



Examining the organizational socialization perceptions of teachers in the lifelong learning process by various variables

Nurhayat Çelebi ^a

^a Prof.Dr., Karabuk University, Karabuk/ Turkey

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine the perceptions of teachers about organizational socialization levels according to various variables. The quantitative study was designed as a survey model. Organizational Socialization Scale used in the research was developed by Taormina (2004) and adapted into Turkish by Balci, Baltaci and Fidan et al. (2012) and validity and reliability analyzes were performed. The data collection tool used in the study was formed in Likert type and consisted of 20 items and four dimensions. Factor load values of items in the original scale ranged from .45 to .81. Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale was .77. These subscales were entitled "social development, organizational understanding, employee support and future expectation". The total data of the data used in the study was gathered from 220 teachers employed in schools in Istanbul Kartal district. Gender, graduation, professional experience, branch and tenure of school were taken as independent variables. Findings of the research revealed that the level of organizational socialization scores of teachers is quite high. According to those findings, it can be said that it is necessary to support the career development of teachers in lifelong learning process and to increase their professional competence with in-service courses.

Keywords: *Teacher, lifelong learning, organizational socialization.*

1. Introduction

Lifelong learning consists not only the formal and non-formal education, but also the education and training in every part of life. Individuals' approach to learning with a growing importance, create opportunities for competition and employment within the labor market (Aksoy, 2013). Lifelong learning has a significance in terms of enabling the transitions from school life to work life and work life to school life, as well as strengthening the learning motivation (Poyraz and Titrek, 2013). Organizational learning, in a sense, is a process that takes place in multiple times for more than one occasion throughout one's career in parallel to lifelong learning (Balci, 2003). It can be described as the individual's process of learning and generally accepting about the constructed norms and ways of a certain social group or society (Çalık, 2006).

The studies on the organizational socialization focus on determining the behaviors of the new employees based on the norm and statuses of the organization and on how the socialization factors form. However, the studies do not provide information on how the changes in organizational socialization take place, and bring these changes forth like a relative concept such as the frequency of searching for information (Feldman and Arnold, 1983; Fisher, 1986; Morrison, 1993 and Schneider, 1983). Organizational socialization defines a dynamic process that occurs when an individual assumes a new and changing role within an organization. In this context, fundamental components of organizational socialization is the reviewing of process, content and results (Chao (2015). Socialization tactics are used for the new participants of the organization so as to ensure the continuity of the values and norms of the organization. Thus, in regard to the human resources aspect of the organization, the incomes to be acquired from the worker selection and training investments increase accordingly (Cable and Parsons, 2001). Throughout this process, the individuals take part in the activities that increase their performances for the areas of interest (Güniç, Odabaşı and Kuzu, 2012). The main purpose of this process is to ensure that the new employee becomes an effective member of the organization. Throughout this process, the employee learns to conduct the assignments correctly and about the compatibility with the organization culture (Aliyev and Işık, 2014).

Individual and organizational socialization consist of learning about the aims of the organization and the tools, duties and responsibilities, organizational value and norms needed to achieve these aims. In that aspect, socialization process is of importance for the employee and the organization. The success of the employee's work depends on his success in the socialization process (Can, 1999 and Kuşdemir, 2005). Organizations offer their employees education programs in a planned manner and strive for the socialization of the employees. The actualization of the organizational aims is possible only through the compatibility of the organizational and individual attitude, value and behaviors. This process of compatibility takes place via a series of studies defined as organizational socialization (Kartal, 2003).

Socialization in organizations is carried out, in general, via basic education, preparatory education and in-service training programs as well as the other formal and non-formal socialization tools. These activities are organized under four main categories. These are: (1) explanation of the terms of the assignment, (2) stating the clarity of the role, (3) enculturation activities and ensuring social unity (Morrison, 1993). Studies suggest that education activities take the information and training applications into consideration for individual learning and develop conceptual perspective at individual and group levels. Researchers aim, at the first stage, to have teachers learn generally through vocational development programs. At the second stage, they focus on the vocational development programs conducted in more than one area as well as the relationship between the teachers for the teacher learning. At the third stage, the focus of the study is based on the comparison of multiple vocational development programs. As a result, need rich information sources and various research tools are needed for the professional development of the teachers. For this purpose, conscious decisions on the

designs and methods along with providing the most appropriate responses for the specific questions are necessary (Borko, 2004).

Preparation of a suitable basis, development of methods and applications and in the meantime, taking the social intelligence perception of the employees into consideration are needed for the realization of organizational socialization. This situation can be a beneficial approach for the organization and all its partners (Çavuş, Pekkan and Develi (2017). Analyzing the studies on socialization, Louis (1980) stated that employees that are not familiar with the norms, procedures and culture of the organization experience alienation, and in the opposite scenario, socialization in organizations takes place in a shorter period of time. For socialization, (a) characteristics of the process, (b) stages of the socialization, (c) socialization of its contents and (d) the impacts of the socialization applications gain importance.

Van Maanen and Schein (1979) state that socialization studies, which are generally different from macro level, are studies on the new employees during their first couple of months in the workplace while they are collecting information, completing their assignments and clarifying their roles within the organization. Sagberg (2016), found in his study that the individuals, within the two years following their graduation, show remarkable effort in complying with the organization and taking part in information exchange.

Many researchers stated that the socialization process affected the careers and life qualities of the individuals. Socialization is claimed to affect the satisfaction, attitude, stress and performance of the employees. Unsatisfying socialization can cause stress, disappointment, stagnation in career development and organizational loss and decrease in efficiency. Most of the new employees do not like these studies for not being part of the routine and technical topics. The first step of the strategies developed for a more effective and efficient process is for an individual to have a reliable job, be happy and enjoy his job. Throughout this process, interpersonal information sources, coworkers and mentors play an important role (Asford and Cummings, 1983, 1985 and Van Maanen, 1976). Additionally, it is expected for the job to be dynamic, and continue its task of being a tool for meeting the motivations and expectations. For example; strong socialization tactics, search for information, creating networks, negotiations on switching careers etc. (Ashford and Black, 1996). Ashford (1986) states that active participation of the new employees into the work environment generally decreases the compliance problems and affects the individual's intention for resigning (Araza, Aslan and Bulut, 2013, 5556-5582). In this process, individual's success in learning as well as using the learning and information on the basis of independent and objective criteria (for example; job examples or supervisor evaluations) are needed (Ostroff and Kozlowski, 1992).

What and how the people as members of the social groups think can affect their behaviors in the social system and their learning outcomes. Therefore, social identity is a key input for learning and performance in the organizations (Korte, R. F., 1986). Typically, if the individuals follow the rules of the institutions, the organizations think the socialization process is successful. New employees internalize the norms expected from their roles. However, at a corporate level (human resources), the individual can

provide information in regard to the occupation, and the organization, supervisors as well as the coworkers can access the fundamental information sources on social and political norms (Gundry and Rausseau, 1994; Ostroff and Kozlowski, 1992).

There are various results of organizational socialization. In literature, there are different categorizations made in relation to the various results of the socialization. Feij (1998) gathers the socialization process of the young within their workspace under four categories. (1) skills, attitudes and values needed by the young as valuable workers or so as to continue their function as a fully integrated member, (2) commitment to the organization and identification with the organization values, (3) interpersonal cooperation and good relations, and (4) job satisfaction, self-reliance and self-efficacy.

Socialization of the teachers include the acquisition of knowledge, skills, values and norms as well as the occupational development. Background of the teacher, local connections and state policy". Background of the teacher consists of gender, race and personal history. Outlining the worldviews of the teachers make their socialization possible. Local socialization is the culture of the school, beliefs, values and applications. State policy is the professional organizational understanding of administration (cited in Nasser, Alhija, and Fresco, 2010).

A teacher's socialization process through the learning of occupational values and norms mostly take place before professional life (university education). During that period, the teacher internalizes the education models, and shape his application and ideals, level of knowledge and professional ethic (Memduhoğlu, 2008). The purpose of this study is to determine what the socialization levels of the teachers are and whether there is a difference between the demographic variables (gender, graduation, professional experience, branch and duration of working at school) and the socialization levels of the teachers.

1.1. 1.1.Sub-problems

- According to the views of the teachers, what is the level of organizational socialization of the teachers?
- Do the organizational socialization perceptions of the teachers vary depending on their gender, school of graduation, professional experience, field of work and duration of working at school?

2. Method

This study consists of the perceptions of the teachers regarding their organization socialization levels towards their process of lifelong learning. The study is descriptive and conducted with the general survey model. Quantitative design is used for this study.

The population of the study consists of a total of 909 teachers working at high schools located in Istanbul's districts Maltepe (N=374) and Kartal (N=535) (istanbul.meb. gov.tr). Within these districts, there are six high schools in Maltepe and eleven high schools in

Kartal. The study group of this study consists of 220 teachers working in these high schools through convenience sampling method. Survey method is used in the collection of the study data. The survey form, which was applied within the scope of the study, consists of three parts. The first part covers the personal information (gender, graduation status, professional experience, field of work and the period of working at school) of the participants. The second part covers the “Organizational Socialization Inventory”, which was developed by Taormina (1994) and updated again by Taormina (2004) in order to determine the organizational socialization levels of the participants. The inventory consists of 20 items. This inventory does not cover all the problems and not sufficiently specific for certain applications. However, it is useful as a theoretical framework (Sagberg, 2016). The sub-dimensions of the inventory are “social training, organizational understanding, support of coworkers and future expectations”.

Social training: This is generally the process of transferring the knowledge and skills necessary for the newcomer so as to actualize his organizational role (Taormina, 1994, 1997).

Organizational understanding: It is the effort of the newcomer in developing an understanding through the learning experiences in relation to the inter-organizational roles and organizational functions acquired during the social training that eventually surpasses these experiences (Louis (1980).

Support of the coworkers: This shows the important roles assumed by the newcomer during the socialization process of the organization members as socialization agents (Louis, 1980).

Future expectations: This reflects the career expectations of the newcomer within the organization during his socialization process (Taormina, 1994, 1997).

2.1. 2.1.. Reability and validity of data

Factor loading values of the items in the original inventory vary between 0.45 and 0.81. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient based on the dimensions are “social training, 0.76”, “organizational understanding, 0.72”, “coworker support, 0.72”, and “future expectations, 0.68”. The total Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the inventory is 0.89. The Turkish adaptation, and validity and reliability studies of the inventory was conducted by Balcı, Baltacı, Fidan, Cereci and Acar (2012). According to the results of the factor analysis, which was applied to test the construct validity, the factor loading values vary between 0.39 and 0.98. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the inventory dimensions are determined to be 0.92 for “social training,” 0.79 for “organizational understanding,” 0.96 for “coworker support,” and 0.91 for “future expectations.” The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the inventory in total is 0.77. The reliability coefficient of the inventory in this study is determined to be 0.934.

The inventory’s intervals are in Likert type (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree) statements and the distance between each category is accepted to be equal. The following intervals are taken into consideration in interpreting the arithmetic means of the findings acquired from the study:

1,00 ≤ arithmetic mean ≤ 2,60 : Low

2,60 < arithmetic mean ≤ 3,40 : Medium

3,40 < arithmetic mean ≤ 5,00 : High

Data Analysis techniques: Prior to the statistical analysis of the study, the frequency, percentage values, mean and standard deviations that determine the demographic characteristics of the teachers were calculated. One sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was used to analyze whether the research data displayed normal distribution qualities, and it was found as a result that socialization displayed normal distribution on the basis of gender, graduation and field of work, while it didn't display normal distribution on the basis of professional experience and duration of working at school. Consequently, non-parametric and parametric analysis techniques were used in the analysis of the distribution of the sub-scale scores of the teachers.

Demographic Findings of the Participants: Based on the gender, 57.3% of the participants (N=126) are women, 42.7% (N=94) are men. Based on professional experience, 94 teachers at most (48.7%) have a professional experience of less than 10 years. The teachers with the highest professional experience have experience of 21 years and above (N=13, 5.9%). Based on the graduation statuses, the majority is a graduate of the faculty of education (N=127, 57.7%) while 28.6% (N=63) is a graduate of the faculty of letters. Based on the field of work, the majority are the teachers of Social Sciences and Turkish Literature (N=77, 35%), and the minority are the teachers of Sciences - Mathematics (N= 42, 19.1%). Based on their duration of working at school, 155 teachers (70.5%) have been working for less than 5 years at their school. 11.4% of the teachers (N=15) have been working at the same school for 11-15 years.

3. Results

Mean and standard deviation values of the sub-scale items of the organizational socialization inventory are given below.

Table 1. "Organizational Socialization Inventory" mean and standard deviation score values

Organizational socialization subscale items	\bar{X}	Ss.
Social training		
This institution (MEB: Ministry of National Education) provided me with excellent social training opportunities in relation to the work that I'm doing.	2,49	1,14
The training programs provided by this institution ensure that I carry out my work in the best way possible.	2,50	1,10
This institution offers all the opportunities necessary for the development of the employees' work skills.	2,60	1,17
Instructions given by my superiors have significance for me to perform my job with excellence.	2,78	1,09
Training programs in relation to work provided by this institution are quite effective.	2,50	1,14
Total	2,58	,960
Organizational understanding		
I fully know how the work is conducted in this institution.	3,41	1,07
I fully know what my duties are in this institution.	3,51	1,05

The purposes of this institution are presented very clearly.	3,44	1,12
I am quite informed about how this institution works.	3,94	1,11
Almost all the employees understand the purposes of this institution.	3,02	,99
Total	3,48	,835
Coworker support		
Other employees are helpful in various ways about my work.	3,37	1,08
My coworkers are generally eager in offering their support and suggestions.	3,52	1,07
Most of my coworkers accept me as a member of this organization.	3,77	1,04
My coworkers were very helpful in complying with this institution.	3,69	1,04
I have very good relations with the other employees in this institution.	4,02	,904
Total	3,67	,830
Future expectation		
There are varies opportunities for a good career in this institution.	2,56	1,20
I am happy about the prizes provided by this institution.	2,47	1,25
The opportunities for advancement in career are open for almost everyone in this institution.	2,66	1,27
I can easily foresee when I will be promoted in this institution.	2,62	1,35
I expect this institution to employ me for many years to come.	2,99	1,35
Total	2,66	1,02

In Table 1; the highest average in the organizational socialization sub-scale of the teacher perceptions is the statement of “I have very good relations with the other employees in this institution” ($\bar{X} = 4,02$.)” The lowest average is the statement of “I am happy about the prizes provided by this institution ($\bar{X} = 2,47$.)”

While on the basis of sub-scale scores the “coworker support ($\bar{X} = 3,67$)” has the highest average in total, the sub-scale of “social training” ($\bar{X} = 2,58$) has the lowest average. As can be understood from these statements, the teachers do not receive the necessary support during their first years in the job via training programs. Analysis of the total scores shows that the scale score mean is average ($\bar{X} = 3,1$, $ss = 0,91$).

Table 2. t- test results of the socialization sub-scale scores of the teachers based on gender

Sub- scale	Gender	N	\bar{X}	Sd	t	P
Social training	Female	126	2.54	.954	-.576	P>.05
	Man	94	2.62	.973		
Organizational understanding	Female	126	3.38	.836	-2.09*	P<.05
	Man	94	3.61	.817		
Coworker support	Female	126	3.63	.851	-.820	p>.05
	Man	94	3.73	.804		
Future expectation	Female	126	2.60	1.04	-1.084	p>.05
	Man	94	2.75	.993		

According to Table 2, the independent groups t-test results show that there was a significant difference on behalf of the males in “organizational understanding” sub-scale

of the male and female teachers' perceptions ($t_{(2,218)}=2.09, p<.05$). It is understood that male teachers are more satisfied with the institution's working system than women.

Table. 3. One-way ANOVA test results of the organizational socialization sub-scale scores of the teachers based on their branches.

Sub-scale	Branches	n	\bar{X}	Sd	F	Sig.
Social training	Turkish Literature and Social Sciences.	77	2.56	.980	3,23	.008
	Science and Maths	42	2.20	.893		
	Religious and Moral Educations	48	2.76	.788		
	Foreign Language and Others	53	2.67	1.03		
Total		220	2.58	.835		
Organizational understanding	Turkish Literature and Social Sciences	77	3.54	.856	1.310	.261
	Science and Maths	42	3.30	.813		
	Religious and Moral Educations	48	3.52	.836		
	Foreign Language and Others	53	3.56	.821		
Total		220	3.48	.835		
Coworker support	Turkish Literature and Social Sciences.	77	3.65	.907	.529	.754
	Science and Maths	42	3.58	.755		
	Religious and Moral Education	48	3.67	.793		
	Foreign Language and Others	53	3.65	.772		
Total		220	3.67	.830		
Future expectation	Turkish Literature and Social Sciences.	77	2.74	1.03	2.071	.070
	Science and Maths	42	2.87	.975		
	Religious and Moral Education	48	2.54	1.03		
	Foreign Language and Others	53	2.61	.983		
Total		220	2.66	1.02		

In Table 3, there was a significant difference between the “social training” sub-scale scores through the one-way ANOVA test based on the field of work variables of the “Organizational Socialization Inventory” scores of the teachers [$F(3, 216) = 3.23, p < .05$]. Scheffe’s multiple comparison method was used so as to find between which groups the differences were. As a result, there was a statistically significant difference between the teachers of science and mathematics with religious and moral education, and with the result being on behalf of the teachers of religious and moral education ($p < .05$). The reasons for this were the fact that the teachers of science and mathematics have more course hours in a week, have more higher course load and responsibility and therefore

their socialization scores are naturally lower than the teachers of religious and moral education.

Based on the one-way ANOVA results, there was no significant difference between the organizational socialization of the teachers and their faculty of graduation ($p > .05$). Sub scales: at social training [$F(3,216)=2,136, p > .05$], organizational understanding [$F(3,216)=1.985, p > .05$], Coworker support [$F(3,216)=.660, p > .05$], future expectation [$F(3,216)=1.825, p > .05$].

According to Kruskal- Wallis H test results, no significant difference was determined among those sub scales which are the socialization of teachers, their social training ($\chi^2=2.345, p > .504$), organizational understanding ($\chi^2_{(3)}=.590, p > .05$), coworker support ($\chi^2_{(3)}=1.245, p > .05$) and future expectation ($\chi^2_{(3)}=6.789, p > .05$).

Tablo 4. Kruskal- Wallis H test results of the organizational socialization sub-scale scores of the teachers based on their duration of service at school

Sub Scale	Duration of service	N	Rank Mean	Df	X ²	P
Social training	Less than 5years	155	123.31	3	10.690	.014*
	6-10	50	94.06			
	11-15	15	117.06			
Total		220				
Organizational understanding	Less than 5years	155	124.87	3	7.650	.054
	6-10	50	99.06			
	11-15	15	111.73			
Total		220				
Coworker support	Less than 5years	155	114.61	3	5.194	.158
	6-10	50	99.32			
	11-15	15	111.73			
Total		220				
Future expectation	Less than 5 years	155	119.81	3	6.625	.085
	6-10	50	96.91			
	11-15	15	116.79			
Toplam		220				

Table 4. according to the Kruskal-Wallis H results, there is a significant difference between the “social training of the teachers” on the basis of their duration of service at school ($\chi^2_{(3)}=10.690, p < .05$). The Mann- Whitney U test was used to clarify whether this finding is supported or not, it is also significant.

Table 4a; Mann Whitney- U results of the organizational socialization sub-scale scores of the teachers based on their duration of service at school

Sub scale	Duration of service	N	Rank Mean	Rank total	U	P
Social training	5 yıldan az	155	74.95	3672.5	1472.5	.018*

Total	6-10	40	58.91	4712.5		
		195				
<hr/>						
Social training	6-10	40	75.64	6051.5	2811.5	.014*
	11 -15	15	94.26	8483.5		
Total		65				
<hr/>						
Social training	5 yıldan az	155	73.23	3588.5	2046.5	.484
	11-15	15	68.24	6141.5		
Total		170				
<hr/>						

According to the results of Mann-Whitney U test, this difference is between 6-10 years among the ones with a duration of service less than 5 years (U: 1472.5, $p < 0.05$). Again, there is a significant difference between the duration of service for 6-10 years and 11-15 years on the basis of “social training” (U: 2811.5, $p < .05$). This difference is on behalf of the teachers with more professional experience. This result shows that the more the duration of working at school increases the better the teachers' relations with the environment is.

4. Discussion

According to the study results, it is found that the perception of the teachers on "the organizational socialization is at a medium level, but the highest average is on sub scale “coworker support”. In those sub-scales on coworker support, teachers stated that their coworkers were helpful, eager in offering their support, give suggestion, assisting about the institutional works. lowest The “social training.”sub scale has the lowest average. In this sub-scale, the teachers stated that they could not receive any sufficient supporting on self-training programs organized by the supervisors of the institutions where they work.

Tosten, Avcı and Şahin (2015) stated in their study that the teachers have high socialization levels, and there was a high-level positive relationship between their organizational socialization and organizational happiness levels. Organizational socialization of the individuals who are happy at workplace is much faster. In a study by Aydın and Nartgün (2015), a positive relationship with moderate significance was found between the socialization levels of the teachers and their “organizational identification” and “competence of working together”, and again in Çerik and Bozkurt’s (2010) study between their “organizational socialization” and “career development”.

In the studies of Çelik (1998), Korkmaz, Saban and Akbaşlı (2004), Duran, Sezgin and Çoban (2011), certain number of prospective classroom teachers stated that they found inter-service training to be insufficient during their organizational socialization process, they had difficulties in adapting to the social environment and the culture of the school and they were assigned with unnecessary duties and responsibilities. In a study by Balcı, Karabulut, Kürce and Ernas (2019), it was referred that the teachers in the beginning of socialization stage experienced reality shock and therefore the importance of individual

activities as well as the coworker attitudes in adapting to their profession and school. Yıldız (2015) emphasizes that the school administrators of the teachers who just began working at the related primary schools did not make much use of the socialization strategies and therefore the newly appointed teachers could not socialize at an expected level.

Feldman and Arnold (1983) stated in their studies that the commitment of the new employees to their jobs was low and this created a problem. As a first step of the strategies developed so as to make this process more effective, it is necessary for the employees to believe that their job is important and to enjoy their job. Morrison (1993) revealed in his study that socialization had an important impact on the newcomers in their search for information. It was seen in the study that a period of six months was sufficient for social integration. There is also evidence that search for information decreases as the duration of working increases.

Kartal (2003), has studied on a research titled “relationship between the job satisfaction and the level of organizational socialization of the administrators and teachers at primary schools”. In this study, it was found that there is the significant difference on behalf of the classroom teachers in motivation, commitment and acceptance. The findings of those mentioning studies clarify that there is a significant difference between the less professional experienced employees with the more professional experienced ones. Gizdem and Kartal (2016) referred that the majority of the teachers during their socialization process are influenced by their coworkers in the formation of their attitude and emotions towards their jobs, and loved their jobs and formed positive attitude towards their jobs, and informal groups had an important place throughout this process. In a study by Çoruk, Tutkun and Genç (2016), it was found that the perceptions of lecturers in regard to especially the interpersonal relations are positive during their socialization process. While there was no significant difference in the perceptions of lecturers on the basis of gender variable, there were significant differences on the basis of the university of employment, academic title and professional experience variables. In this study, there was a difference only in the sub-scale of the organizational understanding on behalf of the men in regard to the organizational socialization perceptions of the teachers. Aygün and Nartgün (2015) determined a statistically significant difference in the gender variable and the sub-scale of the history and language of school of the scale of organizational socialization. This result was on behalf of the male teachers. The results of the study by Argon (2011), Kuşdemir (2005), Özkan (2005) and Yıldız (2015) revealed that the male teachers had higher socialization levels than female teacher. In our study, similar findings were acquired. It was seen that the highest average belonged to the “coworker support.” Yet, there is no difference between the “organizational socialization” perceptions of the teachers and their graduation and professional experience. However, a significant difference was found between the field of work of the teachers and “social training”. This difference was between the teachers of Science and Mathematics with Religious and Moral Education teachers. Religious and Moral Educations' teacher advantages than Science and Maths' teacher for the socialization.

5. Conclusions

As a result, it was seen that programs which would contribute the socialization of the new employees in order to acquire knowledge and behaviors in relation to their job are needed. Thus, the concept of lifelong learning shows that individuals, who improve himself in accordance with the needs of the age we are living in, can adapt to the changes within social and cultural lives and can fulfill the requirements of his profession, are needed. In terms of lifelong learning process, qualified adult manpower is needed by the countries so that they can possess the technological power. Meeting these needs is possible through adapting the level of education to the ongoing changes. Social training programs of the teachers must be regulated in accordance with the changes that take place both in the teacher training institutions and in their professional lives. Organizational socialization programs should be arranged based on the needs and it should be ensured that the teachers internalize the organizational values. Applications such as mentorship should be supported for the professional development of the teachers.

References

- Aliyev, Y. and Işık, M. (2014). Örgütsel sosyalleşme ve örgütsel özdeşleşme arasındaki ilişki. Bir araştırma. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 37 (2), 131-149.
- Araza, A.; Aslan, G., and Bulut, Ç. (2013). Örgütsel sosyalleşme, bir literatür taraması.(Organizational socialization : A literature review). *Journal of Yaşar University*. 8 (32), 5556-5582.
- Argon, T.(2011) İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel sosyalleşme düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından değerlendirilmesi. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 6(1), 197-207.
- Ashford, S.J.& Cummings, L.L. (1983) Feedback as an individual resource: Personal strategies of creating information. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32, 370-398. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(83\)90156-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(83)90156-3).
- Ashford, S. J.& Cummings L. L. (1985). Proactive feedback seeking: The instrumental use of the information environment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 58, 67-79.
- Ashford, S. J. (1986). Feedback –seeking in individual adaptation: A resource perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*. 29 (3). 485-487.
- Ashford, S. J.& Taylor, M. S. (1990). Adaptation to work transitions: An integrative approach. In G. R. Ferris & K. M. Rowland (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*. 8, 1-39. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Ashford, S. J.& Black, J. S. (1996). Proactivity during organizational entry: The role of desire for control. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 199-214.
- Aygün, R. and Nartgün,Ş. (2015). Öğretmenlerin, örgütsel sosyalleşme düzeyleri ile birlikte çalışma yeterlilikleri arasındaki ilişki. *Çağdaş Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*.1(1), Nisan 2015, 9-24.
- Balcı, A.(2003). *Örgütsel sosyalleşme*. Ankara: PegemA yayıncılık
- Balcı, A., Baltacı, A., Fidan, T., Cereci, C. and Acer, U. (Aralık 2012).Örgütsel sosyalleşmenin, örgütsel özdeşleşme ve örgütsel vatandaşlıkla ilişkisi: İlköğretim okulu yöneticileri üzerinde bir araştırma. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırma Dergisi*. 2 (2).48-74.
- Balcı, A., Karabulut, N. ,Gürses, Kürçe, S. and Ernas, K. (2019).Teachers' organizational and professional socialization: The case of Ankara. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 9 (11), 305-350. DOI:10,14527/ pegogoy. 2019.010.

- Bauer, T.N.& Erdoğan, B. (2012). Organizational socialization outcomes: Now and into the future. *In The Oxford Handbook of Organization* (Edit:ConnieWanberg). 97-118. Oxford University Press. Inc. Oxford, Newyork.
- Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational researcher*, 33(8), (Nov., 2004), 3-15. Published by: American Educational Research Association. <http://www.jfstor.org/stable/3699979>.
- Cable, D. M.& Parsons, C. K. (2001). Socialization tactics and person–organization fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 54 (1), 1-23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00083.x>
- Can, H.(1999). *Örgüt ve yönetim*. Beşinci baskı. Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Chao, G. T.(2015) Organizational socialization .Background basics and blue print for adjusment at work. *the oxford handbook of organizational psyhology* (Edit by Stewe W S.Kozlowski) Vol.1 <https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199928309.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199928309>.
- Çalık, C. (2006). Örgütsel sosyalleşme sürecinde eğitimin değişen rolü ve önemi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*.14 (1), 1-10.
- Çavuş, M. F. , Pekkan, N.Ü.& Develi, A. (2017). Sosyal zekanın örgütsel sosyalleşme üzerindeki etkisini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma. https://www.researchgate.net/...320840219_
- Çelik, V. (1998). Alan dışından gelen sınıf öğretmenlerinin sosyalizasyonu. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*. 4(14),191-208.
- Çoruk, A., Tutkun, T.and Genç, S.Z. (2016). Öğretim elemanlarının örgütsel sosyalleşme düzeylerine ilişkin algılarının incelenmesi. *Erzincan Üniversitesi. Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 18(1), 33-358.
- Duran, E., Sezgin, F.and Çoban, O. (2011). Aday sınıf öğretmenlerinin uyum ve sosyalleşme sürecinin incelenmesi. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. Aralık 2011,31, **ISSN.1302-1842, 465-478**.
- Feldman, D. C.& Arnold, H. J. (1983). *Managing individual and group behavior in organizations*. Auckland: Mc Graw Hill.
- Feij, J. A. (1998). Work socialization of young people. In P. J. D. Drenth, H. Thierry, & C. J. de Wolff (Eds.), *Handbook of work and organizational psychology (2nd ed.)*, 207-256. Hove, England: Psychology Press/Erlbaum (UK), Taylor & Francis.
- Fisher, C. D. (1986). Organizational socialization: An integrative review. In K. M. Rowland & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management*. 4, 101–145. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Gizdem, Ö.U., Kartal,S. (2016). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin örgütsel sosyalleşmelerinde informal grupların etkileri. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*. Mayıs 2016, 26 (3), 1359-1370
- Gundry, L. K.&Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Critical incidents in communicating culture to newcomers: The meaning is the message. *Human Relations*, 47 (9), 1063-1088.
- Günüş, S., Odabaşı, H.& Kuzu, A. (2012). Yaşam boyu öğrenmeyi etkileyen faktörler. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 11(2), 309-325.
- Kartal, S.(2003). *İlköğretim okulu yönetici ve öğretmenlerinin örgütsel sosyalleşme düzeyleri: Ankara ili örneği*.(Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Kartal, S.(2008). Eğitim çalışanlarının örgütsel sosyalleşmelerinde ilköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin katkıları ve iki örnek olay. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9 (15),75-88.
- Korkmaz, İ.;Saban, A. and Akbaşı, S. (2004). Göreve yeni başlayan sınıf öğretmenlerinin karşılaştıkları güçlükler. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*. 38, 266-277.
- Korte, Russell., F. (2007). A review of social identity theory with implications for training and development. *Journal of European Industrial Training* 31(3):166-180.

- Kuşdemir, Y. (2005). *İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin öğretmenlerin örgütsel sosyalleşme sürecinde sosyalleştirme stratejilerini kullanma becerileri (Kırıkkale ili örneği)*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Kırıkkale: Kırıkkale Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Louis, M. R. (1980). Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 226-251.
- MEB (2015). İstanbul İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü. *İstatistik Verileri*. <https://istanbul.meb.gov.tr/www/istanbul-il-milli-egitim-mudurlugu-istatistik-verileri/icerik/849>
- Memduhoğlu, H.B. (2008). Örgütsel sosyalleşme ve Türk eğitim sisteminde örgütsel sosyalleşme süreci. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. Aralık 2008. 5(2), 137-153.
- Morrison, E. W. (1993). Longitudinal study of the effects of information seeking on newcomer socialization, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 (2), 173-188.
- Nasser, F., Alhija, A.& Fresko, B. (2010). Socialization of new teachers: Does induction matter? *Teaching and teacher education*. Elsevier. 26 (8), 1592-1597. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.010>
- Ostroff, C., Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1992). Organization socialization as a learning process: The role of information acquisition. *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 849-874.
- Özkan, Y. (2005). *Örgütsel sosyalleşme sürecinin öğretmenlerin örgüte bağlılıklarına etkisi (Ordu ili örneği)*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Poyraz, H. and Titrek, O. (2013). Türkiye'de hayatboyu öğrenmenin geliştirilmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 13(1), 115-131.
- Sacks, A.M. & Asford, B.E. (1997). Organizational socialization: Making sense of the past and present as a prologue for the future. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 234–279. Article No. Vb971614 .
- Sagberg, I. (2016). Newcomer psychologists and organizational socialization: can a content model capture the experience? *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1): 8, 1–13, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.16993/sjwop>.
- Schneider, B. (1983). Interactional psychology and organizational behavior. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 5, 1-31). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Taormina, R. J. (1994), The organizational socialization inventory. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 2(3), 133-145.
- Taormina, R. J. (1997), “Organizational socialization: a multidomain, continuous process model”. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 5(1), 29-47.
- Taormina, R. J. (2004). Convergent validation of two measures of organizational socialization. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15 (1), 76-94.
- Tosten, R., Avcı, Y.E. and Erhan, Ş. (2017). The relations between the organizational happiness and the organizational socialization perceptions of teachers: The sample of physical education and sport. *European Journal of Educational Research*. 7(1), 151-157, <http://www.eu-jer.com/> ISSN: 2165-8714,
- Van Maanen, J. (1976). Breaking in: Socialization to work. In R. Dubin (Ed.), *Handbook of work, organization, and society*. 67–130. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Van Maanen, J. & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B.M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*. 1, 209–264. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Yıldız, K. (2015). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin örgütsel sosyalleşme sürecinde sosyalleştirme stratejilerini kullanma düzeyleri. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 12 (2), 333-355.

Socializational

By: Nurhayat Çelebi

As of: Sep 11, 2019 11:52:56 AM

4,432 words - 25 matches - 9 sources

Similarity Index5%