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Introduction

Organizations are in direct interaction with the economic, technological, cultural and political environment of their society. Therefore, they are constantly in the process of being compatible with the environment they are in. To perpetuate this process, organizations need power to bring the differences and needs they have together and this power is called organizational culture (Sezgin & Bulut, 2013). Robbins (1990) defines organizational culture as the strong values in an organization, the philosophy that determines the policy of the organization towards its internal and external stakeholders, the way things are done in the organization and the common beliefs shared by the members of the organization. In contrast, Peters and Waterman (1982) define organizational culture as a set of structures consisting of common values that occur symbolically in the organization as stories, beliefs, and words. According to Sun (2008), organizational culture is a radical belief and value system shared by the organisation members. In the definitions of organizational culture, the assumptions, values, beliefs, stories, norms and adaptation features accepted by the organisation members are striking. Considering that organizations are created by people, it can be stated that culture forms the basis of the organization. In this context, culture is a system of values that starts with the existence of the organization, shapes the organization, affects the thoughts, behaviors and attitudes of the people in the organization and takes place at every stage of the organization (Akyol, Tanrısevdi, Gidiş, Dumlu & Durdu, 2020). Every organization has a predefined service perception, philosophy and style. This indicates the necessity of a cultural infrastructure. It is a necessity for all the individuals that work in that organization to obey the rules.

Similarly, organizational culture includes the common perceptions, philosophies and styles of individuals. This allows them to think and act jointly. According to Aytaç (2004), the more a member of an organization acts with this common way of thinking, the more he/she becomes an “organizational person”.

Organizational culture determines the success of organizations. Organizational culture is the hidden power of organizations and a phenomenon that leads them to success. The management of the organization’s members in leading the organization to success can be achieved with a strong organizational culture. In this context organizational culture provides some qualities for the organization (Yağmurlu, 1997). Akınç Vural and Coşkun (2007) expressed these qualities that organizational culture brings to the organization as follows: (1) Due to organizational culture, individuals with different job descriptions or units have a common goal. (2) Organizational culture is a phenomenon that increases the teams formed by the individuals and the organisational performance formed by these teams. (3) It prevents all individuals, whether members of the organization or not, from misconceptions about the organization and ensures the development of an organization-specific moral system. (4) The organization members’ common belief and comprehension system strengthens their sense of ownership. Organizations are social concepts. They are formed to perform a job with the others rather than do alone (Can, 1997). Therefore, the purpose of the individuals who make...
up the organization is to put forward a performance. In this context, the performance of the organization is directly related to the culture of that organization.

Organizational culture creates a strong bond between the organization itself and its employees and helps the employee develop a sense of commitment to the organization (Hoy & Miskel, 2015). School culture is a combination of school’s unique values, beliefs and norms. This culture is shaped and developed in time and gains a structure peculiar to that school. School culture helps employees realize the organization’s purpose, acting as a compass for them provides norms for what should be achieved in the organization. Therefore, establishing that culture is essential for supporting and sustaining success in school (Sergiovanni, 2001). Organizational culture is important for non-profit organizations to keep employees together, uniting them around a common purpose, being the power, common goals and values that keep them together. Therefore, a weak culture in an organization may cause deviations from the organization’s establishment aim (Woodbury, 2006). Organizational culture is one of the important factors that determine an organisation’s effectiveness and efficiency, such as schools with an informal aspect (Özdemir, 2012).

Elements of Organizational Culture

Organizational culture is a mental process that reveals the paradigm of the organization. In this process, many different elements such as language, values, norms, symbols, stories, rituals, myths, heroes and ceremonies play role. These elements reveal the features that distinguish an organization from other organizations and make it unique (Güçlü, 2003). Each organization creates its own culture with these elements and maintains its existence (Akyol et al, 2020). These items are listed below;

Values: They are criteria for defining, evaluating and making judgments about the actions and transactions of individuals in an organization (İşcan & Timuroğlu, 2007). These values, which are not widely written, determine the definition of success within the organizational culture and play a guiding role for individuals within the organization. Şişman (2002) stated some values in most organizations as such; hard work, courage, honesty, responsibility, success, independence, belonging, trust, ambition, respect, self-confidence, love, obedience, equality and helpfulness.

Norms: Norms are elements that influence the behavior of organizational members, transform social facts into institutional facts and reinforce them (İşcan & Timuroğlu, 2007). Behaviors that are accepted and not accepted in the organization are shaped by norms and define the set of behaviors that are accepted as ideal in the organization (Sabuncuoğlu & Tуз, 1998). According to Aytaç (2004), sanctions can be imposed when organizational culture norms are not followed and rewards when they are followed.

Beliefs: Köse, Tetik and Ercan (2001) define belief as a continuous regulation of a person’s perception and knowledge in his world. In this sense, it is seen as a synthesis of both social and individual values.
Leaders and Heroes: The leader is defined as an individual who introduces the other individuals in the organization to the organizational culture and makes the organizational culture to be noticed with certain behavioral patterns; whereas the hero is defined as a person who makes the individuals in the organization realize their own values and thus internalize the goals of the organization (Şimşek, Akgemci & Çelik, 2010). According to Özkalp and Kirel (2011), if an individual is aware of the possibility of being a hero or a leader and wants to be a leader, adopting the organizational culture of that person accelerates.

Stories and Legends: Stories and legends are the narratives of true events that are widely known by the members of the organization and transferred to the new members in the process (Gülova and Demirsoy, 2012). However, stories and legends are not always expected to be narratives of positive behavior. Behaviors that are not accepted within the organization can also be a story or legend element. Özkalp and Kirel (2011) stated that organizational members can more easily understand the elements of organizational culture through stories and legends.

Symbols: The symbol can be an organisation's emblem, a slogan known to all members, a song or a traditional event. In this context, in general, an object, an event or a behavior can become a symbol (Özkalp and Kirel, 2011). According to Şimşek et al. (2010), symbols facilitate the transmission of organizational values and feelings to members.

Language: Some elements distinguish the language used in the organization from the language of that society in general and make it special. These elements, in some cases, ensure that the content is understood only by the members of that organization, which strengthens the sense of loyalty of the members to the organization (Şimşek et al., 2010).

Rituals and Ceremonies: According to Gülova and Demirsoy (2012), ceremonies play an important role in rooting organizational culture. Celebrating a member’s birthday, awarding an individual who has been a member of the organization for a certain period, new year, religious celebrations, cocktails, parades and rituals can be examples of cultural elements such as rituals and ceremonies in the organizational sense.

Higher education institutions have many missions, such as producing solutions to problems, shedding light on the future, maintaining information share and transfer, predicting possible social problems and warning the society about them. Due to these missions, they are one of the most important parts of society. In addition, higher education institutions are one of the most important indicators of the development level of a society. Organizational culture plays a critical role in the ability of higher education institutions to keep pace with change, follow developments in science and technology, and enhance the quality of education. At the same time, universities consist of too many semi-autonomous and coordinated loosely structured subsystems. This structure of universities was characterized by Kuh and Whitt (1988) as non-uniform organizations. They emphasized that the subgroups create their own values and structures, which are different from the university's own organizational culture. This situation reveals that the university is a loosely structured organization that creates a cultural synthesis with
different subcultures (Akyol et al, 2020). In this context, it is understood that these institutions and the smaller organizations that make up these institutions also have organizational cultures. Organizations that are part of a higher education institution, such as faculties, institutes, and colleges, have their own unique organizational culture. Moreover, the culture of that higher education institution is determined by the cultures of these smaller units and guides the culture of the institution.

English-language universities around the world have programs designed to support non-native English speakers. An important mission of these programmes, often referred to as “foreign language schools” or often as “preparatory schools,” is to teach the general English that students will need during their university education and the English they will use for academic purposes, and to create, at least in part, cultural harmony (Aydın 2017, as cited in Aydın & Hockley, 2019). In the Regulation on Foreign Language Teaching and Principles to be Followed in Higher Education Institutions (Resmi Gazete, 2016) the purpose of foreign language teaching is to teach the students the basic rules of the foreign language, to develop their foreign language vocabulary, to make them be able to understand what they read and hear in a foreign language, and express themselves orally or in writing. In contrast, the purpose of teaching in a foreign language is to enable graduates of associate, undergraduate and graduate diploma programs to acquire foreign language proficiency in their fields. Preparatory schools in Turkey mostly serve international students from the Middle East, Central Asia and Africa, and some from European countries (Aydın & Hockley, 2019). In this context, it can be stated that there are many students from different cultures in foreign languages colleges. It is known that most of the instructors working in these institutions are bilingual and in some cases, multilingual. Again, it can be stated that instructors benefit from the cultures of the language they teach to solve the problems they encounter in foreign language education. Therefore they are at least as proficient in these cultures as that language. This situation is much more common in foreign language schools, unlike other higher education institution units. Therefore, such organizations may be in a different position than other higher education institution units in organizational culture. It is thought that this difference in the organizational cultures of foreign language schools is also reflected in the organizational culture of the higher education institution they belong to. In this context, it is important to find out the views of the instructors working in these units about organizational culture, the adjustment of the newcomers to the organization, the role of organizational cultures in the success of their organizations, the contributions of administrators to organizational culture, and the factors involved in the development of organizational culture. In the related literature, there are many studies on organizational cultures of higher education institutions (Alamur, 2005; Ateş, 2018; Aydın, 2003; Bankacı, 2019; Borhan, 2020; Çimen, 2001; Göl, 2018; Şahin, 2018). In these studies, the organizational culture of the higher education institution was discussed or the organizational culture of one of the subunits of a higher education institution was examined. The school of foreign languages, in which the majority of the teaching staff, who are assumed to be familiar with more than one culture, occupy a special position in terms of organizational culture. The organizational activities of foreign language schools, which are the cornerstones of foreign language teaching at the college level in
Turkey, are important for foreign language teaching in our country. For this reason, the steps taken to define and describe the organizational cultures of these units will also make important contributions to the foreign language education processes. In this context, this study aims to deal with the culture in these schools through the experiences and perspectives of the instructors who know that culture.

The Purpose of the Study

This research aims to examine the views of the instructors working in the school of foreign languages on organizational culture. In line with this main purpose, answers were sought for the following sub-objectives:

1. What are the instructors’ views working in the School of Foreign Languages on the meaning of organizational culture?
2. What are the instructors’ views working in the School of Foreign Languages about the harmonization activities for the newly appointed instructors?
3. What are the instructors’ views working in the School of Foreign Languages on the causes and consequences of organizational success?
4. What are the instructors’ views working in the School of Foreign Languages about the role of administrators in developing organizational culture?
5. What are the instructors’ views working in the School of Foreign Languages on creating a strong organizational culture?

Method

The Model of the Research

This study, which aims to reveal the views of the instructors working in the school of foreign languages on organizational culture, is in the qualitative research method and case study pattern. In the studies carried out with the case study pattern, various factors such as the environment, events, individuals and processes related to a situation are investigated with a holistic approach in its real natural environment (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016; Yin, 2003).

Case studies are the researches in which an entity is defined and described according to place and time (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç-Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2014) and in which the context is examined through the experiences of people via holistic perspective and in detail (Akar, 2017). In the holistic multiple-case design, each case is handled holistically in itself and then compared with each other. What is important here is that the researcher collects information about the same dimensions in both schools (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016). Accordingly, in this study, the holistic multi-case design was preferred, regarding the views of the instructors on the organizational culture of their institutions, working in the school of foreign languages of 2 different universities which are a state and a foundation university.
The Study Group of the Research

The study group composed of 15 instructors working at a state and a foundation university in Ankara. Maximum diversity sampling technique was used in the study. Variables such as university, gender, age, managerial position, education level, seniority and years of service at school were taken as a source of diversity in the determination of the instructors to be selected for the study group to ensure the diversity of the study group.

The demographic characteristics of the instructors in the study group of the research are shown in Table 1;

Table 1.

Demographic Characteristics of Study Participants

| Code  | University  | Gender | Age | Managerial Duty | Education Status | Seniority | Seniority at school |
|-------|-------------|--------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|---------------------|
| Ayşe  | Foundation  | Female | 35  | No              | Graduate        | 13        | 8                   |
| Leman | State       | Female | 30  | No              | Graduate        | 8,5       | 3                   |
| Hatice| Foundation  | Female | 33  | No              | Graduate        | 12        | 4                   |
| Selma | State       | Female | 36  | No              | Graduate        | 14        | 2,5                 |
| Elif  | State       | Female | 41  | No              | Undergraduate   | 11        | 6                   |
| Özgür | Foundation  | Male   | 29  | No              | Undergraduate   | 6         | 5                   |
| Neşe  | Foundation  | Female | 29  | No              | Graduate        | 7         | 2                   |
| Hale  | Foundation  | Female | 43  | Yes             | Undergraduate   | 20        | 6                   |
| Esra  | Foundation  | Female | 65  | Yes             | Graduate        | 45        | 14                  |
| Ebru  | Foundation  | Female | 51  | Yes             | Graduate        | 29        | 13                  |
| Semra | Foundation  | Female | 31  | No              | Undergraduate   | 9         | 7                   |
| Nazli | State       | Female | 35  | No              | Undergraduate   | 11        | 6                   |
| Osman | State       | Male   | 50  | Yes             | Graduate        | 26        | 3,5                 |
| Zekiye| State       | Female | 45  | Yes             | Undergraduate   | 21        | 2,5                 |
| Meltem| Foundation  | Female | 31  | No              | Undergraduate   | 9         | 7                   |

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that two male instructors from both universities participated in the study. While the age of the instructors at the state university ranges from 30 to 50 years, the age of lecturers at the foundation university varies from 29 to 65 years. Five instructors from Foundation University, three from the State, totally of eight instructors are graduates. While the total seniority of the instructors at the state university ranges from 11 to 26 years, the total seniority of the instructors at the foundation university varies from 6 to 45 years. Looking at the length of service of the instructors at the university where they are currently employed, it is observed that there are instructors who have been with a state university for a minimum of two and a half years and a maximum of six years while there are lecturers at a foundation university who have been with the university there are instructors who serve for a minimum of two years and a maximum of 14 years. While two instructors participating in the study at the state university have managerial duties, three instructors from the foundation university have managerial duties.
Data Collection Tool

A semi-structured interview form consisting of six demographic and 10 open-ended questions developed by the researchers was used as a data collection tool in the study. In preparing the semi-structured questionnaire, the relevant literature was consulted and the opinion of three experts in educational administration was sought by setting different items to find out the views of teachers working in the foreign language school on organizational culture. As a result of the expert review, some items were deleted and some of the terms in the questions were clarified and the questions were rearranged. The interview questions prepared in line with the aims of the research are presented in Table 2;

Table 2.

Interview Questions of the Research

| Aims                                                                 | Interview Questions                                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Aim 1: What are the instructors’ views on the meaning of organizational culture? | What does Organizational Culture mean to you? Which concepts do you use to explain it? |
| Aim 2: What are the instructors’ views on the harmonization activities for the newly appointed instructors? | What kind of adaptation studies are carried out for your colleagues who have just started working at your school? |
| Aim 3: What are the instructors’ views on the causes and consequences of organizational success? | What are the aims of your school? What are the causes and consequences of success in your school? What kind of activities are organized in your school to strengthen the unity and solidarity of the teaching staff? What distinguishes your school from other colleges? What are the possible causes of problems in your school? What can be done to prevent problems in your school? |
| Aim 4: What are the instructors’ views on the role of administrators in developing organizational culture? | Can you tell us about the role/characteristics of the school administrator in developing the organizational culture? |
| Aim 5: What are the instructors’ views on creating a strong organizational culture? | What are your suggestions for creating a strong organizational culture in your school? |

Validity and Reliability

In qualitative research, reporting the collected data in detail and explain how the findings are obtained, are the two important criteria (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016). Among the measures presented to ensure validity and reliability; planning the research process in detail and following the research process by an expert in the research, finding the questions asked in the research in written form, examining these questions by experts who have expertise in the field, obtaining the data in a long-term interaction, recording the answers of the participants to ensure that they can be re-examined, and an indication
of the basis of the inferences reached are found. For this reason, the research process was planned and observed before the study. In addition, the questions to be asked during the interview were prepared in advance and compiled in accordance with the expert opinions and written down during the interviews. The interviews with the participants proceeded by making sure that they could fully understand the questions, and all conversations were recorded with voice recorders. Among the methods presented for checking the reliability and validity of qualitative studies are at least one participant’s examination and confirmation of the findings, continuous comparison and control of the results obtained, and compatibility of the obtained results with the literature are found. In this study, the data obtained after each interview were compared and it was checked if there were any inconsistencies. In this regard, no contradictory statements were found from different participants.

Internal validity is provided via expert opinion, participant confirmation, supporting the obtained findings with quotations, consistency of the questions and findings in the semi-structured interview form, which is the data collection tool with the relevant literature. External validity is provided via definition of research method and steps, describing the data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Internal reliability is provided with the consistency examination. In contrast, external reliability was ensured by the researcher’s detailed description of the methods followed, data collection and analysis processes, individual assumptions and prejudices not reflected in the research, and the storage of the raw data kept.

Data Collection

After the determination of the working group and obtaining the necessary legal permissions, the principals were contacted first by e-mail and then by phone, and they were informed about the purpose and method of the research. In line with the information given, an appointment was requested from the instructors. One-to-one and face-to-face interviews were conducted by going to the schools where the instructors were suitable according to the curriculum. An interview lasted approximately 25 to 40 minutes. First, consent was obtained from the participants by informing them that the names of the institutions and individuals in the study would not be mentioned, that the data would be used for scientific purposes, and that the interviews would only be listened to by the researcher. Upon approval, the interviews were recorded using a voice recorder. All the data obtained from these interviews were listened by the researcher and transferred to the computer environment in a Word file. The data obtained from the survey were sent by email to the email addresses provided by the participants in the voluntary participation form, and the accuracy of the data was confirmed by them.

Data Analysis

Content analysis was used in the analysis of the data. Content analysis is a technique frequently used in social sciences, allowing to study human behavior in indirect ways. Content analysis is a method that enables similar data to be brought together within the
framework of certain concepts, categories and themes and to help interpretation by understandably arranging them. Qualitative research data is analyzed in four stages: coding the data, finding the themes, organizing the codes and themes, and defining the findings (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016). With this method, to analyze the messages from different sources on any subject, the materials can be arranged and comparisons can be made with the appropriate categories, signs or classifications about the subject that the researchers examined (Büyüköztürk et al, 2014).

In the research, the audio recordings of the interviews with 15 instructors were transferred to the Office Word program separately for each instructor. These 15 Word files, from 1 to 15, were coded by giving names appropriate to the gender of the participants to ensure their confidentiality, and content analyses were carried out. Content analysis results were presented with frequency tables by arranging the codes and categories for each question in the interview form in Excel. In order to better identify the similarities and differences in the views of faculty at state and foundation universities, the tables are presented by type of university.

**Results**

**Views on the Meaning of Organizational Culture**

To understand the views of the instructors on the meaning of organizational culture, the first question in the interview form was “What do you think organizational culture means? Which concepts do you use to explain it?”. The answers of the instructors are given in Table 3;

| University   | Codes                          | Participants          | n  |
|--------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----|
| State        | Functioning of the system      | Leman, Selma, Elif, Zekiye | 4  |
|              | Relations between managers and employees | Selma, Elif, Osman | 3  |
|              | Togetherness                    | Selma, Nazlı          | 2  |
|              | Common experience               | Nazlı                 | 1  |
| Foundation   | Togetherness                    | Hatice, Özgür, Neşe, Ebru, Semra | 5  |
|              | Relations between managers and employees | Ayşê, Hale, Semra, Meltem | 4  |
|              | Loyalty to organization         | Ayşê, Esra, Meltem    | 3  |
|              | Common experience               | Hatice, Hale, Ebru    | 3  |
|              | Functioning of the system       | Hale, Ebru, Meltem    | 3  |
|              | Organizational trust            | Hale, Esra            | 2  |

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that the instructors evaluate the meaning of organizational culture as the functioning of the system, relations between managers and employees, togetherness, common experience, loyalty to the institution and organizational trust. Instructor in the state university mentioned common experience (n=1); togetherness (n=2); relations between managers and employees (n=3) and the
functioning of the system \((n=4)\). The instructors in the state university mentioned organizational trust \((n=2)\); loyalty to the organization \((n=3)\), the functioning of the system and common experience \((n=3)\); relations between managers and employees \((n=4)\) and togetherness \((n=5)\). From this point of view, it is seen that the most emphasized code in the state university foreign languages school is related to the functioning of the system. In contrast, it is seen that the participants in the foundation university mostly emphasize communication between managers and employees. Leman said, “To be honest, the organizational culture reminds me roughly of how things work in that institution, and which concepts are held while the system is running. Academically and personally.” Nazlı said, “When I say organizational culture, a group that has a common denominator, some common thoughts, tastes or talents come together and communicate, and because they have this common denominator, they spend or prefer to spend more time together.” Regarding the meaning of organizational culture, Özgür expressed his opinion that organizational culture is everything that is done in the organization by saying, “When we talk about organizational culture, the things that we make into a tradition in our department seem to form that organizational culture”. By saying, “I can say the integrity of the manager and employees. And some values or rules that they created together. I can say to be on the same page both at the point of creating these rules or values when making decisions and when applying them.” Semra referred to the integrity of organizational culture between managers and employees.

**Views on the Adaptation Studies for Newly Started Instructors**

The question in the interview form to understand the views of the instructors on the integration studies carried out regarding the newly appointed instructors was “What kind of adaptation studies are carried out for your newly recruited colleagues at your school?”. The answers of the instructors are given in Table 4;

| Table 4. |  |
|---|---|
| **Views on Organizational Adaptation** | **Participants** | **n** |
| **University** | **Codes** |  |
| **State** | Guidance | Selma, Osman, Zekiye | 3 |
| | Colleague support | Leman, Elif, Zekiye | 3 |
| | Acquaintance meeting | Selma, Zekiye | 2 |
| | Written document support | Zekiye | 1 |
| **Foundation** | Orientation program | Ayşe, Neşe, Esra, Ebru, Semra, Meltem | 6 |
| | Guide/mentor instructor | Ayşe, Hatice, Hale, Esra | 4 |
| | Colleague support | Hale, Semra | 2 |
| | Written document support | Özgür | 1 |

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that the instructors evaluate the adaptation studies for new instructors as guidance, colleague support, acquaintance meeting, written document support, orientation program, guide/mentor support. Views in state university are given on written document support \((n=1)\); acquaintance meeting \((n=2)\); peer support \((n=3)\) and guidance \((n=3)\). In the foundation university, views were given about
written document support \((n=1)\), colleague support \((n=2)\); the appointment of a guide/mentor instructor \((n=4)\) and the organization of an orientation program \((n=6)\). From this point of view, within the scope of adaptation studies, while guidance and colleague support came to the fore in the state university, in school of foreign languages, instructors at the foundation university school of foreign languages stated that more orientation programs should be organized. Selma, one of the participants stated that regular meetings were held, said, “Since we are both curriculum and level coordinators of the new teachers, the coordinator of the level at which they will attend hold a short meeting with the new instructors, tell what is being done at that level, and what are our expectations at that level, we usually inform them about these issues”.

Similarly Osman by saying “We already have an academic calendar, but there is orientation for the teachers one week before the school starts. For example, the curriculum team comes and tells what the curriculum team does. Other instructors come and explain how testing works. Or there is general information about how to live here. Short term, lasting several days.” shared information about orientation with his opinion. Hatice, by saying, “Already, new teachers are appointed with mentor-style, peer coaches every week, and they are helped to adapt every week.” mentioned that another teacher was assigned to guide the new instructors in their school. Semra, by emphasizing the orientation program, again said, “We have orientation days. Apart from that, of course, we have a practice of inviting teachers to our classes in the first weeks to help them teach”.

**Views on the School’s Goals**

To understand the views of the instructors about the aims of the school, the question in the interview form was “What are the aims of your school?”. The answers of the instructors are given in Table 5;

**Table 5.**

**Views on the School’s Goals**

| University | Categories | Codes | Participants | \(n\) |
|------------|------------|-------|--------------|---|
| State      | Organizational goals | Providing foreign language education | Leman, Selma, Elif, Nazlı, Zekiya | 5 |
|            |           | Image | Leman, Selma, Osman | 3 |
|            | Individual goals | Serving the organizational purpose | Leman, Selma, Elif, Nazlı, Osman, Zekiya | 6 |
|            |           | Creating a peaceful atmosphere | Osman | 1 |
| Foundation | Organizational goals | Providing foreign language education | Ayşe, Hatice, Özgür, Neşe, Hale, Esra, Semra, Meltem | 8 |
|            |           | Image | Özgür | 1 |
|            | Individual goals | Serving the organizational purpose | Ayşe, Hatice, Özgür, Neşe, Hale, Esra, Ebru, Semra, Meltem | 9 |
|            |           | Creating an organizational culture | Ebru, Semra | 2 |
|            |           | Rising in/out of the institution | Ebru | 1 |
When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that the instructors evaluate their schools’ goals in two categories: organizational and individual goals. While the instructors at the state university mentioned providing foreign language education \( (n=5) \) and image \( (n=3) \) under the organizational purpose, they mentioned their views as creating a peaceful atmosphere under individual goals \( (n=1) \) and serving the organizational purpose \( (n=6) \) related to individual goals. While the instructors at the foundation university expressed their views on the topics of providing foreign language education \( (n=8) \) and image \( (n=1) \) under organizational goals; they expressed their views under the headings of rising in/out of the institution under individual goals \( (n=1) \), creating an organizational culture \( (n=2) \) and serving the organizational purpose \( (n=9) \). From this point of view, it is seen that the majority of the instructors working at state and foundation universities emphasize serving the organizational purpose and providing education in a foreign language. Among the participants, Selma and Elif expressed their views on teaching a foreign language, respectively, as follows; “Since we are a new university, the current aim of the preparatory school is to be a good preparatory school in Ankara and throughout Turkey. Our goal is to be one of the best preparatory schools that teach English.”; “To make students pass the preparatory class. To somehow enable them to write, speak and read texts at a certain level when they start the faculty. As a teacher, this is the mission imposed on us in preparation, and this is the task.”

Similarly, Ayşe expressed her views by emphasizing foreign language teaching as follows; “Here, we are trying to provide students in English for the needs of the departments and a little more for business life after graduation. We try to equip them with the skills necessary for both academic and professional life.” Meltem also emphasized providing a good foreign language education in line with the organisation’s aims and said, “If we think of it as a vision and mission, we aim to grow up students that are academically well equipped. When we think about our department, we train our students in two fields: general English and the other in an academically to use English for academic skills.”

**Views on the Causes and Consequences of Organizational Success**

To understand the instructors’ views about the causes and consequences of organizational success, the question in the interview form was, “What are the causes and consequences of success in your school?” The answers of the instructors are given in Table 6.

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that instructors mentioned the organizational citizenship, satisfaction with the conditions, participation in the decision, number of students, being a learning organization, organizational control, sensitive manager, strong academic staff, image, increase in demand, increase in income, job satisfaction, satisfaction, of the other departments, organizational culture, being proud of the school, employment of students and increase in workload as the causes and consequences of organizational success. Instructors working in the school of foreign language mentioned the causes of organizational success as sensitive manager \( (n=1) \),
strong academic staff \((n=1)\), image \((n=1)\), participation in decision \((n=1)\), organizational control \((n=1)\), the number of students \((n=2)\), being a learning organization \((n=2)\), satisfaction with its conditions \((n=2)\), organizational citizenship \((n=3)\) codes. They mentioned the consequences as other departments’ satisfaction \((n=1)\), income increase \((n=2)\), job satisfaction \((n=2)\) and increase in demand \((n=4)\).

Instructors at the foundation university identified the reasons for organizational success as organizational culture \((n=6)\), strong academic staff \((n=4)\), being a learning organization \((n=2)\), organizational citizenship behavior \((n=1)\), decision participation \((n=2)\) codes. Instructors at the foundation university evaluated the results of organizational success under the codes of increase in workload \((n=1)\), feeling proud of school \((n=2)\), employment of students \((n=2)\), and increase in demand \((n=6)\). From this point of view, regarding the reasons and results of the success of their schools, it is seen that the participants in the state university mostly emphasize the organizational citizenship behavior as the cause and the codes of increase in demand as a consequence, while the instructors at the foundation university emphasize the organizational culture as the cause and the increase in demand as a consequence.

Selma emphasizes the importance of organizational citizenship for the organisation's success as such: “All the teachers and management put a lot of effort into it. Since it is also a state university, no extra payment is made, but everyone works voluntarily. Because the aim of everyone is that when I come to a new university from a private university where I worked for years, a person has to create a sense of belonging himself. Where do we belong, what do we do, where am I in this system? That’s why it feels good when you volunteer a little bit in those units. We are one of the founders of this school’s system. That feeling is good, it strengthens the corporate culture more, everyone takes the responsibility.” By saying “In general, I see a friendly team. Everyone is friendly and dynamic, I think they are satisfied with their conditions, and I think this reflects positively on most people. There is good communication. In my own experience, which I know from such an incompatible, restless private sector, unfortunately I was very sick of such things as digging a well from behind, slipping my foot, I was really tired. I haven’t seen much of this sort of thing here. I have few negative experiences. Since this does not tire people, we can spend our efforts on other things. We don’t have a very heavy workload, the truth is. Our lesson hours were generally short. The first period was more intense, like 25 hours, but the second period seemed to be 12-15 hours. In this way, we have extra work, in the meantime, we have a lot of extra work. Maybe we read a lot of extra homework papers and so on compared to other institutions. (...) At least I have peace now.” Nazlı mentioned the satisfaction of working conditions and that this brings the success of the organization. On the other hand, Elif stated that there is an increase in the demand for their institutions concerning the results of organizational success and said, “We teach English, they learn. We hear this from our rector, as well as from our manager. Also from our instructors at the head of the professional development unit. Therefore, more students demand us. It was 300 students last year that was the application. We expect around 650 students this year, new students. Demand is increasing every year. So percentile is going up.” Özgür, who works at a foundation university, emphasized the standards in the organisation’s success and said, “The most important thing about success is that we can be the standard. In other words, 40 different classes are opened for one lesson in
our department. For this reason, unfortunately, teachers cannot make decisions such as taking initiative individually. That’s why we all try to do as common things as possible so that every student can go through the same stage somehow. Both in the lecture part and the evaluation part. Therefore, it may be the most important part of success.” Again, Esra emphasized the importance of organizational culture as “Organizational culture affects this success.” Regarding the results of the success, Hatice emphasized the increase in demand, “Therefore, there is an increase in supply and demand. The rate of preference for the school is in direct proportion to the success, in my opinion. I think that the higher the success, the higher the rate of preference.” Again, Neşe, by uttering “At least, the name of the university is made. When students are between two foundation universities, they prefer it when it is a well-known university that is a bit natural.” mentioned the importance of the demand for school.

Table 6.

Views on the Causes and Consequences of Organizational Success

| University | Categories | Codes                      | Participants | n  |
|------------|------------|----------------------------|--------------|----|
|            | Causes     | Organizational citizenship | Selma, Nazlı, Zekiye | 3  |
|            |            | Satisfaction with the conditions | Nazlı, Osman | 2  |
|            |            | Number of students | Leman, Elif | 2  |
|            |            | Being a learning organization | Elif, Zekiye | 2  |
|            |            | Organizational control | Elif | 1  |
|            |            | Sensitive administrator | Osman | 1  |
|            |            | Powerful academic staff | Leman | 2  |
|            |            | Image | Leman | 1  |
|            |            | Participation in decision | Zekiye | 1  |
|            | Consequences | Increase in demand | Leman, Selma, Elif, Zekiye | 4  |
|            |            | Increase in income | Leman, Osman | 2  |
|            |            | Job satisfaction | Leman, Selma | 2  |
|            |            | Satisfaction of other departments | Zekiye | 1  |
|            | Causes     | Organizational culture | Hatice, Özgür, Neşe, Esra, Semra, Meltem | 6  |
|            |            | Powerful academic staff | Ayşe, Esra, Ebru, Semra | 4  |
|            |            | Being a learning organization | Hale, Ebru | 2  |
|            |            | Participation in decision | Hale, Ebru | 2  |
|            |            | Organizational citizenship | Neşe | 1  |
|            | Consequences | Increase in demand | Ayşe, Hatice, Neşe, Hale, Semra, Meltem | 6  |
|            |            | Being proud of the school | Özgür, Esra | 2  |
|            |            | Employment of students | Esra, Meltem | 2  |
|            |            | Increase in workload | Ayşe | 1  |

Views on the Role of Managers in Developing Organizational Culture

To understand the instructors’ views on the role of the administrators in developing the organizational culture, the question in the interview form was, “Can you tell us about the role/characteristics of the school administrator in developing the organizational culture?” The answers of the instructors are given in Table 7;
Table 7.

Roles of Managers to Develop Organizational Culture

| University | Categories                  | Codes                      | Participants                      | n  |
|------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|----|
| State      | Leadership qualities        | High communication skills  | Leman, Selma, Nazlı, Zekiye       | 4  |
|            |                             | Problem solving            | Elif, Osman, Zekiye               | 3  |
|            |                             | High sense of justice      | Leman, Nazlı                      | 2  |
|            |                             | Being accessible            | Selma, Zekiye                     | 2  |
|            |                             | Merit                      | Leman                             | 1  |
|            | Leadership qualities        | Being unprejudiced         | Nazlı                              | 1  |
|            | State                       | Being a role model         | Zekiye                            | 1  |
|            | State                       | Being realistic            | Zekiye                            | 1  |
|            | State                       | Being impartial            | Nazlı                              | 1  |
|            | State                       | Being cooperative          | Zekiye                            | 1  |
|            | Management style            | Having leadership ability  | Osman                              | 1  |
|            | Management style            | Clear business rules       | Ayşe, Elif                         | 2  |
|            | Management style            | Adopting value             | Selma                              | 1  |
|            | Management style            | Organizing special days    | Selma                              | 1  |
|            | Management style            | Strong school climate      | Osman                              | 1  |
| Foundation | Leadership qualities        | Being democratic           | Ayşe, Neşe, Meltem                | 3  |
|            | Foundation                  | Collaborative              | Hatice, Ebru, Semra               | 3  |
|            | Foundation                  | Having a vision            | Esra, Ebru, Semra                 | 3  |
|            | Foundation                  | Communication skills       | Ayşe, Meltem                      | 2  |
|            | Leadership skills           | Leadership skills          | Esra, Ebru                         | 2  |
|            | Leadership qualities        | Being role model           | Semra                              | 1  |
|            | Leadership qualities        | Problem-solving            | Esra                               | 1  |
|            | Leadership qualities        | Being impartial            | Ayşe                               | 1  |
|            | Leadership qualities        | Being apparent             | Esra                               | 1  |
|            | Leadership qualities        | Being unprejudiced         | Ayşe                               | 1  |
|            | Leadership qualities        | Good observer              | Ayşe                               | 1  |
|            | Management style            | Strong organizational climate | Özgür, Hale, Esra                  | 3  |
|            | Management style            | Empathy                    | Hale                               | 1  |
|            | Management style            | Knowledge of management    | Ebru                               | 1  |
|            | Management style            | Open to change             | Hale, Ebru                         | 2  |
|            | Management style            | Organizing special days    | Ayşe, Hatice                       | 2  |
|            | Management style            | Adopting the values        | Neşe                               | 1  |

When Table 7 is examined, it is seen that the instructors evaluated the roles of their administrators in developing organizational culture leadership qualities and the management style. The instructors in the state university mentioned high communication skills \((n=4)\), problem solving \((n=3)\), high sense of justice \((n=2)\), being accessible \((n=2)\), merit \((n=1)\), being unprejudiced \((n=1)\), being a role model \((n=1)\), being realistic \((n=1)\), being impartial \((n=1)\), being cooperative \((n=1)\) and having leadership ability \((n=1)\) under the leadership qualities category and in the category of management style, they included clear business rules \((n=2)\), adopting value \((n=1)\), organizing special days \((n=1)\), strong organizational climate \((n=1)\). Foundation university instructors, on the
other hand mentioned being democratic \((n=3)\), collaborative \((n=3)\), having a vision \((n=3)\), communication skills \((n=2)\), leadership skills \((n=2)\), being role model \((n=1)\), problem solving \((n=1)\), being impartial \((n=1)\), being accessible \((n=1)\), being unprejudiced \((n=1)\), being a good observer \((n=1)\). Under the management style category knowledge of management \((n=1)\), empathy \((n=1)\), strong organizational climate \((n=3)\), organizing special days \((n=2)\) and adopting values \((n=1)\) codes are found. From this point of view, while the high communication skills and clear business rules were emphasized concerning the roles of the managers, the instructors working at the foundation university mostly emphasized the importance of being democratic, collaborative and visionary and having a strong organizational climate. In this respect, Elif mentioned the strong communication with the manager and said; “For example, he holds meetings very often. Our director informs us about the decisions taken by the university, the rector, or the senate, or he warnings that should be made through the meetings. And he makes you feel it too. He also gives warnings. Our manager has very good relations with us. When there is a problem, he goes to individual solutions. He is calling you, talking or sending a private mail and texting you. In this way. For example, I won’t give the subject, but we had a problem collectively, private messages were sent, then collective messages were sent. There were messages that everyone would read with their public CCs, and our manager felt the need to hold a meeting, and he held two or three meetings and we solved the problem before it got bigger. After solving it, he tried to solve the problem by calling them to his room one-on-one about those who still had questions. So solution-oriented.”

Similarly, it is seen that Nazlı expresses that having a strong communication skill is important in the organizational culture role of the manager; “Communication skills must be good. Even if there is a negative criticism, I think he should make a positive start and present negative criticisms without hurting or demotivating the other party.” Hatice stressed that the administrator will increase the instructors’ motivation by organizing special days and said; “First of all, each of us is an expert in our field, we are teachers. But we need a very solid curriculum to achieve the goals throughout the year. And we need very consistent gains. Within this, I think there should definitely be external support from a department such as an education program other than English teaching. Therefore, our management may be expected to be more active in this regard. Can organize events. At the very least, there may be end-of-year events that let us know what we’re doing. There may be situations that reflect our work. For example, how can we reflect the success of one class to other classes? This will be ensured by the management so that such an organization, teachers will be able to fulfill this sharing.”

Neşe said that it is important to adapt to a strong organizational culture that exists in the school, to participate in the decisions taken and to organize regular meetings: “There was one thing when I first came: We always do it this way. This is our application. This inevitably pushes people into it. This is what this place is doing, leaving behind what he knows and what he’s done until now. It’s been a long time. He turns it into something like surrendering by saying that they have something they know. A manager who has adopted his values also makes us adopt them. To strengthen the organizational culture, weekly
meetings are done; people come together, even if it is only for show, it provides a unity to everyone else.”

Activities to Develop Unity and Solidarity at School

To understand the views of the instructors about the activities related to strengthening the unity and solidarity in their schools, the question in the interview form was “What kind of activities are organized in your school to strengthen the unity and solidarity of the instructors?”, The answers of the instructors are given in Table 8;

Table 8.

| University     | Codes                  | Participants         | n  |
|----------------|------------------------|----------------------|----|
| State Social   | Leman, Selma, Elif, Nazlı, Zekiye | 5                   |
| Educational    | Elif                   | 1                    |
| Foundation     | Hatice, Özgür, Neşe, Hale, Esra, Ebru, Semra, Meltem | 8                   |
| Entertainment  | Özkür, Ebru            | 2                    |
| Educational    | Esra, Semra            | 2                    |

When Table 8 is examined, it is seen that the instructors’ views on strengthening unity and solidarity are focused on social activities, educational meetings, and hobby courses. Instructors working in foreign language schools at state universities evaluated the activities to improve unity and solidarity in their schools under the headings of educational meetings (n=1) and social activities (n=5). The instructors at the foundation university made suggestions under the titles of educational meetings (n=2), hobby courses (n=2) and social activities (n=8). From this point of view, it is seen that both the instructors working at the state university and those working at the foundation universities emphasize social activities. Leman and Selma respectively expressed their thoughts on paying attention to social activities as such: “It is newly organized, there weren't many until now, but now we have a small break and end-of-term breakfasts. We have a program on teacher's day. It's something that has existed for the past year, not so much before. There are tea time organizations, Ramadan organizations organized by the school and the university in general, such things.”; “The university has a lot of activities on this subject, not on a preparatory basis. Announcements about it come to us directly from the rectorate and so on. A picnic announcement to be attended by university staff, iftar is organized in Ramadan, where we can all attend.” Neşe and Hale, from the foundation university, also mentioned the importance of social activities with the following thoughts, respectively; “Such as meetings, breakfasts, Christmas events. It's like arranging a meal and gifting a frame to the departed. ……we never had such things when we were studying at the university. We didn't have such traditional situations”; “We are doing something in our department, and it went into a slump. Everyone brings something from home; one afternoon we sit and listen to music, talk, eat, drink and try to relax a bit.”
Views on the Features that Distinguish the School from Other Schools

To understand the instructors’ views about the features that distinguish the school from one another, the question in the interview form is, “What are the features that distinguish your school from other colleges?” The answers of the instructors are given in Table 9;

Table 9

Features that Distinguishes the School from Other Schools

| University   | Categories  | Codes                                | Participants       | n  |
|--------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|----|
| State        | Academic    | Quality of education                 | Selma, Elif, Zekiye | 3  |
|              |             | Academic success                     | Leman, Osman       | 2  |
|              |             | Working culture                      | Leman, Osman       | 2  |
|              |             | Academic staff                       | Elif               | 1  |
|              | Other       | One to one communication with the students | Selma, Elif, Nazlı | 3  |
|              |             | Facilities                           | Elif, Osman, Zekiye | 3  |
|              |             | Number of students                   | Selma, Elif, Nazlı | 3  |
|              |             | The physical location/environment    | Leman, Nazlı       | 2  |
| Foundation   | Academic    | Working culture                      | Ayşe, Hatice, Özgür, Neşe, Esra, Semra, Meltem | 7  |
|              |             | Academic staff                       | Hale               | 1  |
|              |             | Academic success                     | Ebru               | 1  |
|              |             | Quality of education                 | Hale               | 1  |
|              | Other       | Facilities                           | Hatice, Hale, Ebru, Semra | 4  |
|              |             | Number of students                   | Selma, Elif, Nazlı | 3  |
|              |             | One to one communication with the students | Selma, Elif, Nazlı | 3  |
|              |             | The physical location/environment    | Leman, Nazlı       | 2  |
|              |             | Workload                             | Ayşe, Ebru         | 2  |

When Table 9 is examined, it is seen that the views of the instructors working in foreign language schools about the features that distinguish their schools from other schools are grouped under two categories: academic and other. While the views of the instructors working at the state universities were evaluated under the academic category as the quality of education (n=3), academic success (n=2), working culture (n=2), and academic staff (n=1) codes, in the other category their views were evaluated under the physical location/environment (n=2), facilities (n=3), number of students (n=3) and one-to-one communication with the student (n=3) codes. Similarly while the views of the instructors working at the foundation university are evaluated under the academic category, with the codes of working culture (n=7), academic success (n=1), academic staff (n=1), and quality of education (n=1), in the other category, views were evaluated under the opportunities (n=4), number of students (n=3), one-to-one communication with the student (n=3), physical location/environment (n=2) and workload (n=2) codes. While the quality of education, communication with students, opportunities and the number of students are the codes highlighted by the instructors at the state university, the working culture and opportunities are among the codes highlighted by the instructors of the foundation university. Regarding the quality of education and opportunities, Zekiye
said; “We are very open to innovation. We are open to education. Because school supports education, people can go to different places and get education. They support the PhD in all circumstances. In some universities, they can cause difficulties.

On the contrary, we give the students days and hours to arrange their master's, doctorate, and do his homework. Maybe we could do it because our number and the number of courses were enough, we make the programs as our teachers want. We do a lot of training outside. We provide training as private. We try to make up for the mistakes we made there and the things we missed here. Those who come to us here also say they are educated like a private school. Even those who only come to preparatory school, and they do not attend school the following year. Because they receive free intensive English education at the state university”. Regarding the number of students and one-to-one communication with the student, Nazlı said, “We are in the central place. I think this can be an advantage in terms of transportation. Also, we can have more one-to-one communication with students. The number of our students was not very high until now, I think this also has a share in it. But I think we can go a little further in terms of personal communication with students, their help and support. The workload of a school with 1000 students and a school like ours with about 300 or 400 students a year is not the same.”Özgür, one of the instructors working at a foundation university, regarding their work culture said; “Academically; we strive hard to be the standard; we make time to meet each week. We aim to be much more humane and very fair in our measurement tools than other colleges. (Our working culture is different from other colleges). Before we came here, we also worked at the ……university. That's why there were so many different types of assessment, exam preparation, post-exam, and teaching, that I could really feel the difference.” Semra said; “I think people have the freedom to express themselves. When we need to discuss a subject, we can find a medium to discuss it. There can be such a difference. Physically, considering both domestic and international criteria I think our school is very developed. From the outside, a small campus can be seen, in fact, it may not be perceived as a university, but I have enough equipment for academics.” and emphasized that due to the expression way of their views and physical setting their school is different from the others.

Views on the Causes of Problems Experienced at School

To understand the instructors’ views about the causes of the problems in their schools, the question in the interview form was “What are the possible causes of the problems experienced in your school?” The answers of the instructors are given in Table 10 below.

When Table 10 is examined, it is seen that the instructors stated the problems experienced in their schools as individuality, rule ambiguity, managerial attitude, female predominance, physical conditions, workload, authoritarian leadership, manager attitude, lack of communication, and organizational control. It is seen that the instructors’ views in the state university are gathered under the codes such as individuality (n=2), the uncertainty of rules (n=2), managerial attitude (n=2), physical conditions (n=1), workload (n=1), being a female-dominated section (n=1), authoritarian leadership
It is seen that the instructors’ views in the foundation university are gathered under the codes such as managerial attitude (n=3), lack of communication (n=2), individuality (n=2), authoritarian leadership (n=1), organizational control (n=1), uncertainty of rules (n=1). From this point of view, it is seen that the instructors working at the state university mostly stated that the possible causes of the problems are individuality, ambiguity of the rules and the attitude of the administrator, while it is seen that the instructors working at the foundation university mostly emphasize that the problems arise from the attitude of the administrator.

Table 10.

The Reasons of the Problems at School

| University       | Codes               | Participants       | n  |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----|
| State            | Individuality       | Leman, Elif        | 2  |
|                  | Rule ambiguity      | Leman, Zekiye      | 2  |
|                  | Managerial attitude| Nazlı, Osman       | 2  |
|                  | Female predominance | Elif               | 1  |
|                  | Physical conditions | Selma              | 1  |
|                  | Workload            | Zekiye             | 1  |
|                  | Authoritarian leadership | Leman    | 1  |
| Foundation       | Manager attitude    | Ayşe, Neşe, Ebru  | 3  |
|                  | Lack of communication | Özgür, Meltem  | 2  |
|                  | Individuality       | Hale, Esra         | 2  |
|                  | Authoritarian leadership | Hatice   | 1  |
|                  | Organizational control | Semra    | 1  |
|                  | Uncertainty of rules | Hatice           | 1  |

Regarding the problems created by individuality, Elif said, “Ambitiousness in some units sometimes. He loves to work very much, loves to succeed, he says I did, I created, I produced and what I did is right, and he imposes something like you will do it. It happens sometimes, we’ve experienced it. (…) Since we are a female-dominated department, two or three units may have a problem”. Regarding the manager’s attitude, Leman said, “The fact that the teacher is not always included in the process. For example, a change is planned, my expectation as a teacher: there is such a need, we are planning to make such a change because of this need, if necessary, can you contribute to it? If it’s unnecessary, it doesn’t have to happen all the time because we plan to say that, I would like to be informed about that process at least…. Job description and clear determination of working hours in accordance with these definitions. It is like which unit will attend the course for how many hours and how many hours will the unit do the work. Defining these issues clearly can eliminate the problems we are experiencing.” Hatice also stated the problems that arise in the institution are the manager’s attitude, with the following words; “The biggest problem I have observed is the inconsistent decisions made by the management. A different decision can be taken for a teacher, but another can be taken for another teacher.”

(n=1).
Suggestions for Preventing the Problems Experienced

To understand the instructors’ views on the prevention of problems in their schools, the question in the interview form was “What kind of work can be done to prevent the problems experienced in your school?” The answers of the instructors are given in Table 11;

Table 11.

Suggestions for Preventing the Problems Experienced

| University   | Codes                                | Participants          | n  |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|----|
| State        | Merit                                | Meltem                | 1  |
|              | Strong communication                  | Selma, Elif           | 2  |
|              | Supportive leadership                 | Osman                 | 1  |
|              | Participation in decision             | Leman                 | 1  |
|              | Being role model                      | Hatice                | 1  |
|              | Being clear                           | Hatice                | 1  |
|              | Determining vision and mission        | Hatice                | 1  |
|              | Training of managers                  | Leman                 | 1  |
| Foundation   | Solution producing management         | Ö zgür, Semra, Meltem | 3  |
|              | Organizational control                | Hatice, Semra         | 2  |
|              | Workload                              | Semra                 | 1  |
|              | Merit                                 | Neşe                  | 1  |
|              | Participation in decision             | Ebru                  | 1  |
|              | Organizational trust                  | Esra                  | 1  |
|              | Transformational management           | Hale                  | 1  |
|              | Being clear                           | Esra                  | 1  |
|              | Training of managers                  | Ayşe                  | 1  |

It is seen that the views of the instructors in state university are gathered under the strong communication (n=2), merit (n=2), supportive leadership (n=1), decision participation (n=1), being a role model (n=1), being clear (n=1), determining vision and mission (n=1) and training of the administrators (n=1). The views of the instructors working in the foundation university are gathered under solution-producing managements (n=3), organizational control (n=2), transformational management (n=1), merit (n=1), workload (n=1), participation in decision (n=1), organizational trust (n=1), being transparent (n=1), and training of managers (n=1) codes. In this direction, it is seen that the majority of the instructors working in the state university talk about the need to pay attention to merit and strong communication as a suggestion for the solution of the problems, while the instructors working in the foundation universities talk about the need for solution-generating methods. Selma mentions strong communication as a solution proposal with the following words; “People can come together and talk about a problem easily. Maybe that's why the problems don't get longer, they don't get bigger. If there is a problem with the units, not individually, you can go and talk to the management easily. If the teacher has a problem and does not want to talk to the unit coordinator, she can still report it to the management.” Emphasizing the importance of merit, Nazlı expressed her views as “As more experts in their fields, who can handle this job, come to the
necessary units, these problems are largely will be resolved”. Özgür, who works in a foundation university, emphasized the importance of strong communication and said, “I believe in this very much. For example, let’s say there is a problem and someone did it. But this problem is generalized and everyone is warned about this problem. For example, I would like something like this. If our teacher X has done this problem, when you contact him individually, then people who do not have this problem do not feel a burden on them and do not feel constantly warned. For this reason, I think it is more appropriate to communicate individually.”

Suggestions for Creating a Strong Organizational Culture

To understand the suggestions of the instructors about creating a strong organizational culture in their schools, the question in the interview form was, “What are your suggestions for creating a strong organizational culture in your school?” The answers of the instructors are given in Table 12;

Table 12.

Suggestions for Strong Organizational Culture

| University  | Codes                        | Participants | n  |
|-------------|------------------------------|--------------|----|
| State       | Democratic system            | Nazlı        | 1  |
|             | Merit                        | Osman        | 1  |
|             | Being free from prejudice    | Nazlı        | 1  |
|             | Getting professional support | Leman        | 1  |
|             | Being a professional         | Nazlı        | 1  |
|             | Strong communication         | Zekiye       | 1  |
|             | Creating vision and mission  | Osman        | 1  |
|             | Increasing the number of social activities | Hatice, Özgür, Meltem | 3 |
|             | Sharing information          | Hale         | 1  |
|             | Togetherness,                | Ebru         | 1  |
|             | Rewarding                   | Neşe         | 1  |
|             | Organizational trust,        | Esra         | 1  |
|             | Getting professional support | Ayşe         | 1  |
|             | Being professional           | Semra        | 1  |
|             | Clear business rules         | Esra         | 1  |
|             | Being accessible and accountable | Esra     | 1  |
|             | Development of leadership qualities | Ayşe | 1 |

When Table 12 is examined, it is seen that the instructors in the state university suggested a democratic system, merit, being free from prejudice, getting professional support, being professional, strong communication, creating vision and mission, increasing the number of social activities, sharing information, togetherness, rewarding, organizational trust, clear rules, being accessible and accountable, development of leadership qualities. State university instructors’ suggestions for creating strong organizational culture are gathered under the democratic system (n=1), merit (n=1), avoiding prejudice (n=1), getting professional support (n=1), being professional (n=1), being able to communicate well (n=1) and creating a vision and mission (n=1) codes. On the other
hand, the instructors at the foundation university suggested increasing the number of social activities (n=3), sharing information (n=1), providing togetherness (n=1), rewarding system (n=1), organizational trust (n=1), getting professional support (n=1), being professional (n=1), setting clear and clear business rules (n=1), being accessible and accountable (n=1) and developing the leadership qualities of managers (n=1) for strong organizational culture. It is seen that the suggestion mostly emphasized here is about increasing the number of social activities from foundation university instructors. Zekiye mentioned her views as “It is necessary to find ways to communicate socially. These can be open Offices. Sometimes there are advantages and disadvantages. It has disadvantages in terms of working comfortably, but social interaction is a good thing in terms of conversation. The fact that all teachers can be in the same place is that they are in the same building, in the same place, where they can see each other, where they can chat. There has to be communication, by any means. Even whatsaap group is communication so.” Hatice said; “Social activities can be increased. Sometimes we can have breakfast instead of the meeting on Friday, but this is not enough. More social activities can be done. Where I've been before, for example, there could have been evening entertainment. Of course, this is not always possible during the period, for the sake of closing at the end of the period. It can be a social activity outside with the co-workers we work with. In fact, when we are in a school meeting, we are like eating a meal next to you. I think it could be more effective outside to make it a little more special.” And Neşe said “I think everyone works here. If the organizational culture is a culture that will be formed by a person feeling that he belongs to the place where he works, this can be rewarded somehow. It is not necessarily like a contribution to the salary in terms of money, but I think even one day off is a reward for a person. Maybe things like that happen.”

**Conclusion and Discussion**

Instructors working in the school of foreign languages explain the organizational culture with the concepts of unity, common experience, system functioning, relations between managers and employees, belonging to the institution, common experience and organizational trust. While the concepts of “functioning of the system” and “relationships between managers and employees” were used the most by the instructors at the state university, the concepts of “togetherness” and “relationships between the manager and the employees” were used the most in the foundation university. In Aslan, Özer and Bakır’s (2009) study, teachers explained school culture with similar concepts such as interpersonal relations, institutional functioning and trust. In this direction, it can be said that the instructors understand organizational culture as everything that is done together in the organization. The explanation of organizational culture by instructors in both state and foundation universities in the context of relations between managers and employees reveals the importance of the manager’s understanding of management and his attitude towards his employees in fulfilling the goals of the organization, maintaining the existence of the institution, and transforming it into a living institution by gathering around common goals in these institutions.
Instructors have said that efforts to adapt new recruits to the organization should be evaluated within the framework of introductory meetings, guidance, orientation programs, and colleague support. While it was emphasized that the most common adaptation programs in the state university were guidance and colleague support, in foundation university it was determined that orientation programs, mentor academic staff appointment are the adaptation programs. Another finding that emerged from the instructors’ views is that a systematic orientation program is made for the newly appointed instructors at the foundation university. Still, guidance is provided by the unit chiefs mainly at the state universities. Therefore, instructors who have just started working at a state university may have little more difficulty adapting to the institution. It is thought that this situation is because the state university is a much newer institution compared to the foundation university. Another remarkable finding is that while a guide/mentor instructor is appointed at a foundation university within the scope of adaptation efforts, there is no such practice in state universities. This finding of the study is partially similar to the research findings of Gümüş and Gök (2016). In their research, Gümüş and Gök (2016) concluded that faculty members find it appropriate to assign a formal mentor for them to overcome the problems they experienced in the first years of their career or to prevent problems before they even live. Ateş (2018) stated in his research that various orientation programs are organized in both state and foundation universities regarding the adaptation process. In this context, it can be said that in facilitating the adaptation of the new instructors, it is important to have organized planning and an experienced colleague who will briefly guide the school, its culture and its operation. In addition, schools of foreign languages have instructors from different cultures; in this direction, it can be stated that a mentor will play an important role in gaining and internalizing the school culture to the instructors from different cultures more quickly.

Teaching a foreign language and creating an image are determined as organizational goals by the instructors in both universities. Instructors working in both universities also consider serving the organizational purpose as their individual purpose. Özsoy, Ergül and Bayık (2001), Balcı (2003), and Çöl (2004) stated that organizational commitment is the individual’s identification with the organization, adopting the goals, principles and values of the organization, striving for organizational gains, and even putting the interests of the organization above their interests. Based on this definition, it has been concluded that all instructors in both universities aim to serve the organisation's aims individually, and the instructors are affiliated with their organizations. It can be stated that the instructors working in both schools internalized the mission of their institutions to enable students to acquire foreign language skills at international standards, to improve their reading, writing, listening and speaking skills, and to ensure that they are in a distinguished position with foreign language knowledge in their academic and business lives, and also it can be expressed that they are all trying to achieve these goals.

While the instructors at the state university pointed out the organizational citizenship behavior the most as the reason for the organisation’s success, the instructors at the foundation university mentioned the organizational culture the most. Öztevecioğlu (2003) found a positive moderate correlation between organizational citizenship
behavior and academic achievement. There are studies in the literature that support being satisfied with the conditions stated by the instructors at the state university as one of the reasons for the organisation’s success. For example, Akgün et al. (2019), who examined the organizational factors affecting the academic success of nursing students, stated that the academic success of nursing students increased as the satisfaction level of the faculty members increased. In this context, Altunoğlu and Karaman (2007) made the assumption that “happy academics do their jobs well” as a result of their research. It can be stated that there is consistency between the findings obtained from this research on the cause of organizational success and the literature.

The instructors’ organisational success results are gathered under the titles of satisfaction of other departments, increase in income, job satisfaction, image, increase in demand, increase in workload, being proud of the school and employment of students. Instructors in both state and foundation universities expressed the greatest increase in demand as a result of the success of the organization. This finding is similar to the study of Yaman and Çakir (2017). In their study, Yaman and Çakir (2017) determined the most important reasons for the preference of prospective students who will prefer foundation universities as the department’s availability, the school's academic reputation, and the campus facilities, respectively. As in the studies of Bakıoğlu and Bahçeci (2010) in which they stated that the school's success is one of the factors affecting the school's image, the instructors at the state university expressed a similar opinion in this study. The Times Higher Education Supplement (THES, 2008) stated that in evaluating the quality of higher education, one of the four main criteria is the employment rate of students after graduation. This criterion of THES supports the view of the instructors at the foundation university in this research that the organisation’s success affects the employment of students.

According to the instructors at the state university, in the context of the role of managers in developing the organizational culture, the main leadership characteristics expected from the organizational manager are high communication skills, high sense of justice, problem solving and being accessible whereas in the foundation university being democratic, working collaboratively, having leadership qualities and high communication skills are found. The literature states that leadership plays an important role in the formation, development, and institutionalization of organizational culture (Jung, 2001; Ogbonna & Harris, 2000; Tsui zhang, Wang, Xin & Wu, 2006). Therefore, in this research, it is emphasized that instructors and administrators have duties related to giving formal task decisions and orders and must have leadership qualities. The instructors in both universities frequently stated that the administrators’ communication skills should be high to create the organizational culture. This finding is consistent with Şimşek’s (2005) study. Şimşek (2005) found a high level of positive correlation between school culture and school principals’ communication skills. According to the instructors, another role of administrators in developing organizational culture is to determine clear business rules. One of the results of Bilgir’s (2018) study supports this view. According to Bilgir (2018), it is important that the school rules are clear and that these rules are applied with the same approach to all teachers to prevent conflicts in schools. Another
role of administrators in developing organizational culture, which instructors focus on, is the organization of special days. This finding is consistent with the studies showing that school administrators may organize traditional events such as the school's anniversary celebrations, graduation parties, assembly dinners or teas (Aslan, 2008), or organize various activities such as exhibitions, theater, choir, poetry, etc. (Şahin, 2010). Another role of administrators in developing organizational culture, stated by the instructors, is to adopt and make the others adopt values. This finding is consistent with Aytaç's (2013) idea that after managers establish their core values in managing organizational culture, these values should be communicated to internal and external stakeholders. Instructors emphasized that another role of managers in developing organizational culture is to create a strong organizational climate. When the manager uses the organizational climate, it can be a transformation tool within the organization (Ehrhart, Schneider & Macey, 2014). Therefore, it is important for managers to create a strong organizational climate in terms of the dynamics of organizational culture.

It is found that to strengthen the unity and solidarity of the instructors social activities are mostly used. It has been observed that the foundation university is more active than the state university in this regard. However, it was observed that a instructor at a foundation university expressed a different opinion. This instructor stated that they received warnings due to the birthday celebrations in their departments. One instructor in a state university and two instructors in a foundation university expressed their opinion that educational meetings were held to strengthen unity and solidarity. In addition, hobby courses at the foundation university are among the activities carried out by the school. In all activities, the diversity at the foundation university is greater than at the state university. This situation can be the strong organizational culture the university has due to the facilities the foundation university has and its being an old institution.

The instructors’ answers about what distinguishes their schools from other schools are gathered in two categories: academic and other. For both universities, the academic category consists of academic success, academic staff, working culture and quality of education codes. Working culture is the code with the highest frequency stated by seven instructors at the foundation university. The most specified code was determined as the quality of education with three instructors in the state university. When the mission and vision statements of the schools of foreign languages are examined, it is seen that they have common aims in terms of academic and general language teaching to the students. However, although foreign language schools have common goals, they apply different strategies to fulfil these missions. In this context, each school can experience different success levels, so it can be stated that each institution has different characteristics and conditions from the other.

State university instructors stated the most probable causes of the problems experienced in their schools as the administrator's attitude, individuality and the uncertainty of the rules. In the foundation university, the attitude of the administrator was emphasized the most. Confusion in organizational duties and responsibilities (Özer, 2000); unclear duties, authorities and responsibilities (Peker & Aytürk, 2002; Genç, 2005); language difficulties or communication errors such as communication barriers arising from the
structure of the organization, not using the same language between managers and employees (Çınar, 2010); differences in people’s perception of events (Koçel, 2007); differences between management styles (Koçel, 2007); different personality traits such as different goals, abilities, value judgments and attitudes (Peker and Aytürk 2002; Wall & Callister 1995); polarizations in manager and employee relations (Koçel, 2007); the weak problem-solving and reconciliation strategies of managers (Fırat, 2010) are shown among the causes of organizational conflicts. Similarly, Aydın and Hockley’s (2019) research on managerial roles in language schools revealed that managers mostly want to focus on planning the professional development of their employees, planning the curriculum, focusing on the exam, and increasing student motivation. However, they stated that bureaucratic clumsiness and spending time trying to meet unrealistic expectations prevent them from doing all this. In this context, it can be stated that there are various problems in both universities because the administrators cannot find time for the institution's culture, to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization, and to create a strong unity and solidarity.

While the instructors at the state university emphasized strong communication and merit to prevent the problems experienced in their schools, the solution-producing managements and organizational control were emphasized in the foundation university. The views of Uluçınar Türkel (2000) and the view of instructors that strong communication can prevent problems are parallel to each other. According to Uluçınar Türkel (2000), organizational relations can be developed by increasing communication to prevent situations where conflicts may arise from lack of communication in the organization; thus, since employees’ knowledge of each other will grow, misunderstandings can be reduced and prejudiced behaviors can be eliminated. Other solutions suggested by the instructors at both universities are supportive leadership, participation in decision making, transparency and training of administrators. In Bilgir’s (2018) study, it was found that teachers had expectations from administrators such as being impartial, being able to chat, being a leader, paternalistic attitude, transparency of organizational relations, and merit in preventing conflicts. These findings of Bilgir’s (2018) research are very similar to the findings of this research. Similar to this study, in the study of Negiş İşık and Gürgel (2013), the teachers stated that the key factor in solving the problems they experienced was the support of the administrators. Tekkanat (2009) stated that increasing the knowledge and skills of managers may be important in preventing problems. Again, in parallel with the instructors’ views, Ural (1997) examined the problems experienced between teachers and administrators. In the study, it was found that the solution-oriented approaches of the administrators are important in preventing conflicts within the school. It can be noted that there is a parallelism between teachers’ views on the prevention of problems in their schools and the literature.

Among the suggestions of the instructors at the state university to improve the organizational culture are a democratic system, merit, avoiding prejudice, getting professional support, healthy communication, having a vision and a mission. In the foundation university, suggestions are to increase the number of social activities, set clear and clear business rules, share information, ensure unity, reward system, organizational
trust, professional support, being professional, being accessible and accountable, and develop leadership qualities of managers. Among these, increasing the number of social activities is the most emphasized suggestion. There is also a reward system among the suggestions. Parallel to this suggestion, Allen (1999) believes that the organizational reward system can be used to change organizational behaviors. In successful educational institutions with a strong organizational culture, a healthy educational environment free of disciplinary problems (Goldring, 2002), shared strong values, traditions and a strong belief in success (Salfi & Saeed, 2007; Aidla & Vadi, 2007), strong leadership and a strong understanding of leadership that moves decisively towards goals (Griffith, 2004; Aidla & Vadi, 2007), a positive and constructive communication environment (Griffith, 2004) and a fair, objective and transparent management approach (Berry, 1997) are found. In this context, it can be stated that social activities are important to strengthen the unity and solidarity of the instructors, create new relationships between the members of the organization and consolidate the existing ones.

In line with these results, establishing a systematic orientation program in universities can enable new instructors to adapt the institution faster and healthier; at the same time, appointing a mentor to provide one-on-one guidance can facilitate the adaptation process. Creating and maintaining a positive and strong organizational culture is closely related to the success of managers. At this point, all administrators from the highest level to the lowest level of educational administration should be aware of this role they have and should structure their administration with the awareness of this. Considering that the school culture is largely affected by the management style of the administrator, the administrators must take joint decisions with their employees and attach importance to manage their institution with a participatory approach. The research observed that while the school administrators had perceptions that they were managing the organization with an ideal and problem-free administration, the instructors had administrative problems. Therefore, from time to time, administrators can evaluate instructors’ views on the system and management through questionnaires or it can be suggested that they receive feedback through various meetings. Thus, they can correct the deficiencies or errors arising from the management. Care should be taken to assign the job to the right person, both in creating a strong organization and in preventing the problems of merit that may be experienced within the organization. It is necessary and important for administrators to approach all instructors in an equal, consistent and impartial manner in solving the problems experienced within the organization. To prevent problems in the organization, the rules of the organization should be explained clearly and the same approach should be shown to every instructor regarding the implementation of the rules.

School administrators strengthen their empathy and communication skills and show a solution-oriented approach play an important role in preventing problems in the organization or solving existing problems. On these subjects, managers can support their personal development by participating in the trainings given by the experts. Social, cultural and sportive activities should be more as they contribute to unity and solidarity within the organization and increases the communication and interaction between the instructors both in the departments and throughout the university. For researchers, it can
be suggested that different data collection tools and methods should be used to determine the views of faculty members from different departments of the university on organizational culture because this study aims to reveal out the views of the instructors on their own schools.
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