

Available online at [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 5 (2010) 1841–1848

---

---

**Procedia**  
Social and Behavioral Sciences

---

---

WCPCG-2010

# The Relationship between Faculty Members' Perception of Organizational Culture Types and their Preferences for Instruction and Counselling in Iranian College of Education and Psychology

Mehdi Mohammadi<sup>a,\*</sup>, Elham Mahmoudi Yeganeh<sup>b</sup>, Tahereh Dehdari Rad<sup>c</sup><sup>a</sup>Department of Educational Administration and planning, Shiraz University, +98-0711, Shiraz, Iran<sup>b</sup>Department of Educational Administration and planning, Shiraz University, International Branch, +98-0711, Shiraz, Iran<sup>c</sup>Department of Library and Information Science, Shiraz University, +98-0711, Shiraz, Iran

Received January 4, 2010; revised February 21, 2010; accepted March 9, 2010

---

## Abstract

The purpose of this research was to study the relationship between faculty members' perception of organizational culture types and their preferences for instruction and counselling responsibilities in Shiraz, Tehran and Ahvaz both public and private Universities, Colleges of education and psychology. Statistical population of this study comprised of all Shiraz, Tehran and Ahvaz colleges of Education and Psychology faculty members. Using classified random sampling, 4 colleges were selected. In order to collect data two instruments were used in this study i.e. Counsellor Educator Task importance Instrument (CETII) (Orr, 2005) and Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) (Cameron & Quinn, 1999). Results indicated a significant effect of organizational culture types for scholarship and service responsibilities. Additionally, there was a significant organizational culture type × university type interaction effect for scholarship and teaching responsibilities. And a significant organizational culture types × Academic Rank interaction effect for teaching and service responsibilities as well. However, the results showed neither significant organizational culture type × university type interaction effect nor significant organizational culture type × years of service interaction effect for teachers' counselling and instruction responsibilities.

© 2010 Elsevier Ltd. Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).*Keywords:* Faculty members, Organizational culture type, Instruction, Counseling

---

## 1. Introduction

Since 1981, when Peters and Waterman introduced term organizational culture in Organizational science, organizational culture has become a very important field of investigation. However, analyses of organizational cultures face many challenges. One of them which is utmost importance is providing a definition for this term. In organizational literature, Organizational Culture is a construct that addresses very foundation of individual thinking, and behavior (Sokugawa, 1996). According to Jones (2004), organizational culture is “the set of shared values and norms that controls organizational members' interactions with each other and with people outside the organization

---

\* Mehdi Mohammadi. Tel.: +989177384037; fax: +986460583

E-mail address: [m48r52@yahoo.com](mailto:m48r52@yahoo.com)

(p.195). The reason why organizational culture became so popular is connection between appropriate cultures and efficiency and productivity of organizations. In university settings it is especially important to investigate interactions between member of faculty and between faculty and students. An understanding of the beliefs and values that faculties share about their work and their workplace conveys and understanding of how faculty find meaning in their work life (Tierny, 1988). There are many different ways how university culture can be assessed. For example, Becher (1989) differentiate four types of culture (collegial, hierarchical, anarchical and political) on the basis of the type of authority. Fjortoft and Smart (1994) differentiate university organizational cultures on the basis of dynamism and externalism. So, certain universities prefer stability more than dynamism and vice versa. However, for this paper, the most important classification is one proposed by Cameron & Quinn (1999) built upon a theoretical model called the "Competing Values Framework." They differentiate four types of university organizational cultures: 1. Clan: an organization that concentrates on internal maintenance with flexibility, concern for people, and sensitivity for customers, 2. Hierarchy: an organization that focuses on internal maintenance with a need for stability and control, 3. Adhocracy: an organization that concentrates on external positioning with a high degree of flexibility and individuality, 4. Market: an organization that focuses on external maintenance with a need for stability and control.

Many scholars have sought to understand how faculty find the meaning in their work life by investigating the organizational culture of institutions of higher education. There has been intensifying evidence that the culture of individual institutions influences the attitudes and behaviour of the faculty (Austin, 1990; Kempner, 1990; Peterson & white, 1992; Smart & Hamm, 1993a; Tierny & Rhodas, 1993). Researchers theorize that faculty performance is explained by interactions between organizational variables and individual dispositions, beliefs, and perceptions (Cameron & Ettington, 1988; Kempner, 1990; Peterson & white, 1992; Smart & Hamm, 1993a). The differences in faculty perception of their institutional culture affected their approach to teaching and their students' learning (Weis, 1985).

If it is indeed the case differences in teachers' perception of organizational culture types might also result in different preferences regarding to their instruction and counselling related responsibilities. i.e. core tasks of scholarship, teaching, service and Supervision (Adams, 2002; Austin, 2002a; Boyer, 1990; Ramsey, Cavallaro, Kiselica, & Zila, 2002; Lanning, 1990). Scholarship refers to the scholarship of discovery described by Boyer (1990) that involves the investigation, discovery, and dissemination through publication or presentation of new information that expands thought, knowledge, and/or practice in a particular field of study. Corresponds to the scholarship of teaching described by Boyer (1990). Criteria to assess contribution to research/scholarship include, but are not limited to: the number of peer-reviewed publications, books, scholarly presentations, citations of publications and other evidence of impact on the field, and/or grants obtained for research. Teaching involves the design and delivery of curricula in the field of counsellor education. Service used to refer to the tasks related to citizenship as described by Boyer (1990). These service tasks are those that, unrelated to scholarship and teaching, benefit institutions, academic departments, and professional and community organizations. Criteria to assess contribution of service in the university setting include, but are not limited to: professional association offices and committees, editorial boards of journals, review activities for journals, university and departmental committee service, and/or contribution and outreach to the community. Supervision refers to the management of or overseeing the clinical or academic activities of students and those seeking state licensure. Supervision also refers to activities related to maintaining licensure or certification such as attending or hosting a continuing education workshop.

Despite the overwhelming consensus that how important faculty are to the effectiveness of student learning and the achievement of institutional goals and considering the fact that excellence of education lies in the hands of those who interact with individual students on a regular basis and have a primary responsibility for their learning and growth (Cohen, 1982; Seidman, 1985; Sokugawa, 1996). Research has gone wanting with regard to how faculty perceive the culture of their college and whether these perceptions are related to their preferences for their job-related responsibilities i.e. (teaching, scholarship, supervision and service). On the other hand, regarding to the fact that counsellor educators differ from faculty members in other disciplines (including those in other mental health fields) in their need to be able to demonstrate advanced clinical skills as well as the ability to provide supervision to a large group of emerging clinicians (Lanning, 1990). This study proposes to investigate relationship between faculty's perception of organizational culture types of their universities and their preferences for job-related responsibilities.

## 2. Research Objectives

The intent of this article is to investigate the relationship between faculty members' perception of organizational culture and their preferences for instruction and counselling responsibilities, by addressing the following research questions:

1. Which type of organizational culture considered being the most effective one for faculty members' counseling and instruction responsibilities?
2. Is there any significant difference between faculty members in their perception of organizational culture types and their preferences for counseling and instruction responsibilities with respect to their gender?
3. Is there any significant difference between faculty members' perception of organizational culture types and their preferences for counseling and instruction responsibilities with respect to their Academic Rank?
4. Is there any significant difference between faculty members of both Private and state universities perceptions of organizational culture types and their preferences for counseling and instruction responsibilities?
5. Is there any significant difference between faculty members' perception of organizational culture types and their preferences for counseling and instruction responsibilities based on their educational years of service?

## 3. Literature Review

The present study aims to extend and expand the state of knowledge in the area which is about relationship between faculties' perception of organizational culture types and their preferences for job related responsibilities. Specifically, in this apart we present evidence with regard to the following relatively under-researched areas.

An understanding of the beliefs and values that faculty share about their work and their workplace convey an understanding of how faculty finds meaning in their work life (Tierny, 1988). These beliefs and values shape organizational culture of their individual work place. There has been intensifying evidence that the culture of individual institutions influences attitudes and behaviour of the faculty (Austin,1990; Kempner,1990; Peterson & white,1992; Smart & Hamm,1993,a;Teirny & Rhoads,1993). Trow (1977) for example in his research mentioned that because the department is the focal point of faculty member's career, its culture can play an important role. Peterson and white (1992) in their study ascertained that the perception of community college faculty regarding the culture of their organization significantly influenced their motivation and role performance. Furthermore, Weis (1985) stated that the differences in faculty perception of their institutional culture affected their approach to teaching and their students' learning. From Motters' (1999) standpoint institutional culture may have an effect on faculty in terms of the quality of teaching, research, and the overall effectiveness of the department. Researchers have also indicated that the unique cultures of institutions have various effects on faculty and students. For example Smart and Hamm (1993) discovered that specific types of community college cultures were related to particular dimension of effectiveness such as faculty morale, students' development and external community connections. Peterson and white(1992) went further and came to the result that when faculty perceive that there is a strong organizational culture emphasis on the institution's educational mission and goals, they are more satisfied and committed to their work.

## 4. Method

### 4.1. Participants

The sample of this study consisted of 63 faculties (20 female and 43 male) of colleges of Education and Psychology from Shiraz, Tehran and Ahvaz State and Private Universities, were selected using classified random

sampling. Faculties in this sample had 1 to 30 years of service .Additionally, they ranged in Academic rank from lecturers to full professors. Within this sample 22(34/34%) were from State University and the remaining (66.66%) were from Non-State University.

#### 4.2. Measures

Two instruments were adopted and used in this study: The Counsellor Educator Task Importance (CETII) and Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI).

##### 4.2.1. The Counsellor Educator Task Importance (CETII)

The CETII was used to measure participants' preferences for instruction and counselling responsibilities, The CETII is a 48 item survey that utilizes a Likert-type 7 point scale with anchored responses on either end of the continuum. Possible responses ranged from very important to not important at all. The CETII was divided into two main parts. Part one asked participants to rate items according to the level of importance that they would personally assign to a particular job related task. Part two asked participants to rate the same items reported in part one according to the importance that they perceive their institutions assign to those job related tasks. Within both parts one and two there were four sections with six task items in each that correspond to counsellor educators' job responsibilities in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. (Orr, 2005). Cronbach's alpha internal consistency reliability estimates for the subscales of CETII were .84 for scholarship, .89 for teaching, .90 for service, and .82 for supervision. An item analyses showed the validity coefficient of .70 for Scholarship, .56 for teaching, .80 for service and .56 for supervision responsibilities.

##### 4.2.2. The Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI)

OCAI developed by Cameron and Quinn (1999), was used to diagnose organizational culture. The OCAI consists of six different questions which are relevant to the key dimensions of organizational culture:(1) dominant characteristics;(2) organizational leadership;(3) management of employees;(4) organizational glue;(5) strategic emphases; and(6) criteria for success.

Each question has four alternative statements representing the four culture types identified in Competing values Framework (Clan, Adhocracy, Hierarchy, and Market) making a total of 24 questions. (Oney-Yazıcı, *et al.*, 2007) All respondents were asked to rate their organizations' culture on a five-point Likert scale. In this scoring system, for each of the five response categories (strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, and completely agree) a score of 1-5 was assigned, with the highest score of 5 being assigned to "completely disagree". The overall cultural profile of an organization was then derived by calculating the average score of all respondents from the same University type. Reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) were calculated for each of the different culture types being assessed by the instrument. Coefficients were .61 for the clan, .71 for adhocracy, and .61 for the market and .67 for the hierarchy culture, which indicate the fairness of all culture types. An item analysis showed the validity coefficient of .74 for clan, .81 for Adhocracy, .72 for Market and .66 for hierarchy.

##### 4.2.3. Data collection and Procedure

First, faculties completed the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument, and then they administered the Counsellor Educator Task importance Instrument. Each administration required about 20 minutes.

##### 4.2.4. Data Analyses

A1(organizational Culture types)\*4(scholarship, teaching, service and supervision) multivariate analysis of variance(MANOVA) was performed to determine whether types of university organizational culture related to differences in the outcome variables. Also four 2\*4 multivariate analysis including: 2(Culture types ,Gender )\*4(Scholarship, Teaching, Service, Supervision),2(Culture types, Academic Rank)\*4(Scholarship, Teaching, Service, Supervision),2(Culture types, University type)\*4(Scholarship, Teaching, Service, Supervision), and

2(Culture types ,Years of Service)\*4(Scholarship, Teaching, Service, Supervision)were used. Wilk's Lambade was employed as the criterion of multivariate significance. Significant multivariate results were followed up with univariate analysis of variance.

## 5. Results

In order to see whether organizational culture types were related to differences in faculties preferences for counselling and instruction responsibilities a  $1 \times 4$  MANOVA was conducted. The results showed a multivariate significant effect for organizational culture types ( $\Lambda=.65, F(3,56)=4.01, P=.01$ ). Univariate analysis of variance revealed significant effect of organizational culture types for scholarship [ $F(3,59)=4.01, P=.01$ ] and service [ $F(3/59)=2.78, P=.04$ ] responsibilities.

With respect to the second question a  $2 \times 4$  MANOVA was conducted to assess if organizational culture types or gender or their interaction were related to differences in the faculties responsibilities for counselling and instruction. The MANOVA showed only a significant multivariate effect for organizational culture types  $\times$  gender interaction effect [ $\Lambda=.67, F(6, 59) = 2.83, P=.007$ ]. Univariate follow up tests showed significant organizational culture types  $\times$  gender interaction effects for Scholarship [ $F(2, 56) = 7.44, P=.001$ ] and Teaching [ $F(2, 56) = 30.3, P=.05$ ]. See Table 1.

As a follow up to the MANOVA, Univariate analyses then were conducted. These Follow up tests of interaction indicated that female faculties from Adhocracy culture ( $M=41$ ) had significantly higher scholarship responsibility than female faculties from Market culture ( $M=36.75$ ), male faculties from Adhocracy culture ( $M=36$ ) had significantly higher scholarship responsibility than males from Market culture ( $M=35$ ), females from Adhocracy culture ( $M=41.71$ ) had significantly higher Teaching responsibility than males from Hierarchy culture ( $M=31.54$ ), female faculties from Adhocracy culture ( $40.57$ ) had significantly higher service responsibility than either females from clan culture ( $M=22.80$ ) or females from Market culture ( $M=24.87$ ). And finally, females from Adhocracy culture ( $M=35$ ) had significantly higher Supervision responsibility than males from Clan culture ( $M=24$ ).

Table1. Mean Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision responsibilities by Culture types and Gender

	<u>clan</u>		<u>Adhocracy</u>		<u>Market</u>		<u>Hierarchy</u>	
	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>female</i>	<i>Male</i>
Scholarship	40.40	38.67	49 <sup>1</sup>	36 <sup>2</sup>	36.75	35	5.94	38.63
Teaching	33.20	29.87	41.71 <sup>3</sup>	33	31.87	34.80	4.59	31.54
Service	22.80	27.6	40.57 <sup>4</sup>	29.55	24.77	27.10	4.24	30.27
Supervision	22	24	35 <sup>5</sup>	27.11	26.50	27.20	3.69	28.45

Females from Clan culture  $n=5$ . Males from Clan culture  $n=13$ . Females from Adhocracy culture  $n=5$ . Males from Adhocracy culture  $n=9$ . Females from Market culture  $n=8$ . Males from Market culture  $n=10$ . Females from Hierarchy culture  $n=2$  Males from Hierarchy culture  $n=11$ .

1. Significantly higher than female faculties from Market culture at  $P<.01$
2. Significantly higher than males from Market culture at  $P<.01$
3. Significantly higher than males from Hierarchy culture at  $P<.01$
4. Significantly higher than either females from clan culture at  $P<.01$  or females from hierarchy culture at  $P<.01$
5. Significantly higher than males from Clan culture at  $P<.01$

With respect to the third question again a  $2 \times 4$  MANOVA was conducted to determine if there were differences between faculties preferences for counselling and instruction responsibilities on a linear combination of organizational culture types and Academic Rank. The MANOVA showed a significant multivariate effect for organizational culture types [ $\Lambda=.61, F(3, 55) = 2.30, P=.01$ ], a significant multivariate effect for Academic Rank [ $\Lambda=.76, F(3,55)=3.90, P=.008$ ], and a significant multivariate effect for organizational culture types  $\times$  Academic

Rank interaction effect [ $\Lambda=.43, F(3,55)=4.25, P<.05$ ]. Univariate follow up tests showed a significant organizational culture types  $\times$  Academic Rank interaction effect for Teaching [ $F(3,55)=3.83, P=.01$ ], and service [ $F(3,55)=6.09, P=.001$ ]. See Table 2.

Univariate analyses, as a follow up to the MANOVA, indicated that lecturers from Hierarchy Culture (M=40.50) had significantly higher teaching responsibility than Assistant professors from Market culture (M=29.22), Assistants professors from Adhocracy culture (M=39.28) had significantly higher service responsibility than either Assistants professors from Market culture (M=20.77) or Lecturers professors from Clan culture (M=23.60).

Table 2. Mean Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision by organizational Culture types and Academic Rank

	<u>Clan</u>		<u>Adhocracy</u>		<u>Market</u>		<u>Hierarchy</u>	
	Lecturer	Lecturer and higher	Lecturer	Lecturer and higher	Lecturer	Lecturer and higher	Lecturer	Lecturer and higher
Scholarship	40.40	44.61	39.44	44.57	37	34.55	31.50	40.22
Teaching	34	34.15	34.44	39.85	37.77	29.22	40.50 <sup>1</sup>	29.55
Service	23.60	31.53	30.55	39.28 <sup>2</sup>	31.44	20.77	31	30.11
Supervision	26.40	26	27.55	34.42	26.55	27.22	34	27.22

Note: Clan Associate professors n=5 .Clan Associate professors and higher n=13. Adhocracy Associate professors n=9. Adhocracy Associate professors and higher n=7. Market Associate professors n=9. Market Associate professors and higher n=9. Hierarchy Associate professors n=2. Hierarchy Associate professors and higher n=9.

1. Significantly higher than Assistant professors from hierarchy culture
2. Significantly higher than either Assistants professors from hierarchy culture at  $P<.01$  or Associate professors from Clan culture at  $P<.01$ .

With regard to the forth question, a 2 $\times$ 4 MANOVA was used to determine whether organizational culture type or university type or their interaction was related to differences in teachers’ preferences for counselling and instruction responsibilities. The MANOVA indicated a significant multivariate effect for organizational culture types ( $\Lambda=.61, F(3, 54) =2.02, P=.027$ ) and a significant organizational culture types  $\times$  university type interaction effect ( $\Lambda=.57, F(3, 54) =2.61, P=.004$ ). However, follow up univariate ANOVAs indicated no significant organizational culture type  $\times$  university type interaction effect for teachers’ counselling and instruction responsibilities. See Table 3.

Table 3. Mean Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision responsibilities by organizational Culture types and University type

	<u>clan</u>		<u>Adhocracy</u>		<u>Market</u>		<u>Hierarchy</u>	
	State	Non-state	State	Non-state	State	Non-state	State	Non-state
Scholarship	39.16	45.58	39.50	42	34.85	36.36	40.14	36
Teaching	30.66	35.83	38	36.64	29.28	36.18	29	36
Service	28.83	29.58	36.50	34.07	24	27.45	31.28	28.50
Supervision	23	27.66	33	30.21	28.57	25.81	30.42	25

Note: Clan State university n =6. Clan Non-State university =12. Adhocracy state university n =2. Adhocracy Non-State university n=14. Market State university n=7. Market Non-State university n=11. Hierarchy state university n=7. Hierarchy Non-State University n=4.

Finally, in order to assess whether there were differences between faculties’ preferences for counselling and instruction on a linear combination of organizational culture types and years of service, a 2  $\times$ 4 MANOVA was

conducted. The results revealed a non-significant multivariate effect and a non-significant interaction effect, as well. See Table 4.

Table 4. Mean Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision responsibilities by organizational Culture types and Years of Service

	<u>Clan</u>		<u>Adhocracy</u>		<u>Market</u>		<u>Hierarchy</u>	
	<i>1-10</i>	<i>10 and higher</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>10 and higher</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>10 and higher</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>10 and higher</i>
Scholarship	43.07	39	42.40	40	34.44	39	41	35.50
Teaching	34.14	34	36.80	35	34.11	29.66	29.83	35.50
Service	29.50	30	35.20	30.33	24.77	26.33	29	31
Supervision	26.35	28	30	28.66	25.55	27.33	26.66	28

Note: Faculties from: Clan with 1-10 years of service n=14 .Clan with 10 years of service and higher n=1 .Adhocracy with 1-10 years of service n=10. Adhocracy with 10 years of service and higher n= 3. Market with 10 years of service n=9. Market with 10 years of service and higher n=3. Hierarchy with 1-10 years of service n=6. Hierarchy with 10 years of service and higher n=2.

## 6. Conclusion and Discussion

This study investigated the relationship between faculty's perception of organizational culture types of universities and their preferences for instruction and counselling responsibilities. The results of interaction of organizational culture types with demographic characteristics i.e. gender, academic rank, years of service, and university type indicated that faculties, who have recognized the organizational culture type of their organization adhocracy, were more effective in their job related responsibilities which is counselling and instruction. The adhocracy culture is a culture which emphasizes flexibility, individuality, and spontaneity. It is characterized by an emphasis on external positioning, a long term time frame, and achievement-oriented activities. Universities possessing adhocracy culture are innovative and adaptable, as there is no form of centralized power or authority relationships (Cameron & Quinn, 1999). Within an adhocracy, "power flows from individual to individual or from task team to task team depending on what problem is being addressed at the time" (Cameron & Quinn, 1999). With considering the fact that adhocracy culture is a type of culture that is more responsive and flexible to the hyper turbulent, ever-accelerating conditions, furthermore has higher capacity for presenting new services and products, faculties have the opportunity to get more involved in researches which are of very high quality, act more efficient in teaching and participate more in social services in either local or national levels. Therefore, aforementioned features in adhocracy culture make faculties know their managers as innovators and entrepreneurs .In such a culture because faculties are sure about their managers' support; they would act more efficient in areas of research and social services. Furthermore, they use voluntarily more creative methods in areas of research, teaching and social services. On the other hand universities with Market Culture are primarily concerned with external environment, as they focus on transactions with such externalities as suppliers, customers, contractors, licensees, unions, regulators, etc. The market culture operates primarily through monetary exchange, as competitiveness and productivity in these organizations are dependent on strong external positioning and control (Cameron & Quinn, 1999). Additionally, in market culture because managers are considered as competitors, hard drivers and producers, faculties try more to fulfil their responsibilities in the framework which is defined for them. In addition they are not interested in areas such social services and research which is out of this framework. As a result, all of these features have impeded faculties to not involve completely in their job related responsibilities. In other words, when universities put more emphasis on making profit through their faculties' interaction with foreign institutions, consequently faculties would suffer from lack of time to fulfil their responsibilities i.e. teaching, doing research, and volunarity participation in social services. Furthermore, faculties' more concentration on creating specific

knowledge and information for foreign institutions would diminish their performance quality in their academic environment. All in all, in order to train faculties who show more commitment to their responsibilities we should take advantage of managers who try to create a dynamic organizational culture which is actually in concordance with adhocracy culture and its characteristics. Such a culture can help universities and academia to improve faculties' creative characteristics both in local and national levels.

## References

- Adams, K. A. (2002). What colleges and universities want in new faculty. (Preparing Future Faculty Occasional Paper No. 7)
- Austin, A. E. (1990). Faculty cultures, Faculty values. In Tierny W. G. (Ed), *Assessing Academic climates and cultures*, (pp.61-74), San Fransico, Jossey-Bass.
- Austin, A. E. (2002a). Creating a bridge to the future: Preparing new faculty to face changing expectations in a shifting context. *Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 119-144.
- Becher, T. (1989). *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Cameron, K. S. and Quinn, R. E. (1999) *Diagnosing and Changing organizational culture: based on the competing values framework*. Reading, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesely
- Cohen, E. G. (1982). *Expectation states and interracial interaction in school settings*. *Annual Review of Sociology* 8: 209–235.
- Fjortoft, N. and J. C. Smart. 1994. Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness: the importance of culture type and mission agreement. *Higher Education*. 27, 429-447.
- Jones, G. R. (2004). *Organizational Theory, Design and Change*. Prentice Hall: Pearson.
- Kempner, K. (1990). Faculty culture in the community college: Facilitating or hindering leading. *The review of higher education*, 13, 215-235.
- Lanning, W. (1990). An educator/practitioner model for counselor education doctoral programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 30, 163-170.
- Motter, R. (1999). *Regional campus faculty and their academic departments: A complex relationship*. Unpublished master's thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Oney-Yazıcı, E. et al. (2007). Organizational culture: the case of Turkish construction industry. , *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 14(6), pp.519-531.
- Orr, J., J. (2005). Scholarship, Teaching, Service and supervision in counsellor Education: faculty members' ratings of importance. Doctoral thesis of Philosophy in the counseor education program, University of New Orleans.
- Peterson, M. W. & White, T. H. (1992). Faculty and administrator perceptions of their environments: Different views or different models of organization? *Reserach in higher education*, 33, 177-204
- Ramsey, M., Cavallaro, M., Kiselica, M., & Zila, L. (2002). Scholarly productivity redefined in counselor education. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 42, 40-57.
- Seidman, E. (1985). *In the words of the faculty: perspectives on improving teaching and educational quality in community colleges*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Sokugawa, H. I. (1996). *Faculty Perceptions of Organizational Culture in Community Colleges*, University of Hawaii .Doctoral Dissertations.
- Smart, J. C., & Hamm, R. E. (1993a). Organizational culture and effectiveness in two-year colleges. *Research in Higher Education*, 34, 95-106.
- Tierny (1988). Organizational culture in higher education :Defining the essentials. *Journal of Higher education*, 59, pp.2-21
- Tierney, W. G. & Rhoads, R. A. (1993). Enhancing promotion, tenure and beyond: Faculty socialization as a cultural process (ASHE\_ERIC Higher Education Report No.93-6). Washington, DC: George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Trow, M. (1997). The politics of motivation: A comparative perspective. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), *Teaching well and liking it: Motivating faculty to teach effectively*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Weis, L. (1985). *Between two worlds: Black students in an urban community college*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan