Organizational Culture Types that Academicians

Associate with Their Institutions

Semra Kıranlı Güngör[1] & Hakan Şahin[2]

[1] Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Faculty of Education, Educational Sciences, Turkey

[2] Directorate of National Education, Eskişehir, Turkey

Correspondence: Semra Kıranlı Güngör, Faculty of Education, Educational Sciences, Eskişehir Osmangazi Univesity, Eskişehir, Turkey. E-mail: semk2009@gmail.com

This study is produced of the Hakan Şahin's Eskisehir Osmangazi University Institute of Educational Sciences, Department of Higher Education Administration and Policy Master Thesis work that was carried out on May 29, 2018, defended and resulted in success with Consultancy of Assistant Prof. Dr. Semra KIRANLI GÜNGÖR.

Abstract

This study, considering the sample of a university located in central Anatolia region, Turkey, aims to identify culture types that the academicians perceive in relevant with their institutions according to the 4 types of cultures (Clan, Adhocracy, Hierarchy, and Market) given in the Competing Values Framework by Cameron and Quinn. The study includes 205 academicians from different faculties and vocational schools as participants. The data was obtained from the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) that has been prepared particularly for the research group. Analyzes of the data obtained in the study were carried out with statistical package programs as IBM SPSS Statistics 23 and Interactive Lisrel SSI 8.72. The demographic features of the academicians were determined with percentage and frequency analyzes and the mean and standard deviation statistics were used in determining the perception levels of organizational culture types which academicians associate with their universities. For the analysis of the differentiation of culture-type perception levels according to the demographic characteristics of the academicians, t-test, one-way ANOVA test, and post-hoc tests were performed. According to the findings obtained in the research, the most common type of organizational culture that academicians associate with their institution is the hierarchy culture that is presented in Competing Values Framework Model. There is no significant difference between participants' demographic features and their culture perceptions. According to the result of the research, rules, stability, predictability, and sustainable politics are at the forefront of the university. Employees are supervised by managers who tend to be good coordinators.

Keywords: competing values framework, organizational culture, cameron and quinn

1. Introduction

1.1 Organization and Culture

Organization is a structure that consists of people with different characteristics in social, cultural, psychological and academic terms. In other words, each of people in an organization may have different backgrounds, habits, hobbies, behaviors, beliefs, and values. In the same way, these people may contribute to the organization or benefit from it as the leader, a member or a stakeholder of the organization. Despite all these differences, the organization is the structure that holds these people together for a specific purpose and let them be in a constant interaction with each other to achieve the objectives of the organization (Keyton, 2005, p. 10). In recent years, sociologists, anthropologists, and psychologists have studied the structure of the organization from different perspectives to understand how the organization achieves these purposes and they have developed conceptual frameworks and models that have different or common points in their approaches to the subject.

Culture has been associated with the organization by researchers and the concept of organizational culture has been revealed. So, by examining the organizational culture of organizations, shared values, and basic principles, researchers have made inferences in areas needed for analysis, development, change and management of organizational culture

(Şişman, 2015, p.163). According to the aim of the researches, the organizational culture has been studied in order to provide different benefits in areas of the organization, such as the determination of the necessary changes for the efficiency of the organization, determining the changes necessary for the efficiency of the organization and the organization in the environment where the organization is located (Bolman ve Deal, 2017, p. 10).

1.2 Organizational Culture

Organizational culture has been used as a term in the systematic analysis of organizational culture in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Especially in the 1980s and 1990s, the organizational culture was perceived by many researchers as the only key to organizational success (Alvesson ve Sveningsson, 2016, p. 40). It is difficult and complex to define the concept of organizational culture. The reason for this difficulty arises from the use of culture as a term in a wide and varied sense, as well as the fact that culture has a structure so deep that it cannot be easily observed (Schabracq, 2007, p. 7). As a matter of fact, in defining the culture, it is necessary to go below the behavioral dimension, because it may cause other factors other than culture (Schein, 2010, p. 22). In addition, if the methods used by researchers to understand the meaning of the term are not fully understood, the definitions they make do not have much meaning, because how the culture is understood has equal importance with how it is studied (Ehrhart, vd., 2014, p. 125).

Although the researchers dealt with the concept from different perspectives and dimensions, it is seen that the definitions and explanations they made about the concept meet in the common pot at the point of shared values and beliefs. For example, Itzin and Newman (2005, p. 10) discusses organizational culture in terms of gender relations and discusses organizational culture in terms of shared symbols, language, the way things are done and deeply established beliefs and values in their books 'Gender, Culture, and Organizational Change'. They consider these cultural elements as an environment in which sexual identity, sexist practices, and inter-gender power relations are maintained. According to Kwantes and Glazer (2017, p. 10), the elements and levels of the concept of culture were examined in a simple manner, but culture resulted in only a partial definition. Culture is included in a social context with internalized values, beliefs and practices as an individual phenomenon. In this way, the culture defined at the individual level shows a common context with the culture at the group level.

Likewise, Deshpande and Webster (1989, p. 4), who connect different definitions of the concept of organizational culture to different theoretical backgrounds created for the concept, explain organizational culture as a model of common beliefs and values that enable individuals to understand the functioning of the organization and present examples of behavior in the organization. Schein (2010, pp. 18-29), who is one of the leading figures in the field of organizational culture, considers organizational culture in terms of leadership in his book 'Organizational Culture and Leadership' and sees the leader as the initiator of the emergence of culture and describes the culture and leadership as two faces of the same coin. In the same book, organizational culture is defined as a common basic assumptions model that a group acquires in solving internal integration and external adjustment problems.

Kates and Galbraith (2007, p. 3), one of the other researchers who emphasize leadership, state that organizational culture is shared by many members and formed by common behavior norms, disposition, and values. Organizational culture is the result of organizational decisions taken in the past and the accumulation of leadership and leadership behaviors that have emerged as a result of these decisions. Ashkanasy (2000, p. 21) examined the concept of organizational climate in his book 'Organizational Culture and Climate' and associated the concept with the organizational culture. For him, it is the organizational climate that constitutes the organizational culture or vice versa. Organizational climate is a visible layer of organizational culture. Ashkanasy discussed organizational culture from three different perspectives. In terms of structural reality, the organization has qualities such as climate and culture. When evaluated in terms of social structure, the distinguishable order in organization activities constitutes organizational culture. The third aspect deals with the organization and culture in terms of linguistic conformity and states that these concepts serve for the sake of encouraging us to consider.

On the other hand, it is important to understand what the organizational culture does not represent, in other words, what it is not. According to Gallagher (2003, p. 4), organizational culture is not about the products or services offered by the organization, but about the value judgments and beliefs of the organization. Organizational culture is not externally promoted or established, but occurs spontaneously within the organization without being explicitly stated, instead. Organizational culture is not about the policies and procedures of the organization but about the style of the organization. Organizational culture is not related to the recruitment process of the organization but related to the human model that is taken into consideration when getting members. Organizational culture is not about expressing behaviors desired to be exhibited, but about rewarding desired behavior.

1.3 Organizational Culture in Universities

Universities are one of the few institutions that have almost never changed from the Middle Ages to the present in terms of their structure and functioning. The main purpose of higher education institutions is the creation and dissemination of knowledge. While the organizational focus is science, organizational units are departments in the university. The source of the identity perception they have for the academic staff is the scientific and professional communities they belong to with the science they are interested in rather than their corporate membership in the institution they work for (Sanyal, 1996, p. 4). In the 21st century, universities have a structure that serves wider, more complex, diverse students and chase wider targets than in the past (Scott, 2013, p. 15). The universities, which have a continuous and rapid change in social, technological, economic and political aspects, are obliged to adapt to these changes. In the pressure environment caused by this rapid change at both global and international levels, universities accelerate academic reforms such as the creation of common markets, the mobility of students and staff, free movement of services and products (Beytekin, Yalçınkaya, Doğan ve Karakoç, 2010, p. 2).

Each university has its own culture. Everything from the university's name, logo, colors, mission, and history to the university's campus, architecture, the method of business management, graduates, community and clubs is a part of this culture. Each university has both an institutional culture with its goals, beliefs, and traditions evolved from its history, as well as subcultures shared between administrators, faculties, faculty, and students. Universities are governed by a structure consisting of faculty boards, faculty members and administrative managers rather than by one-handed CEOs, as in the business World (Min, 2017, pp. 27-32).

The organizational culture of the university is a special phenomenon due to the fact that the education departments rely on a self-organized system based on the principles of knowledge and learning. University culture; within the scope of internal relations, functions as a platform in which academic and administrative managers, academic and administrative staff and students, public and private sector executives, alumni and parents of them, employers and partners from other educational institutions, competitors, and non-governmental organizations build various relationships (Vasyakin, Ivleva, Pozharskaya and Shcherbakova, 2016, p. 2). As can be seen, the university sees itself as an organizational actor, which constitutes a subjective strategy in the socioeconomic strife of contemporary society, that is, it has an important role in the formation of the information infrastructure and broadens the area of common values and beliefs (Serdenciuc, 2015, p. 5).

1.4 The Importance of Detecting Culture in Universities

All these structural features and functions of the universities have an effective role in their culture. Therefore, studying the cultural features of the universities will provide convenience to academicians, administrative staff, managers in strategy development, and decision-making processes for all stakeholders of the university. In this study, organizational culture is handled in terms of universities with higher education institutions. In this research carried out through the university, the type of organizational culture that academic staff perceived regarding their institutions was analyzed by using Competitive Values Framework model developed by Cameron and Quinn (2006).

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The aim of this research is to reveal the levels of organizational culture types perceived by the academic staff working in the university by using the Competing Values Framework Model developed by Cameron and Quinn. The main aim of this study is to find out which culture type (clans, adhocracy, hierarchy and market) of the model is the dominant culture type perceived in their institutions by university employees. Moreover, it is revealed whether the demographic characteristics of the employees make a difference in their perceptions. In line with this aim, the following sub-research questions framed the study:

1. What are the current levels of organizational culture types perceived by the staff of the university in terms of the organizational culture types included in the Competing Values Framework Model (Clan, Adhocracy, Hierarchy, Market)   and which one is closer to be the dominant culture?

2. Do the organizational culture types perceived by academic staff of the university differ according to their;

    a. Gender

    b. Education status

    c. Seniority

    d. Title?

2. Method

This research was designed in the survey model. The universe of the study consists of 1559 academicians working in the university according to 2017 Higher Education Information Management System data. The study group was chosen by simple random sampling technique. A total of 205 academicians (151 of them from different faculties of the university, 52 of them from various vocational high schools and 2 of them from a research center) participated in the study. The questionnaires were sent via e-mail to 1000 staff who were working in the faculties, institutes and vocational high schools which can be reached during the research process. A second time reminder e-mail was sent because the return rate of the first attempt was low. A total of 211 surveys were returned in total. 205 of these surveys were available to analyze. The return rate is 21%. The reason for the low rate is that the study has been carried out with academic staff that is a professional group having a high workload.

The formula given below is used in determining the size of the sample (Salant and Dillman, 1994, p. 55):

"n = N t2 p q / d2 (N-1) + t2pq

N: Number of individuals in the target group

n: Number of individuals to be sampled

p: Frequency of occurrence of the incident (probability of occurrence)

q: Frequency of incidence of the event under investigation (probability of not occurring)

t: The theoretical value at a given level of significance according to the table t

d: ±sampling error accepted according to the occurrence frequency of the event."

The sample size was calculated as n = 150 with a 99% confidence interval and ± 10% sampling error for this non-homogeneous universe. With this in mind, the scale was applied to 205 students to reach more general results from the scale results.

The findings related to the demographic characteristics of the participants are given in Table 1. The sample constitutes about 13% of the universe. In descriptive studies, a 10% sample representing the universe is seen as the lowest limit. As the universe of this research consists of 1559 academicians, 160 academicians, as 10% of 1559, are sufficient to represent the universe. According to this, there are 205 academicians in the study and so, the sample error limit is exceeded (Gay, vd., 2011, p. 132; Özen and Gül, 2010, p. 415).

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Demographic features		Frequency (F)	Percent (%)
Gender	Male	91	44,4
	Female	114	56,6
Age	Between 20-29	38	18,5
	Between 30-39	110	53,7
	Between 40-49	36	17,6
	50 and older	21	10,2
Education Status	undergraduate	12	5,9
	Master's Degree	83	40,5
	Postgraduate	110	53,7
Total Working Year at the University	0-5 Years	79	38,5
	6-10 Years	75	36,6
	11 Years and more	51	24,9
Academic Title	Prof. Dr.	19	9,3
	Ass. Dr.	13	6,3
	Asst. Prof.	32	15,6
	Lecturer	66	32,2
	Research Asst.	75	36,6
Total		**205**	**100**

2.1 Data Collection Instrument

In this study, the questionnaire, which was prepared by Deshpande, Farley, and Webster (1993) on Cameron and Quinn's Competitive Values Model and adapted to Turkish by Erdem, Adiguzel and Kaya (2011), was applied with permission from the researchers. In the survey, the expressions given in the organizational culture are discussed in four dimensions: organizational type, leadership, organizational glue (ties holding organizational members together) and organizational strategic emphasis. There are 16 items related to four types of organizations: clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, and market in each dimension. 1, 5, 9, and 13. items are included in the survey as a predictor of clan culture. 2, 6, 10, and 14. items are included in the survey as a predictor of adhocracy culture. 3, 7, 11, and 15. items are included in the survey as a predictor of hierarchy culture. 4, 8, 12, and 16. items are included in the survey as a predictor of market culture. The reliability and validity studies required for the scale were performed.

Accordingly, the four-factor structure of the questionnaire was validated as a result of the factor analysis to ensure validity. When the fit indices were examined, X^2/sd value (1.83 <2) showed that there was an acceptable fit in the model (Kline, 2011). The CFI value (.98> .95) indicates a good fit in the model (Hooper, Coughlan and Mullen, 2008; Hu and Bentler, 1999). The RMSEA value was found to be .064. The fact that the RMSEA value is close to .06 indicates that the model has a good fit (Hu and Bentler, 1999). The NNFI value (.97> .95) indicates a perfect fit in the model (Marsh, Hau, Artelt, Baumert, and Peschar, 2006). In addition, factor loadings (λ), t values between items and factor and multiple correlation frames (R2) were calculated. It was concluded that λ, t, R2 values were significant at .05 level. When λ values are examined, it can be stated that these values change between .60 and .82 and can be perceived sufficiently because they are above .40. In terms of dimension, It was found that the factor loadings of the items in the clan size ranged between .69 and .80, the factor loads of the adhocracy dimension ranged from .76 to .80, and the factor loads of the items in the hierarchy dimension ranged from .65 to .80. the factor loads of the items in the market size varied between .60 and .82.

The reliability coefficient of the questionnaire was calculated by the Cronbach Alpha analysis. The internal consistency coefficient calculated for the whole scale was .890. For the sub-dimensions in the scale, the coefficients vary between .802 and .864.

2.2 Data Analysis

In this research, the data obtained by the questionnaire application were analyzed using statistical package programs. As descriptive statistics; T-test for paired comparisons, one-way ANOVA test for more than two comparisons was used over SPSS 23 package program. In addition, Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated for the reliability of the questionnaire using the same program. For the validity of the questionnaire, Lisrel 8.72 program was used. First of all, the missing data were examined and no missing data were found. Then, the normal distribution of the data was examined, skewness (between +1 and -1), and stickiness (between kurtosis / +2 to -2) showed normal distribution and parametric tests could be used for analysis. So, the four-factor structure was analyzed through the Lisrel program on the organizational culture assessment questionnaire. While evaluating the results of confirmatory factor analysis, indexes such as Kikare / sd, RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation), NNFI (Non-normed Fit Index) and CFI (Comparative Fit Index) were used. GFI (Goodness of Fit Index) is not used in the study because it is affected by sample size (Sharma, Mukherjee, Kumar and Dillon, 2005). In addition, the t-test in comparison to the gender of the academicians, the one-way ANOVA test for comparisons according to educational status, study year and titles, and post-hoc tests were used to determine the cause of the difference.

3. Findings

This section presents the findings of the statistical analysis of the data obtained by the questionnaire applied to the participants. The tables and findings related to the sub-objectives of the research are given below.

3.1 Findings on the Level of Participation of Academic Staff in Organizational Culture Types

The first sub-goal of the research is to find the answer to the following question; "what are the current levels of organizational culture types perceived by the staff of the university in terms of the organizational culture types included in the Competing Values Framework Model (Clan, Adhocracy, Hierarchy, Market) and which one is closer to be the dominant culture?" In Table 2 below, the average of participation of the academic staff participating in the survey is given to the organizational culture statements included in the survey.

Table 2. Levels of Academic Staff Participation in Organizational Culture Types

Culture Type	N	X	Sd	Minimum	Maximum
Clan	205	2,40	,88402	1,00	4,75
Adhocracy	205	2,29	,87769	1,00	5,00
Hierarchy	205	3,53	,89972	1,00	5,00
Market	205	2,95	,91301	1,00	5,00

Note: In scale, 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = absolutely agree.

When Table 2 is examined, it can be said all participants agreed to all culture types to some extent. The average of the participation of the academic staff in the survey about the clan culture was found   at "I don't agree" level (X = 2.40), the average of the participation in the statements about the culture of the adhocracy was found   at "I don't agree" level (X = 2.29), the average of the participation in the statements about the hierarchy culture was found   at "I agree" level (X = 3.53), and the average of the participation in the statements about the market culture   was found at "I don't agree" level (X = 2.95). When we examine these values, the type of culture that the academic staff participating in the research associate least with the organizational culture is the adhocracy culture with an average value of 2,29. It is followed by the clan culture with an average of 2.40 and the market culture with an average of 2.95. The highest mean culture type is hierarchy culture with an average value of 3.53. The academic staff responded to the level of "disagree" with the statements about the adhocracy, clan and market culture, and responded to the level of "agree" about the hierarchy culture. Accordingly, although there is a level of participation in all types of organizational culture, it can be said that the type of organizational culture that the academic staff most associates with their institutions is the hierarchy culture. In other words, the type of culture perceived as dominant by the academic staff of the university was found to be closer to the hierarchical culture in the Competitive Values Model.

3.2 Findings of t-Test Results of Gender-Based Perception Levels of Academic Staff According to Gender

The second sub-objective of the study is to find out whether the organizational culture perception levels perceived by the academic staff of the university vary according to the gender of the staff. It was analyzed by the t-test whether the perceptions of the organizational culture of the staff participating in the study differ according to gender and the results are given in table 3 below.

Table 3. The t-test results of the perception of the organizational culture of academic staff by gender

Organizational Culture Type	Gender	N	$\bar{x}$	Sd	df	T	P
Clan	Male	91	2,3956	,84168	203	-,099	,922
	Female	114	2,4079	,92007	199,217	-,100	,921
Adhocracy	Male	91	2,2775	,85184	203	-,203	,839
	Female	114	2,3026	,90137	197,266	-,205	,838
Hierarchy	Male	91	3,5330	,95830	203	-,017	,987
	Female	114	3,5351	,85437	182,064	-,017	,987
Market	Male	91	3,0000	,96753	203	,700	,485
	Female	114	2,9101	,86929	182,879	,691	,490

When Table 3 is examined, there is no significant difference between the four organizational culture types according to gender in the perception of the organizational culture of the participating academic staff (p> 0.05).

3.3 Findings of ANOVA Test Results According to the Age of Organizational Culture Perception Levels of Academic Staff

The third sub-objective of the study was to reach a conclusion about whether the organizational culture perception levels perceived by the academic staff of the university differ according to the age of the staff. The ages of the personnel who participated in the study were grouped as 20-29 years, 30-39 years, 40-49 years and 50 years of age. It is analyzed by one-way ANOVA test whether the organizational culture perceptions of academicians differ according to age groups and the results are given in Table 4.

Table 4. ANOVA Test Results of Academic Staff's Organizational Culture Perception According to Age

Organizational Culture Type	Variance Source	Sum of squares	df	Squares Mean	F	P	Significant Difference
Clan	Intergroup	24,464	36	,680	,846	,717	
	Within Groups	134,960	168	,803			
	Total	159,424	204				
Adhocracy	Intergroup	26,501	36	,736	,947	,561	
	Within Groups	130,646	168	,778			
	Total	157,148	204				
Hierarchy	Intergroup	25,303	36	,703	,844	,719	
	Within Groups	139,833	168	,832			
	Total	165,136	204				
Market	Intergroup	22,839	36	,634	,724	,873	
	Within Groups	147,211	168	,876			
	Total	170,050	204				

When Table 4 is examined, an analysis was made about whether there was a significant difference in the level of organizational culture perception of academic staff participating in the study according to age. At the end of the analysis, .717 value for clan culture, .561 value for the culture of culture, .719 value for hierarchy culture and .873 value for market culture were found. According to these values, there is no significant difference in the organizational culture perception of the academic staff in terms of the age for the four organizational culture types ($p> 0.05$).

3.4 Findings of ANOVA Test Results of Academic Staff's Organizational Culture Perception Levels According to Their Education Level

The fourth sub-objective of the study was to find an answer to the question of whether the organizational culture perception levels perceived by the academic staff of the university vary according to the level of education of the staff. The education level of the personnel participating in the study was grouped as bachelor, master, and doctorate. The results obtained by analyzing the organizational culture perceptions of academicians according to the education level of the personnel by one-way ANOVA test are given in Table 5.

Table 5. ANOVA Test Results of Academic Staff's Organizational Culture Perception According to Learning Status

Organizational Culture Type	Variance Source	Sum of squares	df	Squares Mean	F	P	Significant Difference
Clan	Intergroup	,238	2	,119	,151	,860	
	Within Groups	159,186	202	,788			
	Total	159,424	204				
Adhocracy	Intergroup	,618	2	,309	,399	,672	
	Within Groups	156,530	202	,775			
	Total	157,148	204				
Hierarchy	Intergroup	4,125	2	2,063	2,588	,078	
	Within Groups	161,011	202	,797			
	Total	165,136	204				
Market	Intergroup	3,070	2	1,535	1,857	,159	
	Within Groups	166,980	202	,827			
	Total	170,050	204				

According to Table 5, in the analysis of whether there is a significant difference in the level of organizational culture of the academic staff according to their education level, the value of .860 in clan culture, .672 value in the culture of

culture, .078 value in hierarchy culture and .159 value in market culture were found. According to this, there is no significant difference between the organizational culture perception levels of the academic staff according to the education level of the personnel for the four organizational culture types (p> 0.05).

3.5 Findings of ANOVA Test Results of Academic Staff's Organizational Culture Perceptions According to Staff's Working Year

The fifth sub-objective of the study is to find out whether the organizational culture perception levels perceived by the academic staff of the university differ according to the year of employment of the personnel. The seniority of the personnel who participated in the research was grouped as 0-5 years, 6-10 years and 11 years and above. One-way ANOVA test was used to determine whether the organizational culture perceptions of the academic staff differed according to the year of employment of the personnel in the institution. The results are given in Table 6 below.

Table 6. ANOVA Test Results of Academic Staff's Organizational Culture Perception According to Working Year

Organizational Culture Type	Variance Source	Sum of squares	df	Squares Mean	F	P	Significant Difference
Clan	Intergroup	1,774	2	,887	1,136	,323	
	Within Groups	157,650	202	,780			
	Total	159,424	204				
Adhocracy	Intergroup	4,877	2	2,439	3,235	,041	0-5 years
	Within Groups	152,271	202	,754			and
	Total	157,148	204				6-10 years
Hierarchy	Intergroup	,116	2	,058	,071	,931	
	Within Groups	165,020	202	,817			
	Total	165,136	204				
Market	Intergroup	1,914	2	,957	1,149	,319	
	Within Groups	168,136	202	,832			
	Total	170,050	204				

When Table 6 is examined, .323 value for clan culture, .931 value for hierarchy culture and .319 value for market organizational culture type were found in the level of organizational culture perception of academic staff participating in the research. According to these data, there is no significant difference in the perception level of the organizational culture of academic staff in clan, hierarchy and market culture types compared to the study year (p> 0.05). Having said that, it was determined that there was a significant difference in the level of perception of the organizational culture of the academic staff in the culture of adhocracy with the value of .041 (p <0.05). Accordingly, post-hoc test was applied and it was determined that the difference in organizational culture perception level was significant between the staff who have only 0-5 years working year and the staff who have a working year between 6-10 years. That is to say, it was determined that academic staff with 0-5 years working year perceived the culture at a higher level than the staff who have working years between 6-10 years.

3.6 The Findings of the ANOVA Test According to the Academic Title of the Personnel of the Organizational Culture Perception Levels of the Academic Staff

The sixth sub-objective of the study is to find an answer to the question of whether the perception of organizational culture perceived by the academic staff of the university differs according to the academic title of the staff. The academic titles of the personnel who participated in the research were grouped as professor doctor, associate professor, doctoral lecturer, lecturer, and research assistant. The results obtained by analyzing the organizational culture perception levels of academicians according to the academic title of the personnel are analyzed with the one way ANOVA test and the results are given in Table 7.

Table 7. ANOVA Test Results of Academic Staff's Organizational Culture Perception According to Academic Title

Organizational Culture Type	Variance Source	Sum of squares	df	Squares Mean	F	P	Significant Difference
Clan	Intergroup	1,422	4	,356	,450	,772	
	Within Groups	158,002	200	,790			
	Total	159,424	204				
Adhocracy	Intergroup	,608	4	,152	,194	,941	
	Within Groups	156,540	200	,783			
	Total	157,148	204				
Hierarchy	Intergroup	3,329	4	,832	1,029	,393	
	Within Groups	161,807	200	,809			
	Total	165,136	204				
Market	Intergroup	5,400	4	1,350	1,640	,166	
	Within Groups	164,650	200	,823			
	Total	170,050	204				

When the analysis of Table 7 is examined, it is found that there is no significant meaning according to the academic title of the personnel in the organizational culture perception levels of the academic staff participating in the research. As a result of the analysis, .772 value was found in clan culture, .941 value was found in adhocracy culture, .393 value was found in hierarchy culture, and value of .166 was found for market culture. According to this, there is no significant difference in the level of organizational culture perception of the academic staff for the four types of organizational culture according to the academic title of the staff (p> 0.05).

3. Conclusion and Discussion

In this study, the type of organizational culture which academic staff associates with their institutions was investigated according to Cameron and Quinn's Competitive Values Model. With this in mind, it was aimed to determine the levels of 4 types of organizations (clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, and market) perceived by the academic staff and to determine whether any of them is dominant. The research shows the level of perception of the current organizational culture of the academic staff and what it means in the Competitive Values Model. Moreover, the study contributes to the literature by comparing the results of the research with the results obtained in the previous studies. Furthermore, it explains what the results obtained in the research mean in other similar organizational culture models.

At the end of the research, the academic staff working at the university has associated hierarchy culture with their institutions. There is no significant difference between the organizational culture type and the gender, age, education level and working year variables of the academic staff who are involved in the research. While the organizational culture of the staff participating in the research related to their institutions shows a significant difference in the culture of adhocracy according to their working years, it does not show a significant difference in other culture types. According to this, those who work in the institution between 0-5 years perceive the culture more closely to the type of culture of adhocracy than those who have served in 6-10 years. To put it another way, the relatively new staff in the institution perceives culture as more innovative, entrepreneurial and imaginative.

When the literature is analyzed, the general trend points to a hierarchy culture in the case of organizational culture studies in similar higher education in our country using the Competitive Values Model. As a matter of fact, Erdem, Adıgüzel and Kaya (2011) in Fırat University, Beytekin, Yalçınkaya, Doğan and Karakoç (2010) in Ege University, and Yıldırım (2012) in sports management and physical education departments of universities have identified hierarchy culture as a highly perceived organizational culture type in their parallel studies.

When we look at similar studies conducted abroad, diversity is observed in terms of results. Fralinger and Olson (2007) identified the clan culture as the most perceived type of culture in a similar study in Rowan University, Russia. In the same way, Kaufman (2016) conducted research with universities in the northern states of America and determined that the culture type dominant in these universities was the clan culture. In similar studies abroad, the same results as the results of this research are available. For example, Omerzel, Bloslavo, and Trnavcevic (2011), who examined the

organizational culture of 2 universities in Slovenia, concluded that one of these universities as a result of their research was perceived as a market and in the other as a culture of hierarchy.

When the results of similar researches are evaluated, the establishment years of universities, their priorities, objectives, forms of information creation and dissemination of knowledge, and the general culture of the society in which they exist can be mentioned as examples for factors affecting the organizational culture in universities. Another key thing to remember that each type of culture in the model is perceived at a certain level in institutions. In some studies, each type of culture is perceived to be equal to or close to each other, while others may be perceived as more dominant than others.

It is important to understand what the results of this study mean in the context of literature. The Competitive Values Model states that the culture of clan and adhocracy includes organic processes such as loyalty, commitment, innovation, and entrepreneurship. Accordingly, some organizations such as Microsoft and Nike are considered to be effective if they are open, harmonious and organic. In the same model, hierarchy culture accommodates mechanical processes such as stability, order, and control. Accordingly, some organizations, such as universities and government departments, are considered to be effective organizations if they are stationary, predictable, and mechanical (Cameron and Quinn, 2006, p. 34). Hence, with its having stability, consistency, standardized routines, procedures, rules, regulations, hierarchical structuring and control mechanisms, hierarchy culture is similar to the structure of Weber's bureaucracy and Mintzberg's 'Machine Bureaucracy.' At the same time, in the culture of hierarchy, there are situations such as the fact that the academic staff belongs to labor standards which stem from outside of the institutions. Moreover, they are in contact with self-directed professional associations. Moreover, they are in communication with colleagues from different bureaucracies. In this form, the hierarchy culture has a common point with Mintzberg's Professional Bureaucracy, which is one of the five organizational structures and emphasizes professional authority and expertise (Mintzberg, 1979, pp. 314-380).

According to the hierarchical culture characteristics of the model, a culture type that incorporates the mechanical processes in which tasks, responsibilities and rules are supported by a strict internal-oriented organizational structure is perceived as a dominant culture by academic staff in the university. It is important to have stability, predictability and sustainable policies in the institution. In addition, it can be said that the university has an official structure. The work of the academic staff is determined by the rules, and those who are in the executive position are careful to be a good coordinator and manager. Moreover, it is possible to say that the bond that holds the institution together is official rules and policies. Organizational communication is one-way from top to bottom. Furthermore, according to the hierarchy culture presented in the Competitive Values Model, the reasons why that culture type is perceived as dominant in this institution can be stated as the fact that the institution has a solid management approach due to its 25 years of history, coupled with the environment in which the institution is located has a hierarchical structure as a general culture. Moreover, it has no need to compete in a certain arena due to the fact that the institution is subject to the public, in other words, it has a stagnant environment.

In this study, that the hierarchy culture type is perceived as a dominant culture by the university is a sign that a classical management model is applied in the institution. At this point, in the higher education institutions where the importance is given to the internationalization of higher education increases, other modern participatory management forms suitable for the administration of higher education can be evaluated by the decision-makers, and different organizational culture types and modern organizational change examples can be introduced to all academic staff and awareness raising activities can be carried out. In these studies, it is possible to raise awareness of all academic staff, especially those in the management position, that organizational culture is an important concept that plays a role in service quality by affecting the factors such as organizational performance, efficiency, and organizational effectiveness.

The Competitive Values Model used in this study can be introduced to the university administrators and academicians. Educational seminars can be organized about the advantages and characteristics of each of the different types of organizational culture presented this organizational culture model. According to this model, in addition to informing the academic staff about the type of culture perceived as dominant in the university; the staff can be informed about the advantages and disadvantages of the less perceived culture types at the university. Likewise, the existing organizational culture can be introduced to the new academicians and a new environment of innovation and development can be provided in the context of organizational culture by taking their opinions into consideration. In addition, university administrators can improve their competence in decision-making processes by examining the harmony between the organization's goals and objectives and the organization's current organizational culture.

Furthermore, the questionnaire used in the study is intended to reveal only the current perceived culture type. The survey can be expanded to determine the culture type that the participants prefer to have in their institutions and compare their preferred one with the current one which is dominant. The relationship between the culture types that staff associates with their institution and the university objectives, organizational performance, job satisfaction, and leadership can be examined. Moreover, all or more of the academic staff working at the university can be surveyed. Students and the administrative staff of the university can be included in the study and the research result can be generalized. A study similar to this one can be applied to private universities and the results can be compared or the results can be generalized at the national level by incorporating other universities in Turkey with another research. Finally, the reasons for perceiving the hierarchy culture as dominant organizational culture type in the university can be explored more deeply using qualitative research methods.

References

Alvesson, M., & Sveningsson, S. (2016). *Changing organizational culture*. (İkinci Baskı). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ashkanasy, N. M., In Wilderom, C., & In Peterson, M. F. (2013). *The handbook of organizational culture and climate*. London: Sage.

Beytekin, O. F., Yalçınkaya, M., Doğan, M., & Karakoç, N. (2010). The organizational culture at the university. *The International Journey of Educational Researchers, 2*(1), 1-13.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2017). *Reframing organizations: artistry, choice, and leadership.* (Altıncı Baskı). New Jersey: Jossey-Bass. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119281856

Cameron, K., S. & Quınn, R., E. (2006). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: based on the competing values framework*. (Üçüncü Baskı). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass A Wiley Imprint.

Deshpande, R., & Webster, Jr. F. E. (1989). Organizational culture and marketing: defining the research agenda. *The Journal of Marketing, 53*(1), 3-15. American Marketing Association. https://doi.org/10.2307/1251521

Ehrhart, M. G., Schneider, B., & Macey, W. H. (2014). *Organizational climate and culture: An introduction to theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Erdem, R., Adıgüzel, O., ve Kaya, A. (2010). Akademik personelin kurumlarına ilişkin algıladıkları ve tercih ettikleri örgüt kültürü tipleri. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 36*(2), 73-78.

Fralinger, B., & Olson, V. (2007). Organizational culture at the university level: A study using the OCAI instrument. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning, 4*(11), 95-98.

Gallagher, R. S. (2003). *The soul of an organization: Understanding the values that drive successful corporate cultures*. Chicago: Dearborn Trade.

Gay, L., Mills, G., and Airasian, P. (2011). *Educational research*. (Onuncu Baskı) Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson.

Hooper, D., Coughlan, J., & Mullen, M. R. (2008). Structural equation modeling: Guidelines for determining model fit. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods, 6*(1), 53-60.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2015). Eğitim yönetimi. Teori, araştırma ve uygulama. (M. Şişman, Çev.), *Eğitim yönetimi*. S. Turan (Çev. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*(1), 1-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Itzen, C., & Newman, J. (2005). *Gender, culture and organizational change*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kates, A., & Galbraith, J. R. (2007). *Designing your organization: Using the star model to solve 5 critical design challenges*. San Francisco, Calif: Jossey-Bass.

Kaufman, J. (2016). Organizational culture among master's colleges and universities in the Upper Midwest. *Teacher-Scholar: The Journal of the State Comprehensive University, 7*(2), 3-14. http://scholars.fhsu.edu/ts/vol7/iss1/2 adresinden erişilmiştir.

Keyton, J. (2005). *Communication & organizational culture: A key to understanding work experiences*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). New York: The Guilford

Press.

Kwantes, C. T., & Glazer, S. (2017). *Culture, organizations, and work: Clarifying concepts.* Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47662-9

Marsh, H. W., Hau, K. T., Artelt, C., Baumert, J., & Peschar, J. L. (2006). OECD's brief self-report measure of educational psychology's most useful affective constructs: Cross-cultural, psychometric comparisons across 25 countries. *International Journal of Testing, 6*(4), 311-360. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327574ijt0604_1

Min, J. (2017). "Mergers in higher education: A case study of organizational culture, communication, and conflict management strategies in the university system of Georgia". *Doctor of International Conflict Management Dissertations*. http://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/incmdoc_etd/11/ adresinden erişilmiştir.

Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Omerzel, D. G., Biloslavo, R., & Trnavcevic, A. (2011). Knowledge management and organizational culture in higher education institutions. *Journal for East European Management Studies, Hampp, Mering, 16*(2), 111-139. http://hdl.handle.net/10419/83996 adresinden erişilmiştir.

Özen, Y., ve Gül, A. (2010). Sosyal ve eğitim bilimleri araştırmalarında evren-örneklem sorunu. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Kazım Karabekir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 0*(15), 394-422. http://dergipark.gov.tr/ataunikkefd/issue/2776/37227 adresinden erişilmiştir.

Salant, P., Dıllman, D. A., (1994). How To Conduct Your Own Survey. Wiley, New York.

Sanyal, B. C. (1996). Issues, trends, and international experiences. *Institutional management in higher education: A training course for planners and managers of higher education institutions* içinde (s. 127-128). International Institute for Educational Planning., & Unesco.

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership.* (4. Baskı). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schabracq, M. J. (2007). *Changing organizational culture: The change agent's guidebook*. Chichester: Wiley.

Scott, W. R. (2013). Organization theory and higher education. *Journal of Organizational Theory in Education. 1*(1), 1-24.

Serdenciuc, N. (2015). A reflection on organizational culture in higher education. *International Journal of Social and Educational Innovation-* IJSEIro, Forthcoming. https://ssrn.com/abstract=2795912 adresinden erişilmiştir.

Sharma, S., Mukherjee, S., Kumar, A., & Dillon, W. R. (2005). A simulation study to investigate the use of cutoff values for assessing model fit in covariance structure models. *Journal of Business Research, 58*(7), 935-943. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2003.10.007

Vasyakin, B. S., Ivleva, B. I., Pozharskaya, Y. L., & Shcherbakovaa, O. I. (2016). A study of the organizational culture at a higher education institution [Case study: Plekhanov Russian University of Economics (PRUE)]. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, 11*(10), s. 11515-11528.

Yıldırım, S. (2012). *Üniversitelerin beden eğitimi ve spor ile ilgili akademik birimlerinde dönüşümcü liderlik ve örgüt kültürü tipleri arasındaki ilişkinin analizi.* (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi/Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.