

ISMC 2022
17th International Strategic Management Conference**ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY ON
ORGANIZATIONAL TIGHTNESS-FLEXIBILITY DILEMMAS OF
ACADEMICIANS**Münevver Çetin (a)*, Gizem Dak (b)
*Corresponding author

(a) Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey, mctin@marmara.edu.tr

(b) Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey, gizemdak@gmail.com

Abstract

In the research, it aims to reveal what are the causes of the behaviors that include organizational tightness- flexibility that academicians experience in educational services, research jobs and community service activities according to their duties and responsibilities, and how they can be prevented. In addition, the aim of the study is to determine the behaviors in which they have a dilemma in the context of organizational tightness- flexibility. The semi-structured interview technique, one of the qualitative research methods, was used in the research. The working group consists of 21 academicians working at state universities located in seven different geographical regions of Turkey. In the analysis of the data, inductive content analysis was used. The concept of organizational scholars firmness oppression, fear, restriction, change closure, vertical hierarchical structure, a phenomenon perceived as bureaucratic and organizational flexibility the concept of autonomy, decision making, initiative, change, and considers the specialization of human relations to be an important phenomenon. The behaviors that academicians perceive as organizational tightness- flexibility are firstly in educational and training services, later on in research jobs, and finally in community service activities. The reasons for the organizational tightness- flexibility behavior of academicians are based on the fact that there is a bureaucratic structure and the personnel recruitment criteria are strict. The fact that universities are autonomous, transparent and accountable also minimizes the dilemmas involving organizational tightness and flexibility. The dilemmas experienced by academicians are to a large extent going beyond the definition of the task.

2357-1330 © 2022 Published by European Publisher.

Keywords: Dilemma, organizational change, organizational tightness-flexibility

1. Introduction

The dilemma is, the two propositions of the syllogism the conclusion of each proposition and located in, dilemma, one of the options of undesirable people, mostly forces you to follow one of two options that discussion, describes the situation as a problem or reasoning (Turkish Language Institution, 2022). The organizational dilemma today is a challenge for every organization, it's all about how to Decouple the discrepancy between individual needs and desires on the one hand and organizational goals on the other. In addition, an organizational dilemma is a concept that is based on needs and defined in different ways in accordance with the personal and social interests of members of the organization and group. Depending on the self-Dec decisions of the members, there may be an organization dilemma between personal interests and organizational well-being or between group interests and organizational well-being (Wagner, 1982). On the other hand, a dilemma is a situation in which an individual has to make a decision and take action, but there is no better decision alternative than the other. Therefore, the dilemma requires reflection and reassessment of the situation in order to make the best decision. A situation with a dilemma often leads to organizational ineffectiveness if the individual is forced to take action. A dilemma also leads to ineffectiveness if the individual finds it easier not to take action when action is needed (Steiner, 1998). In this context, the dilemma is a decision-making situation in which at least one of two things is chosen and the other is abandoned no matter what is chosen. This can affect people and the organizations they are affiliated with.

Although the concept of tightness and flexibility has aroused curiosity in the field of management in recent years, it was first studied from the perspective of anthropology, sociology and psychology disciplines (Üstün & Kılıç, 2017). Especially in this period when change is gaining momentum, studies on its organizational effects have become important. On the other hand, it can be said that the concept of tightness and flexibility is related to all organizational processes in the vertical hierarchy. In organizations where tightness prevails, order, harmony and stability are in question and there is a closed and reactive structure to change. In organizations where flexibility dominates, the expected behaviors of employees are diverse, the December of acceptable behaviors is wide, and organic processes that give employees the opportunity to take initiative prevail in task processes (Gelfand et al., 2006). In addition, as societies develop environmental adaptation strategies, they have turned to tightness and flexibility. The binding of norms, how obvious and widespread the norms are, and the binding of sanctions, that is, to what extent deviations from the norms are tolerated and/or punished, constitute the two main components of tightness -flexibility (Wasti & Fiş, 2010, p. 5).

There is limited information available on how to plan and execute organizational change in an era when change processes are difficult and complex, and the pace of change is more than ever (Burke, 2008). As well as the 21st. It is seen as a skill that is considered necessary for managers and leaders of the century (Beer & Nohria, 2000). Universities, as institutions of higher education, are a complex structure in which quite different ideas coexist and perform a public Dec task (Allen, 2009, p. 1). Proceeding from this importance, universities have to change, they are changing, and they are relatively successful, at least compatible, in meeting different and changing demands in socio-economic environments (Sporn, 1999). On the other hand, there are actions of academicians working in universities consisting of teaching,

research, management and community services (Hattie & Marsh, 2002). At the global level, where change is taking place, it may be possible to make some arrangements in accordance with the needs and cultures of societies.

Although the change experienced by academicians in the context of organizational flexibility and organizational tightness may seem like a struggle, the struggle itself is an internal dilemma in academic organizations. From this point of view, universities represent a combination of two incompatible sets of demands. This dilemma is not a dilemma that can be solved simply. Because the current organizational structure of universities is not designed to adapt to the tension created by the professional and organizational dilemma. Proceeding from this, it should be recognized that the organizational dilemma is not a new concept. Universities are required to do many “right” things in order to adapt to their organizational dilemmas. Therefore, the organizational dilemma requires institutions to strike a better balance between the requirements of professional autonomy and academic freedom on the one hand and the need for greater corporate accountability and effectiveness on the other (Ikenberry, 1972). Therefore, the study of the dilemmas and changes experienced in the context of organizational tightness and flexibility requires careful research. In this study, it is aimed to examine the dilemmas experienced by academicians in the context of organizational tightness and flexibility and how these dilemmas affect organizational change. In addition, it identifies behaviors that include organizational tightness and flexibility, problems that may be caused by these behaviors, and solution suggestions. In order to achieve this goal, the answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What are the perceptions of academicians regarding organizational tightness and flexibility according to their duties and responsibilities?
2. What are the behaviors that academicians perceive regarding organizational tightness and flexibility in educational and training services, research affairs, community service and management activities according to their duties and responsibilities?
3. According to the duties and responsibilities of academicians, what are their perceptions about the causes of behaviors that include organizational tightness and flexibility?
4. According to the duties and responsibilities of academicians, what are their perceptions regarding the solution proposals for behaviors involving organizational tightness and flexibility?
5. According to the duties and responsibilities of academicians, what are the dilemmas they are experiencing?

2. Method

In this study, which is a case/case study type of qualitative research methods, a semi-structured interview technique was used. Qualitative research is a systematic study of the subject under study. In addition, qualitative research is a method that includes rich descriptions within the framework of the inductive process that focuses on meaning and meaning (Merriam, 2009). In qualitative research methods, case study is preferred in this research because it includes social and everyday actions consisting of conscious experiences in people's lives (Schram, 2003). Case study research, the researcher real-life, current-limited system (a case) or multiple delimited within a certain time systems (cases) about multiple information sources (e.g., observations, interviews, audiovisual material, and documents and reports)

through detailed and in-depth information we have collected revealed that a qualitative approach is a description of a situation or status of the themes. The analysis unit in the case study can be more than one case (multi-spatial study) or a single case (single-spatial study) (Creswell, 2013).

2.1. Population and study group

The universe of the research consists of academicians working at state universities in Turkey. The study group consists of 21 academics working at seven different universities located in seven different geographical regions and was taken from this universe with maximum diversity sampling from purposeful sampling types. A total of 21 academicians, including three academicians from each university, were interviewed. The reason for choosing maximum diversity is to gain information about the main phenomenon and to develop many different perspectives in order to understand it (Creswell, 2012). In addition, the selection of the participants included in the study group was carried out in an unbiased and non-selective manner. According to the demographic variables given in Table 1 below, 52% of the academicians in the study are women and 48% are men. 43% of the participants have a professional seniority of 1-10 years; 33% have 11-20 years; 24% have 20 years and over. In addition, the duration of study at the institution where the participants are located is 1-10 years with 57%; 11-20 years with 24%; 20 years with 19%.

Table 1. Demographic Distribution

		f	%
Gender	Male	10	48
	Female	11	52
Professional seniority	1-10 years	9	43
	11-20 years	7	33
	20 years and over	5	24
Duration of work in the institution	1-10 years	12	57
	11-20 years	5	24
	20 years and over	4	19

2.2. Data collection tool

In this study, a semi-structured interview form was used as a data collection tool. The semi-structured interview form is functional in terms of the participant's more specific description of his/her perceived world with his/her own thought (Merriam, 2009). During the preparation and implementation of the form, attention was paid to taking measures to increase internal and external validity. In order to create a high-validity form, a comprehensive field type survey was conducted before preparing the questions contained in the interview form. Interview questions prepared for the purposes of the research, before you start applying, two from the Department of Educational Administration, a total of 3 training programs to faculty members were asked for an expert opinion and necessary corrections were made. Then, a pilot application was conducted with 4 academicians who were not in the working group before the actual interview was started. According to the feedback received after the interview, the necessary corrections have been made. The interview form consists of seven open-ended questions. In the last

section of the form, there are four open-ended questions aimed at determining the personal information of academicians.

2.3. Process

In order to obtain the data, 21 academics working at seven state universities in seven different geographical regions were interviewed. The interviews were conducted by video conferencing by appointment from the academicians and lasted for an average of 30 minutes. The interviews were recorded, these records were written down and sent to the interviewed academicians to check and their approval was obtained. All interviews and coding were conducted by the same researcher. In addition, the coding was also done by a faculty member who is experienced in qualitative research methods. The data obtained in the interview form were first written down. Then they are listed and categorized. Behaviors that are divided into categories are grouped. The frequency degrees of the codes have been revealed. In the answers to the questions, the frequency and percentages of the answers were determined, since there was not much diversity. The strategy of categorizing the data and grouping the main headings has been resorted to. The answers to the questions were deciphered one by one for each participant in turn.

2.4. Validity and Reliability

In order to increase the internal validity of the research, the relevant field types were examined when creating the interview form and the questions were determined by taking into account the conceptual framework. After the interview, the statements of the academicians were written down and sent to the academicians and they were asked to check them. In this way, internal validity was tried to be increased by obtaining the approval of the participants. In addition, the participants' point of view is given in the sentences expressed. In order to increase the external validity of the research, the method of the research, the universe and the working group, the data collection tool, the analysis and interpretation of the data are given in detail. As soon as the data of the study were collected, descriptive analysis was started. To increase the internal reliability of the research, the researcher and a lecturer in qualitative research methods and the consistency ratio was calculated by comparing separate encodings encodings. In order to increase the external reliability of the study, the researcher described in detail what was done in the process.

2.5. Analysis and interpretation of data

The data were analysed by inductive analysis from content analysis types. Inductive analysis is a method that reveals the underlying concepts of data in a Decode way and reveals the relationship between these concepts and (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2006). This research has been analysed in three stages. At the first stage, the researcher encoded the data. The same data were further coded by a faculty member who is an expert in qualitative research methods. Then, the formula “Reliability = Consensus/ Consensus + Difference of opinion * 100” was applied on the encodings made by the researcher and the expert faculty member (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The percentage of concordance between Decoders was calculated as 87%. Since it is considered sufficient to have a compliance percentage of 70% or higher, reliability has

been provided for data analysis. The themes in accordance with the codes determined by the researcher and the expert faculty member in qualitative research methods have been established. In the analysis of the data, each of the interviewed academicians was coded as follows:

A1, A2, A3, ...A21: It refers to the academicians whose opinions are consulted.

3. Findings

All figures and tables should be referred in the text and numbered in the order in which they are mentioned.

3.1. Findings on the Organizational Tightness-Flexibility Perceptions of Academicians

According to the duties and responsibilities of academicians, their perception of organizational tightness- flexibility is considered separately. In this context, the answers to the following questions were sought. Table 2 presents the perceptions of academicians regarding the concept of organizational tightness.

Question 1: What does the concept of organizational tightness mean to you?

Table 2. Findings on the Perception of Organizational Tightness of Academicians

Perception of organizational tightness	f	%
Doing business with pressure and fear	21	100
Restrict	18	86
A structure closed to change	15	71
To make control and supervision continuous	14	67
Having only a vertical hierarchy	13	62
Giving importance to the work done	12	57
Getting things back to routine	10	48
Continuity of rules	10	48
The fact that the norms are fixed	10	48
Showing authoritarian leadership	10	48
Command using authority and title	9	43
Excess of conflicts	9	43
Negative organizational climate	8	38
Continuity of the existing organizational culture	8	38

As can be seen in Table 2, all academics have stated that the concept of organizational tightness is to do business with pressure and fear. 38% of the respondents stated that the continuity of the existing organizational culture should be ensured as organizational tightness. In addition, the opinions of academicians who express their thoughts about the concept of organizational rigor are as follows: "There are places where there are inappropriate controls and inspections on issues such as the concept of overtime, job description" (A1).

"It can represent a closed structure to change, in which the activities that take place throughout the department-faculty or university are carried out in a stable manner. It refers to routine work. An example is that sections are subject to certain rules"(A4).

"We are constantly caught between our own departmental affairs and those that the Decanter has given us. The department and the deanery are in a race for control over the lecturers at this point"(A16).

"I perceive it as pressure on me, as if someone is constantly trying to control what I do, to keep it under control"(A10).

Question 2: What does the concept of organizational flexibility mean to you?

Table 3. Findings on the Perception of Organizational Flexibility of Academicians

Perception of organizational flexibility	f	%
Autonomy	21	100
Letting him decide	21	100
Allowing the use of initiative	20	95
Giving responsibility	19	90
A structure open to change	19	90
Vertical and horizontal decentralization of the hierarchy	17	81
Importance of specialization	16	76
The rules are subject to change	16	76
Demonstrate situational leadership	15	71
Give importance to people	15	71
Caring about communication	14	67
Increase employee motivation	14	67
Caring about organizational commitment	10	48

As can be seen from Table 3, all of the academicians stated their behaviors as autonomy and organizational flexibility to allow decision making. 48% of academicians have found that behaviors that care about organizational commitment create organizational flexibility. In addition, the opinions of academicians who express their thoughts on the concept of organizational flexibility are as follows: "Organizational flexibility expresses openness to change, rules may change. An example is the use of personal initiative by individuals related to the work and transactions to be done" (A9).

"Organizational flexibility, from my point of view, refers to a form of management in which there is no fear. Despite the organizational hierarchy, organizational flexibility can also easily arise if there is ease of transportation and communication between top managers" (A13).

"I think it is a flexible behavior where people can easily do their job, but of course they can organize their work plan on their own without neglecting their duties, increasing the motivation of the employee "(A8).

3.2. Organizational Tightness- Behaviors that Academicians Perceive Related to Flexibility

According to the duties and responsibilities of academicians, their perceptions of organizational tightness and flexibility have been considered separately within the scope of educational and training services, research affairs, and community service activities. As a matter of fact, it should be noted that

universities are evaluated in terms of teaching, research and community service activities (Clark, 1987). In this context, the answers to the following questions were sought. Table 4 presents the behaviors that academicians perceive regarding organizational tightness-flexibility in terms of educational and training services according to their duties and responsibilities.

Question 3: What are the behaviors that you perceive as organizational tightness- flexibility in terms of education and training services?

Table 4. The Organizational Tightness in Terms of Educational and Training Services- Behaviors Related to Flexibility

Educational and training services	f	%
Doing more than the job description	20	95
Flexibility in making assignments according to their areas of expertise	20	95
Flexibility in course delivery	19	90
Flexibility of working hours	18	88
Working outside of working hours as well	17	81
The tightness of efficient, effective and economical use of resources	15	71
Flexibility of time and space in course functioning	14	67
Flexibility in disguise, outfit	12	57
To be comfortable in working conditions	12	57
Strict rules and delays in appointments to academic staff	11	52
Injustice in the distribution of lessons	10	48
Exposure to controls and inspections that are not in accordance with the rules	10	48
Tightness of checks and inspections	9	43
Frequency of in-house reports	9	43
Having a sharp frame of the academic calendar	8	38
Firmness of managers in applications	8	38
Keeping the top management and the bottom management under constant control	7	33
Pressure on social media accounts to share	5	24
The time between the receipt and delivery of the documents is short Dec	5	24
The request for an interview with managers contains excessive protocol rules	4	19
Inability to reach managers	4	19
Frequency and tightness of meetings	4	19
Providing flexibility in course attendance criteria and material usage for special needs and foreign students	3	14

As can be seen from Table 4, 95% of the academicians stated that doing more than the job description and giving tasks according to their areas of expertise as behaviors that involve organizational rigor-flexibility in terms of educational services. 14% of the academicians stated that the course attendance criteria and the provision of flexibility in the use of materials for special needs and foreign students as organizational flexibility behavior. In addition, the opinions of the academicians who express their thoughts on the concept of organizational tightness-flexibility in terms of educational and training services are as follows: *“I don't experience space pressure as long as I do my job in terms of overtime. In*

cases where I need permission, understanding is shown unless things go wrong. I am encouraged to take my study permits as I wish"(A7).

"We are able to be flexible to students who come with student exchange programs. We don't push foreign students too much about lessons and rules, especially. Because that's what's wanted"(A14).

"We constantly attend meetings of public institutions and organizations. Instead, I want to take care of my own affairs. I am constantly sent to meetings on topics that are not in my field of expertise, especially with online meetings on the agenda. Meetings are continuous and hollow. The meeting is unnecessarily protracted" (A15).

Question 4: What are the behaviors that you perceive as organizational tightness- flexibility in terms of research jobs?

Table 5. Organizational Tightness in Terms of Research Work- Behaviors Related to Flexibility

Research affairs	f	%
Failure to support new ideas in research	20	95
An effort to add the names of those who did not have labor in the study	17	81
Forcing high-ranking teachers to write articles	15	71
Teachers who are on the dissertation jury should read the dissertation to teachers with a lower title	14	67
Easy obtaining of permission to go abroad to conduct research	13	62
There are strict procedures for awarding research projects	12	57
Strictness in participation in scientific meetings such as Congresses, Symposiums	11	52
There are strict rules for financing scientific meetings	11	52
Strictness of the rules when obtaining permission from the ethics committee	10	48

As can be seen from Table 5, 95% of the academics expressed the lack of support for their new ideas in their research studies as organizational tightness. 48% of the academicians stated the tightness of the permits obtained from the ethics committee. In addition, the opinions of academicians who express their thoughts on the concept of organizational rigidity-flexibility in terms of research work are as follows:

I read the theses that a teacher should read just because I have a lower title. It's pleasant to read. It adds a lot to me, but it can be annoying when I get back into the routine. Because I also have work and research to do. Limped (A2).

Question 5: What are the behaviors that you perceive as organizational tightness- flexibility in terms of serving the society?

Table 6. Organizational Tightness in Terms of Community Service Activities- Behaviors Related to Flexibility

Community service activities	f	%
Interventions aimed at cooperation with institutions and organizations that are known to be close to some political views in community service practices	14	67
Strict warnings about holding community service events	10	48
Leaving the community flexible about performing service activities	5	24

As can be seen from Table 6, 67% of academicians stated that organizational strictness is the interference with cooperation with institutions and organizations that are known to be close to some political views in their applications of service to society in terms of public service activities. 24% of the academicians emphasized that they were left flexible in terms of holding service events to the society. Also the organizational community service activities in terms of firmness-the opinions of scholars who expressed their thoughts on the concept of flexibility as follows: “while performing community service or political views about working with us due to their proximity to certain institutions, some institutions can be challenging. Araya is able to ask a politically powerful teacher for a Decency. "(A3)

3.3. The Reasons for the Behavior of Academicians, which Include Organizational Tightness and Flexibility

Question 6: What are the reasons for the behaviors that you perceive as organizational tightness-flexibility?

Table 7. Organizational Tightness- the Causes of Behavior Perceived as Flexibility

Organizational tightness- the causes of behavior perceived as flexibility	f	%
The hierarchy has a vertical structure	17	81
Having a bureaucratic structure	15	71
The organizational culture is closed to change	13	62
There are strictures in the criteria for recruiting cadres	12	57

As can be seen from Table 7, 81% of the academicians stated that the vertical structure of the hierarchy caused organizational tightness-flexibility. 57% of academicians also reported that the difficulty of recruiting criteria caused organizational firmness- flexibility. In addition, their opinions expressing the issues that cause organizational tightness and flexibility are as follows:

The fact that there is a vertical hierarchy, the managers who hold senior titles and positions distribute tasks according to the idea of tightness or flexibility shapes this concept. If the structure of the teacher, who is the top manager or in the top hierarchy, is the one who cares about bureaucracy, the department is shaped according to him. If the teacher has a democratic structure, there may be flexibility. (A19)

There are problems with the title change in the academic hierarchical system due to the fact that the title cannot be placed on the staff it deserves in universities. For example, research assistants leave their jobs when their time is up. A doctor's research assistant cannot be directly assigned to the staff of a doctor's teaching assistant. Associate professors cannot continue as professors at the institution. These create tightness as well as reduce the enthusiasm to work. (A12)

3.4. Academicians' Suggestions for Solutions to Behaviors Involving Organizational Tightness and Flexibility

Question 7: What are your solution suggestions for behaviors that you perceive as organizational tightness- flexibility?

Table 8. Suggestions for Solutions for Behaviors Perceived as Organizational Tightness- Flexibility

Suggestions for solutions for behaviors perceived as organizational tightness- flexibility	f	%
The management of the university is autonomous, transparent and accountable	21	100
Tasks should be given with attention to individual characteristics	20	95
Tasks related to the department should be given	20	95
Job descriptions should be clear and unambiguous	19	90
Criteria should be shared transparently	19	90
Flexibility of space should be given during working hours	16	76
Understanding should be shown in excuse-related permissions such as health, family	15	71
Permissions for education should be given easily	15	71
Congresses, symposiums, etc. there should be material and moral incentives for meetings	15	71
Be aware and careful when distributing tasks	15	71
If the distributed tasks are successfully performed, the task change should not be done in a short time	15	71
Time should be given for research work during working hours	14	67
Drudgery should not be the responsibility of research assistants	13	62
A climate should be created in which innovative ideas can be discussed and talked about	12	57
A positive climate should be created in the academy	12	57
Criticism should be made in a calm and ethical manner	11	52
A reliable working environment should be prepared	11	52
Flexible, adaptable applications should be made	11	52
Instead of ordering, things should be given with constructive language	11	52
Behavior that includes rankism should be avoided	10	48
Be aware of the perception that the authorities are temporary	10	48
High-level executive academicians should be able to be reached	9	43
Academicians should be free from ambition and work with perseverance	9	43
Managers should adopt contemporary management approaches	9	43
Managers should take a line away from politics	9	43
Managers should be selected according to merit	7	33
There should be freedom in scientific studies and academic publications	7	33
People-oriented leadership skills should be acquired	7	33
Staff distribution should be done fairly	7	33
The student should not be given the role of evaluating the academician	7	33
Creating an organizational culture that allows diversity	7	33
The ethics committee should stretch the permission rules according to the sections	7	33
The departments should decide the criteria for students to continue the course	4	19

As can be seen from Table 8, 100% of academicians stated that the autonomous, accountable and transparent structure of universities will solve the problems experienced on organizational rigor and flexibility. 19% of academicians he emphasized that determining the necessary criteria for students to be able to continue the course can be a solution to organizational firmness-flexibility. Academicians also firmness organizational flexibility for the behavior of the solution as expressed the following views: “*You should have hours to allow research activities, an environment should be created in which innovative ideas of a researcher can be supported and discussed*” (A18).

"Flexible adaptive practices are needed so that every staff member can work in a positive climate and feel safe" (5).

"In order for the personal work of the teachers to be done, it is necessary to provide flexibility in terms of going to the imposition method" (6).

"Everyone should do their duty and give up rank. I wish the dean's office to come with a humanitarian aspect and understand that it is temporary"(10).

"If the conscientious side of academicians is stronger and they are free from their ambitions, they will be a much better educator and will approach those who work under them much more humanely" (21).

3.5. The Dilemmas That You Experience When Carrying Out the Duties of Academicians

Table 9. The Dilemmas Experienced by Academicians

The dilemmas experienced by academicians	f	%
Going beyond the job description	21	100
Which one is it right to Decouple more time between departmental work and research activities	20	95
Being on one side politically is	20	95
Forced to choose sides in conflicts	20	95
Interventions when distributing tasks	15	71
Working in a majoritarian understanding	14	67
Indecision in attendance due to the fact that meetings are too frequent and not fit for purpose	13	62
Disputes between the dean's office and the department in Decisionmaking	13	62
When doing business, the dean's office and the department provide jobs in different applications	12	57
The dilemma Dec preparing an exam question as a research assistant and improving oneself	10	48
Processing another teacher's lesson	10	48
Preparing a resume by becoming a teacher's assistant	7	33
Doing the personal work of teachers	5	24
Behaviors and discourses that contain a dichotomy between the Decanship and the department	4	19
Dilemmas related to students' course attendance criteria	3	14

As can be seen from Table 9, 100% of the academicians experienced a dilemma involving organizational rigor-flexibility in terms of going beyond the job description. 14% of the academicians had a dilemma about the course attendance criteria of the students by having organizational firmness and

flexibility. Academicians also firmness organizational flexibility regarding to their dilemmas expressed it this way: *"As a lecturer exam questions to prepare yourself while the teacher is expected to improve in the absence of-class assistance if you did manage, as you prepare the teacher's side CV personal affairs being busy with things outside of the area, damaging the task of managing quite taxing. This situation makes me have a dilemma about what I do"* (A20).

"I have a lot of dilemmas between senior Deanship and the department. In our bilateral conversations, the department expresses the opposite when we say that the top management is next to us first" (A17).

I do personal work that I don't like because I'm at the bottom of the title hierarchy, even though I don't have a job. I know I shouldn't, but I don't want my comfort to be disturbed" (A11).

4. Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestion

Within the framework of the first finding of the research, organizational tightness is a structure that is closed to change with pressure, fear and restriction, based on orders, where control and controls are continuous in a vertical hierarchy. Organizational flexibility, on the other hand, is a structure that is authorized to make decisions and take initiatives within autonomy, is not completely centralized in a vertical or horizontal hierarchy, is open to change, rules are not sharply framed, and pays attention to human relations as well as the performance of work. These findings are parallel to the researchers conducted in the literature in this respect (Christensen, 2010; Maassen et al., 2017; Ordorika, 2003). In addition, it is perceived October organizational flexibility to make assignments according to their areas of expertise. In the study of Levander et al. (2019), recruitment, distribution and sharing of tasks within the framework of administrative competencies can give weight to different values within the framework of the job description. This situation provides organizational flexibility as well as effective management of human resources.

According to the second finding of the study, the behaviors of academicians who remain in the organizational firmness-flexibility dilemma are most commonly listed as educational and training services, followed by research jobs and community service activities. As a matter of fact, it is thought that autonomy in the field of education and training will contribute to the development of the Turkish Higher Education System (Akyol et al., 2018). In their research, Mussalin and Paradeise (2009) revealed that autonomy and flexibility in universities should be turned into law in order to prevent unrest among the government, students and academicians. Thus, the reforms carried out in higher education promote decentralization, avoiding the rigidity of bureaucratic management, and encourage academicians to make decisions, share responsibilities, and use initiative. From this point of view, the study shows a similarity in the direction of eliminating the dilemmas experienced by academicians in terms of organizational rigidity- flexibility.

According to the third finding of the study, the reasons for the organizational firmness-flexibility behavior of academicians are that there is a bureaucratic structure and the criteria for recruiting staff are strict. The presence of a bureaucratic structure leads to the formation of a chain of command. The fact that the recruitment criteria are also strict causes a number of behaviors that include organizational strictness. Similar to these findings, in the research of Vellamo et al. (2022), bureaucratization of

personnel recruitment, financial decisions and authority in Finland brought about organizational tightness. From this point of view, it is similar to the findings of this study and the bureaucratic structure leads to organizational rigidity and low motivation.

The fourth finding of the study is that universities should be autonomous, transparent and accountable, and this is an attempt to minimize the dilemmas involving organizational rigor and flexibility. From this point of view, the studies conducted in the literature support the finding (Metz, 2010; Tierney & Sabharwal, 2016; Wang, 2010).

As the fifth finding of the study, the dilemmas experienced by academicians are largely outside the task definition. This dilemma increases the workload of the academician and may also cause him to work overtime. In addition, going beyond the job description leads to the fact that many jobs that are considered “unnecessary” are also performed. Thus, the time period during which the academician will conduct research will be shortened. An academician is prevented from his goals by not doing the work he is supposed to do.

Every day, the importance of the rapid development of technology, the internationalization of education and training activities, have the property of knowledge that can be developed to the needs of academicians in higher education institutions within the framework of change has become inevitable. In this context, organizational change and organizational flexibility are phenomena that are intertwined or have common characteristics. In parallel, it is possible for organizational change to take place with the flexibility of the structure of the organization. In order to meet the changing expectations of society and to ensure that it is in competition with other organizations, it does not seem possible for organizations to remain in an unchanging structure (Aykurt, 2019).

The dilemmas experienced by academicians in the context of organizational tightness-flexibility reveal the need to review the information network of other universities in the world in the order in which it is managed. Because while there is autonomy in organizations where flexibility prevails, there is pressure, fear, and a decrease in productivity in organizations where tightness prevails. However, higher education institutions are institutions that produce science on a global scale, show the way and drag society along. From this point of view, the change of rules and practices in higher education, which include organizational tightness and flexibility, is important in terms of autonomy, accountability and transparency.

In this study, the perceptions of academicians about organizational tightness-flexibility behaviors, what behaviors are, what they are caused by, how they can be resolved and the organizational tightness - flexibility dilemmas they experience were tried to determine the context of this research. In the following studies, it may be suggested to conduct research aimed at reflecting the perceptions of academicians about organizational tightness -flexibility on the institution. In addition, research can be conducted on the dilemmas experienced only by senior management or only by students.

References

- Akyol, B., Yılmaz, K., Çavuş, B., & Aksoy, V. (2018). According to the Opinions of Academicians, The Questions Of Higher Education in Turkey, *Turkey Studies Educational Sciences*, 13(11), 111-131. <http://doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.13232>
- Allen, D. K. (2009). Re-Engineering Change in Higher Education. *Department of Information Studies*, 2(2), 1-30. <http://informationr.net/ir/4-3/paper56.html>
- Aykurt, S. B. (2019). Organizational Flexibility and Management. In H. Arslan (Ed.) *Management of Higher Education* (pp. 221-240). Anı Inc.
- Beer, M., & Nohria, N. (2000). *Breaking the Rules of Change*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Burke, W. W. (2008). *Organizational Change: Theory and Practice*. Sage Publications Inc.
- Christensen, T. (2010). University Governance Reforms: Potential Problems of Greater Autonomy? *Higher Education*, 62, 503-517. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-010-9401-z>
- Clark, B. R. (1987). *Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary and Institutional Settings*. University Of California Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th Ed.). Pearson Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Approaches*, (4. Pressing.). SAGE Publications.
- Gelfand, M. J., Nishii, L. H., & Raver, J. L. (2006). On the Nature and Significance of Cultural Firmness and Looseness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1225-1244. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1225>
- Hattie, J., & Marsh, H. (2002). The Relation Between Research Productivity and Teaching Effectiveness. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(5). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2002.11777170>
- Ikenberry, P. O. (1972). The Organizational Dilemma. *Journal of Higher Education*, 43(1), 23- 34. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1980778>
- Levander, P., Forsberg, E., & Elmgren, M. (2019). The Meaning of Educational Qualification in Academic Recruitment: A Blind Spot in the Blackbox. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 25(5), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1576605>
- Maassen, P., Gornitzka, A., & Fumasoli, T. (2017). University Reform and Institutional Autonomy: A Framework for Analyzing Living Autonomy. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 71(3), 239-250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12129>
- Merriam, P. B. (2009). *Qualitative Research Design and Application Guide* (2nd ed.). Jossey Bass.
- Metz, T. (2010). The Dilemma of Academic Freedom and Public Accountancy in Higher Education. *Journal of Educational Philosophy*, 44(4), 529-549. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.2010.00776.x>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. A. (1994). *An Expanded Sourcebook Qualitative Data Analysis*. Sage Pub.
- Mussalin, C., & Paradeise, C. (2009). France: From Incremental Transitions to Institutional Change. C. Paradeise, e. Reale, I. Bleiklie, & E. Ferlie (Ed.), *Within the University Administration* (p. 21-51). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9515-3_2
- Ordorika, I. (2003). The Limits of University Autonomy: Power and Politics at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. *Higher Education*, 46, 361-388. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025382504110>
- Schram, T. H (2003). *Conceptualization of Qualitative Research*. Merrill Prentice is Full.
- Sporn, B. (1999) *Adaptive University Structures: An Analysis of Adaptation to the Socioeconomic Environments of US and European Universities*. Kingsley.
- Steiner, L. (1998). Organizational Dilemmas as Obstacles to Learning. *Organization of Learning*, 5(4), 193-201. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09696479810228577>
- Tierney, W. G., & Sabharwal, N. S. (2016). Academic freedom in the World's Largest Democracy. *International Higher Education*, 86, 15-16. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2016.86.9366>
- Turkish Language Institution (2022). *Current Turkish Dictionary of the Turkish Language Institution*. Retrieved on March 21, 2022 from <https://sozluk.gov.tr/>

- Üstün, F., & Kılıç, K. C., (2017). Examination of Tightness-Flexibility Culture Dimension According to Management and Structural Diversity: A Study on Turkey's Leading Industrial Enterprises, *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 16(4), 963-979. <https://doi.org/10.21547/jss.307228>
- Vellamo, T. M., Kosonen, I., Siekkinen, T., & Pekkola, E. (2022). Bureaucratic, Professional and Managerial Power Hires Follow During the University Tenure. *Peer Review at the Age of Evaluation*, 371-402. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-75263-7_16
- Wagner, J. A. (1982). The Organizational Dilemma: Individualism, Collectivism and the Control of Organization. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign]. Illinois Library.
- Wang, T. (2010). Governance of Higher Education and University Autonomy in China. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, 8(4), 477-495. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2010.537942>
- Wasti, P. A., & Fiş, A. M. (2010). The Effect of Firmness-Flexibility Dimension and Corporate Participation on Sample Culture. *Journal of Management Research*, 10, 11-32. http://yad.baskent.edu.tr/files/2010_cilt_10_2.pdf
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek H. (2006). *Qualitative Research Methods in Social Sciences*. Seçkin Publishing Industry and Trade Joint Stock Company.