predict cognitive readiness most out of three dimensions of readiness for change. According to standardized regression coefficient (β), relative importance sequence of predictor variables for cognitive readiness is as follows: task culture, PDM, bureaucratic culture, support culture and achievement culture.

Emotional readiness

Teachers' level of emotional readiness shows a low but significant relationship with PDM and school culture ($R=0.209$; $R^2=0.044$; $p<0.01$). School culture and PDM explain 4.4% of variance of emotional readiness for change. According to standardized regression coefficient (β), relative importance sequence of predictor variables for emotional readiness is as follows: task culture, support culture, PDM, achievement culture and bureaucratic culture.

Intentional readiness

Teachers' level of intentional readiness shows a low but significant relationship with PDM and school culture. PDM and school culture explain 4.5% of variance of intentional readiness dimension. According to standardized regression coefficient (β), relative importance sequence of predictor variables for intentional readiness is as follows: PDM, task culture, bureaucratic culture, support culture and achievement culture.

DISCUSSION

It is considered significant and favourable to discuss the findings obtained in the research with regards to the relationship between teachers' level of PDM and their views on school culture and their level of readiness for change in parallel with research questions.

Relationship between teachers' level of PDM and prevalent school culture and their level of readiness for change

When teachers' level of PDM and readiness for change is analyzed, it is shown that there is an affirmative and significant relationship between the cognitive and intentional readiness for change and PDM. Accordingly, it can be stated that as teachers' level of PDM increases, their level of cognitive and intentional readiness for change increases as well. It is expected that if teachers feel that they have a voice in decisions, their level of readiness for change will be high. Teachers' viewing change innovative at cognitive level and being eager to see change practices increases in direct proportion to their PDM level, especially on the issues which concern them. There is no doubt that teachers are the ones who are influenced first and most by the change practices in educational organizations. In Aydođan's (2007) study, the result that teachers are reluctant to change as their opinions are not consulted in the process of change supports the findings obtained in this research. Similarly, studies indicate that level of readiness for the change is high in the organizations where participative decision making processes are applied (Armenakis et al., 1993; Cohen and Caspary, 2011). Therefore, leadership styles adopted by school administrators become prominent in relation to providing teachers with more opportunities of PDM. A school administrator with a democratic leadership style is supposed to enable teachers' participation in decision making on the issues concerning them. According to Inandi et al. (2013), democratic leadership is seen to be effective particularly on short-term problems resulting from change process. Yapicier (2007), according to the answers of teachers in his study, underlined desire for a democratic atmosphere at schools and added that school administrators should have a

democratic attitude and featuring democratic educational practices at their schools would be possible with administrators with an understanding of democracy in schools.

The reason why the relationship between teachers' levels of PDM and cognitive readiness is more powerful than their level of intentional readiness may stem from the fact that the teachers are not so willing and determinant in devoting themselves to the process of change. Teachers' devoting themselves to the change in a top-down applied process of change does not seem realistic or logical. As seen, it is clear that associating teachers in decisions from the planning stage of change will enhance their level of readiness for change.

When the relationship between teachers' level of readiness for change and the prevalent school culture at schools where they work is considered, there was found a positive and significant relationship between cognitive readiness and all dimensions of school culture, and also between intentional readiness and support, bureaucratic and task culture while there was a negative significant relationship between emotional readiness and achievement culture and bureaucratic culture. In the body of literature, there are various studies in parallel with these findings relating to the relationship between organizational culture and readiness for change in general (McNabb and Sepic, 1995; Burke, 2002; Harris, 2002; Weiner, 2009).

In this study, it is seen that the cognitive readiness level is enhanced as dimensions of school culture increases. The most powerful relationship between cognitive readiness level and dimensions of school culture is the one with task culture. This result seems significant when the fact that prevalent culture at school is the task culture and cognitive readiness with the highest mean is taken into consideration. It is natural that change is viewed as innovative and desired in a task culture in which teaching is accepted as a job requiring specialization. Specialization requires the individuals to keep their knowledge and skills up-to-date facing organizational or non-organizational conditions. Inandi et al. (2015) found in their study on teachers' and principals' self-efficacy and their resistance to change, that teachers with high level of self-efficacy focus more on their specialization and proficiency, which makes them to desire change rather than getting stuck in traditional structures.

The relationship between support culture and cognitive readiness is the second. This result corresponds to the findings of the study in which Bouckenoghe et al. (2009) revealed that readiness for change attitudes positively build up in organizations, particularly with support culture. There are also studies on the presence of relationship between readiness for change and human relations which are essential to support culture (Jones et al., 2005; Madsen et al., 2005). Teachers feel ready for change as they are sure that they will be in solidarity when overcoming the uncertainty and negative results of change. That

is because they share their happiness and sadness, and value each other. They do not feel alone during and after the change process.

The relationship between cognitive readiness and achievement culture is third while its relationship with bureaucratic culture is the last. Similarly, the fact that bureaucratic culture is weak in schools as compared to other school culture dimensions reflects its relationship with readiness for change. It is thought that, in achievement culture where the biggest reward is to succeed in a task, individuals will be desirous for change for the better and more as their inner motivation level is high. On the other hand, in bureaucratic culture where administrators frequently reminds the rules and hierarchy comes to the fore, teachers are expected to think that current negative conditions will only be overcome through change practices.

The negative relationship between emotional readiness and dimensions of school culture shows that level of emotional readiness for change declines as bureaucratic and achievement culture grows in schools. In achievement culture in which teachers have been found to perceive that they do not get what they deserve, it is obvious that teachers will not feel uneasy with the change if administrators rewards teachers' success. Teachers' level of emotional readiness for change decreases more especially in schools where bureaucratic culture prevails more than the others. However, the fact that input and output of educational organizations are humans restrains hierarchy, bureaucratic rules and seniority are privileges in schools. As in cognitive readiness, relative weakness of bureaucratic culture at schools and teachers' high level of emotional readiness explain such a negative relationship.

It is seen that teachers' level of intentional readiness for change increases as task, bureaucratic and support culture get stronger at schools. The relationship between task culture and intentional readiness is of the highest value, which is similar to the one between cognitive readiness and school culture dimensions. It is remarkable that the relationship of intentional readiness with bureaucratic culture is higher than support culture. This contradicts the notion that bureaucratic culture is a barrier to change. In contrast to what is expected, bureaucratic culture does not influence teachers' intentions on change practices negatively. It can be inferred accordingly that teachers get uneasy and intend to change as bureaucratic structure in which centralist decision-making and hierarchy are fundamental takes in the schools. Positive relationship between bureaucratic culture and school administrators' legitimate and coercive power (Koşar and Calık, 2011) is expected to effect school climate negatively and thus teachers will not be pleased with this and tend to change. Therefore, it can be interpreted that their level of intentional readiness for change increases in direct proportion to bureaucratic culture.

Teachers' predictive level of PDM and school culture on their level of readiness for change

The findings show that PDM and school culture predict teachers' level of readiness for change at a low level. Based on this, it is probable to consider PDM and school culture as determinative factors of readiness for change. This result is supported by the view that involving teachers, who are at the center of change process in schools, in PDM and informing them about their new roles will be effective on their level of readiness for change (Akpınar and Aydın, 2007; Kondakci et al., 2010). As for school culture, readiness for change is associated with organizational members' beliefs, attitudes and intentions which are not independent of organization's cultural values and beliefs (Armenakis et al., 1993).

There is no difference in importance sequence of school culture dimensions in terms of their predictive power on dimensions of readiness for change. However, PDM comes after task culture in predicting cognitive readiness and follows task and support culture for emotional readiness while it precedes all school culture dimensions for intentional readiness. The finding that PDM is most influential on intentional readiness can result from the fact that teachers are not definitely determined to devote themselves to change. People need to have a word in planning, and control and freedom of movement in implementation of change process for an absolute devotion. The uncertainties arising by change may make teachers to behave a bit withdrawn in devotion to change. Furthermore, such factors as not involving teachers in PDM (Vakola and Nikolaou, 2005), centralist structure of Turkish Education System and not rewarding teachers' successes in change process (Zayim, 2010; Helvacioğlu and Kircioğlu, 2010) can constitute an impediment for devotion to change.

It is understood that it is necessary to involve teachers in PDM and take prevalent school culture into consideration so as to increase teachers' level of readiness for change.

Conclusion

According to the analysis of the relationship between teachers' level of PDM and readiness for change, there was found a positive and significant relationship between teachers' level of PDM and their cognitive and intentional readiness for change. That is, as their level of PDM increases, their cognitive and intentional readiness for change increases, too.

Analysis of the relationship between school culture and teachers' level of readiness for change shows the presence of a significant relationship between them. Accordingly, there is a positive and significant relationship between cognitive readiness and all dimensions of school culture. It is seen that the relationship between cognitive readiness and task culture

is the highest. In other words, the more the positive teachers' opinions on task culture are, the higher their level of cognitive readiness. There has been found a significant but negative relationship between teachers' emotional readiness and achievement and bureaucratic culture. Their emotional readiness is negatively influenced especially when bureaucratic culture takes the lead at schools. Lastly, there has been seen a positive and significant relationship between intentional readiness and support, bureaucratic and task culture. As in cognitive readiness, teachers' level of intentional readiness is influenced most positively by task culture of all school culture dimensions. Regarding the fact that task culture is the leading one at schools, it is a significant result that teachers' level of readiness for change is quite high.

It is also seen that PDM and school culture have predictor effects on readiness for change but at a low level. Task culture is the uppermost predictor for cognitive and emotional readiness while PDM comes first for intentional readiness.

In conclusion, school administrators should involve eager teachers in PDM and encourage the indecisive or shy teachers to participate in decision-making by exhibiting a democratic leadership style. The school administrators must be supported at this point particularly by upper-level administrators. A positive educational environment will enhance teachers' job satisfaction and commitment to work, contribute to the construction of a positive school culture and help administrators considerably on readiness for change in schools. To implement the change in time and in a planned way, will enable the schools to catch up with the future. Regarding all these conditions, it necessary to be followed and the administrators at any level of education will create a democratic school environment, involve teachers in PDM and let them take responsibility. The researchers studied on this subject in particular and suggested comparison between private and public schools and examined high school teachers' level of readiness for change in relation to the variables taken in this study.

Conflict of Interests

The authors have not declared any conflicts of interests.

REFERENCES

- Agboola AA, Salawu RO (2011). Managing deviant behaviour and resistance to change. *Intl. J. Bus. Manage.* 6(1):235-242.
- Akdağ B (2002). Eğitim örgütlerinde yönetim süreçlerine katılma. *Öğretmen Dünyası Dergisi* 267:21-25.
- Akpınar B, Aydın K (2007). Eğitimde değişim ve öğretmenlerin değişim algıları. *Eğitim ve Bilim* 32(144):71-80.
- Andersen GR (2006). Conflicts during organizational change: Destructive or constructive. *Nordic Psychol.* 58(3):215-231.
- Angermeier I, Dunford BB, Boss AD, Boss RW (2009). The impact of participative management perceptions on customer service, medical errors, burnout, and turnover intentions. *J. Healthc. Manage.* 54(2):127-141.
- Armenakis AA, Haris SG, Mossholder KW (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Hum. Relat.* 46(6):681-703.
- Aydın M (2007). "Eğitim Yönetimi" (8th Edition). Ankara: Hatiboğlu Yayıncılık.
- Aydoğan İ (2007). Değişim süreci ve okul personeli. *GAU J. Soc. Appl. Sci.* 3(5):13-24.
- Bakan İ, Büyükebeşe T, Bedestenci H C (2004). "Örgüt Sırlarının Çözümünde Örgüt Kültürü" İstanbul: Aktüel Yayınları
- Bordia P, Hunt E, Paulsen N, Tourish D, DiFonzo N (2004). Uncertainty during organizational change: Is it all about control? *Eur. J. Work Org. Psychol.* 13(3):345-361.
- Bouckenooghe D, Devos G, Van Den Broeck H (2009). Organizational change questionnaire-Climat of change, process, and readiness: Development of a new instrument. *J. Psychol.* 143(6):559-599.
- Bovey WH, Hede A (2001). Resistance to organizational change: The role of defense mechanisms. *J. Managerial Psychol.* 16(7):534-549.
- Bruckman JC (2008). Overcoming resistance to change: Causal factors, interventions, and critical values. *Psychologist-Manager J.* 11:211-219.
- Burke W W (2002). *Organization change: Theory and practice* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bursalioğlu Z (2000). "Okul Yönetiminde Yeni Yapı ve Davranış" (11th edition) Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.
- Büyükoztürk Ş, Çakmak E, Akgün ÖE, Karadeniz Ş, Funda D (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* (2nd edition). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Chishti SH, Rafiq M, Rahman F, Jumani NB, Ajmal M (2010). Impact of participative management on employee job satisfaction and performance in Pakistan. *Lang. India* 10(12):89-101.
- Cohen A, Caspary L (2011). Individual Values, Organizational Commitment, and Participation in a Change: Israeli Teachers' Approach to an Optional Educational Reform. *J. Bus. Psychol.* 26:385-396.
- Çetin C (2009). *Toplantı Yönetimi ve Kararlara Katılma* İstanbul: İTO Yayınları.
- Dijk VR, Dick VR (2009). Navigating organizational change: Change leaders, employee resistance and work-based identities. *J. Change Manage.* 9(2):143-163.
- Erdoğan İ (2012). *Eğitimde Değişim Yönetimi* (3rd edition) Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Eren E (2004). "Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetim Psikolojisi" (8th edition) İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.
- Eren E (2008). *Yönetim ve Organizasyon* İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayın.
- Griffin RW, Moorhead G (1986). "Organizational Behavior" Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Gümüş AE (2011). İlköğretim Okullarında Çalışan Öğretmenlerin yönetime katılma düzeyleri ile örgüt kültürü ilişkisinin incelenmesi. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Yeditepe University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Güvenç B (2003). *İnsan ve Kültür* (10th edition) İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Harris A (2002). *School Improvement: What's in it for Schools?* New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Helvacı MA, Kıcıroğlu B (2010). İlköğretim okullarının değişime hazır bulunuşluk düzeyleri (Uşak ili örneği). *Akademik Bakış Dergisi* 21:1-30.
- Honson EM (2003). *Educational Administration and Organizational Behaviour.* (5th Edition) Boston: Pearson Education.
- Hultman K (1998). "Making Change Irresistible, Overcoming Resistance to Change in Your Organization" California: Davies-Black Publishing.
- Inandi Y, Tunc B, Gilic F (2013). School administrators' leadership styles and resistance to change. *Int. J. Acad. Res.* 5(5):196-203.
- Inandi Y, Yesil H, Karatepe R, Uzun A (2015). Öğretmenlerin ve okul müdürlerinin öz yeterlikleri ile değişime gösterdikleri direnç arasındaki incelenmesi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 11(2):563-581.
- Jones RE (1997). Teacher participation in decision making – its relationship to staff morale and student achievement. *Education* 118(1):76-82.
- Jones RE, Jimmieson NL, Griffiths A (2005). The impact of organizational culture and reshaping capabilities on change implementation success: The mediating role of readiness for change. *J. Manage. Stud.* 42(2):361-386.
- Kaya YK (1999). "Eğitim Yönetimi" Ankara: Bilim Yayınları.

- Kenari BA, Alajiveh MK, Hamidi M, Sajjadi SN (2012). The relationship between participative management and job attitudes of employees of national olympics and paralympics academy of Iran. *Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci.* 2(2):123-129.
- Keung CC (2008). The effect of shared decision-making on the improvement in teachers' job development. *New Horiz. Educ.* 56(3):31-46.
- Kim S (2002). Participative management and job satisfaction: Lessons for management leadership. *Publ. Admin. Rev.* 62(2):231-241.
- Kondağcı Y, Zayim M, Çalıřkan Ö (2013). Deęiřime hazır olma ölçeęinin geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalıřması. *İlköğretim Online* 12(1):23-35.
- Kondağcı Y, Zayim M, Çalıřkan Ö (2010). Okul yöneticilerinin deęiřime hazır olma tutumlarının okulun öğretim düzeyi, yöneticilerin deneyimi ve okul büyüklüęü bağlamında incelenmesi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 11(2):155-175.
- Kořar S, Çalık T (2011). Okul yöneticilerinin yönetimde gücü kullanma stilleri ile örgüt kültürü arasındaki iliřki. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi* 17(4):581-603.
- Köse S, B Kartal, N Kayalı (2003). Örgütsel vatandaşlık davranıřı ve tutuma iliřkin faktörlerle iliřkisi üzerine bir arařtırma. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 20:1-19.
- Lengnick-Hall ML, Lengnick-Hall CA (1992). Effective participative decision making: A joint responsibility for success. *Employee Responsibilities. Rights J.* 5(2):1001-116.
- Lines R (2004). Influence of participation in strategic change: Resistance, organizational commitment and change goal achievement. *J. Change Manage.* 4(3):193-215.
- Luecke R (2009). "Deęiřim ve Geçiř Dönemini Yönetmek." (Translated by Ü. Şensoy). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları. (Original version was published in 2003).
- Lunenburg FC (2010). Forces for and resistance to organizational change. *Natl. Forum Educ. Admin. Supervision J.* 27(4):1-10.
- Lunenburg FC, Omstein AC (2004). "Educational administration: Concepts and practices" (4th edition) Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Madsen SR, Miller D, John CR (2005). Readiness for organizational change: Do organizational commitment and social relationships in the workplace make a difference? *Hum. Resour. Dev. Q.* 16(2):213-234.
- Martincic R (2010). Change management in adult educational organizations: A Slovenian case study. *Manag. Glob. Transit.* 8(1):79-96.
- McNabb DE, Sepic FT (1995). Culture, climate and total quality management: Measuring readiness for change. *Public Product. Manage. Rev.* 18(4): 369-385.
- Mittal S (2012). Managing employee resistance to change: A comparative study of Indian organizations and MNCs in Delhi-NCR region. *J. Arts Sci. Commerce* 3(4):64-71.
- Nadina RR (2011). Methods of identification of the need for organizational change as being opportune. *Ann. Univ. Oradea Econ. Sci. Ser.* 20(2):707-712.
- Nodeson S, Beleya P, Raman G, Ramendran C (2012). Leadership role in handling employee's resistance: Implementation of innovation. *Interdiscipl. J. Contemp. Res. Bus.* 4(1):466-477.
- Özdoęru M, Aydın B (2012). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin karara katılma durumları ve istekleri ile motivasyon düzeyleri arasındaki iliřki. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 12(2):357-367.
- Peach M, Jimmieson NL, White KM (2005). Beliefs underlying employee readiness to support a building relocation: A theory of planned behavior perspective. *Org. Dev. J.* 23(3):9-22.
- Rafferty AE, Jimmieson NL, Armenakis AA (2013). Change Readiness: A Multilevel Review. *J. Manage.* 39(1):110-135.
- Rashid MZA, Sambasivan M, Rahman AA (2004). The influence of organizational culture on attitudes toward organizational change. *Leadersh. Org. Dev. J.* 25(2):161-179.
- Sabuncuoęlu Z, Tüz M (1995). "Örgütsel psikoloji" Bursa: Ezgi Yayınları.
- Saunders M, Lewis P, Thornhill A (2009). *Research Methods for Business Students* (5th Edition) London: Pearson Education.
- Schein EH (1990). Organizational culture. *Am. Psychol.* 45(2):109-119.
- Schwartz SH (1996). Value priorities and behavior: Applying a theory of integrated value systems. C. Seligman, J. M. Olsen, and M. P. Zanna (Ed.). "Values: The Ontario symposium" Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc. pp. 1-25.
- Singh SKG (2009). A study on employee participation in decision making. *Unitar e-J.* 5(1):20-38.
- Takmaz UŞ (2009). İlköğretim Okullarında Örgütsel İletişim Düzeyi ile Öğretmenlerin Karara Katılma Davranıřları Arasında İliřki. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Selcuk University Institute of Social Sciences, Konya.
- Terzi AR (2005). İlköğretim okullarında örgüt kültürü. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi* 43:423-442.
- Tokat B (2012). "Örgütlerde Deęiřim ve Deęiřimin Yönetimi" Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Trader-Leigh KE (2012). Identifying resistance in managing change. *J. Org. Change Manage.* 15(2):138-156.
- Ulutař M (2011). Katılımcı yönetimin örgütsel baęlılık ve yaratıcılıęa etkisi: İmalat sektöründe bir uygulama. *Sosyal ve Ekonomik Arařtırmalar Dergisi* 15(21):593-615.
- Ussahawanitchakit P (2011). Building corporate innovation of information technology businesses in Thailand: Roles of employee creativity, organizational change and globalization force. *J. Acad. Bus. Econ.* 11(1):1-10.
- Uyar Ş (2007). Öğretmen ve Yöneticilerin Görüşlerine Göre Öğretmenlerin Okul Yönetimine Katılmaları (Düzce İli Örneęi). Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ankara University Institute of Education Sciences, Ankara.
- Vakola M, Nikolaou I (2005). Attitudes towards organizational change: What is the role of employees' stress and commitment. *Employee Relat.* 27(2):160-174.
- Wadesango N, Rembe S, Chabaya O (2010). An analysis of the type of teachers that participate in decision-making in schools: A case study of Gweru district secondary schools in Zimbabwe. *Int. Stud. Educ. Admin.* 38(2):5-20.
- Wanberg CR, Banas JT (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to change in a reorganizing workplace. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 85:132-142.
- Weiner J B (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. *Implement. Sci.* 4:67-75.
- Yapıcıer İ (2007). Örgüt ikliminin oluşmasında yöneticilerin kişisel ve yönetsel özelliklerinin rolü. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Gaziosmanpařa University Institute of Social Sciences, Tokat.
- Zayim M (2010). Investigating the relationship between primary and secondary level public school teachers' readiness for change and perceived organizational trust. Unpublished Master's Thesis, METU Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.