Eurasian Journal of Educational Research 94 (202) 169-188

Eurasian Journal of Educational Research
www.ejer.com.tr

Organisational Socialisation and Collective Teacher Efficacy: The Mediating Role of School Collaborative Culture

Muhammet Emin TURKOGLU[1] Ramazan CANSOY[2] Hanifi PARLAR[3]

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received: 04 Sept. 2020
Received in revised form: 05 Mar. 2021
Accepted: 14 Mar. 2021
DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2021.94.8

Keywords
Self-efficacy, working conditions, collaboration, supportive climate

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between organisational socialisation, collaborative culture in schools, and collective teacher efficacy. **Research Methods:** For data collection in this study cross-sectional surveys were used. The sample consisted of 840 teachers. Three scales were used to collect the data: the Collective Teacher Efficacy Scale, Collaborative Culture in Schools Scale, and Organisational Socialisation Scale. **Findings:** The study findings indicated the existence of both direct and indirect relationships between organisational socialisation, collaborative culture in schools, and collective teacher efficacy. These relationships were positive and statistically significant. According to the findings, as organisational socialisation increased, collaborative culture and collective teacher efficacy levels also increased. Additionally, collaborative culture played a mediating role between organisational socialisation and collective teacher efficacy.

Implications for Research and Practice: The study shows that collaboration between stakeholders, such as principals and teachers in schools, helps improve collective teacher efficacy. Qualified group work in schools facilitates both organisational socialisation as well as collective teacher efficacy.

© 2021 Ani Publishing Ltd. All rights reserved

*For this research the ethics committee approval was given by the Republic of Turkey, Governorship of İstanbul, Provincial Directorate of National Education (Number:59-090411-20-E.23006146, Date: 29.11.2018).

[1] Corresponding Author: Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyonkarahisar, TURKEY, mturkoglu@aku.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-3883-3414
[2] Karabuk University, Karabuk, TURKEY, cansoyramazan@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-2768-9939
[3] Istanbul Ticaret University, TURKEY, hanifiparlar@gmail.com. ORCID: 0000-0002-6313-6955

Introduction

Schools affect student success in a multitude of ways. Identifying the school factors that have the greatest effect on student achievement is crucial for the improvement of schools (Goddard, Hoy & Hoy, 2000). One important factor associated with student achievement is collective teacher efficacy (Bandura,1997). Collective efficacy has attracted substantial attention in research because of its strong effect on student achievements (Bandura, 1993; Goddard et al., 2000). Therefore, policymakers and practitioners often emphasise the importance of collective teacher efficacy in their efforts for respective school reform (Donohoo, Hattie & Eells, 2018; Mosoge, Challens, & Xaba, 2018; Ninković & Knežević Florić, 2018; Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004).

The effect of collective teacher efficacy on student achievements can create positive learning opportunities for students from diverse backgrounds (Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004). Research has demonstrated that student achievements in schools, without collective teacher competence, is at very low levels (Knoblauch & Woolfolk Hoy, 2008; Moolenaar, Sleegers, & Daly, 2012) because collective teacher efficacy is seen as a strong indicator of student achievements (Goddard, 2001; Mitchell, & Tarter, 2016; Ross, Hogaboam-Gray & Gray 2004). Determining which characteristics of schools affect student achievements is essential for boosting and maintaining school effectiveness (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2004; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986). Schools play an important role in students' perceptions because they spend most of their time in schools. Therefore, investigating the relationships between collective teacher efficacy and various variables may contribute to a better understanding of the factors that will increase student achievements.

Collective efficacy is defined as a common belief in organisations and management of actions necessary for the acquisition of different skills (Bandura, 1997, p. 477). On the other hand, collective teacher efficacy refers to the teachers' beliefs in collaborating and performing certain tasks (Bandura, 1997). Individuals' perceptions of efficacy affect their behaviour and levels of motivation, in addition to shaping their own achievements and the success of the school as a whole (Bandura, 1993, 1997). Collective efficacy is associated with the ability of all teachers to collaborate in organisation and management that contributes towards student achievements (Goddard, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 2004). Teachers' self-efficacy perceptions is defined as teachers' belief in their own adequacy to achieve the desired learning outcomes and success in students (Ruble, Usher & McGrew, 2011), this is also necessary for collective teacher efficacy (Bandura, 1997). While teacher self-efficacy is related to a teacher's perception of their own individual accomplishments, collective teacher efficacy emphasises teachers' perceptions of a common capacity for a purpose, with other colleagues in a school (Kurt, 2012). The literature provides a variety of studies exploring collective teacher efficacy. For example, several researchers have examined the theoretical frameworks of collective teacher efficacy (Adams & Forsyth, 2006; Donohoo, 2018; Donohoo, Hattie, & Eells, 2018; Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004), the relationship between collective teacher efficacy and teacher burnout (Lim & Eo, 2014; E. M. Skaalvik & S. Skaalvik, 2010), the relationship between collective teacher efficacy and student

achievements (Moolenaar et al., 2012; Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004), and the relationship between collective teacher efficacy and the leadership behaviours of school principals (Fancera & Bliss, 2011; Ross & Gray, 2006).

Organisational socialisation can be defined as the employees' adaptation processes to the culture of the institution they work in (Fisher, 1986; Schein, 1971). The concept of organisational socialisation is important because it involves instilling the values shared across the organisation to new members of the organisation, positively changing the attitudes of the employees towards the organisation through socialising factors, as well as increasing their productivity (Feldman, 1976). Many contemporary studies have investigated the factors related to collective teacher efficacy, finding that collective efficacy beliefs coincide with positive attitudes of employees in the organisational socialisation process and explaining the impact of employee behaviours on achieving organisational goals (Goddard et al., 2004). Recent research has demonstrated that organisational socialisation is effective in ensuring employee productivity, reducing uncertainty, and increasing their commitment to work (Saks & Gruman, 2018).

Collaborative culture is also believed to play a key role in increasing the quality of school development and teacher practices in educational organisations. Collaborative culture increases student achievements and school effectiveness (Waldron & McLeskey, 2010). Collaborative culture in schools also shapes teachers' professional development and students' achievements (Ainscow & Sandhill, 2010; Conderman & Johnston-Rodriguez, 2009; Gruenert, 2005; Lieberman, 1990; Tett, Crowther & O'hara, 2003; Waldron & McLeskey, 2010). Furthermore, scholars have asserted that collaborative culture is the most important factor affecting student achievements (Gruenert, 2005).

The Relationship between Organisational Socialisation and Collaborative Culture

Organisational socialisation is a critical human resource function affecting individuals, groups, and organisations. It is an effective way of ensuring individual organisational commitment (Ashforth, Sluss & Harrison, 2007). In other words, it is the process of novices learning the appropriate institutional behaviour and thinking styles (Klein & Weaver, 2000). As a matter of fact, organisational socialisation regulates organisational life and ensures the adaptation of employees to the organisational culture (Chao et al., 1994). The process of organisational socialisation takes place through the long-term interaction of the organisation and its employees (Schein, 1971), involving stages of developments in which expectations are formed and mutually accepted or rejected and organisational values are adopted (Allen & Meyer, 1993; Anakwe & Greenhaus, 1999; Feldman, 1976; Louis, 1980; Haski-Leventhal & Bargal, 2008; Reichers, 1987; Schein, 1971). If the organisational socialisation process is completed successfully, it is expected to yield high job satisfaction rates, organisational commitment, and performances (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Angle & Perry, 1981; Bauer & Erdogan, 2011; Reichers, 1985). The literature outlines specific tactics that should be used in the socialisation process, including collective socialisation, wherein group newcomers gain experiences through collaborations (Jones, 1986). Thus,

organisational socialisation helps create environments that support collaborations (Chao et al., 1994; Taormina, 2009). Based on these considerations, the following research question was asked to frame the current study:

Research question 1: What is the relationship between organisational socialisation in schools and collaborative culture?

The Relationship between Collaborative Culture and Collective Teacher Efficacy

School culture aims to increase student achievements (Cheng & Wong, 1996; Fuller Clarke, 1994; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Hoy, 1990; Gaziel, 1997; MacNeil, Prater, & Bush, 2009; Robinson, 2019; Turnipseed, 1988; Van Houtte, 2005; Van Houtte & Van Maele, 2011) and consists of unwritten traditions, invisible beliefs, and assumptions that shape the daily work of the school (Deal & Peterson, 2016; Karpicke & Murphy, 1996; Lambert, 1988). Moreover, school culture helps increase the communication of teachers' and fosters collaborations for student achievements (Deal & Peterson, 2016). Teachers display a challenging and solution-oriented approach in schools with highly collaborative cultures (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996), and such cultures lead to some distinctive characteristics which can distinguish a school from others (Deal & Peterson, 2016).

Bandura (1986, 1997) states that collective teacher efficacy is shaped by *"mastery experience, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion*, and *emotional state"*. *Mastery experience*: Teachers who perceive themselves as successful beings, thinking that they are talented and will succeed in the future. *Vicarious experience*: It represents what teachers have learned from other schools, classrooms, or their peers. *Verbal persuasion*: It describes how teachers convince other teachers that they form an effective team. *Emotional state*: It means that negativity reduces the pressures on collective effect through the help solidarity among teachers.

In a nutshell, the characteristics of collaborative cultures in schools (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996) and the four sources of collective teacher efficacy (Bandura, 1986, 1997) are interrelated and exert influence on each other. Based on this, the following research question was asked:

Research question 2: What is the relationship between collaborative culture in schools and collective teacher efficacy?

The Relationship between Organisational Socialisation and Collective Teacher Efficacy

Organisational socialisation is a concept that identifies how employees learn and adapt to the content of their new tasks (Chao et al., 1994). The first studies in this realm attempted to define the processes of organisational socialisation (Reichers, 1987). However, subsequent studies focused on what was exactly learned in the socialisation process (Fisher, 1986), and acknowledged the multidimensionality of this field. While individuals may be seen as more social in certain areas within an organisation, they may not show the same performance in other areas. Considering the literature, organisational socialisation is conceptualised under the dimensions of *performance proficiency, relations with members, policy, language, organisational goals,* and *institutional*

background (Chao et al., 1994). The *organisational goals* dimension may be particularly related to collective teacher efficacy when it is associated with student achievements, which represents the common goal of educational organisations.

Studies have emphasised that high teacher self-efficacy perceptions may lead to positive changes in education (Main & Hammond, 2008; E. M. Skaalvik & S. Skaalvik, 2010; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Similarly, schools with high collective teacher efficacy endeavour to achieve their goals (E. M. Skaalvik & S. Skaalvik, 2007). Based on these considerations, the following research question was asked:

Research question 3: What is the relationship between organisational socialisation in schools and collective teacher efficacy?

This study was conducted by assuming the existence of a relationship between organisational socialisation, collaborative culture in schools, and collective teacher efficacy. Collaborative culture in schools is believed to have a mediating role on the effect of organisational socialisation on collective teacher efficacy. Therefore, the following research question was asked:

Research question 4: Does collaborative culture play a mediating role in the relationship between organisational socialisation in schools and collective teacher efficacy?

Method

Research Design

The data in this study was collected using a cross-sectional survey method. Direct and indirect relationships between organisational socialisation, collaborative culture in schools, and collective teacher efficacy were examined.

Research Sample

The sample consisted of randomly selected teachers working in primary, secondary, and high schools in Pendik/Istanbul. The measurement tools were distributed to 1,000 teachers, and 840 (63% female and 37% male) responded. These teachers were working in primary (26%), secondary (34%), and high schools (40%). Considering seniority, 4% of the participants had less than one year of teaching experience, 8% had 2–4 years, 30% had 5–9 years, 18% had 10–15 years, and 40% had 15 years or more. The ethical permission of this manuscript was taken from the Republic of Turkey, Governorship of İstanbul, and the Provincial Directorate of National Education (Number:59-090411-20-E.23006146, Date: 29.11.2018).

Research Instruments and Procedures

The Collective Teacher Efficacy Scale was adapted to the Turkish language and cultural context by Erdogan and Donmez (2015). The scale consists of twelve items under two dimensions: *collective efficacy for teaching strategies* and *collective efficacy for student discipline*. The scale is presented as a five-point Likert Scale, with response

options ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. The explained variance of the scale was 58.5%. Cronbach's Alpha values for the individual items on the scale were calculated to be between .85 and .88, and .88 for the reliability of the whole scale (Erdogan & Donmez, 2015). Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used to examine to what extent the data confirmed the construct, and various modifications were made as a result. However, despite these modifications, the goodness of fit indices did not reach acceptable levels or showed to be a very poor fit. Consequently, the construct validity of the collective teacher efficacy scale was re-examined through Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was calculated as .93 and Barlett Sphericity test results were found to be significant ($\chi 2$ = 4573.23, p: 0.00). As a result of the EFA, the scale showed a single factor structure. The total variance explained by the scale was 52.40%, while the factor loads of the items were between .42 and .62. Since the reliability of the scale was low during the analyses, one item was omitted at the advice of an expert in the field. After these modifications, the Cronbach's Alpha value for the reliability of the whole scale was .91, and the item-total correlation coefficients of the scale ranged between .57 and .72. Thus, the scale was found to be valid and reliable for data analysis.

The School Culture Survey was developed by Gruenert and Valentine (1998) and originally consisted of 35 items under six dimensions: *collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration, professional development, collegial support, unity of purpose*, and *learning partnership*. The scale was designed to determine the level of shared values, beliefs, behaviours, and collaborative relationships within a school. The scale is presented as a five-point Likert Scale, with response options ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. The Cronbach's Alpha values for reliability of the dimensions were between .66 and .95; thus, the scale can reliably determine the perception of the level of collaborative culture in schools (Gruenert, 2005).

Various studies have adapted this scale to the Turkish culture. The first study (Ayik & Ada, 2009) to do so identified five dimensions: *collaborative leadership, teacher collaboration, professional development, unity of purpose,* and *learning partnership*. The reliability values of these dimensions were between .62 and .89. Yurtseven and Altun (2019), who re-adapted the same scale to the Turkish culture, found one dimension, and calculated the Cronbach's Alpha value for the entire scale as .93. In studies with similar samples, the scale was also found to be one-dimensional (Turan & Bektas, 2013).

The present study used CFA to gauge the compatibility of the scale with the data and to verify its structure. However, despite many modifications and the exclusion of particular items from the scale, the goodness of fit indices accepted in the literature could not be obtained. Then, EFA was conducted for the construct validity of the scale. The KMO value was .97 and Barlett Sphericity test results ($\chi 2$ = 16663.03, p: 0.00) were found to be significant. The result of factor analysis showed that the variance explained in a single factor was high, and that the scale was one-dimensional. In addition, seven items with low factor loadings were excluded from the scale. Thus, the variance explained by a single factor was calculated as 51.15%. The Cronbach's Alpha value of the whole scale was found to be .96, while the item-total correlation coefficients were

found to be between .61 and .78. In the end, the scale consisted of one dimension and 28 items. Some previous national studies have also determined the scale as being one-dimensional (Turan & Bektas, 2013; Yurtseven & Altun, 2019). The one-dimensional scale presents the characteristics of collaborative culture in schools; thus, we referred to it as *collaborative culture scale in schools* (Gruenert, 2005).

The Organisational Socialisation Scale was developed by Erdogan (2012). The scale consists of 24 items grouped under five dimensions: *interpersonal relations, organisational history and language, professional competence, adaptation to organisational goals and values,* and *organisational policy*. The reliability of individual items was found to be between .72 and .85., while the reliability of the whole scale was .89. CFA was performed to evaluate the consistency of the scale with the data of this study and to verify its structure. Although the CFA compliance index was within certain limits, it was not found to be acceptable; thus, EFA was performed. The KMO value was .94 and Barlett Sphericity test results were found to be significant ($\chi 2 = 10275.17$, p: 0.00). The scale was found to have a single factor, and six items were omitted due to their low factor loadings. The variance was calculated as 50.64%. The factor loads of the items were found to be between .40 and .64. The Cronbach's Alpha value for the reliability of the scale was .94, and the item-total correlation coefficients were between .59 and .76.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS. Mean and standard deviation values were used to determine socialisation in schools, collaborative culture, and collective teacher efficacy levels. A correlation test was employed to determine the relationships between the variables, and a regression analysis determined the predictive powers of the independent variables. When interpreting the arithmetic averages, the 1.00–1.80 range was evaluated as very low, 1.81–2.60 as low, 2.61–3.40 as medium, 3.41–4.20 as high, and 4.21–5.00 as very high.

We analysed the mediating role. Baron and Kenny (1986) re-evaluated the predictive power of socialisation in terms of mediating variable conditions. According to this method, the independent variable should have a significant effect on the mediating and dependent variables. On the other hand, in the case of including the mediating variable in the analysis, the significance of the mediating variable should be maintained while the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable decreases.

Results

Table 1 below presents the mean and the standard deviation values of the variables, as well as the correlations between them.

Table 1

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Correlation Values of the Variables

Variables	$\overline{X}$	S	1	2	3
1. Socialisation	4.29	.52	1	.67*	.52*
2. Collaborative culture	4.02	.61		1	.61*
3.Collective efficacy	3.90	.56			1

*p< .05

According to the opinions of the teachers presented in Table 1, the overall organisational socialisation was very high (M=4.29), perceived collaborative culture was high (M=4.02), and collective teacher efficacy was high (M=3.90). These calculations emerged from the fact that organisational socialisation was observed at the level of 'strongly agree', while perceived collaborative culture and collective teacher efficacy were found to be at the level of 'agree'. Regarding the relationships between variables, a significant and positive relationship was found between organisational socialisation and collaborative culture (r=.67, p < .05), and between socialisation and collective teacher efficacy (r=.52, p < .05).

After correlation analysis, multiple regression analysis was applied (Table 2 below). The mediating variable role of perceived collaborative culture was examined according to the theoretical model of the research.

Table 2

Regression Findings between Variables

	Independent variable	Dependent variable	β	R^2	p
Step 1	Socialisation	Collaborative culture	.67	.45	
Step 2	Socialisation	Collective efficacy	.52	.28	
Step 3	Collaborative culture	Collective efficacy	.61	.37	p < .05
Step 4	Socialisation	Collective efficacy	.21	.40	
	Collaborative culture		.46		

As is seen in Table 2 above, the regression findings between variables were examined in stages.

Step 1: The power of socialisation to predict perceived collaborative culture was examined. Collaborative culture was included as the dependent variable and socialisation as the independent variable in a linear regression analysis. Socialisation predicted collaborative culture significantly and positively (β=.67, p < .05).

Step 2: The predictive power of socialisation on collective efficacy was examined. Socialisation predicted collective efficacy significantly and positively (β=.52, p < .05). Socialisation explained 28% of the variance in collective efficacy.

Step 3: At this stage, collaborative culture predicted collective efficacy significantly and positively (β=.61, p < .05).

These stages revealed relationships between the socialisation, collaborative culture, and collective efficacy variables. Thus, as stated by Barron and Kenny (1986), the analysis found that the preconditions of a mediating effect were met in the tested model.

Step 4: The predictive power of socialisation on collective efficacy (β=.52, p < .05) decreased and remained statistically significant with the inclusion of collaborative culture in the analysis (β=.21, p <.05). Collaborative culture continued to predict collective efficacy significantly (β=.46, p < .05). Socialisation and cooperation together explained 40% of the variance of collective efficacy.

When the variance values displaying the predictive power between the variables were examined, the variance value of collective efficacy (28%) that was explained by socialisation increased to 40% with the inclusion of the mediating variable (collaborative culture) in the analysis. While collective efficacy continued to be predicted by socialisation and collaborative culture in the regression analysis, socialisation and collaborative culture together explained collective efficacy at a higher level. Therefore, whether the 12% difference was a partial mediator of collaborative culture was examined.

Frazier, Tix, and Barron (2004) stated that some variables can perform full mediation or partial mediation in this type of analysis. Thus, if the independent variable directly predicts the dependent variable, then full mediation occurs. However, if the independent variable continues to predict the dependent variable and there is a decrease in the predictive power when the independent variable enters the analysis, a partial mediating role emerges. Therefore, the Sobel Test was performed to determine whether collaborative culture plays a partial mediating role (Leonardelli, 2019). As a result of the Sobel test, the 'z' value was found to be significant at 16.47 (p <.05). This finding shows that perceived collaborative culture is a partial mediator in the model. When all of these findings are evaluated together, organisational socialisation is confirmed to predict collective teacher efficacy both directly and through perceived collaborative culture.

Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations

The findings of this study demonstrated direct and indirect relationships between organisational socialisation, collaborative culture, and collective teacher efficacy. These relationships were positive and statistically significant. An increase in organisational socialisation increased collaborative culture and collective teacher efficacy levels. Organisational socialisation, which served as the independent variable,

predicted collective teacher efficacy. Moreover, collaborative culture played a mediating role in the research model.

In other words, organisational socialisation was found to be an important predictor of collaborative culture. This result confirms those of several previous studies. Organisational socialisation helps create environments that support collaboration (Taormina, 2009). Talented individuals reap the benefits of collaborative culture in organisations over the long term. Cooperation, trust, sincerity, sharing ideas, courtesy, and appreciation can clearly be seen in the relationships between individuals in such organisations. In addition, industrious individuals who have a sense of belonging in collaborative culture and who manage their time well increase productivity (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996). The awareness of teachers and school administrators about professional responsibility, the quality of the programs, and the availability of tools and equipment support such collaborations (Waldron & McLeskey, 2010). As collaborative interactions increase, the process of organisational socialisation accelerates and heightens job satisfaction, commitment to the organisation, and employee performances (Bauer & Erdogan, 2011). Educators who want to increase student achievements should initiate a collaborative change process that results in new values, beliefs, norms, and preferred behaviours (Fullan, 2007). Collaborative culture in schools is an important factor shaping both teachers' professional developments and students' achievements (Ainscow & Sandhill, 2010; Conderman & Johnston-Rodriguez, 2009; Gruenert, 2005; Waldron & McLeskey, 2010). These results show that collaborative culture forms the basis of a process that differentiates schools and fosters organisational socialisation (Deal & Peterson, 2016). Based on these findings, it can be argued that a qualified collaborative culture in schools is the result of high-level organisational socialisation.

The present study found a significant and positive relationship between collaborative culture and collective teacher efficacy. This finding demonstrates that collaborative culture contributes positively to collective teacher efficacy. Previous studies have also found a significant relationship between collaborative culture and collective teacher efficacy (Demir, 2008; Ross & Gray, 2006). Teacher collaboration has been identified as an important predictor of collective effectiveness (Goddard et al., 2015). Bandura (1997) stated that teachers' collaboration in schools positively affects collective teacher efficacy. Ross et al. (2004) explained that collaboration between teachers can affect their common beliefs and lead to collective actions such as seeking help, problem solving, and sharing instructional experiences. Thus, collective efficacy is associated with teachers' levels of collaboration toward the shared goal of student achievements (Goddard et al., 2004). Therefore, collective teacher efficacy has positive effects on student achievements (Moolenaar et al., 2012). Collaborative cultures are based on voluntary participation and are development-oriented processes (Hargreaves, 1994). Consequently, schools with highly perceived collective teacher efficacy expend significant efforts to achieve their goals (E. M. Skaalvik & S. Skaalvik, 2007).

According to the results, organisational socialisation predicts collective teacher efficacy. As organisational socialisation increases in schools, collective teacher efficacy

also increases. These findings are consistent with those of previous studies. Expectations of collective teacher efficacy are an important part of organisational socialisation and have a significant impact on employee performances (Goddard et al., 2004). The stronger the beliefs in an organisation's collective effectiveness are, the more consistent the efforts of the members of the organisation to achieve their goals will be (Goddard & Skrla, 2006). Therefore, schools with high perceptions of collective teacher efficacy endeavour to achieve their goals (E. M. Skaalvik & S. Skaalvik, 2007). The healthy conduct of organisational activities in schools help teachers work for common goals, garner support for instructional activities, and develop positive relations with colleagues (Friedman & Kass, 2002). A teacher with a strong sense of organisational self-efficacy acts as a better team member and uses school resources more efficiently. Moreover, decision-making processes become more qualified as cooperation between school staff increases. Otherwise, teachers tend to limit themselves solely to classroom activities in a school with a weak sense of organisational socialisation (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Based on these findings, it can be said that healthy functioning and communication within an organisation contributes to collective efficacy, which in turn is a strong indicator of student achievements (Goddard, 2001; Ross et al., 2004).

As a result, this study found organisational socialisation to be an important predictor of collective teacher efficacy. In addition, collaborative culture played a mediating role in the relationship between organisational socialisation and collective teacher efficacy. Based on these findings, teachers' adaptation to the culture of their school provides a positive basis for all teachers to undertake new tasks, work for student achievements, and to ensure collective awareness.

Conducting additional in-depth investigations using qualitative methods, such as observations and interviews, may also contribute to the development of the research model. Additionally, no international organisations have published reports on collective teacher efficacy. In this context, studies can be conducted to examine these concepts by teachers, scholars, and policymakers affiliated with educational organisations. Social, scientific, and artistic activities should also be organised in schools to bolster these values and practices. Teachers should be encouraged to participate in certificate programs, graduate education, scientific meetings, and projects aimed at improving their collaboration skills. The current study shows that collaboration between school stakeholders such as principals and teachers provides a healthy basis for collective teacher efficacy. Qualified group studies in schools facilitate both organisational socialisation and collective teacher efficacy.

This study has some limitations that should also be taken into account when interpreting and applying its findings. Qualitative research is needed in this area because previous studies have typically adopted quantitative research methods. In addition, the present research was limited to primary, secondary, and high school teachers working in public schools in a district of Istanbul. For a better understanding of the key concepts, studies should be conducted in different provinces and districts, particularly in high schools that implement different programs. Examining private schools may also contribute new data and insights towards the literature.

References

Adams, C. M., & Forsyth, P. B. (2006). Proximate sources of collective teacher efficacy. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *44*(6), 625-642.

Ainscow, M., & Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organisational cultures and leadership. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *14*(4), 401-416.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). Organizational socialization tactics: A longitudinal analysis of links to newcomers' commitment and role orientation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *33*(4), 847-858.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Organizational commitment: Evidence of career stage effects? *Journal of Business Research*, *26*(1), 49-61.

Anakwe, U. P., & Greenhaus, J. H. (1999). Effective socialization of employees: Socialization content perspective. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *11*(3), 315-329.

Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *26*(1), 1-14.

Ashforth, B. E., Sluss, D. M., & Harrison, S. H. (2007). Socialization in organizational contexts. In G. P. Hodgkinson and J. K. Ford (Eds), International review of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 1-70). Wiley.

Ayik, A., & Ada, Ş. (2009). Ilkogretim okullarinda olusturulan okul kulturu ile okulların etkililigi arasindaki iliski. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences, 8*(2), 429-446.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*(2), 117–148.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self - efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*(6), 1173-1182.

Bauer, T. N., & Erdogan, B. (2011). Organizational socialization: The effective onboarding of new employees. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA Handbooks in Psychology. APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol. 3. Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization* (pp. 51-64). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Chao, G. T., O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Wolf, S., Klein, H. J., & Gardner, P. D. (1994). Organizational socialization: Its content and consequences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(5), 730-743.

Cheng, K. M., & Wong, K. C. (1996). School effectiveness in East Asia: Concepts, origins and implications. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *34*(5), 32-49.

Conderman, G., & Johnston-Rodriguez, S. (2009). Beginning teachers' views of their collaborative roles. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, *53*(4), 235-244.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (2016). *Shaping school culture*. San Francisco, CA:John Wiley & Sons.

Demir, K. (2008). Transformational leadership and collective efficacy: The moderating roles of collaborative culture and teachers' self-efficacy. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research,* (33), 93-112.

Donohoo, J. (2018). Collective teacher efficacy research: Productive patterns of behaviour and other positive consequences. *Journal of Educational Change*, *19*(3), 323-345.

Donohoo, J., Hattie, J., & Eells, R. (2018). The power of collective efficacy. *Educational Leadership*, *75*(6), 40-44.

Erdogan, U. (2012). *Ilkogretim okullarinin burokratik yapilari ile ogretmenlerin orgutsel sosyallesme duzeyleri arasindaki iliski: Malatya ili ornegi*. (Yayimlanmamis yuksek lisans tezi), Inonu University, Malatya.

Erdogan, U., & Donmez, B. (2015). Kolektif ogretmen yeterligi olceginin Turkce'ye uyarlanmasi: Gecerlik ve guvenirlik calismasi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Yonetimi Dergisi, 21*(3), 345-366.

Fancera, S. F., & Bliss, J. R. (2011). Instructional leadership influence on collective teacher efficacy to improve school achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *10*(3), 349-370.

Feldman, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *21*(3), 433-452.

Fisher, C. D. (1986). Organizational socialization: An integrative review. In K. M. Rowland, & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personal and human resource management,* (Vol. 4, pp. 101-145). JAI Press.

Frazier, P. A., Tix, A. P., & Barron, K. E. (2004). Testing moderator and mediator effects in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *51*(1), 115-134.

Friedman, I. A., & Kass, E. (2002). Teacher self-efficacy: A classroom-organization conceptualization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18*(6), 675-686.

Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1996). *What's worth fighting for in your school?* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fuller, B., & Clarke, P. (1994). Raising school effects while ignoring culture? Local conditions and the influence of classroom tools, rules, and pedagogy. *Review of Educational Research*, *64*(1), 119-157.

Gaziel, H. H. (1997). Impact of school culture on effectiveness of secondary schools with disadvantaged students. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *90*(5), 310-318.

Goddard, R. D. (2001). Collective efficacy: A neglected construct in the study of schools and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *93*(3), 467.

Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(2), 479-507.

Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2004). Collective efficacy beliefs: Theoretical developments, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Educational Researcher*, *33*(3), 3-13.

Goddard, R. D., & Skrla, L. (2006). The influence of school social composition on teachers' collective efficacy beliefs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *42*, 216–235.

Goddard, R. D., Goddard, Y., Kim, E. S., & Miller, R. (2015). A theoretical and empirical analysis of the roles of instructional leadership, teacher collaboration, and collective efficacy beliefs in support of student learning. *American Journal of Education*, *121(4)*, 501-530.

Gruenert, S. (2005). Correlations of collaborative school cultures with student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin*, *89*(645), 43-55.

Gruenert, S., & Valentine, J. W. (1998). *The school culture survey*. Columbia: MO: University of Missouri-Columbia.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *9*(2), 157-191.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (1986). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education*, *94*(3), 328-355.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Haski-Leventhal, D., & Bargal, D. (2008). The volunteer stages and transitions model: Organizational socialization of volunteers. *Human Relations*, *61*(1), 67-102.

Hoy, W. K. (1990). Organizational climate and culture: A conceptual analysis of the school workplace. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, *1*(2), 149-168.

Jones, G. R. (1986). Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and newcomers' adjustments to organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 29(2), 262-279.

Karpicke, H., & Murphy, M. E. (1996). Productive school culture: Principals working from the inside. *NASSP Bulletin*, *80*(576), 26-34.

Klein, H. J., & Weaver, N. A. (2000). The effectiveness of an organizational-level orientation training program in the socialization of new hires. *Personnel Psychology, 53*(1), 47–66.

Knoblauch, D., & Hoy, A. W. (2008). "Maybe I can teach those kids." The influence of contextual factors on student teachers' efficacy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24*(1), 166-179.

Kurt, T.(2012). Ogretmenlerin oz yeterlik ve kolektif yeterlik algilari. *Turk Egitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 10*(2), 195-227.

Lambert, L. G. (1988). Building school culture: An open letter to principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, *72*(506), 54-62.

Leonardelli, G. J. (2019). An interactive calculation tool for mediation tests. Retrieved from http://quantpsy.org/sobel/sobel.htm

Lieberman, A. (1990). *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now*. Bristol: The Falmer Press, Taylor and Francis.

Lim, S., & Eo, S. (2014). The mediating roles of collective teacher efficacy in the relations of teachers' perceptions of school organizational climate to their burnout. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *44*, 138-147.

Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *25*(2), 225-251.

MacNeil, A. J., Prater, D. L., & Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *12*(1), 73-84.

Main, S., & Hammond, L. (2008). Best practice or most practiced? Pre-service teachers' beliefs about effective behaviour management strategies and reported self-efficacy. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *33*(4), 27-39.

Mitchell, R., & Tarter, C. (2016). A path analysis of the effects of principal professional orientation towards leadership, professional teacher behavior, and school academic optimism on school reading achievement. *Societies*, *6*(1), 5.

Moolenaar, N. M., Sleegers, P. J., & Daly, A. J. (2012). Teaming up: Linking collaboration networks, collective efficacy, and student achievement. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28*(2), 251-262.

Mosoge, M. J., Challens, B. H., & Xaba, M. I. (2018). Perceived collective teacher efficacy in low performing schools. *South African Journal of Education*, *38*(2), 1-9.

Ninković, S. R., & Knežević Florić, O. Č. (2018). Transformational school leadership and teacher self-efficacy as predictors of perceived collective teacher efficacy. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *46*(1), 49-64.

Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*(3), 465-476.

Reichers, A. E. (1987). An interactionist perspective on newcomer socialization rates. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*(2), 278-287.

Robinson, N. (2019). *Effectiveness of alternative school interventions in reducing ıncidences of violence in schools and ımproving attendance and graduation rates* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Lindenwood University.

Ross, J. A. & Gray, P. (2006). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values: The mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement. 17*(2), 179–199.

Ross, J. A., Hogaboam-Gray, A., & Gray, P. (2004). Prior student achievement, collaborative school processes, and collective teacher efficacy. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 3*(3), 163–188.

Ruble, L. A., Usher, E. L., & McGrew, J. H. (2011). Preliminary investigation of the sources of self-efficacy among teachers of students with autism. *Focus On Autism And Other Developmental Disabilities*, *26*(2), 67-74.

Saks, A., & Gruman, J. (2018). Socialization resources theory and newcomers' work engagement. *Career Development International*, *23* (1), 12-32.

Schein, E. H. (1971). The individual, the organization, and the career: A conceptual scheme. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *7*(4), 401-426.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(3), 611-625.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(4), 1059-1069.

Taormina, R. J. (2004). Convergent validation of two measures of organizational socialization. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 15* (1), 76-94.

Taormina, R. J. (2009). Organizational socialization: The missing link between employee needs and organizational culture. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *24*(7), 650-676.

Tett, L., Crowther, J., & O'Hara, P. (2003). Collaborative partnerships in community education. *Journal of Education Policy, 18*(1), 37-51.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Barr, M. (2004). Fostering student learning: The relationship of collective teacher efficacy and student achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *3*(3), 189-209.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 202-248.

Turan, S., & Bektas, F. (2013). The relationship between school culture and leadership practices. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 52*, 155-168.

Turnipseed, D. L. (1988). An integrated, interactive model of organisational climate, culture and effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 9*(5), 17-21.

Van Houtte, M. (2005). Climate or culture? A plea for conceptual clarity in school effectiveness research. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 16*(1), 71-89.

Van Houtte, M., & Van Maele, D. (2011). The black box revelation: In search of conceptual clarity regarding climate and culture in school effectiveness research. *Oxford Review of Education,* 37(4), 505-524.

Waldron, N. L., & McLeskey, J. (2010). Establishing a collaborative school culture through comprehensive school reform. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, *20*(1), 58-74.

Yurtseven, N., & Altun, S. (2019). Okul kulturu olceginin Turkceye uyarlanmasi: Bir dilsel esdegerlik, gecerlik ve guvenirlik calismasi. *Akdeniz Egitim Arastirmaları Dergisi, 13*(27), 506-520.

Örgütsel Sosyalleşme ve Kolektif Öğretmen Yeterliği: Okulda İş birliği Kültürünün Aracı Rolü

Atıf:

Turkoglu, M. E., Cansoy, R., & Parlar, H. (2021). Organizational socialization and collective teacher efficacy: The mediating role of school collaborative culture. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 94, 169-188, DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2021.94.8

Özet

Problem Durumu: Okullar, öğrencilerin akademik başarılarını farklı biçimlerde etkilemektedir. Öğrencilerin akademik başarılarını etkileyen okul ve öğretmen düzeyindeki farklı değişkenleri incelemek, okulların iyileştirilmesi için kritik bir öneme sahiptir (Goddard, Hoy & Hoy, 2000). Bu bağlamda, öğrencilerin akademik başarıları ile ilişkili önemli değişkenlerden biri de kolektif öğretmen yeterliğidir (Bandura, 1997). Bu nedenle araştırmacılar kolektif öğretmen yeterliliğinin önemini sıklıkla vurgulamaktadır (Donohoo, Hattie & Eells, 2018; Ninković & Knežević Florić, 2018; Mosoge, Challens & Xaba, 2018; Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004).

Örgütsel sosyalleşme farklı kurumlarda çalışanların verimli çalışmalar sergilemesinde önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Örgütsel sosyalleşme, çalışanların çalıştıkları kurumdaki kültüre uyum sağlama sürecidir (Fisher, 1986; Schein, 1971). Örgütsel sosyalleşme, örgütte paylaşılan değerlerin aktarımı ile süreç içerisinde çalışanların örgüte karşı

tutumlarının olumlu yönde değiştirilmesidir (Feldman, 1976). Yapılan araştırmalar örgütsel sosyalleşmenin çalışanların verimliliğini sağlamada, iş yerindeki belirsizliği azaltmada ve işe adanmışlığı artırmada etkili olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu araştırma kapsamında, örgütsel sosyalleşmenin kolektif öğretmen yeterliği üzerindeki etkisinin, örgüt çalışanların gösterdiği olumlu tutumlarda ve örgüt hedeflerinin gerçekleştirilmesinde etkili olabileceğini ortaya koymuştur (Goddard, Hoy & Hoy, 2004).

Benzer şekilde, iş birliği kültürünün eğitim örgütlerinde okul gelişimi, öğretmen uygulamalarının niteliğinin artırılmasında önemli bir rol oynamaktadır (Waldron & McLeskey, 2010). Araştırmalar okullarda iş birliği kültürünün, öğretmenlerin mesleki öğrenmelerini sağlamada ve öğrenci başarısını artırmada önemli bir etken olduğunu göstermektedir (Ainscow & Sandhill, 2010; Conderman, Johnston-Rodriguez, 2009; Gruenert, 2005; Lieberman, 1990; Tett, Crowther & O'hara, 2003; Waldron & Mc Leskey, 2010).

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bu çalışmanın amacı, öğretmen görüşlerine göre örgütsel sosyalleşme, okulda işbirliği kültürü ve kolektif öğretmen yeterliği arasındaki ilişkileri ve okuldaki iş birliği kültürünün aracı rolünü incelemektir.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Bu çalışmada ilişkisel model kullanılmıştır. Modelde örgütsel sosyalleşme, okul iş birliği kültürü ve kolektif öğretmen yeterliği arasındaki doğrudan ve dolaylı ilişkiler incelenmiştir. Araştırma İstanbul'a bağlı bir ilçede yürütülmüştür. Araştırmaya ilkokul, ortaokul ve lise öğretmenleri katılmıştır. Araştırmanın örneklemini bu okullardan tesadüfi olarak seçilen 840 öğretmen oluşmuştur. Araştırmada verileri toplamak amacıyla Kolektif Öğretmen Yeterliği Ölçeği, Okullarda İş Birliği Kültürü Ölçeği ve Örgütsel Sosyalleşme Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizi, SPSS programı aracılığıyla yapılmıştır. Okullarda sosyalleşme, okul iş birliği kültürü ve kolektif öğretmen yeterlik düzeylerini belirlemek için ortalama ve standart sapma değerleri kullanılmıştır. Değişkenler arasındaki ilişkileri belirlemek için korelasyon testi yapılmıştır. Bağımsız değişkenlerin bağımlı değişkenleri yordama gücünü belirlemek için ise regresyon analizine başvurulmuştur.

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Çalışmadaki bulgular incelendiğinde, örgütsel sosyalleşme, iş birliği kültürü ve kolektif öğretmen yeterliği arasında doğrudan ve dolaylı ilişkiler olduğu gözlenmiştir. Bu ilişkiler olumlu yönde ve istatistiksel olarak anlamlıdır. Örgütsel sosyalleşme iş birliği kültürünü ve kolektif öğretmen yeterliğini pozitif yönde ve istatistiksel olarak anlamlı biçimde yordamıştır. Ayrıca, iş birliği kültürünü sosyalleşme ile kolektif öğretmen yeterliği arasında aracı role sahip olduğu tespit edilmiştir.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Öneriler: Bu araştırma sonucunda, örgütsel sosyalleşmenin, kolektif öğretmen yeterliliğininin önemli bir yordayıcısı olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Buna ek olarak, iş birliği kültürü de bu ilişkide aracı rolü üstlenmektedir. Bu bulgulara bağlı olarak, öğretmenlerin çalıştıkları okuldaki kültüre uyum sağlamaları, yeni görevleri benimsemeleri, tüm öğretmenlerin öğrenci başarısı için çalışmasına olumlu bir zemin hazırlağı ifade edilebilir.

Bu kapsamda bu kavramların politika yapıcılar ve uygulayıcılar tarafından eğitim örgütlerinde incelenmesine yönelik çalışmalar yapılabilir. Okullarda sosyal, bilimsel ve sanatsal faaliyetler düzenlenebilir. Öğretmenlerin iş birliğine yönelik becerilerini geliştirebilecek sertifika programlarına, lisansüstü eğitime, bilimsel toplantılara ve projelere katılım göstermeleri teşvik edilebilir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Öz-yeterlik, çalışma koşulları, iş birliği, destekleyici çalışma ortamı.

*For this research the ethics committee approval was given by the Republic of Turkey, Governorship of İstanbul, Provincial Directorate of National Education (Number:59-090411-20-E.23006146, Date: 29.11.2018).

View publication stats