

## EKLER

### Katılımcılara yöneltilen sorular: (Derinlemesine Mülakat – Açık Uçlu)

1-) Türkiye’de bankacılık sektörünün yenilikçilik konusundaki genel durumunu nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz? Organizasyonlar açısından geleceğe yönelik olarak yapılması gerekenleri belirtiniz.

2-) Türkiye bankacılık sektöründe yer alan kuruluşları göz önüne aldığımızda, organizasyonların yenilikçilik düzeyini gösteren göstergeler sizce neler olabilir?

3-) Organizasyonel yapıyı meydana getiren unsurları göz önüne aldığımızda, Türkiye bankacılık sektörü için, bu unsurlardan hangileri kurumun yenilikçiliği üzerinde en fazla etkiye sahip olabilir? Bu etkiyi açıklayabilir misiniz?

### Katılımcılara yöneltilen sorular: (Pilot Çalışma – Yarı Yapılandırılmış)

1-) Türkiye’de bankacılık sektörünün yenilikçilik konusundaki genel durumunu nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz? Örgütler açısından geleceğe yönelik yapılması gerekenleri belirtiniz.

2-) Örgüt yapısını belirleyen durumsal faktörler olarak “Yaş ve Büyüklük, Teknik Sistem, Çevre, Güç” tanımlanmaktadır. Türkiye bankacılık sektöründe yer alan kuruluşları göz önüne aldığımızda, bu faktörlerin örgütlerin yenilikçilik özelliklerini olan etkisini değerlendirebilir misiniz?

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Yaş ve Büyüklük | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek |
|                 | Açıklama:                                    |
| Teknik Sistem   | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek |
|                 | Açıklama:                                    |
| Çevre           | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek |
|                 | Açıklama:                                    |
| Güç             | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek |
|                 | Açıklama:                                    |

3-) Örgütün yapısını belirleyen tasarım faktörleri olarak “İş Uzmanlaşması, Davranış Uzmanlaşması, Eğitim & doktrinleme, Birimlerin gruplanması, Birim büyüklüğü, Planlama & kontrol, İlişki düzenlemeleri, Dikey & yatay ademi merkezîyetçilik” tanımlanmaktadır. Türkiye bankacılık sektöründe yer alan kuruluşları göz önüne aldığımızda, bu faktörlerin örgütlerin yenilikçilik özelliklerini olan etkisini değerlendirebilir misiniz?

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| İş Uzmanlaşması       | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek |
|                       | Açıklama:                                    |
| Davranış Uzmanlaşması | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek |
|                       | Açıklama:                                    |
| Eğitim & doktrinleme  | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek |
|                       | Açıklama:                                    |

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Birimlerin gruplanması              | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek<br>Açıklama: |
| Birim büyüklüğü                     | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek<br>Açıklama: |
| Planlama & kontrol                  | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek<br>Açıklama: |
| İlişki düzenlemeleri                | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek<br>Açıklama: |
| Dikey & yatay ademi merkezîyetçilik | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek<br>Açıklama: |

4-) Örgütlerin yenilikçilik düzeyini gösteren temel göstergeler “devreye alınan yeni teknolojik ve örgütsel araç/süreçler, yenilikçilik çalışmalarına ayrılan bütçe ve kaynaklar, yenilikçi ürün/hizmetlerin portföydeki oranı, sahip olunan patent & telifler, yeni ürün/hizmetlerin sunum hızı” olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Türkiye bankacılık sektöründe yer alan kuruluşları göz önüne aldığımızda, belirtilen göstergelerin örgütlerin yenilikçilik özelliklerini hangi düzeyde gösterdiğini değerlendirebilir misiniz? Sizce diğer göstergeler neler olabilir?

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Devreye alınan yeni teknolojik ve örgütsel araç/süreçler | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek<br>Açıklama: |
| Yenilikçilik çalışmalarına ayrılan bütçe ve kaynaklar    | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek<br>Açıklama: |
| Yenilikçi ürün/hizmetlerin portföydeki oranı             | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek<br>Açıklama: |
| Sahip olunan patent & telifler                           | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek<br>Açıklama: |
| Yeni ürün/hizmetlerin sunum hızı                         | Etkisiz / Düşük / Orta / Yüksek / Çok Yüksek<br>Açıklama: |

#### Katılımcıların Demografik Özellikleri:

| Katılımcı | Yaş | Cinsiyet | Görev                              | Kamu / Özel Sektör |
|-----------|-----|----------|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| K1        | 54  | Erkek    | Üst düzey yönetici / direktör      | Özel               |
| K2        | 44  | Kadın    | Müdür                              | Özel               |
| K3        | 57  | Erkek    | Üst düzey yönetici / direktör      | Özel               |
| K4        | 49  | Erkek    | Üst düzey yönetici / direktör      | Özel               |
| K5        | 54  | Erkek    | Akademisyen                        | Kamu               |
| K6        | 52  | Erkek    | Akademisyen                        | Özel               |
| K7        | 44  | Erkek    | Müdür                              | Özel               |
| K8        | 37  | Kadın    | Akademisyen                        | Özel               |
| K9        | 49  | Erkek    | Üst düzey yönetici / Daire Başkanı | Kamu               |

|     |    |       |                                    |      |
|-----|----|-------|------------------------------------|------|
| K10 | 56 | Kadın | Üst düzey yönetici / Daire Başkanı | Kamu |
| K11 | 58 | Erkek | Üst düzey yönetici / Daire Başkanı | Kamu |
| K12 | 48 | Erkek | Genel müdür                        | Özel |
| K13 | 46 | Erkek | Müdür                              | Özel |
| K14 | 64 | Erkek | Üst düzey yönetici / direktör      | Özel |
| K15 | 57 | Erkek | Müdür                              | Özel |
| K16 | 49 | Kadın | Üst düzey yönetici / Daire Başkanı | Kamu |
| K17 | 52 | Erkek | Müdür                              | Kamu |
| K18 | 54 | Kadın | Müdür                              | Kamu |

## IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES ON INNOVATION: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY IN TURKISH BANKING SECTOR

Beytullah MISIRLI\*   
Murat KASIMOĞLU\*\* 

The effects of the structural features of organizations on the innovation have been the subject of many valuable studies. In these studies, the effect of structural features on the organization's innovativeness is examined independently from other conditions (King & Anderson, 1995; Schilling, 2006; Tidd, Bessant & Pavitt, 1997; Gong, Kim, Lee & Zhu, 2013; Felin & Powell 2016). It is important to design the model that is studied in multiple dimensions in order to obtain the data necessary for a more accurate examination of the compound and complex effects of structural variables on the innovators of organizations (Damanpour, 1991; Budde, Alkemade, & Weber, 2012). For this purpose, in the study, by considering the situational and design features of the organizational structure, we analyzed the effects of the organization on innovation as a result of the interactions of these elements with each other in multiple dimensions.

It was understood from the preliminary studies that rich data sets from various sources would be needed in order to examine the complex relationship among the variables. Therefore, a qualitative approach was preferred in this research considering that a data of this nature cannot be analyzed sufficiently in depth using only quantitative methods. Meetings, observations, and document analysis were conducted on the institutions involved in Turkey's banking sector within the scope of research, (the Banks Association of Turkey, 2017). In order to investigate, define and explain the relations in the most clear and detailed way possible, "method diversification" was used (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2005). The data obtained from the interviews were compared with the data obtained from the observations and document reviews without being limited to the examination of the answers given only to the

---

\* Istanbul Commerce University, Business Management Department

\*\* Istanbul Commerce University, Business Management Department

interview questions. The data obtained during the pilot interviews with the participants and the in-depth interviews conducted afterwards were compared and combined with the observation notes received during the interviews. The combined raw data was examined in terms of both descriptive and content analysis in accordance with the method proposed by Wolcott (1994) in data analysis. By staying as faithful to the verbal answers given to the interview questions as possible, the statements of the interviewees were mostly transferred to the study with direct quotations. During the descriptive analysis, all the words, definitions and expressions that constitute the conceptual structure of the research were examined by taking into consideration both the real, metaphorical, and common uses in the spoken language. The expressions in the raw data of the research gathered were removed from unnecessary repetitions, the expressions showing the unfinished thoughts were completed and included in the research to reflect the purpose of the interviewer correctly.

Firstly, using the structural dimension group determined in the conceptual structure part of the research, a total of 19 codes (node) were defined as “code” and “subcode” on the code system on the data analysis application, in line with the preliminary results obtained from the pilot study. After the coding process of the data was completed, the results obtained using the relationship model and the “reference density” based on the nodes were analyzed using the discourse analysis technique. In the analyses, a total of 437 references were found within 4 code groups and on a total of 30 codes. Based on these results, the conceptual framework of the research was also revised according to the determined codes and references.

According to the reference density and the relation between the codes, it is understood that Environment (36/108), Competition (25/108) and Technical System (12/108) are prominent among the situational factors and Size (5/108) and Age (5/108) factors have a very low impact on innovation. According to these results, the relations with the ecosystem in which the organization is located and interacts continuously affect its innovation at the highest level. Similarly, the high score of the competition issue emerges as supporting and supplementing relations with the ecosystem. The fact that the effects of situational factors such as size and age appear at a very low level is a remarkable result, as it is incompatible with some of the conceptual studies and field studies. In terms of the comparative effects of structural factors with innovative features; Internal Access and Cooperation (20/115), Vertical / Horizontal Decentralization (18/115), and Relationship Regulations (18/115) have high impact, while Specialization (9/115), Grouping of Units (5/115) and Unit Size (2 / 115) have relatively low impact. Planning / Control (16/115), Doctrine (14/115) and Formalization (13/115) factors are structural factors that affect innovation at a moderate level.

Among the evaluations made within the dimensions of innovation, we see that the highest reference density is the Corporate Culture & Senior Management Support (30/182), Budget and Resources (29/182) and Technological / Organizational Tools and Processes (29/182) factors. According to this, the institutions that develop the innovative corporate culture by providing top management support in a way that makes them feel encouraged and self-confidence and provide the necessary budget and resources, and technological tools and processes to the use of the organization

are considered innovative. On the other hand, it is understood that New Product Release Speed (7/182) and Owned Patents and Copyrights (10/182) factors have the lowest reference density among the innovations.

The results of the research also include the “vision of innovation and strategies for innovation” of the organization. They also show that the organization is significantly affected by intra-organizational collaboration, which allows different teams in different departments to work together by combining the various expertise they have, especially in the “planning and control” approach. Similarly, the training and doctrine studies that spread the institutional common knowledge, experience and formation throughout the organization, and the relationship arrangements that regulate the conditions and rules of use of information are also significant on innovation.

Within the scope of the discourse analysis, the language features and pronoun emphases used by the interviewers to answer the questions were found remarkable. Based on this approach, the new dimension group “Action Focus”, which was not foreseen in the initial phase of the analysis, was also included in the study as the fourth-dimension group. It was evaluated that these preferences of expression may reflect opinions and thoughts about the work, task responsibilities, organizational level that come with this approach.

In addition, the organizational structure factors examined within the scope of the research, defined as the “innovation ecosystem model” as a distribution to factor groups according to their reference density and weight scores. According to this model, the combined effect of the structural elements of the organization on innovation competences “Environment, intellectual capital, tools and processes” is a function of the elements. An independent research focusing on the idea of that model would also make important contributions to the literature.

With this research, a valuable contribution was made to the literature on innovation and organizational structures, and thanks to the results based on the current data from the field, a significant contribution was also made to the accumulation of knowledge in the sectoral context. Regarding innovation, the results of the research can also be evaluated within the scope of reorganization, benchmarking and assessment studies conducted both on a sectoral and firm basis.