

Full Length Research Paper

Secondary school teachers' perceptions on their school's openness to change

Rüyam Küçüksüleymanoğlu^{1*} and Cem Terzioğlu²

¹Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, Uludağ University, Bursa, Turkey.

²Ministry of National Education, Turkey.

Received 22 June, 2017; Accepted 18 July, 2017

Any possible difference to occur in the subsystems or dimensions of the organization or the interrelations between them is called organizational change. Organizational change means an organization's adapting a new way of thinking or an action. In this sense, change is such a comprehensible term that includes all events and phenomena related to creativity, renovation, growth and development. The purpose of this research is to investigate the secondary schools' openness to change based on the views of teachers. This is a descriptive research in which both qualitative and quantitative data gathering techniques were used. The sampling group of the study consists of 105 teachers working at 9 secondary schools in the districts of Nilüfer and Osmangazi of Bursa province in 2015 to 2016 academic year. In order to determine the secondary schools' openness to change, the Faculty Change Orientation Scale (FCOS) which was developed by Smith and Hoy (2007) and adapted into Turkish by Demirtas was used. For the analysis of the quantitative data, descriptive statistics which are Anova and Kruskal Wallis were used. To analyse qualitative data, content analysis technique was used. As a result of the research, it was found that the secondary schools' scores from different dimensions of the scale differ significantly with regard to gender, seniority, and last higher education program the teacher graduated from, years at current school and union membership.

Key words: Openness to change, change, teacher, secondary school.

INTRODUCTION

Change is one of the most important and common concepts in the globalizing world of the 21st century. It is possible to experience change in every aspect of life in today's globalizing world. Before going into any further details, it might be useful to define what change means.

According to Hargreaves (2004) "change is defined as

movement from one state to another". From another point of view (Konaklı, 2014) suggests that "change refers to a shift from previous qualitative or quantitative characteristics in a planned or unplanned way".

Altrichter (2000) states that change is a term that can be used to describe an improvement process and the results of this process. In addition, these products and

*Corresponding author. E-mail: ruyamk@superonline.com. Tel: +905424125337.

processes have a lot of different parts and small details that fit together. It can be said that organizations must always change and renovate themselves in order to survive, be more productive, reach their goals more effectively and have a creative and competitive capacity. Any possible difference to occur in the subsystems or dimensions of the organisation or the interrelations between them is called organizational change. Every aspect of life is affected by change.

Organizations' ability to catch up with the change determines their existence. With this knowledge in mind, it can be said that without adapting itself to the changing environment, it is implausible to think that organizations or institutions will continue to exist and achieve their goals. Organizational change is a purposeful initiative. From an organizational perspective, change has general aims which include being ready for the future, enabling organization members to have a mutual trust and support, and a good rapport among each other. The other aims involve delivering solutions to problems or issues and creating synergy. For organizations, change is inevitable; however, the attempts which are made to realize change in organisations result in failure. Organization members react differently to change at times of change.

The impact of changing demands can easily be seen on educational institutions and schools, as well as other institutions and organizations. As an open system on its own, it is more likely that schools have got a fragile structure towards those change claims. In addition, school as an educational institution is more open to the environmental forces of change than other organizations, since, it processes its raw material, human being, considering the social expectations and again supplies its output into the same society. As educational institutions, schools have to possess a multifunctional structure which is always open to renewal; produce, use and promote knowledge; provide confidence thanks to team work; open for 24 h a day; meet the society's emerging needs; and aim at developing free and creative thinking students (Kalmaz, 2007).

With all types of organizations, educational organizations are influenced by global changes in science, psychology and technology. It is leaders who primarily facilitate and lead the change in the process. In this regard, teachers are primarily the most important people to lead the change in educational organizations. As teachers are people who are going to support and enhance the change, their views are quite important. Educational institutions have to keep up with the demands of the ever-changing environment to survive in this globalizing world. Considering that, it might be possible to say that the future of educational institutions will be determined by their ability to realize their change process effectively.

Openness to change represents a situation marked by the tendency, readiness and willingness (Wanberg and Banas, 2000). Researches that have been conducted to

investigate openness to change (Harris, 2001, 2006, 2009, 2011; Hopkins, 2003, 2007; Levin, 2007; Murphy, 2005; Priestley, 2011; Seashore, 2009; Sergiovanni, 2000; Stoll, 2009; Wheatley, 2006) which show that openness to change is related to a lot of different factors. One of the potential variables affecting the success of change at schools is teachers' (Çalışkan, 2011; Demirtas, 2012; DePaulo, 2000; Griffith, 2010; Ha et al., 2004; Lee, 2000; Moroz ve Waugh, 2000; Waller, 2008).

Employees' attitudes towards change must be known before beginning organizational change studies. Thus, possible resistance can be prevented and planning, implementation and evaluation studies can be done in accordance with the attitudes of the employees. It can be said that the success of a change process is proportional to the organization's employees' openness to change. This also applies to the school organisations. The success of change practices in schools, depends on the acceptance and adaptation of those practices of the administrators and teachers of the school.

Teacher is the most critical element of education system. Change relies heavily on the willingness of individuals to change and their positive ideas as to its potential consequences (Tal and Yinon, 2002; Tasdan, 2013; Demirtas, 2012; Yilmaz, 2010; Altun and Buyukozturk, 2011; Akpınar and Aydin, 2007; Hall, 2005; Voorhis and Sheldon, 2004; Konaklı, 2014, Wanberg and Banas, 2000).

It can not be expected that the results of change will be positive for an organization with employees who do not believe in the necessity of change. Studies have demonstrated how influential teachers who are willing to change are in the success of changes. In this study, the main purpose was to determine openness to change of secondary schools based on teacher opinions on the success of change. It is important that the teachers who are practitioners of change in education should be aware of change.

The purpose of this study is to determine the secondary schools' openness to change based on teachers' views. The following research questions were posed in accordance with this overarching purpose:

1. What is the level of secondary schools' openness to change according to teachers' views?
2. Is there a meaningful difference between teachers' views about schools' openness to change according to their gender, branch, seniority, graduated faculty, in service training experience and union membership?

METHODOLOGY

Sample and population

A descriptive approach was used in the present study in which the data were collected with both quantitative and qualitative methods. A total of 105 teachers from 9 secondary schools in Bursa, Turkey were the sample of the study in 2015 to 2016 academic year. Each

Table 1. Personal information for quantitative data.

Variable		Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	70	66.6
	Male	35	33.3
Branch	Verbal	29	27.6
	Numerical	60	57.1
	Other	16	15.2
Graduated faculty	Education faculty	64	60.9
	Faculty of arts and sciences	41	39.0
Seniority	1-5 years	13	12.3
	6-10 years	34	32.3
	11-15 years	51	48.5
	16- years and more	7	5.6
In service training	Yes	78	74.2
	No	27	25.7
Union membership	Yes	85	80.9
	No	20	19.0

subject was given the questionnaire by the researcher directly with a set of specific instructions describing the study. The personal data about the sample is given in Table 1.

33.3% (n=35) percent of the group was composed of males and 66.6% (n=70) females. The number of years of teaching varied considerably. Branches of teachers were categorised under three headings including numerical, verbal and others. Social sciences, English language, Turkish language, and such, were categorised under the heading of "verbal".

The branch "numerical" included courses such as science and mathematics. The last category "others" was composed of courses like information and communication technology, physical education, music, arts, education of religion and ethics. Among the teachers 57.1% of the participants were numerical branch teachers (n=60), 27.6% verbal branches (n=29) and 15.2% other branches (n=16). 60.9% of the teachers (n=64) have an undergraduate degree in education faculties whereas 41% have an undergraduate degree from faculty of arts and sciences (n=41).

While 74.2% (n=78) have in service training experiences in the last 5 years 25.7% (n=27), others do not. In terms of tenure, 12.3% (13) of teachers have 1 to 5 years, 32.3% (34) of teachers have 6 to 10 years, 48.5 (51) of teachers have 11 to 15 years, 5.6% (7) of teachers have 16 and more years. 74.2% of the teachers (n=78) attend inservices training whereas 25.7% do not (n=27). 80.9% (n=85) of the sample affiliates a union and 19.04% (n=20) do not.

For qualitative analysis an interview was held with 19 teachers. 8 of the interviewed teachers were female whereas 11 were male, 9 participants had 1 to 5 years experience, 5 participants had 6 to 10 years experience, 4 participants had 11 to 15 years experience and 1 participant had 16 and more years of experience.

In terms of graduated faculty, 8 of the teachers were from Faculty of Sciences Letters whereas 11 were from Education faculties. 4 of the participants were numerical branches, 12 of the teachers were verbal branches and 3 were other branches with regard to branches. 12 of the interviewees had in-service training, 7 others

did not have any in service training during their teaching career. 14 of the interviewees had union memberships and 5 of them did not. As the privacy rules, the participants are coded as T1 to T19 (Table 2).

Measures

The data were collected through Faculty Change Orientation Scale – (FCOS), Personal Information Form and interviews. The FCOS was translated into Turkish by Demirtas (2012). Openness to change scale consists of 14 items and 3 factors. These factors of the scale are 'academic staff openness to change,' 'principal openness to change and 'community pressure for change.'

On the other hand, Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for present study were; $\alpha = 0.73$ for the 'academic staff openness to change' dimension; $\alpha = 0.78$ for the "principal openness to change" dimension and $\alpha = 0.70$ "community pressure for change" dimension. The dimension "faculty' openness to change" contains five questions as to the extent to which teachers are open to change and how they view change. Some of these questions are "in this school, faculty welcomes change, teachers in this school readily accept changes to new rules and procedures."

The second dimension involves six questions that measure principals' openness to change. These questions include "In this school, the principal is committed to major change; "the principal in this school embraces new change initiatives." The third dimension comprised of three questions designed to identify the school environment's pressure for change. Community pressure for change can be considered as "strong pressure from community and community to change school policy and influence the functioning of the school". These questions include, "faculty in this school is open to ideas of the community. Most community members are happy with their schools. "Whereas, the first part of the questionnaire contained questions as to the participant teachers' personal

Table 2. Personal information for qualitative data.

Variable	Gender	Union membership	Inservices training	Branch	Graduated faculty	Seniority
T1	Female	Yes	Yes	Numerical	Education	1-5 years
T2	Male	Yes	Yes	Numerical	Education	1-5 years
T3	Female	Yes	No	Numerical	Arts and Sciences	6-10 years
T4	Male	No	Yes	Numerical	Education	16years and more
T5	Female	Yes	No	Numerical	Arts and Sciences	6-10 years
T6	Male	Yes	Yes	Numerical	Education	1-5 years
T7	Male	No	Yes	Verbal	Arts and Sciences	1-5 years
T8	Female	Yes	No	Numerical	Education	1-5 years
T9	Female	No	No	Verbal	Arts and Sciences	11-15 years
T10	Male	Yes	No	Others	Arts and Sciences	1-5 years
T11	Male	No	Yes	Numerical	Arts and Sciences	1-5 years
T12	Male	Yes	Yes	Numerical	Arts and Sciences	11-15 years
T13	Female	Yes	No	Others	Education	1-5 years
T14	Female	Yes	Yes	Numerical	Arts and Sciences	11-15 years
T15	Male	Yes	Yes	Numerical	Education	1-5 years
T16	Male	Yes	Yes	Others	Arts and Sciences	6-10 years
T17	Female	No	No	Numerical	Education	6-10 years
T18	Male	Yes	Yes	Numerical	Education	6-10 years
T19	Male	Yes	Yes	Numerical	Education	11-15 years

information, the second part was based on the items of the schools' openness to change scale. Participants were asked to express their thoughts in 'I absolutely disagree,' 'I disagree,' 'I partly agree,' 'I agree' and 'I absolutely agree' with 5 point Likert type scale. The high score on the scale shows the school's change-of-openness, while the low indicates the opposite.

Data collection

Teachers and school administrators were contacted through site visits to each school and provided with a permission letter from the National Ministry of Education for the research and a letter explaining the study. It was explained to teachers that their participation in the study was completely voluntarily. Once verbal consent was received from the principals, arrangements were made with teachers to give detailed information about the study and the FCOS. The teachers returned the FCOS to the researcher within one week. The sample for this study was selected according to random sampling method.

The qualitative data were collected through a researcher-designed semi-structured interview and the sample was asked about their school openness to change, 19 voluntarily participant teachers were interviewed in depth, on an individual basis lasting approximately one hour for each. The original interview schedule was first pilot-tested with three teachers working in a different secondary education school.

After each interview, interviewee's comments were elicited, followed by a number of fundamental modifications in the schedule. During the interviews conducted by the researcher, the synonyms of change in Turkish were listed, and then openness to change was explained in detail. The following questions were asked:

1. Do you think that teachers are open to innovation?
2. How are the other teachers' attitudes towards teachers open to

innovation and trying to implement these innovations?

3. Are the manager, the teacher, the community open to the innovations the time has brought?
4. In which areas are your school easier to change?
5. Will the community make an effort to enable the change at school?
6. Which branch of teachers is most committed to change?
7. Do you think this school will change?

Data analysis

The Shapiro-Wilk test was used to find out whether the data show normal dispersion or not. For the data showing normal dispersion, t-test and one-way analysis of variance were applied. For the variables that were found significant, Turkey HSD test was used to make comparisons across groups.

For the data that did not disperse normally, Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis tests were used. The relationships among the variables were investigated using the co-efficient of Spearman correlation. The significant level was found to be $\alpha=0.05$. For the statistical analysis of the quantitative data, statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) 13.0 was used.

The data gathered from the interview forms was first transferred to Microsoft Office. After that, the data was read several times by the researchers and codes were formed accordingly. Afterwords codes were brought together and the themes that form the main line of the research were found.

Lastly, descriptive analysis was used to analyse the interviews. Descriptive analysis involves identifying coherent and important themes and during the interviews by using the word processor program; the responses of the participants were cut and pasted under each category. After that, thematic similarities and differences were identified under each category.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics related to FCOS.

FCOS subscales	Lowest	Highest	X	Level	SS
Academic staff openness to change	5	25	15.80	Moderate	5.52
Principal openness to change	6	30	16.12	Moderate	6.34
Community press for change	3	15	5.90	Low	3.12
Total	20	69	42.20	moderate	10.42

Table 4. Descriptive statistics related to FCOS and gender.

FCOS subscales	Gender	N	X	Ss	t	p
Academic staff openness to change	Female	70	15.05	0.61	0.805	0.54
	Male	35	14.45			
Principal openness to change	Female	70	17.1	0.74	1.58	0.03
	Male	35	17.94			
Community press for change	Female	70	10.02	0.44	1.41	0.02
	Male	35	9.48			
Total	Female	70	42.14	0.47	0.25	0.70
	Male	35	41.86			

RESULTS

The quantitative and qualitative findings of this research is presented in six main parts as openness to change according to gender, branch, seniority, graduated faculty, inservice training experience and union membership. The level of secondary school teachers' openness to change is given in Table 3.

When the teachers are examined in terms of the openness to change, it is seen that the lowest score is 5 and the highest score is 25. According to the results of the analysis, teachers views about openness to change is moderate level on academic staff openness to change subscale ($X=15.80$).

In terms of principal's openness to change, the lowest score is 6 and the highest score is 30. The teachers participating in the study stated that moderate level expressions on principal openness to change subscale ($X=16.12$) and in terms of community press to openness to change, the lowest score is 3 and the highest score is 15.

In the present research, the level is found low on tahat subscale ($X= 5.90$). When the teachers are examined in total, it is seen that the lowest score is 20 and the highest score is 69. Teachers participating in this research declared that secondary school teachers are open to change at moderate level ($X=42.20$) (Table 4).

According to the results of the analysis, teachers views about openness to change do not show a significant

difference according to participants' gender ($t(103)=0.25$, $p=0.70$). The female have higher mean score ($X =42.14$) than the male about openness to change ($X=41.86$). Although female teachers ($X=15.05$) have more positive views of academic staff openness to change than male teachers ($X=14.45$), there is not any statistically significant difference.

There was a significant difference between the participants in their views of principals' openness to change ($t(103)=1.58$, $p=0.03$). More male teachers ($X =17.94$) than female ones ($X=17.10$) reported that principals were open to change. Similarly, there was a significant difference between male ($X=9.48$) and female ($X=10.02$) teachers in their views of the community's press for change ($t(103)=1.41$, $p=0.02$). Female teachers ($X=10.02$) reported more positive ideas than male ($X=9.48$) ones on community press for change subscale.

There was no statistically significant difference between teachers in the scale of FCOS according to gender. Female teachers have high mean scores than the male in openness to change. During the interviews many female teachers mentioned that:

"Female teachers are more open to change because generally the female have more negative views of the status quo"(T1, T3, T8, T9)

whereas male teachers expressed their opinions as:

"Teachers are not open to change at all. They do not

Table 5. Descriptive statistics related to FCOS and branch.

FCOS subscales	Branch	N	X	Ss	F	p	Significancy
Academic staff openness to change	Verbal (A)	29	14.65	4.13	7.951	0.000	A-B//B-C
	Numerical(B)	60	14.95	4.37			
	Others (C)	16	14.35	4.25			
Principal openness to change	Verbal (A)	29	18.66	2.69	4.422	0.014	A-B
	Numerical(B)	60	18.42	2.27			
	Others (C)	16	14.16	2.83			
Community press for change	Verbal (A)	29	9.42	3.96	2.951	0.063	
	Numerical(B)	60	8.94	4.15			
	Others (C)	16	10.83	4.87			
Total	Verbal (A)	29	41.3	3.12	0.423	0.046	A-B/A-C/B-C
	Numerical(B)	60	42.42	3.65			

update themselves. They do not keep track of what's happening in education "(T2, T4, T6, T18).

On some points of views both male and female teachers have similar opinions about the faculty's openness to change as

"the main reason for not being warm to change is that teachers do not want to change their job descriptions, job routines, and working hours" (T1, T4, T6, T10, T13, T15, T16, T18, T19).

During the interviews, many female teachers mentioned that:

"female teachers are more open to change because generally the female have more negative views of the status quo"(T1, T3, T8, T9).

whereas male teachers expressed their opinions as:

"Teachers are not open to change at all. They do not update themselves. They do not keep track of what's happening in education "(T2, T4, T6, T18).

On some points of views both male and female teachers have similar opinions about the faculty's openness to change as:

"the main reason for not being warm to change is that teachers do not want to change their job descriptions, job routines, and working hours" (T1, T4, T6, T10, T13, T15, T16, T18, T19) (Table 5).

Test results showed statistically significant difference among the mean scores of teachers from different

branches on Academic staff openness to change (F=7.951, p=0.00). The significant difference is among verbal teachers (X=14.65) and numerical teachers (X=14.95) and numerical teachers and other teachers (X=14.35).

Among all branches numerical teachers have more positive views towards academic staff openness to change sub scale. On principal openness to change subscale there is a meaningful significant difference between verbal (X=18.66) and numerical (X=18.42) branch teachers (F=4.422, p=0.01).

On communitys press for change subscale though there is not any significant difference between branches (F=2.951, p=0.06) other branch teachers have more positive (X=10.83) perceptions than the numerical (X=8.94) and verbal (X=9.42) branches. On overall, there is significant difference among all branches ($F_{(4-100)}=0.423$, p=0.04). The mean scores are verbal (X=2.95), numerical (X=3.03) and others (X=2.84) respectively. Numerical branch teachers declared that:

"The parents are not aware the importance of change. They do not want to take responsibility for change. They wait all the effort from school and teachers. The community will not make an effort for change" (T3; T8; T11; T15, T19) (Table 6).

Although there is not any significant difference on "Academic staff openness to change" subcale ($F_{(4-100)}=0.736$, p>0.05). The most senior teachers expressed a more positive opinion of "academic staff openness to change". Regarding the subscale of "principal openness to change" ($\chi^2_{(4)}=6.853$, p>0.05), compared with others, teachers with 6 to 10 years of experience delivered a more positive opinion of "principal openness to change".

On "community press for change" subscale ($F_{(4-100)}$)

Table 6. Descriptive statistics related to FCOS and seniority.

FCOS subscales	Seniority	N	X	Ss	X2	p
Academic staff openness to change	1-5 years (A)	13	14.8	2.64	0.736	0.570
	6-10 years (B)	34	14.8	2.83		
	11-15 years (C)	51	15.7	2.77		
	16years and more(D)	7	16.0	3.72		
Principal openness to change	1-5 years (A)	13	17.58	3.36	6.853	0.411
	6-10 years (B)	34	17.88	3.57		
	11-15 years (C)	51	16.14	5.30		
	16years and more (D)	7	15.66	3.35		
Community press for change	1-5 years (A)	13	9.75	3.12	1.179	0.325
	6-10 years (B)	34	9.84	4.06		
	11-15 years (C)	51	12.00	3.80		
	16 years and more (D)	7	10.26	4.78		
Total	1-5 years (A)	13	42.14	2.84	0.473	0.755
	6-10 years (B)	34	42.42	3.10		
	11-15 years (C)	51	41.72	2.76		
	16 years and more (D)	7	43.68	2.81		

$t_{(100)}=1.179$, $p>0.05$) teachers with 11 to 15 years of experience reported a positive opinion. No significant difference was observed between the averages of the groups regarding the whole of the measuring instrument ($F_{(4-100)}=0.473$, $p>0.05$) and teachers who have the most experience ($X=43.68$) presented a more positive view.

The findings revealed by the present study are that those teachers with a length of service ranging between 1 to 10 years had more negative views of schools' openness to change when compared to those with a length of service varying from 10 to more years. During the interviews, without any seniority especially young teachers have expressed the difficulty in creating change at school, using expressions such as:

"Everything at our schools is old-fashioned and outdated. It is too difficult to make changes at the schools. It seems that teachers are the most resistant group of professional to the change. Teachers think that they know everything and they do have a negative point of view against change. I think that there is no difference between the time I was a student and the present in terms of teachers and schools. Everything is the same. (T1; T2; T5; T7; T8; T15;)

Another reason why teachers are not open to change according to the views of the teachers is as follows:

"Teachers who are open to newness are not welcomed

and accepted by others."(T5; T7; T10; T11; T12; T13) "Teachers seeking change is not welcomed by other teachers. Teachers who support and want the change are seen like people who are keen on impressing their principals and trying to make themselves stand out in the eyes of other teachers." (T3; T5; T11; T13; T17; T18)

Although, the teachers between 6 to 10 years experienced believe that principals are open to change;

"In fact, if regulations allow principals they can be more open to change. If this change is positive, it will be very useful for future of principals" Professionally they will be able to progress much more easily and quickly (T3, T5, T16, T18); some teachers declared that "The principal do not really want radical changes because they do not want to lose authority and power. It is more comfortable for them to maintain usual practices. "(T4, T5, T12, T19) (Table 7).

According to the results of the analysis, teachers views about openness to change do not show a significant difference according to participants' graduated faculty ($t_{(103)}=1.065$, $p=0.70$). The analysis suggests that education faculty graduates have higher mean score ($X=16.9$) than graduates of faculty of arts and sciences ($X=15.65$).

Although education faculty graduated teachers ($X=16.9$) have more positive views of academic staff

Table 7. Descriptive statistics related to FCOS and graduated faculty.

FCOS subscales	Graduated faculty	N	X	Ss	t	P
Academic staff openness to change	Education	64	16.9	0.14	2.307	0.63
	Arts and Sciences	41	15.65			
Principal openness to change	Education	64	17.1	0.27	-1.346	0.56
	Arts and Sciences	41	17.82			
Community press for change	Education	64	9.96	0.41	1.676	0.03
	Arts and Sciences	41	7.62			
Total	Education	64	42.84	0.32	1.065	0.70
	Arts and Sciences	41	39.62			

Table 8. Descriptive statistics related to FCOS and inservice training.

FCOS subscales	Inservices training	N	X	Ss	t	P
Academic staff openness to change	Yes	95	14.8	1.25	0.814	0.074
	No	10	15.7			
Principal openness to change	Yes	95	17.46	2.64	0.631	0.058
	No	10	16.92			
Community Press for Change	Yes	95	9.84	2.18	0.251	0.063
	No	10	9.69			
Total	Yes	95	42.14	3.10	-0.117	0.082
	No	10	42.28			

openness to change than the graduates of Arts and Sciences faculty ($X=15.65$), there is not any statistically significant ($t_{(103)}=2.307$, $p>0.05$). There was not a significant difference between the education and arts and sciences graduates participants in their views of principals' openness to change ($t_{(103)}=-1.346$, $p>0.05$).

More arts and science faculty graduates ($X =17.82$) than education faculty graduates($X=17,10$) reported that principals were open to change. However, there was a significant difference between education faculty graduates ($X=9.96$) and arts and sciences graduates ($X=7.62$) teachers in their view of the community's press for change ($t_{(103)}=1.676$, $p<0.05$).

According to the graduated higher education institution, the opinions of the secondary school teachers about the change of schools are significantly different from each other. Education faculty graduates teachers have optimistic views about faculty's openness to change:

In fact, teachers are very open to change if the system is suitable. It is not possible for us to train new generation students according to old methods and patterns.

Technology, the more active the children, the easier it is to reach the information, the teachers have to change and they change it in the way they see it (T1, T6, T13) (Table 8).

According to the results of the analysis, teachers view about faculty's openness to change do not show a significant difference according to either the participants have inservice training or not in recent 5 years ($t_{(103)}=0.814$, $p=.74$).

The analysis suggests that the teachers who do not have inservices training have higher mean score ($X =15.7$) than the ones who have not ($X=14.8$). Although there is not any statistically significant difference ($t_{(103)}=0.631$, $p=0.058$) the teachers who have inservices training ($X=17.46$) have more positive views of principal openness to change than the ones who do not have ($X=16.92$).

In their views of community's openness to change ($t_{(103)}=0.251$, $p=0.63$). More inservices training experienced teachers have more positive views ($X =9.84$) than the ones who do not ($X=9.69$).

Table 9. Descriptive statistics related to FCOS and union membership.

FCOS subscales	Union membership	N	X	Ss	t	p
Academic staff openness to change	Member	85	15.7	0.47	1.66	0.034
	Non member	20	14.8			
Principal openness to change	Member	85	17.46	0.57	1.06	0.000
	Non member	20	16.92			
Community press for change	Member	85	9.84	0.78	1.32	0.026
	Non member	20	9.69			
Total	Member	85	42.28	0.29	0.879	0.001
	Non member	20	42.14			

Similarly, there was not a significant difference between the groups of inservices training experienced ($X=42.14$) and non experienced ones ($X=42.28$, $p=0.082$). The teachers who have inservices training in the last 5 years reported positive views of principal's openness to change. 4 teachers who have inservice training expressed similar views:

"If enough effort is made, many things will change in school. Teachers and community really change very much. Community are able to make a lot of sacrifices if this change is to the benefit of the students" (T6, T11, T14, T16) (Table 9).

According to the results of the analysis, teachers view about faculty's openness to change shows a significant difference according to participants' union membership ($t(103)=1.66$, $p=0.034$). The analysis suggests that the teachers who are members of a union have higher mean score ($X =15.7$) than the ones who do not ($X=14.8$).

There is statistically significant difference ($t(103)=1.06$, $p=0.00$) between union member teachers ($X=17.46$) and non member ones ($X=16.92$), on principal's openness to change. There was a significant difference between the participants in their views of community's openness to change ($t(103)=1.32$, $p=0.026$). More union member teachers ($X =9.84$) than the ones who do not ($X=9.69$).

Similarly, there was a significant difference between union member teachers ($X=42.28$) and non ($X=42,14$) in their view of the teachers openness to change ($t(103)=0.879$, $p=0.001$). Union member teachers have expressed a positive opinion on the issue of change on faculty, principals and the community. It is thought that these teachers experience and view the influence of the union on policy makers and the legislators. They report the power of the union as

"Teachers, of course, can change, as long as the union wants them to change". (T2, T8) *The union is really very effective on both the teachers and the principals. If the*

union want to change, they are definitely done in every condition? (T11).

DISCUSSION

The change to be made at school is a complex, time consuming and difficult task. Schools and teachers are one of the most important occupational groups faced with change.

In the present study, the teachers are assessing the openness to change on the faculty, principal and community subscales moderately which may not be sufficient to achieve change. The findings of this research are supported by several other studies (Beycioglu and Aslan, 2010; Kurşunoğlu and Tanrıöğen, 2006; Akpınar and Aydın, 2007; Yılmaz, 2010; Ozer, 2010; Demirtas, 2012). It is very clear that secondary schools need to be improved in terms of openness to change.

Teachers are the most critical element of the education system. For this reason, the success of change practices in a school is largely dependent on teachers. Effective involvement of teachers in the process is a fundamental requirement for the achievement of change initiatives. As Devos et al. (2007) claim that organizations will be able to survive and succeed as long as they and their employees are prepared to change.

In this research, it was observed that at the end of the interviews, the teachers were divided into 3 groups according to the answers given by about the change of the school. The first group is the supporters of the exchange who are ready to adapt to change, the second group is opponents of change and the last group is the ones who are unrelated and indifferent to change. It can be said that the teachers' openness to change is a critical prescription for the provision of the human resources needed to increase the exchange capacity of the school.

There was no statistically significant difference between teachers in the scale of FCOS according to gender. But similar to the review of literature (Huang, 1993; Crow and

Glascook, 1995; Klecker and Loadman, 1999) also in this study female teachers have high mean scores than the male in openness to change.

On some points of views both male and female teachers have similar opinions about the faculty's openness to change. As a result of this finding, it can be concluded that without gender discrimination change efforts can affect working conditions, ways of working, communication with other people and the existing status quo and that's why teachers may not welcome the change process.

As Knippenberg et al. (2006) declared the change process is causing a variety of worries in employees, eliminating these concerns is crucial to establish a successful process of change. It is known that it is important for teachers to be open to change in terms of providing responsibilities for the development of the school and enriched learning opportunities for the students. For this reason, the importance of teachers' belief in change is very crucial and vital because school administrators and teachers were found to have more responsibility for increasing the school's learning capacity in a culture where change is supported (Goh et al., 2006).

The findings revealed by the present study are that those teachers with a length of service ranging between 1 to 10 years had more negative views of schools' openness to change when compared to those with a length of service varying from 10 to more years. The studies by Arafat (2003) and Balıkcı (2004) were in contradiction with the present research. This might have been caused by the fact that newly-recruited teachers have more up-to-date theoretical knowledge and higher expectations than other teachers. It is not surprising that they have negative impressions of change when they interfere with each other and observe the applications at schools. Several other studies support the idea (Datta et al., 2003; Tasdan, 2013).

According to the graduated higher education institution, the opinions of the secondary school teachers about the change of schools are significantly different from each other. Education faculty graduates teachers have optimistic views about faculty's openness to change.

Union member teachers have expressed positive opinions on the issue of change on faculty, principals and the community. It is thought that these teachers experience and view the influence of the union on policy makers and the legislators.

Arafat (2003) and Balıkcı (2004) investigated the influence of teacher attitudes on organizational innovation and found that branch teachers remained distant towards the change. There might be reasons for this difference between the branch teachers and the others. For example, branch teachers have to teach a lot of different classes depending on course load. Another reason is that they are not able to fully recognize their students in each of those classes and they take less responsibility for changing the behaviours of the students. Last reason is

about communication with parents. Teachers do not have enough communication with parents.

The teachers who do not have inservices training in the last 5 years reported positive views of secondary schools openness to change. Perhaps teachers who did not receive education reported a more favorable opinion on this issue as they did not know the process of change. This finding does not coincide with the findings of the study (Tal and Yinon, 2002) which claims that there is a positive link between being open to change and self-improvement. It is clear that ensuring the understanding and adoption of change by teachers is the most important criterion for successful change in school.

It can not be expected that the results of the change will be positive in an organization with employees who do not believe in the necessity of change. The teachers who have inservices training in the last 5 years reported positive views of principal's openness to change. One of the most fundamental reasons for this is that perhaps teachers who have inservices training are evaluating principals with a different perspective because they know how change should be and that principals are the most important factors to initiate change.

In the present study, the teachers reported that principals were moderately open to change. However, roles and responsibilities of principals have now been alienated from traditionalism and diversified by the influence of changes and transformations, it is essential that principals, who will play a pioneering role in change by motivating teachers and students, should be open to change.

The school principal is responsible for establishing a vision in their schools and ensuring the adoption of this vision by school members. Studies have reported that roles of principals are much in the process of change (Portin et al., 2006; Cooner et al., 2008). It is impossible to realize change in an organization that does not have leaders with the ability, the mission and the vision to manage change.

The most important role in achieving organizational change must be played by the principals who hold organizational authority. If principals in the organization do not see change as a necessity, or if they lack the ability to lead in the organization, it is the point that change fails (Yeniçeri, 2002).

A principal should be a leader that applies what he has learned, pioneers learning, takes collective decisions, recognizes the needs for renewal, represents this recognition in the school, establishes a trustworthy and intimate working environment, and attempts to turn change initiatives into reality.

In the present compared to numerical branches, verbal branch teachers reported more positive views of principal's openness to change. In all schools that the data were collected the principals were verbal teacher originated. This finding is similar to the findings of the studies in which school principals from verbal branches

are found to be more open than school principals from numerical branches. (Aslan et al., 2008; Ocaklı, 2006),

Interpreting the school community at moderate level of change may be related to the level of involvement of education (including community) in education. Unfortunately, the school community is far away from being open to change due to the decentralized nature of the education system in Turkey, the low level of co-decision making and the ineffective participation of democratic decision-makers. Effective communication, experience, resources and support must be available for successful change at schools.

It can be said that the success of a change process is proportional to openness to change of the organization's employees. Attitude towards change is dealt with in the context of variables such as readiness to change, resistance to change, pessimism against change, change openness, change coping, change adaptation, adoption of change and change commitment, which form a wide spectrum.

The success of change practices in schools, which are an educational organization, depends on the acceptance of those practices by the administrators and teachers of the school. Apart from that, in order for those practices to be successful, administrators and teachers also have to be open and adapt to change. Change is a difficult task. Considering that the people who make up groups and organizations have the knowledge and experiences that they get from different environments with different opinions, thoughts and tendencies, adaptation to change can be seen as a challenging and difficult process in terms of organizations.

Teachers have to be the people who lead the change in school. Teachers need to take initiative to learn from each other and to improve teaching in school, which is an important variable in terms of change. For a successful and healthy organizational change, it can be said that teachers in the school must understand the organizational change process effectively and internalize this process by showing necessary behaviors.

The attitude of being ready for change is the first step of change applications. If change is successful, organizational change initiatives are adopted by employees. On the other hand, when the attitude of readiness to change is neglected, employees will be faced with resistance either actively or passively. Therefore, creating an attitude of readiness to change while working in the success of organizational change initiatives emerges as an important necessity.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

Akpinar B, Aydin K (2007). Change in education and teachers'

- perceptions of change. *Egitim Ve Bilim-Educ. Sci.* 32(144):71-80.
- Altrichter H (2000). Introduction. Images of educational change. (Eds: Altrichter, H. ve Elliot, J.). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Altun SA, Buyukozturk S (2011). Change tendencies scale development. *Kalem Egitim ve Insan Bilimleri Dergisi. J. Kalem Educ. Humanities.* 1(1):73-90.
- Arafat N (2003). Orgutsel Yenilesmede Ogretmen Tutumlarının Etkisi. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Aslan M, Beycioglu K, ve Konan N (2008). Principals' openness to change in Malatya, Turkey. *Intl. Elect. J. Leadership Learning.* 12(8):1-13.
- Balıkcı A (2004). İlköğretim Okulu Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerinin Değişime İlişkin Algıları ve Değişimin Eğitim Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Beycioglu K, Aslan M (2010). Change and innovation as main dynamics in school development: Administrators' and teachers' roles. *Yuzuncu Yil Uni. J. Faculty Educ.* 7 (1):153-173. Retrieved from. http://efdergi.yyu.edu.tr/makaleler/cilt_VII/haziran_2010/2010_kadir%20beycioglu.pdf
- Cooner D, Quinn R, Dickmann E (2008). Becoming a School Leader: Voices of Transformation From Principal Interns. *Int. Elect. J. Leadership Learning.* 12(7):1-11.
- Crow GM, Glascock C (1995). Socialization to a new conception of the principalship. *J. Educ. Admin.* 33(1):22-43.
- Çalışkan O (2011). Investigation of the relationship between teachers' readiness for organizational change and resilience (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Datta DK, Rajagopalan N, Zhang Y (2003). New CEO openness to change and strategic persistence: The moderating role of industry characteristics. *Brit. J. Change.* 14:101-114.
- Demirtas H (2012). Primary schools' openness to change. *Elementary Educ. Online.* 7(1):18-34.
- DePaulo LA (2000). Building teacher capacity: Staff development, socialization and receptivity change (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis database. (UMI No: 9977588)
- Devos G, Buelens M, Bouckenoghe D (2007). The contribution of content, context, and process in understanding openness to organizational change: two experimental simulation studies. *J. Soc. Psychol.* 147(6):607-629.
- Goh SC, Cousins JB, Elliott C (2006). Organizational learning capacity, evaluative inquiry and readiness for change in schools: Views and perceptions of educators. *J. Educ. Change.* 7(4):289-318.
- Griffith SD (2010). Transformational leadership and change readiness using assessments for near-term prescriptive organizational intervention (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis database. (UMI No: 3434003)
- Ha ASC, Lee JCK, Chan DWK (2004). Teachers' perceptions of in-service teacher training to support curriculum change in physical education: The Hong Kong Experience. *Sport Educ. Soc.* 9(3):421-438.
- Hall PA (2005). The principal's presence and supervision to improve teaching. *SEDL Letter.* 17(2):12-16.
- Hargreaves A (2004). Inclusive and exclusive educational change: Emotional responses of teachers and implications for leadership. *School Leadership Manage.* 24(2):287-309.
- Harris A (2001). Building the capacity for school improvement. *School Leadership Manage.* 21(3):261-270.
- Harris A (2006). Leading change in schools in difficulty. *J. Educ. Change.* 7(1-2):9-18.
- Harris A (2009). Big change question: Does politics help or hinder educational change? *J. Educ. Change.* 10(1):63-67.
- Harris A (2011). Reforming systems: Realizing the fourth way. *J. Educ. Change.* 12(2):159-171.
- Hopkins D (2003). *School improvement for real.* London: Routledge.
- Hopkins D (2007). *Every school a great school: Realizing the potential of system leadership.* McGraw-Hill Education (UK); Feb 1.
- Huang TH (1993). The relationships between elementary school principals' psychological types and openness to selected changes in organizational culture (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State

- University).
- Kalmaz G (2007). Performans yönetim modelini uygulayan okullarda öğretmen ve yöneticilerin değişim sürecini algılama düzeyleri. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. İstanbul, Yeditepe Üniversitesi.
- Klecker BM, Loadman WE (1999). Male elementary school teachers' ratings of job satisfaction by years of teaching experience. *Education* 119(3):504-513.
- Knippenberg VB, Martin L, Taylor T (2006). Process-orientation versus outcome-orientation during organizational change: The role of organizational identification. *J. Org. Behav.* 27(6):685-704.
- Konaklı T (2014). Schools' openness to change according to teachers' views: A sample of Turkey/Kocaeli. *Education* 135(1):69-78.
- Kurşunoğlu A, Tanrıoğlu A (2006). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel değişmeye ilişkin tutumları, 15. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Sempozyumu, Muğla Üniversitesi, Muğla.
- Lee JCK (2000). Teacher receptivity to curriculum change in the implementation stage: The case of environmental education in Hong Kong. *J. Curriculum Stud.* 32(1):95-115.
- Levin B (2007). Sustainable, large-scale educational renewal. *J. Educ. Change.* 8(4):323-336.
- Moroz R, Waugh RF (2000). Teacher receptivity to system-wide educational change. *J. Educ. Admin.* 38(2):159-178.
- Murphy J (2005). Connecting teacher leadership and school improvement. California: Crown.
- Ocaklı E (2006). Okul müdürlerinin duygusal, bilissel ve davranışsal boyutlarda değişime acikliklarının ölçülmesi (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Ozer N (2010). İlköğretim okullarının örgütsel diriklik, bürokratiklik ve örgüt normları açısından analizi. (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Malatya: İnönü Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Portin BS, Alejano CR, Knapp MS, Marzolf E (2006). Redefining roles, responsibilities, and authority of school leaders. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.
- Priestley M (2011). Schools, teachers, and curriculum change: A balancing act? *J. Educ. Change.* 12(1):1-23.
- Seashore, K. R. (2009). Leadership and change in schools: Personal reflections over the last 30 years. *J. Educ. Change.* 10(2-3):129-140.
- Sergiovanni TJ (2000). Changing change: Toward a design science and art. *J. Educ. Change.* 1(1):57-75.
- Smith PA, Hoy WK (2007). Faculty Change Orientation Scale. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Stoll L (2009). Capacity building for school improvement or creating capacity for learning? A changing landscape. *J. Educ. Change.* 10(2):115-127.
- Tal C, Yinon Y (2002). Teachers' conservatism, openness to change, transcendence and self-enhancement in daily life and in school situations. *Social Psychol. Educ.* 5(3):271-293.
- Tasdan M (2013). Developing personal and professional openness to change scales for primary school teachers: An application. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi.* 35:1-20.
- Voorhis VF, Sheldon S (2004). Principals' roles in the development of US programs of school, family and community partnership. *Int. J. Educ. Res.* 41:55-70.
- Waller LD (2008). An investigation among teacher efficacy, reflective practice, openness to change and the use of student response system technology (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis database. (UMI No: 3351707)
- Wanberg CR, Banas JT (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 35:132-142.
- Wheatley MJ (2006). Leadership and the new science. California: Berrett-Koehler.
- Yeniceri Ö (2002). Örgütsel Değişimin Yönetimi: Sorunlar, Yöntemler, Teknikler, Stratejiler ve Çözüm Yolları. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.
- Yılmaz D (2010). Investigating the relationship between teachers' sense of efficacy and perceived openness to change at primary and secondary level public schools. M.S., Department of Educational Sciences.