

# Views of the Teachers of Social Studies and Administrators Relating Impediments of Organizational Learning

Özlem Bektaş Öztaşkin

Refahiye Vocational School, Erzincan University,  
Erzincan, Turkey

Rıdvan Küçükali

Faculty of Literature, Atatürk University,  
Erzurum, Turkey

Schools are the significant places where new information and skills are obtained and practised. There are some problems in the social and educational development of organizational activities learned at schools. Change, share and distribution of knowledge, transfer of knowledge to students, fruitful and effective use of organizational aims, production of organizational intelligence and organizational knowledge, socialization, management, information management strategies, school culture, understanding of systemic thinking, school climate, team work, democratic environment, communication, motivation, performance activities, politics, curriculum, professional development and economic sources are factors of organizational learning in school functions. The objective of this study is to determine the views of teachers of social studies and administrators relating impediments of organizational learning. This research employs a descriptive research method as the survey model. Required data were gathered through a questionnaire and the results were assessed through descriptive statistics method. The population of the study is composed of the teachers working at the primary schools of the Ministry of National Education. The study was conducted with 100 randomly-selected teachers teaching the social studies lessons in the 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th grades at 10 schools in Erzurum, Turkey. The research utilises a questionnaire as a means of data acquisition, which intends to identify organisational learning impediments of the social studies teachers. The statistical analysis of the quantitative data gathered by the research is conducted on computer by SPSS (Statistical Program for Social Sciences) 15.0. It was observed that many factors affect organizational learning skills. The following questions were answered in relation with this issue: (1) What is the present situation of social studies teachers in school teams in terms of their participation in tasks for the innovation and change? (2) What is role of social studies teachers and administrators in peer observation and sharing of professional ideas as a part of school life? (3) What are the organizational impediments according to social studies teachers and administrators? According to social studies teachers, there are differences within both educational and organizational experience sharing with respect to planning, collaboration, knowledge sharing, team work, professional development and communication structure. Therefore, institutional and educational politics should be developed in order to maintain general organizational skills of schools and eliminate dissatisfaction.

*Keywords:* organizational learning, impediments, social studies

## Introduction

Organizational learning is defined as “an organizational process including both conscious and unconscious elements, information acquisition, accessing information and affecting organizational action, realizing by evaluating the information” (Kalkan, 2006, p. 403); learning organization “is a system teaching itself by learning the changes around its environment, developing and learning, knowing to induce lesson from every event, developing the competence of solving problems so by adopting innovations advancing and institutionalizing all those functions” (Öneren, 2008), and “in which all the members are encouraged to learn, machineries are formed for them to acquire information and competence, and which will contribute to the continuation of the organization by using information and competence by using it for productivity” (Sayılır, 2003, p. 1). As it will be understood from these definitions as well as direct experience, it is obtained from others or organizational memory. For this reason, it becomes more important for vision sharing and common view points (İbicioğlu & Avcı, 2005).

Thought of change, which is based on the essentiality of loyalty to learn and teach, forms the philosophy of organizational learning (Celep, 2004). Changes in learning organizations, unexpected surprises and mistakes are seen as chances for learning, focused on managerial quality and development consciousness (Çalık, 2010). Reasons which force the organizations to changes can be generally ordered as “environmental forces, lack of communication in the organization, organizational crisis and conflicts, low performance in organization, changes in organizations culture, changing laws and regulations, technological developments” (Töremen, 2002). For this reason, organizations should use this as an advantage by following change closely.

Learner organization employees are people who have capacity for active learning, are successful and creative, and spend time to strengthen their capabilities (Kale, 2010). Effectiveness of organizations is bound to quality and quantity of the human sources. However, beyond their formal responsibilities need, it is important for employees to show altruism by helping other employees or trying more than their responsibility needs (Sezgin, 2005). We can order some needing elements for the success of the organization.

### Organizational Loyalty

Organizations’ employees feel psychologically belong to organization, internal objectives and values, and begin to acquire some information about their profession to form a creation, “Organizational loyalty is affected by a lot of variants such as organizational justice, organizational trust, participation in decision process, to be known in organization, alienating to organization, promotion possibilities, some rights except for salary” (Izgar, 2008).

### Organizational Socialization

Socialization can be evaluated for organizations as vocational and organizational. Socializing is the most important factor affecting organizational success in employees’ orientation to organization and behaving according to values, norms and frugalities. Organizational interaction and organizations’ value systems facilitate understanding the organizations’ function and desired behavior molds. Organizational socialization affects the degree of effectiveness, pace, loyalty, sacrifice, productivity and revenue directly (Kartal, 2006).

In terms of educational institutions, socialization, especially for new teachers, facilitates solving problems faced during teaching, acquiring norms and frugalities related to profession and realizing school philosophy and mission (Kartal, 2006). Teachers’ socialization by learning occupational values and norms actualizes with occupational services mostly in pre-service period. Organizational socialization is not only limited to educational programs, but also be consisted of programs including interactional activities, such as meeting of organizations members, participating meetings and extending consultation services (Memduhoğlu, 2008).

**Facilitator Led**

According to Töremen and Karakuş, expectations about leadership and understanding of the changing world put human to center and try to answer its concerns and needs. Facilitator led has roles, such as “developing harmony and collaboration, creating a common vision, accepting the role of change agent in organization, supporting development and cultivation of personnel, supplying source and planning, facilitating learning, building moral in organization, managing organization with values, strengthening teachers and controlling the process” (Töremen & Karakuş, 2008, p. 9).

**Team Work**

In learner organizations, team work has a greater intelligence potentiality than individual intelligence. Naturally, team work is essential for schools as educational organizations. Reaching objectives determined by educational organizations are enabled by employees to feel organizations objectives as their own objectives and work according to them, cooperating and realizing organizations successes in team work spirit. However, “Total quality understanding tried to be embedded in our schools result from need of developing team spirit and work” (Demirtaş, 2005, p. 42).

**Organizational Trust**

Organizational trust needs individual to have positive expectations for politics and practices which will affect the organization itself and he/she should be supported by the organization. Individuals’ perception changes according to the support by the organization. Organization members believe that leaders are trustful and honest people. There are five basic criteria for building trust in schools: benevolence, trustfulness, capability, honesty and clearance (Yılmaz, 2010). Organizational trust needs its members to be loyal to each other. And this is effective in increasing productivity, cooperation, change and transformation (Arslan, 2009).

**Synergism**

Team works should have features which disclose synergism. In this context, we can count synergisms basic dynamics as “mutual understanding and agreement, open communication, mutual trust, mutual support effective management of individual differences, teams selective use and leadership”. Supplying a productive working field and creating a secure working place by school leaders is a must for a synergic school culture. It can be said that employees can express their thoughts freely in the transparent places where they felt close friendship and comfort. This situation encourages new objectives and projects by enabling employees to put forward their thoughts and to express their doubts (Töremen, 2010).

**Organizational Culture**

Organizational culture consisting framework of cultural structures enables needed basis for realization of organizational learning. Basically, organization culture is accepted as personality of organization as well (Güçlü, 2010). Organizational culture which is focused on equal and just treatment to employees should be applicable to outer conditions changing in rational conditions (Murat & Açıkgöz, 2007). Compatibility to outer conditions makes inner compatibility a necessity, “Degree and strength of inner compatibility, length of groups consistency and groups existence period, intensity of groups learning experience, positive support of mechanism in which learning takes place are a function of groups founders or leaders estimates” strength and clearance (Schein, 2002, p. 7). Negative standards or values, hostilely relations and pessimist stories are the functions weakening school culture (Çelikten, 2003).

### **Organizational Climate**

Inner features, which give organization its identity and which are dominant in organization by combining in organizational climate, consist the individual personality of the school. Organizational climate is evaluated in two terms: open climate and close climate. It is the kind of climate in which organizations' leader brings employees bound to him/her and remains them under his/her control and examination continually. This kind of climate does not give desired results all the time. Usually, open climates are taken into consideration. Open climate in the organization enables such an organizational situation in which organization members have an advanced feeling of cooperation that creates sincere relationship between members. Work satisfaction of employees is low or high according to open or close situation (Güçlü, 2010). School climate affects school members' thoughts and behaviors, common behavior perception of administrators, teachers and students, and these features give organization another identity (Özdemir, 2002).

### **Continuing Education**

Continual learning people consist the developmental aspects of the organizations. By combining dynamic and strength strategies with continual learning, organizations update becomes more important. At the same time, individuals perceiving and applying in the organization enable them to go beyond their current situation by identifying their capabilities and performances with contemporary needs. In the continual learning scope, learning society includes concepts such as productivity, social change, developing the organization, learning webs, educated society, citizenship and dharma (Duman, 2003). In this frame, organizations should endeavor to gain functions, such as technology, globalization, competition, change and pace (Töremen, 2002).

### **Organizations Health**

Organizations health shows schools' psycho-social condition. We can count psycho-social tools enabling motivation for employees as following: independence at work, social participation, value and statue, development and success, adaption to environment, proposal system and psychological guarantees (Sabuncuoğlu & Tüz, 2001). In short, a healthy educational institution "is an institution whose technical, managerial and associational levels are brought in an ordered whole, which supplies meaning and tool needs successfully, tackle with outer demolishing factors and directing its energy to its mission" (Altun, 2001, p. 32).

### **Organizational Communication**

Communication is a vital element for the organization. Communication between inferiors and superiors as dialogs, realization of desire for sending views and thought in a good atmosphere encourage employees to be more effective and productive. Factors preventing communication in organization are classified as: cultural differences, deficient feedback, statue differences, lacking of attention and interest, too much information load, problems deriving from electronic communication, physical conditions, organizational mistakes and individual differences (Bakan & Büyükbeşe, 2004).

### **Activities for Schools as Learner Organizations**

There are some activities that must be done in schools as learner organizations to realize an effective learning.

**In-service training activities.** In-service training is a learning process in the axis of objective-need of organizations, as well as supplying appropriate grounds for career expectations of administrators and teachers. Individual and occupational development information and competence are supported by real life activities (Eren, Özen, & Karabacak, 2007).

**Class teachers meeting.** In order to plan and execute education and teaching studies more deeply and

flexibly, class teachers meetings are an important tool to develop learning organizations, especially to increase students academic success, to discuss problems faced in teaching, to identify effective learning ways and techniques, to increase cooperation between teachers and parents, to encourage students to study with their teachers and to supply important contributions to organizations' developments by creating opportunities (Küçük, Ayvaci, & Altuntaş, 2004).

**General teachers meeting.** In teachers meeting, education and teaching studies are planned and evaluated, and points that are thought to contribute schools development are discussed to wit schools administrators and teachers. Well organized meetings increase productivity, and form options for solving educational problems. Meetings facilitate school management by enabling teachers' participation and strengthening democracy at school (Demirtaş, Üstüner, Özer, & Cömert, 2008). Taking care of teachers' views leads productivity of organization by increasing teachers' motivation.

**Inspection, checking and guidance activities.** Educational checking comprises of identifying situation, evaluation, correction and development elements and a tool preparing appropriate environment for realization of organizations objectives. Evaluation of outputs with inspection concept need identifying realization degree and planning in this direction (Gökçe, 1994).

**Parent teacher association and protection of school association meetings.** These meetings include a lot of gains, such as following teachers' and parents' desires and complains in the context of facts and events about school and education (Akbaşı & Kavak, 2010), informing parents about all the educational and social facilities, letting them participate in deciding process, and contributing to development of educational institutions (Aslanargun, 2010).

### **Problem**

Schools should have the features of "learning organizations" in order to continue their existence, lead other organizations and apply learning organization philosophy (Şimşek & Yıldırım, 2004). But in Turkey, in context of learning organization, although organizational change and learning studies are found in schools as learning organizations and features of these schools' OLI (organizational learning impediments), it is seen that organizational change studies are limited (Gizir, 2008). It is thought that identifying problems in organizational learning will enable abolishing impediments in transition from "teaching school" to "learning school" by examining strong and weak dimensions of schools administrators and social studies teachers from the point of organizational learning.

### **Purpose**

The objective of this survey is to determine thoughts of social studies teachers by noticing factors about OLI. In the survey, answers are searched for the following questions:

- (1) What are the impediments of administrators and social studies teachers in dealing with barriers of organizational learning in dimension of development and change within schools as learning organizations?
- (2) What is the role of administrators and social studies teachers in sharing occupational ideas as a part of school life?
- (3) What are the roles of administrators and social studies teachers in realizing common objectives of school?

### **Methodology**

In this research, survey in depictional research method is used. After organizational learning literature is

scanned, theoretical structure of research is founded. Needed data are formed and collected with the help of poll. Research questions are given to 2009-2010 period school management and want them to deliver to social studies teachers. Completed polls are collected. Results are evaluated by using depictional statical methods.

### **Sampling**

Sample of research is consisted of 10 schools chosen randomly from Erzurum in 2009-2010 educational year. And research datum is consisted of 20 administrators, 80 teachers from those schools. This poll developed in order to obtain research data is delivered to 150 administrators and teachers and 125 polls are taken back, and 100 of them are evaluated.

### **Collecting and Analyzing the Data**

In order to develop data, collecting tool literature is scanned. Based on the obtained information, pool is developed for research. In part I, there are 40 items comprising of seven parts: (1) continuous learning 5 items; (2) dialogue and inquiry 5 items; (3) group learning 5 items; (4) shared systems 5 items; (5) strengthened employees 5 items; (6) connection between systems 5 items; and (7) supportive leadership and shared vision consisted of 10 items. In analysis of data, Likert type 5-degree scale is used, as points of answers given by administrators and teachers are: “completely disagree” (1), “disagree” (2); “indecisive” (3); “agree” (4); and “completely agree” (5). In analysis of data, frekans (f), percent (%), arithmetic mean ( $\bar{x}$ ) and standard deviation (sd) values are used, and points obtained from results and gender, relationship between administrators and teachers are analyzed with independent samples t-test. In analysis,  $p < 0.05$  and  $p < 0.01$  meaning levels are used. In evaluating the data, SPSS package program is used.

In this research, “Dimensions of the Learning Organization Questionnaire Scale”, which is developed by Karen E. Watkins and Victoria J. Marsick and designed by Harun Şeşen and Cem Harun Meydan (2010), “Learning Organizations Personal Practices Profile (2010)” scale developed by O’Brain and adapted by Chris Townsend and “Analysis of School Administrators Perception Related to Organization” scale developed by Nezahat Güçlü and Hakan Türkoğlu (2003) are used.

The reliability of the test is found to be  $\alpha = 0.90$ . As in this poll, Cronbach  $\alpha$  value is  $0.60 \geq$  it is secure.

## **Results and Discussion**

According to the findings obtained in this part, views of administrators and social studies teachers are interpreted with the help of tables.

### **Individual Information**

(1) Fifteen percent of administrators are females and 85% are males, 38.8% of teachers are females and 61.2% are males. 36.7% of social studies teachers are females and 63.3% are males;

(2) For the service year of administrators and teachers who are attended to research: between 1-5 years, 22%; between 5-10 years, 16%; between 10-15 years, 25%; 15-20 years, 11%; and more than 20 years, 26%;

(3) Ages of teachers attending the research: between 20-30 years, 26%; between 30-40 years, 28%; between 40-50 years, 20%; more than 50 years, 26%;

(4) Classification according to their field: 20% administrators and 80% social studies teachers.

### **Ideas of Administrators and Teachers on OLI**

According to Table 1, arithmetic mean of all factors is  $\bar{x} = 2.94$ , and standard deviation is  $sd = 0.46$ . Means according to classification of administrators and teachers in administrators is  $\bar{x} = 3.42$ , and in social

studies teacher is  $\bar{x} = 2.82$ ,  $sd = 0.44$ . According to developed OLI scale, it can be said that administrators' views are more positive than social studies teachers'.

Table 1  
Views of Administrators and Social Studies Teachers About OLI

Branches		Administrators		Social studies teacher		Administrators and social studies teachers t-test	
	Items	sd	$\bar{X}$	sd	$\bar{X}$	t	p
a. Continual learning	1 Organizational members discuss their mistakes clearly in order to take lesson.	0.68	3.55	1.22	3.22	1.142	0.256
	2 Organization members can define whom they need in the future according to their competences.	0.44	2.90	0.99	2.82	0.329	0.743
	3 Members share what they have learned with each other.	1.06	3.25	0.99	3.52	-1.091	0.278
	4 Organization members are supported in all ways and awarded.	0.44	3.75	1.08	2.31	5.781	0.000**
	5 Enough time is given to organization members to learn.	0.48	3.85	0.86	3.21	3.157	0.002**
b. Dialogue and research	6 Organizational members give feedback to each other clearly and frankly.	0.44	4.25	1.08	3.23	4.087	0.000**
	7 Organization members ask each others ideas and listen respectfully before they start speaking.	0.39	3.95	1.01	3.43	2.206	0.030*
	8 Organization members can ask clearly the question "why".	0.68	3.40	0.95	3.28	0.494	0.622
	9 Organization members are respectful to each other.	1.16	3.25	0.98	3.51	-1.031	0.305
	10 Organization members spend time to create trust environment.	1.21	2.30	0.91	2.62	-1.321	0.190
c. Group learning	11 Administrators have freedom for ordering their own departments according to needs and objectives.	1.19	3.95	0.87	2.75	5.067	0.000**
	12 Administrators trust equally all the members without considering their ranks.	0.59	3.60	0.88	3.23	1.724	0.088
	13 Administrators are focused on both their responsibility and how group works.	0.83	4.20	0.77	2.43	8.944	0.000**
	14 Administrators check their views according to information or group discussions.	1.14	2.95	1.07	2.32	2.293	0.024*
	15 All group members are sure that their proposals will be noticed by administrators.	0.78	3.10	0.85	2.56	2.553	0.012*
d. Shared systems	16 My institution supplies a communication environment with proposal systems or various meetings.	0.96	2.90	0.84	2.80	0.458	0.648
	17 My institution gives needed information easily and fast and I make use of advanced technology while communicating with others.	0.60	3.05	0.82	2.67	1.909	0.059
	18 My institution has scales to measure differences between current and expected performances of employees.	0.44	3.90	0.94	2.70	5.502	0.000**
	19 My institution let all employees to learn what is taken as lesson from problems.	0.92	3.70	0.96	3.25	1.887	0.062
	20 My institution evaluates spend and sources used for learning.	1.39	2.80	0.87	2.93	-0.550	0.583
e. Strengthened employees	21 My institution approves "workers" initiative.	2.78	2.95	1.23	2.31	1.542	0.126
	22 Institution presents options while giving responsibilities.	1.03	2.15	0.97	2.36	-0.863	0.390
	23 Institution let employees to have control over sources they need while doing their responsibilities.	0.47	2.30	0.87	3.03	-3.620	0.000**
	24 My institution supports employees who take plausible risks.	1.53	3.65	1.09	2.12	-0.098	0.922
	25 My institution makes an order between different departments visions according to need.	0.64	2.00	0.742	2.92	-5.102	0.000**
f. Connection between systems	26 My institution encourages employees to think from a larger perspective.	0.94	3.50	0.92	3.17	1.400	0.165
	27 My institution encourages all employees to bring inferiors to decision point.	0.81	3.35	1.21	2.40	3.303	0.001**
	28 My institution takes into consideration employees morale when taking decisions.	1.22	2.65	0.99	2.08	2.154	0.034*
	29 Organization works with different organizations to answer their mutual needs.	0.75	3.45	0.98	3.20	1.057	0.293
	30 Institution encourages employees to get support and answer from organization while solving a problem.	0.87	3.35	1.01	2.62	2.941	0.004**
g. Supportive leadership and shared vision	31 Leaders usually support claims for learning and learning opportunities.	1.03	3.35	0.870	3.45	-0.442	0.660
	32 Leaders share information about organizations' objectives and future plans.	0.55	3.75	0.90	3.40	1.645	0.103
	33 Leaders endeavor to train their inferiors.	0.44	4.10	1.01	2.90	5.154	0.000**
	34 Leaders constantly seek opportunities for learning.	0.64	4.00	1.08	2.30	6.705	0.000**
	35 Leaders enable organizations' functions and values to be in harmony with each other.	0.60	3.95	1.12	3.10	3.267	0.001**
	36 By creating synergy tries to encourage to contribute to institutions vision.	0.41	3.80	0.91	2.36	6.819	0.000**
	37 While preparing plans for the future of our institution our ideas are taken.	0.71	4.25	0.98	2.22	8.662	0.000**
	38 Objectives of our institution are clear and true.	0.75	3.55	0.82	3.45	0.492	0.624
	39 Institutions' and employees' objectives are in harmony and this encourages employees.	0.51	4.50	0.81	2.77	9.051	0.000**
	40 Members of institution believe institutions' objectives and want to work here for long years.	0.47	3.70	1.22	2.00	6.090	0.000**

Notes. \* p < 0.05, \*\* p < 0.01.

Organization members are supported in all ways and awarded, ( $t_{(98)} = 5.781$ ,  $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ); organization member are given enough time for learning, ( $t_{(98)} = 3.157$ ,  $p_{(0.002)} < 0.01$ ); organizational members give feedback to each other clearly and frankly, ( $t_{(98)} = 4.087$ ,  $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ); administrators have freedom of designing their own parts along with pre-determined objections and needs, ( $t_{(98)} = 5.067$ ,  $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ); administrators are focused on both their responsibility and how group works, ( $t_{(98)} = 8.944$ ,  $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ). The authors' institution has scales to measure differences between current and expected performances of employees. ( $t_{(98)} = 5.502$ ,  $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ), institution let employees to have control over sources they need while doing their responsibilities; ( $t_{(98)} = -3.620$ ,  $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ), "institution makes an order between different departments visions according to need"; ( $t_{(98)} = -5.102$ ,  $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ), my institution encourages all employees to bring inferiors to decision point; ( $t_{(98)} = 3.303$ ,  $p_{(0.001)} < 0.01$ ), leaders endeavor to train their inferiors; ( $t_{(98)} = 5.154$ ,  $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ), leaders constantly seek opportunities for learning; ( $t_{(98)} = 6.705$ ,  $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ), leaders enable organizations' functions and values to be in harmony with each other; ( $t_{(98)} = 3.267$ ,  $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ), by creating synergy tries to encourage to contribute to institutions' vision; ( $t_{(98)} = 6.819$ ,  $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ), while preparing plans for the future of our institution our ideas are taken; ( $t_{(98)} = 8.662$ ,  $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ), institutions' and employees' objectives are in harmony and this encourages employees; ( $t_{(98)} = 9.051$ ,  $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ), members of institution believe institutions' objectives and want to work here for long years; ( $t_{(98)} = 6.090$ ,  $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ), members ask each others ideas and listen respectfully before they start speaking; ( $t_{(98)} = 2.206$ ,  $p_{(0.030)} < 0.05$ ), administrators checks their views according to information or group discussions; ( $t_{(98)} = 2.293$ ,  $p_{(0.024)} < 0.05$ ), all group members are sure that their proposals will be noticed by administrators; ( $t_{(98)} = 2.553$ ,  $p_{(0.012)} < 0.05$ ), administrators take into consideration employees morale while taking decisions; ( $t_{(98)} = 2.154$ ,  $p_{(0.034)} < 0.05$ ), shows such a meaningful difference.

**When it is evaluated according to dimensions.** (1) In continual learning dimension: While item 2 is seen as an impediment by both group (2.90-2.82), item 4 is seen as an impediment by teachers (2.31); (2) In dialogue and research dimension: Item 10 is seen by two groups; (3) In group learning dimension: Items 11, 13 and 15 are seen just by teachers, and item 14 is seen by both groups; (4) In shared systems dimension: Items 16 and 20 are seen by both groups, and items 17 and 18 are seen only by teachers; (5) In strengthened employees dimension: Items 21, 22 and 25 are seen by both groups, item 23 is seen by administrators, and item 24 is seen by teachers; (6) In dimension of connection between systems: Items 27 and 30 are seen just by teachers, and item 28 is seen by two groups; and (7) In dimension of supportive leadership and shared vision: Items 33, 34, 37, 39 and 40 are seen as impediment by teachers.

**The lowest degrees in administrators.** In item 22, institutions present options while giving responsibilities; In item 25, institutions make an order between different department visions according to need; In item 10, organization members spend time to create trust environment; In item 23, institutions let employees to have control over sources they need while doing their responsibilities.

**The highest degrees.** In item 39, institutions' and employees' objectives are in harmony and this encourages employees (item 13); Administrators are focused on both their responsibility and how group works (item 37); While preparing plans for the future of our institution, our ideas are taken, and organizational members give feedback to each other clearly and frankly (item 6).

Table 2

*OLI T-Test and School Administrators', Social Studies Teachers' Views Results*

	N	$\bar{x}$	SS	sd	t	p
Administrator	20	3.42	0.194	98	5.88	0.000**
Teacher	80	2.82	0.44			

Note. \*\* p < 0.01.

According to Table 2, when we take into consideration administrator and teacher variant, it is observed that administrators ( $\bar{x} = 3.42$ ) show more positive views than teachers ( $\bar{x} = 2.82$ ). This finding can be interpreted as a meaningful relationship between OLI views and administrator-teacher situation.

When t-value is examined, teachers' OLI views show a statically meaningful difference according to administrator and teacher situation ( $p_{(0.000)} < 0.01$ ). This finding can be interpreted as a meaningful relationship between OLI views and administrators, social studies teacher situation.

Table 3

*OLI T-Test and School Administrators', Social Studies Teachers' Genders Results*

Gender	N	$\bar{x}$	SS	sd	t	p
Female	34	3.06	0.40	98	1.77	0.079*
Male	66	2.88	0.49			

Note. \* p > 0.05.

According to Table 3, when we consider gender variant, female samples ( $\bar{x} = 3.06$ ) show more positive views than males ( $\bar{x} = 2.88$ ). When t-values are examined between samples gender, it is observed that social studies teachers' OLI views do not show a meaningful difference according to genders ( $t_{(98)} = 1.77$ ,  $p_{(0.079)} > 0.05$ ). This finding can be interpreted as there is a meaningless relationship between OLI views and genders.

In this research, it is observed whether administrators and social studies teachers have freedom of ordering institutions function in line with determined objectives and needs. They focus on team work, take into consideration other members' proposals warnings and views and whether they can supple mutual communication or not. Even it is determined whether individuals within organization are informed with needed knowledge by making use of technological tools or not. The results of Titrek's study also support our findings (Titrek, 2009).

While preparing future plans, organization members' views and preparation in line with these views are seen enough.

In our study, it is found out that leaders think that they try hard enough to train their inferiors, and teachers think reverse. Arslan's study also supports change of administrators. New teachers are being helped in all matters. But this positive appearance does not give new teachers enough training for better services (Arslan, 2009). This view is common with our findings.

In fast, changing information are all education members who should innovate themselves to catch up the changes. For this reason, there should be separated enough time for new teachers and awarding factors should be noticed to share what has been learned and to increase it. It is important for organization to update innovation and reconstruct itself according to age needs. In our study, it is proved that members are not supported enough in motivation and award. In Aydemir's (2002) study, educational institutions state that they

should innovate themselves but it is proved that this cannot be realized enough. These studies have things in common with our data.

School administrators are observed not to supply members with enough control over sources they need to take initiative and to use source and time. In a study taken by Gündoğan, it was emphasized that enabling developing positive attitudes for learning was a facilitating factor (Gündoğan, 2003).

It is observed that organization leaders do not create enough opportunities for other members' learning, they do not pay attention to harmony of members expectation and organization's future objectives, nor affect organization members expectations negatively. In a study by Kantos, Çuhadaroğlu, and Taşdan (2009), it was stated that while administrators give a decision, they did not ask teachers' views. It is interpreted as this is the current view in schools and they behave as administrators more than leaders. And in a study by Cemaloğlu (2007), it was stated that school administrators affected organizational health negatively. This study shows that in composing of organizations, healthy leadership features are important and administrators who perform transformational leadership features affect organizations' health positively, teachers can communicate with each other positively and develop themselves in occupational respects, organization shows more organizational features, teachers are protected against outer presses, and teachers show a feeling of more belonging to school and increase their morale. Moreover, according to a research by Töremen (2010), it was found out that administrators should endeavor to create a synergy in line with organization members and objectives, but they did not try hard for this. This view also supports our findings.

### Conclusion

Administrators expressed more positive views than teachers. So these results are induced in direction of pre-determined dimensions:

**In continual learning dimension.** Item "organization members can define people they will need in works and they will do in the future" is perceived negatively in both groups, and item "organization members are supported in all ways and awarded" is perceived negatively only by teachers.

**In dialogue and research dimension.** Item "organization members spend time for enabling mutual trust environment" is perceived negatively by two groups.

**In group learning dimension.** Items "administrators have freedom of designing their own parts" along with pre-determined objections and needs, "administrators are focused on both their responsibility and how group works", "all group members are sure that their proposals will be noticed by administrators" are only perceived by teachers, and item "administrators checks their views according to information or group discussions" is perceived negatively by both groups.

**In shared systems dimension.** "My institution supplies a communication environment with proposal systems or various meetings", "My institution evaluates spend and sources used for learning" items by both groups and "My institution gives needed information easily and fast and I make use of advanced technology while communicating with others" items are just perceived negatively by the teachers.

**In strengthened employees dimension.** Items "My institution approves workers' initiative", "My institution presents options while giving responsibilities", "Institution makes an order between different departments' visions according to need" are perceived by both groups, item "My institution let employees to have control over sources they need while doing their responsibilities" is only perceived by administrators, and item "My institution supports employees who takes plausible risks" is perceived negatively only by the teachers.

**In dimension of connection between systems.** Items “My institution encourages everyone to bring inferiors’ ideas to decision points” and “My institution encourages employees to have supports and answers from the group while solving a problem” are only perceived by teachers, and “My institution cares for employees” is perceived negatively by both groups.

**In dimension of supportive leadership and shared vision.** Items “Leaders endeavor to train their inferiors”, “Leaders always search for chances to continuous learn while preparing plans for the future of our institution our ideas are taken”, “Institutions, employees and objectives are in harmony and this encourages employees”, “Members of institution believe institution’s objectives and want to work here for long years” are perceived negatively only by teachers.

According to the answers by administrators and teachers positive and negative degrees are as follows:

**The lowest degrees in administrators.** (1) Institutions present options while giving responsibilities; (2) Institutions make an order according to need between different visions; (3) Organization members spend time to supply a mutual trust environment; and (4) Institution let employees to have control over sources they need while doing their responsibilities.

**The highest degrees in administrators.** (1) Institutions’ and employees’ objectives are in harmony and this encourages employees; (2) Administrators are focused on both their responsibility and how group works; (3) They ask ideas for and give attention to their ideas while preparing future plans; and (4) Organizational members give feedback to each other clearly and frankly.

**The lowest degrees in teachers.** (1) Members of institution believe institutions’ objectives and want to work here for long years; (2) They take into consideration employees’ morale while taking decisions; (3) They support risk of taking employees; (4) Organization members are supported in all ways and awarded; (5) Administrators check their views according to information or group discussions; (6) Institution approves workers initiative; and (7) To ask ideas and give attention to their ideas while preparing future plans.

**The highest degrees in teachers.** (1) To share what they have learned with each other; (2) To be respectful to each other; (3) Leaders support for learning opportunities and claims; (4) Leaders share plans about future and information about objectives; and (5) To identify organizations objectives clarity and truth.

### Suggestions

The suggestions are as follows:

- (1) To make willing to learn by administrators and social studies teachers;
- (2) To ask teachers ideas while giving decisions about organization;
- (3) To identify needed time and conditions for teachers learning and support in this respect;
- (4) To know teachers well and to share responsibilities according to their capabilities and performances;
- (5) To give teachers opportunity to use their initiatives;
- (6) To form organizational culture positively and to take needed measures to keep employees’ morale and motives high;
- (7) To give chances to administrators and teachers to attend courses and to innovate themselves.

### References

- Akbaşı, S., & Kavak, Y. (2010). *The realization level of highschool family units’ duties*. [PDF document]. Retrieved February 3, 2010, from [http://www.sosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr/sos\\_mak/makaleler/.../AKBAŞLI,%20SAİT.pdf](http://www.sosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr/sos_mak/makaleler/.../AKBAŞLI,%20SAİT.pdf)
- Altun, A. S. (2001). *Organizational health*. Nobel Yayın Dağ., Ankara.

- Arslan, M. M. (2009). Technical and industry vocational high school teachers' organizational trust perceptions. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 5(2), 274-288.
- Aslanargun, E. (2010). The review of literature on school-parent cooperation and students' school success. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (18). [PDF document]. Retrieved February 3, 2010, from [http://www.manas.kg/pdf/sbdpdf18/09\\_Aslanargun.pdf](http://www.manas.kg/pdf/sbdpdf18/09_Aslanargun.pdf)
- Aydemir, M. (2000). Organizational learning and total quality management. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2(3). Retrieved February 3, 2010, from <http://www.sbe.deu.edu.tr/adergi/dergi06/aydemir.html>
- Bakan, İ., & Büyükbeşe, T. (2004). The relationship between organizational communication and the aspects of job satisfaction: A field study for academic organizations. *Akdeniz İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, (7), 1-30.
- Basım, N., Şeşen, H., & Meydan, C. H. (2010). *The effect of learning organization perception on intrapreneurship: A study in the public sector*. [PDF document]. Retrieved February 3, 2010, from <http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/42/1998/12141.pdf>
- Buluç, B. (2008). The relationship between organizational health and organizational citizenship behaviors at secondary schools. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, Güz*, 6(4), 571-602.
- Çalık, T. (2010). *Educational institutions as learning organizations*. [PDF document]. Retrieved February 3, 2010, from <http://yordam.manas.kg/ekitap/pdf/Manasdergi/sbd/sbd8/sbd-8-09.pdf>
- Celep, C. (2004). Assessment Turkey university as learning organization. *XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı* (pp. 6-9). Temmuz, İnönü University Education Faculty, Malatya. [PDF document]. Retrieved February 3, 2010, from <http://www.pegema.net/dosya/dokuman/5868329.pdf>
- Çelikten, M. (2003). Principal's role in shaping school culture. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, Güz*, 1(4), 453-462.
- Cemaloğlu, N. (2007). The effect of school administrators' leadership styles on organizational health. *TSA, Yıl*, 11(2), 166-194.
- Demirtaş, H. (2005). Team perception of school employees' (An example of Malatya). *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 6(1), 39-59.
- Demirtaş, H., Üstüner, M., Özer, N., & Cömert, M. (2008). Efficacy of the teachers committee meetings based on teachers' views. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(15), 55-74.
- Duman, A. (2003). Critical analyses of some selected concepts in the fields of educational studies. *Muğla Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Bahar*, (10), 1-10.
- Erdem, F., & İşbaşı, J. Ö. (2001). Organizational culture in educational institutions and the perceptions of student subculture. *Akdeniz İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, (1), 33-57.
- Eren, A., Özen, R., & Karabacak, K. (2007). In-service education through constructivist viewpoint: Need, career, learning and motivation dimensions. *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Dergisi*, 24(2), 29-48.
- Gizir, S. (2008). Organizational culture and organizational learning in the process of organizational change. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(2), 182-196.
- Gökçe, F. (1994). Purpose and principles of governance in education. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (10), 73-78.
- Güçlü, N., & Türkoğlu, H. (2003). The perception level as regards learning organizations of the principals and teachers working in primary schools. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1(2), 137-161.
- Güçlü, N. (2010). *Organizational culture*. [PDF document]. Retrieved March 10, 2010, from <http://yordam.manas.kg/ekitap/pdf/Manasdergi/sbd/sbd6/sbd-6-11.pdf>
- Gündoğan, N. (2003). Life-long-learning as a tool for employment policy in EU countries and some sample programs and practices. *Kamu İş*, 7(2), 1-15.
- Izgar, H. (2008). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of school directors. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (25), 317-334.
- İbicioğlu, H., & Avcı, U. (2005). Shared vision in organizational learning and the importance of paradigmatic accordance. *Muğla Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi, Bahar*, (14), 157-166.
- Kale, M. (2010). *The comparison of public and private science lycees in terms of organizational learning*. [PDF document]. Retrieved February 3, 2010, from [http://www.tebd.gazi.edu.tr/arsiv/2004\\_cilt2/sayi\\_2/159-177.pdf](http://www.tebd.gazi.edu.tr/arsiv/2004_cilt2/sayi_2/159-177.pdf)
- Kalkan, V. D. (2006). Organizational learning and knowledge management: Points of intersection and disintegration. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Bahar*, 5(16), 22-36.
- Kantos, Z. E., Çuhadaroğlu, E. O., & Taşdan, M. (2009). The opinions of primary school teacher's related to management styles of primary school managers (A qualitative research). *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 17(2), 393-402.
- Kartal, S. (2006). The role of basic and preparatory education in the organizational socialization of clerk candidates. *Burdur Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (11), 131-143.
- Kartal, S. (2008). The primary school administrators' contributions to the organizational socialization of the educational staff and two example cases. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(15), 75-88.

- Koç, U. (2009). Organizational learning: Its definition, the conceptual distinctions with the nearby terms and the behavioral approach. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, XI(I), 51-165.
- Küçüköğlü, A. (2005). *Organizational learning and learning impediments*. [PDF document]. Retrieved February 3, 2010, from <http://Yayim.Meb.Gov.Tr/Dergiler/166/Index3-Kucukoglu.htm>
- Küçük, M., Ayvaci, H. Ş., & Altıntaş, A. (2004). The effects of decision which were taken by the Committee of Teachers' Group (CTG) on learning and teaching practices in schools. *XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı* (pp. 6-9). Temmuz, İnönü Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Malatya.
- Learning organizations personal practices profile*. (2010). [PDF document]. Retrieved February 3, 2010, from <http://aled.tamu.edu/342/IN%20CLASS%20- Personal %20Profile.pdf>
- Memduhoğlu, H. B. (2008). Organizational socialization and the process of organizational socialization in the Turkish educational system. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, V(II), 137-153.
- Murat, G., & Açıkgöz, B. (2007). An analysis of the managers' perceptions about organizational culture: The case of Zonguldak Karaelmas University. *ZKÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(5), 1-20.
- Öneren, M. (2008). Learning organization approach in business enterprises. *ZKÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(7), 163-178.
- Özdemir, A. (2002). The various aspects of a healthy school climate and student success. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, Mart, 10(1), 39-46.
- Sabuncuoğlu, Z., & Tüz, M. (2001). *Organizational psychology*. Bursa, Ezgi Kitabevi.
- Sayırlı, A. (2003). The role of senior management in forming a learning organization. *Mevzuat Dergisi*, Yıl, 6(69). Retrieved February 3, 2010, from <http://www.mevzuatdergisi.com/2003/09a/05.htm>
- Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 109-119.
- Schein, E. H. (2002). Organizational culture. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (Çev: Atilla Akbaba), 4(39), 1-32.
- Sezgin, F. (2005). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A conceptual analysis and some inferences for the schools. *G.Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(1), 317-339.
- Şimşek, Y., & Yıldırım, M. C. (2004). The cultural structure of learning schools. *XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı* (pp. 6-9). Temmuz, İnönü Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Malatya 1-11.
- Titrek, O. (2009). The level of organizational justice in schools according to school types. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2), 551-573.
- Töremen, F. (2002). The obstacles and seasons of the change in educational organizations. *Firat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Elazığ, 12(1), 185-202.
- Töremen, F., & Karakuş, M. (2008). Endeavor of making affairs easy in schools: Facilitative leadership in school management. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(25), 1-11.
- Töremen, F. (2010). Une espede de creativite dans l'administration de l'ecole: Synergie. *Firat Üniversitesi Sos. Bil. Enst. Dergisi*, 11(1), 201-212. Retrieved February 3, 2010, from [http://web.firat.edu.tr/sosyalbil/dergi/arsiv/cilt11\\_sayil1.htm](http://web.firat.edu.tr/sosyalbil/dergi/arsiv/cilt11_sayil1.htm)
- Yılmaz, E. (2010). *Warranty and validity research of organizational trust scale in schools*. [PDF document]. Retrieved February 3, 2010, from [http://www.sosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr/sos\\_mak/articles/2005/14/EYILMAZ.PDF](http://www.sosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr/sos_mak/articles/2005/14/EYILMAZ.PDF)
- Yücel, H., & Toprakçı, E. (2010). *Educational inspection as the ignored dimension of teacher inspection*. [PDF document]. Retrieved February 3, 2010, from <http://public.cumhuriyet.edu.tr/etoprakci/turkishweb/webpup/temsen1web.pdf>